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Each doctrine has its own philosophy and technique to attain the highest truth. All philosophies aim at the same goal - realisation of the Absolute. A seeker is concerned with the attainment of the truth. He may follow any technique but the important thing is that he reaches the state of equality where he sees and experiences the Oneness of everything in the world. I hope the way shown in *Krama Tantricism of Kashmir* will help seekers to realise that goal.

SWAMI MUKTANANDA
PREFACE

Perhaps the author owes an apology for publishing a work on the Krama system which has not been, unfortunately, noticed by any traditional author of the available compendia like the Sarva-darsana-samgraha etc. It is rather equally curious to see the modern studies on the Indian philosophy in general and Tantricism in particular turn totally apathetic to such a system of philosophy barring a few honourable exceptions. The latter include the second edition of Dr. K.C. Pandey's study on Abhinavagupta incorporating a chapter on the Krama system and discussing the same in broad outlines. In addition, one has one or two paragraphs from M.M. Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj on the same briefly dwelling upon some or its major aspects. (Vide his Preface to the Second edition, Tripura Rahasya, Jnana Khanda, p. iii., Tantrika Vanmaya me Sakta Drsti, Prastavana, p. 4.)

It augurs well that the studies on the Kashmir Saivism as well as on Tantricism have come to gain - slightly greater momentum since Woodroffe first undertook to enter the forbidden land. Yet it is unfortunate that dearth of analytical thinking coupled with detailed exploratory investigations into specific fields remains a constant handicap of a modern student. The net result is that a great deal of the Saiva, Sakta and Tantric wisdom is now lost to us and many of their important theses now look completely strange. M.M. Dr. G.N. Kaviraj in his recently published work Tantrika Vanmaya me Sakta Drsti, (Prastavana, p. 4) gives an eloquent expression to it: “क्रमव, पदुकालव, भासवलव प्रमुख का विवेचन, साधन तथा द्वानवाश्च के क्षेत्र से एक प्रकार से निर्मित हो पुरा है। कोष तथा कलन का रहस्य भी इसी प्रकार प्रकटित रहे गये हैं।” In this context due stress may be laid on the fact that the concepts of Krama, Paduka, Bhasa and Kalana exclusively belong to the Krama system.
While writing a dissertation on the Stotras of Abhinavagupta for his M.A. examination the author was particularly attracted by the *Kramastotra* of Abhinava. This marks the first point of his interest in the system. The paucity of material for the study of the *Stotra* and the difficulty in interpreting the same inspired the author to undertake a comprehensive study of the same for his doctoral dissertation. The interest and fear both grew with each passing day when the author was able to grasp the enormity of the task taken up by him. Now this study is submitted for what it is worth to the discerning judgement of the reader.

The Krama system has triple significance. First, it is a Tantric system. Second, it is a monistic Saiva system. Third, it marks the emergence of the Sakta tendency in the Saiva philosophy. It has, therefore, developed into a synthetic and complex whole in which the Saiva philosophy, the Sakta esotericism and the Tantric synoptic view of life are inter-knitted together. It has been a difficult test for the author to appreciate their distinct implications and yet retain their synthesis. The Krama system is therefore not only a system of pure philosophy revelling in epistemic and ontological issues but also an esoteric discipline of spirituality constituting an important ingredient of wider Tantric culture. The reader is earnestly urged to bear this aspect in mind while going through the pages of this work.

The complex character of the Krama system has considerably influenced and defined the basic plan of this work. It has been divided into two parts, the first giving out a general and historical survey and the second the analytical exposition of the Krama philosophy. The second part does not deal with the ontology, epistemology, mysticism and esotericism of the Krama system under separate sections, because such a water-tight division was neither possible nor worth-while in the very nature of the Krama system. The chapters, therefore, follow the traditional scheme of the Nine Prameyas (i.e., objects of discussion) and Cakras (forms of cyclic consciousness). Because by adopting this method alone justice could be done to the complex character of the Krama system. Special care has
been taken to highlight the real philosophical and epistemic nature of apparently esoteric issues in the relevant contexts.

Owing to an earnest desire to make the work as thorough and authentic as possible the author has added five indices (together with a Corrigendum incorporating major corrections) to the Volume One including a classified Bibliography which because of its comprehensive and up-to-date coverage may be found of special interest. The other index titled "Chronological tree of the Krama authors" offers a brief tabular account of the historical evolution of the system through the ages.

The Volume Two carries with it an appendix incorporating a few of the unpublished small but important texts having direct bearing on the system. In this volume the author has further appended tables or tabular charts wherever necessary in order to afford a synoptic peep into the complex and varied contents covered in a particular chapter. It is, however, imperative to keep in mind that the two volumes together form an integral whole and need be perused as such.

The capacity of the author has several limitations. First of all, the lack of tradition is to be extremely regretted because the precise tantric spirit has lain under the cloud of mystic jargon. Second, the system has failed to catch the notice of the modern student of Kashmir Saivism and Tantricism. Third, all the printed texts are either incomplete or require critical editing. Fourth, the bulk of the extant Krama literature is still in manuscript form. Most of it is inaccessible today. Luckily, despite great hardships, the author could lay his hand on certain unnoticed manuscripts but for which many aspects of the system would have remained a question mark. And even these manuscripts are mostly in Sarada characters. Of the lost texts, the loss of the Krama-keli of Abhinavagupta is a very serious loss to the system.

In the above circumstances and in the absence of any previous groundwork as well as for the reasons of space, it was not possible for the author to take up a thoroughly critical study of the Krama system. The author has confined himself to making an analytical investigation into and exposition of the system. He has adopted a critico-comparative method, wherever
it was feasible, in the specific frame-work of the Tantric discipline. This work is intended basically to serve as a groundwork for the future studies of the Krama system and allied Saiva Tantricism of Kashmir.

In works of such a type as this it is practically impossible to do away with obscurity of expression, more so on account of the occult language and esoteric phraseology in which the system is couched, apart from the author's own limitations. The indulgence of the reader is craved for any inconvenience he is put to in this behalf.

It is difficult to lay claim to absolute originality in regard to an indological study like this, but it will be worth-while to draw attention of the reader to the new ground covered by the author.

In the first place, the author has ventured to touch upon an almost neglected area of Kashmir Saivism in general and Tantricism in particular.

In the second place, the author has utilized the opportunity to go through all published texts on the Kashmir Saivism as well as the Krama system. He has also tried to utilize a large number of important manuscripts on the system which would be testified to by the bibliography appended to this work as well as the profuse excerpts from them given throughout the work. The author has also sought to lay his hands upon all relevant historical as well as literary texts. Moreover, the author has also taken due cognizance of relevant literature in original, belonging to other Tantric cults, specially Tripura, having anything in common with the Kashmir Saivism and the Krama system. It may, however, also be pointed out that the author has done his best to go through all the available secondary literature, whether published or unpublished, known and accessible to him on the Kashmir Saivism and other cognate Tantric schools.

In the third place, the author has essayed the task of reconstructing the history of the Krama system - not considering the chronology of the authors or works only, but tracing out the historical and logical growth of the Krama notions as well - in the larger context of the history of the Kashmir Saivism. Besides, virtually discovering quite a few of the Krama authors
such as Gandhamadana, Siddhanatha, Cakrapani, Devabhatta, Ramyadeva, Losthadeva, Srivatsa, Somaputra, Ananta Saktipada and Bhattaraka, the Krama associations of the known Spanda and Trika authors have also been brought out. These include the famous Vasugupta, Kallata, Pradyumna Bhatta, Ksemaraja, Varadaraja, Jayaratha, Sivapadhyaya and a host of others. Some already established dates and genealogical relationships have been re-examined in the light of fresh material and additional collateral evidence. In this connection the dates of Sivananda - the first preceptor, Varadaraja, Hrasvanatha, Bhojaraja, Cakrabhanu, Mahesvarananda deserve particular mention. Similarly on the basis of a new interpretation of the terms Atmaja and Santati parental ties between Somananda and Utpala and those between Utpala and Laksmmanagupta have been rejected and preceptorial relationships re-affirmed instead. These modifications will go a long way in determining the final course of the history of Kashmir Saivism yet to be reconstructed fully by future scholars.

In the fourth place, the author has tried to reconstruct the precise Krama metaphysics, its answer to various philosophical problems and the basic values that have permeated the length and width of its spiritual approach. The author has also attempted to determine the place of Krama in the compact whole of Kashmir Saivism and evaluate its positive contribution. It has also been pointed out how the Krama developed along two basically different lines under the impact of Northern and Southern schools, if such a loose expression be permitted to be used, and how they conditioned the entire growth of the Krama philosophy.

In the fifth place, the work refers to many texts including manuscripts for the first time and makes extensive use of a number of them. The two Mahanaya Prakasas, one of unknown authorship (attributed to Sivananda II by us) and the other of Sitikantha, the Bhavopahara of Cakrapani and its gloss by Ramyadeva, and the Krama-stotra of Abninava are among the primed texts that have been studied for the first time. In addition to numerous manuscripts, the MSS of the Chummasampradaya, Kaulasutra, Jnana-kriya-dvaya-sataka, Saivastakakosa have been
author is beholden to Dr. R.C. Dwivedi (now Professor and Head of the Sanskrit Department, Jaipur University), who initiated the author into Saivite studies, for his constructive interest in the academic advancement of the author. The author is earnestly thankful to Drs. J.P. Sinha and A.K. Kalia, both of the Sanskrit Department, Lucknow University, in whom he found his benefactors. The author acknowledges with gratitude the interest taken by ThakurJaidev Singh, a well known name in the field of Kashmir Saivism, in the publication of this work. He is also deeply appreciative of Prof. Vidya Niwas Misra, Director K.M. Munshi Institute of Hindi & Linguistics, Agra for his continued encouragement to the author. The author would record his profound appreciation of his esteemed friend Dr. Harsh Narain, Department of Indian Philosophy and Religion, B.H.U. for his valued assistance in many forms. The author's gratitude to him is a matter of feeling and not of expression.
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CHAPTER I
KRAMA AS A DISTINCT SYSTEM

A brief analysis of the features that lend an independent status to Krama as a system of thought.

1. Krama: A system of Saiva philosophy in its own right

While sharing much in common with the Pratyabhijna and Kula systems of Kashmir Saiva monism, the Krama system has much of its own to justify its recognition as an independent system of philosophy. The phrase Kashmir Saivism generally stands for the Pratyabhijna system, whereas in fact it has a much wider application comprising as it does all the monistic trends of Saivite speculation having their home in Kashmir. In spite of the fact that all these systems have common fundamental data since they spring from the same source of Saiva philosophy, they retain their intrinsic individual genius and appeal. In consequence, when a system is presented in its own merit, the idea is not to decry its integral character under a wider perspective, but to emphasize and analyse its real worth and significance. It is in this sense that the Krama system, despite its close affinities with the sister trends of thought, claims recognition as a system of philosophy.

2. Traditional recognition of its independence

Historically as well, Krama has been regarded as an independent system. Mankha in his Srikanthacarita mentions Mahanaya, another name of Krama, as a distinct philosophical school where the act of creation follows that of withdrawal.

I. प्राचीनदीर्घ विचारवचनः स्वरूपं पश्चात्तुप्रत्येकाः स विवेयासीतम्।
योऽवसंहितविवेयासमस्तेष्ठं पतं महानन्दैः प्रथमः स्मरस्य॥

S. K. C. 5.40

Jonarāja observes—
यसो महानन्दैव द्वितीयफोर्मः। तस्यन्तरं द्वि संहायनमस्ते सुविक्॥

Comm. on S. K. C., p. 89.
implying that the Krama system ardently adheres to the cyclic notion of Reality. This allusion to Krama in a literary work of the eleventh century is a sufficient proof of the popularity of the Krama school, even beyond the philosophical circles, in Kashmir. Abhinavagupta recalls the same fact in unmistakable terms in the *Malinivijayavartika*. In the *Tantraloka* also this very fact has been reiterated. In his *Viveka* on the *Tantraloka* Jayaratha talks of the Krama system to be an independent one. The treatment of the Krama system in the fourth Ahnika has been prefaced by him with a similar remark. It is significant to note that in the last autobiographical verse, marking the conclusion of his *Viveka*, he declares 'Trika' and 'Krama' as two different systems. The author of the *Mahanaya-Prakasa* clearly stresses its individuality and independent status among the varied schools of philosophy.

1. अतिमाणःक्रमकुलतिक्रमसेतुवतादिति
   *M. V. V.* 1. 192.

2. अभ्योतित्वनबिकर्ष्यं क्रमकुलकर्मयोगिन्निवधिति
   *T. A.* 30.1.

Also see,

मष्ठसांवित्तताकृतिष्ठितसृजक्षमाति
   *T. A.* 1. 106.

Jayaratha remarks—

अभ्योतित्वनाशुद्धं
   *T. A. V.* 1, p. 150

Also cf.

तद्देव क्रमसमानक्षत्रविवाहात्

Also cf.


4. तद्व चेतानि निक्षेप दर्शयन् क्रमसंसारितामस्य दर्शवत्व अविद्यति

5. ...तिक्तविविष क्रमायं...

6. जसे सार्चनपिण्यां प्रस्या कायि या रिष्यता
   *M. P. (T).* 7.130.

7. कुलसार्चनाकामाधराकृतिष्ठितादिविव...धार्मिको हि महायवः

महानयमहोणांवेदादातिय्यादिः
not forget to record his appreciation of the Pratyabhijna and the Krama as two separate systems\(^1\) even when he means to pinpoint their common characters.\(^2\)

3. *External evidence establishing its individuality*

Apart from the unanimous verdict of the Krama authors, there is external evidence also which establishes its independent status. It differs from other systems in point of its origin, its history, and its literature. Just as the Pratyabhijna has its first preceptor in Somananda, the Trika in Vasugupta, and the Kula in Macchanda, the Krama \[has the same in Sivananda.\] The Krama system is further distinguished by the place of its origin. Its very conception took place in Kashmir, while all others somehow or the other, with the exception of the Spanda system, were imported into Kashmir by their preceptors or descendants and followers thereof.

4. *Main Features*

We, however, have to distinguish between what others say of it and what the system says of itself. A brief account and comparative analysis of its salient features are attempted here to substantiate its unique character.

(a) *Krama as a Sakti-oriented and Tantric system*

The Krama system at the outset appears to reflect a systematic emergence of the Sakta tendencies in the monistic Saivism of Kashmir.\(^3\) As such it gives rise to many interesting developments and leads to many adjustments in the history of the Krama thought. The most important of such developments is the split of the system into two schools, one having its accent on the supremacy of the Siva aspect and the other on the Sakti aspect.

---


2. \(\) *M. M. P.*, p. 96.

3. ...\(\) *M. P.*, (S), *M. P.*, p. III.
Thus, while all other systems including the Kula, Pratyabhijna and Trika of Kashmir Saivism are Siva-oriented, the Krama is Sakti-oriented. The Spanda system is an exception in the sense that it marks the transition between the two ideologies. But, at the same time, it has a natural leaning towards Sakti, the dynamic aspect of Reality. The important distinction between the Spanda and the Krama lies in the fact that while the latter is a Tantric system, the former is not. It is perhaps the reason why Abhinavagupta, in his *Tantraloka*, deals with the Krama system under the Saktopaya as a distinct system of thought and does not accord a separate treatment to the Spanda school, though it (*the Tantraloka*) is full of references to and extracts from the Spanda authors and works. The fact that the Pratyabhijna has secured a separate treatment under the Anupaya in the *Tantraloka* unlike the Spanda, the latter approximates to the former in respect of metaphysics rather than mysticism and

1. Likewise, the Kula and Tripura too are known to be different systems, but in fact they complement each other with the difference that while the Tripura lays stress on Sakti, the Feminine aspect, the Kula on Siva, the Masculine.

2. It may not entirely be out of point to connect this tremendous emphasis of the Sakti aspect with the spiritual activity undertaken by the female preceptors. The importance of the role played by the female teachers may be assessed from the fact that the system is said to have originated from the mouth of the Yoginis (lady ascetics). It is difficult to establish a "cause and effect" relationship between the Sakti-orientations and early preachings by female ascetics, yet it is a factor to be reckoned with. We have tried to deal with this phenomenon while discussing the tantric character as well as the historical development of the system. This may, however, be taken as a practical translation of the theoretical orientation.

3. Howsoever strange it may appear, it is important to note that Abhinavagupta who wrote so profusely and copiously on almost all the matters relating to Kashmir Saivism did not write a single independent work bearing on the Spanda branch. This fact has been noticed by Ksemaraja. Vide, 

अन्तःपरिशङ्कृतं केशवस्मयं स्मरितमृद्धशः।
विवृतं स्पन्दयास्तरं नौ गुरुणा नो, मयास्य युः॥

*Sp. N.*, p. 77 (concluding verse No. 2).
esotericism.\(^1\) On the contrary, the Kula and the Krama, both being Tantric in origin and form, are more mystic than metaphysical. Yet, with all their differences they constitute together what is precisely meant by monistic Saivism of Kashmir.

\(\text{(b) Leaning towards monistic-dualistic character of Reality: its implication and consequences}\)

Another aspect which distinguishes the Krama system from other associate schools is its proneness towards the monistic-dualistic character of Reality at the pre-realization stage. As a spiritual discipline it has been specially designated as Bhedabhedopaya in order to bring out the importance it attaches to the idea of dualism or diversity within the general framework of monism or unity. The Krama system in the above role does not seek to confuse or mix up the two polarities (duality-cum-unity) but instead, unearths unity in the phenomenal duality as its intrinsic character (unity in duality - Bheda abhedah).\(^2\) In other words the Krama is more closely connected with the immanent reality and interprets immanence as an essential expression of transcendence. Against this, the Pratyabhijna and Kula systems are immediately concerned with reality as unity (abheda) or the transcendental aspect of Reality. Whenever there appears a difference in the systems it is only the difference of approach or the general outlook. Even when the Bhedabhedavadin (in practice) is a real monist (in theory), he justifies the individuality of his approach by his utmost tolerance towards the other cognate systems.\(^3\) It eschews its dogmatism in this respect. In fact, the Krama system regards both duality and non-duality as irrelevant, since such a concept of Reality cannot be anything but relative. As a consequence, the system is very very critical of the concepts of Bandha

1. In incorporating the Pratyabhijna as an inalienable part of the basic plan of the \textit{Tantraloka} Abhinava was possibly motivated by its enormous metaphysical value. Because it is the notion of Pratyabhijnana (recognition) that is the most significant single constituent of all the monistic Saiva systems of Kashmir.

2. Cf. \textit{Ibid.}, under "The Defining Features of Saktopaya" etc. and "Multiplicity of Approaches: A Special Feature".

3. Cf. \textit{Ibid.}, under "The Krama versus Other Systems" etc.
Thus the Kula system prohibits the rituals and the Siddhanta Saivism advocates them. But the Krama and the Trika systems look upon the concepts of prohibition and injunction or negation and predication as external to the nature of Reality.

(c) *Spiritual progression and moksa as synthesis of bhoga and moksa: Key features*

Moreover the definition of the Kula and Krama systems in terms of Sambhavopaya and Saktopaya is enough to focus their mutual points of difference and agreement. This point will be discussed on the occasion of the study of the Krama system as Saktopaya. It is however, necessary to remember that the Pratyabhijna and the Kula do not subscribe to the idea of spiritual progression. But, the concept of spiritual progression is the very life-blood of the Krama system and its theory of the refinement of the thought-constructs (Vikalpa-samskara). The very term Krama denotes what is called spiritual progression. Similarly the term Kula (i.e., an organic whole) justifies its nomenclature by its non-adherence to the theory of Vikalpa and succession in self-realization. Thus the tantric ideal of self-realization as synthesis of Bhoga and Moksha, better termed as Bhoga-moksha-samarasaya, is realizable in the Krama system alone.


2. दृढ़ युज्यते परमायुज्यते सिद्धिप्रक्षणेन तद्विभिन्नम् तत्तत्त्वेऽपि न निविज्ञ प्रयोजनम्।

   \[ T. A. V., III p. 286. \]

   \[ \text{Cf. T. A. I., 290.} \]

   See for details, Pt. II, Ch. I, under “Problem of Purity and Impurity in Relation to Consciousness”.


4. \[ M. M. F., p. 137; also see p. 172 \]

   \[ \text{Cf. M. P. (T). 7, 125.} \]
theory of progressive refinement of Vikalpas lays equal emphasis on each and every step of self-realization as an embodiment of spirituality. The Kula and Pratyabhijna are not opposed or averse to such an ideal, but they do not have proper scope for it, since they adhere to the concept of instantaneous and immediate self-revelation. The image of the Krama system becomes clear only when we see through its concept of the Samarasya of Dhama-Varna (Name and Form) and Cit (consciousness).\(^1\)

(d) *Absolutic functionalism : A significant aspect*

In this context a minor but significant point, though not entirely relevant, may also be adverted to. The functionalistic doctrine of the Trika i.e., five functions of the Absolute, has been adjusted suitably to the requirements of the Krama system. Thus the last two of the five Absolutic acts namely, Tirodhana and Anugraha, have been replaced by Anakhya and Bhasa.\(^2\)

(e) *Positive emphasis on the epistemic side of our experience*

Krama is a system with a positive epistemic bias. The epistemic undertones of the system form its special character and contrast it from the other systems.\(^3\) It has just been noted that the Pratyabhijna and Spanda Schools are more metaphysical in intent. And though the Kula and the Krama, in common, have esoteric and mystical appearance, it is the Krama that lays more positive emphasis on the cognitive and the epistemic

1. 1. मूलामन्त्रिनिश्चिताः धामत्वमिवविष्णुवात् ||
   अन्योत्तमेऽत्मायं सामस्त्यंदेशतत् ||
   मन्त्रार्थकमयं वस्त्रं विना यात्रानांविचारम् ||
   यो विशालिक्षमं वयस्मायां वै ज्ञातविचारे ||

2. Cf. Pt. II. Ch. I, under "The Discovery of One's Potencies as a means to Self-discroy; Ch. III, under "The Relevance of the Present Treatment to Saktopaya and its Metaphysics".


\(M. P. (T). 7.129\) and \(185\).
aspect. This is perhaps the basic philosophical value of the Krama as a system of philosophy.

(f) Preference for Prakrta and certain minor features

A reference to another unique Krama phenomenon would not be out of place here. It is really a characteristic feature of the Krama school that it favours Prakrta in place of Samskrta for the presentation of its tenets. There is positive evidence to show that works like the Krama-sutra, both of the Mahanaya-Prakasas, Mahartha-Manjari, Chumma-sampradaya, Prakrta-trimsikavivarana and works of a few other authors were written in some form of the Prakrta or local vernaculars. Mahesvarananda is the first authority who takes note of it. There is only one other Tantric system which also evinces a preference for the use of Prakrta. But that is a Sakta system, not Saiva, famed as Tripura. It, however, does not mean that the use of Samskrta was rare and unusual. On the contrary, the bulk of the literature, presently available, is in Samskrta. Likewise, a sweeping conclusion that the Krama had more popular appeal than other systems will probably be somewhat remote from truth. What is the possible source of such a phenomenon is a question that is proposed to be taken up in our study of the historical forces that gave the Krama a shape and a figure. Similarly the division of entire monistic Saiva thought into two classes namely, Traiyambaka and Ardhatriyambaka, will also be considered under our study of Krama's tantric character. In this connection it may be noticed that while Kula is considered to be the Ardhatriyambaka, the Krama, Kula and Pratyabhijna belong to the Traiyambaka category. The only justification for alluding to it here

1. विन, अहमदुदासस्विनानतासमृद्ध्यान्न स्तंबां: प्राइम्विनीतिन्यमुष्म्भासे।

2. द्वुतीयमसम्वरभोमि: श्रुत्स्वरुविशिवायम......प्राइम्विनीतिन्यमुष्म्भासे।
   Jbid.

But this has again to be noted that no work on the Tripura, which is in Prakrta, has come to our notice, whereas at least three of the above mentioned Krama works e.g., M. P. (S), C.S. (MS) and M. M. have come down to us.
lies in the nature of the present enquiry which particularly aims at projecting the individual character of the Krama system.

It should now be clear that internal as well as historical evidence is weighty enough to substantiate that the Krama is a system of tantric philosophy which merits a sincere consideration in its own right.
CHAPTER II

ON THE NOMENCLATURE OF THE SYSTEM

A study into the philosophical basis of the various names of the system and their significance

The Krama system is variously styled as Kramanaya, Mahartha-naya etc., etc. Let us take each seriatim.

1. Krama-Naya

The first ever definite reference to the Krama as a system of philosophy, as we have already seen, is found in Abhinava. But it is rather amusing that he did not try to define the word symbolizing a particular system. It is Jayaratha who identifies it with the theory that confides in the fourfold functionalism of the Absolute.\footnote{T. A. V., I, p. 150.} This interpretation is not Jayaratha’s own, but traditional one. For even before Abhinava, Utpala, popularly called Utpala Vaisnava and a contemporary of his teachers, interpreted the term in traditional phraseology of Kramacatuska (fourfold succession).\footnote{Sp P., p. 48.} This is borne out by a statement of Ksemaraja who takes the word Krama to stand for the succession of the cyclic consciousness of emanation (Srsti),

1. क्रम: अक्षुद्वार्यः ।

2. एव एव अतिरिक्तर्कमार्कविवाद्यो उद्भोगवभासस्वमविलाश्यः। क्रमवुऽक्रमोऽक्रमैः युक्तेऽपि।

Similarly Sivananda, the grand teacher of Maheśvarananda, has nearly the same definition:

मुख्यमुक्तमुक्तमुक्तमयोऽक्षुद्वार्यः ।

मुख्यमुक्तमुक्तमयोऽक्षुद्वार्यः ।

sustenance (Sthiti) and withdrawal (Samhrti).\(^1\) While explaining the words "Krama-mudra" and "Mudra-krama" from the Krama-Sutras he also defines the word Krama in the context of the system. According to him, it is called Krama because it (i) causes emanation etc. to appear in succession (Krama) and (ii) itself constitutes the very nature of that (as well as their) successive appearance.\(^2\) Hence Krama is the system that deals with such a phenomenon exclusively, all other aspects remaining subordinate to it. Let us consider in brief its precise bearing on the problem. One of the most basic tenets of the entire monistic Saiva thought of Kashmir is its theory of the five acts of the Absolute, namely, Srsti (emulation or emergence), Sthiti (sustenance), Samhara (withdrawal or submergence), Tirodhana (concealment), and Anugraha (dispensing grace). The functionalistic doctrine, in question, maintains that the Absolute is unceasingly busy in bringing about these five acts, be it phenomenal order of existence or the trans-phenomenal one. It is the unfoldment of his being. Therefore, those who always reflect upon this pentadic activity of the Godhead, knowing the universe as an unfoldment and expression of the essential nature of Awareness, never fail to attain perfection and realize their true self in this very life. Those, for whom the objective content of their experience does not partake of the godly essence, continue to remain under the binding influence of ignorance.\(^3\) The greatest advantage of this theory consists in its distinguishing the Kashmir Saiva monism from the Vedantic one.\(^4\) Now the Krama is the system that

1. अवायमेऽऽवाययास्तृतिर्यतीस्बूङ्गविविधातान्त्वकं क्रमम्……।

2. क्रम: अपि सूचिपादिकमाभासास्त्रस्तु ततः माधवस्वल्पस्तवः क्रम ॥

3. तव च भवना यथोरं मन्त्रात्मकोऽर्थमेव स्वरूपाक्षमप्राप्तिः सूक्ष्यात्मकी विशेषतः ॥

4. इत्य ईश्वरायविविधानम् श्रद्धानिदिः। अयनेन विषेषः।

\(^1\) Pr. Ht., p. 92

\(^2\) S,S,F. (V), 1.40-41.

\(^3\) Pr. Ht., p. 94

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 61.
Krama Tantricism of Kashmir

specially builds on this theme.¹ So active has been its interest in the problem that the system saw the emergence of two divergent opinions with respect to the exact meaning of the word Krama. These theories later crystallized into what are known as Four-function (Catustayartha) and Five-function (Pancartha) theories. We however refrain from entering into controversy except making some necessary references since the same has been enlarged upon in the sequel.²

Samvit or Awareness-reality itself is succession or Krama. Whether it is a process of empirical cognition or that of reflective meditation or cosmic emanation, it is Samvit that defines and undergoes the process of succession (Krama). This process of succession is also termed Mahakrama.³ Owing to varying traditions the entire process might be said to entertain four⁴ or five⁵ phases. In the four fold scheme the fifth function namely, Bhasa, is excluded while the fivefold scheme comprises all the acts. Whatever the case, these phases presuppose the cyclic notion of reality whose flow remains uninterrupted and uniform throughout. The genesis of numerical difference and successive phases lies in the intrinsic dynamism of the reality itself. The unitary flow appears to be divided due to the four acts that come in a succession. This divisive flow of the inherent

¹. Cf. Pt. II, Ch. I, under ‘Rise of the Cycle of Awareness”; Ch. III, under “Anakhya Cakra as Samviccakra and Saktopaya”.

². Cf. Pt. II, Ch. III, under “Krama as Pancartha and Catustayartha” etc.

³. …..विश्वविद् प्रतिद्वंद्वसम्बन्धादितः जगत्वं विद्वान्तं सत्यमयम् तत्त्वात् अतिरिक्तम् न विद्वान् कर्मस्ततदेनानि।
M. P. (S), p. 39. Also see p. 41.

⁴. तृतीयाप्रवृत्तेऽयेऽकार्यां रन्यापरायतः।
उवः नये ज्ञानादायर्थमतिर्तिभवते कर्मस्ततु यस् पुरुषः।
Ibid., p. 43. Also see M.M. P. p 88.; cp. pp. 63, 68.

⁵. इति कार्यां एव प्रवृत्तं पर्याप्तिः।
tतत्वात् बद्वनु दूष्यतया श्रीपर्यायं कर्मात्।
Ibid., cp. also M. M.P., p. 8.
dynamism itself constitutes the Krama or succession.¹ Sometimes the place of the godly function is annexed by the godly potencies with little material effect on our stand.² The conception and structural niceties of the Samviccakra can only be explained with reference to this definition of the Krama and its implications, too, regarding the cyclic idea of reality resulting from its dynamic character. Because the twelve Kalis are the epistemic-metaphysical-mystic transformation of the fourfold (or fivefold) functionalism with regard to the object, subject and means of knowing or the first three acts,³ in epistemic and cosmogonical settings respectively. This provides the proper context where the Krama system brings the real synthesis between the successive process of cosmic emergence and the trans-successive monistic principle - the primal origin of the ensuing succession. Unity and continuity of the absicatic (and hence subjective) dynamism can be realized only when the seeming gaps between the discrete modes viz., creation etc., of the absicatic manifestation are conserved and transformed into the real links that not only join but build the synthetic whole. This is done by tracing out the inner unity that pervades all these functional cycles. It is why the one, who has developed an intuitive insight into the essential character of the succession characterising the cyclic movement of the absicatic agency, earns a claim to emancipation during one's lifetime.⁴

1. ब्रेदेशाचुविष्करणां शक्ती धर्मम्यां क्रमम्।
बृद्धविदतिवदानांस्य: स क्रम: परिकृतिः।

M.P. (S). p. 45.

2. एकस्य ज्ञित्र्यास्य क्रममेव: त्योबृते।
इत्याचारणिधारिये: क्रमार्थ: तोब्रिषिझीये।

M.P. (S) p. 45.

3. The first three acts, like Pancartha and Catustayartha, may be designated as Tryartha (ह्यथ): This is possibly suggested by the following extract:-
खणितरसमसतार्थेयो यर्चत्रपंचविवाराम्यो क्रमः।

C. G. C., 4.113.

4. हत्य्येत्तक्रमश्चायवं एव र्वात्मस्वस्वप्नोऽयुक्त्योऽविलोकः।


See for detailed discussion, Pt. II, Ch. I, under "Mutua relationship of the five cycles and conclusion"; Ch. III, under "Two Relevant Sub-features of Liberation."
The Krama has been further defined, under the spell of the Kashmir Saivism in general, in terms of time (Kala) and has been doubly designated as Kalakrama\(^1\) as well as Kala.\(^2\) Kalakrama is a tautological expression because in its verbal analysis it is rendered as the succession called time (Kalakhya Kramah) and not as succession of time (Kalasya Kramah). The Krama as time is responsible for the manifestation of total objectivity and absence thereof.\(^3\) It rather partakes of such a manifestation or non-manifestation as the case may be. In all fairness, it must be admitted that the present definition is not meant to explain the Krama’s special status as a system of Saiva monism.\(^4\) The sole underlying idea is to expatiate upon and account for the phenomenon of succession in our routine experiences ranging from the microcosmic level to the macrocosmic one, and also how the discrete units coming in a series flow from the non-dual supra-sequential source. Because it is the objective world that is characterised and determined by succession and not the Absolute. In the context of the absolute reality the word Kala would not mean simple sequential time, but creative time, the potential for the emergent reality of emanation.\(^5\) Hence the interpretation of the

1. कालक्रामसायतः रूपचालकोत्यत्वागतः ।
   नैवेद कालित्व प्रतीति: स्वादिशिकाधारभेदः ।
   \(M. P. (T). 9.28\)

2. द्विद्विगतभागभागमेव कालद्वितीयमेवमेवा ।
   \(C. G.C. 1.22\)

3. कालो भावानैवभावानति भावानाथा कुम: ।
   \(M. M. P. 50\)

4. We know of at least one tantric effort that tries to give an esoteric explanation. It, however, has no intrinsic worth, for the entire jargon transpires to interpret it in terms of Kala-krama.
   Cf.
   क्रान्त: कोषधपरस्पर भक्तापर मंगलो भवेत् ।
   गोधे तु मंगले गृहालो रूप: कालक्रमो भवेत् ।
   \(M. M. P., 109\)

5. अतः नास्ति... वैभवायत्वकालानामादेव क्षेत्र नास्ति... \(M. M. P., p. 136\)

[contd.]
term Krama signifying temporal (as well as spatial) succession has received our attention in the context of Kali, the supreme metaphysical, ontological and mystic principle.¹

We now come to the third definition of the Krama offered by certain quarters of the system itself. Accordingly, the word Krama may be employed in two different ways e.g., the relative as well as the absolute. As a relative expression it calls for its counter-entity (Pratiyogin) in Akrama (trans-sequential) and signifies a particular phenomenon of our experience. In the phenomenal realm when the different operations of our cognitive apparatus and psychoses are directed to the grasp of external multiplicity, the whole situation is reckoned as Krama. Likewise, when the phenomenal level is transcended by diverting the same mechanism towards the trans-phenomenal, non-dual, undifferentiated reality, everything is automatically realized in its essentially trans-sequential character. This phenomenon is designated as Akrama.² On the other hand, as an absolute expression the word Krama stands for the same 'Akrama' reality which remains always continuous, contd.]

1. See Pt. II, Ch. II.

Quoted from an Agama, T. A. V, III, p. 132.

Be it noted that the expression Devatah stands for the Karanesvaris. It is peculiar Krama notion which visualizes ,the sense-organs, both external and internal (Karanas), as forms of the respective divinities in the Krama parlance.
eternally potential, self-subsistent immediate and indeterminate. It is this reality that constitutes the supreme ideal of the Krama doctrine and marks the terminus of the entire spiritual adventure advocated by the system. In the Krama works yet another use of the word Krama is encountered as denoting some form or act of worship or ritual. But such a contention is presently irrelevant and wide off the mark.

Thus the main accent of all those attempts, that dwelt on the Krama as a specific system, appears to have been on the modus operandi of the principle of awareness (Cit-Krama). By fully appreciating the course and process adopted for the manifestation and realization of self we are made to fathom the inner depths of consciousness i.e., Reality per se. Thus the Krama, in simple language, may be identified with Cit-krama or Bodha-krama.

(a) Anuttara-Krama

Sometimes the word Krama is qualified by or prefixed with some other appellation or epithet in order to lay special emphasis on a particular aspect of the system without interfering with its actual signification. Thus, for instance, it has been

1. दृष्टत्वं क्रमापेक्षा यो भावस्मादहृदयः।
   स एव संस्करितिकः क्रमः कोण्यं निर्माणः।
   प्राणुस्तरमात्रांनि शरीरस्तरं सदर्दिदीते।
   सत्तम स्फुटं शास्त्रांकर्माकर्मानात्मिकः।
   C. S. (MS), p. 12

2. कृष्णं पुरुषाधिकारः क्रमः क्रमयज्जितः।
   महामाया पुरा निरुच गतितस्यप्रस्थिनः।
   M. P. (T). 1.11

3. क्षण श्रीविष्णुः—
   पृष्ण हिमः क्रमवर्य धर्म भास्तोत्रं विश्वाः।
   तत्र ध्यानं जयः कृष्णं तथ्योन्नत्य निर्भासम्।
   quoted, M. M. P., p. 122

4. वस्मादित्वस्तरम् हृदयं भिन्नं निराेद्ययाविश्वायम्।
   तत्त्वात्माकार्यविनाविवं गुरुः प्राप्तमिस्वर्गसूत्राधिकारिन्मीवः।
   M. M. P., p. 1

Cf. तस्मात्मतिं तस्मात्म नात्मात् नात्मात्म प्राप्तमि याविश्वायम्।
   महायोग मनोविवेकं प्रहृदस्त्य परमात्मिनः।
   B. P. नमोन्नितः श्रीम्।
   T. A. V. III, p. 108
described as Anuttara Krama (metempirical order) bringing into focus the transcendental character of the supreme experience as twin-accomplishment in which lay the two poles of objective enjoyment and subjective freedom in perfect harmony.¹

(b) **Anupaya-Krama**

Exactly on similar lines the Krama has been designated as Anupaya Krama² marking the highest spiritual and yogic attainment. The Anupaya-krama precisely has the same meaning as one conveyed by the word Krama when employed in its absolute sense of the ultimate ideal, as seen above.

(c) **Devata-Krama**

Similarly it has been styled as Devata-krama (order of the divinities) emphasizing that the inner significance of all the stages of cosmic emanation and spiritual advancement and, for that matter, of the Samviccakra lies in their divine character. Each step in the process, therefore, represents a divinity.³

(d) **Mahakrama**

In the opening pages, Mahakrama as a synonym of Krama⁴ has been looked into. This title has been probably coined in the wake of another name of the Krama system i.e., Mahartha, which is proposed to be discussed below and which literally means 'the great reality' or 'the great meaning'. This becomes quite clear when we find Mahesvarananda presenting

---

1. श्रीमद्बुद्धव्रजसृज्ञ क्रमान्त्रित वायुप्रायन्त्रेय परमेश्वरक्रमा वर्मकाश्यमात्रोपायित्वमायमाण्यां

   **M. M. P., 172**

2. जीवित्व्यापन्निदिश्वाशसमाश्रयवाचनम्
   अनुपायात्मां सोवभ वायु हि (स्कृति: स) योगिराद्

   **M. P. (T) 1.13**

3. थोष्यतसमस्दन्तवर्त्तोत्तरसृज्ञक्रमः
   देशनाथम् उवाचनार्तम् तस्य हि तपस्यित देवेनाम्

   **C.G.C. 4.113**

4. ज्योतिर्यापि वा सहस्रयो महायो श्रेयः

   **M. P. (S), p. 56.**
his famous work *Maharthamanjari* as the *Mahakramamanjari* in the concluding verses of commentary called *Parimala*.\(^1\)

(e) **Mahartha-Krama**

In spite of its renown as the Mahartha exclusively, there is no dearth of the phrase i.e., Maharthakrama.\(^2\) In such an expression, both the constituents of the compound enjoy the same import. The phrase stands for the Krama pertaining to the great reality (i.e., as conceived by the Mahartha system). This phrase and the like actually have become the typical idiom of the system.

(f) **Auttara-Krama**

The same Krama which has been presented as the Anuttara-krama from the metaphysical point of view is designated as the Auttara Krama\(^3\) from the point of view of its place of origin. The Krama system arose in and spread from Kashmir\(^4\).

1. **Graha-yogantarakhmadanavardhakramavardhakramamjari**
   
   \textit{M. M. P., p. 201}

   \textit{Ibid., p. 202}

2. **Maha-rakhmadanavardhakramamjari**
   
   \textit{Ibid., p. 170}

   \textit{Ibid., p. 194}

   It says that the total play of succession or Krama as advocated by the system rests in Vrnda-cakra. By implication it also means that the entire eightfold order namely, Samvitkrama, Dhamkrama etc. form part of the Vrnda-cakra.

3. **Prakara-yogantarakhmadanavardhakramamjari**
   
   \textit{M. M. P., p. 190}

   \textit{Ibid., p. 200}

   \textit{Ibid., p. 201}

4. **Samvinsthakramamjari**

   \textit{Ibid., p. 193}
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which is in the north and has been described as the Northern Seat (Uttara-Pitha) as well. In a similar strain it has been described as Auttara Artha-tattva (principle of ultimate reality pertaining to the north). Since a reference has also been made to Sivananda, the earliest preceptor, whose name is associated with Kashmir, it appears a feasible reason to call the Krama system by the name of the Auttara Krama or the Auttara Tattva. Another factor that might have contributed to such a nomenclature is Krama’s inclusion under Uttaramnaya. According to the traditional lore Uttaramnaya stands for the teachings proceeding from the Northern mouth of Siva, that is, the 'Vamamarga', because the Northern face is to the left. According to Dr. Pandey, this interpretation agrees with the fact that the Krama enjoins the Dutiyaga and the use of liquor, woman and meat as essentials of worship which are necessary ingredients of the Vamamarga. It is, however, difficult to say that this is the precise suggestion of dubbing the Krama as practising the Vamamarga. Although in the later form of the Krama system, which is chiefly presented by Mahesvarananda, such apparently immoral tendencies did crop up and earned a respectable place for themselves, yet the main stress laid by the Krama has always been on the spiritual side. Moreover the Krama is not called Uttaramnaya, but the cream and essence of the Uttaramnaya. In fact, the entire monistic current of

1. उत्तरसिद्धि:। उत्तरतद्वितुः। उत्तरग्रहणः।।

2. अन्तरसिद्धि:। अन्तरग्रहणः। अन्तरसिद्धिः।।
   M. M. P., p. 183

5. एवं विनिविवाहिनी! मातृका! विनिविवाहिनी! विनिविवाहिनी!।
   M. M. P., 87

6. भूयस्यवस्तुः! भूयस्यवस्तुः! भूयस्यवस्तुः! भूयस्यवस्तुः!।
   Ibid., p. 162

   Cp. तत्त्वंस्यवस्तुः।।

7. अन्तरसिद्धिः। अन्तरसिद्धिः।।
   M. M. P., p. 198.
Kashmir Saivism is identified with Uttaramnaya \(^1\) i. e., teachings that proceeded from the Northern mouth of Siva. On the contrary, the Kashmir Saiva agamas are classified under the Daksina group of the three categories of Saiva tantras namely, Varna, Daksina and Siddhanta. \(^2\) Sitikantha sets at rest all doubts in this respect. The Uttaramnaya occupies the highest place of all the amnayas and the Mahartha i. e., Krama, ranks supreme among the Uttaramnayas. \(^3\) All these observations are, however, at their tentative stage, since it is difficult to close the chapter with a final judgement. The difficulty is aggravated by Raghava Bhatta, who in his commentary on a verse of the Saradatilaka, \(^4\) remarks that the first half of the verse incorporates the Pratyabhijna doctrine as propounded by the Siva-sutra and Trika-bhedha etc., whereas the second half represents the Uttaramnaya view. \(^5\) He quotes from a certain source to substantiate his contention but does not name the work. If one abides by the thesis of Raghava Bhatta, he will have to admit that the Trika and the Uttaramnaya are two different things and reject the previously held view that the Uttaramnaya is another name for the monistic trend of the Saivite speculation of Kashmir. As a compromise formula it may be suggested that while distingu-

---

1. उत्तरामन्यायग्रेषि: सत्यान्यायप्रियोऽवब्धालित्रताः।
   \(\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 6.}\)

2. \(\text{See} \text{तन्त्रप्रमाणः, N. R. Bhatta, S. S., 20. I p.72.}\)

3. \(\text{तत्त्वज्ञानोद्विगुणानां य: परं उक्तमेति; उत्तरामन्यायं: तत्त्वज्ञानमेधेविन्याय: पद्धतिः प्रत्येकमेति तत्त्वज्ञानमेदेविन्याय: केदाराः महाबृहः।}\)
   \(\text{M. P.(S), p. 18.}\)

4. नव-कक्ष (nine cycles) here refer to typical Krama cakras called Prakāśa, Mūrti, Anākhyā etc.

5. \(\text{S. T., 25. 2.}\)

---

Padarthādharśa on S.T.T., 11, pp. 893-94.
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ishing between the two (Pratyabhijna and Uttaramnaya) the commentator (as well as the author) wants to pinpoint their classical and agamic nature respectively. But as the things are, the Uttaramnaya view, in question, is nearer to the Krama than to the Pratyabhijna. Still, as has been said, it is difficult to state anything categorically in such a confused state of affairs. Nevertheless, though we may not be certain about the exact significance of the term Uttaramnaya, the appellation Auttara Krama, from its geographical perspective, does not pose a problem.

2. Mahartha or Mahartha-Naya

The other equally meaningful and popular denomination of the system is Mahartha. In its most current form the word Mahartha is used to denote the system, but occasionally the word Drsti (i.e., point of view or philosophy) or Naya (i.e., perspective) poses a problem.

---

1. It might be useful to quote the following observation of M. M. Gopinath Kaviraj:
"कालो के विषय में प्रतिलो नाम से अर्थिक ही एक प्राचीन नाम नहीं, जिसमें चार पट्टा हैं। उसमें निष्कासक है कि एक ही महाशक्ति धर्मबळानाथ-रूढ़ (अल्प-अल्प छोटे संहारमा में भाष्य) छह भाष्यांको को तैयार हैं। उसमें पूर्ववाचन को देखी का नाम है पूर्ववाचनी, दक्षिणवाचन को देखी का नाम है दक्षिणवाचनी, पश्चिमवाचन की देखी का नाम है कुम्भसर, उत्तरवाचन की देखी का नाम काली है एवं उत्तरवाचन की अविभक्ति का नाम भी दिखाई है। उस प्रथमें दो पट्टा के अंथ होता तक भव्यतिक कालो का ही कम निर्णय है।"

तात्त्विक साहित्य, Introduction, p. 28:

2. युक्त महाशक्तिमात्र न किवध ववष ।
सवेतमातमादो हि ततो महार् ता ॥

M. P. (T), 1.4.

महाशक्तिमात्र ववषा विनाय यागवाड़णम् ।
या विनायी स्वप्नस्व सेवकव्य न जावले ॥

Ibid., 7. 133.

3. "नन्तो श्रीमानमहाशक्तिमात्र ॥


श्रीमानमहाशक्तिमात्र यागवाड़णप्रसन्नहैं ॥
Pr. Hr., p., 64.

दिश्यमहाशक्तिमात्रायुक्तालौ हैं नमः। श्रीपादप्रसन्न प्रतिज्ञित्वं उपविदिष्य ॥
S. St. V., p. 344.

महाशक्तिमात्र चित्तवादयस्तु पूर्वकल्पः ॥
Ibid., p. 199.

4. महाशक्तिमात्रायुक्तालें एकत्रेतेन न ॥

Ibid., p. 49.
system) has also been added to give it a more compact look. Historically the term Mahartha as a substitute for the word Krama meaning a system is a later development and perhaps the earliest allusion to the system in this form may be traced to Ksemaraja.¹ And as the system grew, the word Mahartha rather overshadowed the usage of the word Krama in later literature² and gained the status of a full-fledged system, as the use of the word siddhanta³ for it would indicate. In this context it is necessary to note that this word is employed to convey two different, though complementary, senses. In the first place it is a name of a philosophical system⁴ and in the second, it stands for the ideal or value the system deems to be ultimate and, consequently, harnesses its entire machinery to attain the same.⁵ Really speaking the first sense is derived from the second one and, hence, stands for that system which deals with the principle of Mahartha.

1. Cf. fns. 3 and 4 supra p. 21.
2. Cf. fn. 2 supra p. 21. Also see M. M.P., pp. 179, 194, 197, 201.
3. यदू संभूतम् सांस्कृतिक्षभावः महार्थशिक्षनालोपनिषदं मोक्षते।
4. प्राचीनकालीन महायान संस्कृतियोज्य: सोद्धर्म महार्थ:।
   M.P.¹⁵. p. 15.
   महार्थ संबंध रायतानु।...
   Ibid., p. 56.
5. स एव च महार्थोन्यां संस्कृतिक्षणमविद्याम्।
   Quoted from the Pāṇḍukodāya, M. M. P., p. 12.
   अद्वय भूतसम्बन्धोद्वैमाहाविद्यानां महार्थप्रारंभितां मायाप्रथमभावनमेति यथावत्।
   Ibid., 178.
   निर्विरोध (२) महार्थः ज्ञितविषयं संबंधूत: शनिनि राजनी: केन:।
   C. G. C., 3.91.
   एवं च उपसम्बन्धोद्वैमाहाविद्या स्थिरेनां वर्णनूतं तत्वात्मक: समानज्ञानपरन्तप्रमूः
   तत्त्वविशेषिणाः शास्त्रस्य।
   SP., N. p. 74.
   महार्थास्मादप्रदेशस्पन्दयति:।
   S., S. T., p. 106.
   महार्थास्मादप्रदेशस्य नारेपन्वितविषयं तत्त्वात्मक: स्वत: प्रदीपित।
   Ibid., p. 300.
   अत्यस्तवस्त्रस्य च महार्थानाप्रेक्षोदेवस्यविषयस्य।
   S., T. V., I, p. 11.
It may, however, be noted in passing that the word Mahartha seems to have been formulated under the tantric impact, particularly that of the Tripura system. It is conceived to serve as the basic substrate for the totality of the sixfold reality or meaning as envisaged in the Sakta tantras. A peep into a statement\(^1\) of Mahesvarananda would perhaps explain the basis of the present contention.

Let us, now, enquire into the precise meaning and nature of the Mahartha. Why is it that it is preferred to name the principle of fundamental reality as Mahartha? The obvious reason seems to be that the tantric philosophy usually holds that the ultimate reality has two aspects - word and meaning (vacaka and vacya). The entire stretch of our field of experience, whether mundane or meta-mundane, is subsumed under these two aspects which are knit together by the relation of significand-significans (vacaka-vacya-bhava). Thus the ultimate reality, in its aspect as the Logos i.e., word, is the Vacaka and so is it with regard to its ontological being and formal becoming, the Import i.e., Vacya. Vacya and Artha being synonymous, it is the absolute or the basic reality that is termed as Mahartha.\(^2\) Thus the term Mahartha, as denotative of the "great principle of meaning or reality" brings into relief the emergent nature of reality as containing the total possibilities of self-becoming. This has an explicit reference to the dynamic aspect of reality which comprehends and accounts for the cosmic expansion of the Abolutic personality. The Krama is necessarily related with this emergence and expression of Reality.\(^3\) Sitikantha, the celebrated author of the \textit{Mahanaya-}

\begin{enumerate}
\item योग्य महारथकोषाभाषानित्योपकृत: भारायं: समारथ्योपसनिवार्यवर्णकोलिक: ।
\textit{M. M. P.}, p. 183.
\item वाण्यविज्ञानंसंष्ठात्संस्कृतकरणीयो: व्यक्तय-व्यक्तिभावणिवर्ण महाभाष्य: प्रसन्नकरणिव.
\item संस्कृतकरणिवद्वाराचारणवर्णयत: ।
\textit{M. P. (S)}, p. 2.
\end{enumerate}
Prakasa has devoted the first and third chapters (Udayas) of his treatise exclusively to discuss and determine the precise meaning of the term Mahartha. A few aspects of the problem have again been looked into in the fourth and eleventh chapters. For want of space it is not possible to go into each detail, but an attempt will be made to study his important observations in this regard.

He himself poses the problem - what can be said to be the great meaning denoted by the word Mahartha and proceeds to answer. His primary contention is that in view of the monistic ideology, none else than the reality itself which is one with consciousness, can be the true import of the term. But when it comes to adopting an analytical attitude towards reality, there are five things that may afford to be called Mahartha. These five are - (i) the indivisible and partless reality, (ii) aspects of that reality, (iii) approaches leading to the attainment of the reality or (iv) to that of the aspect thereof, and (v) ancillary approaches that are instrumental to the fruition or fructification of the primary approaches indicated above. Of course, it is the reality proper which may be called Mahartha in its own right, while the rest are so called only indirectly or secondarily.

After interpreting the term Mahartha from the point of view of reality, he now goes ahead to define the same from the point of view of our experience, spiritual or otherwise. He again puts the question - what is this Mahartha, is it meditating upon the cycles and their presiding deities? No, it denotes the

1. नेष्क तक्स नाम महार्थस्य महात्माधेविष्केषं। ?.....कोष्यो....तिन्तरणस्वागत्याय वाक।

2. एवमेक्षणस्य वक्तुत्तत्वानां न मे उपायः। तुपंपरमिदीपिते वार्षिक उपामानवाची इतिस्तुतः पारस्ते ता महार्थस्वेत्वाया प्रवचनम् सवलं इतिस्तुतम्।

3. महार्थस्य नाम युग्मशाया रसस्य पश्चिमकामं।
   पारस्त्येष तदापीतरवैत्तिकस्यवपमम्।
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condition when one is completely possessed of the feeling of self-sameness\(^1\) with the Absolute. He takes up eight instances\(^2\) for the sake of illustration and each instance in their ultimate analysis is found to culminate in or turn out as the experience of unity and non-duality with the self. Thus by Mahartha we are to understand that state of mind or spiritual awakening which never loses the sight of ultimate non-duality in all sorts of experiences, whatever the realm of existence they might belong to\(^3\) because everything that can be thought of is but an instance of the basically monistic principle. In other words, therefore, the perfect state of mind or the state of self-fulfilment may be equally designated as Mahartha - that dispels even the slightest tinge of distinction between 'I' and 'you' i.e., the self and the not-self.\(^4\) The same state of self-perfection is identified with the Anakhya stage in the doctrinal parlance which, too, is said to be characterised by harmony and utter want of duality.\(^5\) It, thus, may be logically concluded that these items i.e., the unitary character of reality and the basically non-dual harmonious experience etc., form the main subject-matter of the system. Hence the name Mahartha.

3. **Mahanaya**

The term Mahanaya as an appellation of the Krama system appears to have been a favourite of the later Krama authors because the earliest references available do not go

---

1. तथा कोश्य महायोऽ नाम कि चरुक्षेत्रस्वरीसिद्धविवेकविविवेक्षरेणालम्? नैत्यं—महायोऽ

2. तथा च—परेशिक्षणार्थवाणो... इति अद्यं, हि थि?

3. इति—सत्वप्रक्रारामास्तथा अद्वैतस्म स्वस्वास्त्पवायु चिदद्वायविवृणेऽधशयोऽस्योऽ

---

\(Ibid., p. 36.\)

\(Ibid., p. 36-37.\)

\(Ibid., pp. 36-37.\)

\(M. P. (3), p 37.\)

\(Ibid., p. 48.\)

\(Ibid., p. 120.\)
back beyond Sivananda II, the author of the *Mahanaya-Prakasa* (T) But that the phrase was extremely popular is evinced by the very fact that at least the two important Krama texts have been named after it. The one is just referred to above and the other is by Sitikantha. The other references to it, indicative of its denoting a system, are found in Jayaratha, Sitikantha and Ananta Saktipada. It has got exactly the same meaning as its counterpart, Mahartha. At least once it has been stated that the word 'Maha' (Mahan) in the compound stands for "Artha" i.e., reality. It may also be surmised following the present line of thinking that the word Mahanaya was probably a condensed or abridged form of the phrase Maharthanaya wherein 'Mahan' stood for reality (as conceived by the Krama system) and 'Naya' for the system.

4. *Mahasara*

We are not absolutely certain that the word Mahasara stood for the Krama system. But the context, in which this phrase is found, is weighty enough to support the hypothesis that Ksemaraja wants us to believe that it was another way of presenting the Mahartha ideal. Because the phrase immediately

---

1. *M. P. (T).* 1.4.
7. *V. N. S. V.,* p. 5.
follows his remark that the Stotra in question (i.e., *Divya-krida-bahumanastotra*) is replete with the statements bearing upon the Maharthatattva. Moreover, his qualifying the word Mahasara with the epithet Stiman, as he usually does with Mahartha when he wishes to refer to the system, strengthens our conjecture.

5. Atinaya

On the authority of an extract cited by Jayaratha in order to demonstrate the lack of complete unanimity with regard to the precise line of the Krama teachers, it may be concluded that the Krama system was also known as Atinaya. In Sitikantha one finds this position categorically endorsed.

Here a problem poses itself which escapes a definite solution for the present. Abhinavagupta, while enumerating different systems of the Kashmir Saiva group, also mentions a system named Atimarga. Since the Atimarga is mentioned side by side the Krama and Kula, it is natural to treat them as the separate lines of thought. But, curiously enough, Jayaratha cites a passage which presents Atimarga as Kula, because the reference is being made to Sumatinatha, the great-grand-teacher of Abhinava in the Kula system. Now the problem can briefly be put as under:

1. इति महारथमपरिमायः सारोपदेशवर्णिणि द्वारािनि सुकृति उक्तसचिति।

2. Cf. fn. 6, p 26 supra.


4. संतत्योद्भिदिनपथ साधिता इति घोडङ्गेरणम्।

5. अतिमर्गायंत्रसारसिंहस्येकमाचारम्।
   *M. P.* (S), p. 126.
   अन्तरावतियविद्वद्वताम्।

6. अतिश्च कुलविहाराभिनंदित्यादि।
   *M. V. V.*, p. 192.

7. पंखूनिपदा शास्त्रितमिविधेयस्ते वास्तविक्यता न यति।
   लोकःमृते दुर्गति।...
(a) Do the two terms namely, Atinaya and Atimarga, stand for one and the same system? If so which is that system, since

(i) Atimarga is different from the Krama and Kula systems according to Abhinava,

(ii) Atinaya is identified with the Krama, as has been noted above,

(iii) Atimarga is identified with the Kula system by an authority approvingly quoted by Jayaratha.

There are two probable alternatives. First, the Atimarga may be taken as constituting a common trait of all the monistic systems of Kashmir which, according to the unanimous verdict of the tradition, are inherently superior (atinaya - nayam atikramya) to other systems. Hence its equation with either of the Kula and Krama does not cause much difficulty. The separate identity of the Kula and Krama withers away when the Krama ultimately culminates in the Kula. This contention has a purely hypothetical value in the absence of any positive evidence to bear it out. The second alternative is suggested by a cue from Sitikantha. The Atinaya, accordingly, may be identified with the Samaya-Vidya i.e., Tripura system, in the sense that the highest ideal of the Krama system is also the supreme goal of the Samaya-vidya marking the culmination of the entire panorama of the Krama.¹ This alternative seems more plausible, because Kashmir's contribution to the Tripura system is immense and in no measure less than that to the Kula etc. The Krama system may also be viewed as a transitionary link between the Kula, a Saiva system, and the Tripura, a Sakta system, with no fundamental difference except one in their varying emphasis on one of the two aspects. When Abhinavagupta refers to the Atimarga as independent of the Kula, he might have intended to highlight the individual status of the two systems (Tripura and Kula). And where Atinaya is identi-

¹ मिष्कार्तनवसारसहस्त्रं क्रमं भवन्ति स्थान तद्यद सर्वेणा क्रमणम विभानतश्वायृ उत्तम व्राह्मणवाल्यम् प्रथमविचार ॥ M.P.(5), 126.
On the Nomenclature of the System

fied with Krama or Atimarga with Kula, the emphasis seems to be on their agreements. We however leave the question open for future research with the comment that there was a time in the history of the Krama thought when the word Atinaya signified the Krama system. Thus the controversy view comes to address itself to the feasibility and tenability of the equation between the Atimarga and the Atinaya.

6. Devatanaya or Devinaya

From the context it is obvious that Jayaratha interprets the word Devinaya in terms of the Krama system. The doctrine that holds the female divinity (the female aspect of reality i.e., Sakti or Kali) as the ultimate principle is designated as Devatanaya. The main thesis of the system consists in the capacity of reality (in its female aspect) to come out and chisel the entire multiplicity even without the support of a canvas. The term Devatanaya is more palatable to those who subscribe to the theory of the absolute ultimacy of the female aspect and relegate the male aspect of reality (i.e., Siva) to a slightly inferior position. They believe in the basic identity of the two aspects, yet feel that whatever their difference, however minute, is worthy of careful attention for the infallible and correct appreciation of reality. To them, therefore, the Paramesvara (or the Lord-Absolute) marks the end of the traffic of time (Kala), whereas the Devi (the Lady-Absolute) is the repository or the culminating point of that end itself. Sitikantha cites certain

1. .....

2. सा देवी कथ्ये सत्यं ग्योविर देवलाभः:

3. यवग्रङ्गेश्वरीः (गा? गो) पर टिकेन्द्रौ नाभततः

**Avagraha (s) after Apte has been added by us to make the line intelligible.
agamic source to suggest that the Devatanaya (i.e., system of the goddess) is the system that revolves round the divine functionalism and where the functions e.g., Srsti, etc. are the other names of the powers of the Absolute such as volition etc.¹

7. Kalinaya

There are no particular reasons for naming it as Kalinaya other than those adduced above. The Devi, which is the absolute ontological principle, is designated as Kali or Kala-Samkarsini.² Another possible reason might lie in its adherence to the Anakhyā-krama or Samviccakra which accounts for cosmic emanation in terms of the twelve (or thirteen) Kalis.⁴

8. Conclusion

There are a few other designations of the Krama system which are not considered for fear of unnecessary details. Moreover, those appellations do not have the common approval of the Krama authors. If they are coined and also referred to, the intention always has been to reflect on the nexus between the Krama system and the particular context in which they figure. Nevertheless a few denominations, that have bearing on its tantric character, have been taken into account in our enquiry on the tantric character of the Krama system.

---

¹ See, Pt. II, Ch. II.
² See, Pt. II, Ch. II.
³ See, Pt. II, Ch. II.
⁴ See, Pt. II, Ch. II.
CHAPTER III

KRAMA AS A TANTRIC SYSTEM

An analysis and exploratory study of the fundamentals of the Krama Tantricism in the wider perspective of the esoteric tantricism of monistic Saivism of Kashmir

1. Rise of tantricism in Krama: A later development

Profuse references to the tantric leanings of the Krama system in the past impel us to advert to the study of the tantric character of the system. The entire growth of the Krama thought has undergone a radical process of transformation from philosophy to tantricism or a journey from the metaphysical speculation to the tantric practice and symbolism or, to be more exact, from the philosophic tantricism to the esoteric tantricism.

From the earliest phase devoted to the analysis and examination of the functional and activistic character of the Absolutic dynamism, one comes to an era of pure tantricism in Mahesvarananda who describes his work as a Tantra

\[^1\] with a sense of pride. It is no doubt a fact that the Krama system, having been nurtured under agamic influence, had tantric associations from the very beginning, yet the philosophical and mystical side enjoyed the upperhand. Later on, the same was made subservient to the tantric demands on it.

\[^1\] M. M. P., p. 2.

[Ibid., p. 198.

[Ibid., p. 201.

[Ibid., p. 198.

[Ibid., p. 201.
2. Tantra-Prakriya Versus Kula-Prakriya: Krama as a part of the Tantra-Prakriya in the Tantraloka

The very fact that Abhinavagupta deals with the Krama system in the Tantraloka (lit., the light of the Tantras) makes out a strong case in support of its tantric build up. This conclusion does not take into account the circumstantial evidence alone. It is, in fact, implied, according to Jayaratha, in the very scheme of the Tantraloka. He says, the whole subject-matter of the Tantraloka falls under two heads viz., Tantra-Prakriya and Kula-Prakriya. One is not immediately concerned with Abhinava's comparatively more favourable disposition towards the Kula. What is significant is the fact that the mainstream of the monistic thought has been split into two currents. The first current namely, the Tantra-Prakriya, is traced to Traiyambaka and the other one namely, the Kula-Prakriya, to Ardha-traiyambaka. As the tradition has it, there were four preceptorial schools (or lines of teachers) technically known as Mathikas. The schools founded by Amardaka and Srinatha and continued by their spiritual descendants related to the dualistic and dualistic-cum-monistic trends of thought respectively. Traiyambaka was responsible for propagation of the monistic thought. In his case the most peculiar thing is that he is credited with having inspired two monistic schools - one, which he propagated directly, was called the Traiyambaka Mathika and the other, which was founded by a descendant on his daughter's side, won the title of the Ardha-traiyambaka Mathika. It is these two

schools that are sought to be identified with the Tantra and the Kula Prakriya respectively. But it is quite likely that one may miss the precise implications of the above contention with regard to the Krama system. It may be noted that while the Kula system is accorded a separate identity as constituting Ardha-traiyambaka line of thinking, all other monistic systems, namely, Trika, Krama and Pratyabhijna (Spanda excluded) are subsumed under the Tantra-Prakriya or the Traiyambaka school.\(^1\) It is further to be noted that the fact of such inclusion has not been admitted openly, but the conclusion becomes irresistible when one finds the entire Sadardha-krama-vijnana (one of the typical ways of presenting the monistic-Saiva thinking of Kashmir in general)\(^2\) being identified with the Traiyambaka school. It may also be noted that although the Krama and Trika etc. have different secular history, they seem to be one in the matter of their origin. One factor consists in the generally acclaimed close affinity between the Trika and the Krama.\(^3\) The assertion that the Krama system finally culminates in the Kula refers more to the ultimate spiritual possibilities of the Krama system than to their apparent structure, while the identity between the Trika and Krama system ensues from their present character. The other factor happens to be that Abhinava learnt Krama from that very set of teachers led by

---

1. निखिलशास्त्रोपयोगमूर्त्तमेश्वरायणमज्ञातवेश्वरायणानादरेण अवतारक्ताराद ।
   \( T.A.V., 1, p. 29. \)
2. वाक्ति पदनागरित्व: स्मृतमेवेश्वरायण:।
   अनुसरणानां वर्र्कस्य तंकार्य: नेव्यः ॥
   \( T.A., 1.14. \)
3. अनेन श्रीप्रभापितकलमण्योऽर्थाय साधोऽपूर्वस्य व्याख्यातमः ।
   \( M.M.P., 36. \)

Be it noted that while dwelling upon the Krama concept of parity between predication and negation (निलापविभिन्नत्व) Jayaratha generally refers to Krama as Trika, as if the two were one. See, \( T.A.V., III, pp. 279-290. \) Also of Pt. II, Ch. I, under "The Krama versus other sister systems etc."
Somananda from whom he learnt Trika and Pratyabhijna.\(^1\) As opposed to this, he had a different line of teachers for the Kula culminating in Sambhunatha. And yet both the Tantra and Kula Prakriyas join each other as a part and parcel of a monolithic monistic complex evolved by Abhinavagupta. This may be perhaps due to:

(i) the descent of divine revelation of the monistic brand through the same source, namely, Traiyambaka (either directly or indirectly), and

(ii) the Kula’s unflinching adherence to the agamic wisdom in common with the fellow doctrines, as contained in the *Malini-Vijayottara Tantra* and thus inclusion of the Kula under the broader Trika scheme.\(^2\)

3. **Tantra-Prakriya Analyzed**

It is disquieting to see that Abhinava, even though subjecting his observations to the minutest analysis, nowhere men-

1. श्रीदेवीश्रावर्णितकृति स्वयं श्रीदेवीश्रावर्णितकृति: प्रमूर्ति विकर्षात्वन्दवज्जु पुरुषः।
   *T.A.V.*, III, p. 194.

Jayaratha lends additional support to the above contention in following lines:-

“पूर्वे जगतित्व शुद्धः॥ इति सामायोत्य इत्रोपति समस्कारो ध्यानारुत्तेत समस्कारो...ततोऽयोगाः पुरुषः॥”

“इत्याशुरक्षा परमेश्वराक्ष्य सवर्धामातिरिक्त तत्त्वं कर्तते श्रीकालासन पर्यस्त:॥ इति विष्णुवंशस्वामीकारणे गुरुपरमान्य-परमेश्वरः॥ पुरुषः परास्तुताः॥”


a. *TA* 1.8 referring to the earlier teachers of the Traiyambaka school i.e., *Tantra Prakriya*.

b. *M.V.T* 17.18 suggesting the Krama doctrine of Sattarka i.e., Right Logic.

c. Laksmmanagupta, Utpala and Somananda respectively, *vide T.A.* 1.10.11.

2. नन्दु सामीयोत्य ज्ञातार्थविनिधानला प्रतिपाद्य गुरूपरमान्य-परमेश्वरः परमेश्वरः॥
In this connection it might be interesting to take into account the following observation made by Ksemaraja in his Pratyabhijnahrdaya while explaining the 8th Sutra. According to this statement all the three schools viz., the Tantra, Kula and Trika, stand on different footings and propagate divergent views with regard to the nature of the ultimate reality. Thus, the ultimate reality is transcendental to the Tantrikas, immanent to the Kaulas and transcendent-immanent to the Trikas.

This view of Ksemaraja, apparently, comes in direct conflict with the stand adopted by Abhinavagupta that the word Tantra Prakriya is comprehensive enough so as to include all the varying shades of Trika, Krama and Pratyabhijna within its ambit. It is very strange that all the editions of the Pratyabhijnahrdaya and their respective editors are silent on this point - in fact it does not seem to bother any one of them. It, however, appears to the present author that Ksemaraja does not use the word Tantra and Kula in the same technical sense as is used by Abhinava. For, the views ascribed to the Tantra and Kula systems by him are not exactly those as they are known to have held on the basis of the available literature. So far as the concept of the ultimate reality is concerned, all the systems - those which are assigned under Tantra-prakriya and those which are not (i.e., those which subscribe to Kula-prakriya) - unreservedly take it to be both, transcendent as well as immanent. This view is essentially one which has been ascribed by Ksemaraja to the adherents of the Trika and its like systems (note the word 'adi' in Trikadi). It is, therefore, plausible to conclude that the words Tantra and Kula as used by Ksemaraja do not stand for their counterparts within the fold of Kashmir Saiva Monism, instead they represent alien forces. The word Trikadi, in fact, stands for the monistic Saivism of Kashmir in general which is further subdivided into Tantra and Kula Prakriyas. It would, therefore, appear that the view expressed by Ksemaraja does not contradict what has been shown to have been maintained by his master, Abhinavagupta.
tions 'his' conception of the Tantra-Prakriya in contrast with the Kula Prakriya. It remains for his students to draw their own conclusion.

1. No attempt is made here to define the word Tantra. In tantric parlance, however, it is called Tantra because it promulgates great knowledge concerning reality (tattva) and Mantra, and, because it saves from the worldly trammels—

Hare ye, princes, pious bhaktas, listen to this: let your heart be strong and your mind take confidence.

Kāmika Agama, Tāntrāntara Pañcāla.

Owing to his uncompromising monistic attitude the Trika author views the phenomenon of knowledge as a continuity and totality of the final Awareness. Hence, to a Trika author Tantra stands for such a text where the teacher, the taught and the teaching—everything happens to be identical with the supreme consciousness and it is consciousness that enacts the role of the teacher and the taught in the form of the enquirer and the replier:

But such descriptions fail to enlighten us about the precise nature and subject matter of the Tantras. For details of the etymology, genesis and definition of the word Tantra see Sakti and Sakta, Sir John Woodroffe, pp. 52-53 and History of Dharma Sastra, Kane, V-II, pp. 1031-33.

Unswerving mind and controlled senses—these two things are said to constitute the essential features of the tantric culture. But this, too, does not give us insight into the bases of the tantric way of thinking as well as living

This is all that we find expressly mentioned in the essentials of tantric culture. But this, too, does not give us insight into the bases of the tantric way of thinking as well as living
One is, therefore, supposed to directly appeal to the contents of the *Tantraloka*, *Tantrasara* and *Mahartha-manjari* (which is professedly presented as a tantric treatise) to find out what are the tantric features the Krama system claims to partake of.¹

1. For fuller grasp of the subject and comparative analysis of the common features of the tantras Woodroffe's following observation will be helpful:-

"As instances of general ideas I may cite the following: the conception of Deity as a Supreme Personality (Parahamta) and of the double aspect of God in one of which He really is or becomes the Universe; a true emanation from Him in His creative aspect; successive emanations (Abhasa, Vyuha) as of "fire from fire" from subtle to gross; doctrine of Sakti: pure and impure creation; the denial of unconscious Maya, such as Samkara teachers; doctrine of Maya Kosa and the Kancukas (the six Saiva Kancukas being, as Dr. Schrader says, represented by the possibly earlier classification in the Pancaratra of the three Samkocas); the carrying of the origin of things up and beyond Purusa-Prakrti, the Samkhyan Gunas, and evolution of Tattvas as applied to the doctrine of Sakti; affirmation of the reality of the Universe; emphasis on devotion (Bhakti); provision for all castes and both sexes.

"Instances of common practice are for example Mantra, Bija, Yantra, Mudra, Nyasa, Bhutasuddhi, Kundaliniyoga, construction and consecration of temples and images (Kriya), religious and social observances (Carya) such as Ahnika, Varnasrama Dharma, Utsava; and practical magic (Mayayoga). Where there is Mantra, Yantra, Nyasa, Diksa, Guru, and the like, there is Tantra Sastra. In fact one of the names of the latter is Mantra Sastra. With these similarities there are certain variations of doctrines and practice between the schools. Necessarily also, even on points of common similarity, there is some variance in terminology and exposition which is unessential." Vide *Sakti and Sakta*, pp. 58-59. Vide also Introduction to *Principles of Tantra*, pt. II, pp. XII-XIV; *The Saktas* by E. A. Payne, p. 137, for a similar view. Also of, *History of Dharma Sastra*, Vol. V, Pt. 2, p. 1092, fn. 1768.

Similarly T. A. Gopinatha Rao makes an important observation while distinguishing between the words agama and tantra which appears profitable to quote, "The words agama and tantra are used throughout this work as synonymous; strictly speaking an agama differs but slightly from a tantra. The former is said to deal with twentyfive subjects such as the nature of the Brahman, Brahmadvidya, the names of the different tantras, creation and destruction of the world, etc. The latter treats of only seven out of the twentyfive subjects dealt within
a. **Characteristic Features of Tantra as Outlined in the Tantrasara**

Abhinava in his *Tantrasara*, an epitome of the tantric knowledge, seems to suggest the following points as common grounds among the monistic tantras:-

(i) ignorance as imperfect knowledge identified with impurity (mala); twofold division of ignorance in the form of the spiritual (Paurusa) and the conceptual (Bauddha), the latter being more important as constituting primary step towards self-realisation;

(ii) Reality as self-luminosity and consciousness;

(iii) objective multiplicity as a manifestation of Awareness;

(iv) the Supreme Consciousness as Free Will;

(v) Reality as simultaneously transcendent and immanent due to its integral dynamism and freedom;

(vi) individual self or empirical being as a phenomenon of self-limitation of reality;

(vii) re-emergence of the limited self as Universal Self - spontaneously, owing to unrestricted agency of the self or gradually, with the help of earlier means necessitating the refinement of Vikalpas;¹

(viii) necessity of Sattarka (right logic), Sadagama (right scripture) and Sadguru (right teacher) as aides to re-emergence of eclipsed personality in original splendour on a graduated scale through purification of thought-constructs;

(ix) Sattarka (right logic), the most efficacious part of the Yoga, as an immediate means for self-attainment;

the agamas. Sometimes the word yamala is used as synonymous with agama and tantra; and a yamala deals with only five out of the twentyfive subjects in the agamas." *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, Vol. I, Pt. I, p. 21 (fn.)

Rao, however, does not enlighten us on the source of his information. It is, therefore, difficult to assess its textual authenticity.

¹. **For points** from (i) to (vii) see T.S. pp. 2.7.
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(x) recourse to practices such as Vaga, Homa, Vrata, Yoga etc. for subliming the right logic which is pure-knowledge (Suddha-Vidya);

(xi) realization of perfection-consciousness through manifestation of totality of powers;

(xii) supremacy of the Trika scriptures.¹

b. Mahesvarananda and Ramyadeva on Tantra as well as the Tantric Character of Krama

Mahesvarananda in his Gathas ², ⁶⁹³ which he devotes exclusively to examining the essentials of a tantra and by implication of his Mahartha tantra i.e., Mahartha-manjari, too, is more specific and precise than the generalization of those that have not been covered above. Thus these aspects are:

(i) The worldly multiplicity, represented by sensuous objects such as touch, sound etc., ordinarily supposed to be binding turns out to be the unfailing means of self-realisation.⁴

(ii) The means and goal of the spiritual attainment are identical.⁵

(iii) Harmony of the two aspects of reality i.e., Being (Prakasa) and Dynamism (Vimarsa), constitutes the nucleus of our physical being which too is identical with the totality of six channels (Adhvans).⁶

¹. For points from (viii) to (xii) of T.S., pp. 21-32.
². अथ गन्तव्यसम्बन्धाय तत्त्वस्वाभावाय प्रयोजनतयावेत्यां चाहिदान:। M.M.P., p. 9.
³. प्रारंभिक भावात्मक निष्कर्षमात्रं च संष्टोष्ट्रात्मिकां। Ibid., p. 180.
⁴. दर्शनात्मकाय-प्रेमसागराय सारविप्रायोगीनकल्लित: भक्तिप्रथमितविद्वानों। जीव- बुद्धलक्षणां विबलं विश्वं स्वातः स्वातं स्वतः त्व्यायः। M.M.P., p. 14.
⁵. अथ योयोद्यायायाय अध्यात्मिक-शास्त्राय। Ibid.
⁶. दिवं प्रसाध्वासासम्बन्धस्मृत्तयाय स्वरूपस्थानायन्तरत्मार्थसामविवाहवायं तद्वाँ वस्मि। स द्वारकाकालायोगितायान्तरावश्च भूषणत्वस्वरूपं वृत्त्यिनिः। Ibid., p. 181.
(iv) Abhyudaya and Nihsreyas of the Vedic terminology are transformed into Bhoga and Moksa in the tantric phraseology. While ordinarily enjoyment (bhoga) and freedom (moksa) cannot be combined as being opposite forces, they are synthesized into one unit marking the state of liberation where an object of enjoyment is visualized as an expression of self-reality.

(v) Wine, woman and meat which stand badly condemned in other systems occupy a place of basic importance in the ritualistic scheme because they offer a crucial and hard test of one's spiritual advancement.

(vi) Mantra is the fundamental component of any spiritual or textual adventure as it stands for the indeterminate matrix of the world known as Para Vak. The same is also identified with the principle of supreme agency consisting in I-consciousness or self-experience that enlivens the mantra.

(vii) Worship (Pujana), deity (Devata) and physical postures (Mudra), - everything transpiring to be essentially a reflection on the individual's self's identity with the Universal Self - are the factors that impart a definite tantric look to any doctrine.

1. वेन या क्षणमाध्यममेवापि जननमर्यादास्यापि जननपद्भावादेवमेवापि जततर्यादिकापि जनस्मृतिजन्मोपप्रेयते।
   M.M.P., 132.

2. अभ्युदयमेवापि निःखृतापि।
   Ibid.

3. वेन माताके शरीर परमेश्वरपालते।।
   जननमाध्यमेवापि क्षणमाध्यममेवापि।
   जननमाध्यममेवापि।।
   Ibid., pp. 198-200.

4. पुजार्थानविनिहिताः प्रचलिताः।।
   देवताय विनिहिताः।।
   महापूर्वप्रतिष्ठिताः।।
   जननमाध्यममेवापि।।
   M.M.P., p. 20.
The fourth aspect is logically deduced from the first one as presented above. In this connection an allusion to a few observations made by Ramyadeva in his commentary on the Bhavopahara would make this study more meaningful. He portrays the Krama system as one that believes in the identity of the Full (Purna) and the Lean (Krsa) deity. Implying that even when Reality (i.e., divinity par transcendence) is not involved in cosmic manifestation owing to withdrawal of the latter, it retains its perfection. The other remark relates to the seventh aspect, mentioned above. In his view recourse to the practices like worship etc. being essentially another way of meditative realization of one’s divine essence, turns out to be instinctive and integral part of our spiritual personality. As an essential dimension of spiritual being the act of worship never comes to a close.

c. Characteristic Features of Krama as a Tantric System

Thus it is evident that the Krama as a tantric system, rests upon intuition and discourages dialectic. In doing so it approximates to some modern tendencies of the Western philosophy. The tantric character seeks its fulfilment in the harmonious reconcilement of intuition with practical realization. It is why, by the fourfold divisions of tantric subject matter (Jnana, Yoga, Kriya, Carya) Jnana is linked up with Kriya and Carya through Yoga. It also explains the reason behind acclaining the Malini Tantra as the chief source of inspiration, because it struck a balance between speculation and practice. Likewise,

1. दृष्टि संचयनानामालं वृत्तो अविनुलकेष परिपुष्यन् —
   दृष्टि पूर्णकर्मेऽश्चतात्समपन्तः कामाभ्य न्याय: प्रभवत: ।
   \[B.U.V., p. 38.\]

2. सत्दीपश्यात्सागरश्च सत्ततोदिकौधिस्तिमपुजनय: उद्भुजित: ।
   \[B. U. V., p. 4.\]

3. तच्च सिद्धान्तमाळसामालकोपाध्यायकामलात्तिविभिः ।
   नल विनाप्रवर्धन्ते सिद्धान्तमें, शास्त्रविद्यामालकोपाध्याय ।
   तदृस्थम तदुपयवः भालस्यभवत्तय इति तद्व विभिः ।
   \[T.A.V., p. 49.\]
synthesis of Bhoga and Moksa - the *sine qua non* of the tantric philosophy is the tantric rendering of harmony between knowledge and action. The key objective of the *Tantraloka* is to expound this theme through an exposition of the four upayas that are the tantric adaptations of the various systems under the Trika.¹ This synthesis is achieved by leading intuition, according to the tantra, into higher and higher possibilities by means of Sadhana i.e., practice, whose result is the gradual unfolding of the spirit’s latent potencies. Thus philosophy of the tantra is a practical philosophy which, according to an eminent Indian author, "not merely 'argues' but 'experiments'."²

4. *Two Phases of the Krama-Tantricism*

In the earlier phase which comes to a close with Ksemaraja or Varadaraja, the Krama system was marked by a definite-proclivity towards philosophical and intuitional issues. In tantric phraseology the aspects Jnana and Yoga remained superior to those of Carya and Kriya. It is in fact its main plank against the Kula and Siddhanta doctrines as subsequent study would reveal. But later on the emphasis was reversed and the ritualistic aspect came on the threshold. Mysticism and metaphysics were made to serve the interests of esotericism and ritualism. The tendency makes deeprooted strides as we drift close to Mahesvarananda and Sitikantha. Sometimes the author is so lost in esoteric jargon that it becomes a test for a modern student³ to carry on his perusal. However, the later phase

---

¹. इति स्मार्थस्मृतः उपरिपुजितसाधवस्तुवः ।
तमया तद्यथावर्त्तिकाभ्यां शासने ॥

*T. A. 1.245.*

². *Sakti and Sakta*, p. 03. The view referred to has been ascribed to Prof. Pramatha Natha Mukhopadhyaya, now of Swami Pratyagatmananda fame.

³. For instance the following phrases from the *Bhavopahara-vivarana* have surpassed the comprehension of the present author:

देवलमणिर्माणिकित्रस्यभिन्नतामृतमुक्त्यत्र दायस्तिकित्रस्मृतिलक्यम्यक्येण अमावतः—
attaches importance to the Mudra, Mantra and Pujana etc. to the extent that these emerge as the central features of the system. Similarly the Pitha, the spiritual seat, which attracted only passing references before, now comes to be eulogised as constituting the most vital element in the system.

1. 萬般輪回（p. 23）：
2. 如理如義（p. 28）：
3. 阿若努波裡（p. 29）：

It is just an instance, Sitikantha's work, in particular abounds in such expressions.

1. 摩陀羅（p. 122）.
2. 叉曰：

3. 邪思（p. 1.5）：

4. 洛論（p. 86）：

The above lines do not try to ascertain the exact number of spiritual seats (Pithas) according to the Krama system. But according to the material available, the indications are that they did not deviate much from these in the other traditions. In support we reproduce an extract from the History of Dharmasastra, by P. V. Kane (Vol 5, Pt. 2, p. 1038, fn. No. 1673) which brings into open a comparative estimate of tantric thinking in regard to the Pithas. It reads:

"It appears that in some Tantra works five Pithas are named (according to H. P. Sastri's Cat. of Nepal Palm-leaf and selected paper MSS in the Nepal Durbar Library. Calcutta, 1905, p. LXXX) viz., Odiyana (in Orissa, says H.P. Sastri), Jala (in Jalandhar), Purna Matanga in Srisaila and Kamakhya in Assam...The Sadhanamala (Vol. II, pp. 453 and 455) mentions Uddipana, Purnagiri, Kamakhya and Sripitha. The Kulacudamanitantra (Tantrik Texts, Vol. IV, in 6th Patala, verses 3-7) refers to five Pithas viz., Uddiyana, Kamarupa, Kamakhya, Jalandhara and and Purnagiri (Vide also 3rd Patala, 59-
61)." Also vide "The first two are respectively identified with Kamakhya or Kamarupa (three miles from Gauhati) and modern Sylhet. The exact situation of the other two (Kamakhya and Kamarupa are identical according to others) is a controversial matter. M M.H.P. Sastri identified Uddiyana with Orissa. His son Dr. B. Bhattacharya furnishes good ground for holding that Uddiyana was near Swat valley in N.W. India and Grousset In the footsteps of Buddha pp 109-110 holds the same view" (ibid., pp. 1038-39).

For the sake of relevancy it may be pointed out that Mahesvarananda does not treat Sripitha and Uddiyana as two separate pithas. Though Oddiyana is a subordinate pitha 'yet it ranks supreme in its effectiveness as spiritual seat. (अंपीयोऽत्तथा ज्ञातं कृतान्तकरणेष्व गहनः बोध्यते।).

M.M.P., p. 36).

Sitikantha echoes the same view (vide, M.P.(S) pp. 2 and 50). It may be mentioned that the former belonged to Chola in Kerala, whereas the latter to Kashmir. The Cidgagama-Candrika, extols Purnapitha as the highest (पुर्णकन्तकरणेष्व मंगले त्वांश्रावविक्रते कृतं । C.G.C. 4. 128). There is mention of another Pitha e.g., Uddiyana which is identical with present Kashmir - (ततो ध्वात तु पदयो जन्मिन्ति मिथियानमत्तयां विभिन्न भिन्नम् । M.P.(T). 2. 37; and उत्तरपीठायां वदेषामि श्रीशिवानन्दस्य पिन्नम् || T.D.V., 111, p. 192). Really speaking Krama is called Uttaramnaya because it arose in and spread out from Uttarapitha. This Pitha has escaped the notice of other Tantric works. There is still another view which tends to identify Kashmir, indeed by implication, with Oddiyana. On this view, which banks on Sivananda's statement in the Rjuvimarsini and has been quoted by Mahesvarananda (M.M.P., p. 193), Tripura and Krama both the systems would originate from one place. However, the spokesman of this view would seem to take Uttarapitha and Uddiyana as one.

Cf. "उद्धवविराताः पोषायां हिंदी कर्मसमपथे एवं बोधिते। नामार्थव त्वां हिंदी पश्चिमस्य ब्रह्मार्थे प्रकृति । गुरुवाचनोऽत्तुत्तम्या गुरुवाचनस्य ध्वाकान्तानि इति कर्पते स्म।

सत्यं एवं उद्धवविराताः स्वामिः प्राचीनार्थं यस्य यानायामि इति कर्पते स्म।

सत्यं एवं उद्धवविराताः स्वामिः प्राचीनार्थं यस्य यानायामि इति कर्पते स्म।"

— विद्वानस्य निरीक्षणं आदायः कुलकाव्यं, Braj Vallabha Dwivedi, submitted to the 22nd session AIOC, Gauhati; also sec Ann, कौटिल्यासहित वर्ष भारत भारतम्।

S.S. 6, 3-4, p. 342.
The Krama subscribes to the general tantric belief that their philosophy was revealed through the Yoginis. This belief is a legacy of the earlier stages and has been retained even afterwards. Such a convention suits Krama more than any other system. Because, as we are likely to see, the first recipients of the Krama wisdom were the female ascetics. Similarly, in one of mythical accounts of the system's origin, it is traced to Makaradevi. Even the famous twelve Kalikas are sometimes described as Yoginis. In this connection liberty may be taken for hazarding a suggestion that Mahesvarananda's story of divine inspiration from a female ascetic in a dream might be a left-over of this tradition. In the beginning the Krama system was intended to cater to the spiritual urges of all strata of human society and hence it envisaged a scheme of graded emancipation. But gradually, as the time passed, greater and greater secrecy came to shroud it and it did not, perhaps, allow common man the same easy access to it as he was accustomed to enjoy. It might be one of the factors, other than historical ones, that led the system to oblivion. Some statements amply testify to it. One of possible causes of such a tendency might be ascribed to the general tantric practice of total reliance on one's preceptorial lineage. And, no doubt, only a few could have

1. तथेष्व योगिनीवशहस्त्रप्रदायक्रमाया।
   विखुलश्यामेवेशा नित्येन विलम्बी स्थिति:॥
   
   M.V.V. 2.94.

2. शाश्वश्रस्त्रस्वानात: सपि भिखले।
   योगिनीवशहस्त्रप्रदायक्रमाया॥
   
   Ibiv., 2.97.

3. तद्वस्तू परमेश्वरे योगिनिनां गुरूं निष्ठवस्।
   गुहागममतास्थानं गुजारे गुरुपारितांम्॥
   
   M.P.(T), 7.168.

4. तलिकाओऽन्व योगिनीर्गते नामान्त एवं चेष्टां न प्रकुल्प त्वत्त॥
   

4. एवं महायात्मकम् परार्थ्यम्यं पीठमेत्र गुप्तमल्ल्य महायात्म॥
   

वद्वस्तू परमेश्वरे।

M.P. (T), 7.168.
been the worthy custodians of the schools' secrets. Likewise, the theory of Cakras was a logical deduction from reality being conceived as kinetic and continuous. The esteem, in which the Anakhya or Samvit Cakras etc are held, is too well known to require elucidation. But still in Abhinava the ritualistic significance is not so predominant. So much so that even the most characteristic theories of Vrnda Cakra etc are not traceable to Abhinava or to the Tantraloka. But gradually the importance of the Cakras like many other aspects grew and the system came to be designated as the Cakra-krama-sampradaya (school of the cyclic order), or the Navacakra-Sampradaya (school of the nine cycles). The Nava-cakras include the five functional cycles (i.e., Srsti, Stthiti etc.) three cycles of the optical trinity (Trinetra) i.e., Prakasa, Ananda and Murti and the Vrnda Cakra. Similarly another esoteric appellation of the system is found in the phrase "Ady-

1. गुह्मृत्त्रथमात्र दायमाध्यमन्

2. नववर्धनायोगिनः सर्वभाग्यसंयोजनः

3. नववर्धनायोगिनः सर्वभाग्यसंयोजनः
aksara Sampradaya" (the school of the first letter). In fact the Akara (A) is deemed to be the most important part of the entire alphabet according to the esoteric symbolism. Akara, accordingly, is said to have four crests and represents the first stage of manifestation and assumes the cosmic dimensions. It is, however, gratifying to note that the Krama system, though in later stages advocating the use of wine and woman etc., which constitute the Pancatattva of the tantras, does not preach licentiousness. And a comparatively rarer reference has been made to this aspect. The Krama authors had to subscribe to it, because they aimed at complete self-control demonstrated not only through abstinence from but also through participation in the objects of enjoyments. But the fact remains that Abhinava does not take cognizance of these things in his presentation of the Samvivcakra and dwells on the spiritual bearing of the same through an analysis of epistemic experience. In contrast, Sivananda II is prone to incorporate the wine etc. in the context of Samvivcakra (anakhya cakra) marking out a diversion of emphasis from spiritual inquiry to mystic experimentalism. But even here this form of worship was prescribed only at a very advanced stage of spiritual development when the things that usually lure one away could create no mental digression.

5. Experience, Pure and Simple: Pivot of the Tantric thinking of Krama

The whole of the above discussion may perhaps be subsumed under one single doctrine that posits the realization of identity of the Individual Soul with the Universal Soul as a fundamental premise. Reality is conceived in terms of univer-

1. अक्षरासम्प्रदायी ग्रंथावलीमुद्र sanskrit
2. इतिहासमा अक्षर एवं विश्वनामासर्वविश्वकोटि: sanskrit
Vide also: अनुवादक संदर्भम्: sanskrit
sal idea or Experience pure and simple (Samvit). Experience (Samvit) and Reality (Sat, being) are essentially one. Hence the method preferred is not to bifurcate reality owing to the limitations of the dialectic and logic in comprehending the whole of reality, but to experience i.e., intuitively realize, the self (sat, being). Thus 'being' spells the content of 'experience' and 'experience' defines the nature and method of 'being'. In the typical Trika phraseology it is described as realization of Prakasa through Vimarsa. In still other words self-realization is nothing but the realization of Prakasa as being involved in the very nature of Vimarsa. Precisely the unity of the self and the Supreme Self (शात्त्रप्रकाशायद्भव्यम्) is arrived at through unity of the being (Prakasa, Sat) and its inherent possibilities of becoming (Vimarsa, Sakti) (सक्त्योत्तरिेंश्चित्म). This is the logic behind the most cherished method enjoined in terms of discovering the essential identity between the agenthood of the empirical subject and that of the Absolute (Pancaknya-parisilana). Hence the experience of self is not a simple act of knowing but a complex one of re-knowing (Pratyabhijna). Since logic fails us in our hopes of attaining our alogical character, the intuitive realization turns out to be a process of mystic experiencing. It is why the mystic side of our self-experience has been so ardently embarked upon.1 Moreover, in the nature of things, a priori awareness leading us to the intrinsic self-experience is bound to be mystical both in and out. Hence the process of synthesis occasioning complete dilution of the subjective and objective polarities in one is equally bound to be mystic in character. Esoterics is therefore the only methodology suited to realization of the mystic goal of self-experience,2 former

1. वश्यामानमात्रविबन्धस्यक्ष्यस्यान्तः। सूत्रस्ये स शून्यता।

2. प्रक्ष्यान्तः कोशलस्यान्तः। सूत्रस्ये ॥

3. इद्युत्त्वातीर्थ्ये भावानुष्वामान। सूत्रस्ये ॥

4. अनुक्रमकुपल्लिये भावः पुरुषोऽवश्यः।

5. अध्येत संतोसतः शतादतः जञ्जस्याति परक्षत:।

6. प्रक्ष्यान्तः कोशलस्यान्तः। सूत्रस्ये ॥

† M.P. (T) 7.18.

† M.P. (T) 9. 61-68.
Krama as a Tantric System

remaining always subservient to the latter. It is only when the true significance of intuitive realization is lost sight of due to deficient and hastily inculcated spiritual vision of the aspirant, the esotericism becomes the rule of the day, the method and means replacing and discarding their very ideal.\(^1\) A close study of the Tantras will demonstrate, why the Tantras give preference to what is called the inner worship (Antaryaga)\(^2\) and to pure reflection (Bhavana), which in the Krama system synchronizes with the highest level of Sattarka, the principle of Right Logic. And the various rites in Krama worship will be found, as will be seen later, conducive to such a realization on the graduated scale.\(^3\) This may be the only rationally possible implication of the process of the refinement of determinate ideality (Vikalpa-Samskara), in the context of the tantric substructure of the system. Even the tantric worship aims at harmonizing the deity whom one worships and the macrocosm over which she presides. In this the Krama system joins Samaya school in discarding the external worship for the attainment of the self.\(^4\)

Apart from the naturally dominant tendency towards mystic possibilities of self-experience, the other factor that

1. स्वयं स्वामिस्वेते वामने तत्त्वमाप्नुप्रेरणात्।
   बहादुरं त्वं नान्तः प्राप्ताय विचारनेतरायहि।।
   \(Ibid.,\) 7. 187-188.

2. पुजा नाम न गुप्ताचोरीर्मतिः किंतु इत्यदृश्योऽहि।
   निषेधोपि सत्योपलिपि सा पुजा ह्यादरस्वमः।।
   \(Ibid.,\) 8.4.

3. अत आत्मशिराज्ञाने समाने निषेधकथा।।
   विवक्तचलावचिद्दे पूजात्माया प्रवशते।।
   \(V. Bh.\) 147.

4. अत्यावरणिकमाः पुजा गर्भेन्दोलस्तः।।
   क्षति: पुजा विवक्तचाय दयनं न जावते।।
   \(Vāmaksicāra Tantra (Ch. 51),\)
contributed to the regularly swelling esoteric aspect of the system consists in its inter-action with the other tantric and agamic forces of the day. In this connection one should also briefly consider its relation and attitude to some other systems of philosophy of non-agamic origin. The next section is addressed to the study of this question as well.
CHAPTER IV

MUTUAL EXCHANGE WITH AND IMPACT ON THE OTHER PHILOSOPHICAL AND TANTRIC SYSTEMS

An enquiry into the sources of influences responsible for the rise and development of particular doctrines or esoteric tendencies in the Krama systems

1. Nature and Scope of the Proposed Enquiry

Here we intend to concentrate upon an examination of the nature and extent of the influence exercised by the other systems of thought on the Krama system and vice versa with special reference to the specific trends evinced by Krama, naturally excluding those ideas that subscribe to the general build-up of all the tantric systems. Thus, the admission of the Samkhya scheme of tattvas to the thirty-six-category scheme of all the Saiva and Sakta tantric systems and the tantric transformation of the Sadrsha-parinamavada doctrine into the theory of Abhasa-vada etc are ruled out from the present treatment; similarly an analysis of the doctrinal Krama attitude towards the Veda and Vedic systems and their comparative validity is also excluded since it has been dealt with on a subsequent occasion. The sole and ultimate purpose of the present treatment is to pick up and point out the source of influences that directly or indirectly inspired particular doctrines or esoteric tendencies in the system without attempting a comparative estimate of the various systems as such.

2. Krama versus Spanda with Regard to the Concepts of Reality and Fourfold Absolutic Functionalism

Let us begin with a glance at the immediate surroundings of the Krama system. The attention has already been invited to the fact that Krama was a Saiva system with basically Sakta
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It becomes evident from the Krama accent on Sakti, the dynamic aspect of the Male Polarity i.e., the Lord. The word Spanda (from Spadi - to throb, the palpitate, to move slightly) is an exact counterpart in Samskrta of the word 'dynamism' in English. The two commentators on the Spanda-Karikas, namely, Utpala-Vaisnava and Ksemaraja, are the first authors to discover the close correlation between the two systems with regard to their two particular theses. While explaining the first Karika¹ in his Nimaya Ksemaraja takes the phrase "Svasakti-cakravibhava-prabhavam" as representing the Krama or Mahartha ideal of the fivefold Absolutic functioning occasioned through the agency of the deities headed by Srsti Kali etc.² He further endorses his thesis by observing that the highest Mahartha ideal is contained in the first and the last Karika of the Spanda-Karikta.³ The essence of the Spanda doctrine is best represented in the Mahartha concept of the supreme reality that consists in realising the self as "power-ful" (Saktiman) through unearthing real nature of his "powers" (Sakti) by way of five acts. This view is reiterated in his Vimarsini⁴ on the Siva-Sutra 1.6.⁵ Our other author Utpala Vaisnava, who is more thorough-going a Spanda-vadin, suggests in his commentary on the forty-fourth

1. यद्योपेयतंत्रताः जनाः प्रभृतिर्वर्णिः
   ते शरिकेतयविवर्णलेख संस्कर्स्ययुपः।

2. नवोदयमहार्णवेल्प्प्रभुअर्द्धशास्त्रसाहित्यमेधयोगी जनाः प्रभृतिर्वर्णिः
   संस्कर्स्ययुपं तत्वंभेदगुणे यथे नियतः—द्वारामविवर्णः
   ते शरिकेतयविवर्णलेखः।

3. एवं बोधेत्रयोभिर्महार्णवेल्प्प्रभुअर्द्धशास्त्रसाहित्यमेधयोगिः
   वर्णमल्लतः तत्वाखान्तं यस्तुर्ज्ञानोपयोगितानुपूर्वकम्
   यस्तविज्ञानीयर्विवर्णिः।
   Ibid., p.74.

4. यद्योपेयतंत्रमहार्णवेल्प्प्रभुअर्द्धशास्त्रसाहित्यमेधयोगिः
   तत्वाखान्तं यस्तुर्ज्ञानोपयोगितानुपूर्वकम्
   यस्तविज्ञानीयर्विवर्णिः।
   नवोदयमहार्णवेल्प्प्रभुअर्द्धशास्त्रसाहित्यमेधयोगिः।
   नवोदयमहार्णवेल्प्प्रभुअर्द्धशास्त्रसाहित्यमेधयोगिः।
   नवोदयमहार्णवेल्प्प्रभुअर्द्धशास्त्रसाहित्यमेधयोगिः।
   नवोदयमहार्णवेल्प्प्रभुअर्द्धशास्त्रसाहित्यमेधयोगिः।
   यद्योपेयतंत्रमहार्णवेल्प्प्रभुअर्द्धशास्त्रसाहित्यमेधयोगिः।
   Sp. K. 49.
   यद्योपेयतंत्रमहार्णवेल्प्प्रभुअर्द्धशास्त्रसाहित्यमेधयोगिः।
   S. S. Vi., pp. 21-23.

5. शरिकेतयविवर्णलेखः।
Karika\(^1\) that this Karika embodies the essence of Krama teaching that one develops a state of continuous realization of the principle of Spanda through one's recourse to various methods of self-reflection.\(^2\) And on the forty-second Karika\(^3\) he makes it absolutely certain that the Spanda concepts of Bindu, Nada, Rupa and Rasa are the exact Spanda correspondents of the four functions of the Absolute in the Krama system.\(^4\)

Now it is difficult to ascertain as to which of the either school is indebted to which, yet a few conclusions may tentatively be drawn. Despite the fact that both the schools are wedded to the doctrine of dynamic Absolutism, the Krama appears to pursue it with more vigour. Hence, the Spanda system might be indebted to the Krama system for these ideas. Reasons for hazarding such a guess are as under:

(i) Krama, being the earliest monistic Saiva System of Kashmir, is earlier than Spanda also.

(ii) The supremacy of the Absolute vis-a-vis the same of the Absolutive Dynamism i.e., Sakti or Kali, is a matter of controversy in view of the fundamental role assumed by the latter in the Krama system, whereas the ultimacy of the Absolute has never been questioned in the Spanda with all its accent on the dynamic aspect i.e., Spanda, that is Sakti.

(iii) The first two verses, unlike Ksemaraja, are not interpreted in the light of the Krama system by the

---

1. प्रबुद्धं स्वेतं तिपण्डजानाहं गोवर्धनं ।
   एवंवार्षिकञ्चं ततामुखं न वैद्यते ॥
2. एतातिथ्वां तपारोहृतिका च ब्रह्मचालिनाम् ॥
3. अन्तो विद्वृत्तो नादो युपम्स्मादलो धमः ।
   प्रवर्तवर्न्तितिस्वीव ओभक्तमेति वैहन ॥
   Also see Pt. II, Ch. I, under “The Discovery of One’s potencies as a means to self discovery”.
4. एस्मातिथ्वांश्चार्मार्थविवाहम् उदात्थतानामवर्णं विलापनम: ।
   मन्त्रवयंको श्रमोंदेव नुष्टोटिष्ठन: ॥

Ibid., p. 49.
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other Spanda authors notably Ramakantha indicating lack of unanimity with regard to the Krama impact on the Spanda.

(iv) The fortysecond and fortyfourth Karikas have not been accorded with the Krama interpretation by Ksemaraja unlike Utpala Vaisnava indicating the same as in (iii) above.

(v) Yet, both the sub-schools of the Spanda system - the one headed by Ksemaraja and the other by Utpala - recognize the element of the Krama theses as latent in the Spanda dicta.


Coming to the Kula system one finds that the process of influence has gone on a bilateral scale. It has been noted earlier that the Krama system, under the spell of its maintaining a parity between affirmation and negation both, adopts a completely indifferent attitude towards rituals like phallus-worship, the putting on of the matted hair and sacred ashes on the body, observance of religious vows, worship of deities, and the spiritual efficacy of Ksetra (station) as well as Pithas\(^1\) (seat). Such an attitude comes in sharp contrast to that of the Siddhanta and Kula systems with their enjoining and prohibiting these respectively. However, with regard to the phenomenon of Pitha etc. Kula does not prohibit but advocates them, while they stand negated by the Mata system. Likewise, while Kula prescribes Samayacara\(^2\) and worship of Ovallis, Mudra, Chumma etc., the Mata Sastra prohibits the same. And Krama, as usual, does not bother itself.\(^3\) But this equilibrium of mind and posture

1. क्षेत्र नेत्राश्याम वेन्द्र कामश्याम, उपपीठ देवीलोकाविरि 1...
   द्वृ फुलवसुभवानि नास्तिदि ।
   \textit{T. A. V., III, pp. 200-91.}

2. The discrimination between what one ought to do and what one ought not is the essence of the Samayacara—द्वृ कुर्वादिः न कुर्वाः स्वक्षर्मासम्
   सम्बन्धाः ।
   \textit{T. A. V., III, p. 202.}

of neutrality is not maintained for long. The Pitha, rituals, Ovallis, Ghara, Pallis etc. are injected into the system under the Kula influence and we come to know of a few Ovallis at least, namely, Mahananda and Kularani in the Krama. Similarly the line of teachers under Kula system including Yukanathas and Rajaputras, which initially did not find favour with Krama, later became acceptable inasmuch as their worship was advocated in Sthiti-cakra. This question has been discussed at its proper place subsequently. Even in later history we do hear a few discordant notes, but once an influence has interpolated itself it is difficult to pull it out. These later developments took place in the wake of the Kula system, because there came a stage when the Kula was thought to be superior to the Krama system. One has already seen that Abhinava himself elevates the Kula-prakriya as compared with the Tantra-Prakriya. The process was logically extended to the point when Kula came to be acknowledged as constituting the crowning point of the Krama ideology and even the Krama works were referred to as the Kula texts. A natural outcome of such a tendency was that the Krama authors were gradually led to imbibe and import all those Kula theses that could be fitted in the Krama plan.

2. Ibid., p. 107; also see M. M. P. p. 1.
7. Ibid., p. 199.
But at the same time, the Kula system also could not remain immune from the impact coming from the opposite direction i.e., Krama. The most important exchange took place with regard to the theory of the twelve Kalis or Samviddevis constituting the power-cycle (Sakti-cakra). This process did not remain confined to the Kula system alone but infected other systems as well, the Sara system in particular. As a natural corollary, the Anakhya-krama forced its way into the Kula fold.

4. Krama and Tripura: Reciprocal Impact

The other cognate creed that seems to have shaped and inspired quite a few theses of Krama is the Tripura system in spite of its not being a Saiva ideology. Krama owing to its temperamental attachment to the Sakti is rather soft to Tripura, a Sakta system. Sitikantha is most alive to this influence when he defines the scope of Mahartha as ranging from the Pitha (Spiritual seat) to the Samayavidya i.e., Tripura philosophy. But for its Saiva associations, Krama is certainly a Sakta system. He says that the Samaya-vidya is one because it marks the summit of all Krama achievement and the total variety of the Kramas is finally reposed here. Hence he describes Anakhya and Bhasa as Anakhya-Samayesvari and Bhasa-Samayesvari. Similarly, Vrnda-cakra, which according to Mahesvarananda is the most important single aspect of the Krama

1. Shukalokottara-samhita, Adbhutata.


4. Ibid., p. 238.

5. Ibid., p. 126.

6. Ibid., p. 128.
system\(^1\) is introduced by him as Sri-cakra,\(^2\) an equally valued part of Tripura. There is some evidence to show that the concept of Vṛnda-cakra was not completely unknown to the Tripura authors. The anonymous commentary on the Kama-kalavilasa (Kashmir edition) of Punyananda refers to two types of Vṛnda-cakra viz., Pada-vikṣepsa and Kramodaya.\(^3\) The former represents the Absolutic capacity for infinite possibilities of self-becoming and the latter with the traditional history. It is our impression that while Sri-cakra may be held responsible for the very inspiration of Vṛnda-cakra, the notion of Vṛnda-cakra is an export from the Krama into Tripura. Because in early stages we do not have any record of Vṛnda in Krama, Vṛnda being a later development. But on the other hand, Sri-cakra starts from the initial stages of the Tripura history. Tripura, the highest ideal of the Tripura system, is sought to be identified with Kala-Samkarsini\(^4\) - the Ultimate in Krama. As has been said earlier, Jayaratha leaves no doubt about the Tripura’s identity with the Kula system.\(^5\) If such contention be accepted without reservation, the Kula and, for that matter, the Tripura might be said to have exercised tremendous influence on the Krama. But Tripura has received also in return.

1. किंवत्, धौम्यस्थार्यमार्गप्रथमं सन्धिं पृथच्छविषयमाति।
   M.M.P., p. 194.

2. अय श्रीस्वर्य वृषभं उपाध्यक्षमाति...।
   Ibid., p. 57.

3. कृतान्तं उपविशेष: कमोदककृतं रूपं भवं।
   K.K.V., 35. (K.S.S.)
   उपजाति।
   Ibid., comm., p. 38.

4. परस्तःपरप्राणमहाभाष्यं श्वरकारे अभ्यव्यक्ते विवाहिनिधात्रां एकं वाच्य वस्तुः
   वर्णसाक्षरोमितिद्वारा अन्यं किंचिद्विपुरसंसर्गयद्धतत्त तत्संबूर उद्धोपयते।
   V.M.V., p. 103.

5. अन्तर्व आपवेन बहवेगुरुर्यः
   द्विधिक्षितं भौर्म्भिनीकभः कुटजेजितं कुलेनः प्रवृत्तितं जागुरुः।
   ब्रह्मात्मास्वादित्वायुपपुष्पितर्यायुप्प्वासनाय शरीरम् तानात्माय वेदायं।
   हृदयं उड़तं।
   नव्यवेण्ट्ट नामकार्यबस्तितः वस्त्रं केशवस्त्रेऽकामिन्य परमप्रसंपर्य शाश्वे
   किंवेश्यलिधिया व्याज्ञित्रप्रणांय वधादानमायेन न स्वम्य।
   Ibid., p. 28.
Anakhya, the fourth act of the Absolute - and also Reality as such according to the four-function theory\(^1\) (Krama-catuska) of the Krama system -., is probably borrowed from the latter.\(^2\) Jayaratha also suggests that Krama advocated Srsti-cakra and Samhara-cakra as independent from each other. Tripura borrowed and employed this doctrine with regard to the other theories of the system. For instance, the eighth and ninth cakras in Tripura are also independent cakras.\(^3\) This phenomenon is equally discernible in certain other spheres as well. The concept of Sattarka (Right Logic) for instance, seems to have been borrowed by the Tripura system from the Krama despite the fact that at both the places it is brought forth as an agamic notion.\(^4\) Likewise, the unusual fondness of Krama for Prakrta languages is a legacy from Tripura. Mahesvarananda’s citing a statement from \textit{Rjuvimarsini}, a Tripura text, in support of Krama’s explicit preference for Prakrta would probably evince the veracity of this statement.

5. \textit{Impact of Buddhist Tantricism on Krama: Sadanga-yoga, Anakhya and some other Minor Doctrines}

The introduction of the Sadanga-yoga (six-limbed yoga) in place of Patanjali’s Astanga (eightfold) Yoga marks a

1. सूत्राविवर्णनाकेशुप्रोचितानेन अभिधागमे करति।
   \textit{V.M.V., p. 37.}

2. वाक्यसंप्रदातिविनेदस्यां सत्कार सूक्ष्मान।
   सुविदेश्यत्वःस्रवः आचार्यनिधिः।
   \textit{वरिष्ठा-रहस्यः १. ३२।}
   अग्निद्वारा विद्योगन्यालोक: समाचितः।
   हर्षपर्यकेशायोहसीन्धवसमस्मानविवेदिशेऽवाः।

   \textit{Prakasha by Bhaskara Raya on the above, p. 28.}

   \textit{Vidh also……सूत्राविवर्णनाकेशुप्रोचितानेन अभिधागमे करति।}
   अतएव……स्मितहै अन्तरसिद्धान्तिः।
   अविदेश्यत्वः अष्टंयात्मानार्थात्।
   उद्देश्ययोगिनं सिद्धान्तपर्यंत्विज्ञायत्वा
   महाविद्युतपूर्वकः प्रायोगिकवेष्ठा या विद्युत तत्क्रितिकम्……।
   \textit{V.M.V., p. 26.}

3. \textit{नमस्तमन्यस्यद्वागीषु सत्कारः। कृपित्वामिलकरुणामेव आचार्यनिधिः।}

   \textit{Ibid., p. 71.}

4. \textit{Cf. Pt. II, Ch. 1.}
curious departure from the general trend in the history of the Krama thought and has evaded a satisfactory answer so far. Because each of the monistic Saiva doctrines of Kashmir abides by the Patanjala discipline of the eightfold path. Even Abhinavagupta, who is interpreted by Jayaratha as subscribing to the theory of Sadanga-yoga, does not, in fact, expressly commit himself to the said thesis From a close study of him it will be found that he actually dwells on the eightfold yogic discipline. This incongruity is deliberate and is explained by Jayaratha in terms of Abhinava's underlying motive. According to Jayaratha, Abhinava wants to suggest that the number of parts as eight of the Yoga is, in any case, final and cannot be enhanced further. Abhinava actually supplants Sattarka for the highest stage of the Krama process of Yoga and castigates the first five items as futile by virtue of their being external and adventitious in character. It is Jayaratha who cites a verse in order to describe the six-limbed doctrine from an unnamed source. The extract in question eliminates the first three parts namely, Yama, Niyama and Asana, from the original eightfold scheme and adds Tarka or Sattarka, thus bringing the total to six. It is queer that he nowhere attempts to define the six members of the scheme individually, instead all the definitions are drawn verbatim from the Yoga Sutras of Patanjali. In such circumstances one is prone to believe that the doctrine of six-limbed Yoga was an interpolation which may possibly be traced to the Tantric Buddhism. In the Sri-guhya-samajatantra (Ch. xvIII) the

1. यन्नाम अश्च योगस्य स्वदर्शनोक्तानि वदन्नझन्यक्ष्याय पातंजलिकौ यमा-वज्जप्रसन्नमु रक्षामु, तर्कस्तादिपि एवद्रुत्स्तकृतिप्रितम् अयथादवस्तरं नविताम्।
   T.A.V., III, pp. 102-103.

2. प्रणालियमस्तता ध्यायं प्रयाग्न्याऽर्हं ध्यानं।
   तदस्त्रां तस्मात् साम्प्रदायो शृंकृतो गंगुहा उच्चवेदी।
   T.A.V., III, p. 15.

3. यम-नियम-प्रणाम-प्रणायाम-प्रत्याज्ञा-ध्यानं-सामाधिगीताप्रज्ञानि।
   Y.S. 2.29.

4. J. Ensink however differs from the present author. He does not think the doctrine of Sadanga Yoga to be an off-shoot of Tantric Buddhism, instead it may be traced to some older tradition to which the Javan-Balinese literature is also indebted.

(contd.)
Sadanga Yoga has been painted as the most conducive means to the highest accomplishment.\(^1\) The detailed description of these six parts of Yoga has again been fully enlarged upon in the commentary called *Sekoddesa-tika* by Nadopada.\(^2\) It is worth mentioning that the first three Angas of Yoga mentioned in the *Yoga-Sutra* viz., Yama, Nivama and Asana, are omitted and a new one, Anusmrti, is added.\(^3\) One may notice the marked similarity between the Krama and Buddhist treatment of the problem. Except the additional aspect i.e., Tarka or Anusmrti, in their respective presentations there is virtually no difference. And one may even be tempted to go so far as to say that Jayaratha has borrowed verbatim from the *Guhya-samaja* only substituting the phrase "Tarkascaiva" for Anusmrtih".\(^4\) The possibility of the *Guhya-samaja* being indebted to Krama is very slender, because (i) the *Guhya-samaja*, according to its editor, B. Bhattacharya\(^5\) dates back to the fourth century A.D.; (ii) the first and only reference to the doctrine in the Krama works is as late as the beginning of the thirteenth century to which Jayaratha is

The author is thankful to Ensink for sending the relevant portion of his paper. "Sutasoma's teaching to Gajavaktra, snake and the tigress" in which he has utilized some materials from this dissertation. The book being in the press, while this paper was received, the author could not have the privilege of examining Ensink's observations in detail. He, however, does not see much reason to change his opinion for the time-being.

1. सेतु वर्गवृत्तम् कुत्ता भाषामुलम् तद्दृश्यन्ति |
   शास्त्रेन्द्रीयान्ति वाच्याते भिन्नत्वं भावना।
   \*Guhya-samāja*, p. 173.


3. प्रवाहदर्शनम् धार्मिक प्राणायामोऽध्यायोऽवधारणा |
   अनुमुक्तिः समाधिश्च पद्माः योग उच्चवे।
   \*Guhya-samāja*, p. 173.

4. Compare

   तक्षेत्रवर्ण गम्याश्रयः पद्माः योग उच्चवे।
   \*T.A.V.*, XI, p. 113.

   with अनुमुक्तिः समाधिश्च पद्माः योग उच्चवे।
   \*Guhya-samāja*, p. 163.

assigned; (iii) even if the doctrine had the approval of Abhinava, it does not go beyond the tenth century which is the time of Abhinava; (iv) the thesis has not been developed in its full dimensions in the Krama works whereas the Buddhist works, referred to above, have built up a complete system of esoteric yoga containing six-limbed discipline. The only doubtful line that demarcates the two schools is the place of Sattarka and Anusmrti in their respective schemes. In the verse cited above Jayaratha follows the original order of the *Guhya-samaja* which places Anusmrti just before Samadhi. In this way Tarka should also precede Samadhi. But from a critical perusal of Jayaratha, it will be discovered that Jayaratha and Abhinava both regard Tarka as the best and highest part of Yoga and treat all other parts as subordinate to Sattarka, which alone is the direct means of self-realization. The other difference of detail consists in the concepts of Anusmrti and Sattarka. Anusmrti is the remembrance of the realisation of previous stages, while Tarka is the pure knowledge that can discern the spiritually meaningful from what is spiritually spurious. Moreover, the other five concepts of the Sadanga Yoga in Buddhism have an independent character whereas in Krama they seek an anchorage in Patanjali.

Buddhist tantricism apart, the philosophical Buddhism too seems to have exercised notable influence on the vital Krama

1. त्वापि तेजाभावोमन्तातु अभी उत्तममम्न्तर्याः योगस्वोपप्...।

*Vide also*

योगान्बत्त यमादेस्तु समाधयस्तथा सम्बन्धिते । ।

*Guhya-samaja*, p. 104.

2. विधिः तु वेष्टमाणं स्माधिष्ठिति स्वकापि ।

विधायति वद्वाद्वृत्त तदादान्तन तु सम्बन्धतः ।

अनुभवविश्वासिविश्वय प्रतिभास्येतः ज्ञाते ।

*T.A.*, 4. 105.

3. द्वैतवेदज्ञ तत्त्वस्मीति दृष्टि विलयत ।

*T.A.*, 4. 105.
dicta. Refinement of determinacy (Vikalpa-Samskara), for example, evinces considerable impact of the Buddhist law of contradiction (Apohana) and theory of instantaneous being (Ksanikavada). This question has been considered in the sequel separately. The enormous influence exercised by Buddhism is also evinced by the Krama doctrine of Anakhya. The term Anakhya standing for a coveted stage of self-accomplishment, is possibly a positive Krama interpretation of the wholesale nihilism (Sunyata-vada) of the Madhyamikas. In fact, the twin notions of Sunyata are mutually different owing to their positive and negative character respectively. But what is important here, is to note the inspirational value of the Sunyata-doctrine in so far as the concept of Anakhya is concerned. The ultimate reality being free from temporal and spatial affiliations is beyond the reach of words and, hence, is inscrutable. This is the precise implication of word Anakhya. The Sunyata-doctrine, which is based on the original Buddhist maxim i.e., "all is void" (Sarvam Sunyam), was not adopted from the Mahayanic philosophers direct but through the esoteric Buddhists who tried to give it a positive accent instead of its all-devouring nihilistic thesis pleading the essencelessness and sheer absurdity of the universe of our discourse. Thus, of the four gradations in the Sunyata doctrine suggested by Nagarjuna in his Panca-krama the final one viz., Sarva-sunya, is identified with supreme omniscience. This is the ultimate truth, the unity that transcends the scope of verbal expression.

1. Cf. Pt. II, Ch. I.

2. ढूंगः शैवतामिकानां माधवभिक्षुवै जनाभासाक्षायिनिव स्वातंत्रमात्रदृष्टाः साधुभः ।

3. विन्दुक्कल्लितां में देवो देवार्थिणिः ।

4. V. Bh., 14.
Mutual Exchange with Philosophical and Tantric Systems

From its absolute self-luminous purity proceeds the Enlightened One (Buddha). Thus the Anakhya doctrine is much nearer to the Sunyata-doctrine of the esoteric Buddhism. But the same is poles apart from that of the philosophical Sunyavada of the Madhyamika. Sivopadhyaya, in fact, has noted this difference.

6. Bhartrhari's Impact on Krama

Yet another single source that must be credited with supplying the bulk of the sub-structural material of the Krama system is met in Bhartrhari. His is the unique contribution. Because, the basic pattern of the process of the Vikalpa-samskara has been largely determined by that of his Sabda-samskara and Sabda-purva-yoga. Moreover Kali, the absolute and ultimate principle as conceived by Krama, is by and large the Krama transformation of Bhartrhari's idea of the Kala-Sakti or Krama-Sakti. Similarly, the fourfold or fivefold theory of

---

1. सूक्तकर्मकुलिन्यां प्रभासिकं युक्तेऽवते ॥
   तस्मादप्रायस्तं तत् तस्मादपरिवृत्तिः ॥
   ज्ञातुनिवृत्तवं तत्स्वर्णस्ववस्थितरम् ॥
   विभक्तिइरविविधानं निग्रहेऽपि विनिग्रहेऽपि
   अस्त्यितं न च नास्तीस्व न च तद्वादस्योनाशरम् ॥
   अतः प्रभासितां तुदात् ज्ञातव्यवस्थितं
   इत्विशेषसंयग्यां शृङ्खलस्य व्यवस्थितं
   तथ्यात्मापि ज्ञातं न: ततः ॥

   Panca-krama, M.S., pp. 22 (B), 23(A), quoted by Dasgupta, An Introduction to Tantric Buddhism p. 46.

2. इति कृतान्तातसावतातुते
   एवम् अभि-विवेकावशेषाः प्रचारिताः...शृङ्खलाः...सर्वविषयवेत्तेऽधर्मिस्त ॥

   V. Bh V., p. 141

3. केवला गुणसुलभाविता शृङ्खलारसार्य, देवीनिधिपालितं न अथ्यात ॥

   Ibid., p. 110.

   For fear of irrelevance further reference to their differences has not been embarked upon. However, for further details about the basic differences between esoteric Buddhism and Kashmir Saivism see Sp.N. pp. 26-28.

speech in the Krama system shows the unmistakable signs of having been developed under the spell of Bhartrhari’s theory of Sabda-brahman or Yak with its inherently emergent character. All these have been discussed in their proper contexts.

7. Kashmir Saivism and Pancaratra: Certain Unsettled Issues

Let us advert to a slightly different issue. We know of one more agamic system, that is, the Pancaratra system. It is yet one of the big question marks of the history of Indian thought as to what was the exact nexus between the Kashmir Saivism and the Pancaratra. We find Pancaratra bracketed with Buddhists etc. for the purpose of criticism in the Saiva works. They are assigned to the realm of Avyakta, i.e., Prakrti, in the Saiva scheme. Similarly the Pancaratra have been grouped into two classes e.g., Samkarsana Pancaratra and Samhita-Pancaratra. These references go to indicate that the Kashmir Saivism was fully familiar with the Pancaratra doctrine, - whatever be the cause of such familiarity. What is more remarkable is to find signs which suggest, though do not define, that some sort of relation and exchange did subsist between the two. In support, an appeal may be made to the extracts cited from the Pancaratra works. Thus Utpalavaisnava quotes from the Jayakhya Samhita with approval and Mahesvarananda from the Laksmi-Samhita. Yogaraja, too, quotes from the Laksni-Samhita. On

3. अन् त्र: कर्मायतीतिका: संकर्यंपादकास्वदीकाः।
4. अन् त्र: कर्मायतीतिका: संकर्यंपादकास्वदीकाः।
5. अन्त्र: कर्मायतीतिका: संकर्यंपादकास्वदीकाः।
the other end, Yamunacarya, in his famous work *Agama-pramanya* speaks of his another work known as *Kasmiragama-pramanya* which probably dealt with the validity of the Kashmir agamas. In this connection it is interesting to note that Mahewarananda quotes from one *Rahasyamnaya*. This work has also been alluded to by Natananandananatha in his commentary *Cidvalli* on the *Kama-kala-vilasa*. In the Pancaratra tradition the Rahasyamnaya is identified with the Ekayana-veda. According to Vedanta Desika the central theme of the *Kasmiragama-pramanya* has been to expound and establish the impersonal origin of the *Ekayana-veda*. Pt. V. Krishnamacarya, the editor of the Adyar edition of the *Laksmitantra*, is of the view that the alleged extracts from the *Pancaratra-Sruti* and *Pancaratra-upanisad* etc. in the *Spanda-Pradipika* by Utpala Vaisnava are most probably taken from the *Ekayana-veda*, that is, *Rahasyamnaya*. It is unfortunate that the text of the *Rahasyamnaya* is now lost to us. It is very difficult to assert that the two *Rahasyamnayas* (one in the system and other in the Pancaratra) are one. Because the extracts ascribed to the *Rahasyamnaya* in the Saiva works are more of esoteric nature and the pattern suggested is that of an agamic treatise. It is, therefore, fraught with serious obstacles to the precise relationship between the Kashmir Saivism and the Pancaratra. Yet the fact remains that the two were closely related and even influenced each other. It is a pity that we can neither determine the nature nor gauge the intensity of mutual influence, if any.

---

3. pp. 19-20, 21, 42, 55, 68 (Madras edn.)
5. ॥ ग्या वैमात्रान्तरायम् अन्योह्यवर्तं तया काम्पतर्नायमाय एवं प्रविधिकस्मिनं भीत्र प्रास्यः ॥
   *Pancaratra-raksa*, Vedintadesikagranthamala, ed. Annangaracarya, p. 95. This statement is repeated by Vedanta Desika in *the Nyaya-Parissuddhi*, p. 168 (2nd Ahnika, Sabdadhyyaya).
8. Impact of Krama on Tantricism in General

The biggest contribution made by Krama to the history of tantric thought lies in the emergence of various Krama-creeds within the fold of cognate tantric doctrines. Thus the Tripura and many other Sakta systems have evolved their own code of Krama. Even the Buddhist and Vaisnava tantricism has gone ahead with evolving its own Krama-doctrine. In fact all branches and schools of Indian tantricism whether they be Sakta, Saiva or Vaisnava have embraced the Krama-idea by heart and given vent to it both ritually and spiritually. The large number of Krama texts such as the Krama-stuti of Samkara,\(^1\) Krama-Dipika of Kesava Bhatta,\(^2\) Kramottoma,\(^3\) Krama-ratna,\(^4\) Krama-ratnamala,\(^5\) Krama-samgraha,\(^6\) Krama-sandhana,\(^7\) Krama-malika,\(^8\) Sri-krama-samhita,\(^9\) and Krama-vasana\(^10\) etc. add weight to the above contention.

---

4. Vide, Cat. Cat., p. 132.
5. Vide Cat. Cat., p. 132.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
CHAPTER V
DIFFERENT TRADITIONS AND SUB-SCHOOLS

A critical evaluation of the potential richness of the Krama system evinced through the divergent trends of internal thinking in respect of the basic issues and resulting consequences.

1. Potential Richness of the Krama System

The value of a philosophical system is determined by its capacity to divergent and manifold ways of reacting to the presented data or stimuli. If a system, within its confines, can inspire many a mode of looking at the problems posed to or by it, without affecting its consistency adversely, its vitality and richness would require no further testimony. Judging on this criterion the Krama would emerge as a potentially creative and substantially rich system. The contention turns into a conviction when a keen eye discovers not only the presence of different traditions but also the rise of a few sub-schools inside the Krama-fold. This enquiry, therefore, is directed to examining the identity of such schools and nature of the differing traditions.

In the Kashmir Saivism one encounters two texts namely, the Vatula-natha-sutrani and the Chumma-Sampradaya ascribed to two sub-schools, namely, the Sahasa-school and the Chumma-school. It may, however, be held that these two schools positively belong to the Krama system. Let us see how and why.

2. The Sahasa Sub-School

With regard to the Vatula-natha-sutrani it is explicitly averred that its main theme is to propound that one's real nature is acquired by the firm stay in the pre-eminent Sahasa.¹

¹ महासाहस्यम् तुष्पदायः सूत्रा १.
The Krama Tantricism of Kashmir

Hence, the commentator Ananta Saktipada styles the system as Maha-sahasa-carca-sampradaya (School dealing with the great Sahasa).\(^1\) In his enthusiasm to focus the attention on the individuality of the system he offers his benedictory salutation to the principle of Sahasa.\(^2\)

Sahasa literally means an unexpected or forceful happening. Therefore, from the Saivistic point of view, it stands for the highest state of inspiration or self-revelation which needs no preliminary preparation and which is said to take place often under the shadow of extremely intense bestowal of the divine grace. It transcends deterministic order and is a purely indeterminate state of self-intuiting awareness.\(^3\)

The notion of Sahasa as underlining the sudden and forceful self-realization has never been unknown to the Kashmir Saivism. The concepts of Hathapaka and Alamgrasa owe their being to the principle of Sahasa\(^4\) Likewise, it may also be noted that one of the eight approaches to the Vrnda-cakra is spelt by Mudra-krama which carries five Mudras under it to be discussed subsequently.\(^5\) Of these five Mudras, Khecari is deemed to be the highest and belongs to the realm of Sambhava-siddhas. All other Mudras are derived from Khecari, the

1. \(...\text{...महासाहसरचार्चासम्प्रदाय मिश्रय...}\)
   \textit{V.N.S.V.}, p. 2.

2. \textit{तत्त्वोग च महासाहसरचार्चासम्प्रदायम्}
   \textit{V.N.S.V.}, p. 1, verse 1.

3. \textit{असत्तत्त्वसाहसराहसरासम्प्रदायतमः}
   \textit{सत्तत्त्वायामात्सरासम्प्रदायतमः}
   \textit{कर्त्त्विषिद कार्यकर्त्तिविद्या अवतारोत्तरमेरा गुरुधारितिः...निरा प्रमोन्तनामीतिस्वरुपात्मामत्वसम्प्रदायतमः}
   \textit{......अवतिभ इति रहस्यायः} ।
   \textit{V.N.S.V.}, p. 2.

4. \textit{अहंप्राःनितम्}
   \textit{सौर्या महासाहसरम्}.
   \textit{M.P.(T).} 2.29.

For these concepts of. Pt. II, Ch. 5, "The Place of Vrnda Cakra and Significance of the Hathapaka Process."

primal Mudra. Ananta Saktipada presents the Khecari-drsti as the most cardinal tenet of the Sahasa-school. This view, on a close scrutiny, will be found to have been anticipated by Abhinava who in the 32nd Ahnika of the Tantraloka, which is devoted to the exclusive treatment of Mudras, cites from the Bhargasikha, though not a text of his own school, in support of his contention. In this school the Khecari Mudra has eight varieties, the highest going by the title of Vira-bhairava. This is on a par with the Khecari proper. The Vira-bhairava Mudra, which is nothing short of Khecari, consists in one's entry or entrenchment in the state, technically known as Sahasa. Hence it is also portrayed as Sahasa Mudra. The striking analogue between the Sahasa-mudra as an embodiment of Khecari of the Bhargasikha on the one hand, and the Sahasa-principle as incumbent upon the Khecara-doctrine of the Vatula-natha-sutra on the other, gives one further insight into the more antique beginnings of the concept that later bloomed in the form of a sub-system. The principle of Great Sahasa has always remained charged with the responsibility of sub-merging

1. एका मुद्रा खेचरी च मुद्रीयः। आचरणोऽध्यायः।
   T.A., 32. 65.

2. खेचरी खेचर्दुःशा प्रकटज्ञस्य द्वृ त्नमेव साहसस्वर्ग एकहस्तस्तुतिः॥
   V.N.S.V., p. 1.
   The phrase Maha-vismaya-Mudra in the 13th sutra of the Vatulanatha-sutra has been explained in the following manner -

3. अस्था एव सदनं अतिपात्तं दृष्टिर्भिरुण जष्ठाभान्तरकथापि कामेषु कुष्माण्डः।
   T.A.V., XII, p. 329.

4. साहसामुखप्रेमेण हुनिन्त हस्तस्तुतिः॥
   अधूरोविद्याविंशीं च सत्यस्तुतिःसमवितव्॥
   वैरामर्गकामेण ठाठी वैधव्याधिः।
   अद्वैताक्षरत्व विनयाय श्रीभवरिताविनयुक्ते।
   T.d., 23. 61-62.

5. ...साहसमुखप्रेमस्य ब्रह्मविद्या वाचनमेव यथा योगी वैविद्योऽवेदो भोजेऽन्तः।
   सदैव हस्तो वैरामर्गस्य अष्टमेऽ।
   T.A.V., XII, pp. 332-33.
our total associations with the world of objectivity.\(^1\) This marks the climax of the Kramic ascent and, for that matter, the highest stage of the Kula achievement as well. It appears that the Sahasa school owed its origin to the internal motive of those who intended to emphasize the unique and irresistible vigour of the Sahasa method.

Now Sahasa as Sunyata-samavesa, that is, immersion of the self in great vacuity, is no doubt a Krama phenomenon. Anantasaktipada is quite assertive on this point when he depicts the above viewpoint as the gist of the Mahanaya school.\(^2\) The other factor strengthening one's belief in the equation of Sahasa with Krama stems from the fact that the entire spiritual wealth of the book is attributed to Niskriyananda-natha who is avowedly a Krama author,\(^3\) as will be pointed out later. Moreover, the text employs the typical Krama idiom while describing the fivefold Absolutic functioning etc.\(^4\) In addition to its oral tradition being traced back to the female monastic deities (Pitha-devis) who took some accomplished aspirant in their favour.\(^6\) This, too, is also a Krama characteristic.

3. **The Chumma Sub-school**

From the Sahasa sub-school we proceed to examine the Chumma sub-school to which the hitherto unpublished text i.e., *Chumma Sampradaya*, is ascribed.\(^6\) The exact meaning of the word

1. महासाहस्योद्धादेवि‍नात्तितिकः ||
2. द्वत्य महासाहस्योद्धाश्री सवेशश्रीप्रणवन्तीतान्ति बाच्याच्यां विभवं... आधुनिकतमागुपयता-समावेशमयेऽ...) ||
4. उद्योगवशाच्यांति प्राप्तिविभागितपत्याय... ||
Chumma is somewhat obscure. Nowhere in the text itself has an attempt been made to interpret the word. In the *Tantraloka* the word Chumma comes twice. At one place, it is used as a technical concept and is intended to suggest that Chummas and Mudras, like Palli and Ghara etc, change with the change of preceptorial line. In the other place he enumerates six Chummas without caring, in the least, for the nature and meaning of the word Chumma. From the nature of these, the Chummas probably mean the physiological centres of spirituality. A slightly clearer idea is furnished by Ksemaraja in his commentary on the *Svachchanda Tantra*. He says, Chummaka is a technical name (Pari-bhasiki Samjna) and represents the system one belongs to. The main purport of the Chumma theory is to preserve the secretive and esoteric nature of the system and to present the same as well.

1. मुझे छुपे तेरा छ दिखाया लक्ष्यरस्ता ।
   । T.A., 4. 268.

2. विद्वानातोद्देशकुछालिकवृहदनामिनकदभिति छुम्मा।
   । T.A., 28.37.

Cf. छुम्मका: संवद्याबाइ कुलाब्याये मायासिता: ।
   नीतिः प्रबद्धायाइ हिरोबस्तेन बुधालारी।
   । पुजायस्ते दूरोबस्ते संप्रदायस्ते जालुर्यस्ते।
   । सावित्रु दुर्योद्धनः अवमालारसु शुद्धिः।

Quoted from the *Kula-Kridavatara*,

3. जपयानादितुस्तय बर्तिकसरस्त ।
   । छुम्मका: संवद्यवाच षामस्य दरान्यः।
   । Sp.T., 15.1.

4. छुम्मका तत्समयुपविकितस्वित्या परिव्याधिकी संजा।
   । Sp.T.V., VI, p. 128.

5. अथ तस्यक्षये समययत्वात्तत्त्वपुर्वोस्तव्य नित्यानाविद्याहुस्ममत्वं प्राक्षप्रयोजने
   । तथा पस्तवानामेववृहदन्यायमात्मात्प्रायिकत्वसाधेयस्तियोऽसाध्यार्थवेत्ति, पुद्जया
   । भास्तस्य अस्य तत्समयामि देवोऽस्मु ।

Ibid., p. 125.

6. See preceding note.
or Chummaka, perhaps, stood for the most relevant and useful aspect of a certain mystic or occult rite. It is difficult to be absolutely sure whether or not one should identify these Chummakas with the Chumma of the Chumma Sampradaya. Needless to say that the work abounds in esoteric symbolism and hence the mysterious and secretive aspect of the system is well preserved. In this respect both the texts stand on the same footing. Yet, one can smell that the Chummas were reduced to two categories - secondary and ultimate. Although the attitude of the Chumma Sampradaya towards the secondary Chummas, which include the above Chummas of Abhinava and Ksema-raja, is not known, no doubt is left with regard to the primary Chumma which has been designated as the Paryanta Chumma. Now this is interesting to see that the notion of the ultimate Chumma has been explained in terms of Sahasa which is the continuous transcendental principle.

4. Sahasa and Chumma are Identical

The equation of Sahasa and Paryanta-Chumma offers a strong ground for arriving at the identity of the Chumma with the Krama. Another phase of interest in respect of this equation is their unflinching adherence to oral nature of their respective traditions. In pursuance to this tendency the Sahasa school is termed "Vaktramnaya" (oral revelation or tradition) and the Chumma-school is depicted as having been handed down exclusively through the medium of oral transmission. The hypothesis is further vindicated by the fact that the authorship of the Chumma Sampradaya, too, is attributed to Niskriya-

2. Cf. fn. 1, p. 55 supra.
3. C.S. (MS), folio, 6.
nandanatha. The only difference between the two works being that the Vatulanatha-sutrani contains the cardinal features of the spiritual wisdom received by Niskriyananda and thereby remains his indirect work, whereas the Chumma Sampradaya is his direct work. This adds a touch of conclusiveness to the conclusions: that there is no basic difference between the concepts of Chumma and Sahasa, in their final analysis and shape; that both of the Sahasa and Chumma belong to the realm of Krama tantricism; and that Niskriyananda may be credited with elevating the ordinary notions of the system to the rank and status of a sub-system. But one must not forget that this process must have taken time and hence such a development seems to be a later phenomenon. Moreso, when we already know that the Chummas etc. were not so favourably viewed in the earlier phase of the Krama system.

5. Another Sub-School of Krama

There is an oblique reference to another sub-school of the Krama in the 29th Ahnika of the Tantraloka. This school has not been named as such but is said to be a progeny of a mixture of the two theses, one propounded in the Derya-yamala and other in the Madhavakula, which by itself is a part of the Tantraraja-bhattaraka. In this school, spearheaded by a section of teachers, worship and adoration of one’s preceptorial line along with Pitha, Ksetra etc. are not altogether vanished. In accordance with the thesis, the Pithas have been assigned to the different parts of the body, details of which bear no relevance to the problem in question. This mode of veneration provides the aspirant to contemplate and, therefore, visualize the

1. Cf. Ch. 6.
2. ॥ श्रीमाद्यन्त्रम् मद्यायनोत्सर्कमुक्तं क्षेत्रवीर्यादिष्ठताः प्रेषयति ॥ अभि हि केवलं दुर्योऽर्थाय श्रीद्वातात्यतानं श्रीद्वातात्यतानं सम्बन्धं समवयं समवयं ॥
3. ॥ पीठोपेक्षार्थं सततं ॥ श्रीमाद्यन्त्रम् ॥
   T.A., 29. 56.
4. Ibid., 29. 52-63.
Pithas and their guardian deities as essentially identical with the self.¹

Now the tenability of the present hypothesis that thrives on the possibility of a fresh school under the Krama system is a very delicate affair. Because it simply depends upon how we interpret the word "Matantara" (Mata=view, ideology) employed by Jayaratha in this connection.² Since the entire 29th Ahnika deals with the Kula system,³ "Matantara" must mean something different from the main thesis under discussion. If 'Mata' stands for a view, it will mean "a different view from the general choir of the Kula system"; and if we take 'Mata' to convey the sense of an ideology, it will mean "the different ideology". In the first case, it is a simple deviation within the Kula system itself. In the second case, it is another system. If we are in for the second meaning, the only system that occupies the focus happens to be the Krama. For the reference to the concepts of Krama-catustaya⁴ and Kalasamkarsini⁵ does not require further explanation for our holding so. Of these the former concept belongs to the Madhavakula, while the latter to the Deviyamala.


2. अन्तःक्रामकोषुक्षेत्रात् मद्य यथान्तः मतान्तरस्य अभिधातुगाह ।

3. अथ सत्संपादित्यं क्रामशिवकौण्डः


5. अब तत्त्वायसिं नवसत्म्येतोऽविभक्तिं अविभक्तिः

6. तत्त्वाच समानप्रभवित्वेतोऽविभक्तिं अविभक्तिः


8. *Vide* 29-37 नवेद्यान्तः मद्य विभक्तिं अविभक्तिः


10. अथ तत्वायसिं विभक्तिं अविभक्तिः


This is to be noted that the distinction between Kula-prakriya and Tantra-prakriya is retained even here. *Vide* 29-37 नवेद्यान्तः मद्य विभक्तिं अविभक्तिः
6. Divergent Traditions and Tendencies with Regard to the Specific Problems

Coming back to the Krama system proper, we find the volume of controversies and differences of opinion on many a question does not appear to shrink instead swells up.\(^1\) The following lines will bear this out.

(a) Two Traditions Regarding the Nature and Status of the Absolute and its Consequences

There are two definite schools or traditions with reference to the nature and status of the Absolute. These tendencies seem to have their root in the Krama agamas from the beginning, as will be pointed out at the appropriate occasion, which resulted in two categories of agamas - Devi oriented and Siva-oriented. The scholars affiliated with Somananda and his spiritual descendants regarded Siva to be the ultimate reality.\(^2\) The rest differed and reckoned Kali or Devi to be the ultimate truth. The very term "Kali-naya" as an equivalent for the Krama-naya smacks of reaction on the part of those who revolted against Siva's supremacy. Somananda's obsession with the grammarian's convention reducing the feminine gender to be a particular form of the masculine was, to some extent, responsible for his opposition to the female personality of the Supreme Being. Reference to the female form anywhere, were the outcome of the intensive devotion of the devotee to the deity.\(^3\) On the basis of the material provided by Somananda and Utpala, it appears that a real confrontation took place between the two

1. संम्रदायमोदेव व्यासान्तिविलेन: स्थाने स्थाने दृष्टे ||
   \(M.P.(S),\) p. 81.
2. अर्धासारान्त्ये महेषे नित्यानि विनितानि विचारस्वास्तः \(\|\)
   \(\text{ibid,}\) p. 84.
3. विपर्ययायान्तिविलेन: \(\|\)
   \(K.S.(A),\) 28.

\(S.Dr.V.,\) p. 98.
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opposing protagonists. But such a difference of emphasis has more far-reaching implications than is generally recognised, because this is a Krama transformation of the general Saiva problem that calls for the evaluation of the precise relation between Prakasa and Vimarsa aspects of Reality. In this context Prakasa is called as Paramesvara, Manthana or Manthanabhairava; and Sakti or Vimarsa as Kali, Devi or Kala-Samkar-sini. Consequently, those who declare Siva to be the ultimate, treat Kali or Sakti as His manifestation and hence relegate it (Sakti) as slightly subsidiary. In this case Bhasa and Anakhya in their respective domains come to be regarded as His functions. Vyomesvari or Vyoma-vamesvari, under Pancavaha (five flow doctrine) are also deduced from Him. In this connection it is amusing to watch the exponents of the ultimacy of the male aspect subscribing to the twelve-aspect theory (Dvadasa Kalis) under Samviccakra. Likewise, these schoolmen are also constrained to prescribe only sixty-four aspects, excepting five vaahas, under Vrnda Cakra. On the other hand, the other section of the scholars wedded to supremacy of the female aspect naturally deviates from the above premises. For them Sakti i.e., Absolutic dynamism, itself turns out to be the Dynamic Reality. It is the Absolute per se. In their case Siva is rendered somewhat secondary to Devi or Kali. Bhasa or Anakhya, as the case may be, is identified with reality as such. Similarly, the supreme Vaha called Vyoma-vamesvari is not distinguished from Kali as such. Interestingly enough, again the members of this school subscribe to the thirteen-aspect theory (Trayodasa Kalis) under Anakhya cakra i.e., Samviccakra. The consequences may be multiplied. Instead of sixty-four they propound sixty-five mystic categories as constituting Vrnda-cakra. In fact, in such cases the ultimate reality is treated as forming part of the whole episode, whereas in the Siva-oriented doctrine the ultimate is treated separately.

(b) These two traditions vis-a-vis Pentadic and Quartic tendencies with special reference to the absolutic functioning

Sometimes, though not necessarily, a handsome distance

1. अभिज्ञानः स्थितः परमशिवाग्रासनाते श्वेयुध्वानात्वकाविष्ठः प्रति इतद्वै आरूपः।

Ibid., p. 94.
is tried to be maintained between the two schools even with reference to the Absolutic functioning. Accordingly, the believers in the ultimacy of Kali are thought to subscribe to the five-function theory, whereas the others, who believe in the absoluteness of Siva, to the four-function one.\textsuperscript{1} But these are overlappings and no uniform rule can be laid down in this regard. Although divergence of views on the nature and number of the Absolute’s functions itself constitutes a very vital schism in the ranks of the system and accounts for several developments. This difference is vital in the sense that it has direct bearings on the meaning of the word \textit{Krama}, as has been hinted earlier.\textsuperscript{2} This is in fact the original source of pentadic and quartic tendencies in general that have gone a long way in determining the general outlines of the system. It may be recalled that the entire Kashmir Saivism (monistic branch) subscribes to the theory of the five functions of the Absolute, but barring a tacit acceptance a serious attempt has never been made to explore and study the philosophic and esoteric bearings of the theory. The two tendencies referred to above are the logical outcome of such an analysis, both conscious and sub-conscious, on the part of the \textit{Krama} thinker.

\textit{(c) Quartic Tendency}

Thus under the quartic tendency an attempt is made to present the system’s basic concepts in terms of four or groups of four. In this case the fifth function (Anugraha or Bhasa) is subsumed under the fourth act (Tirodhana or Anakhya). In consequence, the fifth power (Cit) of the Absolute is again subsumed under the fourth one (Ananda). Factually, the fourth state marks the synthesis. As a natural upshot, the ultimate reality in this case comes to be designated as Anakhya and not Bhasa. Nevertheless, from the arrangement of the twelve Kalikas in the three groups of four each as presented by Jayaratha it appears that Abhinava too was inclined to favour the four-function theory.\textsuperscript{3} According to him, the four godly acts

\begin{itemize}
  \item 1. \textit{Cf. Pt II, Ch. 3.}
  \item 2. \textit{Cf. Ch. 2, supra.}
  \item 3. \textit{Cf. Pt. II, Ch. 3.}
\end{itemize}
Srsti, Sthiti, Samhara and Anakhya in relation to each of the subject, object and the means of knowledge respectively give us the twelve deities. Again under this scheme the functional cycles such as Srsti-cakra etc. number four and end with the Anakhya cakra. Likewise, a deeper significance is attached to the four cycles e.g., Pancavaha, Prakasa, Ananda and Murti. The biggest impact of the quartic tendency is seen in the theory of speech. Despite the efforts to introduce Suksma, as we shall subsequently see, to augment the number of the aspects of speech to five, the sizeable majority of the Krama thinkers has always sided with the theory of fourfold speech.

(d) Pentadic Tendency

Yet the pentadic tendency appears to have been a greater favourite of the Krama system in general. The tendency is manifest in attempts to present the concepts of the systems in terms of five or groups of five notions. Thus the primary pentad goes by the name of Pancavaha representing the five flows of the self-emanative spiritual energy ranging from Vyoma-vamesvari to Bhucari. The functions of the Absolute which this section fervently expounds are five - Srsti, Sthiti, Pralaya, Anakhya and Bhasa. The Absolutic powers are also five - Cit, Ananda, Iccha, Jnana and Kriya. Mahesvarananda under the influence of this tendency adds Suksma to the fourfold division of speech maintained hitherto by the system. Now these run as - Para, Suksma, Pasyanti, Madhyama and Vaikhari. The esoterically and metaphysically symbolic groups, which are enjoined for contemplation, also number five - Sripitha, Pancavaha, Netratraya, Vrnda Cakra and Gurupankti. Of these the Vrnda-cakra, which according to Mahesvarananda represents quintessence of the Krama thinking, contains

1. कष्टाचार्याः कण्ठस्व वनस्पतिः सन्निपाद्याः पूज्याः तिष्ठति।
   महेश्वरानां अनुसरणाः संस्कृतप्रकाराः सन्स्कृतप्रकाराः।
   M.M.P., p. 86.

2. Vide Pt. II, Ch. 7, "The Stages of Vak etc."

3. श्रीकष्टाचार्याः कण्ठस्व वनस्पतिः सन्स्कृतप्रकारः
   प्रस्तरः शुभं यथा विषयं वेत्ति।
   M.M.P., p. 86.
many a pentad. The entire Vrnda Cakra centres round the five Siddhas and their numerous significations. These Siddhas are - Jnana, Mantra, Melapa, Sakta and Sambhava. Under the Vrnda-cakra the Dhama-krama lays down five dhamas as respective abodes of these Siddhas. They are - Kanda, Nabhi, Hrt, Kantha, and Bhrumadhya. In the same strain Mudra-Krama speaks of five Mudras i.e., Physical postures, - Karankini, Krodhani, Bhairavi, Lelihana and Khecari. The concept of 'five letters' technically spoken of as Panca-pindas under Varna-krama too reflects the same tendency. Exactly on these lines the five cycles namely, Prakasa, Ananda, Murti, Pancavaha and Vrnda go to erect the superstructure of Divyaugha.

This pentadic tendency characterizes the efforts to identify even those groups, which admittedly consist of more than five ingredients, with the basic pentad termed Pancavaha. Thus Sripitha has nine constituents (Kala) - (1) primal subjective stir (Adya Spanda) (2) extrovert subjective tendency, (3) the stir of the means of perception, (4) the rise of tendency in the means of knowledge to apprehend determinately, and (5-9) awareness of the objective which is fivefold in accordance with the five elements (Bhutas). By ignoring the division of the objective into five elements this group of nine is rendered identical with the five Vahas.

(e) **Dispute about the Exact Number of Parts of the Krama Toga**

The ideological antagonism has often touched other frontiers of the system as well. If one recapitulates what has been said about the Sadanga Yoga, it will be found that unanimity was wanting with regard to the precise number of the parts of
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Although Jayaratha mentions the theory of sixfold Yoga, he does not appear to take it very seriously. Abhinava himself feels more at home with the eightfold doctrine. A minor unpublished Krama text entitled *Jnana-kriya-dvaya-sataka* makes no pretentions about its abiding by the eightfold path.¹

(f) Several minor controversies referred to

These pages do not consider it advisable to dilate upon the minor controversies. In spite of their enormous magnitude and wide range, their treatment may be conveniently postponed for future consideration in their respective contexts. Such controversies in the main include e.g., exact number of divinities to be reflected upon in the Anakhya-cakra; serial order of the five functional cycles for the purpose of adoration; inclusion of Yuganathas and Rajaputras in the Krama system; precise serial order of the five flows (Pancavaha); equation of Prakasa, Ananda and Murti cakras with five flows; the serial order of Prakasa, Ananda and Murti cakras; concept of Puryastaka; precise number of aspects of the Vrnda cakra; Mudras and Mudrakrama of Vrnda-cakra; stages of speech, their nature and number. These problems are culled here with the sole desire to give the reader an idea of the extent these divergences reach out to.

7. Sources of the Quartic and Pentadic Tendencies

The only question in this connection, that now remains to be considered, is to locate the probable cause of such a pentadic or quartic tendency. According to Pandey, this pentadic tendency is not the exclusive property of the Krama system alone. It has been anticipated by an earlier system of dualistic-cum-monistic Saivism which is known as Lakulisa Pasupata.² In this case the pentadic tendency was aroused by the five Mantras of the *Taittiriya Aranyaka*, which provided the back-drop for the conception of the five aspects of Siva to be contemplated at the five stages on the path to final salvation. This trend was

1. आध्यात्मिकोन्यात्तृत्तम समर्थतार्द्ध्यामास ि.....
   उपचारम् आयुत: स्वात्मिकाध्यामासः ि

   *Jnana-kriya-dvaya-sataka*, vv. 16, 22 (MS)

2. Cf. Bhaskari, III, pp. CXII and CXXXIV.
maintained in the *Gana-karika* which summarises the whole system through the medium of eight pentads.¹

However, the pentadic (or quartic) tendency of the Krama system seems to have been inspired by the quinary functionalism of Absolute. Even these five functions of the absolute owe their genesis to the five modes of Absolutic dynamism known as Kalana. The very basis of designating the ultimate reality as Kali is, in fact, supplied by its capacity to effect five types of kalana, namely, Ksepa (projection), Jnana (knowledge), Prasankhyana (determination), Gati (self-identification) and Nada (pure awareness).²

---


2. ध्रुव प्रज्ञान च संज्ञानं धृतिनां धृति ध्रुवात् ॥...
   ध्रुति पंचविन्यसनां कल्पना कूर्वली पद॥
   देवी काली तदा कालकारिणी देवि रूपयेन ॥

   *T.A. 4. 173, 176.*
CHAPTER VI

SOURCES AND LITERATURE

A reconstructive study of Krama history and an analysis of the entire known as well as extant Krama literature with special reference to its authorship, historicity, availability, classification, subject-matter and chronology.

1. Kashmir: The Land of Origin of the Krama System

While switching over to an enquiry into the history and literary wealth of the Krama system we are reminded of a feeling reference made by Bilhana to Kashmir, the land of Sarada (Sarada-desa). He says it is only Kashmir which has the unique privilege of producing saffron filaments together with the poetic ingenuity.¹ And, were one to add that Kashmir is equally the land of philosophical originality as it is a country of saffron flowers, he need not be afraid of being accused of exaggeration. The Krama system, with its long history and voluminous literature, only goes to exemplify the above statement. Jayaratha has not failed to take note of these twin peculiarities² of Kashmir, the seat of the goddess of learning,³ with special

1. तह्ते: फ़ुलुःक़ेम्बराणाः भूतांत्रिक सूक्ष्म कविताविष्कार:।
   न जारामार्ममाण्य दृष्टेऽपि गद्यम कथा प्रशोहः।

   वि. ल. 21.

2. तिविषोमनंदकारस्त्रीतिककुर्मविद्याविद्वान्नामाः
   तच्छा यद्वै सांक्रमणाचिन्न कहायमात्रवर्तविभावः।
   कस्मीरेः प्रमुखं फ्रासरिपस्त मुनयुवां सबदेशानु
   ब्रह्मविद्यामनव्युद्दु चुंगवानुमानसवत्वविबद्धायः।

   त.अ.वि., द्व., प. 429.

3. युक्तां बोधाय्याः स्पष्टालिङ्गमहत्स्वार्थं बार्ह्या शासनी
   बिशारीः प्रथापः प्रपितामिकसायाय साधारेसरीः।

   इ.बि.द.
reference to Kashmir Saiva monism. Even the plan and design of the city of Srinagar has been patterned on that of the Sri Cakra, according to a tradition current even today. In this connection it is of special interest to remember, as has also been pointed out whenever the occasion so warranted, that of all the systems of monistic Saivism associated with Kashmir the Krama is the lone system that arose from the soil of Kashmir. We have repeated this again in view of its extreme significance. The name "Auttara Krama" is only an acknowledgment of the fact because Sivananda, who is the first preceptor of the system and hence is called 'the originator' (Avatarakanatha), is said to have received his spiritual lessons in Kashmir, the Uttarapitha. Jayaratha appears to have hinted at Sivananda's possible association with Kamarupa, renowned for its great tantric affiliations, when he is presented to have been blessed by Jaya etc. the deities. But this observation, as per its context, is not intended to explain his relation with the Krama system. Jayaratha, who is in fact reproducing the account as given in the Kramakeli of Abhinavagupta, is very categorical about the fact that the Krama secrets were revealed to him in Kashmir. The enormous

1. In the Asiatic Society of Bengal, there is a manuscript of the text named Vidyarnava by a student of some Pragalbhacarya, which also records this tradition. By implication, 'Srinagar' is an abbreviation of the original 'Sri-vidyanagara'.

2. श्रीपत्तारकानाथेन्द्रि... \(T.A.V., \text{III, p. 195; also see. p. 197.}\)

3. उत्तरपीठलभोगदेशठे श्रीशिवानन्दानाथेन्द्रि... \(T.A.V., \text{III, p. 192.}\)

4. अर्थ च प्रथमत्वाभिवेच समस्येष जन्मवज्ञानविद्यं गुर्जर: इति पुरोऽवेदन... \(ibid., \text{p. 201.}\)

Caruka is not a name of a teacher etc., instead, it means an important item in the Kula-yaga. Vide,

\begin{quote}
शर्कः सम्प्रदायकः चित्तम् ग्रोमः तथा।
पुजारकर्मिष्ठाय ते भिन्नतितोत्त मुखे स्थितम्॥
\end{quote}

Quoted, \(T.A.V., \text{XI, p. 19 (Ah. 19).}\) Caruka's being a part of a Kula process may well also endorse Kamarupa's relation with Kula and not with Krama.

5. उत्तरपीठलभोगदेशठे श्रीशिवानन्दानाथेन्द्रि लघुयागःहर्षम्... \(T.A.V., \text{III, p. 192.}\)
praise heaped on the Uttara Pitha further bears it out.\(^1\) Maha-
svarananda’s citing an extract from the *Rtuvinarsini* puts the last
word on it.\(^2\) However, the Krama system did not remain re-
stricted to Kashmir alone. It spread even as far as Cola-desa (modern Karnatak). Krama’s association with various Pithas like Oddiyana,\(^3\) Puma Pitha\(^4\) etc., is a sign of its prevalence
even beyond the boundaries of Kashmir. The correct geogra-
phical identification of these pithas will no doubt add to certi-
tude of our knowledge about Krama.

2. *Origin and Early History*

The exact record of origin and initial phases of the system
is clouded in the labyrinth of the mythical, mystical and sym-
bolical accounts. The Krama practice of worshipping the pre-
ceptorial line at the end of Vrnda-cakra\(^5\) has proved to be an
asset in view of its supplying the traditional records of the
historical data, if any. More so, the general tantric convention
which makes it imperative for an author to begin his venture
with homage to his teachers\(^6\) also helps one inculcate a rather
coherent historical view. At the same time, this practice has also
contributed to confusion and complicated the issues since such
an account, for want of historical perspective and purport,
leaves many gaps unfilled and many more questions un-
answered.

(a) *Esoteric symbolism as part of the Krama History:
Theory of Three Oghas*

But the tantric, and for the matter of that, the Kramic
notion of history is drastically different from one we generally
hold, because it makes esoteric symbolism as a part and parcel

1. *M.P.*\(^{(T)}\), 2. 37.
2. ......सम्प्रदायक काश्मीरी-मृत्तिकाय......, *M.M.P.*, p. 193.
5. अत्य वृद्धजन्मान्तै पूर्णेऽपरि पृष्ठावति. *M.P.*\(^{(T)}\), 8. 3; also cf. *M.M.* 36.
6. दह खन्तु चास्या तदः राधानुपदे विरुद्धेन व्यवहारः स्वास्थ्यदेहि कृतेन कार्यये. *T.A.V.*, I, p. 33.
of its historical thesis. Krama, treading the current tantric line, arranges the entire course of history in three succeeding phases under the names of Divyaugha, Siddhaugha and Manavaugha standing for the traditions of the divine, the semi-divine or sacred, and the humans respectively. Among these the second occasionally and the third usually are historically relevant. These three may roughly be compared with the three phases namely, Sruti, Smrti and Purana of the orthodox account of history. The word Ogha, which forms the substantive part of the words denoting the three phases, means a community of those possessing similar character. By implication, the members displaying a common personality make-up have been classed accordingly under three groups. This is corroborated by another interpretation of the word 'Ogha' in terms of creation. Accordingly, the three, terms e.g., Divyaugha, Siddhaugha and Manavaugha, may be said to represent the orders of creation pertaining to the divine, to the accomplished and to the humans respectively with special respect to the preceptorial line.

(b) Various traditional accounts of the initial phase of the Krama System

Besides occasionally conflicting versions among the various traditions, our only regret is that nowhere has a consistent account of three stages been maintained. All the things have got mixed up and whatever comes before us is just a medley.

According to a tradition, ascribed to the Kramakeli by Mahesvarananda who has preserved it for us, the entire Gita
is an attempt on the part of Krsna to expound to Arjuna the philosophy of Krama. Besides, the famous opening of the fourth chapter of the Gits, according to him, records the original history of the Krama system. While initiating Arjuna into the Krama secrets, Krsna had to enter the supreme spiritual state of Kala-samkarsini. Arjuna, after knowing the fundamental spiritual truth, renounced the world having enthroned Yudhisthira as the head of the state. Mahesvarananda takes a lot of pain to present the arrangement of the subject-matter and plan of the Gita in terms of Krama, all of which is of no particular relevance from our point of view.

Mahesvarananda records yet another tradition of the Krama and suggests the coverage of all three stages by it. The first ever revelation is said to have proceeded from Bhairava, Parma Siva, who delivered it to Bhairavi, the Iccha Sakti. With the passage of time it was imparted to Sivananda and further through a series of teachers it was finally handed down to Mahesvarananda. It is strange that an author of his eminence

1. पनमेव महाय जुरारम्भे पाठुमूलस्य।
   शोभयतवस्तिःक्रमेः उपस्थितत्व माधव इति नित्यसम ॥
   M.M. 70.

2. माधव: पाठुमूलावलोकितस्तीति गुणितिक्यम्याविदर्जनमे, 'हम विवेकन्वे योगमु रूस्ये हृदं तेनवं' इति गुणितवेक्षमास्मि: सम्बन्धक्यवाक्यसंस्कृतं गृहिते।

3. कालामृतमृतवारीकाः कालसंवौषिणीं कलामृत।
   अनुभविक्ष योगवेन बबरीविजीताः॥
   Ibid., p. 188.

4. अत्रमेव प्रतिविध्य स्वस्य राज्ये युगितिंद्रम्।
   स्वसंवौषिणमुपवेन स्वे वासने अनुभवम् बहि:॥
   Ibid., p. 190.

5. तथा तथा किंवतस्यावैष्ठास्तमुपवेन हृदयन्।
   अर्थसंवौषिणान्दवैतरस्यांविदाम्॥
   Ibid., p. 196.

6. अथ तद्वा कालामृतके विवेकार्थम् धीरेनः।
   विवेकाकार्धणक्ष्मै देवी विवेकार्थिनिवेकवाम्॥
   अनेन वने तापसां विभान्त्रम्: भुवे: रूस्यः।
   विवेकसंवौषिणान्दवैििवाक्याविदविदाम्।
   अतोत्तराः पञ्चमविश्वासमहार्यविधिम्॥
   M.M.P., p. 197.
and acumen does not attempt to indicate the precise composition of the three phases e.g., Divyaugha etc. Even on other occasions, particularly while discussing the lineage of his preceptors (gurupankti), he merely reiterates, but does not add to, what he has already said except introducing Mangala Devi in place of Bhairavi or Iccha Sakti.\(^1\) Only at one place does he tell of his immediate preceptorial succession in the order e.g., Sivananda, Mahaprakasa and Mahesvarananda.\(^2\) This Sivananda is indeed different from one mentioned above as the first human recipient of the Krama dicta. His immediate ancestry appears to have been suggested in the benedictory verses of the Parimala commentary.\(^3\) Coming back to the original problem, we may systematize the above account by placing Bhairava, Bhairavi etc. under Divyaugha, and Sivananda etc. under Manavauha. His taciternity leaves us in dark about his view of the Siddhaugha, although he talks of those elements in different contexts that go to constitute the Siddhaugha according to other authors. Thus for instance, Abhinava in his Tantraloka refers to a tradition of the Siddhas (Siddha-santati) beginning with Khagendra and ending with Mina,\(^4\) which has been adored by Mahesvarananda in the Sthiti-Krama.\(^5\) This view of reckoning the four Yuganathas comprising the Siddha tradition (Siddhaugha) also seems to have been endorsed by the Mahanaya-Prakasa\(^6\) which, we shall see, is a work of Sivananda II,

---

1. स तु भवता शीश्रृङ्खला-केन्द्रीयार्थ शीर्षकृत्वा सर्वनन्दग्रहान्तं पुष्कर् प्रभावनां गुलालयाश्नाम्...। M.M.P., p. 98. He further avers—आर्थिक्य मर्गात्मकता-सिद्धांतादिकं कयम्।
   \(Ibid.\), p. 99.

2. श्रीमलानन्दमहाप्रकाशार्थैः सर्वप्राप्तिर्मुखत्वम्। संपूर्णत्वेतृं उपयुक्तमात्मवत्। \(Ibid.\), p. 135.


4. युगक्रमे तृतीया शीताइत सिद्धांतस्तित। \(T.A.\) 4, 267.
   Jayaratha comments—आर्थिक्य-सिद्धांत संबंध, तत्र कृत्यस्य श्रीपृक्षाभास्करस्य श्रीकृष्णसामायस्वाती। कृत्याकारणस्य: तथा त्यस्य।
   \(T.A.V.,\) III, pp. 296-97.

5. शाक्तिविश्व तथा निर्क्षेऽत्र यूनादाश्चवातः...। \(Ibid.\), p. 102.

6. Cf. \(M.P.(T).\) 8, 14-17.
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The grand teacher of Mahesvarananda. But the Siddhaugha of this type is not approved by the other stalwarts of the system notably Abhinava and Sitikantha. Abhinava does not regard the Siddha-santati as essentially a Krama phenomenon, because prescribing or denying such a tradition is not in conformity with the Krama tendency of absolute monism. He, however, makes it absolutely clear elsewhere that the Siddha-tradition at issue is exclusively a Kula phenomenon. Sitikantha, too, is vocal about it and vehemently opposes it. He positively holds that such a tradition (ayatikrama) is an imposition of an exotic doctrine on the Krama. He rejects even the slightest occasion for such a thesis in the system and holds that the four Siddha-groups represented by Jnana, Mantra, Melapa and Sakta under the Vrnda-cakra would, of necessity, supply the basic content and material of the Sthitikrama. Since these are esoteric notions and symbolize the mystic concepts, the Siddhaugha loses most of its historical value.

But Sitikantha agrees with Mahesvarananda who also traces the system to Mangala Devi as its first teacher. But Makara Devi is no less than the self-adumbration of the Primordial Divinity which, in its own right, presides over and

1. एवं श्रीवेष्टायासंस्कारतनामनिधानात्
   नामावलीयायर्तंद्वयासानीर्गीतिपर्चिन्ये
   न तस्य च सिद्धेयं यद्यतत्तथयेक्षेरन्त्रः

   T.A. 4, 270-71.

2. मिश्रकः दशालोको महापरिभाषेयं श्रीवेष्टायासंस्कारतनामनिधानां क्षेत्रः
   तत्त्वाविवर्भूतमिन्यः

   T.A.V., XI, pp. 2-3 (Jayaratha on T.A. 293.)

3. अन्यतः वरमनात्रेण कुमाकुलवर्धयं एवंविन्यासकर्ममेव भविष्यत्यासानस्वतारः
   श्वेतद्वारा:
   …हि पूजयत् आरीण्ते, शित पापस्वेयं नाशोऽविचितः

   M.P. (S), pp. 115-16.

4. तत्त्वा कोशालः कानिष्टत्र गुणवस्तुम् पूजयतात्याम्, शितं जनुङ्गिरेन श्रावसिद्धः
   सिद्धिकमः

   Ibid., p. 118.

5. भोगकारदेषी आदिरुपस्य जीवायत्

   M.P. (S), p. 5.

6. तद्यथा युग्माद्वीपमत्ताः श्रीदेवस्य तिब्बता

   Ibid.
constitutes the Divyaugha. Divyaugha, which also goes by the name of Mahaugha is a sheer mythical concept. The professed identity between the triad of cycles comprising Ananda, Murti and Prakasa and Divyaugha is a pointer in this direction. In fact, Sitikantha talks of five Oghas (traditions) namely, Paraugha, Divyaugha, Mahaugha, Siddhaugha and Manavaugha, but the first three can be conveniently subsumed under Divyaugha. Hence the primary classification of the three Oghas is not disturbed. Adverting to Siddhaugha we find that it begins with Makaradevi. The rest has already been seen in the preceding paragraph. The only thing of dubious historical significance is a reference to some Jnananetranatha who is said to have directly inherited the spiritual fortune from Mangala or Makara-devi. A reference has also been made to some Srinatha. The similarity of context tends heavily in favour of identifying the two, though it is also a case of doubtful equation. However, this equation cannot be dismissed as wholly unfounded because Sivananda, the author of the other Mahanaya-Prakasa, too, makes an explicit reference to one Antarnetranatha who seems to have unravelled the mystery of the highest Pitha.

1. ibid., p. 3.
2. ibid., p. 86.
3. ibid., p. 89.
4. ibid., p. 141.
5. ibid., p. 104; also c. p. 107.
7. ibid., p. 78.
For, there is no basic difference in the meaning of the Jnana-netra or Antarnetra and twisting of names without interfering with their meaning is not uncommon among Sanskrit authors, their identity cannot be brushed aside without proper scrutiny. It appears that, in spite of their probable historicity, these Nathas (or Natha, to be more exact) were assigned to Siddhaugha which is succeeded by Manavaugha in chronological order. The Manavaugha or human phase is traced to some Hrasvanatha and is terminated with Cakrabhanu.¹ The Manavaugha has a further sub-division i.e., Sisyauha² (lineage of the disciples), which starts with Cakrabhanu and closes with Sitikantha.³ Now this Manavaugha or human phase has immediate bearings on the historical character of the Krama system. The exact significance will be examined at the proper occasion in the sequel but it may not escape our notice that Sitikantha’s presentation, though by far the most comprehensive, is by all means incomplete and sketchy.

(c) Consistent account of the early history of the system

One must feel grateful to Jayaratha who, though citing from the Kramakeli, has preserved to us the account of early history of the system.⁴ It goes to his credit that his is the first rational and consistent effort to supply the links left missing in the cryptic statements of the authors including Mahesvarananda. The Kramakeli acknowledges the earliest preceptorial status of Sivananda having received his lessons in the Uttarpitha. The close affinity between the Kramakeli’s and the Mahanaya-Prakasa’s accounts forces us not to unduly distinguish Sivananda from Srinatha, although it has nowhere been so explicitly asserted. Sivananda handed over the spiritual wealth to three of his female disciples namely, Keyuravati, Madanika

². मानवविविष्योपोषिकेत्ये गुरुकन्: ।
   Ibid., p. 140.
³. Ibid., p. 107.
and Kalyanika. Next in the line are Govindaraja, Bhanuka and Eraka to whom were revealed the Krama secrets by these female ascetics simultaneously. The first two e.g., Govindaraja and Bhanuka, marked the beginning of the two different traditions of the Krama scholars. Somananda was connected with Govindaraja who trasmitted the creed of Krama to the former, and Bhanuka headed the other tradition to which later belonged Ujjata and Udbhata. The latter tradition came down intact to Jayaratha. The third, Eraka, did not bother about forming a school of his own, instead he thought it better to propound the system all alone.

Thus, it may be noted that Sivananda's position as the first preceptor of the system is in no way compromised. But a quotation from the *Devi-pancasatika*, again our thanks go to Jayaratha, alludes to three precursors of Sivananda along with their spouses as under:

1. Niskriyananda — Jnanadipti,
2. Vidyananda — Rakta,
3. Saktyananda — Mahananda, and
4. Sivananda — Samaya.

1. नक्रियानन्दा ज्ञानदीपिका, विद्यानन्दा रक्त, सक्तिनन्दा महानन्दा, सिवनन्दा समयाः।
2. Jayaratha suggests that this Krama tradition has a stamp of conclusiveness about it. He, in his prefatory remark on *T.A.* 29.43, raises a question as to why other teachers such as those mentioned in the *Devipancasatika* are not referred to here in the 'present' context (because these teachers are different from those that are being alluded to presently). Here the present context means the Kula system Jayaratha’s explanation bints at the impossibility of explicitly mentioning the teachers that have nothing to do with Kula. These teachers enjoy a detailed treatment in the Kali-kula, but they need not be worshipped instead, remembered only in the Kula context for the simple reason that these do not come under the purview of the Kula system. The word सूक्ष्ण (see the preceding note) is very pregnant and
In the interest of logicality, if one could establish the identity of the present Sivananda with one recognised as the inventor of the system, one will have adequate ground to believe that Krama had earlier beginnings. Two strong considerations lend their weight to the surmise that these two are one. First, the Devipancasatika is a recognised textual authority on Krama as the following pages would reveal. And secondly, Ananta-saktipada, a commentator on a later Krama text ‘Vatulanatha Sutra’, and Sivopadhyaya, the learned author of the Uddyota commentary on the Vijnanabhairava, record the opinion of some Niskriyanandanatha who is nowhere taken note of in the Kashmir Saiva texts even once except in the Devipancasatika. If this contention be true, Niskriyanandanatha should be recognized as the first thinker of the Krama system. If he is not so recognized in place of Sivananda, it is perhaps because he did not build up a system. The process of even greater antiquity of the system does not end here. Niskriyanandanatha is preceded by some Gandhamadana Siddha who took the former in his personal favour. Gandhamadana probably had a book which he showed to Niskriyananda and divulged its contents to him.

Thus, historically Krama seeds were sown much earlier than one is apt to believe. One may also ascertain the approximate historical status of these early thinkers. From the account furnished by Jayaratha, Sivananda was removed by two intervening generations (i.e., Keyuravati and Govindaraja) from Somananda, whose chronological position is almost certain. He is assigned towards the close of the ninth century. By assigning

1. Vide V.N.S.V., p. 4.
2. V.Bh.V., pp., 67-68.
3. V.N.S.V., p. 4.
4. Ibid.
Sources and Literature

twenty-five years to each generation according to the usual practice of the historians, Sivananda may be placed in the first quarter of the ninth century. Gandhamadana, who is by four generations older to Sivananda, has to be assigned towards the beginning of the eighth or the last quarter of the seventh century. Ostensibly enough, the Krama system dates back fairly early. In a sense it is the earliest system amongst the monistic Saiva systems of Kashmir, because all other systems arose or emerged somewhere around the beginning of the ninth century.

Such a hoary antiquity of the system is further established by collateral evidence. The Haravijaya of Ratnakara who is attributed to middle of ninth century by the scholars because he flourished during the reign of Avantivarman,\(^1\) eulogizes the ultimate deity as Samkarsini\(^2\) in course of offering prayers to Sakti. A student of the Krama philosophy is fully well aware of the implications of this term. It is a typical Krama method of naming the Absolute. The word Samkarsini and Kalsamskarsini have no semantic difference. They stand for the one and the same principle.\(^3\) This reference helps one recognize the basic issue that the Krama dicta began to gain currency fairly early. It is these scattered ideas whose crystallization into a systematic form begins by the close of the seventh or beginning of the eighth century.

1. मुस्ताफ़्क़च: यिङ्गस्थाची काविरात्यवर्त्तः।

वर्षों रतनकरस्तामातु सांसारिकसङ्क्रमणः।

R.T. 5.34 (V.V.R.I. edition)

2. प्रत्याशिष्यधिपत्यामनुष्युपलब्धन्योगिर्विवेकेन स्वरूपात्मकायामयीतम।

विद्वेदन साधुविधिविद्वेदम् संक्रिया निगड़न्ति तीत जातें रबुम्।

H.V., 47.55.

3. कंकणी च्यंत्रसंप्रदायः।

बुद्ध ध्येयम् शास्त्रः —

विद्वेदार्थ सम्पूर्णा विधा ग्रन्थदातः।

कालसंप्रदायेन नामा।।

T.A.V., XI, p. 49 (Ah. 29).
3. Creative period of the Krama system - Rise and Decay
(9-18th century)

It may now be in the fitness of things to advert to the study of the creative phase of the Krama history which one encounters in the immediate succession. It is here that one finds himself face to face with remarkable scholars and outstanding personalities like Utpala, Laksmanagupta, Hrasvanatha, Siddhanatha, Pradyumna Bhatta, Utpala Vaisnava and Bhaskara etc. This community of scholars is further joined by even the persons of the eminence of Abhinavagupta, Ksemaraja and Ramyadeva etc. Really speaking, once the creative stream starts flowing, its current does not lose its rigour till it comes to Devabhatta. But the force of the central current is again restored after a brief pause in the personalities of Sivananda II, Jayaratha and Mahesvarananda. With Mahesvarananda one enters into the thirteenth century. These names form the galaxy of important Krama authors in addition to numberless those who have made humbler contributions. To this period belongs the illustrious tradition of Cakrabhanu, Hrasvanatha, Bhojaraja, Somaraja and Srivatsa who have made a hall-mark in the history of the Krama system by departing from the old rut and by making fresh contributions. It is the tradition which has escaped the certitude of historical accuracy for want of requisite material.

From the historical point of view, the Krama history unrolls a vast panorama that stretches from the 9th to the 18th century. There comes a lull after the 13th century and a vacuum obscures the creative arena, if any, from our sight. To be frank, a period of decadence looms large with the exit of Jayaratha and Mahesvarananda. And the vacuum is only partly and sporadically filled. Only two names, e.g., Sitikantha (1575-1625 A.D.) and Sivopadhyaya (1725-1775 A.D.) arrest our attention for their brilliant attempt to revive and preserve the system. To this period may be assigned Anantasaktipada, the commentator upon the Vatula-natha-sutrani, and the author of the Chumma-Sampradaya whose exact chronological status is not yet beyond doubt.
The period ranging from the 9th to 12th century is most creative. The creative vitality is reflected not only by the number of authors and texts, but also the impact it made on the other systems. This period witnesses a big community of authors who not only share their greatness, but also enjoy blood-affiliations; and consequently, we are in the midst of not only the rich preceptorial traditions but also family traditions. In the subsequent study we shall have sufficient opportunity to expatiate upon this contention. This period evinces a positive philosophical aptitude to be replaced by deep esoteric tendencies towards decaying finale of the system. A transitional compromise is easily perceptible among the authors flourishing towards the conclusion of the primary creative phases e.g., Mahesvarananda etc.

The system did not degenerate overnight. The long process had started fairly early. By the close of the 12-13th century, the cracks start showing in the erstwhile cemented wall of the system. One can easily feel the pressure of surging winds in Jayaratha. His diatribe at his opponents is indicative of the fact that they had lost touch with the traditional secret of the system. But Jayaratha's criticism is so lively and retains its contemporary flavour to such an extent that by his time Krama continued to be a living force. Even a superficial perusal would convince one of this. Similarly Sivananda II, the author of the Mahanaya-prakasa, has castigated such people hinting at the growing ignorance of the system among the votaries of the system themselves. The tendency gradually turned into a fact. Coming to Sitikantha, one finds Krama fast disappearing from the popular scene. He, at one place, bemoans the forgetful

1. अत्र श्रवणस्य एवं बुधद्वस्तंत्रायतनारुताः, ..., तस्य वाच्यं वृन्दं श्रवणप्रेरिततमेव हर्षप्रेमकामः।

2. इति श्वविरेश्वरस्य श्रवणस्य यज्ञस्य द्वितीया संवर्त्तुष्ट्रपूर्वानुन्नु... श्वविरेश्वरस्य यज्ञस्य भोध्यस्त्युन्नुः: ते तत्प्रेष न ब्राह्माण्डालिनः।
   *M.P.* (T). 8.186-87; also see 8.180.
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public memory. The Jnanakriyadvaya-sataka, a stotra of Krama leanings and much later origin, gives a very vivid and graphic description of degeneration of the noble tenets of the system at the hands of its followers. It is a lengthy caricature (verses 37-63) and indicates how they lost any sense of the ethical proportions, social decorum and spiritual values in pursuing their carnal, sensual and mercenary motives.

4. Historical backdrop of these Phases

If one reviews the Krama history against the general backdrop of the history of Kashmir, it would be clear to him that the period covering the creative phase of the Krama system is in fact reflective of the renaissance that overtook and enervated every field of intellectual activity. This period has given us many classics in different branches of learning e.g., philosophy, poetics, religion and literature. The process of patronizing the intellectuals and creative geniuses that started with King Lalitaditya (7th century) went unabated till the time of Jayasimha (1127-1149 A.D.) with a few exceptions. There was a great impetus for the composition of new and original works in Kashmir. Works on poetics practically commenced from the 8th century A.D. with Udbhata and Vamana. Works on the Trika system of philosophy began to be written about the same time and historical works also fall in the same period. The reasons for this are not far to seek. Firstly the literary glory and creative upsurge of Kashmir was at its peak during this period and was largely responsible for creating an intellectually fertile atmosphere in which nothing mean could ever aspire for recognition. Sociologically knowledge-seeking and intellectual activity were the values supremely cherished by the society and individuals alike. According to the social psychology deep-rooted

1. तिमुने शुक्लसृष्टिभाष... ।

2. The stotra is still unpublished. See "classified bibliography" for particulars.
values in the subconscious-mind of society act as a formative principle and impart a direction, depth and meaning to the cultural and creative adventures of the age. Knowledge-seeking became the cult of the then India, not to talk of Kashmir alone. Secondly, foreign emissaries like Hiuen-tsang and I-tsing visited India so that there was ample opportunity for exchange of ideas between the great nations like China, Persia, Greece and India. Thirdly, Kashmir Saivism emerged as a critique of the Vaibhasika and Yogacara schools of Buddhism and a constructive continuator of Bhartrhari's philosophy of language which had attained a high degree of intellectual advancement. Fourthly, the kings like Jayapida (779-813 A.D.) and Avantivarman (855-883 A.D.) were enlightened and generous and they kept the flame of learning ever kindled during their reign. A king's popularity and success were measured in terms of his respect for learning. Kalhana has stated that during his time king Jayapida, like his remote precursor Lalitaditya, invited scholars from all parts of India in large numbers. Of Avantivarman Kalhana says that during his reign Siddhas such as Bhatt Kallata were born for the benefit of the world. King Yasaskare who has won the laurels from Kalhana for his flawless administration in maintaining the integrity of the housewives was also a patron of many a scholar. He was a Seme contemporary of Abhinava (950-1020 A.D.). Vallabha, the grandfather of Kama who was Abhinava's favourite student and Puma Manoratha, the first known ancestor of Jayaratha, were ministers of Yasaskara. Similarly in Sussala (1101-1197 A.D.) we meet a great patron of learning. Mankha has paid high tributes to him. Practically all the brothers of Mankha including himself

1. अनुवादः सांकरास्वाद भद्रभीकल्याण:।
अर्थितमेऽऽ: काले शिवदा स्वयंवरान:॥
R.T., V. 66.

2. नाद्यथस्व च वेदेनाग्रो गुप्तद्वीपदेवात्।
कुलायाः प्रत्यहीतीनिषेधं सुखेदृशः॥
R.T., VI. 12.

3. विशेषिते गुप्तद्वीपविग्रहणं स्वयं वरीययति सत्त्विनिर्विशेषे।
विधाय च द्वारे स्वयंसंवधिं लिपि स लेख्यंस्य विच्छुद्ध्यात्।।
S.K.C., 352
were under the employment of Sussala. Mankha’s elder brother Alamkara, who himself was a great patron of learning, was a high state official under Sussala. Ramyadeva and Losthala - both Krama authors, Ruuyaka - the famous poetician, and a host of others were regular members of Alamkara’s literary club. Jaya Simha (1127-1155 A.D.), whose court poet was Kalhana, stepped into the shoes of his father and closely followed his foot-prints. Mankha has very high opinion about him. Jaya-ratha, ostensibly one of the most remarkable figures of the system, was a son of Srngararatha, the court-minister of Jaya-simha who has been probably referred to as Rajaraja. Encouragement from the rulers and a creatively lively academic environment made Kashmir a virtual seat of learning which bewitched scholars from every corner of the country. And consequently and rightly, too, an adage earned currency among the scholars that the real test of the scholarship lay in Kashmir.

Particular mention may be made, in this connection, of the encouragement that was given to Sanskrit learning during the later part of this period (which has been called as the period of decadence) even by Muslim rulers such as King Zain-ul-Abidin (1420-1459 A.D.), Sultan Hasan Shah (1472-1484 A.D.) and Emperor Akbar. Zain-ul-Abidin made a history by proclaiming a total ban on cow-slaughter by reducing ziziah to a
nought. Hasan Shah was the patron of Sitikantha - author of the *Mahanaya-prakasa*, and Srivara Pandita - author of the later edition of the *Raja-tarangini*. All the three rulers ordered the translations of Sanskrit works into Persian and Arabic and vice versa, so that the exchange of ideas was mutual and not unilaterial. But there was a great difference between the initial and final periods of the creative phase. These Muslim rulers of the final period, however, were not the rule but exceptions who gave a fillip and stimulus to Sanskrit learning in brilliant contrast to the wicked performance of the Muslim rulers in general who took it as a religious duty to destroy the culture of Kashmir; whereas in the initial period such rulers were exception as were not generous, nor enlightened. This difference among the rulers speaks by itself of the difference between the two periods.

The dazzling flame of classical Sanskrit tradition ultimately began to flicker and extinguish after the death of king Zain-ul-Abidin. The Hindu society in Kashmir began to disintegrate marking the decline of Sanskrit study. Persian language began to spread its influence. The place of Sanskrit was usurped by Kashmiri which was born afresh by a mixture of Persian and Sanskrit. Its magnificent examples are found in the pithy sayings of Lalla, *Mahanaya-prakasa* of Sitikantha and *Chumma-Sampradaya*. It is a pity that the land which was a living shrine of the goddess of learning succumbed to foreign influences and was forced to pass through a process of complete degeneration and total eclipse of its cultural identity. The process has been so thorough and its after-effects so severe that the Kashmiris today have yet to realize their real cultural identity. However the rich heritage that has flowed through blood among the Kashmirians down to the present day is visible in the commentaries of Sivopadhyaya on the *Vijnanabhairava*, of Ratnakanta on the *Stuti-Kusumanjali*, and of Bhaskarakantha on the *Iswara-pratyabhijna-vimarsini* and in the *Devinamavilasa* of Sahib Kaul. The first and third works speak of the original calibre of their authors. Sivopadhyaya, who is credited with the authorship of certain other works as well, flourished under the patronage of Sukhajivana (1754-1762 A.D.), a Hindu king. The fourth work
also belongs to the close of eighteenth century. With his exit the
curtain is finally dropped and all intellectual activity comes to a
close only to be revived in the present century.

5. Chronological Position and Contribution of the Individual Authors

As is logical, one may now proceed to determine the chronological status as well as examine the contribution of the Krama authors individually. Such an attempt will possibly facilitate better understanding of the system. The place of an author in the proposed treatment corresponds to his exact or approximate position in chronology. Cases of doubtful or unknown authorship have been treated along the same lines except agamic works to which a separate section has been devoted.

(i) Vatulanatha (675-725 A.D.)

Little is known about him. It is also difficult to say whether he belonged to the Siddha tradition (Siddhaugha) or the Human one (Manavaugha) although he is referred to as a 'Siddha'. If he is a historical personality he should be placed before Niskriyanandanatha whose period falls about 700-750 A.D., because the tradition (not the authorship) as presented in the Vatulanatha-Sutrani is traced to some Vatulanatha.\(^1\) The main thesis, according to him, is to negate duality and uphold unity of the various categories of spiritual experience i.e., the adorer, the adored and the adoration. He is the first exponent of the Sahasa school.

\(^1\) Verse 3, V.A.S.V., p. 1.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 18.
(ii) **Gandhamadana (700-750 A.D.)**

He is known from a brief reference\(^1\) where he is represented to have shown an unauthored (probably of divine origin or received traditionally) book to Niskriyananda while taking the latter into his personal favour. He is also said to be a Siddha i.e., the accomplished one. The text *Vatula-natha-sutra* is supposed to be a detailed exposition of these teachings. Coming before Niskriyananda he may be placed in the vicinity of the first two quarters of the eighth century. He also subscribed to the Sahasa branch of the Krama system.

(iii) **Niskriyanandana (725-775 A.D.)**

During the hoary antiquity of the system Niskriyananda appears to be the most important author. He is the first among the four preceptorial dignities mentioned by the *Pancasatika*.\(^2\) He is mentioned alongwith his consort i.e., *Jnanadipti*. His importance becomes self-manifest the moment one finds at least two works ascribed to him. As has already been noted in our study of the Sahasa school, these works are the *Chumma-Sampradaya*\(^3\) and the *Vatulanatha-Sutrani*. It is to be noted that one does not meet such explicit declaration of his authorship of these two works. To be more precise and exact, he may be said to be the author of the *Chumma-Sampradaya*, whereas he transpires to be a recipient of the Sahasa doctrine from some Gandhamadana resulting in the form of the *Vatulanatha-Sutrani*.

---

1. श्रीमान्मोहनदेवरामानुवाच श्रीमान्मोहनदेवरामानुवाच श्रीमान्मोहनदेवरामानुवाच श्रीमान्मोहनदेवरामानुवाच श्रीमान्मोहनदेवरामानुवाच श्रीमान्मोहनदेवरामानुवाच श्रीमान्मोहनदेवरामानुवाच श्रीमान्मोहनदेवरामानुवाच श्रीमान्मोहनदेवरामानुवाच श्रीमान्मोहनदेवरामानुवाच श्रीमान्मोहनदेवरामानुवाच श्रीमान्मोहनदेवरामानुवाच ।


The editor, Pt. Madhusudan Kaul, translates the word अकृतकुस्तक as "by the self-composed book". Cf. p. 5 of the translation. However, this rendering appears to be incorrect.

2. *T. A.* XI, p. 31 (Ah. 29).

3. The work is available in Manuscript form only and happens to be in the list of the projected publications of the Research Department, Kashmir. The book is divided in about 74 sub-sections known as Kathas. Under each Katha a few verses occur in which Sanskrit verses precede those in the local vernacular. It has in all thirteen folios and bears the MS. No. 151. We have made copious use of the manuscript throughout the present study.
His authorship of the first work is established by an irrevokable fact. According to Sivopadhyaya, he reads 'Karankini' for "Karankini" in the context of Mudrakrama under Vrndacakra. In support Sivopadhyaya cites two verses from him. Fortunately these verses are traceable verbatim to the *Chumma-Sampradaya* which is still unpublished. He also seems to have written a commentary called "Prakasa" on it which is also in manuscript form.

In this connection it is perhaps significant to remember that all these works as they are available today convey an impression of their being of much later date. This conclusion is derived from three facts viz., (i) these works are nowhere referred to in the earlier literature. Even Mahesvarananda and Jayaratha do not take any notice of them, (ii) the prevalence of Prakrta in the *Chumma-Sampradaya* and esoteric symbolism in the *Vatulanatha-Sutrani* are definitely later characteristics of the system; and (iii) the only other reference one gets after the *Pancasatika* is by Sivopadhyaya (18th century). The only explanation that seems plausible at this stage is that antiquity of

---

1. Vide C.S. (MS), folio 8.


3. The manuscript belongs to Pt. Dinanatha Yaksa, the then head pandit of the Sanskrit Section of the Research and Publication Department, Jammu and Kashmir Government, Srinagar. I was not permitted to have a look into the work. But he very kindly supplied to me a transcribed copy of the colophon with which the commentary ends. It is written in Sarada characters. Sutras in Prakrta have been commented upon by Niskriyananda in Sanskrit verses. The colophon reads:

```sanskrit
तिभिङ्ग्यनन्दनार्थस्य करणिक्या दति फळतिः—यथा—
करणिकायाः सर्वकालिकोभूतम्।
अकं ले सतितेताय: सतिरो देभेत्याः।।
तत्रकरणिकमुखात्म तत्सम प्राप्तार्थाचादनम्।
तिभिङ्ग्य करणिकस्मृतिर्निर्धर्म्य परं विः।।

V. Bh. V., p. 67.
```
Niskriyananda is no doubt very early and his teachings did come down to posterity unbroken, but they were consolidated and circumscribed into the form of the books at much later date. Or else there may be two separate authors of the same name. But in the absence of any contrary evidence, the first view seems to be more tenable. Whatever the case, he is inalienably connected with the Sahasa sub-school of the Krama system. According to Sivopadhyaya’s account he held Vamesvari to be the primal and absolute principle. He believed in the sixty-four aspects of the Vrnda-cakra, the sixty-fifth aspect being constituted by Reality itself which also passes under the name of Raudresvari.¹ This account tallies with what has been preserved to us in the two extant texts.

(iv) Vidyanandanatha (750-800 A.D.)

Besides the Pancasatika’s mention of his, as reported by Jayaratha,² complete darkness surrounds his identity. He is second in lineage from Niskriyananda and Rakta happened to be his spouse. This is all that is known about him.

It is, indeed, almost certain that he is different from the two Vidyanandas belonging to the Tripura sect. One is the author of the famous work called Artharatnavali and the other is the author of the Sivarcana-candrika and Saubhagya-ratnakara etc. Both of them belong to much later date³ (the 12th and 16th centuries respectively), hence their identification with the present author is totally out of question.

(v) Saktyanandanatha (775-825 A.D.)

Once again we seek recourse to the Pancasatika which puts him in the third place from Niskriyananda and as an

1. V.Bh., pp. 67-68.
2. T.A.V., XI, p. 31 (Ah. 29).
3. विपुरास्थपन्यापिताआचार्योऽन्तङ्करण, B.B. Dviveda, S.S., p. 25. The author has given convincing reasons to prove the lateness of (he authors in question. Vidyananda of the Krama system cannot be dragged to a later period for that would create historical absurdities. The Pancasatika was known to Somananda (T.A.V., III, p. 194) who flourished in the first quarter of the tenth century. And it is this Pancasatika that is one’s sole access to Vidyananda.
immediate predecessor of Sivananda. His spouse was Mahananda by name. We know nothing more about him.

(vi) *Sivananda* (800-850 A.D.)

Sivananda is the first literary figure about whom the history is less silent. Generally he is acclaimed as the first systematic exponent of the school and for that reason is known as "Avatarakanatha" in the doctrinal circles. He, as has already been pointed out, belongs to the opening era of the ninth century. This date is arrived at from basing our calculations on the dates of Somananda (875-925 A.D.) and Abhinavagupta (950-1000 A.D.). He is removed by two generations from the former and by five from the latter. He hailed from Kashmir, the Uttarapitha, which was also the seat of his spiritual initiation. He also visited Kamarupa where he was taken into personal favour of the deities of the Jaya class. The circumstances pertaining to his visit perhaps have a bearing on his relation, if any, with the Kula system. He had three female ascetics as his immediate pupils who bore the burden of propounding the Krama dicta. They were known as Keyuravati, Madanika and Kalyanika respectively. In Jayaratha's time there raged a controversy with regard to the total number of Sivananda's actual disciples. Jayaratha quotes a verse giving out the number of his students as seventeen and refutes the same because the verse, in his opinion, does not take into consideration the two other pupils and also because there is always

1. C.G.C., 4.121.
a possibility of his having still another student. By implication there was a wide range of scholars and devotees to whom he seems to have addressed his teachings.

It is doubtful if he wrote some specific work for the propagation of Krama. It is unfortunate that his views on various philosophical questions have not come down to us except on one question i.e., the number of Kalis to be worshipped in Anakhya-cakra. It appears there were two interpretations in tune with the doctrinal demands of his views. The tradition is interpreted by one group to mean that he advocated the number of Kalis to be thirteen and two verses are cited from him in support of their thesis. The other group headed by Jayaratha, instead, holds the number to be twelve which, he declares, has descended to him direct from Govindaraja and cites a verse to substantiate his contention. Jayaratha presents it as an uncontroversial fact that the twelve goddesses alone were intended by the teacher-sage. Today it is difficult to objectively

1. तृतीय, सम्प्रदायक-प्रशिक्षणभेदं दोषदेहात साक्षात:।
   सर्वप्रभृति शिष्ययानं च शृंगारसिद्धां:।
   इति सिद्धमो न स्मायम् — शिष्य-प्रशिक्षणं,
   श्रवण-परिगमननातू अनुस्मरणि कर्तव्यत्वस्य संबन्धायमात्:।

Ibid., p. 105.

2. तन्त्र नूतने मूलमेत्यत्र कर्मकारिं मिश्रितं संस्कृतम्।
   यदद्वादौ सन्त देवं देवा देवं देवा, यथाः
   श्रीमद्ये परंतक-विश्वासम् अत श्रीमद्ये सिद्धमिता:।
   श्रीमद्ये नित्य-ब्रह्मांत्यं प्रसंसन्ति सिद्धां:।

3. तत्तथा, श्रीमद्येन्द्रनाथ खगोलविज्ञानमात्र:।
   तत्तत्वस्य श्रीमद्येन्द्रनाथ-विज्ञान:समकुलं सदृश:।
   इति श्रीमद्येन्द्रनाथ-विद्वानं सहजस्वरूपात्मायो मूर्ति
   विश्वाभित्रं प्रसंसन्ते जयति ने कथम्।


4. तस्पि अस्थान श्रीमद्येन्द्रनाथ खगोलविज्ञानं सिद्धां।

Ibid., p. 109.
determine his precise views with regard to this or that issue. This is, however, clear that the twelfeoldness of Kalis was derived by him from the purely functional interpretation of the Absolutic agency. Each of the four functions namely, Emanation, Sustenance, Withdrawal and Rest, happens to enjoy three distinct phases of rise, maintenance and dissolution respectively. It may also be taken to be implied that he subscribed to the thesis of four-function doctrine (Krama-catusaya).

A student of the Krama history is familiar with one more Sivananda (generally referred to by us as Sivananda III, the grand teacher of Mahesvarananda, who belongs to a period as late as the twelfth century. In the tantric history, in general, there are quite a few Sivanandas and any irresponsible identification must be avoided without proper and strong basis. Yet one Sivananda quoted in the Siddha-Siddhanta-paddhati,1 because of his antiquity and historical approximity, may be identical with our author. The tone of the citation also lends weight to the above hypothetical value at present. If such a contention has any force, it is probable that Sivananda wrote some work or works too.

Earlier, in this very chapter, the identity of Sivananda with Srinatha, Antarnetranatha and Jnananetranatha has been suggested. Here one would like to consider additional evidence which could not be adduced there for want of space and relevance. The immediate transmission of the Krama tenets by Mangala Devi to jnananetranatha2 in Sitikantha finds a close analogue in Sivananda’s receiving the spiritual secrets from Mangala Devi in the Maharthamanjari.3 Moreover, Antarnetranatha is the first preceptor ever to be mentioned in connection with the Northern Seat by the Mahanayapprakasa.4 This, again,

---

1. उक्ते व शिवानन्दिदार्शः — सर्वेश्वराः प्रसारोपेन सख्यः संग्रहित भवते, 
   न संबंधिता मूलतमवृत्ताः। अत: प्राप्तं सर्वेश्वरास्तुपांवक्ता भवति। 
   Siddha-Siddhanta paddhati, p. 20. MS belonging to Saraswati Bhawan, Varanasi.
bears a close affinity to Sivananda's relation with the Northern Seat. Srinatha is said to have secured revelation of the spiritual truth at the first or original seat. The caravan of corroborative facts does not stop here. Ksemaraja has quoted from some Srinatha a passage containing his views about Kali which is definitely a Krama concept. It is interesting to note that Sivananda has also been referred to as Natha. From these premises the following conclusions can be safely drawn that -

(i) Srinatha subscribed to the Krama system,

(ii) he flourished before Ksemaraja,

(iii) there is no other Srinatha before Ksemaraja (except one, who is credited with the exposition of the dualistic-cum-monistic thesis and is a contemporary of Amardaka and Traiyambaka) subscribing to the monistic tradition,

(iv) Srinatha of Sitikantha does not appear to be different from his Jnananetranatha, because of the close similarity in their relation with their Pithas. there is only nominal and no semantic difference between Jnananetra and Antarnetra,

(vi) there is a strikingly close resemblance among the accounts of Sivananda, Jnananetra, Antarnetra and Srinatha, and

2. *M.P.* (S), p. 73.
3. 3. *S.S. VI.*, p. 92.
6. Ibid., p. 49.
7. Ibid., p. 73.
(vii) there is nobody else than Sivananda who could fulfil all these qualifications simultaneously before the time of Ksemaraja.

Hence the proposition laying down their equation cannot be ridiculed as absurd and unfounded. However, this suggestion has been advanced here only as a tentative measure. About his personal life we know nothing except that Samaya, according to the Pancasatika, was his spouse.

(vii) Vasugupta (800-850 A.D.)

Among the authors ascribed to this period the claim of Vasugupta must be considered, who is primarily a Trika as well as a Spanda author and is nowhere mentioned as the Krama author. But a close perusal of his Siva-Sutras as well as the Spanda-Karikas would reveal his contribution to the cause of the Krama system too. There are two schools with regard to the interpretation of the Siva-Sutras. Bhaskara represents one school that explains it as embodying the Spanda doctrine and divides the work into three Prakaranas or Prakasas. In so doing he steps into the shoes of Kallata who got the Sivasutras in four divisions, the first three of which he explained by his Spanda-Karikas and the last one by a commentary called Tattvartha-cintamani.1 Bhaskara comments on the first three chapters only. Here in his interpretations his taciturnity regarding the Krama system does not permit one to form a definite view. But the other school represented by Ksemaraja and Varadaraja interprets the Sivasutras in the light of the Trika system or so to say, the Kashmir Saivism in general and divides the whole work into the three sections in accordance with the three Upayas. Thus the second section deals with Saktopaya which is the traditional way of presenting the Krama system. Below in footnote a few Sutras, in addition to the second chapter, that particularly incorporate the Krama tenets

1. ... चतुःवर्णदान सायय \| स्मारकर्तलिकनर्वित्यः स्मादूति: स्मार्कक्षत्यः \| तत्त्वार्थस्वातान्त्र्यमाहार्य श्रवणमिलनम् \| S.S.V., I. 4-5, also see S.S.Vi, p. 138; Sp.P., p. 30; I.P.V.V., II, p. 30.
are also indicated. In the philosophical portion a reference has invariably been made to such portions of the *Siva-Sutras* as have the slightest bearing on the Krama system.

Similarly Ksemaraja, who ascribes authorship of the *Spanda-Karikas* to Vasugupta, presents the basic theme of the Karikas as consisting in the enunciation of the Mahartha doctrine. We have also seen Utpala, the author of the *Spanda-Pradipika*, referring to the common features between the Spanda and Krama systems. Hence this study.

The date of Vasugupta does not present much difficulty. We know Kallata was the direct disciple of Vasugupta. According to Kalhana, Kallata was a contemporary of king Avantivarman whose period of reign extends from 855 to 883 A.D. It is, therefore, reasonable to believe that Vasugupta, the teacher of Kallata, belonged to the preceding generation which might have been alive and active during the first half of the ninth century.

Besides the two works alluded to above, the three other books ascribed to Vasugupta are the (i) *Spandamrta*, (ii) *Vasavi Tika* and (iii) *Siddhantacandrika*. The claim of the first work as an independent treatise is now rejected by the modern scholars. It is supposed to be identical with the *Spanda-Karikas* with difference in the title only, because the word *Spandamrta* seems to be more of a metaphorical expression. The *Vasavi Tika* is a commentary on the *Bhagavadgita*. A complete manuscript of it has not yet been discovered. The first six chapters are probably mixed up in another commentary on the *Bhagavadgita* called *Lasaki* by Rajanaka Lasaka the manuscripts of which, according to Natarajan; are however available. The third work e.g.,

1. *Sp.K.*, 1. 6, 12, 17, 21, 22; 3. 13, 16, 25, 27, 30, 43.
Siddhanta Candrika is noticed by Buhler. Since Vasugupta is not an exclusive author on the Krama system unnecessary details may be avoided.

It may not be out of place to add that the Siva Sutras, as extant now, are known to us not in their entirety. Ksemaraja, in his Spanda Sandoha, quotes two Siva-Sutras which are not traceable to the published text. Abhinavagupta also refers to one such Sutra in his Isvara-pratyabhijna-vivrti Vimarsini. It is possible that these Sutras belong to the fourth division of the Sivasutras which has not been commented upon by any author except Kallata who is depicted by Bhaskara to have written the Tattvartha Cintamani commentary on it. A further probe into the available literature would perhaps give us a few more such Sutras.

(viii) Three female disciples of Sivananda - Keyuravati, Madanika and Kalyanika (825-875 A.D.)

We have just seen that Sivananda's immediate disciples included three female ascetics namely, Keyuravati, Madanika and Kalyanika. As such, there is no difficulty in fixing their approximate date. All our information about them is based on an extract from the Kramakeli as preserved by Jayaratha. Till their period one does not find any trace of the mainstream of Krama splitting into sub-schools. Like Keyuravati, Madanika and Kalyanika too were taken into favour by Sivananda.

2. For further reference of Abhi., pp. 154-157; Contribution (S), pp. 296-299, 327-330.
3. अन्तः च भिन्नस्वभावं 'मुक्तिभावतोपातव्यं धृतर्घनः' न क्याचि अदेशायस्यम्।
ततः 'विद्यन्त्यापरपूर्वैः विश्वम्' द्वारामिभं।
4. भ्रातानि कपलमार्तेः तस्माद्दृष्ट्यामिनिष्ठेण सर्वेऽपि सर्वदा विचारित।
5. धीर्यश्रीरेनूः उत्पीड़कनिष्ठेऽविश्वासः\p \ भौतिकानिश्चावाचलघ्नम् भौतिकस्यायः...।
6. किं व भौतिकशाखान्येन भौतिकश्रीरेयन्ति... भौतिकशाखार्जूनिष्ठैर्मययुपयोगस्य चादृश्यं।

T.A.V., III, p. 192.

T.A.V., III, p. 192.
of them were the guardian deities of some Pitha. Keyuravati, who was also called Kakaradevi, appears to be most important among the three. These three were responsible for imparting the Krama tenets to Sri Govindaraja, Bhanuka and Eraka. Besides this, Jayaratha has preserved some more information about Keyuravati. The historical value of the information will be determined later while discussing Cakrabhanu. In addition to these three, namely, Govindaraja etc. she is said to have three other disciples as well whose names are not known. Yet the preceptorial traditions ensued from the latter three students. Hence they are depicted as 'Savamsas'. It is impossible to identify these people today. At another place also from Keyuravati down to the pupil of Cakrabhanu, sixteen generations of the Krama teachers are said to have flourished. But validity of such a view is somewhat dubious, because the intention of Jayaratha behind alluding to these views is to suggest the conflicting nature of hearsays with regard to one and the same person or author and impossibility of construing any definite conclusion from such a scattered mass. Nevertheless, the respect enjoyed by Keyuravati is not compromised. This is borne out by the homage paid to her by Eraka or Naverakanatha, who eulogizes her as the Divinity par excellence.

(i) Kallata (825-875 A.D.)

Kallata, though not exclusively belonging to the Krama

1. Vide fa. 5 on p 110.
2. See fn. 6 on p.110
4. Ibid., p. 192.
5. अनु शीलकाररूपायः

प्रकृतप्राप्तप्रधानमिविभवम्

विविधात्वम्

सत्यसत्यः

इति तत् वाचः

नामीन्तप्रपश्चाय।

संसारस्वरूपायः

अभिशिष्यः

Ibid., pp. 195-96.
6. शर्मकृत्तित्वतः श्रवण्वः खरणुशुद्धिस्वरूपम्

विकृतदैविन्द्रशिवाय

इति तत् वाचः

नामीन्तप्रपश्चाय।

7. यहंसः सचम्बरस्यर्यौऽस्त्रावलाविभिः

विविधान्तनामिनितसः

नामीन्तप्रपश्चाय।

Ibid., p. 106.
school, is one of the most creative geniuses of his time. He is preeminently a Spanda author. The only justification for considering him under Krama lies in his valued contribution to the Krama system through the Spanda-karika as well as his commentaries thereon. On the authority of Ksemaraja and Bhatta Utpala one comes to know the amount of the Krama wisdom as contained in the Spanda-karika. Abhinavagupta presents Kallata as indirectly propounding a Krama doctrine.¹

Being a contemporary of king Avantivarman (855-883 A.D.) his date covers the second and third quarters of the ninth century. Kalhana calls him a great Siddha born for emancipating the suffering masses. Historically he occupies a unique position and from him ensue the two laudable traditions of the Spanda branch. One begins with Pradyumna Bhatta and is continued up to Bhaskara who is also a teacher of Abhinavagupta, and the other starts with Mahabala and is carried up to Utpala Bhatta. Pradyumna Bhatta and Utpala Bhatta are famous for their contributions to Krama as well. Computing backwards from Abhinava (960-1020 A.D.) who is a student of Bhaskara, one arrives at exactly the same period, since five intervening generations have filled the gap from Kallata to Abhinavagupta.

Kallata, apart from being a spiritual and religious personality, was also a man of versatile genius and wide interests. Besides his numerous philosophical major and minor treatises he is credited with the composition of literary pieces as well. A few verses have come down to us through anthologies² and some

¹ Vide Subhasitavali or Vallabhadeva, Verse No. 136.
² Quoted by Dr. S.V. Singh, Contribution of Kashmir to Sanskrit poetry, Thesis (MS), p. 78.
other sources.\(^1\) He also contributed his mite to the Kula system as well. It is apparent from Abhinava's reference to him in a positively Kula context.\(^2\) It is difficult to say whether or not he wrote separate treatises on Kula and Krama. But he did ventilate his views regarding problems pertaining to these systems.

Such wide erudition he could command due to his curiosity and unextinguishable thirst for knowledge. He calls himself as "a student of all" and naturally he never suffered from dearth of people readily telling him everything. After the typical slang "Every Tom, Dick and Harry", we take it, he avers that his teachership ranged from Tapana to Motaka.\(^3\) Abhinavagupta quotes this verse in his Tantraloka with slight modification\(^4\) and admits the debt of Kallata without reservation in one respect. He (Abhinava) also flanked the doors of all sorts of teachers even in branches of learning inferior to his own, out of sheer curiosity and quest for knowledge. In this he was largely inspired by Kallata's example.\(^5\)

The salient factor behind Kallata's peerless renown consists in his controversial authorship of the Spanda-karikas. Controversial in the sense that the tradition has not remained unanimous in recognizing him as the absolute author of the

1. उच्चर बुद्धेनेत्रस्य—

2. स्यमर्तैरहितस्स्न्तुवधाविवादिति तत् प्राह ।

3. भावानायोजकान्त्व शस्त्रमें ग्यास्तानिः ।

4. त्.अ 13 344.

5. त्.अ 13 345-46.
said text. There is a group of traditional scholars who attribute
the authorship of the Karikas to Vasugupta. Ksemaraja\(^1\) and
Mahesvarananda\(^2\) who closely follows the former, treat it as a
work of Vasugupta. In fact this is the heritage that they have
received from Abhinava - his (Abhinava's) own statement
testifies to it.\(^3\) Abhinava and Ksemaraja both seem to base
their judgment on the authority of the following verse found
in their recension as retained by Ksemaraja in his \textit{Spanda
Nirnaya}:

\begin{quote}
लश्वायक्यस्मात्माण्यस्मानहत्या हृदयत्वत्त्वहिति:।

वस्मुदात्रिजः यि भवति सदा सर्वोपस्थित:।

—\textit{Sp. N.} 4.2
\end{quote}

Strangely enough, this verse is not found in the recension of
Bhatta Utpala, author of the \textit{Spanda-pradipika}, who ascribes its
authorship to Kallata. He (Bhatta Utpala) on the strength of
the 53rd verse, categorically holds it to be a work of Kallata.
The verse runs -

\begin{quote}
वस्मुदात्रिजः यि भवति सदा सर्वोपस्थित:।

रक्तस्रयो द्वीवकामा समयक् श्रीभद्दकल्लक्त:।

But, amusingly again, this verse is not found in Ksemaraja's

1. \textit{तत् आधारं तु मुङ्गविन्धुपृवत्ते}। समतत्ताततायंगर्भो श्रुत्वेनात् स्थुतिमिमामण्डितेश भीमान्

\begin{quote}
अवाचुधुपृवत्ते।।

\textit{Sp. S.}, p. 3.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
‘तत् आधारं तु मुङ्गविन्धुपृवत्ते}। समतत्ताततायंगर्भो श्रुत्वेनात् स्थुतिमिमामण्डितेश भीमान्

\begin{quote}
अवाचुधुपृवत्ते}।। \textit{Sp. S.}, p. 3.
\end{quote}


3. \textit{तत् आधारं तु मुङ्गविन्धुपृवत्ते}। सविद्यासृवधक्यायो उपयोगितेष्यो सबाहिनिमान्यायो

\begin{quote}
लवोदयोपलितेश्यपर्याप्तान्वयेन निरुपित ते।।

\textit{I.P.V.}, III, p. 312;
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{cp. the first Kārka c.e.,}

प्रशोक्योपनिमान्यायो जनम् ब्रह्मोदयो।।

\begin{quote}
\textit{तत् आधारं तु मुङ्गविन्धुपृवत्ते}}।। \textit{Sp. K.} 1.
\end{quote}
recension. In the beginning of his Pradipika\textsuperscript{1} Utpala emphatically asserts his position that Vasugupta revealed the Spanda secrets to Kallata who wrote a compendium in fifty verses for the sake of easy understanding by his pupils. He, in this connection, also records a slight modification in the tradition in respect of the Siva-sutras to the effect that the Siva-sutras were revealed to Vasugupta by a Siddha and not by Siva himself as held by Ksemaraja etc.\textsuperscript{2} Bhatta Utpala is supported by a host of scholars including Bhaskara, the author of the Varttika on the Siva-sutras, and Ramakantha who wrote a Vrtti on the Spanda-karikas. According to Bhaskara, Kallata got from his teacher four divisions of the Siva-sutras on the first three of which he wrote his Spanda-karikas or Spanda-sutras, and on the last one a commentary called the Tattvarthacintamani.\textsuperscript{3} Probably the Spanda-karikas, intended to be a commentary on the first three divisions, was known as Madhu-vahini.\textsuperscript{4} Because both of them, according to Abhinava, are commentaries on the Siva Sutras and are mentioned by him in the order that conforms to Bhaskara’s stand.

Thus the following facts emerge from the above discussion. Both the schools concurred that -

1. \textit{Sp.P.}, Introductory verses. This is also to be noted that Ksemaraja talks of 51 Karikas whereas Bhatta Utpala of 60 Karikas.

2. See fn. 3 below.


\textit{Vide also K.S., Chatterji, pp. 31, 37.}
(i) the Spanda-karikas were a commentary on the Sivasutras,
(ii) Vasugupta and Kallata both are related to the Spanda-karikas whether directly or indirectly,
(iii) Kallata did write two commentaries on the Sivasutras.

And the two schools disagreed with regard to -
(i) its authorship - an issue Vasugupta versus Kallata,
(ii) origin of the Siva-sutras - Divine i.e., received from Siva, or Secular i.e., revealed by a Siddha,
(iii) recension of the Spanda-karikas - mutual black-out of the verses pertaining to authorship and their number e.g., fifty-one or fifty, in their respective recensions, and
(iv) divisions of the Siva-sutras - three or four.

On the basis of the material produced above there should be no doubt that one does not have extant today the original text of the Spanda-karikas. What one has must be an edited text - rendered and modified by the schoolmen in order to cater to their doctrinal requisites. If one sets out to locate its cause, one has to make a study in the motives of these schoolmen before he can positively conclude anything.

It has been frequently repeated that the Spanda system is nearest to the Krama for its unmistakable emphasis on the dynamic aspect of reality which technically passes under the name of Sakti or Spanda or Vimarsa. If this be granted, the Spanda-karika must propound a system that is Sakta in nature. It is why the Spanda-karika, despite the fact that it is a commentary on the Sivasutras, is considered to be the Bible of the Spanda system, whereas the Sivasutras are concerned with the Trika in general. According to Bhaskara, Kallata directly transmitted his interpretation of the Sivasutras to Pradyumna Bhatta¹ who has been ruthlessly criticized for his Sakta leanings by

¹. एवं रूपप्रमण्य मातुलेय वांवद्वस्त ।
भोगशुन्मुनधृष्टाय । ... ।
S.S.V., 16.
Somananda. In the wake of such contingency, if Kallata is allowed to lay his claim to the *Spanda-karikas*, it will be an uphill task to filter Saiva theses from the *Spanda-karikas*. Because that would mean leaving the Saiva system in the hands of the Saktas who, though kith and kin of the former, tread a different line. Hence Somananda and his fellow-travellers accepted Vasugupta to be the author of the *Spanda-karikas* and accordingly modified their edition in so far as it threw whatever feeble light on its authorship. Kallata, it appears, was the original author, for the simple reason that even before Somananda his system happens to show a marked softness to Saka tendencies. It was for this reason that his direct disciple falls a victim to the tirade launched by Somananda. Moreover Ksemaraja refers to Bhatta Lollata, who was a precursor of Abhinava and wrote a commentary on the *Spanda-karikas* and suggests that Lollata explained them in conformity with the gloss of Bhatta Kallata, whereas he (Ksemaraja) has not always done so. Even elsewhere Ksemaraja clearly professes to have taken an independent line. In this connection it is also to be noted, to which attention has been drawn earlier too, that Abhinava - the prolific master author - did not write anything on the *Spanda-karikas* in spite of his numerous reverential references to

1. *S D.r.V.*, p. 98; also see pp. 16, 94-95.

2. *Sp.N.*, p. 34.


Kallata. This we know on the authority of Ksemaraja. The only logical and irresistible conclusion that follows in the wake of such strong evidence is to admit the original authorship of the *Spanda-karikas* as belonging to Kallata.

Besides his *Spanda-karika* which is most probably identical with the *Spanda-sutras* mentioned by Bhaskara,\(^1\) which again is perhaps identical with his *Madhuvahini*, he wrote several other works. Amongst which a brief commentary on the *Spanda-karikas* known as *Spanda-Vrtti* has come down to us and has been published in combined IV-Vth volumes of Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies. What is today known as the *Spanda-sarvasva* is not a different text but probably a name for the Vrtti and Karikas together.\(^2\) This is clear from the concluding verses of his Vrtti. Kallata also makes it clear in the second concluding verse that he owes the Spanda-thesis to Vasugupta who got it in the form of *Siva-sutras* from the Lord in a dream, but the credit of bringing it before the public must go to him (Kallata).\(^3\) This statement from Kallata also goes to favour the present ascription of authorship of the *Karikas* to himself.

Of all his Spanda works the *Tattvarthacintamani* seems to have won special favour with the later authors. Abhinava refers to it more than once.\(^4\) Bhatta Utpala quotes it twice\(^5\) and

1. याक्षरोतिकत्वसत्त्वः स्पद्यूधः स्पद्युत्त्वः
\[ S.S.V., 1.5. \]

2. स्पद्याकार्यतत्वचिन्तमानः प्रधुरण प्रत्यक्षःसत्त्वः
\[ Sp.K.V., p. 40. v.1. \]

3. दृष्टं महावेशंगीरस्थं पत्तुरविधिविभाजनायुक्तं
\[ Ibid., p. 40, v. 2. \]


5. तत्वचिन्तमाणी व—
\[ Sp.P., p. 30. \]

\[ S.P., p. 49 (on Sp.K. 43.) \]
Ksemaraja also falls in line with them.\(^1\)

On the testimony of Bhatta Utpala one is led to conclude that Kallata also wrote a work named \textit{Tattvavicara}. It may, however, be added that this work has not been noticed earlier by any author on the Kashmir Saivism. According to Utpala, Kallata is the author (Granthakara) of the \textit{Karikas}. He has referred twice to the \textit{Tattvavicara} as another work of the author.\(^2\)

From the perusal of the quoted verses it appears to be a metaphysical treatise and an independent work not a commentary, by Kallata who gave expression to the outcome of his philosophical reflections in it.

Whatever little material we have in our possession is sufficient to indicate that in addition to his known works he attempted several other works. Attention has already been invited to his ventures in the spheres of the Kula system as well as the literature. Jayaratha, while explaining a reference by Abhinava to Kallata,\(^3\) cites three sutras\(^4\) and attributes them to the latter without assigning actual textual source. From Jayaratha's treatment it appears that all the three sutras fall into succession.\(^5\) These sutras are not traceable to his extant works.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{S.S.Vi.}, p. 134.
\item (a) \textit{Sp.P.}, p. 9.
\item (b) \textit{Sp.P.}, p. 9.
\item \textit{Ibid.}, p. 39.
\item \textit{T.A.V.}, XI, p. 133.
\item \textit{T.A.}, 28.398-399.
\item \textit{T.A.}, 28.398-399.
\item \textit{T.A.}, 28.398-399.
\item \textit{T.A.}, 28.398-399.
\item \textit{T.A.}, 28.398-399.
\item \textit{T.A.}, 28.398-399.
\end{enumerate}
The last two are, however, in all probability from the *Tattvarthacintamani*, though it is extremely difficult to say anything definitely about the source of the first one.

(x) *Govindaraja, Bhanuka and Eraka* (850-900 A.D.)

Govindaraja, Bhanuka and Eraka were the direct spiritual successors to the three female ascetics. They were contemporaries and received their lessons in Krama almost simultaneously from Keyuravati etc. With them a new element in the Krama history is introduced. The unitary mainstream drifts into various sub-currents and the foundation of multilateral development is laid. This multiplicity of traditions was kept alive till the time of Jayaratha. Both Govindaraja and Bhanuka head the two rich traditions. Govindaraja taught Somananda while Bhanuka was responsible for founding a different line of teachers of the eminence of Ujjata and Udbhata etc. Jayaratha came in this line of teachers and was in possession of the traditional and scholastic secrets.

Since only one generation intervened between these three and Sivananda and since Somananda came in the immediate next generation, their time is almost certain. They may easily be assigned to the second half, or to be more exact, the third quarter of the ninth century.

After his spiritual enlightenment, it occurred to Govindaraja that nothing worthwhile was left for him to do in view of his attainment. Thus with a spirit of dedication he gave himself till his last breath to the task of imparting the system to

---

1. अर्थात् क्रमेन्द्र क्लेन्द्रणे प्राणाध्यनिर्बलता रमणे, प्राक्षर्पिकाणी परिणामयात् इति तत्त्वार्थात्तीतामार्गाध्यात्मकः।
   T.S.V., p. 138.
2. तः भक्तिसंगोऽवतः प्रेमस्वरूपी-धीमतिता-प्रेमकारणाभ्य: भावार्थवनः।
   T.A.V., III, p. 192.
3. भौमातिरिक्तवायणानुपस्थित्रित्वमेवं भौमातिरिक्तवायणानुपस्थित्रित्वः: समस्तीति।
   Ibid.
4. ज्ञात्तिरिक्तवायणानुपस्थित्रित्वमेवं भौमातिरिक्तवायणानुपस्थित्रित्वः: परिपूर्णतिः।
   Ibid.
the elite capable and eager to learn.\textsuperscript{1} Towards the last moment he handed over the doctrinal mysteries to Somananda.\textsuperscript{2} He subscribed to the view that the number of Kalis to be worshipped in Anakhya Cakra was twelve. This view had come down to Jayaratha, although he did not belong to Govindaraja's tradition.\textsuperscript{3}

Eraka was the third pupil of Keyuravati etc.\textsuperscript{4} He developed a feeling of ascetic aversion towards worldly enjoyment that necessarily results in pain. He, therefore, decided to keep celibate all his life and dedicate himself to spiritual emancipation of the laity by means of the stotras\textsuperscript{5} which he composed for propagating the system among the masses. Unfortunately none of his stotras could survive the atrocities of time. Only two verses of his have come down to us. In one of them he adores Kalamaksarnini and describes it as an inevitable outcome of one's attaining the ultimate state.\textsuperscript{6} In the second he extols the spiritual attainment of Keyuravati, his preceptor, who by virtue of her realizing the Khecari state is said to remain in constant unison with the cosmic reality.\textsuperscript{7} Jayaratha has recorded a verse from some other source which speaks highly of Eraka as one having scored victory over the dualistic consciousness.\textsuperscript{8} In fact

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ibid.}
\item \textit{S Chandram, श्रीसंपादनसत्यिनी सरस्वती, गुवेश संबद्धाध्य युक्ता।}
\textit{Ibid.}
\item \textit{अध्य नामग्रं अभिमेता इत्यंभिताः, यद्वंकारणं श्रीमोक्षिद्राजात्योन्मुद्धरेऽपि। प्रवृत्तो वीणास्तर्यं स्मरणं, मायां।}
\textit{Ibid., p. 193.}
\item \textit{Ibid., pp. 192, 196.}
\item \textit{तत्त्रात्रानां तिर्थ भवसन्धयापवेयं स्तोत्रमुखेनानि तावत्सारायण लोकानु अनुभूतिः- यामं इति।}
\textit{Ibid., p. 193.}
\item \textit{श्रीमलमाक्षिनय्यपोढ़ शहीमपली, भोमोक्षिद्राजात्योन्मुद्धरेऽपि। मन्त्राचार्यां तत्त्वंभवं हृद्योद्धितविषु इति।}
\textit{T.A.V., III, p. 193.}
\item \textit{Ibid., p. 196.}
\item \textit{वद्यो ध्यातसमस्तस्थायर्यं श्रीमोक्षिद्राजात्योन्मुद्धरेऽपि। न यो यत्तिकर्मिपपातालितस्योपयोगिः।}
\textit{Ibid.}\
\end{enumerate}
it is a glowing tribute to his spiritual eminence. To point out that he was an avowed celibate\(^1\) is perhaps to imply that other teachers led a married life. He was also known as Naverakanatha\(^2\) or Navera.\(^3\)

Out of all the three known disciples of Keyuravati the personality of Eraka arouses some curiosity and controversy. While dealing with his own genealogy and preceptorial succession in the concluding portion of the *Tantraloka*, Abhinava mentions one Eraka\(^4\) who is a Desika (teacher) and father of a Vamananatha. The question is whether the two can be identified. Vamananatha is mentioned as a teacher of Abhinava and Eraka happens to be his father. Eraka is, therefore, removed by one generation from Abhinava. One has to bear in mind that the first Eraka is a class-fellow and, for that reason, a contemporary of Govindaraja and Bhanuka and hence is removed by three generations (e.g., Somananda, Utpala, Laksmanagupta). The other Eraka naturally seems to be a contemporary of Utpala, the grand teacher of Abhinava. It is difficult to reject the theory of Eraka's being a classfellow of Govindaraja in view of their much insisted synchronous initiation. It is therefore, perhaps reasonable to take the two Erakas as different.

(xi) Pradyumna Bhatta (850-900 A.D.)

In his essay on the Tripura system Braj Vallabha Dwivedi has observed in categorical terms that the *Tattvagarbha*, a stotra by Pradyumna Bhatta, was a Krama work.\(^5\) The ground for his contention has been supplied by the theme of the

---

1. स ब्रजाचारित्रं वार्तज्ञीवं प्रफन्नमोक्षरक्षमात्तरः...

2. नेत्रेकनायस्यायम् अव जिप्पिः
3. Vide in. 8 on p 1:1
4. के के गुरु दीर्घाधवनाह—
   तारोपिनिकृतवर्तमनकाचारः
   *T.A. 37.60 (T.A.V., XII, p. 414).*
5. तिरुपरमाणुपरिचितां आचायाः कुलवुध्,
   *S.Su., Vol. 20-II, p. 16, fn. 3.*
Stotra - it is addressed to Ambika, the Mother Divine. Before the veracity of this statement is examined, a few words about the work and its author appear called for.

Pradyumna Bhatta's importance may be gauged from the very fact that he has been referred to in some way or the other by every author right from Somananda to Ksemaraja. He was bitterly opposed by Somananda for his Sakta predisposition inside the Saiva fold. Utpala elucidates what has already been said by his master. Abhinava and Ksemaraja cite him in their support.

He was a worthy student of his worthy teacher Kallata and also a maternal cousin of the latter. Bhaskara, in the prefatory part of the Siva-sutra-vartika, gives out his preceptorial lineage as below:

```
 Vasugupta
  |  Kallata
  |  Pradyumna Bhatta (maternal cousin of Kallata)
  |      |  Prajnajuna (son of Pradyumna Bhatta)
  |      |      |  Mahadeva Bhatta
  |      |      |      |  Srikantha Bhatta (son of Mahadeva Bhatta)
  |      |      |      |      |  Bhaskara
```

Even on a cursory glance it would be obvious that he is removed from Vasugupta by a generation only. And although he was a direct disciple of Kallata, he must have been his junior contemporary too, since he was his (Kallata's) maternal cousin. Between him and Bhaskara three generations intervened. Bhaskara was Abhinava's teacher. On the other hand,
Pradyumna Bhatta preceded Somananda as the latter criticizes him. Of all these, Kallata and Abhinava are of definite dates, hence Pradyumna Bhatta's time is almost certain. He is somewhere between Kallata and Somananda. He may, therefore, be conveniently placed during the latter half of the ninth century.

Excepting the *Tattvagarbha-stotra* no other work of his has yet come to our notice. On Utpala's authority we know that it was his work. That Somananda does not refer to anyone else except Pradyumna Bhatta becomes obvious from Utpala's testimony, though he nowhere mentions Somananda by name. The verses that have been cited in this connection by Utpala are prefaced with the phrase "Tairuktam" (lit. said by them) i.e., him). Here "Tair" (lit. they i.e., he), according to him, stands for the author who propounded the ultimacy of Sakti and also interpreted the Saktistage (state of Sakti tattva) in terms of slight swelling up (Kinciducchunata). Besides Pradyumna bhatta none else has done so. Hence, in course of Somananda's criticism of the Saktivadin, all the references and citations are deemed to be from Pradyumna Bhatta, and for the matter of that, from the *Tattvagarbha*.

Owing to paucity of material the task of forming a well-knit view of his philosophy is rendered more onerous. Yet

1. Dr. V.S. Agrawala had told the author about the presence of one manuscript of the *Tattvagarbha* in the Hindu University. It was a recent find. But before the present author could have managed to look into the MS personally Dr. Agrawala, unfortunately, passed away. Since the whole collection, in which the MS was found, is uncatalogued as yet, it is regretted that details of the MS could not be given.

2. सूचि विचित्रपूजना कथ्यं भद्रप्रभुस्मृतम् सूचिकरणम् ।

   *S.Dr.V.*, p. 16.

3. *S.Dr. 1.16, 3.1, 3.2; S.Dr.V.*, p. 16, 94, 101, 102.

4. वनस्ते नेत्र न्यान्तु सप्तस्रव्यालोकोऽनि विचित्रपूजनास्त्योऽन्तरs

   *S.Dr.V.*, p. 95.

5. विचित्रपूजना सौव्र पर्यालंकृतं विचित्रपूजनम्

   *S.Dr. 1.18.

Utpala remarks—योद्धीरीभावं सौव्र विचित्रपूजनता कथ्यं पर्यालंकृतम् सूचिकरणम् ।

   *S.Dr.V.*, p. 16.
whatever little is available is adequate to give an idea of his mental disposition. The first premise of his philosophy is to reckon Sakti as the Ultimate and yet continue to be a monist.\(^1\) He stuck to his view in spite of the odds of his Saiva affiliations. Hence he was a Saktivadin though he clung to the Saiva discipline.\(^2\) The Mother Divine, who is the Divinity par transcendence, is pure luminosity and passes under the name of Siva also.\(^3\) He, in a slight deviation from the general practice of identifying Sakti with Ananda and in apparent agreement with Somananda, equated the Sakti-category with "little swelling" which is identical with proneness (Aunmukhya).\(^4\) This Sakti-stage came just after the ultimate stage which is akin to the Mother Divine\(^5\) - this view was used as a counter-argument by Somananda against Pradyumna Bhatta. The latter held the absolute female principle as identical with Siva with the reservation that it was Mother Divine who was also known as Siva. Hence, while dealing with the various stages of speech he proclaimed that there was no such form of speech as was not present in Siva, a name of the Mother, marking the Para or transcendent stage.\(^6\) All the three lower aspects of speech namely, Pasy-

---

1. अद्व्याद: रिष्वतः, पश्यन्तिविचारावनति त्रेबृहस्ताध्याविदः। स्म द्वारातीम्
\(\text{Arthasastra}\)
\(S.Dr.V., \text{III, p. 94.}\)

2. अन्यथा: मात्र शाक्तिविदिति...इष्टेष्वमिस्त्रितात् शैवयश्विनिश्चैति पाणिनि।
\(\text{Ibid., p. 101.}\)

3. वर्ण निद्धारितज्योतिस्यायाः, सिद्धवर्णः।
\(\text{व्यवह्य: परं तत्त्वान्यन्तरं निष्क्षमूलश्चभवेत्}\)
\(S.Dr.V., \text{III, p. 94.}\)

4. \(\text{Ibid., see fn. 5 on p. 124}\)

5. \(\text{Ibid., p. 95.}\)

6. \(\text{१५५२३५३३४५३६३७३८३९४०४१४२४३४४४५४६४७४८४९५०५१५२५३५४५५५६५७५८५९६०६१६२६३६४६५६६७६८६९७०७१७२७३७४७५७६७७८७९८०८१८२८३८४८५८६८७८८९८०८१८२८३८४८५८६
\(\text{Ibid., pp. 101-102.}\)
antI, Madhyama and Vaikhari, emerge necessarily under the aegis of succession, Para always remaining their fundamental fulcrum. Likewise, he was of the opinion that the entire stretch of the category kingdom encompassing the thirty-six categories is, in essence, an unfoldment of the Sakti suggesting that the godly freedom remains inevitably inherent even in the world of logical constructions.¹ Possibly this was the recurring theme of the Tattvagarbha.² It is, therefore, due to the force of rectitude of the reflective awareness that one is able to realize everything at will.³ This rectitude is incumbent upon one's recognition of one's potencies of knowledge and action. The main plank of the adverse criticism heaped on him by Somananda consists in the latter's stand that the position of Siva, as the ultimate principle, cannot be compromised. To say that Sakti appears as Siva is a statement made in a fit of devotional ecstasy.⁴ Otherwise, Sakti in utter isolation from its prius (Saktiman) is beyond conception. Nevertheless, if Sakti with utter disregard to its substrate is thought of, the one holding such a view may be anything but a Saiva.⁵ It is argued that not only Somananda argues against him but he (Pradyumna bhatta) himself tacitly

1. Śrīmadvidyāvā中关: स्वभावस्थानोऽवलं विभवविवर्धनविकारः तत्तवविवर्धनात्मभूतः, तस्य एव निवेद्याये एव सारस्मिति मात्रायां।
   I.P.V.V.. II, p. 337 on I. P.K. 1.6.11.

2. अतएव प्रीतबत्तार्घ्योश्च विकिर्षन्त्रलेभीमयार्यि वाप्रक्रमस्वतावर्ते तद्न्यन्त्राविक्रमस्वतावर्ते विनिर्षयेऽपि
   बिंबस्ययोऽगतां
   अतएव तु ये वेदित्तु परस्मार्न्तृतार्यि
   तेनां तत्र वच्चस्य स्ववोज्यिद्धं न लुप्तं।
   P.Hr. p. 49.

3. तत्त्वं तथानि
   या तं तेनायुतस्या वाप्रक्रमस्वतावर्ते बिंबस्ययोऽगतां
   बिंबस्ययोऽगतां दार्शनिकाः
   तथा च तेनायुतस्यायां वाप्रक्रमस्वतावर्ते बिंबस्ययोऽगतां
   S.Vi p. 126.

4. अव वस्तो वाप्रक्रमस्य वाशस्यायां वाशस्यायां
   युक्तस्य प्रकाशितं देशस्यायां वाशस्यायां वाशस्यायां
   S.Dr., 31.

5. तत्त्वात्त्वं तथानि वाशस्यायां वाशस्यायां वाशस्यायां
   वाशस्यायां वाशस्यायां वाशस्यायां वाशस्यायां
   S.Dr.V., p. 98.
acquiesces in the supremacy of Siva by expounding that all the stages of speech finally culminate in Siva. However, the criticism by Somananda is very brief and bereft of constructive logic. In fairness to Pradyumna Bhatta, one must be cautioned that Somananda’s last plank is slightly misleading since the former has steered his position clear by recognizing Siva as an expression for or an appellation of the Mother Divine.

Let us now be back to our original question. Is Pradyumna Bhatta a Krama author? The answer is difficult indeed. According to the testimony of Bhaskara, a spiritual descendant of Pradyumna Bhatta, he inherited the Spanda wisdom from Kallata. While discussing Kallata, it was also noticed that Somananda and his followers were rather cut-off from the Spanda school and it is the reason why one does not get any contribution from his group to the Spanda system before Ksemaraja. Pradyumna Bhatta’s name nowhere appears in the later Krama literature. Moreover Somananda himself was a man initiated in the Krama discipline, why should he criticize another Krama author? Why then he (Pradyumna Bhatta) be not treated as a Spanda author rather than a Krama author?

As has been said, a categorical commitment is impossible and also uncalled for. But for a fuller and better perspective one must look to the other side of the picture as well. Bhaskara’s observation is no doubt a limited but not a negative one. He does not reject Pradyumna Bhatta’s claim to Krama. Somananda himself, before the critical study and thorough survey of the Krama system as such, was not known to be a Krama thinker. Neither he (Somananda) has been mentioned in the later literature as a Krama author and nor has any work come down to us from his pen on Krama, yet he is a Krama preceptor. Moreover teachers of the early phase, excepting Sivananda, have seldom been remembered in the later literature. Hence

1. अन्यथा वैः शिष्याविदिषिः प्रयथ: तिनाश्रित्वीतःपाण्: जितजस्म्या । स्थायेः”हतेय-मधिमानात् शिष्याविदिषिः”हतेय”युक्तन”सिवे यत्रा न भायुष्म श्रृवःप्राप्तानन्तिबिः दृशि नैरिववस्तयमात्म्य उक्तम्।

this argument loses much of its force. The reasons for putting forward Pradyumna Bhatta as a Krama author lie in the central theme of the *Tattvagarbha* and its relatively deeper proclivity towards Krama. The *Tattvagarbha* is a hymn paying obeisance to the Cosmic Mother. Earlier it was pointed out that despite Sakta leanings Spanda considered Siva to be the Ultimate principle, as will be testified to by the very first and last verses of the *Spanda-karika*. That is, the Spanda system retained its Saiva fervour in spite of its Sakta tendencies. But in the case of Krama the things were different. There were two distinct schools which occasionally and often necessarily entertained divergent trends. Their most fundamental line of demarcation was drawn by their respective emphases on the Siva or Sakti aspects. The natural outcome of it was to treat either of them as the Supreme Reality, all other things being derived from it. Since the school holding the supremacy of the female deity was in ascendance, Krama has also acquired the name of Devinaya or Kalinaya. Further, it has to be noted that there was a lot of mutual digging at between the two schools, hence criticism by Somananda, the mouth-piece of the "Siva is the Supreme" - theory, of the opposite "Sakti is the Supreme" - thesis is understandable, because in his entire chain of argument he takes strongest objection to the supremacy of Sakti alone. In view of the above argumentation it appears that Pradyumna Bhatta belonged to the line of the Krama thinkers opposite to Somananda's. Hence Pradyumna Bhatta's claim to the Krama authorship requires a careful examination whatever decision one may ultimately arrive at.

(xii) *Somananda* (875-925 A.D.)

It may be recalled that Somananda was the immediate successor of Govindaraja who, at his last moment, transmitted all the doctrinal mysteries of Krama to the former. All information about Somananda’s associations with the Krama is miserably confined to this cryptic sentence from the *Kramakeli* as recorded by Jayaratha. Nothing is known whether he ever

1. त नेत्रं खुश्यं प्रोतसङ्गनाशिवाणाय गुरुर्यं संजार्ववाम्युऽृ

*T.A.V. iii*, pp. 192.
attempted a work on the Krama except that Abhinava received his lessons in the *Devi-Pancasatika*, a Krama text, from him through Utpala and Laksmanagupta.¹

The determination of his date, although recognized to be an untedious affair by the scholars, is slightly perplexing because of a few bottlenecks in the form of at least five preceptorial traditions that invite our attention in this behalf. On the basis of the following two parallel traditions Somananda emerges as a contemporary of Kallata²:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Somananda³</th>
<th>Kallata⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utpala</td>
<td>Mukula Bhatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laksmanagupta</td>
<td>Bhattenduraja⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhinavagupta</td>
<td>Abhinavagupta.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The truth of this tradition is further corroborated by a statement of Raghava Bhatta, the commentator on the *Sarada Tilaka*, wherein Somananda is represented to be a direct disciple of Vasugupta⁶ - one simply has to recollect that Kallata, too, is an immediate student of Vasugupta. But the greatest anomaly entailed by such an admission would jeopardise the dates of Sivananda, Keyuravati etc. Because according to the original calculation the two were loosely contemporary of

1. Śrīvēndrakāšikasāstraḥ अश्व श्रीमोहनाच्छेदनोदेशः प्रथुति लिखतमेवदेव यु.म. ¹


3. तैयंसक्रमं सरारस्वाधियोक्तं दासामयन्तु क्लक्त्य वेमायमः. T.A., 37.01.

4. भूपकलापुदेशः भृगुनन्तितवितात्।

5. शृङ्गवेड़ोऽध्वनिः कतःस्तक्तिया।

6. भूपकलापुदेशः भृगुनन्तितवितात्।

Quoted from Bhitteaduraja’s commentary on the *Karyalankara-Sara* and Mukula’s *Abbidha-vrtti mattrka*, Abhi., p. 137.

7. भूपकलापुदेशः भृगुनन्तितवितात्।


8. भूपकलापुदेशः भृगुनन्तितवितात्।

Quoted, *T.V.*, 1 p. 7.
Vasugupta and Kallata respectively. However both these traditions agree with regard to a gap of two generations subsisting between Somananda and Abhinava or that of three generations between Vasugupta and Abhinava. Since Kallata's date is fixed owing to his flourish during the reign of Avantivarman (855-883 A.D.), there should not be a gap of more than fifty years between Somananda and Abhinava. The implication being that Abhinava should be placed somewhere 900-950 A.D. instead of 950-1000 A.D., his commonly agreed date. Abhinava's accepted date is further established by the fact that he belonged to the next generation of King Yasaskara who ruled in 839 A.D. and the grandson (i.e., Sura) of whose minister Vallabha was Abhinava's student. Hence Abhinava's date cannot be advanced earlier. Let us see how one can emerge from this dilemma.

The other three traditions, given below, widen the gap between Abhinava and Kallata by at least four generations in place of two as noted above. These traditions are:

1. Mahabala
2. Mahabala (Vasugupta)
3. Acarya Pandita
4. Trivikrama (Kallata)

| (grandson of Srikrsna Mahabala on Pradyumna Bhatta (maternal side) cousin of Kallata) |
| | |
| Laksmanagupta | Bhatta Utpala |
| | (author of the Spanda Pradipika) |
| Abhinava | Mahadeva Bhatta |
| | (Abhinava) |
| | Srikanta Bhatta |
| | Bhaskara |
| | Abhinava |

2. अत्तेतनान्तरात्मक्यामुत्ता पूर्णतातात्म्यायणं महेश्वरं वदवानं सङ्गमं देवीमातीश्वरी विषयोऽदर्शनं। *S.P.*, p. 3.
3. गार्भगणनायं उत्तप्रकाशं विषयं चेतनमात्रं सुतोऽत्मार्थम्। *Ibid*, concluding verse.
Among these family or preceptorial trees, the one ranging from Kallata to Bhaskara (Abhinava's teacher) involves at least three intermediary generations even if one takes Pradyumna Bhatta, Kallata's first disciple, as the latter's contemporary by virtue of the former's being his maternal cousin. We have already seen Somananda criticising the view and work of Pradyumna Bhatta and he must have taken time in attaining eminence of the kind that he could elicit criticism from Somananda. Thus Somananda is bound to be a junior contemporary, if not a successor, of Pradyumna Bhatta who himself was a disciple of Kallata. In the other tradition ranging from Mahabala to Laksmanagupta, the celebrated teacher of Abhinava in Krama and Pratyabhijna, the latter is separated from the former by two generations or from Abhinava, for that matter, by three generations. This distance between Mahabala and Abhinava is substantiated by yet another tradition starting from Mahabala and coming up to Bhatta Utpala who transpires to be a contemporary of Laksmanagupta on the basis of the temporal equation of the two exactly parallel lines. If these latter twin traditions are correct - they ought to be correct because they come from different sources and yet speak of the same thing -, Somananda being the grand-teacher of Laksmanagupta must be a contemporary of the latter's grand-father, Acarya Pandita, and may at best be a successor to or a junior contemporary of Mahabala. Stretching the present logic a little further one may conclude that Mahabala himself was Kallata's successor or in any case a contemporary of Pradyumna Bhatta.

But one should not feel baffled because such a complex analogue is found even within the traditional account of the Krama system itself. It has been made absolutely clear that Bhanuka was a contemporary of Govindaraja, teacher of Somananda in Krama, and was at the head of the tradition which had immediate successors in Ujjata and Udbhata. This Udbhata was perhaps identical with one mentioned by Abhinava as his teacher, thus the gap between Bhanuka and Abhinava has been further shrunk from three to two generations, if one abides by the first two traditions mentioned in the beginning.
In the face of such yawning incongruities it is difficult to give a year to year account. One has to make allowance for marginal errors in calculations because the requisite material is not available in its entirety. Keeping this in view, it will be found that, barring the scope of minor adjustments always, our basic stand with regard to respective dates need not be revised. Because, though twentyfive years are allowed for a generation by the historians, one's actual age has no fixed span and may even cross the barriers of middle age or long age. Abhinava himself was known to have enjoyed a long life going well beyond eighty years. Likewise, Mahabala taught Trivikrama, his grandson, implying the old age of the former. In view of all these considerations Somananda seems to have enjoyed a fairly long life. Moreover, he was a very junior, if at all, contemporary of Kallata whose successors in literature too must have enjoyed a considerably long age, otherwise the two generations on the one side and the four on the other covering the same expanse of time is beyond logical comprehension. Here, in this study, twentyfive years have been allowed for each generation with a margin of another twenty-five years for computing one's period and date without prejudice to one's other claims. This practice has additional advantage of making allowance for long age as well. Somananda, therefore, has been assigned to the last quarter of the ninth and the first of the tenth century. This period is always open to minor revisions as researches proceed to make headway.

He is known to have written several works. But only the incomplete texts of the Siva Drsti is extant today. One of his minor works i.e., Saktavijnana has also been brought out by the Research Department of Kashmir Government. His other two works, both commentaries, are known from references only. One of them is said to be on the Siva Drsti - this view has, however, been rejected by Dr. Stein. The other was on the Pira Trims ka according to the statements of Abhinava.¹ Let us

¹ P.T V, pp. 16, 52, 59, 63, 87-90, 92, 95, 201.
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now switch over to other authors.¹

(xiii) Ujjata (875-925 A.D.)

As has already been observed, he came in the line of Bhanuka and the tradition that began with him remained intact up to Jayaratha.² As an immediate successor to Bhanuka, he is supposed to be contemporaneous with Somananda. We are completely ignorant about the other aspects of his personality.

(xiv) Utpala (900-950 A.D.)

There is nothing in the works of Utpala himself that may induce one to include him among the Krama authors. It is Jayaratha on whose account one knows that Abhinava received the Krama education from the same set of teachers who imparted to him the lessons in the Trika system.³ In fact, one does not get anything in the form of a tangible contribution, earlier than Abhinava from the line of spiritual teachers as emanating from Govindaraja in the field of Krama. Utpala is credited with having produced as many as eleven works namely, (i) Isvarapratyabhijnā-karika, (ii) Isvara-pratyabhijnā vrtti, (iii) Isvara-pratyabhijnā-tika or vivrti, (iv) Siva-stotralali, (v) Ajadapramatrsiddhi, (vi) Isvara-sidhi, (vii) Isvara-siddhivrtti, (viii) Sambandha-sidhi, (iv) Sambondha-sidhi-vrtti, (x) Vrtti on Somananda’s Siva Drsti, and (xi) Paramesa-stotralali. Except works nos. (iii) and (xi) all the works have been handed to us either in full or in fragments. Work No. (iii) i.e., Isvara-pratyabhijnā-tika or vivrti was supposed to be a large commentary which was later commented upon by Abhinava under the title of Isvara-pratyabhijnā-vivrti vimarsini. The catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Government Oriental Library, Mysore mentions one Isvara Pratyabhijnā-Vyakhya by Utpala Deva. The MS. is numbered

² दृष्टियोगी एवमात्र । तत्वेयं चैव श्रीकुल्लकोद्वदनानायुपविपिनसहीस्वस्तिः। 
श्रीकल्लकोद्वदनानायुपविपिनसहीस्वस्तिः।

² T. A. V., 111, pp. 192-93.
³ Ibid., pp 192, 194.
(B 167) A 133 Pa and is bound in one with Isvara-pratyabhijna-nyaya-dipika by some Mahesvara Nathananda. It is not known if it is identical with the Tika in question.\(^1\) Work No. (xi) is noticed by Dr. Buhler in his Kashmir Report as MS No. 458. But probably this is identical with his Siva-stotirvali. The published edition contains twenty stotras and it is important to note that stotras Nos. 2, 3, 8, 17 and 20 have enough material that contains the Krama undertones.\(^2\) Particularly the 8th and 17th stotras are most conspicuous by their overt Krama propensities.

There are indications that Utpala perhaps attempted several other works also. A manuscript entitled as "Mantrasara" No. 501 of 1895-98, BORI, Poona ascribed to Utpala Deva\(^3\) has come to our notice. The MS in all has 11 pages and 21 folios. It abounds in scribal errors and has later, from P. 8. onwards, been mixed with some portions of Ksemaraja's Pratyabhijna-hridaya. But the original work differs from the latter. It seems to be a commentary on the Paratrisika and contains an account of successive emergence of Sanskrit alphabet with its symbolic mysticism and descriptive definitions of various categories followed by a discussion on Guna, Substance and various types of subjects (Pramatrs). These lines refrain from drawing any premature conclusions as to its authorship except advancing the hypothesis for future scrutiny.

Utpala's probable date does not present any problem. He, being the pupil of Somananda and the grand-teacher of Abhinava, may safely be assigned to the first half of the tenth century.

---

1. Similarly there are two MSS numbered 466 and 464 of 1878-76 and described as Pratyabhijna-vimarsini and Pratyabhijna-Brhati-vimarsini by Utpala and Abhinava respectively at BORI, Poona.
2. Vide, for instance, S St.V., pp. 32, 48, 106, 199, 206, 296, 300, 303, 340, 346 etc.

3. सदामप्रचारणं जयति व्याख्यं विकसति।
श्रीमुक्तलब्धयं मंत्रसारं तु (र)भयं।

MS, folio 1a, opening verse no. 2.
But before one passes on to the next item it appears advisable to clear up a general misunderstanding with regard to his genealogy among the modern authors on the subject.

According to them Utpala was both the son and pupil of Somananda.\footnote{Abhi., p. 160, 162; Contribution. (MS), p. 335.} Besides, he was the father and teacher of Laksmanagupta.\footnote{Ibid., p. 7, 164, Contribution, (MS), p. 340.} This lineage is said to have been derived from Abhinava’s own statement:

\begin{quote}
[{
Somananda, his son Utpala and his son Laksmanagupta recline on the ocean of the lineage pertaining to Tryambaka].
\end{quote}

The conclusion seems to be in order on the face of Abhinava’s statement.

But if one accepts it, one is trapped in another anomalous situation. Utpala himself names his father as Udayakara in the last verse of his Isvara-pratyabhijna-karika\footnote{T.A. 37. 61.} and refers to Somananda as his great and illustrious teacher.\footnote{Dr. Pandey quotes the text with slight variation and reads ईवायम्बकस्तसागरशायिः (Vide, Abhi., pp. 160 and 764) for ईवायम्बकस्तसागरशायिः as found in the printed edition of the Tantraloka. In that case, the English rendering would be ‘Somananda, his son Utpala and his son Laksmanagupta, were like waves in the ocean of the lineage pertaining to Tryambaka”. However, this difference in reading is immaterial for our present purpose.} If Somananda was his father as alleged above, he could have utilized the opportunity to assert the same. In addition, Abhinavagupta commenting on the last Karika does not dispute Utpala’s version but readily confirms the same.\footnote{Ibid., 4.1.16, p. 309.} Even on the issue of
his son he has not kept mum and gives out his name as Vibhramakara whose pursuasion impelled Utpala to undertake the commentary on the *Sivadrsti*.\(^1\) Had the truth been otherwise, Utpala would not have failed to mention Laksmanagupta as his son, who was infinitely more illustrious and intelligent than Vibhramakara. Here again he implicitly refers to the author of the *Sivadrsti* as his guru. There was all the more reason to refer to Laksmanagupta in this context, because it was the latter who initiated Abhinava into the *Sivadrsti*. And if Utpala be accused of misleading the posterity, Abhinava had the opportunity to make corrective amends which he did not do. There is an additional collateral evidence to substantiate the present contention that Laksmanagupta was not Utpala’s son. According to the *Saradatilaka Tantra* he (Laksmanagupta) was the son of some Srikrsna, grandson of Acarya Pandita and great-grand-son of Mahabala.\(^2\) This point would be examined in detail when we discuss Laksmanagupta.

Then, should Abhinava be held guilty of misguiding the people by his statement on which the conclusion at issue is based? It is not the case. In fact, Abhinava is here alluding to his teachers\(^3\) and is discussing their ‘Santatikrama’ (lit., geneology) which as a technical expression stands for their preceptorial lineage, implying that the unity of a tradition depends upon the extent of its continuity. Anybody falling under that tradition would be known as Santana of his spiritual predecessor.\(^4\) Purity and exclusiveness of a preceptorial tradition

---

1. विश्रामकरंसम्बन्धः स्वतृद्वागारिष्ण जोतित ।
   पञ्चाध्यायभागेन तथा स्वद्दमारिष्ण ॥
   इत्याद्यध्यायोग्तिरेकादेके व्यापिते ।
   विभूषितापर्करोऽसुरेण करोऽसुर एकसम्बन्धिते ॥
   *S.Dr V.*, p. 2, V. Nos. 2 & 3


3. के ते पुर्व संसारसागः ।
   *T.A.V.*, XII, p. 414

4. पवानस्य संतानो मृदुस्तारथस्व वैतिः ।
   *T.A.*, 1. 215

Jayaratha remarks संतानः प्रत्यृविशयपादित्यः ।
*T.A.V.*, 1, p. 252.
is deemed to be a very sacred affair in Kashmir Saivism. Thus the expression 'Ja' in the words 'Somanandatmaja' and 'Utpalaja' is figurative and not literal. This will be apparent from a perusal of Abhinava's statement in full, because his sole intention is to refer to all the four traditions of Kashmir Saivism pertaining to Ananda, Srinatha, Tryambaka and the Fourth School.

Moreover, all doubts on this score have been set at rest for good by Jayaratha who interprets the phrase "sons of Somananda" used by Abhinava as "pupils of Somananda such as Utpala etc." The mistake in taking Somananda as Utpala's father and Laksmanagupta as his son appears to have crept in due to interpreting the word Atmaja and Santati in their literal sense. Thus Utpala's parental and preceptorial traditions would take the following forms respectively:

Udayakara  Somananda
Utpala    Utpala
Vibhramakara  Laksmanagupta  Padmakara

(xv) Udbhatta (900-950 A.D.)

He is supposed to be the grand pupil of Bhanuka and successor to Ujjata. It is a matter of guess if he ever wrote on
the Krama system, but there is no doubt about his being a repository of the tradition that was kept intact up to Jayaratha. Besides him, there are two other Udbhatas as well. One came pretty early and was described as the Sabhapati of King Jayapida of Kashmir (779-813 A.D.) by Kalhana. He was a great poetician. The other Udbhata, in question, is one mentioned by Abhinava as his teacher. Of these two, the latter may be identified with the Krama author. However, this personality-equation is being advanced as a tentative measure, for Jayaratha actually reads Udbhatta and not Udbhata. But this might be due to scribal mistake also. If this equation be granted, he must have been of fairly advanced age when Abhinava approached him for instruction. He may also be placed in the first half of the tenth century.

(xvi) Stottrakara i.e. Sidha Natha (900-950 A.D.)

The authorship issue of the famous Krama stotra is a crucial question in the history of Krama thought. The tantric history has recorded the presence of about four Krama-stutis. One is attributed to Samkara, son of Kamalakara, and is taken note of by Kaivalyasrama in his Saubhagya-vardhini on the Ananda Lahari. The other is a work of Abhinavagupta and was composed in the years 990-991 A.D. which will be dealt with during our treatment of Abhinava. Uncertainty prevails about the third Krama stuti a reference to which has been made by Monier Williams under the word "Krama" in his dictionary without giving further details or source of information. The fourth is one in question whose authorship is the subject-matter of the present enquiry. We are not aware if the third and fourth works are one and identical. The first Krama stuti is presently beyond our scope owing to its adherence to the Tripura system. The third, too, is left out in the absence of necessary and relevant data. Hence we concentrate on the fourth Krama stuti whose author is yet a matter of speculation.

1. R.T., 4.495.
2. अन्योन्य प्रभुक्षेपभाषानककुन्तस्मृतिपरिस्परस्मृतिपुस्तकादिपरमाणुयां महान: ॥
   T.A., 37.69.
The traditional account is silent even on the bare details of the author. He is always described and presented as the Stotrakara. Since the questions of his identity and date cannot be investigated in isolation from each other, the only course open is to treat them together.

The earliest author who refers to the *Krama stotra* is Abhinava himself who, on his own information, wrote commentary on it called *Kramakeli*. His date is definite i.e., second half of the tenth century, and he himself composed a *Krama stotra* emulating his precursor’s example during the year 990-991 A.D. Therefore, the lower limit of the *Krama stotra* is set by the date of Abhinava. It, therefore, must have been composed prior to 950-975 A.D. A dive into Jayaratha’s account would reveal that various commentaries had come up by his time and certain doubts were being raised about its precise content and number of verses comprising it. Different interpretations were advanced and a state of confusion tends to overtake us. Jayaratha draws our attention to at least two such expositions.

The other cue in Jayaratha’s treatment traces the traditional line of the Stotrakara in descending order as the Author of the Stotra, Bhaskara and Kuladhara. Of these, Bhaskara is comparatively familiar figure and is perhaps the same as Abhinava’s teacher of the same name. This possibility gains firmer ground in view of the absence of any other Bhaskara prior to Abhinava. Since the Stotrakara preceded Bhaskara, he must belong to the first quarter or the first half, in any case, of the tenth century. In other words, his date should not be later than Bhaskara’s. This is the time to which Laksmana-

---

1. एतदाग्नेन श्रीलोकारप्रभुपुत्रान्यः ।


3. द्वाराध्य विवरणकारानात्मकं चतुर्दश पदं पाठं दितं ।
   विवरणकारानात्मक implies the presence of two distinct commentators.

4. श्रीलोकारप्रभुपुत्रान्यः स्वयं श्रीकृष्ण्यायं संवर्तितं ।
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gupta and Sambhunatha, Abhinava's teachers in Krama and Kula respectively, belonged. On the other hand, the upper limit of the *Krama stotra* does not extend beyond Eraka who, as a contemporary of Govindaraja and Bhanuka, is assigned to the third quarter or the second half of the ninth century. Because, the first ever credit of writing the stotras in the Krama history goes to Eraka who made it a mission of his life to popularise the Krama system through his stotras. Hence the probable time of the *Krama stotra* and, for this matter, its author must fall somewhere within 850-950 A.D.

From the tentative fixation of the probable period of the Stotrakara let us now proceed to discover the identity of the author. The *Cidgagana-candrika*, which on its own authority is a commentary on the *Krama stotra*, attributes the authorship to some Siddhanatha\(^1\) or Siddhinatha.\(^2\) There is no reason whatsoever to deny the account as furnished by the *Cidgagana-candrika*. Now, according to Prthvidharacarya, the author of the *Bhuvanesi-stotra*, Siddhinatha and Sambhunatha are the two names of one and the same individual.\(^3\) During the projected period (850-950 A.D.) only one Sambhunatha is known to the history of Tantric monism. He is the most esteemed teacher of Abhinavagupta whom he initiated into the Kula system and guided along the path of final emancipation. It is of course interesting to note that the first concluding verse of the *Tantrasara* echoes Prthvidharacarya's depiction of Sambhunatha not only in import but in choice of diction too.\(^4\) This has been the

\(^1\) सिद्धनाथस्वतः कालिदासरचित्तं स परिवर्तनम्

\(^2\) पूर्वस्वरूपतः सिद्धेश्वर भास्त्रसमारसतः

\(^3\) श्री सिद्धनाथ इति केतन हृदये सरस्वते प्रातिविश्ववष्ट कल्याणः कृतान्तिम्।
श्रीशंकृत्यविभागयास पाधि प्रास्तन्तेक्षत्रस्वत्स्मागम्यं कमः

\(^4\) स्रिद्रव्याचरमालोके महाशृण्यं, भवेत् स्वतं कथनम्।

\(^4\) श्रीशंकृत्यविभागयास पाधि प्रास्तन्तेक्षत्रस्मागम्यं कमः

\(^4\) श्रीशंकृत्यविभागयास पाधि प्रास्तन्तेक्षत्रस्मागम्यं कमः

\(^4\) श्रीशंकृत्यविभागयास पाधि प्रास्तन्तेक्षत्रस्मागम्यं कमः

\(^4\) श्रीशंकृत्यविभागयास पाधि प्रास्तन्तेक्षत्रस्मागम्यं कमः

\(^4\) श्रीशंकृत्यविभागयास पाधि प्रास्तन्तेक्षत्रस्मागम्यं कमः

\(^4\) श्रीशंकृत्यविभागयास पाधि प्रास्तन्तेक्षत्रस्मागम्यं कमः

\(^4\) श्रीशंकृत्यविभागयास पाधि प्रास्तन्तेक्षत्रस्मागम्यं कमः

\(^4\) श्रीशंकृत्यविभागयास पाधि प्रास्तन्तेक्षत्रस्मागम्यं कमः

\(^4\) श्रीशंकृत्यविभागयास पाधि प्रास्तन्तेक्षत्रस्मागम्यं कमः
main plank of A. Avalon, the editor of the *Cidgagana-candrika*, in identifying the two.¹

But let us be careful. The odds against this personality-equation are equally heavy. First, Sambhunatha is famous for his teachings in the Kula system and not in the Krama. Though it is not unusual for a Kula teacher to be proficient in any other cognate philosophical system Abhinava, who is so scrupulous in mentioning the minutest possible details about his teachers, should not have failed to record this aspect of his teacher's personality. Secondly, this Siddhanatha alias Sambhunatha of Prthvidharacarya should necessarily precede the latter as it is the latter who refers to the former. As we know, Prthvidharacarya came in the tradition of the Samkaracaryas. The manuscript of the *Balarcanavidhi* in the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society² gives out the preceptorial lineage of the Srngerimatha in this sequence - Gaudapada, Govinda, Samkaracarya, Prthvidharacarya, Brahma Caitanya, Ananda Caitanya etc. etc. Thus Prthvidharacarya is placed next to the Samkaracarya who is assigned to the 8th century.³ As Samkara died early, Prthvidharacarya's period too falls in the vicinity of his predecessor's. Therefore his date cannot be stretched beyond the first quarter and, at any rate, the second quarter of the ninth century. Hence Sambhunatha of Prthvidharacarya transpires to be a contemporary of Samkara. But Sambhunatha, the teacher of Abhinava, cannot be put back beyond the first half of the century. In fact, in view of his being Abhinava's teacher, he need not be pushed back beyond the second quarter of the tenth century. Thirdly, Padmanabha the commentator of the *Bhuvanesi stotra* interprets the word Varunalaya as standing for a village on the banks of

¹ C.G.C., Introduction (English). p. 3.
³ Artharajadarsana-paraśatvate śāṅkara-darśinādādhyakṣa-sūtra (—782 A D) veśavāhāve śāṅkara-darśinā śāṅkura-śāṅkara-samkhya-samābāh ।
Narmada\(^1\) whereas Abhinava's teacher hailed from Jalandhar.\(^2\) Moreover, it has also been noted that the upper limit of the *Stotra* cannot be extended beyond the latter half of the ninth century on the basis of the historical premises of the Krama system. In the wake of these discrepancies it is fraught with grave misgivings to identify the two Sambhunathas. It may, therefore, be firmly held that the two are two different persons and the editor of the *Gidgagana candrika* has been misled by the identity of names.

But the author of the *Gidgagana-candrika* is perfectly right when he names one Siddhinatha to be the author of the Krama stotra. Fortunately, the name of one Siddhanatha in the annals of the Kashmir Saivism has come down to us and, for this, our thanks go to Bhatta Utpala whose *Spanda Pradipika* has proved to be a mine of information so far as the early phase of the Krama history is concerned. According to Bhatta Utpala, this Siddhanatha was the author of the work entitled *Abheda-artha Karika* from which a passage has also been cited.\(^3\) Since Bhatta Utpala is a contemporary of Laksmanagupta, Siddhanatha may be said to have belonged to any generation earlier to Bhatta Utpala's. But we are not required to go back farther. Because according to the Krama tradition, recorded by Jayaratha and referred to earlier, Bhaskara, the teacher of Abhinava, is an immediate successor to the Stotrakara. Hence Siddhanatha, who is now identified with the Stotrakara, may in all probability have flourished during the first half of the tenth

---

1. Vide कङ्कणया युक्ते वल्सणार्ये प्रामणविशे नरसारसिकवर्तिति !
   *Balabodhini on the Bhuvanesi mahastotram*, p. 25.

2. श्रीमान्त मम्मुखितत प्रसिद्धमम्मयाक्षणाकलिते।
   *T.A.V.*, I, p. 236.

3. प्रेम्यो चैतल निर्धारणेन अपेद्यां चारिकाणुनः
   हस्तुरी भावबोध्य प्रियर्यथा निराकुर्ते।
   कल्यंमयेद्वे नेतृत्व युक्तज्ञवर्षपद्येकवम्।
   नेतृत्वं निरीक्षितं चारिकाणुस्मृति।
   अपेठो भवापद्वः तथापृत्यः न युक्तज्ञ।
   ईति।
   *Sp.P.*, p. 4.
century and be, therefore, placed somewhere during 900-950 A.D.

It is by a happy chance that the Krama stotra, almost complete, has survived to this date in the pages of the Viveka of Jayaratha. In all about twelve verses are accessible. But the chances are that it contained a few verses more, because sometimes two verses instead of one were addressed to certain Kalis, for instance, Rudrakali and Yamakali. Coming to the contents of the Krama stotra we see that there was correspondence in the root idea between the Krama stotra and the Pancasatika, though they disagreed in one field. While the Pancasatika retained the name of Sukali in the list of Kalis to be adored and thus maintained the total number of Kalis at thirteen in Anakhyacakra, the Krama stotra excluded Sukali and numbered them twelve. Jayaratha also pointed out a misunderstanding current in a section of the followers that the Krama stotra went by the Krama Sadbhava in its treatment of the Kills in Anakhyacakra. Jayaratha rejects any such possibility and holds, instead, that it did emulate some Agama though quoted but not named by him. It disagreed with the Sardasatika regarding the order of the Kalis. While Sardhasatika, as elsewhere, discusses Sthitikali after Srstikali, the Krama stotra first takes up Raktakali in lieu of Sthitikali. The primary object in doing so is to present the real Samvitkrama. No incongruity attaches to it. Since, in the Agama the order is modified or reversed so as to conceal the Samvit-krama as is done in the Pancasatika with regard to the Sthitikrama. It is in sequel to this that the 'Order of Worship' (Pujana-krama) is ordained by the teachers. With a view to effectively establishing and presenting the Samvit-

3. Ibid., p. 189.
4. Ibid., pp. 190 191.
5. Ibid., p 162.
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krama the actual order of Kalis has been preserved and retained in the Krama stotra as well as the Tantraloka. Abhinava, according to Jayaratha, has stood by it in his Kramakeli.¹

Jayaratha’s presentation makes it well nigh certain that the Krama stotra, in his time, became vulnerable to two types of interpretation, one maintaining the number of Kalis to be thirteen and the other twelve. Jayaratha has no sympathy with former group which had a different text or the reading of the Stotra together with a different arrangement of the verses, as is testified to by another commentary called Vivarana. But possibly Jayaratha’s group could not make much headway in appealing to the reason of the opponents as is evinced by the compromise formula evolved by Jayaratha that one should better go in for that reading which has the sanction and approval of one’s preceptor.²

Abhinavagupta and Sivopadhyaya both have invited our attention to the metaphysical richness of the Krama stotra. Abhinava presents it as advocating the elimination of doubt, which as principle of limitation is the primal cause of mundane duality, for realizing the true self.³ For Sivopadhyaya the central theme of the Stotra is to prevail upon one to attain the Ultimate Divinity which uproots the limitations accruing from time and space and finds own counterpart in the Prajnaparamita of Buddhism.⁴

(xvii) Bhaskara (925-975 A.D.)

From the point of view of his contribution there is apparently no valid ground for including Bhaskara in the list of

1. इदू पुष्यादकामोहस्वयं सत्यमयां स्वायम्। वदधकृतस्मांसिद्धम्। परिनिदितिरियतम्।

2. प्रत्येकनाथि तथा एवं पुरुषदेश एवं निभवनः।

3. प्रत्येकनाथि तथा एवं पुरुषदेश एवं निभवनः।

4. इदविभेदानुसाराणां विवाहं विविधत्वं विभेदानुसाराणां विवाहं

¹ T. A. V., III, p. 162.
² P. T. V., III, p. 203.
³ B. Bh V., 140
the Krama authors. He is generally included among the authors of the Spanda branch, in the light of which he wrote his famous *Varttika* on the *Sivasutras*. The only reason for making a reference to him, here, consists in the fact that he is presented as the immediate successor to the Stottrakara and as transmitting the latter's doctrinal dicta to the next generation. There was a doctrinal scuffle between the two opposite groups as to whether or not the Stottrakara followed the *Krama-Sadbhava*. Jayaratha rejects any such adherence on the part of the Stottrakara, while the other school acquiesced into giving out the tradition of the Stottrakara.¹

Bhaskara is a student of Srikantha in the Spanda branch² and of the Stottrakara in the Krama. He is the son of Divakara as stated by him.³ Abhinava's reference to one son of Divakara and author of the *Vivekanjana* is meant for him.⁴ Yogaraja also refers to a son of Divakara as the author of the *Kaksyastotra*.⁵ A verse from this work has figured in the *Pratyabhijnahrdaya* of Ksemaraja.⁶ Abhinava has generally referred to him as Bhatta Divakaravatsa.⁷ These references indicate that Bhaskara was more popular as the son of Divakara than by his personal name. As Abhinava has frequently referred to him not only as Divakaravatsa but as Bhatta Bhaskara⁸ also, he is supposed to be earlier than Abhinava. He is also included in the list of Abhinava's teachers.⁹ On the other hand the ancestral tra-

1. *Alaṅkārasaṅgraha* (S.R. 3.264); शिष्य न शास्त्रायुद्धः--
2. भौरूपम्‌।
3. ध्रुवोपत्यतर्कम्‌।
4. ध्रुवोपत्यतर्कम्‌।
5. ध्रुवोपत्यतर्कम्‌।


Vide, p. 86. Also see *I.P. V.V.*, II, pp. 301, 328; *S.P.V.*, p. 79.

dition given by Bhaskara also places him approximately around
the same period —

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Vasugupta} & \\
\text{Kallata} & \\
\text{Pradyumna Bhatta} & \\
\text{Prajharjuna} & \\
\text{Mahadeva Bhatta} & \\
\text{Srikantha} & \\
\text{Bhaskara} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

The four generations that intervened between Kallata and him
may account for a century's gap in between them. Thus he is
an older contemporary, if not necessarily a predecessor, of
Abhinava and may be assigned to the 2nd and 3rd quarters of
the tenth century.

Apart from three works enumerated above he is also cre­
credited with the authorship of two more works namely, the
Mimamsa-samgraha-kaumudi and Padyamrtasopana. This sugges­
tion is advanced by Natarajan in his valued thesis who has
relied on the information supplied by the Madhya-Yugina­
Caritrakosa, p. 585. There is no evidence either to affirm or
deny the statement.

Bhaskara is, however, most renowned for his Varttika on
the Sivasutras. In this connection it is to be noted that not
only his approach is different from Ksemaraja's but even their
versions of the text of the original Sivasutras sometimes vary.
Pt. M.S. Kaul, for instance, has called our attention to the
following Sutra which is found in the Varttika but not in the
Vimarsini:

\[
(\text{xviii}) \text{ Laksmanagupta (925-975 A.D.)}
\]

Laksmanagupta, the pupil of Utpala and grand pupil of

1. S.S.V., 1.3.8.
Somananda, had equal command over Trika as well as Krama and was, therefore, Abhinava's teacher in both the systems. Abhinava has never hesitated in recording his immense respect for his teacher whenever he could get an opportunity to do so. Like his teachers', none of his works on Krama is accessible today, but there is a strong likelihood of his having written a Krama work so far as available evidence goes to show. Commenting on the word 'Anyatha' of T.A. 15.246, Jayaratha indicates that Laksmanagupta advocated a different type of Nyasavidhi from one advanced by Sambhunatha. His main thesis is to analyse the six-fold Sakta-nyasa, which again is one of the six original Nyasas, in order to invoke and realize Kalasamkar-sini. This, as we know, is a typical Krama concept. From this one gets inclined to concede that he definitely wrote a few works. The only definite word in this behalf is met with in a statement where he is stated to have produced a work called "Srisastra". It seems improbable to make out anything definite out of such random and cryptic statements.

But there comes an incentive from another source to keep up optimism. The author of the Saradatilakatantra calls him—
self Laksmana Desikendra towards the end of the Tantra.\(^1\)
Contents of the work are not immediately relevant, because it is an esteemed text of the Tripura sect. But what is remarkable is to find this author being presented as a student of Utpala by Raghava Bhatta, the author of the *Padarthadarsa* commentary.\(^2\) Raghava Bhatta places him on a high pedestal and gives further information that Laksmana was the disciple of Utpala and his preceptorial line ran as under - Srikantha, Vasuman, Somananda, Utpalacarya, Laksmana, Abhinavagupta and Ksemaraja - among whom persons till Utpala were his teachers while others after him, his pupils.\(^3\) Raghava narrates the background episode of Laksmanagupta's undertaking to write the *Saradatilaka*. Motivated by a sense of deep compassion he embarked upon producing a digest of entire agamic thinking for its easy comprehension by the laity yearning for spiritual enlightenment but handicapped by its limited capacities of understanding.\(^4\)

In the absence of any negative evidence one cannot discard Raghava Bhatta's account as unauthentic, more so when it is endorsed by the author of the *Saradatilaka* himself,\(^5\) as has just been noted above. If, therefore, a suggestion is mooted

1. आचार्यबिन्नार्थभवत् कथा ज्ञातः प्रयोजनविधिविधिनः।
विद्वानोशेषसु कलासु गर्भोर्नर्यप्रथा गयो गहती प्रवदे॥

2. तत्रोजस्वार्यवृत्तान्तायः धोलकामणाचायः...शारदार्जिकः तान्त्रिकः विकीर्णः...मंगलम् ...उपविनयनो बाहु।

3. सुहृत्तिं यदुर्वयां पुराणं सुरह-परस्मुह-परापरः यथेऽविशेषः बो ज्ञातं व मुह-प्रक्षेतः—


out for identifying the *Sri Sastra* with the *Saradatilaka* tantra, it must be conceded in the interest of logical consistency.

The account of Laksmana's parentage also goes a long way to vouchsafe the veracity of the present thesis. At the end of the book he says that his father was Sriksrna, his grand-father Acarya Pandita and great-grand father Mahabala. All of them, he says, were men of great piety and erudition and enjoyed great reputation for the same. Of all his ancestors, fortunately, Mahabala, his great-grand father, is known to us. He is the author of the *Rahasyagarbha-stotra* and also the great-grand father of Bhatta Utpala on the daughter's side. Mahabala, as we have already noted during our study on Utpala and Somananda, is a contemporary of Pradyumna Bhatta and Somananda. Laksmanagupta and Bhatta Utpala both being grandsons, one on the son's side and the other on the daughter's, of Mahabala are contemporaries and have blood affiliations. In the history of Kashmir Saivism we have no other Laksrnana except one, the teacher of Abhinava, whose time exactly coincides with that of the author of the *Saradatilaka Tantra*. Care has been taken to make it absolutely clear that Laksmanagupta was only a pupil and not a son of Utpala as has been made out in some scholarly circles. Thus, one may be inclined to hold Laksmanagupta as identical with Laksrnana Desikendra and his *Srisastra* with the *Saradatilaka*. The name, Sri *Sastra*, too,

1. ग्राह्यलय प्रणोदितमश्च सयं कृत्वलखितमचित्तवयलयः।
   वेदाध्येयतं चूर्तस्तम्भं विधाश्चारणमः।
   सदस्यस्मिः हृद्दीर्द्धेषामेवः।
   वैश्वद्विद्यावृद्धिदभिस्तितं॥

2. अत्यक्षरितमुपर्यायमहायज्ञरूपेण...रहस्यवस्त्रौ॥
   रुपे, p. 3. ।

implies its automatic association to the Tripura cult. To repeat, he was a disciple of Utpala and son of Srikrsna. He may, therefore, be assigned to the second and third quarters of the tenth century.

(xix) Bhatta Utpala (925-975 A.D.)

He is an important author on the Spanda system of philosophy, but whatever glimpses one gets from his Spanda-Pradipika, a commentary on the Spanda Karikas, justifies this reference to him under the Krama context. These lines, however, are not addressed to a study of his individual Krama views, since the same have been subjected to elaborate treatment in their respective contexts in the philosophical section, but there is no gainsaying the fact that he was fully aware of the important Krama doctrines and tried to interpret the Spanda and Yoga concepts in the light of the Krama philosophy.¹

Besides the Spanda Pradipika, his only extant work, he wrote one work called Bhogamoksa-pradipika. It is not known whether it was also a commentary or an independent work. He has referred to it thrice² and in one of these extracts the Krama attitude is easily discernible.³ In the two he deals with the rise of the Spanda principle⁴ and Rahasya-rnudra evidently

1. See, for instance, Sp.P., pp. 48, 49, 50
3. भववेष्ठ छोट्कं भोगमोक्षप्रदीपिकायाम्—
   अयस्य विभागाः कस्तल्लनन्त्रिस्व विनावस्य वेष्ठमीयुम् ।
   पीतवा तूर्णो विषमेनीरोद्गो योगविचयस्वर्गवेठ स्तोतः ।
   एस्तत्त्मायेव रङ्गरामस्य भवस्यान्यम् ।
   तत्तुस्वयं च कथितं सविन्यौध्योपनाय यथा ।
   Ibid., pp. 49-50.
4. यथापूक्तं भोगमोक्षप्रदीपिकायाम्—
   कामाक्षे विषमेन निरंजनान्यौऽः कन्याच्य निर्भटः ।
   भूप भोगमोक्षप्रदीपिकायाः शमत्वेष्ठिती शार्तजानास्वर्गम् ।
   इति।
   एवं त्यथाभन्नस्तेशु उद्य: द्रोकलः ।
   Ibid., p. 32.
under the influence of the 43rd Karika of the *Spanda Karika*.\(^1\) We are however uncertain about the contents of this word and the system it subscribed to.

In addition he wrote several other work or works, passages from which have been cited by him without naming their source and have been ascribed to himself.\(^2\) In all these extracts he has dwelt on the common tenets of the monistic Saivism namely, the instrumentality of the objective world to the cause of emancipation, a *priori* unity of consciousness, and matchless superiority of the spiritual guide respectively.

He is different from his namesake predecessor, the teacher of Laksmanagupta, and in contrast to bare Utpala, is known as Bhatta Utpala or Utpala Vaisnava. It has not been possible to trace out the origin or logic of his second epithet i.e., Vaisnava. According to a modern scholar the *Spanda-pradipika* is a commentary on the *Spanda Karikas* on Vaisnava lines.\(^3\) This might have been a probable source of his fame as "Vaisnava". But even a superficial peep into its contents belies the above contention. It is a pure Spanda interpretation with occasional flashes about the cognate systems.

He hailed from a place called Narayana in Kashmir and

---

1. श्रेष्ठ तत्त्ववृत्तिसामान्यो रूपस्मृतियुक्ता । मयोक्तं भौतिकोक्तदीपिकायाम्—
उत्तमता वेतन दो विद्यानवृत्या स्पंदमुलास्तीति ।
स्वप्नपूर्वकेतिन्द्रावननननन्दुपूर्वि योगी ॥
पूर्वोऽड्क्षत्वं भिक्षुवर्त्तार्था प्रवुद्धोऽधिक ॥


2. (a) तथा मयाधि—


(b) मयाधिपुक्तं कवाधि—


(c) मयावेशं कवाधि—

*Ibid*, p. 54.

was the son of some Trivikrama and Brahma by caste.\(^1\) Compassion on mankind and anxiety for his students' wellbeing were the chief motives that actuated him to take up the writing of *Spanda Pradipika*. He was a great-grand-son of Mahabala whom he mentions as a maternal grand-father of his father.\(^2\) Thus he occupies the same position in the daughter's heritage of Mahabala which Laksmanagupta does in the filial lineage of Mahabala. His time, therefore, is almost definite and may be assigned to the second and third quarters of the tenth century.

(xx) **Bhutiraja I (900-950 A.D.)**

Bhutiraja is a very important name in the history of the Krama thought despite the unfortunate fact that none of his works is extant today. There are four Bhutirajas that attract our notice in the whole range of the Kashmir Saivism. The first happens to be a teacher of Abhinava in Brahmavidya. The second is the father of Bhatta Induraja. The third is the father of Helaraja, the illustrious commentator on the *Vakyapadiya*. And the fourth is a pupil of Cakrabhanu, a Krama celebrity, and who rather proved to be the focal point of a heated controversy in Jayaratha's time.

We are presently concerned with the number one Bhutiraja because, while quoting him in the Krama context, Abhinava refers to him as his teacher.\(^3\) But there should be no misunderstanding, he did not teach the Krama system to Abhinava.

---

1. (a) *नारायणस्यसंस्कृतांज्ञायिनितिविकाव्यः*
   ताती जनानुवहारं व्यायामिनि स्पपदेणः*
   

2. (b) *नारायणस्य उपाधिप्रितीतिविवरणाय गुणोज्ज्वलनम्*
   वर्णन स्विन्धद्वितियाय हृदा वर्ण व तमोदृश्ये स्मातः*
   

3. अन्वश्यामदिव्यवहारांश्च तिपिकाय प्राणः महाभक्तः*
   

4. वदात्तः: *भृगुविद्यूः*
   
   *T.S.*, p. 30.
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nava were Brahmavidya and Sambhu Sastra. Jayaratha has taken extra pains to clear out the misgiving that Bhutiraja ever taught Abhinava the Krama system. Jayaratha explicitly admits that Bhutiraja was a teacher of Abhinava but what he objects to is that the Krama system or any text pertaining to Krama e.g., the Devipancasatika, was not his specific field of instruction. But at the same time, he did make some solid contribution to the Krama system in his own right which is borne out by the two extracts attributed to him. In one he derives the word Kali from the root Kalana meaning Ksepa and Jnana and in the other he asserts the sameness of Mantra with the transcendent principle of Awareness owing to its all-encompassing capacity. Besides the above two sciences, he also initiated Abhinava in three mystic disciplines pertaining to Pranava Maya and Bindu. He also entertained definite views of his own regarding Bhuvanadhvan and Pratistha Kala.

Abhinava had an extremely high sense of respect for his teacher so that he respected his teacher more than his father.

1. अधीश्चन्ते श्रमाविच तस्मां प्रक्षेपान्तिनि।

2. श्रीमूर्तिराजस्यचिन्तनोत्तरम्।

3. अधीश्चन्ते कथासत्त्वस्य श्रीमूर्तिराजस्य चिन्तनोत्तरम्।

4. यदाहूः श्रीमूर्तिराजस्य श्रीपाठाध्यायी काली शताब्दीशतान्तराः।

5. श्रीमूर्तिराजस्य चिन्तनोत्तरम्।

6. श्रीमूर्तिराजस्य श्रीमूर्तिराजस्य चिन्तनोत्तरम्।

7. T.A.V., XII, p. 216.

8. T.A., 8.265.

9. Ibid., 410.

10. ततो यथा: श्रीमान् मूर्तिराजो महामहति।
He looked upon him (Bhutiraja) as the Lord-incarnate himself in a human frame. Perhaps barring the teachers of the four main schools (Mathikas), nobody else has won so much praise at the hands of Abhinava as Bhutiraja. Jayaratha had to justify the mention of Bhutiraja's name by Abhinava in the *Tantraloka* while paying obeisance to his teachers, as the *Tantraloka* having a defined aim and scope need not refer to persons from the outer circles.

Bhutiraja, by dint of being Abhinava's teacher, may be bracketed with his other teachers and therefore may be said to have belonged to the previous generation of Abhinava. But his date may be pushed a little earlier, because Abhinava was not a student of Bhutiraja alone but of his son as well. Hence he must have been of fairly old age when Abhinava approached him. He may, therefore, be assigned to the first half of the tenth century. He is also identical with the Bhutiraja Number Two who has been referred to as father of Bhattenduraja who, in addition to Dhvanisastra, initiated Abhinava in the mysteries of the *Gita*.

The genealogy of Induraja given by Abhinava in the concluding portion of his *Bhagvadgitarthasamgraha* is self-explanatory. The same is reproduced below:

```
Katyayana
   | Sausuka
   |
Bhutiraja
   | Bhattenduraja
```

In this connection the issue of the third Bhutiraja may also be taken up, who is identified with the father of Helaraja.

1. य: साहारभजन्नः क्रियो मातुः।

2. T.A., 1.9.
4. योमृतिरावतनादः स्वपितूपारादः।

5. Bh.G.S., p. 186, also see Abhi., p 214.
According to Pandey, and there is no reason to dispute him, Bhutiraja in question is identical with this Bhutiraja also. Because Helaraja, in the colophon to each section of his commentary on the *Vakyapadiya*, regularly refers to himself as the son of Bhutiraja (Bhutirajatanaya).\(^1\) Abhinava has included one Bhutirajatanaya whom he does not name among his teachers.\(^2\) He came in the lineage of Srinatha, the first exponent of dualistic philosophy, and was possibly taught by his father. By implication, he educated Abhinava in the dualistic Saivism. The two Bhutirajas may be identified since,

(i) Abhinava does not refer to his teacher in Saiva dualism by name but by his parental description i.e., Bhutirajatanaya,

(ii) Except Helaraja nobody else refers to himself as Bhutirajatanaya,

(iii) Abhinava evinces great familiarity with Bhartrhan's system as presented by Helaraja specially in respect of the Kalasakti that acted as harbinger of the Krama concept of Kali.

If that be so, the two Bhutirajas, too, become one and Induraja and Helaraja happen to be brothers, one shining as the literary critic and the other as a philosopher.

In this connection attention may be drawn to a reference by Sitikantha to some Dutirajatanaya who, in spite of his not belonging to the Krama system, had inherited different versions regarding the Yuganathas and tried to thrust them on the Krama system proper.\(^3\) Sitikantha has criticised such behaviour. Our contention is that this Dutirajatanaya is none else than Bhutirajatanaya. 'Du' and 'Bhu' in hastily written Sarada characters are difficult to distinguish, hence the scribal mistake. This is borne out further by the fact that Bhutirajatanaya is shown as adept in the Dualistic Saivism. Here too Du (?Bhu)ti-

\(^1\) भृतिराजजनये हेलाराजजतैः

\(^2\) श्रीमूर्तिराजजनये भृतिराजजतैः स्म्यितूमस्यः

\(^3\) यस्तु योगार्थक्यायेऽपि पत्रिकामेव दृतिराजजनयायिन्तो युगानाथायां पृथ्वी स ऋषिप्रि सामजनयं नीपायति
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\(T.A., 37.60.\)

\(M.P.(S), p. 115.\)
rajatanaya is an outsider in the Krama fold. We may, therefore, possibly identify the two.

Coming to the fourth Bhutiraja we find that he is a different person altogether. Because this Bhutiraja, the pupil of Cakrabhanu, could not have been Abhinava's teacher. For the simple reason that Cakrabhanu, as will be seen in the sequel, is historically posterior (i.e., circa 1050-1100 A.D.) to Abhinavagupta. Hence to say that his pupil (circa 1075-1125 A.D.) was a teacher of Abhinava would be a historical absurdity. Moreover, the method of worship advocated by this Bhutiraja is said to be based on the Pancasatika, according to which the number of deities to be worshipped is not twelve. It, therefore, seems logically incongruous to treat Bhutiraja, a spokesman of the not-twelve doctrine, as a teacher of Abhinava, a staunch protagonist of the twelve-deity doctrine. Thus these two Bhutirajas seem to be two different personalities, though both having definite relationship with the Krama system.

(xxi) Kuladhara (950-1000 A.D.)

We know nothing about him except that he directly came into the line of the Stotrakara after Bhaskara. He, therefore, appears to be a contemporary of Abhinavagupta.

(xxii) Bhatta Damodara (950-1000 A.D.)

He seems to be a minor Krama author and is said to have composed certain Muktakas (independent verses). He has been referred to only once by Ksemaraja and no other reference,

1. अत्साहाय एवं सुप्रसमवजनात्मके मयानाय:—
   बुद्धिविशिष्टसंकल्प-शास्त्रानुसारप्रतिष्ठाने।
   भिन्नविशिष्टतया गृह्योदयां हि कालिन्ये गुस्तत।।
   इत्यादि प्रद्धतं तत् स्वीत्थ्रविशिष्टमेव हस्तेक्षः।।


2. ततापि च अन्धकारात्मक-संस्कारायुतायोहम 
   इति देवोम संस्कारायुताय 
   गुस्ततसंस्कारा संस्कारायुताय।
   इति प्रवृत्तिः पिन्योऽत्मकाः
   इति प्रवृत्तिः पिन्योऽत्मकाः।।

   Ibid., p. 194.

3. Ibid., p. 191.

4. तत्त्वान्त् च उत्तरसंस्काराभिर्युतेनात्मकाः
   प्रशस्तायुताय 
   विमुक्तिः केवल।।

   P.Ht., p. 70.
either before or after Ksemaraja, appears to have been made by any author to him. The guess that he devoted a few verses to Krama is based on the circumstantial and contextual evidence because the verse ascribed to him\(^1\) deals with the Pancavaha, a typical Krama phenomenon, and is quoted in the same context in particular and under Saktopaya in general. He has been commended for his intuitive realisation of the Supreme Bliss. Since he has not been noticed by any author before Ksemaraja, he might have belonged to the latter's preceding generation. Hence, it is possible he might be a contemporary of Abhinava (950-1020 A.D.). He is different from Damodaragupta, the author of the Kuttanimatam and a minister of King Jayapida of Kashmir (779-813 A.D.). He is also different from one Damodara who was a contemporary of Mankha (1125-1175 A.D.) and has been mentioned as such,\(^2\) whereas the present author comes prior to Ksemaraja (975-1025 A.D.).

(xxiii) *Abhinavagupta* (950-1020 A.D.)

The personality as well as the volume and scope of Abhinava's contribution is so rich, enormous and extensive that we propose to confine ourselves strictly to his contribution in the field of Krama alone. Exception will be made only when some new information is intended to be furnished.

According to all available accounts, Abhinava was not his actual name but a title conferred on him by his teachers in recognition of his extraordinary calibre and outstanding intellectual accomplishment.\(^3\) He was also called Bala-valabhibhu-


\(^2\) *S.K.C.*, 25.08.

\(^3\) *I.P.V.,* III, p. 106.
Abhinava possibly knew the immense value of furnishing historical data in respect of an epoch-making personality. It is why Abhinava's date, span of creative life etc., do not pose problems. To begin with, he has given the dates of composition in the case of his three works. The *Kramastotra* was composed during 990-991 A.D. (4066 Saptarsi Era), the *Bhairavastotra* during 992-993 A.D. (4068 S.E.) and the *Brhati Vimarsini* during 1014-15 (4090 S.E.). Thus the whole period of his literary activity, giving a margin of five years on each side for other possible undertakings, appears to have been spread over a period from 985 to 1020 A.D. In view of his vast erudition acquired through personal approaches to almost every teacher in all the then possible branches of learning, if he is allowed a preparatory period to thirty to thirty-five years before he could embark upon writing, he may be said to have flourished and lived during 950-1020 A.D. One will arrive at approximately similar dates from a different source as well. Kama, one of his favoured students, was the grandson of Vallabha, the court-minister of King Yasaskara, who definitely reigned in the year 939 A.D. It is a strange coincidence that Purna Manoratha, the first known ancestor of Jayaratha, was a colleague of Vallabha in the court of the same king. Vallabha's son Sauri (who was also a minister) and daughter-in-law Vatsalika were Abhinava's contemporaries and the latter was looked after by Vatsalika when he was engaged in writing his *Tantraloka*. In addition, Yogesvaridatta, the son of Karna, came of age and displayed merits equal to his name before the eyes of Abhinava. Thus

1. भवदेव: स्वरूपे तौतातिष्ठतितम भानभवन्वन्यायादुवाच राजपुर। दान्यव्यूह हसोविभ-  

Quoted from an unspecified source, *Contribution*, p. 342.


7. *P.T.V.*, p. 279; *A.A.*, 37.73, 75.

8. *T.A.*, 37.82.

Abhinava belonged to the generation next to king Yasaskara’s and continued to live for another two generations. Even on this calculation his probable time remains almost the same as above.

In all about forty-four works, both major and minor, are ascribed to him and twenty-three of these have been published till now. But this list does not include three other minor Stotra works attributed to him namely, *Amaresvarastotra* and *Sivastotra*. The *Tantroccaya* which figures in the above list, like the *Tantra-vata-dhantka*, is a summary of the *Tantraloka*. A manuscript of it is available in the Tagore Library of the Lucknow University. Of all the five pages and nine folios, six folios contain Sutras and the rest verses. But the whole thing is so haphazard, and style and method so shabby that it raises serious doubts about its being a work from the pen of Abhinava. Besides, Abhinava refers to one *Slokavarttika* in the *Tantrasara*. It is uncertain whether this is identical with the famous Mimamsa text of the same name by Kumarila. But the way Abhinava refers to it and the context in which it finds a place, make it quite probable that Abhinava might have attempted a work under this name. Or else it might be another name of the *Malini-vijayavarttika*. The evidence in hand, how-

1. See *Abhi,*, pp. 26-27; *Contribution,*, pp. 342.44.
3. R.A. Sastri refers in his "Diary" to this Stotra which is in the personal library of Pt. Ram Jiva Kokil, Banmahal, Kashmir, *Ibid.*
5. The following portion from the letter no 125/R addressed to the present author from the Dy. Director, Research Publication Department, Jammu and Kashmir Government is self-explanatory - "However it is to inform you that the Sivastotram by Abhinavagupta is available with Pt. Lambodar Razdan, 5/o R.N. Temple, Srinagar". We unsuccessfully tried our best to contact Pt. Razdan.
6. Accession No. 45827 and Catalogue no. RS 180.414/A174T.
7. एलेवेट अक्षाचावतुद्यां पिणाक्षापदाधिकारात्मवत्कालिकाय यथीमिनान्। अवह्येहित्त, प्रसंजावन-धर्माट सर्वोत्तमाय भविष्यित: महाश्वानिः प्रचं इति पद्यः। अन्तर्याव चित्तं तवान-तोकां वसोकीर्तिकं च।

*T.S.,* p. 197.
ever, is not conclusive to indicate anything definitely. Jayaratha also appears to attribute to him one work named *Anupratabhijna* and cites a passage from the same. Here again one is totally ignorant if it was another name of certain work among the known works or an original one by itself, or a work by his pen at all. Yet it is difficult to say that all these works, enumerated or alluded to above, exhaust the total expanse of his literary activity. The profuse and frequent references to and extracts from Abhinava hint at his having written infinitely more than is known today. The MS of the *Sarika-nityapuja-paddhati* contains a few verses that are ascribed to Abhinavagupta by the colophon. At least in one field, that is, Stotras, one may feel absolutely certain that he penned many that have not come down to us. His and his successors' own statements bear the palm of this contention. Similarly he wrote a commentary, called the *Tattvaviveka*, on the *Trikasutra* which was later embodied in his Vivarana on the *Paratrimsika*.

Raniero Gnoli, an Italian scholar of Saivism, has called our attention to yet another five unpublished verses of Abhinava-

1. अनुप्रताभिज्ञना

   नाय तय बिना बिश्व बहुते स्वरूप दलितम्।
   प्रतेन्द्र उपेन्द्र द्राक्षारामसंवतसम्॥

   इत्यादिवतम्।

   *T.A.V.*, p. 73.


3-4. दत्तेऽनुमनि शौचबिच घरणः संसारस्थानो रिपूः

   पीवं इव रंगेशहस्याधिकर्द भृतं ब्रह्मचारार्थम्।

   भाषा: स्वतंत्रतमेश्वर: किमपरं सम्पूर्णस्वतंत्रिस्वाधेयः

   कालो प्रश्नमुद्गलस्य सम्यकु श्रवणसंन्यमाणोः॥

   *Vide Contribution*, p. 347. But no textual authority could be traced in support of this statement.
According to the colophon of the MS there should be two verses instead of five as available. As to the possibility of their having been composed by two authors - the first three verses by some unknown author and the remaining two by Abhinavagupta - , Gnoli is inclined to believe that they are all by Abhinavagupta since "Nothing in the style or contents however forbids us from attributing them to Abhinavagupta." A manuscript of the same is preserved in the Bhandarkar Institute which has not been consulted by Gnoli as per his own statement. A final judgement on his findings can only be pronounced after looking into the said manuscript.

Let us revert to the Krama system. The system has profited by him in at least four positive ways - firstly, as an indispensable repository of tradition and thought; secondly, as a sourcebook of authors and their works preceding him; thirdly, as a commentator on the few important Krama texts; and finally, as an original thinker of enviable value who fostered the thought with a critical analysis and insight. But for him, we, today, would have missed the richness of the entire traditional intellectual development. He assimilated the tradition and then enriched it by exposition and embellishment. In the history of the Krama thought only two names can be cited to match him in the enormity of historical allusions. They are Jayaratha, his own commentator, and Mahesvarananda. But for Abhinava's Kramakeli the early history of the system would have remained the "pre-history" for a modern student. As a commentator he has produced the Kramakeli on the Kramastotra

   The MS., according to Gnoli, belongs to a private collection, details of which have not been furnished. Vide, p. 216.

2. श्लोकेयेषु कोष अभिनवगुप्तायाम्।
   
   कृत्यते अनुपस्थितवाद्यायाम्।

   Vid., p. 223.

3. Ibid., p. 222.

4. See Buhler, No. 474.

5. श्रीत्रस्वमित्रं महेश्वरं इत्यादिभिः प्राचीनकालिकं शिष्यम्।
   
   M.V.V., 1894.
The Krama Tantricism of Kashmir (of Siddhanatha). His other commentary Vivarana is an exposition of his own Prakarana Stotra. The Tantraloka, Krama Stotra, Prakarana Stotra and Tantrasara are his original contributions to the system. The Tantraloka covers a vast expanse and, in its massive efforts to preserve and present the Kashmir Saiva thought in its fullness, deals with the Krama dicta and theses to almost perfection. The Tantrasara tries to do the same in brief. His Krama works will be taken up for a fuller treatment.

When he diverted his attention from literature to the study of Saiva monism, Krama was his first love in philosophy. The earliest date of the Krama Stotra bears ample testimony to it. The first verse of the Krama Stotra makes it obvious that he was restless and had no peace of mind before he turned to Krama. Abhinava attained his proficiency in Kramic experiments and went very far in realizing the true spirit of the system. He himself affirms it. Apart from his specific Krama treatises, there are certain other texts namely, the Malinivijya-varttika, Paryanta Pancasika and Paratrimisika-vivarana wherein he occasionally dwells on the Krama tenets at length. Among his Krama works, the Krama Stotra is his first contribution in the chronological order as its earliest date would vindicate. After ventilation of his views about the nature and purpose of devotional prayer, the Stotra grows through four stages viz., (i) the background of the Kramic emanation, (ii) rise and emergence of Kramic evolution through twelve Kalikas, (iii) repose of Krama in the Absolute, and (iv) the epilogue invoking the Godhead's grace

1. अर्थं थुः स्वाभाविकस्वरूपः पार्थ्य्रिथितः । 
   महासौभाष्यामन्त्रप्रथमं तुदिवतिस्वरूपः ।
   प्रत्यक्षावलम्बनं साक्षिकभूमिनक्षिति ।
   विशेषं ततोद्वितीयमाधवति केतोऽपि व्यवहयम् ॥

   K.S. (A). 1

2. बतो भविष्यात भृगुसाधिग्रामसिद्धे । 
   वेदभाविन्यस्महार्द्धसारसूत्रस्मृतं श्राणविधे द्वाध्वः ।

   T.A., 4.278.

3. बतो भविष्याते बतो निप्पाधिग्रामसिद्धे । 
   वेदभाविन्यस्महार्द्धसारसूत्रस्मृतं श्राणविधे ॥

   K.S., 10.
on humanity. The order in which the various stages i.e., Kalis, succeed each other is in consonance with the metaphysical aspect (Samvit-krama) of it and not with the ritualistic one (Pujana-krama). The ante-penultimate verse indicates Abhinava's unmistakable adherence to the school that held Siva as the ultimate reality. The *Prakarana Stotra* is known today only from a reference to it by Abhinava in the *Tantrasara*. Its chief purpose was to dwell on the concept of Kali with an accent upon its etymological implications. The *Prakarana Vivarana* was in all probability a commentary by Abhinava himself on the said *Stotra*. Both of these works were intended to cover in detail the nature of the dynamic Absolutism and its *modus operandi* echoing the manifold derivative significance of the word 'Kalana.' A word of caution may be added. Abhinava does not give out the name of this text as the *Prakarana Vivarana*. He simply says *Vivarana*. It is not known whether he meant by it the *Krama-keli*, a commentary on the *Krama Stotra*, or an independent commentary on the *Prakaranastotra* itself. In such a fluid state of affairs one has to base one's hypothesis on the contextual evidence and should press it only to that extent, no further. In this connection, it may be noted that he wrote another work called the *Prakunaka-vivarana*. It is yet hypothetical to say that the two were identical. Dr. Pandey appears to take them as two separate works. Nagarajan follows Dr. Pandey. But on a close perusal

1. *Ananta Prayogavatam, kante nitya nishchayat gatim, visheshvajuktah*
   

2-3.  
   "ध्वन्द्व: श्रीभूतिराष्ट्रः, ‘कृपाध्वनं नामस्मि काली कालवंशगतयाः’ हिति। एव एव एवेनः
   
   तव तस्मिन्नन्तः निप्पितं विवरणं प्रकटानि विषयं वीर्यं "
   


The Krama Tantricism of Kashmir

their difference does not remain tenable. According to Nagara­ajan\textsuperscript{1} it is a grammatico-philosophical work. If one accepts this contention, which one should, their distance vanishes. Because even the two contexts resemble each other in the respect that the books in question are purported to answer the grammatical and derivational requirements and analyse ensuing implications of the philosophical concepts. Let us, however, await the verdict of future investigation on it. The single work called \textit{Tantraloka} is sufficient to make him the doyen of the monistic philosophers of Kashmir. For fear of repetition no reference is being made to its varied contents. However, Ahnikas 4, 13, 31 and 32 specially deal with the Krama system while Ahnikas 1, 3, 9, 15 and 30 contain brief but useful information about Krama. The \textit{Tantrasara} is an abridged \textit{Tantraloka}. Its Ahnikas 4 and 13 are particularly relevant. The former presents a masterly epitome of the Krama ideals. The \textit{Kramakeli}\textsuperscript{2} is an important Krama text. Although it is a commentary on the \textit{Krama Stotra} of an earlier author, it speaks of the originality and vast comprehension of its author's mind. At present our knowledge is limited to references only made by himself,\textsuperscript{3} Ksemaraja,\textsuperscript{4}

1. \textit{Ibid.}
2. While in Kashmir (1963 Summer) we made an extensive search to trace out its manuscript. We were told by Pt. D.N. Yaksa of the Sanskrit Section of Research Department, Jammu and Kashmir Government, that a MS of the \textit{Kramakeli} was available with Mr. Somanatha Razdan of Purshiar, Aba Kadal (2nd bridge), Srinagar, but it was difficult to procure from him. The personal meeting with the gentleman resulted in the impression that he had inherited a large treasure of rare MSS from his grandfather, an avowed Sanskritist. But he could not be persuaded even to allow us to have a look of the text, not to talk of parting with it. Even the monetary temptations failed. On a later date Prof. B N. Pandit of Khannabal informed us that he knew of one MS of the \textit{Kramakeli} in possession of a person whom he knew. But his efforts, too, were doomed to failure.

3. भारतीय साहित्य संस्कृत संस्मरण अभियांत्रिक क्रमकेली शिल्पकवि.

4. भारतीय साहित्य संस्कृत संस्मरण अभियांत्रिक क्रमकेली अभियांत्रिक क्रमकेली।

\textit{P.T.V.}, p. 236.

\textit{S.S.I.V.}, p. 149.
Jayaratha\textsuperscript{1} and Mahesvarananda.\textsuperscript{2} The only thing worthy of note is that it was also liable to two sorts of interpretation with regard to its stand about the full-size controversy on the correct number of Kalis. Jayaratha is very insistent that the \textit{Krama Stotra} (of Siddhanatha), and for that matter Abhinava, did not budge an inch from the twelve-kali theory.\textsuperscript{3} But on the other hand, Mahesvarananda tends to show him as supporting thirteen-kali theory.\textsuperscript{4} Nevertheless, so far as the question of interpreting Abhinava is concerned, it is more advisable to abide by Jayaratha not only because of his \textit{Viveka} on the \textit{Tantraloka}, but also because of his claim that he was in possession of the original tradition which started with Sivananda and was actuated by Abhinavagupta.

A brief explanation would perhaps be necessary for exclusion of the \textit{Dehartha-devata-cakra-stotra} from amongst the Krama works, since the same has been taken as a Krama text by some authors.\textsuperscript{5} The stotra, in question, eulogizes the physical body as an abode of spirituality, and each constituent organ of the body has a particular divinity stationed in it. This theme is taken to be a particular aspect of the Krama system. In fact, the things do not appear to be so. This is a general feature of the Kashmir Saivism and consequently all the systems comprising it share this notion.\textsuperscript{6} Hence it has not been considered to be a Krama work.

2. \textit{M.M.P.}, pp 104, 106, 127, 156, 178, 179, 180, 192. For the English rendering of these extracts see \textit{Abhi.}, pp. 482-84.
6. It may, further, be noted that such a theory in particular may be associated with the Kula system. \textit{Cf. N.T.} 12.1-4; \textit{T.A.V.}, I, p. 23.
An illustrious student of an illustrious teacher, Ksemaraja may be ascribed to the close of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century. He was both Abhinava’s cousin and a pupil. Of all Abhinava’s students he is the only figure who is mentioned by name by Madhuraja Yogin in his Gurunatha-paramarsa. After an examination of the available data, Dr. Pandey has established Vamadeva, Abhinava’s uncle, to be his father. Among his own pupils he mentions, inter alia, Sura or Suraditya, son of Gunaditya, for whose enlightenment most of his works were written. Among others he includes Srirama, Raktika Bhatta, Gargesa with particular reference to the Netra Tantra, and Kesava. Besides Abhinava he mentions Prayaga as his teacher. There were probably a few more teachers according to a hint thrown by himself. Accordingly Sankarajnadhar was also probably his teacher.

The present enquiry is concerned with Ksemaraja as an eminent post-Abhinava Krama thinker. He seems to have profound knowledge of the system and in his Uddyota on the Netra

2. आभिनव: क्षेमराजयुधितिरस्वीति; शेतिन्त: निधिवेदः: वर्ष: नवशत्, p. 254.
5. N.T.U., II, p. 343 - संसारिकमर्शितं सम्बुध: सत: भीरामादिपुरुषरामस्तवादनातिनयेवार्य: न ज्ञातःनाम्।
6. भौगोलिकमधुसूदनसागरः भौमविदेशाय ह्यक्षणयान्तरम्।
   सवितारण्यायो पुरुषस्तगाये तेजस्वयंवर्तत: पुनःवालोऽधि:।

This line may also be construed to mean that Sankara and Ajnadhara both were his teachers. In this case there would be two persons instead of one as suggested above.

Tantra he refers to Krama as a distinct system. In fact it is to single out even a small work except the Vritti on the Stava-cintamani from his printed works in which he has not specifically referred to the Krama or Mahartha system. In his Uddyota on the Svachchanda Tantra he does the same. The Pratyabhijna-hrdaya and Siva-stotravalivriti abound in references to Krama. Likewise, his commentary on the Siva-sutras called Virmasini and those on the Spanda-karikas known as Spanda-samdoha (on the first Sp. K. alone) and Spanda-nirnaya are no exception to the rule. His attachment to the system appears to be so deep that he spares no opportunity to elucidate, present or expound the Krama tenets. He even goes to the length of interpreting the entire Spanda philosophy in terms of Krama. His own pronouncements make it sure that he planned and achieved this on conscious level. In addition, he also commented upon certain sutras from the Krama-sutras by some earlier authority. This incidence has prompted scholars to credit him with the authorship of a Tika on the Krama-sutras. However, the bulk of available material fails to substantiate it conclusively. Because

1. अन्यथा अयं प्रणवपद्मारायणमद्वाराणां क्रमकुलसत्सहायतिभविर्मविज्ञानसन्मथिते


i. Vide pp. 32, 48, 55, 106, 140, 159, 199, 206, 340, 346 etc.

4. The 2nd chapter deals with Saktopaya which is identical with the Krama system, vide pp. 20-23.

5. Vide pp. 8, 11-12, 16, 19-22.


8. एवम्...प्रमस्थलमुनिताहं महाबृहतत्ततम्...हि स्यादत्तेवेद पञ्चविषयेशिश्वः स्थीतः

Sp.N., p. 49.

एव बोधवेदारायणस्हाप्तत्ततसुपन्दुका दर्शनम् तत्त्वात्त्वाद तत्त्वात्त्वादिकेऽपिनिनयमर्थमयततः

M.T.U., p. 74.

9. तदुपर्यं पूर्वसूचि: स्त्राभंताब्येषु क्रमसूक्ष्मेण ।

P.Hi., p. 77.

विपर्येक्षं क्रमसूक्ष्मेण...। अवधारण: ।

ibid., pp. 99-100.
nowhere - neither in the *Pratyabhijnahrdaya* where a reference has been made to the two sutras of the *Krama-sutras* and their explanation by Ksemaraja, nor in the *Parimala* of Mahesvarananda wherein the entire portion with regard to the *Krama-sutras* has been adopted *verbatim* from the *Pratyabhijnahrdaya* - one comes across any statement to the effect that he wrote a commentary on it. Hence it is doubtful and difficult both to maintain his having written such a work. But he did write some works is pretty clear from his own and Mahesvarananda's statements to this effect. The latter is indebted to him for his exposition of *Pancavaha*, a Krama concept. Extracts from his own Stotras in *Pratyabhijnahrdaya* and *Siva-stotralili-vivriti* entertain an unmistakable Krama undertone.

Dr. Pandey has enumerated as many as eighteen works that are ascribed to Ksemaraja. The mere number of the works attempted makes him a formidable author. The list of Dr. Natarajan swells upto twenty. But the following works noticed by Dr. Pandey, are missed by him:

(i) *Dhvaneyalokalocanoddyota*
(ii) A Commentary on the *Pratyabhijnahrdaya*
(iii) A Commentary on the *Krama-sutra*

(iv) A Stotra
(v) Vrtti on the Parameasa Stotravali of Utpala.

The following works recorded by Natarajan, however, seem to have escaped notice of Dr. Pandey:

(i) Sattrimsat-tattva-samdoha
(ii) Paramartha Samgraha
(iii) Vamodaya
(iv) Sivastotra
(v) Spandanilaya
(vi) Svachchandananaya

It is unfortunate that Dr. Natarajan has not disclosed the sources of his information in connection with the works noted above.

A few necessary remarks might be welcome here. His Uddyota on the Vijnana-bhairava is available only up to the 23rd verse. Sivopadhyaya starts his commentary from the 24th verse finding Ksemaraja's commentary henceforward mutilated beyond repairs. The Samba-pancasika on which he wrote a commentary, published long ago, is a work of some Samba Misra according to the Rjuvimarsini. Its full name, therefore, is the Samba-misra-pancasika and the Sambapancasika is only an abbreviated form. Hence Ksemaraja's commentary was also known as Samba-misra-pancasika-vivrti. The Bhairavanukarana Stotra from which Ksemaraja has preserved fourteen verses in his Vivrti on the Svachchanda Tantra is not fortunately lost to us. Gnoli has published this Stotra which he found in the same manuscript belonging to a private collection in which he found five stanzas of Abhinavagupta. In all there are 48 verses out of which stanzas 16-21, 22, 24-29, 31 are quoted in the Svachchanda Tantra and verse 3 in the Samba-pancasika.

1. भूमिदेव्य मोक्षायित्रिप्रस्ताववाचार्योक्तम्
   उक्तेऽपि प्राणविद्याकद्व मेंराजः कुमाः ।
   V.Bh.V., p. 143.

2. सारभाष्यमतिशाश्वाक्षरितमः कीर्तिदेशास्यायनं इत्यःस्वम्
   Rjuvimarsini by Śivānanda, Ed. B.V. Dvivedi, p. 239.

The metre of the verses is Arya. The Stotra is dedicated to the homage of Cidbhairava. Similarly, one manuscript of the Paramarthasarasamgraha-Vivrti is available at the BORI, Poona.\(^1\)

A comparative look into the contents of the MS with the one written by Yogaraja proves beyond doubt their absolute identity and it is through a scribe’s mistake that the authorship has been confused. The colophon ascribes the work to a student of Ksemaraaja.\(^2\) Regarding other works there is no fresh material to add.

But this does not close the list of his possible ventures. Apart from his suspected Krama works, he quotes from his own unnamed work in the Pratyabhijnahrdaya.\(^3\) Jayaratha also cites a passage from him without specifying the precise source.\(^4\) There is a verse in the Siva-sutra-varttika\(^5\) by Varadaraja which raises serious doubts as to whether Ksemaraaja wrote a commentary on the Tantrasara as well. For want of any internal or collateral evidence the possibility of such a work is not very strong. Srinivasabudha, the author of the Tatparyadipika on the Tripura Rahasya cites a verse from Ksemaraaja.\(^6\) But the same verse is attributed to the Agamarahasya by Bhatta Utpala in the Spanda.

1. MS. No. 459 of 1875-76.
2. श्रीमोङ्कलकामत्स्रे मदुदंत्रायायादिति:।
   साधारणतःशेषर्व तथ्यात्मावसिष्या नया॥
   MS. No. 459, folio 33a.
3. P. 45.
4. तेनस्त्रीकोशराजपादः: तत्तवमिच्छायं यन्त्राद्वारास्तरवः तदेव क्रामाक्रात्माभारे-भृत्वविनियन्त्यभवते॥
5. एतर्भृत्वकामराजेन मदुदंत्रायं श्वासतात:॥
   सङ्क्वादः सत्तात्: समवत्तितं निन्दुत्तिति:॥
   S.S.V., 2.13-14.
6. वर्ध्यं श्रेयोध्राणाशः:—
   दे स्थीतर्म अपरिशिष्ठितं निरित्तितइहुः
   नासिनिजस्वरीपरिशिष्ठिताण्यः
   कन्यायायावर्जनेन वाचस्पतिः
   कामोपशिष्ठितंमयी तत संगृहः॥
Pradipika.\(^1\) Owing to Bhatta Utpala's chronological antiquity the proposition seems unlikely that Ksemaraja was the author of this verse or the work from which the verse is quoted. In addition to these he has cited several other passages ascribed to himself,\(^2\) which are not traceable to the available works either in print or manuscript. Among his works the Pratyabhijnahrdraya was popular as Sakti Sutra\(^3\) and its commentary by him as Sakti Sutra Bhasya\(^4\) in the Tripura circles. The Kamakala-vilasa refers to it as the Hrdaya-sutra\(^5\) and also as the Pratyabhijna-sutra\(^6\) - a name that has been usually in vogue for Utpala's Pratyabhijna-karikas among the Saivist schools.

The various stages in his creative thinking may be discerned in the chronological order on his own testimony.\(^7\) He had his first philosophical encounter with the Spanda system. First, he wrote the Spanda Samdoha followed by the Spanda Nirnaya in which he perceptibly deviated from the traditional Spanda schoolmen. The Pratyabhijna was his next field in which he produced his two famous works namely, Pratyabhijnahrdraya and Svachchanda-tantlra-udyota. This was followed by his illustrious commentary on the Siva-sutra called Vimarsini. Similarly his commentaries on the Stava-cintamani and Netra Tantra, too, came after that on the Svachchanda Tantra. During this period he continued his other literary and philosophical minor ventures allusions to which are splashed through all his works.\(^8\)

He has tremendous respect for his teacher and has closely drawn on him for whatever has passed through under his pen. Yet he never compromised reason and originality with love and reverence. His own pronouncements to the effect amply bear

1. Vide Sp.P., p. 23
4. Ibid., pp. 16, 70.
7. S.S.Vi., pp. 3, 12; Sp.N., pp. 1, 7; P.Hr, p. 63; St.C.V., p. 126.
8. P.Hr., p. 84; Sp.N., p. 13, 34, 36, 77; S.S.Vi., p. 146; Sv.T, I, p. 108.
out his claim.\(^1\) In the last verse of his *Spanda Samdoha*\(^2\) he makes it absolutely clear that though he owes much of the Spanda doctrine to Abhinava yet whatever he has written embodies his own reflections as well.

From the verses at the end of the *Vivrti* on the *Stavacintamani* it is manifest that he lived at the Vijayesvara, the modern Bijbihara (in Kashmiri Vyajibror), a town about thirty miles off Srinagar on the eastern side where, on persuasion of his pupil Sura, he finished within a couple of days the writing of his commentary on the *Stavacintamani* of Narayana Bhatta,\(^3\) who was Ksemaraja's grandteacher also.

Thus, there is no doubt that his contribution to the Kashmir Saivism as well as the Krama system is inferior only to his redoubtable master.

(xxv) Varadaraja (1000 - 1050 A.D.) alias *Krsnadasa*

Varadaraja perhaps did not write any treatise pertaining to Krama. The only factor that has necessitated his mention here consists in the fact that his work, *Siva-sutra-varttika*, contains enough important material to indicate the historical development of the Krama concepts and ideas.\(^4\) In the philosophical section of the thesis every opportunity has been exploited to deal with this aspect of his contributions in their relative contexts. In this connection it has to be noted that notwithstanding his enormous debt to Ksemaraja, he does add a touch of his own with regard to the presentation of the Krama dicta.

The *Sivasutravarttika* is his famous work which he has wholly drawn on Ksemaraja's *Sivasutravimarsini* as confessed by

---

1. शुस्या सामन्तं प्रमोर्भिन्नार्यसेवकं च फिनिखिया \।
   क्षेमेणाधिक्षेत विद्वृतं अप्रेष्याशुलं नासक् \।

2. तेनाधिखियत्तु विनितिन्तु रैरौ श्रेम्यराजी यथार्थः \।
   क्षेत्रे श्रेमसंहरसा विस्मेऽद्या विवालात्ता \।


3. विवृतिभाषा तथांतस्ततुनिर्निर्नाश्चालनमाहिःश्रेम्यराज्यायर्मेधमन्तकविवाचनमाद्यत्र-रात्रिकिंरणन्तिकरणा।

   *Colophon to St. C. V.*, p. 13.

4. *Vide* his *Varttika* on the *S.S.* 1.6, 7, 12, 17, 22; 2-5, 6; 3.16, 43.
him.\(^1\) In addition to this, he appears to have written a book
called *Laghu-vrtti-vimarsini* whose manuscript is available in
the Curator's Office Library, Trivandrum.\(^2\) In the opening
verses the author calls himself as Krsnadasa\(^3\) (and this agrees
with the colophon)\(^4\) and tells that it is a commentary on the
*Paratrimshika*.\(^5\) There is no problem in identifying the authors of
the two works. Because in his *Varttika* also he gives out his
other name as Krsnadasa.\(^6\) Besides, at both the places he refers
to Madhuraja. In the *Varttika* he presents himself as his young­
est son\(^7\) and in the *Laghu-vrtti-vimarsini* as Madhura’s student.\(^8\) In
the latter work he throws a veiled hint at his being a direct
disciple of Abhinava.\(^9\) In fact Madhuraja and Madhura are the
same persons. Madhuraja himself refers to it in his *Gurunatha-

\(^1\) Ibid.

\(^2\) Ibid.

\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^4\) Ibid.

\(^5\) Ibid.

\(^6\) Ibid.

\(^7\) Ibid.

\(^8\) Ibid.

\(^9\) Ibid.
paramarsa. 1 According to P.N. Pushp, Madhura is a place name and is identical with modern Madurai. 2 If such be the case, which it probably is owing to the extensive countrywide tours of Madhuraja, it forms a prelude to Kashmir's cultural and intellectual intercourse with the South that reached its culmination in Sivananda, Mahaprkasa and Mahesvarananda from Cola (Modern Karnatak).

The date of Varadaraja may be settled easily. On the basis of a probable interpretation of the phrase used by Madhuraja e.g. "Siddha-visakha-kramrta-varse", Dr. Pandey hypothetically places Madhuraja in the Saptarsri year 4167 (1093 A.D.) when he was eighty years of age. 3 And if it is interpreted in terms of Kali era, the year of his birth comes to be 4087 Kali On this latter calculation, he would be 28 years old during the year 4115 of Kali era (1014-15 A.D.) when the Isvara-Pratyaharnavirvrti-vimarsini of Abhinava was completed. 4 This would naturally place Varadaraja somewhere between 1020-1080 A.D.

But on certain additional evidence Varadaraja seems to have flourished little earlier. The 38th verse of the Gurunathaparamarsa explicitly mentions Madhuraja's age at 74 when he first called on Abhinava. 5 He lived there for four years at his master's feet and was 78 when he composed Gurundthaparamarsa. 6 At that time Abhinava was alive. On the above

1. अभान्तरसन्धकतिमेव वस्मीपित्वते बन्धुरास्मिः सद्यमाधुरोज्ज्ञम् ।
   Verse 39.

2. Prefatory to Gurunathaparamarsa, p. ii.
3. Abhi., p. 259.
5. नवनार्थकतिमेव वस्मी मध्यनान्तिमैत्रोऽति शर्ममाति चूर्मविभाषि ।
6. नवनार्थकतिमेव वस्मी मध्यनान्तिमैत्रोऽति शर्ममाति चूर्मविभाषि ।

Dr. Pandey quotes this verse as No. 6 from the Svatma-paramarsa. Abhi, p. 258.
calculation it would appear that Madhuraja visited Abhinava during 1060-61 A.D. and remained with him till 1064-65 A.D. This would be probably stretching the date of Abhinava beyond proportions. Moreover Varadaraja, though closely following Ksemaraja, does not introduce himself as latter’s pupil. Instead, he flashes a subtle hint that he was taught by Abhinava and Madhuraja both. In that case, he might have been of mature age when his father approached Abhinava, because then his father himself was 74. Since he follows the *Vimarsini* of Ksemaraja which was among the latter’s last works, he comes to be his slightly junior contemporary and may be placed around 1000-1050 A.D.

It therefore seems likely that the interpretation of the verse, alluded to above, requires a further probe. In this connection we may suggest as a tentative measure that if the word Visakha be interpreted as standing for number ‘one’ representing Karttikeya (himself) instead of ‘six’ (representing his six faces) as taken by Dr. Pandey, we find the phrase "Siddhavisakha-karamtravarse" will mean "in the year 4117 (and not 4167)." This will further mean that Madhuraja was eighty years old in 4117 (1016-17 A.D.) of Kali era. Thus he would be 78 years when Abhinavagupta completed his *Brhari-vimarsini*. Accordingly all events connected with Madhuraja, on this interpretation, will go back by 50 years. This will more or less tally with our date assigned to Varadaraja and eliminate the difficulties enumerated above.

(xxvi) **Devabhatta (Devapani?)** 1025-1075 A.D.

Mahesvarananda refers to himself as a devout adherent to the school of Devapani and accordingly admits that the functional cycles are to be adored in the order that commences with Srsticakra and closes with Bhasa cakra. He rejects any alternative arrangement. Beyond this one knows nothing of Devapani.

1. नैदेवसागरसम्बन्धया सृष्टिनिधिभावान्तः जर्जर अदेक्यागिनः प्रविद्धैरस्माभिन्नत्तुस्क्लोपेयते, न पुरस्वलिंगपर्यंत।

* M.M.P., p. 108.
Of late certain material has come to notice that may help one hazard a guess in this regard. Dr. Raghavan has invited the attention of the scholars to a work, *Anuttara-srigurupankti-paramarsa*, by name.\(^1\) The MS belongs to the Madras Govt. Oriental Library and bears No. MD 15330. The work deals with the linear chronology of the Pratyabhijna authors in the following sequence - Somananda, Utpala, Laksmanagupta, Abhinavagupta, Ksemaraja and Sura. Sura is mentioned as a pupil of Ksemaraja. The author of this *Gurupankti* is one Deva Bhatta who describes himself as a pupil of Sura.\(^2\) We are not aware whether or not Devapani can be equated with this Devabhatta, Bhatta being an honorific title or surname. There is another name ending with the word Pani e.g., Cakrapani, among the Krama authors to be discussed subsequently. He has also been referred to as Cakranatha instead of Cakrapani.\(^3\) Hence, it does not seem utterly irrelevant to view Devapani's whereabouts in this perspective.\(^4\)

If, at all, such possibility is conceded, Devapani's (?) date is fairly certain, since he comes next to Sura, the pupil of Ksemaraja (975-1025 A.D.) and may, therefore, be assigned to a period about 1025-1075 A.D. But, it may be repeated, it is a mere hypothesis.

(xxvii) *Hrasvanatha* (1025-1075 A.D.)

With Hrasvanatha one enters into one of the most complicated arenas of the Krama history. His advent is a landmark

2. तत्स्यापि धृततमापूणत्
3. श्लोकाच्य न्यायब्रह्मचारिणाय: वकासंपीतां वीर्यायाति

\(^{1}\) Dr. Raghavan also refers to a work named *Sivasutra-varttika* in the MS: No. 21 (other details missing) by one Bhisag Devaraja. *JOR*, XIV-IV, p. 323. His silence over other aspects of the author or text makes it meaningless to derive any implication whatsoever.
in the Krama annals, because he heads a tradition that has produced the texts of the eminence of the Cidgaganacandrika and Mahanayaparakasa(S) etc.

His time may be discussed first, since it is the main hurdle. The forthcoming paragraphs are addressed to examining the relevant data to the extent available and allowing each factor and evidence to suggest its own conclusion. It may, however, be pointed out that Cakrabhanu's date is a key-factor in deciding the date of Hrasvanatha. Let us take these data one by one.

(i) Jayaratha (1150-1200 A.D.) refers to Hrasvanatha, Bhojaraja and Somaraja in a succession. Hrasvanatha, therefore, must precede Jayaratha and, in view of the intervening generations, be placed around 1075-1125 A.D. In other words he should not be later than this date.

(ii) According to a tradition current in Jayaratha's time, the series of the Krama teachers from Keyuravati (825-875 A.D.) to Bhutiraja, the pupil of Cakrabhanu, (both inclusive) account for sixteen generations of Krama. In other words, the distance between Keyuravati and Cakrabhanu (both exclusive) spreads over thirteen generations. Allowing 25 years to each generation (i.e. about 325 years) he may be placed around 1150-1175 A.D. since Keyuravati belongs to the second and third quarters of the ninth century. But at this point we encounter another tradition recorded by Jayaratha. It does not take the first six

1. श्रीह्रस्वनाथाय श्रीम मिथिलाय श्रीभोजराजानाम: श्रीभोजराजानाम: वर्षस्यायं सम्बन्ध, तद्वद्यस्यवयाय यत्रधर्मस्य तद्वधर्मस्य व्यामशालोक्य श्रीभोजराजानाम:।
   T.A.F., III, p. 198.

2. श्रीन्यूरुक्ती: प्रत्तति श्रीश्रीकान्तावधापत:।
   संतालोक्तित्व यत्रधर्मस्य तदस्य व्यामशालोक्य।
   Ibid., p. 195.

3. तथा हि तद्य श्रीकार्किराताय:।
   'प्रत्तति यत्रधापत: प्रत्तति यत्रधापत:।
   तद्य तद्य एव शिष्य:।
   इति न वाचय: श्रीभोजराजानाम: सभाभाववृत्तिभिर्यथानां नवेरूक्तित्वात्यथ।।
   Ibid., pp. 195-96.
pupils of Keyuravati in vertical order but in horizontal one, that is, the first six pupils were mutually contemporaneous. Hence, Cakrabhanu's removal from Keyuravati is cut short from 13 to 8 generations \((13 - 6 = 7, +1\) representing all the six disciples). The approximate date of Cakrabhanu may, therefore, be put in the vicinity of 1025-1075 A.D. This conclusion is further substantiated by Jayaratha's final premise \(^1\) that twenty generations account for the entire preceptorial tradition from Sivananda to Bhutiraja, pupil of Cakrabhanu. Among these, first generation has three teachers (Keyuravati etc.) and the second six (Govindaraja etc.). Thus Cakrabhanu (and not his pupil) is removed from Sivananda not by twenty but by ten generations (both exclusive). Ten we say, because between Sivananda and Cakrabhanu seventeen (excluding both as well as Cakrabhanu's pupil) generations have intervened. If we deduct seven generations (not nine because three pupils would account for one and the other six for the other generation) from seventeen the gap is reduced to ten. Computing it from Sivananda (800-850 A.D.) upto Cakrabhanu, a period of 250 years seems to have elapsed. Cakrabhanu, therefore, comes close to the era (1050-1100 A.D.) as discussed above.

(iii) Jayaratha has drawn our attention to the fact that Hrasvanatha either possessed a commentary in manuscript form on the *Krama Stotra* (of Siddhanatha) or else wrote a commentary on it.\(^2\) Whatever be the case, Hrasvanatha therefore cannot be placed earlier than 925-975 A.D., the date of the Stotrakara. From Jayaratha's description it is obvious that people had started speculating about the number of the verses in and the central theme of the *Krama Stotra* and, consequently,

---

1. तद्वेष अनुकलचापुल्लयश्रयेष्याश्रयोपयोग्येश्वती नाय:।
   नाशत्रैन शिष्याविष्कार संज्ञानिर्विवाहः॥
   इति नित्यो न न्यायं — शिष्याद्वयं अर्थं अपरिणमितं अन्यमार्थं
   अर्थावविश्वासीं न च शिष्याविष्काराय।

2. धीर्द्वन्तस्मायापि रविलिपिविषयसंभवं हृद्दात्तत्।
numerous commentaries had come into existence. Therefore an allowance has to be made for the adequate lapse of time between the *Stotra* and Hrasvanatha so as to give rise to the controversies with regard to the *Stotra*. A hundred years' gap may be sufficient to account for the confusion. Consequently his date falls about 1025-1075 A.D. On this count, Bhojaraja and Somaraja being the consecutive successors would naturally be placed around 1050-1100 A.D. and 1075-1125 A.D. respectively.

(iv) Jayaratha quotes two verses from Somaraja describing his preceptorial ancestry. It is to be noted that Hrasvanatha was removed from Somaraja only by one generation e.g., Bhojaraja. It was natural for Soma to come at the end of the tradition since he himself is recording the tradition.

(v) In this connection the *Cidgaganacandrika* also traces the origin of the tradition to Sivananda and places Soma at the end of the tradition. The place of Cakrabhanu comes in between and he is referred to as the pilot (ananagra) among the pupils. It is therefore implicit in it that Soma came at the end of that tradition which was presided over by Cakrabhanu.

(vi) Cakrabhanu is described by Sitikantha as marking the end of human tradition (Manavaugha) but constituting the beginning of the line of disciples (Sisyaugha). With Hrasvanatha the human tradition begins. In other words Hrasvanatha

---

1. सर्वप्रथमेऽन्तः विविधवकुञ्जान शर्तपूर्वः पाठानं स्तोत्रोक्तोऽविश्वासी दृष्टवयं...एव वाड़े के द्वारां प्रद्वेद्।
3. हर्तुक्ष स्वप्नार्थः व्याकातायेन श्रीसोपराजे।
5. ये विद्वानमुखः श्रीमन्द्रकविभक्तनिर्विभाषिनं युजस्य।
   आदिवालिमण्डितः क्रर्षावशो वस्त्रवृत्तिवधवम् व्याक्रम यथा।
   *C.G.C.*, 4.121.
7. मात्रविशेषार्थः ह्रस्वनाथेति ब्रह्मस्थित्य कुलरी...उपर्युक्तानम्, तदस्तः पात्रोप-स्थ्याने विश्वामद्वीपोपन्नः।
   *M.P. (F)*, p. 107.
The Krama Tantricism of Kashmir

precedes Cakrabhanu. This tradition was in course of time handed down to Sitikantha.

(vii) Since (a) Hrasvanatha precedes Cakrabhanu,¹ (b) Soma or Somaraja comes at the end of the tradition presided by Cakrabhanu,² and (c) only one generation intervenes between Hrasvanatha and Somaraja,³ the gap between Hrasvanatha and Somaraja is necessarily filled in by Cakrabhanu on the one hand and Bhojaraja on the other.

(viii) To come back to dates again. It has been seen that the *Cidgaganacandrika* takes note of a tradition headed by Sivannanda and concluded with Soma. The author of the *Cidgaganacandrika* claims to have learnt the secrets of the system from Somaputra i.e., Soma's son.⁴ That is, the author of the *Cidgaganacandrika* chronologically succeeds the son of Soma. This text has been frequently quoted by Mahesvarananda in his *Parimala* on the *Maharthamanjari*.⁵ Mahesvarananda is assigned to the close of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth (1175-1225 A.D.) century. In the circumstances, the following picture of the authors' chronological succession emerges:

```
  Cakrabhanu
   \       /  \\
    Soma  /    \\
      \   /     \\
        Somaputra
          /    /
   Author of the *C.G.C.* (Srivatsa?)
      /     /
Mahesvarananda (1175-1225 A.D.)
```

Thus one arrives at Cakrabhanu's probable period which falls about 1075-1125 A.D. Hrasvanatha, owing to his historical priority, would naturally belong to 1050-1100 A.D.

4. लोकस्पूदार्मकमवस्तेः मरुगतस्तत्राधिकर्षेः किन्तुः क्षुद्रो भया
   *C.G.C.*, 4,123.
(ix) In this connection a point must be considered. The last verse of the *Cidgaganacandrika* mentions the name of its author as Srivatsa. If this Srivatsa is taken to be identical with one who is Mankha's friend and contemporary, Srivatsa would be placed round about 1125-1175 A.D.; because Mankha was a court-minister of King Jayasimha (1127-1151 A.D.).

In that case the son of Soma, Soma and Cakrabhanu would naturally come around 1100-1150, 1075-1125 and 1075-1100 A.D. respectively. Contemporaneous with Cakrabhanu, Bhojaraja would also be placed during 1050-1100 A.D. Hrasvanatha being an immediate precursor of Cakrabhanu would automatically date back by a generation i.e., 1025-1075 A.D.

Thus from all these considerations Hrasvanatha may be assigned to the second and third quarters of the eleventh century. Similarly Bhutiraja, the pupil of Cakrabhanu, may be bracketed with Soma (1075-1125 A.D.).

Corning to his creative side, one is not placed in a very happy position to say much about his scholarship and contribution. He was also known by another name i.e., Viranathapada. If one abides by Dr. Pandey's suggested modification of 'Hrasvanathenapi' into 'Hrasvanathasyapi', one may be able to say that Hrasvanatha wrote a commentary on the *Krama Stotra* in his own hand-writing and the same was accessible to Jayaratha. If, however, the original construction is retained, one would have an occasion to say that Hrasvanatha had his own manuscript copy of a commentary on the *Krama Stotra*. A verse from his manuscript of the *Krama Stotra* which contained

1. वा नराक्ष महर्षिः व श्रीरत्नो विदिषे संधु 

4. श्रीरत्नपदाध्यापि
   "“श्रीवरस्तपदेष्ठे पंच च देवीनेये कृत: ग्रन्थाः ।
   हरित न पंजैवेन ग्रन्थाः।"

5. *Abhi.* 473.

---

an additional verse pertaining to Rudra-kali, not traceable to other commentaries, has been cited by Jayaratha.\(^1\) Hrasvanatha had seen this verse in his script.

Hrasvanatha, too, was not free from the complications of a controversy Jayaratha criticises a verse that gave the number of his pupils as five, whereas Jayaratha points out that he had six students, the sixth being Bhojaraja.\(^2\) The controversy, however, clarifies the issue of the precise number of his students.

There is one more Hrasvanatha, who is said to have written a work entitled Advayasampatti. His father’s name was Harsadatta.\(^3\) The problem is whether the two could be

---

\(^1\) त्य इति भ्रजवनाधिकारिः।

dhāryaśīkāḥ शोभुकृष्णवतीन्द्रावती ्ताम् वैभव्यो निश्चयस्तवलाम्।

\(^2\) व्रजवनाधिकारिः।

dhattita न प्रवीच गिज्ञात:—भ्रजोविज्ञावत: नागवत: संस्कारः।

\(^3\) भ्रजवनाधिकारिः।


\(^4\) भ्रजवनाधिकारिः।

dhattita न प्रवीच गिज्ञात:—स्वाभाविकता नागवत: संस्कारः।

Ibid., p. 196.

---

In the Library of BORI, Poona, (here is a manuscript of (no. 472 of 1875-76) a work called Bodhavilasa. Its author is some Harsadattasunu (i.e., son of Harsadatta). The colophon reads -

हृदयविष्णुहरिसुनुसनान: अहृतासरस्वतीय:।

It is a small work in Sarada characters. Its author is the son of some Harsadatta very proficient in the Mimamsa system. But the comparison of the text with that quoted by Sivopadhyaya from Advayasampatti ascribed to Vamananatha vide V.Bh.V., pp. 78-79 shows their verbatim affinity barring a few minor variations. The only difference between the two texts consists in the four additional verses contained in Bodha-

vīlāsa, two in the beginning and two towards the close. Keeping in view the arguments advanced above it leads one to formulate the following views - (i) Bodhavilasa was an additional title of the Advayasampatti, (ii) the MS as it is, has been copied from the Vivriti of Sivopadhyaya, appending four extra verses to it, (iii) whatever the name of the text it was written by the son of Harsadatta, possibly also known as Vamananatha, (v) the work was intended to be a commentary on
identified. Abhinava refers to one Vamana, author of a commentary on the Advayasamparti, called Advayasampatti-varttika.\(^1\) If there is a Varttika on the Advaya-sampatti of Hrasvanatha, son of Harsadatta, he gets even remoter and older than Abhinava. Naturally the two cannot be identified. There is an additional support for the above contention. The same quotation is attributed to Vamananatha by Sivopadhyaya who attributes Advayavartrika to Hrasvanatha, the son of Harsadatta, in a different context.\(^2\) Here he is spoken of as the author of Dvayasampatti. Actually initial 'A' is missing owing to the scribe's omission. Thus Hrasvanatha alias Viranathapada is different from Hrasvanatha at issue who was considerably older than the former.

(xxviii) Cakrabhanu (1050-1100 A.D.)

A comparative estimate of the various opinions expressed about Cakrabhanu elevates his stature in the eyes of the reader as an eminent Krama author.

The problem of his date has already been settled by us in the foregoing pages. 'He seems to have flourished around the second half of the eleventh century.

It is to be regretted that no work of his either in reference, manuscript or print has come down today. Hence it is extremely difficult to ascertain the magnitude and nature of his contribution. A few scattered allusions to him are one's only-guide.

With him the main human pedigree (Manavaugha) of teachers comes to an end and an intra-human series of disciples (Sisyaugha) begins. He enjoys an position of unchallenged superiority among all the persons that constitute the chain of

the Advayasampatti, since Vamananatha wrote another commentary in addition to the existing one by somebody else, and (vi) the commentary also went by the name of the original text as the two extracts cited by Sivopadhyaya prove. This is all that may be said at present.

\(^1\) \textit{P.T.V.,} p. 198.

\(^2\) \textit{V. Bh V.,} p. 18.
disciples (Sisyaugha). He was possibly a student of Hrasvanatha, because he belongs to the tradition of Soma, the grand pupil of the former, and because the former had six pupils one of them being Bhojaraja, the teacher of Somaraja. The enviable status enjoyed by Cakrabhanu among the tradition of the disciples is possible only when he is at the helm of the tradition. That this is so has been confirmed by Sitikantha and the Cidgaganacandrika. Since Somaraja is separated from Hrasvanatha by one generation, Cakrabhanu together with Bhojaraja in all probability be a pupil of Hrasvanatha.

Although he belonged to a different tradition from one subscribed to by Jayaratha and Mahesvarananda etc., he came direct in the original tradition of Keyuravati. As after Keyuravati etc., many a tradition became afloat within the precincts of the Krama system, Cakrabhanu might be associated with one of those traditions. He, through tradition, might be linked with any of the three unnamed disciples of Keyuravati, since the whereabouts of other remaining three are well known.

Cakrabhanu had eight pupils, himself being the master of them. Amongst these a lady ascetic called Isana was responsible for a fresh tradition which continued uninterrupted till the time of Sitikantha. His (Cakrabhanu's) role as a Krama teacher has elicited extreme admiration from Sitikantha.

Till the time of Jayaratha his importance had blurred the precise view of his actual contribution, so much so that his pupil Bhutiraja was confused with one of the same name who

1. सत्त्र्मण्डलीप्रभातेः शिष्योपासर्वश्रीराजेनादि:
   

2. C.G.C., 4.121.
4. Ibid.
5. C.G.C. 4.121.
8. शिष्योपासादेवनां शिष्ययां प्रश्नः यथावता राजी ईशानाक्ष्यः स (ब) दल्लेन्यमन्यदल्लेन।


9. तद्धृत भानुः प्रच्छन्नाः शिष्यामर्मानां विद्याभिसः, हृति
was Abhinava's teacher in Brahmavidya.\(^1\) Jayaratha completely rejects the theory as without foundation that Cakrabhanu's pupil was Abhinava's teacher. Jayaratha even goes to the extent of decrying the claim of Bhutiraja as a pupil of Cakrabhanu. Cakrabhanu's abstinence from such type of teaching has been the main source of confusion and consequently numerous interpretations of his views.\(^2\)

Thus the respective stands taken by Jayaratha and Siti-kantha tend to appear paradoxical. In view of the weighty collateral evidence frequently referred to, it is difficult to agree with Jayaratha that he never taught anybody. He, therefore, might be construed to mean that Cakrabhanu never taught any Bhutiraja and thus the paradox be tentatively reconciled. Possibly this will be a more reasonable attitude towards Jayaratha too.

(xxix) **Cakrapani** (1050-1100/1075-1125 A.D.)

According to the original plan Cakrapani was to be discussed among the authors of the next generation, but this deviation appears necessary in view of the foregoing discussion impelling us to hazard certain suggestions in the context.

The Research Department of Kashmir Government has brought out as the 14th volume of Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies a work called *Bhavopahara* ascribed to one Cakrapani with a commentary by Ramyadeva. The *Bhavopahara*, on going through its contents, transpires to be a Krama stotra. Ramyadeva's commentary totally actuated by the Krama ideology leaves no doubt about it. Its precise philosophical views have been fully taken into account at appropriate occasions luring the course of philosophical treatment. Ramyadeva, in the opening verses of his commentary\(^3\) and in his commentary\(^4\) on the

---

2. इत्यादि दृष्टवत्ता तत्त्वविद्यातिरिक्तम् —*संयुक्तस्य* | नदि भौजनावनवत्यास्यः कस्यविद्यम् एवमूषिद्वन तत्त्वविद्यातिरिक्तम् | कस्यात्मकविद्याः कस्यविद्यम् एवमूषिद्वन | *T.A.V.*, III, pp. 193-94.
   देव चन्द्र ख्या भौजनावनवत्यास्यः | *Ibid*, verse 3.
4. इति चक्रानुवेक्षावधाय भौजन: ज्ञातविवेकम् ख्या विवेकम्: | *Ibid*, p. 44.
last verse\(^1\) of the *Stotra*, gives out the name of the author of the *Stotra* as Cakrapani who has been variously called Cakranatha and Cakresa etc.

Coming to the personal details and time of Cakrapani one finds a veil of mystery surrounding it. Let us try to pierce through it.

The commentator of the work is Ramyadeva who refers to a work of his son also.\(^2\) Now both of these, father and son, are described by Mankha as members of his brother's (Lankaka's) intellectual club.\(^3\) Ramyadeva, therefore, appears to be a senior contemporary of Mankha (1125-1175 A.D.) and may be assigned to the twelfth century (1100-1150 A.D.). The *Bhavopahara*, in the fitness of things, would precede this period, that is, the lower limit of the *Bhavopahara*’s period would not go below 1075-1125 A.D. The work cannot be much older, because no Krama author beyond Devabhatta (1025-1075 A.D.) takes note of it. Moreover the language of the *Stotra* and the contents both have a greater imprint of mysticism and esoteric symbolism which are definitely signs of the later phase of the Krama system.

During this period there is only one person, except Cakrapani, who has the word Cakra forming part of his name. He is Cakrabhanu. He is a known Krama author. Will it, therefore, be incongruous and without basis to identify Cakrapani with Cakrabhanu? Cakrabhanu’s time is about 1050-1100 A.D. Cakrapani’s probable time is not later than 1075-1125 A.D. Thus a gap of twentyfive years is not an unbridgeable gap and since there is rather greater certainty about Cakrabhanu’s date, it will be better to push the date of Cakrapani slightly back. If this equation be conceded, one would be in a better position to appreciate the creative aspect of Cakrabhanu’s genius.

1. महाशामुखोति तंत्रिक तापसः।
   वर्ण चिन्तकस्य शत्मोशिवायु तराम्।
   *B.U.*, verse 47.

Whatever little is known about him, has already been brought to notice. A few points of information alone remain to be given here. As seen already, Bhojaraja as the sixth student of Hrasvanatha and a contemporary of Cakrabhanu belongs to the latter half of the eleventh century. He was also known by his other name i.e., Vamanabhanu. Somaraja, from whom Jayaratha quotes, while giving out his preceptorial pedigree in two verses figuratively suggests that Bhojaraja perhaps wrote a work, the *Kramakamala* by name, on the system. Because in both the passages he is portrayed as an adept in letting the Kramakamala, bloom. One knows of a similar title e.g., *Kula-kamala*, belonging to the Kula system. Hence it is not at all improbable that he might have written some such work. He was a man of high spiritual attainments.¹

Sri Braj Vallabha Dwivedi in his essay on the Tripura Darsana² raises an important question in this regard.

According to him, the *Rjuvimarsini* by Sivananda refers to one Dipakanatha who was ostensibly influenced by Bhojaraja. This Dipakanatha is one among the Tripura teachers preceding Jayaratha. According to the Tripura tradition, Dipakanatha is posterior to Dharmacarya who is the author of the *Laghustava*, and for that matter, the *Pancastavi*, on the authority of Amrtananda, the author of the *Saubhagyasudhodaya*. The 18th verse of the third Stava has been quoted by Bhojaraja in the fifth chapter of *Sarasvatikanthabharana* and a verse from the same Stava has also been cited by Mammata in the 10th chapter of

---


his *Kavya Prakasa*. Thus Dharmacarya is definitely anterior to Bhojaraja and Mammata. His successor (not necessarily immediate) Dipakanatha is said to have been demonstrably influenced by Bhojaraja. Now the question is who is this Bhojaraja - the author of the *Sarasvatikanthanabharana* or a different one.

Mr. Dwivedi has raised an important problem. It is difficult to say that the problem can be answered easily. Yet, an annexure may be added to the question itself.

From the above presentation it is definite that whosoever this Bhojaraja might be, he does belong to the same period as do Dipakanatha etc. The author of the *Sarasvatikanthanabharana* and the *Tattva-prakasika* (a Saiva Siddhanta text) is identified with the king Bhoja of Dhara whose period is taken to be 1010-1060 A.D. by Smith.¹ Now this Bhojaraja, the Krama author, has been assigned above to the period 1050-1100 A.D. It is, however, not definitely known whether all these Bhojas are one or different. But as a hypothesis one must consider the issue if Bhojaraja, the Krama author, can lay any claim to influencing Dipakanatha. In the history of the tantric system, however, such cross-influences or synthetic personalities do not present an unusual spectacle.

*(xxxi)* Somaraja (1075-1125 A.D.)

Somaraja came next to Hrasvanatha, his teacher, in order of succession. He probably wrote a work which included the details of his preceptorial ancestry. The two verses cited and ascribed by Jayaratha² to him are probably from this work. He was the last teacher in the tradition that came direct from Sivananda³ and was punctuated with the teachers of the eminence of Cakrabhanu. He had a son who later transmitted the mysteries of the system to the author of the *Cidgaganacandrika*⁴ He, as discussed earlier, may be assigned to the close of the eleventh and beginning of the twelfth century.

The great-grand (Paramesthi) teacher of Jayaratha (Visvadatta?) (1075-1125 A.D.)

The Paramesthi guru of Jayaratha is mentioned only once and a verse is also attributed to him by Jayaratha. In fact the verse is very popular among the authors of Kashmir Saivism and appears in many a text as a benedictory verse. Jayaratha gives the three interpretations of the first verse of the *Tantraloka* in accordance with its bearings upon the Kula and Krama systems and Abhinava's parentage respectively. It is in the context of the second i.e., Krama interpretation, that the verse is cited in support of his presentation of the Ultimate Awareness technically called Anakhya.

Fortunately Jayaratha gives in full both of his genealogies - parental as well as preceptorial. In the line of his teachers one finds only one person, Visvadatta, who could perhaps be equated with Jayaratha's Paramesthi guru in question. Visvadatta is the father of Tribhuvanadatta and the grandfather of Subhatadatta who is credited with having performed Jayaratha's initiation.

If one puts the two genealogies side by side, it will be apparent that Visvadatta was a contemporary of the two great grandfathers of Jayaratha, namely, Gunaratha and Devaratha. They themselves were grandsons of Utpalaratha who was a minister of the king Ananta (1028-1063 A.D.) and their eldest uncle Sivaratha was a minister of king Ucchala (1101-1111 A.D.). Therefore, Gunaratha and Devaratha may be placed somewhere during 1075-1125 A.D. Visvadatta being their con-
temporary would also belong to near about the same period. It may also be noted that Utpalaratha II was the maternal nephew as well as a pupil of Vibhutidatta, the father of Visvadatta. Vibhutidatta could not bear the loss of his elder son and consequently being completely disillusioned and detached he could not educate his another son, Visvadatta, who was quite young. Visvadatta was therefore left to the care of Sricakra, a student of Vibhutidatta, and who handed over all the ancestral learning to Visvadatta. Utpalaratha II, the maternal cousin of Visvadatta brought the latter to his home and brought him up. When he attained the age, Utpalaratha got a residence erected for him opposite the temple constructed by some Kanakadatta and gave him sufficient resources - movable and immovable both - in order to relieve him from worldly worries.

It was this Visvadatta who is possibly referred to as Jayaratha’s greatgrand teacher. It is really striking to observe that from the very beginning the teacher and the taught relationship had been obtaining between the two ancestral lines - one preceptorial and the other parental - of Jayaratha.

(xxxiii) Somaputra (1100-1150 A.D.)

The author of the Cidgaganacandrika expresses his indebtedness to the son of Soma for divulging to him the Krama Tantricism of Kashmir.

1. श्रीमान् विभूतिदत्तो व्याख्यादेव मातुजः विष्णु: ||
2. अध्याया भिन्नित्संहिताः अति सुलभोऽनिमित्तं युक्ते पुत्रे व्याख्या देवसारप्रियताःस्वके दिनेऽस्वत: सुतार्यः ।
   वैद्युतन ब्रह्मिष्टे संवदाद्वादशाय सेवं ततो देव्या स्त्राष्टव्यान्धितो|श्यात्प्रणालिते नमःस्वस्तितिः ॥
   \textit{T.A.V., XII, p. 430.}
3. श्रीमान् स्वल्पोऽविवर्तिते श्री श्रीवर्तिते श्रीवर्तिते श्रीवर्तिते ॥
   \textit{Ibid., p. 431.}
4. अथ यस् पर्यर्युक्तमावस्ते पुरी स्वते विश्वनाथस्वते स्वते विश्वनाथस्वते ॥...
   श्रीकल्पसिद्धितविनिर्देशार्थं मयं श्रीपाकायः
   \textit{T.A.V., XII, p. 430.}
secrets\(^1\) or the text on which the former commented. The part of
the text that contains this information is very defective, yet
its sense may easily be derived. Soma, his father, is the terminal
point of the tradition originating from Sivananda.\(^2\) Being the
son of Soma or Somaraja, his time may be determined about
1100-1150 A.D.

\(^{xxxiv}\) Ramyadeva (1100-1150 A.D.)

Ramyadeva is the most important author of his era. His
Vivarana on the Bhavopahara is undoubtedly a Krama work. Despite
the fact that he is more inclined towards esotericism, his commentary
does not lack in original flashes.\(^3\) He has tried to point out the specific character of the Krama system.\(^4\) An
attempt has been made to take note of each contribution of his
in its proper place.

In addition to his Vivarana on the Bhavopahara he has
written six other works as stated by him. The works are given
below:

1. **Akrana-kallola-karika**\(^5\)
2. **Akulakalika-trimsika**\(^6\)
3. **Siva-rava-stotra**\(^7\)

\(^1\) Bhavopahara

\(^2\) Sivananda

\(^3\) His commentary on the Bhavopahara

\(^4\) His commentary on the Bhavopahara

\(^5\) His commentary on the Bhavopahara

\(^6\) His commentary on the Bhavopahara

\(^7\) His commentary on the Bhavopahara

---

2. B.U.V., vp. 26, 31-32 etc.
3. Ibid., pp. i, 22, 23, 29, 38, 40, etc.
4. Ibid., p. 4.
5. Ibid., p. 8; also

---


---

B.U.V., p. 10.
(iv) *Cakresvara-bhairavastaka*\(^1\)
(v) *Siva-ratri-vicara-varttika*.\(^2\)
(vi) *Krtanta-tanti-santi-stava*\(^3\)

The third and sixth works are admittedly classed as stotras. The second and fourth are also possibly stotras as a close look into the extracts ascribed to them would reveal. The fifth seems, on the usual pattern, to be a commentary on the text entitled *Sivaratrivicara*, which might be from his own pen or from somebody else's. We do not know. The first appears to be an independent work dealing with the Krama system.

According to the colophon\(^4\) he was the son of Bhatta Jyogdeva and according to the closing verse of his commentary his teacher's name was Yogananda.\(^5\) He also cites a verse from his son\(^6\) but does not give his name. From Mankha we know that his name was Losthadeva.\(^7\) The fact that his son was mature enough so that his father might quote him leads one to think that Ramyadeva wrote this *Vivarana* at quite an advanced age.

As has been hinted earlier, Ramyadeva was an older contemporary of Mankha. According to Mankha, Ramyadeva was a man of ascetic temperament. He had thorough command over Vedanta and his action bore the imprints of his thought. He was an extremely proficient and generous teacher. He was

1. तत्रुतं मया चक्रेशपीरवाद्ये—
2. तत्रुतं मया विवर्तिनिविचारावलिके—
3. तत्रुतं मया कृतान्ताविचारावलिके—
4. ऐसि थोषसमर्थिनामुतितविचित्रेण भाजीप्रत्यक्षोऽविचित्रे विवरणं समाप्तम्
5. योगान्तमािगालिगालिजबयंबयंतिपैदाकिष्ठिनीकृक्षियावतः
   *B.U.V.*, p. 44.
6. तथा बारतमुः—
specially at home in the *Kathavalli* and was a successful exponent of the Vedanta text called *Istasiddhi*. These autobiographical touches no doubt lend special richness to Ramyadeva's manifold personality. It is strange that Mankha does not refer to Ramyadeva's attainments in Krama though he was fully conversant with the system. Maybe Mankha is referring to that aspect only with which people were not so conversant, or else Mankha is taking note of only those aspects of the author's personality that won recognition in the intellectual circle. Both, Ramyadeva and his son Lōstdēva, are mentioned in the company of Lankaka, Lankata or Alamkara, Mankha's elder brother. Lankaka was a minister statesman under the king Sussala of Kashmir (1112-1127 A.D.). The *Raja-tarangini* refers to him as a man of martial achievements. Mankha was an officer-in-charge of state administration under king Jayasimha, the son and successor of Sussala. The reign of Jayasimha falls between 1126-1159 A.D. Thus the literary circle of his elder brother must have been a long affair spread over 1112-1159 A.D. Since Ramyadeva is mentioned along with his son, he must be of ripe age when an audience took place between him and Alamkara. It would, therefore, be reasonable if he is assigned to the first half of the twelfth century.

(xxxv) Lōstdēva (1125-1175 A.D.)

As alluded to above, Ramyadeva quotes a passage from his son with marked overtones of the Krama system. It is

1. S.K.C. 5.40
3. निवेशिते श्रस्त्रभूविवीजला स्वयं गरीवत्थि संयोजितः।
   निधाय च त्रयोंप्रायोऽविलिङ्गमध्ये सेषतम्यं सत्तत्वः।
4-5. अनन्तर तुम्हादेवनेवसी यमादाराच्छो प्रसिद्धदृष्टिः।
   वध्दाणारामणंनर्गयूपं स्य विद्वदाराच्छोत्तुमृतः।
6. निग्रामाच्छला संहारंदे तथा चास्तुपुरः।
   शिष्य निग्रामाच्छलुन्थेन श्रद्धां निग्रामाच्छलाच्छलात्मितः।
   युगतयोऽगिरागस्थालाविची अधजित कादेऽकला निग्रामातः।
   श्रुति।
   *B.U.V.*, p. 6.
possible that his son might have written a treatise on Krama from which a passage has been cited by his father.

Although Ramyadeva does not disclose the name of his son, he is none other than Losthadeva. This information is furnished by Losadeva himself.\(^1\) He was also known as Lostaka. Being tortured by worldly trammels he diverted his attention from poetry to spiritualism. His work pertaining to Krama might be a product of this period.

Mankha has spoken highly of his linguistic accomplishment. He had a linguist's command over six languages and his speech and poetry were characterised by their flawless felicity and lucidity.\(^2\) Several verses read in praise of Lankaka find place in the *Srikantha-carita* and they betray a real poetic flavour in his utterances.\(^3\) He is credited with writing a stotra entitled *Dinakrandanasotra* which has been brought out by Nirnayasagar Press in the Part VI of the Kavyamala series. Towards the close of his life he went to Varanasi, turned ascetic and renounced the world. The stotra gives powerful expression to the pangs of his disillusioned heart pining for the spiritual ultimate. He ultimately gets peace and in a tranquil mood refers to his achievement.\(^4\)

\(^1\) \[Verse 50\] Dinakrandana Stotra. \[S.A.C. 25.34-36.\]

\(^2\) \[Ibid, 25.57-47.\]

\(^3\) \[Ibid, 25.57-47.\]

\(^4\) \[Ibid, 25.57-47.\]
Suktimuktavali, attributes a verse to Lostadeva. It, therefore, goes without saying that he was equally gifted in language, literature and philosophy and it is a misfortune that his works, either on Krama or other systems, have not survived the atrocities of time.

(.xxxvi) Srivatsa: Author of the Cidgaganacandrika (1125-75 A.D.)

The time of the author of the Cidgaganacandrika is not so puzzling as his identity. The Candrika is a commentary described as Pancika by him, on the Krama Stotra of Siddhanatha. And in autobiographical references he too introduces himself as Kalidasa. The proposition ascribing the Candrika’s authorship to Kalidasa has been reiterated and echoed several times. In addition, the last line of the second opening verse is practically the same as the last line of the opening verse of the Malavikagnimitra of Kalidasa. These factors have led the editor of the Calcutta edition of the Cidgaganacandrika to concede its authorship to Kalidasa. Karra Agnihotra Sastri, the erudite modern commentator on the text, fully endorses the
views of Svami Trivikrama Tirtha, the editor of the Calcutta edition. Besides, Sastri advances a few more arguments in favour of his contention. As his entire methodology consists in finding analogues between the present and the original Kalidasa and interpreting them to suit his convictions, it is not very relevant for us to go into whole of it here. However, to cite an instance, he finds an implicit reaffirmation of the Abhijnana-sakuntala’s eightfold Purls in the eightfold structure of the Vrnda-cakra. Even to the last verse, where the name of some Srivatsa occurs, he accords an entirely mystic interpretation taking him as a crest of meaning called Srivatsa. This is the verse which is of key importance in connection with the authorship-issue. The only difference between Sastri and Trivikrama Tirtha revolves round the identity of this Kalidasa. The former insists that the present Kalidasa is identical with the original one, while the latter is prepared to concede to the existence of some later Kalidasa who seems to have flourished before Abhinavagupta.

The testimony of the tradition also lends weighty support to the present thesis. The passages from the Cidgaganacandrika quoted by Bhaskararaya in his commentary famed as Saubhagyabhaskara on the Lalitasahasranama have been acknowledged by him to be the assertions of Kalidasa occasionally with reference to the name of this text. Similarly, Sastri has invoked the support of a Tantric text called Hrudayacandrika by Kavi Cakravartin which explicitly identifies the author of the Cidgaganacandrika with Kalidasa. But it must be frankly stated that a host of scholars, who have profusely quoted from the text in

2. Ibid., p. 4.
3. C.G.C., Calcutta, p. 3. (Skt. Int.).
5. ब्राह्मणवैभवादि प्रकाश्च कालिनाय इति कोणीप फलवनात्।
वैन विद्यमनचन्द्रवर्मनं हृदयपिन्नद्रमसे युधिष्ठिरां हृत तयं।
Quoted, C.G.C. with D.C., I, p. 3 (introd.).
question, have maintained complete silence over its authorship. Among these are Mahesvarananda,¹ Amrtanandanatha² and Kaivalyasrama.³

A modern student, however, finds it difficult to swallow the claim for the original Kalidasa's authorship of the Cidgagana-candrika. To begin with, the author mentions some Siva as a pioneer of the preceptorial line, Cakrabhanu as an eminent teacher and Soma as the concluding figure of the lineage to which the author pledges his allegiance. The author received his tuitions in Krama from the son of Soma. It simply means that he is not the legendary Kalidasa, but a different person. Cakrabhanu and Somaraja, and for that matter his son, more or less have a definite chronological status that puts them within a century’s bracket running from 1050 to 1150 A.D. as they come in preceptorial hierarchy. Even the earliest limit cannot go beyond the tenth century, because the author of the Krama Stotra i.e., Siddhanatha, belongs to the first half of the tenth century. But since the author maintains direct doctrinal and scholastic affiliation to Cakrabhanu etc, his date need not be pushed back from the point of actual occurrence which falls in the vicinity of the temporal bracket mentioned above. Besides, the earliest references made to this work are by Mahesvarananda who belongs to the close of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth century. Therefore his date cannot be advanced either, barring the modifications by a margin of 25 to 50 years on each side. Had he flourished much earlier, the early texts could not afford to ignore him altogether. Therefore, on every count, the present author is different from the great poet.

Coming to the other aspect of the question, let us try to find out who this Kalidasa was.

The author of the *Cidgaganacandrika* in the last verse gives out his name as Srivatsa in unmistakable tone. Kalidasa seems to be his honorific title and not his actual name, according to his own statement. Owing to the grace of Mother Divine his unique literary and spiritual accomplishment fetched him this valued title. However, from the historical perspective, many authors have quite frequently allowed to envelop their true personalities due to this practice in India. In order to cater to his vanity it has been natural for an author to emphasise his title as compared with his name.

The present thesis with regard to the *Candrika*’s authorship becomes more convincing, if something with regard to the historicity of the author named Srivatsa be available. Fortunately, exactly during this period, one Srivatsa arrests one’s attention. Mankha refers to a pair of the two celibates namely Bhudda and Srivatsa in course of his description of the literary circle of his brother and heaps an exceedingly high praise on both of them for unparalleled poetic richness and beauty of their verses - as if the Goddess Muse herself put a stamp on the wealth of their poetic art. Mankha, being a contemporary of king Jayasimha (1127-1151 A.D.) is ascribed to the second and third quarters of the twelfth century. Srivatsa, too, therefore, would belong to the same period. Since (i) this Srivatsa and the author of the *Candrika* flourished on an almost synchronous point of time, and (ii) Srivatsa, the author of the *Candrika*, has the title of Kalidasa for his poetic brilliance

1. दूरपीढ़में विद्रोहचाचत्वमादस्यात् ।
   या तरिकां यथावेर्ष श्रीवटसी निचित्ते स तु ।

   **G.G.C. 4.124.**

2. कालिकायमनि श्रवणितम् रक्षाप्रसन्नंदुर्यायकिंचित्तयः ॥

   **Ibid., 4.127.**

3. यथाविकास्तो वस्त्रस्त्रव्यवस्त्रयंडुर्यम् ॥
   मृत्युम वृक्षधर्मेन योग कार्यकाल्याभिषं ।
   पृथक्ष्यंध्रोवस्त्रसमानी हृदि सहभाजनी ।
   वाच्यंतःजत्सुपूजः सादरं सूक्ष्मावलयम् ॥

   **S.K.C., 25.81-82.**

4. Cf. fn. 2 above.
and ingenuity like his illustrious counterpart hailed for his poetic achievements, it will not be entirely unfounded to treat the two as identical.

The necessary corollaries that follow in the wake of such proposition are that the author of the Candrika was Srivatsa, identical with his namesake referred to by Mankha, who made this attempt for the welfare of mankind. He was known as Kalidasa for his literary genius. The verse containing the line from the Malavikagnimitra is spurious and a later interpolation. He was a pupil of Soma’s son who perhaps was also known as Gupta. He belonged to Purnapitha, the centre of his spiritual activity, where he wrote this Pancika on the Krama Stotra. The whole work, according to the author, comprises three hundred and nine verses in traistubha metre. However, there are in all three hundred and twelve verses in the printed edition and the first two verses are not in the above metre. Thus the total number of verses in the above metre amounts to three hundred and ten and if the last verse pertaining to the author himself is excluded, the total corresponds to the figure mentioned by the author.

But it is doubtful that the original text has come down to us in full, because a few verses quoted by Kaivalyasrama, Amrtanandanatha are not traceable to the printed text.

1. गुद्दामस्वतंत्रगृहज्ञानम् गत्वता सरसस्म मेघमव या ।
   C.G.C. 4.36.
   राज्यस्मात्रसम्बन्धमय घटकात्मजस्विदयतः।
   नामानीय सुमदनस्थितम्। सबूती अति विसर्जनेयः। कम्। II
   Ibid., 3.92.

2. पूर्णापिठाचरणय झंगस्क्रमिश्रितां मृदु युग्मः ॥
   C.G.C., 4.128.

3. कालवर्धिनिः शरस्वतिः। सप्त तात्क्षोभिः। वेशादाहवः। इत्यादिः।
   नेपुष्पेश्वरस्य। परमेश्वरस्य। कालवर्धिनिः। स्मरणिः।
   Ibid., 4.130-131.

4. अथव तात्क्षोभिः। स्मरणिः। इत्यादिः।
   गंगा देवी। विवेकार्जूः। कालवर्धिनिः। स्मरणिः।
   Quoted, S.V. on A.L., p. 4.

5. भावनामसंपर्कं च वसेष्य वृक्षमुक्तम् ॥
   Quoted, T.H.D., p. 179.
Ojaraja (1125-1175 A.D.)

He was probably an authority on the *Devipancasatika*, a recognized agama on the Krama system. With regard to the portion of the text dealing with the importance of the "final seed" (Antya Bija), he differed from the usual interpretation owing to a variation in the reading of the text.\(^1\) This is the only information available about him at present. Since this view was conveyed to Jayaratha by his teacher, Ojaraja might have been a predecessor or contemporary of the former's teacher. His date is quite uncertain. He may, tentatively, be placed during the period 1125-1175 A.D. due to his priority to Jayaratha's teacher. We are completely ignorant about other aspects of his personality.

Sivananda II (1125-1175 A.D.): Grand Teacher of Mahesvarananda

The contribution of the grand teacher of Mahesvarananda is so vivid, rich, versatile and profound that it is difficult to find a like of him in the post-Ksemaraja period save, perhaps, Mahesvarananda and Jayaratha. The only drawback that has obscured his exuberant personality is the non-availability of his works in print. In him one is able to trace a systematic development of the post-Ksemaraja form of the Krama system for which Mahesvarananda fully leans on him. And it is really strange, when the Krama philosophy was moving towards its slow but gradual decay in Kashmir, Mahesvarananda and his teachers kindled the fire in full blaze in Cola, the modern Karnatak, on the banks of Kaveri. One may, in other words, still say that their contribution was immense and so powerful that they succeeded in evolving a sort of Southern school of the Krama system - though it is not stated nor claimed anywhere. The thirteen-deity or not-twelve-deity doctrine, the extra emphasis on the five-fold functional dynamism of the Absolute, the sixtyfive mystic aspects of the Vrnda Cakra, and induction

\(^1\) अवस्थायः छ अवस्थायः...इत्यादिना श्रीदेवीपञ्चसातिके माहेश्वरधामसूक्तम्। ।

*T.A.V.*, XII, p. 197.
of greater esotericism in the body metaphysic of the Krama system in common with other cognate tantric creeds are the chief features of this school.

Except once, Mahesvarananda does not refer to his grand teacher, Sivananda, by name. That he is doing so is itself established on going through the collateral evidence. He, however, ascribes the following works to his grand-teacher:

(i) *Rjuvimarsini*²
(ii) *Krama-Vasana*³
(iii) *Subhagodaya*⁴
(iv) *Saubhagyahirdaya*⁵
(v) *Samvit Stotra*⁶
(vi) *Tripurasundarimandira Stotra.*⁷

Of these the first and third works namely, the *Rjuvimarsini*⁸ and the *Subhagodaya*, are extant even today. Their manuscripts in Malayalam characters are available in the Curator's Office Library, Trivandrum. The *Subhagodaya*⁹ is a Tripura work and Sivananda Yogi is the author of the text according to the concluding verses.¹⁰ The *Rjuvimarsini*¹¹ purports to be a commentary on the *Nityasodorikarnava Tantra*¹² on the lines of

¹. तद्युवादनं प्रवृत्तम्। श्रीविष्णुनास्यमयाध्यायत्वं स्वरूपान्योऽनुसरणं प्रभुत्वमिलाति। संहृदृष्टनेऽन्न-शुभम्यमात्रवान्।


⁴. Ibid., p. 132.
⁵. Ibid., pp. 13, 73.
⁶. Ibid., pp. 71, 129.
⁷. Ibid., p. 195.
⁸. The *Rjuvimarsini* has since been brought out under Sarasvati Bhavana Granthamala by the Research Institute, Sanskrit University, Varanasi. It was under preparation while the present work was in progress.
¹⁰. विष्णुनास्यमयाध्यायत्वम्।

MS No. 878B, C.O.L. No. 960B.

¹². व्याकरणिक बनाभ्योऽनुप्राध्यायर्दिक।

Ibid., p. 1921.
the Lopamudra sect of the Tripura system. Its author is Sivananda and his teacher is Svatmananda. The third work i.e., Krama-vasana also passes in the name of the Subhagodaya-vasana. Its manuscripts are preserved in the libraries of the Madras Government and the Kerala University. The fourth work e.g., Saubhagya-hrdayastotra is available in manuscript in the library of BORI, Poona. Both of these works have been taken note of by Mahesvarananda, the Yogini-hrdaya-dipika and the Kama-kala-vilasa-cidvalli. According to Dwivedi, the Sambhavaikya-dipika too is a work by Sivananda and its incomplete manuscript is in the Madras Government Library. Mahesvarananda refers twice to this work but is silent about its authorship.

Before adverting to the question of his time one is called upon to answer an important problem whether Sivananda can be credited with the authorship of the Mahanayaprakasa (T) as well. As will be realized later, a correct answer will necessarily reduce complexity of the riddle.

The authorship of the Mahanayaprakasa is clouded in mystery, as nowhere in the body of the text itself one finds any reference whatever to its author. But the author makes it absolutely clear that he has written some more works as the secrets of the Krama discipline cannot, for fear of corruption and
complacency, be put together at one place and only those who are well conversant with the antecedents and consequents of the Mahanayaprakasa can appreciate its teaching fully.\textsuperscript{1} It is against this background that he refers to the Samvit-stotra in respect of certain doctrines.\textsuperscript{2} And in the end of the printed text he attributes the authorship of the Stotrabhattacharya, too, to himself.\textsuperscript{3} It is to be noted here that one of these texts i.e., Samvit-stotra, has been attributed to his grand teacher by Mahesvarananda. The other work i.e., the Stotrabhattacharya,\textsuperscript{4} as well as the Mahanayaprakasa\textsuperscript{5} have been frequently quoted by Mahesvarananda. Many of the passages ascribed to the Mahanayaprakasa are traceable to the printed text.\textsuperscript{6} But quite a few of them\textsuperscript{7} could not be located in the printed form. This simply goes to prove that the present text as printed is incomplete. It is, no doubt, bewildering that Mahesvarananda, who is so scrupulous in referring to his teacher or grandteacher even where there is no occasion, should maintain reticence over the authorship of these important texts. In the first instance it appears that these works have a different author. But on the second look one may probably have to revise one's opinion. The reasons for this may be set forth below:

1. परं श्रृंखलयों कविताम् निहितविविषयः बिन्नतिः सम्बन्धितम्।
   सर्वसमयमेहत्त्वत्सत्सात्वत प्रकाशते॥
   महानयाप्रकाशिकिन्तुः पुरावर्तथेवतः॥
   हृद्वरणविदुः तेषां वस्तुतत्वं प्रकाशते॥
   \textit{Ibid.}, 0.23-24

2. स्तोत्रस्त्रीयमेव प्रस्तावित बद्धमिति यज्ञयोः।
   \textit{संक्षतीस्त्रीयाः समस्ता प्रमाणार्थम्} वर्तमानः (द्व:?) ते॥
   \textit{M.P.(T)}, 0.27.

3. द्विद्वयंपरास्य द्विद्वयंस्वरूपं भवत्॥
   स्त्रुतः ये विशुद्धः प्रस्तावितः॥
   \textit{Ibid.}, 0.69.

(i) The author of the *Mahanayaprakasa* and the *Stotra Bhattaraka* is the same, because the former uses the word "maya" (by me) with reference to the latter.

(ii) Although the reference to the *Samvit-stotra* is not accompanied by the word "maya" or the like, it comes from the same pen -, contextual evidence lends enough support to it.

(iii) The *Samvit-stotra* has been ascribed to his grand teacher by Mahesvarananda. Hence, by implication, these two works should also be credited to the same authorship.

(iv) Mahesvarananda’s reticence with regard to the two works is suggestive, yet it is not necessarily a negative gesture. Because in the case of the *Sambhavaikyadipika* it was pointed out that it is also a work of Sivananda, the grand teacher of Mahesvarananda, in spite of the fact that he (Mahesvarananda) keeps silent about its authorship, too.

(v) The work named *Stotrabhattaraka* cannot be dismissed as spurious\(^1\) since (a) it has been quoted by Mahesvarananda as well as Jayaratha\(^2\) besides Sivananda, and (b) there is complete correspondence between the *Mahanayaprakasa* and the *Stotrabhattaraka* on the issues e.g., the thirteen Kalis, unity of Prakasa and Ananda, Mantra as Supreme awareness, etc.\(^3\)

(vi) Sivananda in his *Rjuvimarsini* has elevated Prakrta as the official language of the Tripura school. This view was endorsed and its application extended to the Krama system by Mahesvarananda.\(^4\) There is an unmistakable evidence to suggest that the *Mahanayaprakasa* was written originally in vernacular (Bhasaya

---

This coincidence lends a further support to the alleged identity of the authors of the *Rjuvimarsini* with that of the *Mahanayaparakasa*.

(vii) Even if, for a second, this authorship-equation is not granted there is absolutely no doubt that both - the author of the *Samvit-stotra*, as well as that of the *Mahanayaparakasa* - occupy the same point on chronological scale because the author of the latter refers to the former and the grandson of the author of the former refers to the latter. In fact this historical coincidence in point of time is additional evidence in favour of the present contention establishing identity of the two.

In this connection one may agree with Dr. Pandey in rejecting the ascription of the *Mahanayaparakasa* to Abhinavagupta by Sambasiva Sastri. The contention is utterly untenable in the face of the *Mahanayaparakasa* clearly betraying the influence of Ksemaraja.

Let us now revert to the period of Sivananda. The latest author referred to by Sivananda is Ksemaraja in the *Rjuvimarsini*. The books referred to are the *Sambapancasika* and *Pratyabhijna-hrdaya Sutra*. The precise implication is that Ksemaraja marks Sivananda's upper time-limit. Amrtananda, the author of the *Dipika* on the *Yogini Hrdaya* and a pupil of Punyananda, refers to the *Subhagodayavasana* (i.e., *Krama-vasana*) of Sivananda. Although Amrtananda's time has not been finally
settled the general opinion among the scholars is to place him somewhere in the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{1} This may form the lower limit of Sivananda's emergence. It is extremely significant to note that Jayaratha refers to two works of Sivananda namely, the *Stotrabhattaraka* and *Mahanayaprakasa*. The first is mentioned with explicit reference to the title of the text.\textsuperscript{2} A passage is cited\textsuperscript{3} from the other without disclosing the source, but the same is found in the *Mahanayaprakasa*.\textsuperscript{4} It is quoted as a *prima facie* view propounding the thesis of the thirteen Kalis against that of Jayaratha's Kali-theory. Jayaratha's time is almost certain. His father Srngararatha was a court-minister of king Rajaraja who is identified with the king Jayasimha (1127-1151 A.D.). Hence he, in any case, must be active during the second half of the twelfth century (1150-1200 A.D.). Thus Sivananda cannot be brought below this period, i.e., 1150-1200 A.D. Ksemaraja, who constitutes upper limit, is assigned to about 975-1025 A.D. The gap can be reduced further, Mahesvarananda refers to the *Cidgaganacandrika* of which the probable time is almost settled. It is put around 1125-1175 A.D. Mahesvar-

\textsuperscript{1} Y.H.D., p. na. (Skt. Int.).

\textsuperscript{2} अत एव भीतोभंभुर्कर्के
कालावलयाधीयोक्तन(थाम बिरं जयाधारक्षकाशायिण)
करं महरसंहृतिरिष्टम् गत विदाकाः प्रत्यक्षविस्मरणी

इथाविना संहृतारूपेनां अविशेषः जनतः

*T.A.F.*, III, p. 223.

\textsuperscript{3} नन्दु प्रभृत: परस्पर: संवीदोभौर्यस्य प्रभाणा प्रगाधामकल्पमुक्तम्

पुस्तम—एकं स्वरुपां हि मानयेत्भमतितः

यत्रावरसङ्ग्रहययुद्धकालस्य वर्त्ते

स्वरुपां विदि विदितुः प्रत्येकं कालावलयान्तः

भृतिस्वरूपां विद्वत्वादितिभिर्भस्म्य तत् अपि कालावलयान्तः

कालावलयान्तमुत्वान्तां विभवी हि यः

तत्त्व मिथ्यानिर्देशित ततो देवश्वेदः

अनार्घीनं प्राध्यामाल्पूजनीयमित्रम रिष्टितः

इदिः

इति

हूः च इत्यक्षममुद्भवे वृत्ति किलेताः

\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{4} M.P.(T)., 9.15.18.
ananda is the grand pupil of Sivananda. It is, therefore, necessary that whatever probable period of Sivananda's existence one may arrive at, it must account for both of them. Sivananda is removed from Mahesvarananda only by a generation. Since the latter refers to the *Cidgaganacandrika*, his upper limit must be determined by this fact, that is, Mahesvarananda cannot belong to an earlier period than 1125-1175 A.D. On the other hand, Sivananda, by virtue of his being alluded to by Jayaratha, is not supposed to cross the period 1150-1200 A.D. In other words the upper limit of Sivananda does not extend beyond 1075-1125 A.D. (As it is 1125-1175 A.D. for Mahesvarananda) The lower limit of Sivananda is almost decided, as noted above. Hence Sivananda must flourish somewhere between 1075-1125 A.D. to 1125-1200 A.D. In order that Jayaratha might be able to refer to him he must be placed, at least by a generation above Jayaratha i.e., 1125-1175 A.D. He may, therefore be assigned to the second and third Quarter of the twelfth century. This also satisfactorily accounts for both of them, the grandteacher and his grand pupil, as will be clear from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sivananda (1125-1175 A.D.)</th>
<th>Mahaprapaka (1150-1200 A.D.)</th>
<th>Mahesvarananda (1175-1225 A.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In this case Mahesvarananda does not ascend beyond 1125-1275 A.D. on the upper side and Sivananda does not descend below 1150-1175 A.D. on the lower side.

Now his system-wise contribution may be detailed in the form of the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tripura system</th>
<th>Indefinite</th>
<th>Krama system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Kramavasana Subhagodayavasana)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Stotra- Bhattaraka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subhagodaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tripura-sundarimandira-stotra.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For reasons of space we are constrained to leave out the detailed discussion on each work.


txxxix\textit{ Mahaprapakasa} (1150-1200 A.D.)

 Mahaprapakasa is the esteemed teacher of Mahesvarananda\textsuperscript{1} and himself a disciple of Sivananda. His time, therefore, ceases to be a problem and he is assigned to the latter half of the twelfth century.

 Mahesvarananda has paid glowing tributes to his wide erudition, profound scholarship and spiritual achievements.\textsuperscript{2} It was upon his interpretation of the dream and inspiration that Mahesvarananda took to writing of the \textit{Mahartha-manjari}.\textsuperscript{3}

 He had traditional insight into the Mahartha system which came direct to him through his teacher and which he passed on to his illustrious pupil.\textsuperscript{4} He is described as an author of the tantric treatises (Tantrakrt), though none of his works is physically extant. All his works are accessible only in the form of extracts therefrom in the \textit{Parimala}. He was a prolific author of the Stotras, three of which have been brought to our notice by \textit{Parimala}. His \textit{Matangistotra} probably dealt with the concept of Suddha-vidya.\textsuperscript{5} His another stotra was the \textit{Anandatandavavilasa-stotra} pertaining to the Absolute

\textsuperscript{1} नमः विश्वेन्द्र हृदेश्वरे श्रीमाने महारथ भक्ति ।
प्रसन्नतात् महारथश्रवणीमयो भुजित महेश्वररामसः।
\textit{M.M.} 1.

\textsuperscript{2} \text{तव्यं तव्यस्यं तिलो तदर्शवत्कालिनः}।
महारथस्मृतिर्यां श्रवणायामेव देयिन्द्रम्।
\textit{M.M.P.}, p. 199.

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., p. 197.

\textsuperscript{5} \text{यथृत्तमस्यूप्यास्मिन् कीमात्रेऽहृदेश्वरे} —
\text{हतात् मायो यूर्द्धविश्वासुक्ती सुविद्यो तवथाय नवमित्य श्रवणार्यो}}।
\text{प्रियता वर्मनानिदिष्कृती सुनिंदे मयो तर्न वाहुमित्रद्वयकाशो}।
\textit{Ibid.}, p. 44.
freedom as the cosmic principle of causation.\(^1\) The third stotra i.e., \textit{Manonusasana-stotra} dealt with the principle of mind as a unique sense-instrument.\(^2\) His greatest contribution, however, was Mahesvarananda himself.

(xl) \textit{Jayaratha} (1150-1200 A.D.)

The name of Jayaratha is a milestone in the history of the Krama thought. His commentary on the first, fourth, thirteenth and twenty-ninth Ahnikas of the \textit{Tantraloka} is not only a monument of the Krama culture and philosophical discipline but also a repository of the innumerable historical allusions without which the Krama history would have suffered in accuracy, precision and vastness. The last verse of his \textit{Viveka} on the \textit{Tantraloka} proclaims him to be a thinker of profound merit and matchless standing in Krama in addition to all the then important branches of learning.\(^3\) And it is not a boastful or conceited statement, since it is well known that his contribution covers a vast field ranging from all the schools under Kashmir Saivism and Tripura System to literature. In Krama, he is proud of the fact that he directly came in the preceptorial lineage of Bhanuka, a student of Keyuravati.\(^4\) He

---

1. यथोपत्तमस्यस्मांसीमितिविषयात्माचारविविधस्वतः —
   यथाविषयं विभागः विहितं फलस्य तदन्तोष्णे।
   स्वस्वप्नम् विज्ञानावधानस्वतान्त्रयत्वैः नगम:।
   \textit{M.M.P.}, p. 100.

2. तुदुःस्यस्मांस्यभावसाधनस्तोलोके—
   हृदाः पतििते प्राचर्य यात्रा तदन्तोष्णे महासङ्करास्ते।
   अत्यद्वृता तव गार्गेयवर्मनस्य निधिन्ययः विद्यमानः।
   \textit{Ibid}, p. 12; also see pp. 46, 94.

3. पदेः पदयु भावे निखिलाविष्कारश्वेतुणिष्ठदि
   अविद्यायाय यातरुहां दयमिर निर्मित ज्ञात:।
   तथापि अभावं वानस्य भौति नान्ति विकारानि
   भलेऽभवद् च भवतः तदपि भुवन: कालिकस्य।

4. तद्रेषु (पालुकक) ४०४: ४०५। शारदयुक्ते-भावनापदिकातीतयाकेषु परिवर्त्येन विद्यमानः।
was, equally, conversant with the other tradition headed by Govindaraja.\footnote{1} And, in addition, his familiarity with the southern scholars\footnote{2} goes to evince the vast realm of Krama practically covered by him. Jayaratha probably understood the value of viewing a scholar, for fuller appreciation, against his historical background. He, therefore, provides us with a sufficiently detailed account of his ancestral as well as preceptorial lineage which may be given in these tables.\footnote{3} (see pp. 211, 212)

From these tables it may be clear that his time poses no difficulty. The dates of his three ancestors are known. From Utpalaratha II (1028-63 A.D.) he is away by four generations and from Sivaratha (1101-11 A.D.) he is separated by three generations. Srngararatha, his father and a minister of Raja-raja, who is generally identified with king Jayasimha (1127-1151 A.D.), is succeeded by him immediately. On the preceptorial plane, he is removed by two generations from Visnadatta, his great-grand teacher and a younger contemporary of Utpalaratha II (1028-1063 A.D.), who brought the former up after the death of his father. After giving due allowance for the intervening generations, he may be safely assigned to the second half of the twelfth century (i.e., 1150-1200 A.D.). This is further confirmed by the fact that he in his Vimarsini refers to the Prthvirajavijaya\footnote{4} of Jayanaka. According to the general consensus of historians Prthviraja died in the year 1193 A.D. and before his death the work had been written. This is vindicated still further by the fact that Jayaratha wrote his Vimarsini on the Alamkara Sarvasva of Ruuyaka who was a senior (Seep. 211)

1. पदविकारण श्रीपोणिकन्दराददीवामुद्देशः प्रकृतो योजन्यर्युक्तकामि प्राप्तः।
   
   Ibid., p. 198.

2. Ibid., pp. 128 [quoting Mahanayaprakasa (T)] and 223 (quoting Stotra bhattaraka).

3. Ibid., XII, pp. 430-433.

4. यथा पुरोपरापविषये—

   पूर्वत्तिः प्रकृत भवस्तु बाणर्षिविप्रयत्मः।
   अन्नभद्रेभ यथाकान्तिनिष्ठयति नामदा॥

   Alahkara-sarvasva-vimarsini, p. 82.
I. Parental Genealogy

Pūṇamanceratha (Minister of Yaśaskara 939 A.D.)

Utpalaratha I

Prakāśaratha

Dharmaratha  Uttamaratha  Sūryaratha  Manoratha

Amṛtaratha  Viśiṣṭaratha  Utpalaratha II

Jyeṣṭharatha (Minister of Ananta)

1028-1063 A.D.

Sivaratha  Śakraratha  Sammaratha  Nandiratha

(Minister of Ucchala)

1101-11 A.D.

Gūnaratha  Devaratha

Gūgharatha  Lankāratha

Śrīgararatha

(Minister of Rājarāja (Jayasimha))

1127-1155 A.D.

Jayaratha  Jayadratha

1. T.A.V., XII, p. 430, verse 8.
2. Ibid., verse 13.
3. निरवर्तय्युष्यो स्वासमय विवर्त्यालयः।
   विष्णुः परस्परेन हुमलत्वदिको व्यस्त्यवत॥

   RAj. T., VIII, V, 911.

5. We know of one Rajadeva (1213-1236 A.D.) also. But it is difficult
to identify him with Rājarāja because, on the testimony of Jonarāja
(Raj. Verse 74-87) he was just a usurper and had neither talents nor
energy for asserting his authority (vide Raj. of Jonarāja, pp. 56-57
V.V.R.I.). It is difficult to believe that such a king would have
patronized Jayaratha. In addition, this equation will also lead to
historical and chronological absurdities which it would be difficult to
reconcile.
II. Preceptorial Genealogy

![Genealogy Diagram]

Contemporary of Mankha (1125-1175 A.D.). Hence Jayaratha's date may either coincide with Mankha's or be little later. Since Jayaratha's father is a minister of king Jayasimha (1127-1151 A.D.), he must succeed his father. Moreover, Jayaratha owes the inspiration for writing his Viveka to the same king. His date must be in the vicinity of the time of Jayasimha's reign. In view of all these factors, he must be placed during the latter half of the twelfth century.

Thus he was gifted both ways - parentally as well as preceptorially. Even his younger brother Jayadratha is famous for his epic poem called Haracarita-cintamani and his stotra

1. T.A.V., XII, pp. 430-31, 433-34.
2. तं शौचक्षेपालस्य श शिष्यं मुद्रयुद्धरूपः ।
   सौभाग्यमयक्षोतसंवेदमानन्त स ॥
3. इति भव यज्ञक्षेत्रायं विवेचनाय सतो
   निर्यिविभिभिविश्वसंहः त एव निमित्ताम् ॥
called Paridevitadvadasika, still unpublished, but available in manuscript\(^1\) in the library of Sanskrit Parishad, Lucknow. There is no ground for the identity of the two brothers as alleged in some quarters because Jayaratha makes it clear that he was the elder.\(^2\)

He was son of Srngararatha who carried out renovations of five buildings at the Mahadeva hill.\(^3\) His initiation was performed by Subhatadatta\(^4\) whose Vivarana on the Tantraloka proved a model for his Viveka.\(^5\) In statecraft he owed his proficiency to his father’s teacher Srngara, son of Dasirajanaka.\(^6\) He received lessons in Saivism and other agamic lores from Kalyana. His other teacher Sankhadhara or Sangadhara imparted education in all other sciences including Grammar and Mimams.\(^7\)

Coming to his works one finds that his creative genius almost covered all the fields and in this he is superseded only by his master Abhinavagupta. The Viveka on the Tantraloka is

1. Classification No. 175 (Bhakti).

2. अये‌दोजनोक्षारिः संवानिकों विदेशिनम् ।
   \textit{T.A.V.}, XII, p. 434, v. 41.


4. श्रीसुभोतसलु आरीसस्य गृहाः ममाध्यूक्त दे‌शाम् ।
   \textit{Ibid.}, verse 35.

5. श्रीशुभोतसलुके किव गृहांतर्र विवर्णम् ।
   यथस्थ मर्याद्यो निष्शिलविशारामार्घविदभुतः ।
   \textit{Ibid.}, verse 39.

6. अये‌दोजनो किश्तवतो राजांतिपासम् गृहः ।
   \textit{Ibid.}, verse 36.

7. श्रीशुभोतसलुके किवतो जगादिधर्मः
   श्रीक्षुड़हरामपरं परिपरं विद्याम् सवांस्थितः ।

Also see \textit{T.A.V.}, XII, p. 433, verse 39-41.
The Krama Tantricism of Kashmir

a monument of his learning, but for which Abhinava would have been a mystery to us. On the Tripura system he gave us Vivarana which was a commentary on the Vamakesvarimata. On the rise and development of the Tripura system in Kashmir no better source can be pointed out.

In the field of poetics he wrote Vimarsini on the Alamkara-sarvasva of Ruyyaka and presented a model of constructive literary criticism to the later commentators. Among his thoroughly original works he is credited with writing a work called Alamkarodaharana that served as a preliminary to the studies in poetics by his grandson Sangaka. In the last verse of this work, he refers to his Vimarsini. There is a manuscript of it in the BORI Library, Poona. Besides these, he composed a Stotra also, three verses from which are quoted by Sivopadhyaya in his commentary on the Vijnanabhairava. Sivopadhyaya also cites his opinion on the natural Japa. Jayaratha quotes from himself without specifying the source of his own statement in the Vamakesvarimata-vivarana. On comparing the nature and versi-

1. प्रतिःपुत्रायनमेवेदारु स्युष्येश्व विचारायः ।
बर्तकारविगमिन्यो दुतित्रप्रभास यत् ॥
एक्समुदाय निम्न स्वस्वव वास्ये भृतायिन्यो वैतम् ॥
अन्तिमानिकातिक्षणविशिष्टाः प्रधाणः संसुथाय यत् ॥

2. MS. No. 240 of 1875-76 of Government Collection.
3. जयराघवीलातिरचीतियानां तैराधिकारियों अनुपुस्तकात् युध्वक्षरः स्तोत्रः ।

V.Bh.V., p. 125.

4. इचलमृगासंगीतं चोप्र संघोमेवले जननमरणां मायाः कालाः वित्तिकाः ।
अन्तिमार्ध्रांत्येवपद्यारंश्च विशिष्टां अनुपद्यानां हि नापरस्नेऽनि ॥

Ibid., p. 138.
6. V.M.V., p. 58.
cular style of the two passages, the likelihood of his having written another work or works on the Tripura or other systems becomes stronger.

(xli) Mahesvarananda (1175-1225 A.D.)

Mahesvarananda is one of the most prolific authors on the Krama system. His solitary extant work, the Maharathamanjari with the Parimala on it, gives a clear idea of his deep insight into and enormous contribution to the Krama system. Like Jayaratha, he also claims a complete command over not only the Pratyabhijna Karikas and Sivadrsti, but also on the manifold secrets of the Krama philosophy. He moved with equal felicity in the Kula system. The very pattern on which the Maharathamanjari moves, conforms to his synthetic approach to the Krama system by placing it in the overall perspective of the Kashmir Saivism. This attempt of his reflects the impact of the Tantraloka which marks an essay in synthesis and not in isolated analysis of the Trika systems.

His original name was Goraksa, but on his baptism he was named Mahesvarananda by his teacher. He is apparently different from his various namesakes in tantric philosophy.* The traditional Krama philosophy was inherited by him and he came direct in the line of the Krama teachers. He hailed from Cola, modern Karnatak, on the banks of Kaveri (southern Mysore). He was the son of Madhu (Madhava) and a devout pupil of Mahaprakasa. He became a consummate scholar in

1. Abhi., p. 274.
3. Ibid., p. 1.
poetics after acquiring an insight into the *Kavyaloka* of Ananda-vardhana and the *Locana* by Abhinava.\(^1\) Then he made his way into the Pratyabhijna system. As a yogin he conducted successful experiments in spiritualism and consequently was a self-realized person.\(^2\) Like Jayaratha, he has secured an enviable position, since he ensures a monolith of information for the historical reconstruction of the Kashmir Saivism in general and the krama system in particular. As mentioned by him, he travelled far and wide in almost every direction before he took to writing the *Maharthamanjari*.\(^3\)

He belongs to the close of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century (1175-1225 A.D.). One need not go into the reasons for it, since they have already been dwelt upon at length while discussing the period of his grand teacher Sivananda.

Whatever contribution he has made to the Krama system or other fields is known today from references only made by himself in the *Parimala* commentary. So far we know of eleven works from his pen -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of work</th>
<th>Number of the reference-page in M.M.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mahartha-manjari</td>
<td>(Extant).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parimala</td>
<td>(Extant).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Padukodaya</td>
<td>11-12, 90, 99, 100, 103, 105, 112, 118, 149, 177.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. सांहिक्यायिके कहाँदारोध्यात् काव्यालीकृ तीचन चानुषैन्यः।
तदरू स्वतंत्र तत्कावन्तम बोध्य मान्यो भूल्या प्रस्तुतिसकाल्याम्।


2. समयानुस्वर्तकसुष्माविभिकसम्भवस्मेंकोरमारोक्त्विकालास्मालोक्यः
अंतरानायांवेषयास्तव्यादिक्योधिकांनन्दिनान्तः।


3. अर्थमुन्दे बेतन्त मित्रं जप्तं ध्यायंकम विश्वलम्।
पवेण देवय विनाशलम् लक्ष्मण्य विभ्रस्तं विश्वलः।

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of work</th>
<th>Number of the reference-page in M.M.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Parastotra</td>
<td>77-78, 94, 107, 140, 148.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mukundakeli</td>
<td>73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kundalabharana</td>
<td>73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Nakhapratapa</td>
<td>73.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps, he has written certain other works in addition to the above. In the penultimate verse of the Parimala he has spoken of one Krama as his work.\(^1\) We are not aware if the verse may be interpreted otherwise. For, the use of plural number in the word "Krama" coming at the end of Samahara-Dvandva compound should bear out the present observation. Even otherwise he cites a passage without indicating its source and ascribing it to himself.\(^2\) The verse in question discusses the technical Krama concept of 'Gati'. It is again doubtful if the said verse is from the book suggested above. If this contention holds good, the number of his works goes up to twelve.

It appears that the Parimala on the Maharthamanjari is his last work, because it is here that the cognizance of these works is taken. It is, however, certain that Maharthamanjari was taken up immediately after his Padukodaya.\(^3\) On his own admission\(^4\) we know that at least his five works namely, Maharthamanjari (and for the reason of that Parimala, too), Padukodaya, Komalavalli-or Komala-stava, Parastuti and Krama are strictly the Krama

---

1. **Footnote 1 above.** *(M.M.P. p. 203.)*

2. **Footnote 2 above.** *(Ibid., p. 180.)*

3. **Footnote 3 above.** *(Ibid., p. 199.)*

4. **Footnote 4 above.**
texts. However, this list leaves out the Maharthodaya which, too, is a Krama text as its very name implies and which primarily deals with rejuvenation of the respective deities and mantras.1 His other two works namely, Samvidullasa and Sukta, are no doubt philosophical works and in a broad way echo the salient theses of the Kashmir Saivism, but no information is at hand about their precise doctrinal associations. Regarding the rest of the works that comprise Kundalabharana, Mukundakeli and Nakhapratapa, the absence of extracts therefrom and Mahesvarananda's wholesale taciturnity make it extremely difficult to be definite about them. But the contextual evidence does demonstrate his emphasis on the literary merit of these works.2 Probably these were the pieces of literature. Although the Komalavallistava and Parimala have also figured in along with these, they have been shown to be Krama works.

The Maharthamanjari was the practical realization of a divine vision. The story has it that he was impelled by a Yogini, in whom he visualized Kalasamkarsini, to undertake the writing of the Maharthamanjari.3 Obviously, according to Prof. A.N. Upadhye, it is a composition of the Saptati or Saptati pattern.4 Since the Yogini, who appeared in dream used Prakrta in expressing her will, he adopted Prakrta in his Maharthamanjari though he does not betray the command on Prakrta which he has on Sanskrit.5 But philosophically it is a mature text and

1. अन्तः तस्ततां त्वां तस्ततां त्वां तस्ततां त्वां तस्ततां त्वां तस्ततां त्वां तस्ततां त्वां तस्ततां
2. अतः श्रवणायं स्वरुपाधिन यथार्थमानं साहित्यविहितं स्वरुपाधिनं रूपाधिनं स्वरुपाधिनं स्वरुपाधिनं स्वरुपाधिनं स्वरुपाधिनं स्वरुपाधिनं स्वरुपाधिनं स्वरुपाधिनं स्वरुपाधिनं
3. भवसंदर्भमुद्ध्वाय सम्बंधतिन्निर्माणिनी देवी
5. The composition of the Gathas clearly betrays that the author thinks and mentally drafts first in Sanskrit and then renders them into Prakrit. This introduces a mechanical form and dialectical artificiality in the verses. Ibid.
well deserves its description as a "Prasthan Grantha".\(^1\) It was also known as Mahakrama-manjari.\(^2\)

The work called Padukodaya is so named because it expounded the notion of Paduka as its central theme. Paduka is identical with the Power-absolute which consists in pure bliss and tends to eliminate the sense of duality between self and notself.\(^3\) It is purely a Krama concept.\(^4\) Mahesvarananda has considerably influenced the subsequent tantric literature. For instance, Sivopadhyaya leans on him for supporting his several statements.\(^5\) Ramesvara, the commentator on Parasu-rama-kalpa-sutra, refers to him on no less than three occasions.\(^6\) Kaivalyasrama quotes from his Parimala in the Saubhagyavardhini on the Ananda-Lahari,\(^7\) Rajanakalaksirmarama, an 18th century commentator on Paratrimsika quotes the Maharthamanjari in his commentary styled as lagku-Vrtti.\(^8\) Saubhagyvardhi i also refers to some Parastotra and cites from it.\(^9\) It is not known if it was identical with one composed by our author.

It is to be noted that Jayarasi Bhatta, the author of the Tattvopaplava-simha styles his work as the Maharthodaya.\(^10\) But it is definitely a different work, because (i) Jayarasi Bhatta is much anterior to Mahesvarananda, and (ii) the work by the former is addressed to the Lokayata system, whereas the latter's deals with the Krama system. Hence the two cannot be identical.

2. Ibid.  
3, 4. तस्मात्प्राविष्टतारकचित्रम्—परापरागतम्: तस्मात्: परानत्ममयी स्वातिरंकुञ्जलनोद्वृत्ता परा शक्तिः पद्धकेष्वी मीपते हति।...हति निघारा प्रत्याविष्टवा जनार्दनमें वर्दायते गीवपुरुषोऽवर्ते तत्स्तिः। । ।
6. V.Bh.V., pp. 109, 111, 137.  
7. P.K.S., pp. 64, 95, 114, 115, 117.  
8. S.V. on A.L., p. 46.  
10. महाठ्यद्विविद्याचारिकृतम्: जुभदो महापादवः।
   तस्मात्प्राविष्टतारकचित्रम्—एव हति म: क्षमति द्वारे यास्मिन्
   Tattvopaplava-simha of Jayarasi Bhatta, p. 125 (last portion)
With such an outstanding personality the later stage of the creative phase comes to an end and one finally enters into a period of darkness and complete decadence.

Sitikantha (1450-1500 A.D.)

Barring the studies in Cola, the Krama studies in Kashmir practically came to a dead stop after Jayaratha. This lull is broken by Sitikantha. Thus there were a few sporadic activities during this period as references to one Siddhapada by Sitikantha show, who like Lalla ventilated his views through the then Kashmiri dialect. There is reason to believe that the traditional lore of the system also did not die out completely because Sitikantha himself claims to have inherited from, through preceptorial lineage indeed, Isana who was one of the eight students of Cakrabanu. But there is no evidence to indicate if it had any creative activity worth the name. The three hundred and odd blank years are beset with the appearance of Sitikantha on the Krama horizon with his *Mahanayaka Prakasa* which is different from its namesake by Sivananda from Cola.

Besides the *Mahanayaka Prakasa*, his other works include the *Stotramala*, *Kaulasutra* and commentary on the *Katantra Vrtti*. The *Mahanayaka Prakasa* or *Maharthaprakasa*, as it is alluded to by several catalogues, is extant in print and is almost complete (KSS No. XXI). Not only that it helps one trace the missing links in the history but also that it gives a thorough exposition of the Mahartha principle. It is composed in the local vernacular of Kashmir of his time. But the commentary, that too

---

1. वदू तिथिपाशा आदिवरिष्टूं:...... I  
   *M.P. (S)*, p. 32; also pp. 59-60.

2. तत्तन्त्र मातृपृथ्वीने तिथिओधारणीमानस: रूपानां विद्यानां प्रमु: तन्मध्यानां 
   ईशानां विशिष्टित परमध्यविदाम्।  
   *M.P. (S)*, p. 107.

It may, however, be noted that the pedigree of his teachers to be given towards the end of this section does not include the name of Isana. It is possible that Soma, who heads the list, might have come in that tradition - we do not know.

3. Dr. Pandey attributes, perhaps due to oversight, this work to the author of *Mahanayaka Prakasa*. Vide *Abhi.* p. 439. Sitikantha ascribes the work to himself; *M.P. (S).* p. 47.

4. अयोध्यातिरिक्तो गृहु सर्वनामान्यम् देवोनिष्ठेन संस्कृतिविदाह्।  
   *M.P. (S).* pp. 47-48.
also by the same author, is in Sanskrit. Towards the beginning of the century Grierson contributed a valued paper on the philological study of the Kashmiri language as used in this work. For reasons of space as well as relevance one has to abstain from going into details on this question.¹ He himself refers to the Stotramala as a work from his pen.² There are two manuscripts of the same name in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.³ As the contents of the MSS could not be looked into, it is difficult to be sure of its author or subject matter. But presumably it pertains to the Stotramala of Sitikantha, because hitherto no Stotramala by any other author has come to light as belonging to the Kashmir Saivism. The Kula Sutra or Kaulasutra is his next work which pertains to the Kula system. Sitikantha also quotes from one Kulasutra without mentioning the author.⁴ But the two manuscripts that are available today ascribe it to the authorship of Sitikantha in their colophons.⁵ Aufrecht has taken notice of this

1. "The results value from two points of view. In the first place, they show clearly the lines of connection between the Indo-aryan side of Kashmiri and Sanskrit and, in the second place, they throw light on the various forms in Modern Kashmiri that, but for the Mahanayaparakasa, would be inexplicable."


2. यस्युन्त स्तोत्रमालां मयीः

   निदोषस्य निवेधस्य यथोऽयं परदुपलब्धीगुणां गणों बहि: ।
   अवश्यद्वारा ध्यात सन्नातमालां सरस्य निदोषस्य निवेधस्य बहि: ||

   M.P. (S), pp. 47-49.

3. MSS Nos. 568 and 569 of 1884-86, BORI, Poona.

4. तथा च कुलदुपारपु वर्णम्

   कुलपीठशास्त्रिनां भ्रमणप्रभावपरीप्रस्थितमालास्माकर्षणाः
   बहुभावाभिमानसंविशे: समायानं गुणमालाखानं धारीतः ।

   M.P. (S), p. 60.

5. तितिवस्त्रितिनी श्रुणसि

   (Kashmir MS),
   कुलपीठशास्त्रिनां भ्रमणप्रभावपरीप्रस्थित श्रुणसि

   (BORI MS).
work.\textsuperscript{1} The one of the two extant manuscripts of this work belongs to Pt. Dinanatha Yaksa, the formerly head Pandit of Sanskrit section, Research Department, Srinagar and other is available in BORI Library, Poona.\textsuperscript{2} Both the MSS begin with a similar remark by the scribe that he has written only a part of the text owing to the mutilated and dilapidated condition of the model script.\textsuperscript{3} But still the MS at BORI is more correct and enlarged. The (BORI) MS appears to have finished where its Kashmiri counterpart ends,\textsuperscript{4} but it again takes up the thread. The \textit{Kulasutra} seems to have been originally divided into sixteen chapters called Svarakalas.\textsuperscript{5} The (BORI) MS in its continuation gives seven such Kalas from 10th to 16th. The nine are missing. Under such circumstances one should not be surprised if one does not find the passage cited by Sitikantha in the MS. The work is in the Sutra style and highlights the esoteric aspect of the Kula system. The relevant aspects of the text of the MS have been taken note of in the philosophical portion of the thesis. It may, however, be noted in passing that the BORI MS refers to the Kula and Krama system alike.\textsuperscript{6} And a comparative analysis of the \textit{Mahanayaprakasa} and the \textit{Kulasutra} unearths the identity of views with regard to a few controversial problems of the Krama and further establishes the oneness of their authorship. His fourth work, called Nyasa, is a famous sub-commentary on the \textit{Balabodhini} commentary by Jagaddhara on the \textit{Katamtra Vratti}. The present enquiry would not be even remotely connected with the work in the present

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{Cat. Cat, App. I. 445.}
\textsuperscript{2} MS. No. 445 of 1875-76, BORI, Poona.
\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Cat, App. I. 445. (Both MSS).}
\textsuperscript{4} MS. BORI, folio 2a (Kashmiri MS ends here).
\textsuperscript{5} MS. BORI, folio 4b.
\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Ibid., folio 3a.}
context, but for its autobiographical references that make the
task of determining his date much easier. He is remotely blood-
related to Jagaddhara. He is son of the daughter's daughter of
the great-grandson of Jagaddhara.\footnote{1} And he wrote his Nyasa
during the reign of Hasan Shah, the son of Haider Shah.\footnote{2} Sri
Mahavira Prasad Dwivedi basing his conclusions on the various
statements of the Nyasa points out that before he undertook to
write the Nyasa, he visited Gujarat and was warmly received by
the king Mohammad Shah.\footnote{3} According to the Kasmirakusum\textperpendic\textperpendica by Hariscandra, Husain Shah came to throne in 4583 Kali year
equivalent to 1482 A.D. This date is confirmed, with slight
modification, by Srivara who puts the period of reign of Hasan
Shah from 1472 to 1484 A.D.\footnote{4} and, according to the Rasamala,\footnote{5}
Mohammad Shah ruled over Gujarat from 1458 to 1511 A.D.
On the basis of these historical data it is easy to find out his
place in the chronology. He had visited Gujarat before he
wrote his commentary; and while he started writing, king
Hasan Shah was at the helm. Hence he must have begun his
work by 1480-82 A.D. Allowing a margin of about thirty years
for intellectual equipment he may be assigned to the latter half
of the loth century. That is, he seems to have flourished during
1450-1500 A.D. On the basis of a few verses in the introduction,
according to Dr. Nagarajan,\footnote{6} his family tree on the parental

\footnote{1} Quoted from \textit{Ny\textperpendic\textperpendica}, Grierson, “The Language of the
Mahânavaprat\textperpendic\textperpendic\textperpendic\textperpendic, p. 74.

\footnote{2} Ibid.

\footnote{3} Vide “नयसा का सूत्राकृत समालोचना” by Mahavira Prasad Dwivedi,
Kalyana, Sivanka, pp. 317-325 (reproduced from his work called
Sahitya Sandarbha).

\footnote{4} (Vide Raj. T. by Srivara, Chap. VI) \textit{Ibid.}

\footnote{5} Contribution, p. 520,

\footnote{6} Contribution, p. 520.
side, may be roughly drawn up in this manner:

```
    Soma
     |
    Avatāraka
     |
    Manohara
     |
    Mocaka
     |
    Yodhaka
     |
    Arjuna
     |
 Šrīkanṭha
```

It is also gathered that Srivara, perhaps the famous historian who was patronized by Sultan Zainul-Abidin, Haider Shah and Hasan Shah successively, Srinasesa (?) and Varadesvara were his teachers. It is, thus, obvious that preceptorially and ancestrally - on both sides - he was richly endowed with an atmosphere conducive to scholarly pursuits.

(xliii) Ananta Saktipada (1700-1750 A.D.)

The colophon of the published commentary on the Vatulanatha-sutra attributes it to some Anantasaktipada. Although the tradition as recorded here belongs to the Sahasa school and is traced to one very old preceptor of the Krama school namely, Niskriyanandanatha, the commentary as such is quite recent. One knows nothing about the actual author of the Sutras or the commentator thereon. One of the reasons behind this ignorance lies in its total escape from the notice of other texts and scholars. This commentary, like Chummasampradaya-prakasa, must be of quite late origin. In the absence of any evidence, either external and internal, it may be bracketed with the

\(^1\) [Samaṣṭhe śrīmadvāstuṇḍakṛṣṇa-śloka-puruṣa: śrī śrīmadvāstottara-prakāśa.]

---

\(^1\) Note: The author has referenced a Sanskrit verse from the Śrīmadvāstuṇḍa-sūtra, which is a part of the Śrīmad-vāstu-sūtra, a text associated with the Śrīmadvāstuṇḍa tradition. The verse mentions Śrīmadvāstuṇḍa and his work, indicating his association with the Śrīmadvāstuṇḍa tradition.

---
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Chumma Sampradaya on the basis of the similarity of contents. Since a passage from the Chumma Sampradaya has been quoted by Sivopadhyaya (18th century), Ananta Saktipada can only be placed somewhere before him. While discussing Niskriyananda some doubts in this behalf have already been expressed.

According to M.S. Kaul, the editor of the printed text, the glossator seems to have commented also upon the Bahurupagarbha-stotra. The MS. No. 1135 of 1886-92 at BORI, Poona contains the text of the Bahurupagarbhasotra with a Vrtti which is bound in a single cover with the Svacchanda Tantra. It is not known if it is identical with one in question.

(xliv) Bhattaraka (1700-1750 A.D.)

Not much is known about Bhattaraka except that he was the author of the work named Prakrtatrimisa-vivarana. The frequent discussion on the nature of the Vrdacakra was the main feature of the book - this is all that Sivopadhyaya tells us. The fact that the text primarily deals with the Vrnda-cakra is enough to prove that it was a Krama text. From the pattern of the title of the text, it may be conjured up that it was probably an exposition of some text in Pakrta language modelled on the pattern of the Para Trimsika in Sanskrit. Since it is from Sivopadhyaya’s reference that one comes to know of him, he may be tentatively placed prior to Sivopadhyaya who is assigned to the period 1725-1775 A.D.

(xlv) Sivopadhyaya (1725-1775 A.D.)

With him the Krama system finally comes to a full stop. He is not primarily a Krama author, yet the reason for present temptation to include him among the Krama authors lies in his ingenious remarks that he has never failed to make about the intricacies of the Krama system, whenever he could seize an opportunity to do so throughout his Vivrti on the Vijnana-

1. V.Bh.V, p. 67.
2. V.N.S., Foreword, p. 2.
3. वृद्धचक्रलिपिकारुचि सुदृढ्छ्य श्लोकाष्ठ ज्ञानशास्त्राध्यायो विद्वानं इत्यतः "V.Bh.V., p. 69."
In depth, subtlety and maturity, he sometimes reminds us of the best masters and presupposes a little bit of acquaintance with the system on the part of the reader. It will be amply borne out in the philosophical portion of the present work.

His erstwhile printed work, the Vivrti, is an attempt to restore to posterity the commentary of Ksemaraja that was irreparably lost even in his time. It was available only upto the 23rd verse. In continuing the venture he closely draws on Ksemaraja as is evinced by the fact that he attributes Spanda-Karikas to Vasugupta and not to Kallata. By now one is fully conversant with the significance that this controversy assumed in the realms of Kashmir Saivism. But at the same time he points out the omissions of Ksemaraja and throws veiled hint of the improvement brought about by him.

His only other known work, the Srividyavivarana pertaining to the Tripura system - is extant today only in manuscript. One of the available manuscript entitled Srividyavivarana belongs to Pt. Dinanatha Yaksa of Kashmir, whereas the other named Mantraraja to BORI, Poona, which is bound with other MSS numbering 452, 481 and 482 of 1875-76. It is not numbered and has been described as "fragment Mantrasastriyo granthah." The book seems to be complete work although the last few words are missing.

Some of his whereabouts have come down to us. In the end of his commentary on the Vijnanabhairava, he gives out his name as Sivaguni, Gotra as Kausika and suggests the necessary accompaniments of his name with the Jati-little "Upadhyaya".

1. V.Bh V., pp. 47, 50-52, 58, 66-69, 85-86, 95-97, 104-111, 115, 140 etc.
2. वृत्तें व्यभिचारित्वस्तन्यायं वानन्दः ।
   कांम्यं सर्वादिप्रसान्तं स्मरणात्केत शुभम् ॥

V.Bh V., p. 143.

3. यदुश्च बसुन्दरस्यः एकाधिकारस्त्रवस्त्रये ।
   ...तमुद्वस्त्रयेऽः ।

Ibid., p. 84.

4. तद्द शिक्षार्थिपिश्चाकारायुं तत्समाप्त्य: ।
   केतुराजादिपि: न च तत्त्वानिति तत्त्वानां ।
   तोत्तरायुं-स्वतंत्रत्वायुं-स्वतान्त्रत्वायुं एवं प्रत्येकायुं ।

Ibid., p. 116.

5. विज्ञानान्तरिक्षुः कुलसंघोदं श्रवणस्तद्विद्धि स्वविद्योक्तियादि ।
   नान्यानाथिदिगोप्यस्कृतिस्वरूपायांतरिक्षुः ।

V.Bh.V., p. 143.
He was also known as Siva-Svamin, but the Jati-title Upadhyaya always formed the part of his name - this one learns from the concluding verse of the *Srividya-vivarana*. It was a commentary on a Tripura text called *Mantraraja* pertaining to the Saubhagya school. He belonged to Kaithula province of Kashmir which, though escaping a definite identification, was a village or township on the banks of Jhelam (Vitasta). The colophon of the MS also gives the name of his father as Prakasopadhyayasvamin and also the other title of his commentary as *Anubhavabodha-vidya*. Similarly, the colophon of the *Vivrti* tells us that he was the pupil of some Sundarakantha who was probably famous as Govindaguru or the teacher of Govinda.

In this connection it is quite interesting to know the real psychology behind his unusual insistence on the Jati-title Upadhyaya. In his time the Jati-title Upadhyaya carried a special social recognition. He alone could lay claim to the membership of the Upadhyaya class (or Padipi in the spoken language) who could teach respective systems to their followers distinguished by their respective surnames as the Trika, Kaula and Bhatta. In the local dialect the first and third were known as the Tiki, and Raina or Rajana respectively. Those who concentrated on the

1. *Asthakama-bhuradhi-ni-nimitha: bhetaganayaparabhadra-
   nathanen kamprakaripunamitharamasvaparyakala*

   *Vishnuiti mabreng: prakritnavamala: parap:*

   *Bhramiyaya nagari: nirvishitvam kriyabodha*

   *Vakryanukrama paryant vradhi pranavi bhraminnasita
gita parvodbhagmanusamudrutpurangadhyatma nari*

   *Namasree kriyanukrama vranyatamamrakramah: kriyabodha*

   *Vishnuiti prabhadharyamahatmayam jatamupadhyayat:

   (MS. of Pt. Yaksa)

2. *Bhramiyavidhiuktaram arushobhag-vidhaya kriti: prabhavedhahayakshamupadhshito*

   *Hbid.*

3. *Kriti: bhramiyavidhiuktaram parabhagupadhshito*

   *Hid. vap.Bh.V., p. 144.*
Trika system were called Tiki; those who were dedicated to the performance of the Kaula rituals and the study of the *Kula sutra* were called Kaula; and, those who belonged to the higher strata among the Brahmins and claimed highest accomplishments with their proficiency in the science of Mantras were called Rama or Rajana. Naturally, Sivopadhyaya is fully justified in his extra emphasis on the class-title, because it reflected his still higher social status and superb intellectual achievement.

His time is almost certain. According to him, he completed his commentary on the *Vijnana-bhairava* when Kashmir was being ruled by King Sukha-Jivana. According to historians king Sukhajivana reigned over Kashmir from 1754 to 1762 A.D. Hence he may be assigned to the second and third quarters of the 18th century.

6. *Certain Krama works by anonymous authors including exclusive Krama Agamas*

Really speaking these works which are proposed to be taken up presently did not require a separate section. They should have been dealt with in the preceding section, but for the reasons specified below. Presently the main intention is to take a brief notice of those works whose authorship, for various factors, is not known today. And consequently their exact chronological position is also a matter of speculation. In the last section a special endeavour was made to maintain a chronological continuity to the fullest possible extent. Perhaps that continuity would be difficult to maintain, if these works of unknown whereabouts were also included therein.

1. एवं विज्ञानां तथा विवेचनाः स्वरूपायेत्। तेन विद्यान्तरं द्वारा भूमिकां जिन्ततिर्यंश्च।

2. यद्विकृताश्रितम् रक्षितते न नाबन्धः।

In this section we have two types of literature. The first type consists of the revealed i.e., Agamic literature and the second includes the works of human authorship. In the first category there are again two subtypes. One pertains to the Agamic Saiva literature of Kashmir in general which every system of the Kashmir Saivism feels impelled to draw upon, and which in its deliberations anticipates many Krama doctrines. The other relates to the exclusive Krama Agamas that are mainly responsible for the rise of divergent traditions with regard to the important Krama theses. Owing to the enormity of the literature of the first type it is not possible to discuss them here, more so in view of their having been resorted to wherever called for in the philosophical part of the thesis. This category includes such esteemed agamas as the Malinivijaya, Sarvajnanottara, Brahmayamala, Tantraraja and Kiranagama, etc. etc. The other type comprises the Krama agamas alone. They are but a few in number and the relevance of introducing them need not be questioned. The next category of works includes the works of human origin and though their names are known from references, their authors are not known and the texts are not extant. In view of the importance attached to them in the system, a reference to them seems justified. It is proposed to take up the agamas first and then, the other works.

(a) *The Krama Agamas*

Before the discussion of the individual agamas is embarked upon, it may be noted that the Krama agamas as such are of a comparatively later date than their counterparts in the general field. In this connection it is also interesting to note that they generally belong to the 'Nigama' class of the tantric classification. 'Agama' refers to that class of scriptural literature which is addressed to Parvati by Siva, while 'Nigama' is said to refer to works spoken by Parvati to Siva.¹ The

¹ आगुंतु शिशुबन्धेभ्यो गतं च गिरिजानने।
   सवं च वामुदेश्वरं तस्मादांगम् उच्यते॥
   निम्बं हि सिद्धांश्वतादू गतं च शिवाःभिः॥
   मवं च वामुदेश्वरं तस्मानिन्नम्भ उच्यते॥
majority of the Krama agamas would fall in line with the Nigama class. In fact these two classes of agamas in the strict Krama parlance, represent the two tendencies distinguished by their respective emphasis on the supremacy of either of Siva and Sakti. Let us now advert to the agamas proper in their probable chronological order.

(i) Pancasatika or Devipancasatika

The Pancasatika is one of the earliest or the earliest known Krama agama. Jayaratha explicitly tells us that this agama was known to Somananda. Abhinava also seems to have referred to it. It was also known as Devipancasatika. A fairly definite date can be assigned to it. Since the Pancasatika contains the name of the first four teachers of the Krama including the last one i.e., Sivananda, and also since it was known to Somananda also, it may be placed somewhere in between them.

1. It has been included among "the works of Early Teachers" by Dr. Pandey, Vide Abhi., pp. 471, 474. But it is not so. That it is an agama is proved by its construction and that it was taken to be so, is established by Jayaratha's own statement. In a passage quoted from it (T.A.V., iii, p. 181) Devi is the speaker and Siva is being addressed, vide 

2. Likewise, Jayaratha is very clear on its being an Agama. Vide T.A.V., XI, p. 31 (Ah. 29th).


4. For a similar passage also see p. 169. Likewise, Jayaratha is very clear on its being an Agama. Vide T.A.V., III, p. 160. For a similar statement of Jayaratha, also see pp. 100-161.

5. T.A.V., XI, p. 31 (Ah. 29th).
Sivananda, the first preceptor, is ascribed to the first half of the ninth century and Somananda is distanced from him only by two generations - that is, Somananda belongs to the close of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century. It is, therefore, quite likely that this agama would have come up towards the middle of the ninth century.

Coming to the views of the *Pancasatika* one finds that the Rudrakali, which signifies the nature of withdrawal with reference to the means of knowledge in Anakhya cakra, was termed Bhadrakali by it without any change in the meaning. One of the important implications of Jayaratha’s discussion on the pancakesatika is that by including the name of Sukali in the list, the text seems to subscribe to the thirteen-kali theory. This marks a sharp contrast from the *Kramastotra* which sticks to the twelve-kali doctrine. The opponents of Jayaratha object as to how he (Jayaratha) still maintains that the *Kramastotra* follows the *Pancasatika*. First, Jayaratha side-tracks the issue by calling attention to the original question - whether or not the *Kramastotra* adhered to the twelve-kali thesis - and then, retorts that if the opponent persists in his accusation he does not even know the meaning of the *Pancasatika*. However, this goes to evince amply that its tradition had suffered a great setback by the time of Jayaratha. Even its text started having variants and naturally became liable to varying interpretations. Jayaratha has cited one such instance, while referring to Ojaraja's interpretation of a portion of it. Besides these it maintained a topsyturvy manner in Sthitikrama so as to hide the real Samvit-krama. In designing Pujakrama the Krama authors rather emulated it. Similarly it maintained the separate identity

6. फिर आगे सत्यक्रमसङ्गमन्त्रम् भवेन्द्रविशेषमेकब्रह्मचिदान, यथा श्रीप्रभुरथिक्यमन्निर्मिते-क्रेमेदेविनि, यदेक चांगुलय यहाँपुरस्थः: पुष्पाकम् प्रकाशः ।

of the Cakras like Srsti and Samhara, etc.¹

(ii) **Sardhasatika**

The *Sardhasatika* is another important agama that completely dittos the stand taken by the *Pancasatika* with regard to the precise number of Kalis in Anakhya Cakra. And, therefore it always mentioned Sthitikali after Srstikali. On the contrary, in the *Kramastotra* Rakta-kali and not Sthitikali is made to follow Srstikali. An objection is raised by the opponent as to whether it is not a clear violation of the agamic authority.² The context makes it abundantly clear that *Sardhasatika*, too, was an equally authoritative Krama agama as the *Pancasatika*, otherwise sanction of the same would not have been invoked on an exclusively Krama issue. The only other available reference to it has figured in a similar context.³ It appears to be a fairly old agama. On the basis of dialogue between it and the *Pancasatika* it may be assigned to the same period subject to future investigations in the field.

(iii) **Krama-rahasya**

The *Krama-rahasya* seems to be a minor agama. It is referred to only once by Abhinava.⁴ It may, therefore, be

---

¹ तेन्मूळमध्रवत्तमयोऽभन्नोऽऽज्ञैः: अंतिमीपन्तावति मूडतिसहारसाक्षाक्षात्विवं एकेकाविद्यं न
नरिष्विद्विषेषः।

² ननु सर्वेनेन्द्रत्रुष्का अरूपादिकावन्धनां अश्रवणाब्वहिताय | भौगतमार्गिताय अस्वाव्योऽमः नरिष्विद्विषेषः

³ त्वज्राजसस्त्रुष्का तद्वर्तनं अश्रवणाब्वहिताय अस्वाव्योऽमः। ननु सर्वेनेन्द्रत्रुष्का

⁴ त्वज्राजसस्त्रुष्का अश्रवणाब्वहिताय अस्वाव्योऽमः। ननु सर्वेनेन्द्रत्रुष्का

---

(T.A.V., XI, p. 14, Ah. 29)
concluded that this agama may not be as old as the *Pancasatika*, but its antiquity does go beyond Abhinava. Abhinava quotes it in a Kula context in order to show how the emphases vary from system to system. In Kula rituals wine is said to be of utmost importance. But, the *Krama-rahasya* is represented to hold the other view and, instead, attaches the supreme importance to the trio of Arghapatra, Yagadhamma and Dipa. Now which else can this other system be? Obviously it ought to be Krama as is suggested by the very nomenclature of the text. That it belonged to the agama’s category is confirmed by the fact that it was the Lord Himself who expounded this view in the *Krama-rahasya*. Perhaps, it mainly concentrated on the ritualistic part of the system.

(iv) *Kramasadbhava*

The *Krama-sadbhava* is again an agama of the Nigama type, because it is in the form of a dialogue between Parvati and Siva. Authors of the rank and file of Abhinavagupta, Jayaratha, Mahesvarananda and Sitikanthacarya have referred to it. It was possibly known as *Krama* also. While reasoning out the necessity of the removal of doubt, Abhinava looks up to the agamas as well. Among the other agamas the name of the *Krama* also appears. Jayaratha’s immediate interpretation of the word is in terms of the Krama philosophy, but soon after he quotes from each agama at issue and it is the *Krama-

1. कालोरितवता महामहेश सानवर मदिनी चिरि ।

   *T.A.V.,* III, p. 190.

   The address "Mahadeva" may be noted. Vide also

   गुरु सङ्कराय देव पद्माश्मांलमः ।

   *M.M.P.,* p. 108.

2. न जात्र युक्तिरेवाति यादाश्चायोजोन्याहस्ती ।

   शोधनाचार्यायान्त्रिकशास्त्रारूढः ।

   जास्तस्य पिताय चैत्यं सूक्तं तत्त्वाभावे ज्ञत: ।


   क्रम: कम्बेश्वराद्यः ।

   *T.A.V.,* VII, p. 106 (Ah. 12).
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sadbhava which is quoted for the Krama. This seems to be conclusively established, because elsewhere also Jayaratha refers to the Krama Sadbhava as Kramabhattacharaka, the title bhattaraka being only an honorific one. This is further confirmed by his reference to Krama Sadbhava as the Kramasadbhavabhattacharaka. It is thus certain that Abhinava by the name Krama means the Kramasadbhava. Consequently this agama, too, belongs to the period preceding Abhinava.

By the time of Jayaratha, people appear to have lost direct touch with the text. Evidently some confusion prevailed in respect of its actual stand on the number of Kalis to be adored in Anakhya-cakra. At one place, while invoking its authority in support of the Sodasara Cakra Jayaratha takes their number to be sixteen, while at other place the statement ascribed to it recognizes their number to be seventeen. Due to the unity of their source it is difficult to know today what its actual stand was. Yet, it is sure that it did not agree with the projected number of the deities at twelve or thirteen. Despite the controversy with regard to the real allegiance of the Kramastotra, there is no doubt that the Kramastotra took a different line from that of the Kramasadbhava. The view, therefore, that the Stotratara closely followed this agama is erroneous and misleading. It coined a few phrases to describe

1. तत्तत्त्वमेव ग्रन्थेऽकेशमुपर्यावरति……… श्रीक्रमसाध्वभाष्यम्—“शंकासूयो मेंत्वक्त” दैति।
   \(\text{Ibid.}, \text{p} \ 106-107.\)

2. श्रीक्रमसाध्वभाष्यम् विषमाशकाच्यालोचनस्यध्येयस्यम्, नववर्ष तत्र—।
   \(\text{Ibid.}, \text{III, p} \ 163.\)

3. श्रीक्रमसाध्वभाष्यम् यहाँकारित्य अपविदेश्यः।
   \(\text{Ibid.}, \text{p} \ 173; \text{also see p} \ 190.\)

4. वदव्यासवेदारूपेय श्रीक्रमसङ्ग्रहसाहित्यम् अनाद्यत्वमुक्तिम् बोधीयद्वैतवेदन्ताः।
   \(\text{T.A.V. III p} \ 136.\)

5. यतं श्रीक्रमसङ्ग्रहसङ्ग्रहाद्याः अनाद्यत्वमें सत्त्वं देशम्: पूज्यवेदनोक्ताः, नववर्षं
   तस्मां ।
   \(\text{Ibid.}, \text{p} \ 190.\)

6. अनेकं एवं द्वाराभवन्त श्रीक्रमालोकारस्त् पूज्यवेदाम्, दैति न प्राहोम्—।
   \(\text{Ibid.}, \text{p} \ 191.\)
certain deities. Thus Sthitikali is termed as Stiti-nasakali\(^1\) and Bhadrakali as Rudrakali.\(^2\)

According to Sitikantha, the *Kramasadbhava* discussed Vrnda Cakra in detail.\(^3\) This is borne out by at least one passage, cited from it by Mahesvarananda, that deals with the Patakrama under Vrndacakra.\(^4\) The *Krama Sadbhava* is quoted again in support of his view that the order of the five functions of the Absolute, in which they ought to be worshipped, begins with Creation and ends with Bhasa.\(^5\) A few minor views also have been ascribed to the *Kramasadbhava*, which are not referred to here.\(^6\)

(v) *Kilikakrama*

The utterances quoted from the *Kilikakrama* are marked by their genuine philosophical aptitude unnoticed in any of the agamas discussed so far. It is the reason why Ksemaraja\(^7\) quotes so profusely from it in his *Vimarsini* on the *Sivasutras*

2. \textit{Kriyakramadaksana}\(\text{\kern-0.2em}}\) (\textit{Svatantra}\(\text{\kern-0.2em}}\) (\textit{Tattvabodha}\(\text{\kern-0.2em}}\).
4. *Kalikakrama*.
5. *Kalikakrama*.
and the later authors do not, except for one identical passage. Because with the passage of time real philosophical zeal started to simmer down among the Krama authors. Among the later authors are included Yogaraja, Sivananda (the author of the Mahanayaparakasa),Jayaratha and Mahesvarananda. The work also passed in the name of the Devikakrama. For, while quoting the some passage as hinted above, Mahesvarananda attributes it to the Devikakrama.

The very first look at the extracts conveys the impression of their being from some philosophical treatise and not from an Agama. But a passage cited from it by Ksemaraja leaves no scope for doubting its agamic character. In this extract the work is said to be of divine origin, that is, the philosophical truths herein are revealed by Bhairava.

Coining to its time some broad outlines may be indicated. Till Abhinava there is no trace of the work; it is learnt from Ksemaraja for the first time. Since Ksemaraja claims to have received all his knowledge from Abhinava, it may be surmised that Abhinava at least knew of it. Even otherwise, the text might be contemporaneous with or slightly later than Abhinava, because one has already seen that Vimarsini is the last work of Ksemaraja.

As to its philosophical contents, one may begin with the most famous passage to which attention has been drawn. As its first premise it declares the entire manifold - whether internal or external - to be of the nature of pure awareness. It is awareness that assumes the form of respective objects.

1. तत्त्वज्ञान स्थान बहुतः प्रकाशते।
   ज्ञानश्रृंगता स्यानहयथः सनो तजः अभिनः।
   नाहि ज्ञानश्रृंगता भावा: केनविद्याकाविश्वा।
   ज्ञानं तदालम्बात् यदात्मत्तेऽयत्तेऽसास्तीसी।


2. तत्त्वज्ञानस्थानम् ावसते।
   इत्य श्रीदीपिनाकम् एसरिष्या।

3. तथा ं श्रीकालिकांशे
   तस्मात्तत्त्वायैव सुदृढ्य तथा यों भवेण वर्णे।
   अविकल्पन्यात्त भवेणे स्यात्तत्त्वायैव भवत्।
   यथावर्णः स्तत्तमां यथत्तत्त्वं भगवनं वर्णोऽविकारं।

   M. M. P., p. 10.

   S. S. V., p. 111.
Nobody has even visualised the objective world unless it has become a fact of his experience. Since awareness does not proceed without its object, just as affirmation is meaningless without negation; and, since the two are always simultaneously realised, the awareness and its object are bound to be one in essence. It is why the Krama system views the objective variety as an expression of the Absolutive dynamism.¹

In another similarly popular passage it draws one's attention to the nature of the Absolute as supreme awareness and that of its power, called Vimarsa, as omniscience. In fact the two cannot be visualised analytically. Thus the process of Japa, if undertaken by a yogin, transpires to be self-reflection on the self-divinity.² In a similar strain it is insisted upon that one, who could realize knowledge - without its referent and - as consisting in self-consciousness, achieves true freedom even during the embodied span of life.³ Ignorance and knowledge, both being the manifestations of the ultimate reality, the talk of destruction of either is meaningless. Because, even when the interplay of nescience is said to have been eliminated, the real nature of it remains intact. To talk of rise and annihilation of nescience is the sheer luxury of figurative language. The only cure, therefore, by implication, lies in appreciating the

---

1. गृहत्सकारत्रेषीि
   तत्तदतसत्त्वा नामात्रं अवश्यीवते \|
   वस्तुतास्तिरिविभागेन निपर्वशिलिबिय्यम: ||
   स्मार्तमभावान्ति प्रत्येकान्तिष्माभावान्ति ||
   कुतुभङ्कवस्त्रानां सम्बोधनकूण्डलासते || इति ।

   S.S.Vi, p. 118.

2. तत्तैः देवादेववस्तेः परस्सामवस्तेः ||
   विमाहे: परम्परा विनिति: यत्सता सामाजिकि ||
   इति श्रीमान्तालकाचनित्तिरित्यथा ... ... स्वाभाविकविद्वत्तिसिक्ष्यकार्यानांत्यार्थेः अपो
   जापयते ।

   S.S.Vi, p. 113; also see p. 139.
   Vide also T.A.P., III, pp. 187, 387.

3. अतते साधारणताकाये: ||
   तथा सर्वेऽवृज्ञ निरतत्वात्वत्त्वात्स्वप्नमात्स्वकृत्\|
   य: परमात्माति स शुभरतात्वा जीवनेत्र न रसस्य: ||

   Ibid., p. 119.
basically Absolutic character of the two. Thus the experience of pleasure and pain is a necessary outcome of the enormous mental construction. A yogin is advised to pierce through this great illusion of duality so as to attain the real fruit of the yoga. In fact, the entire objective paraphernalia beginning with the categories of the pure order such as Siva etc. is the logical corollary of the loss of knowledge coupled with the rise of mental constructions. And all the good or bad objects stem from the same. What one calls evil, leads one to pain and hell because of its character as sheer intellectual fabrication.

It is, therefore, imperative for one to eliminate all the empirical as well as imaginary associations (Vrtti), to rest on the inner plane, to relinquish the empirical network of mental constructs through one's monistic attitude, and then to remain self-composed and ever prepared to kill the element of time, if he cares to reach the highest stage of his existence consisting in freedom. Such a view needs no explanation. Because, just as in one's daily life the objects of a dream are no longer perceptible when the person is awake, in the same way the world ceases to figure in the yogin's perception when he views

---

1. यदुज्ज्वल तदेव—
   नारेविविधाएवाध्ये स्वधारणो न विलक्षणः।
   उत्तमितिविरहात् प्राणायामार्गः न वास्तवः।
   यतोदिशात् स्रियैंधे सारस्वताय विपर्ययः।
   नात्स्वागतेण तर्कते तत्त्वत्त्वं तत्त्वमात्रे॥ इति ।

Ibid., p. 120.

2. तुक्तसे धीयतिकर्मः—
   मुख्यं ख्यातिविषाणिनक्षान्तरसंहंनितं।
   प्रिया बैलमहापोवः बोगो योगाणं संकेत।॥

S.S.Vi, p. 123.

3. तुक्तसे तद्वच—
   नन्दविवाचसतव विवाचविविधायां।
   निर्जार्यनैव विशिष्टमुखुधाः समुद्धाष्टिक्षालाः।
   तद्युक्ताः शुभायुधं धारण तदद्वयमेत् तदद्वयं।
   अमुगन्धित्यं प्रावेशं परं हुः प्रज्जाप्तेऽ॥ इति ।

Ibid., p. 123; also see, p. 131.
it through Bhavana i.e. identifying it with the universal self.¹

This was of course a Krama text as the above deliberations would show, in addition to the suggestivity of the title.

(vi) **Krama-siddhi**

The *Kramasiddhi* is an agama of a later origin. It is difficult to ascertain its exact period but it was known to none of Abhinava, Ksemaraja and Jayaratha. Throughout the history of the Krama thought it is Mahesvarananda alone who draws our attention to it.² It, therefore, appears likely that the work did not come into light until the lapse of the 11th century.

The lower limit may further be stretched up to the time of Jayaratha. It may also interest one to note that even in later Krama or other tannic literature one does not hear of this work. It, therefore, must have been a minor work. It chose the form of a dialogue between two - the God and the Goddess. But it is doubtful who really played the role of teacher and who that of disciple. Because, of all the four extracts cited by Mahesvarananda only two have some bearing on this point. In one Siva is addressed by Devi who imparts to him the secrets of the Samvitkrama,³ whereas in the other Siva is approached by Devi and he tells her the esoteric

1. यदृकतं तत्रेव—
   यथा स्तव्यास्त्रप्रपारायानं देव नष्टनिः।
   तथा भावाय योगी संसाराय नैव प्रभावित। हलि।
   तथा निरस्त मद्यकुक्तिः संप्रभाय श्रद्धागतरम्।
   निश्चिताय कल्याणास्त्रात्मेन परात्मेन।
   ये स्वात्मतिः निरस्त्य अन्यायालेभक्तिः।
   कैव्यवाच्चिदार्थायै स निर्विपण मन्त्रेन। हलि।

S.S.Vi., pp. 133-34.


3. यथोपाद अर्णविदः—
   सृजनम् देव वृहूर कल्याणिः सृजनम् हलि।

*M.M.P.*, p. 97.
The Krama Tantricism of Kashmir

significance of the word Krama. The obvious conclusion seems to be that this agama adopted a midway course and alternately subscribed to both the tendencies about the concept of the Absolute in the Krama system.

Certain other views, beside those described above, have come down to us. There were varying opinions about the precise order of the five flows (Pancavaha) of the Universal Energy. The order followed by Mahesvarananda was the one laid down by the Kramasiddhi. The question has been fully considered in connection with this study on the Pancavaha. In another passage, the Kramasiddhi is represented to have prescribed a specific type of the Patakrama. The Patakrama is one of the constituents of the eightfold approach to the Vrnda Cakra. The Pata consists in finding out the basic identity between Pancavaha and Vrndacakra. But the same may be found to consist in the identity between the five siddhas namely, Jnanasiddhas etc., and the five Absolutive functions ranging from Srsti to Bhasa.

He also explains the logic behind naming a particular power. It is to be recalled that in each of the five powers (Srsti etc.) all the five powers are present, yet each of them is so termed as to indicate the most predominant one in the group.

1. यथा आत्मसिद्धि—
कर्तरः कोष्ठवस्तुषु परायो ज्ञातो भवेन ||
आयो तु महेन्द्रे सुभवः हम्: सत्तमोऽभवेत् इ
पूर्वायतं क्रमसामान्यासिद्धिकर्म परम्
क्रमसामान्यात्येव वैवैक्यं कलोक्तम् ||

Ibid., p. 109.

2. तत् तत्तत्प्रवर्धयाधुर्धात् तत्तत्तथाप्रवर्धयाधुर्धात्
अस्मात्मस्तु विद्विद्वतः एव || यथा आत्मसिद्धि… इ


3. प्रच्छवहृद्वयोरीक्षायानुमानान्यां पात यति वातश्चार: ||
एव सूक्तवर्धयोरोपिष्ट्य पातोपीतेन्द्रेव: || यथेऽस्तु आत्मसिद्धि—
संविर्भ देव पूर्वः वथायमि सुदर: ||
सूक्तिः स्वित्यां च सहस्राद्याभायामानस्यस्यकम् ||
आनायां च नेलार्थत्वं काष्ठं शास्त्यसंस्युः ||

Ibid., p. 97.
A metaphor will elucidate it. The milk, though present in whole of a cow's body, drips down through her udder only. Likewise, the power of the Lord is all-pervasive and all-inclusive, yet it spreads fully through one power.¹

All these concepts predominate the later phase of the Krama system. This also testifies to its recency in origin.

With this agama one comes to the close of the Krama list of the agamas. But this simply shows the limitations of our knowledge and information at this stage. Numerous references, made to and extracts quoted from the anonymous sources, simply labelled as the agama,² will perhaps bear out the above statement.

In this connection it may also be pointed out that the agamas named Brahmayamala, Tantraraja Bhattaraka etc., have not been included among the Krama agamas, as has been done in certain quarters.³ Because in the first place, they belong to the general category of agamas and, in the second place, the contents of the manuscript of the Brahmayamala, available in the library of Asiatic Society of Bengal⁴ and the study made by John Woodroffe of the Tantraraja⁵ do not present them as exclusive Krama agamas. It is of course a different matter that they do contain useful material on the Krama system too, but not as the Krama system as such but as a part of the wider tantra literature. We have, therefore, not ventured to dilate on them at the moment.

(b) Non-Agamic Krama works

Here again the proposed discussion will be restricted to the exclusive Krama texts.

¹ तत्तदृश्योपवषयक्रमेऽविषयं दृढ्यादीनाम् पृथृप्तचर्या | यथा श्रीकृष्णरसिंहो

² दोषे व्याप्त वैद्य धौर हलनामः प्रसद्दम् यथा | सारंगा अध्यात्मिनी सृष्ट्यम् एकरिमेण प्रसून्ता जितो |


⁴ Vide, for instance, T.A.V., III, pp. 132, 171; M.P.(S), p. 45 etc.

⁵ Abhi., pp. 470-71.

⁶ MS No. 6392, Catalogue No. 5892, Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts, Vol. VIII (Tantras), Asiatic Society of Bengal, pp. 94-95.

(i) **Krama-Sutra**

About the *Krama-Sutra* certain remarks have already been made while discussing Ksemaraja who, for the first time, invites our attention to this text. It was probably written in the Sutra style as the title and the two extracts go to show. The most significant thing about it seems that it was originally written in the own vernacular of the author.\(^1\) The necessary implication being that the Sanskrit version or rendering cited by him was done either by him or was done in his time. If this hypothesis be true, the *Krama-Sutra* in its original form might have been an older text than Abhinava. But, in any case, it must belong to the same period as Abhinava does. This also shows that the trend of composing the Krama works in vernaculars, which later on was acknowledged to be a salient feature of the Krama literature, had its seeds in the early stages of the Krama history. The first of the two Sutras quoted by Ksemaraja asks the aspirant to consume the objects of the sense which act like fetters, just as the fire set ablaze consumes fuel.\(^2\) The second Sutra lays down the twofold path towards self-realization. The first, which is characterized by inwardness, is known as the Krama Mudra. This consists in turning from the outward to the inward. The second, which is called Mudra-krama, consists in looking from the inward to the outward, that is, in looking upon the worldly objectivity as an expansion of the inner self.\(^3\) Both these types are the spontaneous outcome of Samavesa. The second Sutra has been commented upon by Ksemaraja.\(^4\) Mahesvarananda also

\(^1\) *P. Hr.*, p. 79.

\(^2\) *P. Hr.*, pp. 77-78.


refers to the second Sutra and quotes it together with its explanation by Ksemaraja. But it looks quite feasible that Mahesvarananda did not have the actual text before him, because he does not appear to quote from the original itself but from the Pratyabhijnahrdaya instead, which contains both the Sutras as well as its exposition. Moreover, he does not add a word of his own to it.

(ii) Siddhasutra

It is referred to only once in the Mahanayaprakasa (T). There were two traditions with regard to the proper order in which the various cycles were supposed to succeed one another for the purpose of worship. One of the traditions placed Anakhyacakra immediately after Vrnda-cakra and discarded the worship of the three cycles such as Srsti etc. This was probably the tradition followed by Jayaratha etc. One may infer this from Jayaratha’s criticism of the Mahanayaprakasa’s attitude as representing opponent’s tradition. The Mahanayaprakasa did not agree with his view and maintained that after Vrnda-cakra these cycles must be worshipped in order to ensure the total completion of Pujana that results in acquisition of the tremendous capacity. In this context the Siddha-Sutra is quoted in support. It holds that the worship of all these cakras leads to the attainment of the Khecara state. And as a secondary outcome of the self-knowledge one is able to command the Siddhis like Anima etc. on their own accord.

In this connection it is to be specially noted that Siti-kantha also refers to the Subhasita (pithy or noble sayings) of some Siddha. He has quoted some Siddhapada earlier. Both,

1. यदुश्रेष्ठ उपमसुरेश्य—वाश्यस्तत्रादेवः।
   वाश्यस्तत्राचार्यसुरेश्यप्रेयं।
   यदा च
   व्याश्यात्म व्रीव्यश्यायायाजन ।

   *M.M.P.*, p. 166.

2. अश्रेष्ठकोश्वल द्विपि परपुरुषोविधिये ।
   पुरुस्वति तथ वेदस्वति हि विद्वानः प्रवर्तेऽि।
   पुरुस्वति तस्य वेदां विद्वानः प्रवर्तेऽि।
   वाश्यस्तत्रां प्रवर्तेऽि।

   *M.P. (T)*, 8.26, 28.

3. तत्वं च प्रमुखस्य मुह्यंसिद्धम्—प्रिययुष्म आप्तां देनु उक्तस्य

   *M.P. (S)*, pp. 69-60; also see p. 32.
however, appear to be one, owing to the identity of the extracts attributed to them. It is not known if the *Siddha-sutras* have to do anything with the *Siddha-subhasitas*, if one is permitted to present them in this way. The only hurdle seems to be the language. Because, the *Subhasitas* have been composed in Prakrita, whereas the *Siddhasutra* is apparently a Sanskrit work. However, this is left out as an unsettled question.

The work, in question, belongs *to* a later date. Sivananda II, the author of *Mahanayaprakasa* (T) is assigned to the second and third quarter of the twelfth century. The work, therefore, may be assigned to a slightly earlier period.

(iii) *Mahanaya-paddhati*

It was a minor work and is referred to only once by Mahesvarananda. It is quoted to substantiate the contention that the external formalities amount to plain mockery. According to it, the strong and abiding reflection on the ultimate reality unobscured by anything constitutes the genuine form of worship. This is a peculiar Krama thesis. In addition, the title of the text goes to prove its Kramic complexion. It might be chronologically slightly anterior to Mahesvarananda who alone refers to it.

(iv) *Kramodaya*

The *Kramodaya* seems to be an important work. Two extracts from it appear in the *Parimala* on the *Maharthamanjari*. Amrtananda in his *Yogini-hrdayadipika* refers to it twice, though citing the same passage. Bhaskaracarya in the *Setubandha* commentary on the above also alludes to the work repeating the quotation just mentioned.

1. *ित्यादिनिशार बाहुतारम्बः केवलं विद्वन्तामांशः व्याख्याते ।* । ।

2. *लोकभाषा ।\* ।


Its main accent seems to have been ritualistic. However, in one passage it refers to the five limiting conditions of the individual subject as such as Raga, Kala etc., due to which the universal self appears as personal self.\(^1\) In the other, he calls upon the aspirant to perform Duti-yaga before he embarks upon the worship of nine powers stationed in the body.\(^2\) The stress on ritualism was so predominant that fivefold esoteric worship (Pancamakara) seems to have overshadowed other things. Like sex in the former, wine occupies a place of eminence in yet another extract. According to it once the liquor, which is a sort of final oblation (Purnahuti) and is defined by harmony of 'I' and 'this' experience, gets in, it obliterates the duality; and the resulting pleasure comes to persist even though there is visibly no object to cause pleasure.\(^3\) Hence, it is meant to suggest that one should worship the external cycles only when one's mind has become stable and poised.

In this connection an important point deserves careful attention. The verse quoted by Amrtananda and Bhaskararaya

1. \(\text{महुत्त मीरमोड़े—}\
   \text{रामो साम्र ला विष्णु निक्रिति: काल एवं यज्}\
   \text{वन्दयोगृहयः सवं पाश्चात्यति प्रभृतितः.}\
   \text{M.M.P., p. 50.}\)

2. \(\text{एवं पीठार्ययादि प्राध्याय कोंदिलु हाधी हुरीरज्ञमार्याप्योप्ृष्ठसेतु धृष्ठा}\
   \text{श्रीमोड़े—}\
   \text{स्वित्यः सवं ववनेयः योगिन्यः धृजु मंवंगम्.}\
   \text{रेष्यव योगितागुम्बतः आत्मबीत्तगुम्सरोपतस्.}\
   \text{योगिनि नवालुक्ष स्वतः स्वनंदःवाचरीम्.}\
   \text{वुज्जनगुप्त पूजाय योगिनात्मेश्वरम्.}\
   \text{नवालुक्ष सु मंवंग स्वपनेलिन्तकाळस्तु.}\
   \text{बिवाशक्यातम्भरेवन युज्ज्रं मन्मक: स्वेतु:}\
   \text{मन्न्येष्वरस्त: शातिक मधुकुलागुम्बिनितम्.}\
   \text{M.M.P., p. 87.}\)

3. \(\text{मान्याविष्ठनमुमुन्न्त्य इश्नाध्यात्मातस्वस्थ्यम् मधुपं वृत्तपुष्युलित यह्वहो दुह्वा पारिस्परिक}\
   \text{तद्वानं भीतेत्तथा पुष्युलितम्:}\
   \text{अतएव—}\
   \text{महुत्त मीरमोड़े—}\
   \text{स्वित्यः सवं ववनेयः योगिन्यः मन्न्येष्वरस्तः शातिक मधुकुलागुम्बिनितम्.}\
   \text{Y.H.D., p. 266; also see, pp. 283, 285.}\)
also occurs with little modification in the *Mahanayapra
dasa(T).*\(^1\) It forms part of the text and there is absolutely no hint of its having been borrowed from some other source. The first ever mention of the *Kramodaya* which finds in Mahesvarananda and Amrtananda is not far away from him, hence the *Kramodaya does not seem to be an old text.* Mahesvarananda also refers to the *Mahanayapra
dasa.* That means the two were different works. Now the question is which is the borrower. The whole situation is confusing. The answer depends upon another question - which work is earlier? If the *kramodaya* is earlier the *Mahanayapra
dasa* must have borrowed from it, and if later, the *Kramodaya* must be the borrower. But, since (i) Sivananda II the author of the *Mahanayapra
dasa*, belongs to the 2nd and 3rd quarters of the 12th century, (ii) the *Kramodaya* is earliest referred to towards the close of the 12th or the beginning of the 13th century, and (iii) the verse in question is a part of the text and fits well in the context and conforms to the construction of the text, one may be tempted, for the time­being, to conclude that it is *Kramodaya* which appears to have borrowed from the *Mahanayapra
dasa(T).*

\(^{(v)}\) *Amavasyatrimisika*

The *Amavasyatrimisika* seems to be an important text of the age of decadence. It was produced during the lull between Mahesvarananda and Sitikantha who refers to it.\(^2\) What was the real purport behind such nomenclature is a matter of guess today. Either it contained thirty verses or, like the *Paratrimisika*, dealt with the three Absolutive powers. Sitikantha has elsewhere quoted a verse bringing out the etymological meaning of the word *Amavasya.*\(^3\) The verse is self-explanatory. What is important to note in this connection is that Ramyadeva describes

1. *Pravachana: Shripur (स्नेपन) में त्रिमित्रायतनन्।*
   स्नेपिति समस्तारो जिन्न विषयसंप्रवरः।


3. *Abhay nam pāye rāmāyanaḥ samālātva: tānu।*
   अभयां कल्लो वस्मादमाहुयः र्येवः स्मुत्तः।
   *Ibid., p. 82.*
the Krama system as the one steeped in or infused by the idea of Amavasya.\textsuperscript{1} It, therefore, appears fairly certain to take this work as belonging to the Krama system.

This work was probably more famous as the Samvada, because the first of the three verses quoted from the Amavasya-trimsika has been attributed to the Samvada.\textsuperscript{2} Otherwise, Samvada as a loose expression stands for a dialogue or discourse. A perusal of the extract reveals that the book probably owed its name to the three aspects of the ultimate power of the Lord, the three aspects being Will, Knowledge and Action. The present judgement is based on the second verse of the passage. In other words it speaks of the transcendence-plus-immanence, all-pervasiveness, infinitude, ubiquity and equanimity of the Absolute. The innate power of the Lord is all-powerful and, though one in herself, she accounts for the multiplicity by virtue of Her constituting the powers such as Will, Knowledge and Action. But this duality is nothing but functional when She is at work. Otherwise on retiring from activity, She rests in Siva, the infinite Absolute and principle of harmony, holding these differences back in Herself.\textsuperscript{3}

The esoteric idea of the Amavasya came into existence with reference to the Krama system with Ramyadeva who

1. आमृतस्वानमेवप्रकाशितांतत्रैःसंकेताःस्मिन्निर्देशिताः ज्ञातं मेवप्रवर्तिताः...अमावस्यात्मानं- 
   वासितं: करणिः संस्कारव्यः: उद्भुजितः:।
   \textit{B.U.V.}, p. 29.

2. विभाषामत्वात् परमात्मा महाभ:। तथा चौतृतः सवादे—
   योऽयैः परापर: जात: सिवः सर्वगतो महाम्।
   अभयो हृदत्तम गवेश्यापि महेष्वर: ॥
   वति स एत महार्यामम।।
   \textit{M.P. (S)}, pp. 13-14.

3. तथा च आमावस्यात्मान्त्वात्—
   योऽयैः परापर: जात: सिवः सर्वगतो महाम्।
   अभयो हृदत्तम गवेश्यापि सर्ववशेषाद:।
   तत्त्वाति सहाता हवासि: सर्वकष्ट्विनमयी परा।
   वा वैशाखान्तिक्षितम् तैसुकं कुत्सा रिष्या ॥
   तथा उदित्प्रायवै वेदोऽवस्यं कार्यमेव वतः।
   तत्त्वनस्तु ममहृदृश्य समपर्ये वियवं रिष्यता ॥ वति।
   \textit{M.P. (S)}, pp. 9-10.
belonged to the first half of the 12th century. And it is referred to by Sitikantha, who flourished at the threshold of the 15th-16th century. The work, therefore, may be placed somewhere during this intervening period.

(vi) Rajika

This seems to be a minor work of very late origin and has been mentioned once only by Sitikantha. As to the nature of the contents, it will suffice to say that it dealt with the real character of the great Yaga, otherwise known as Madhya-yaga also. It has three varieties namely, gross, subtle and the ultimate. In the first stage mind, intellect and ego-feeling are withdrawn in order to put an end to the emergence of mental uprisings (Cittavrittis). In the second round the vital airs are withdrawn. Ultimately Prakriti, the principle of pure awareness, makes an anxious present of herself to the Lord finding Him half-satiated. This is the land of unison, harmony. It is in this connection a verse is cited from the Rajika.1 In the Viveka, Jayaratha refers to certain Rahasyarajikayoginis who were blessed, due to the grace of Divinity, with a beatific vision and attainment of true knowledge. What one is not supposed to miss in this context is that Rajikayoginis have been referred to as belonging to the "different" system. Since the context is primarily occupied with the Kula system, the 'different' system means "other than the Kula". Hence, in the Kula context these Rajikayoginis are to be remembered only and not worshipped.2 It is not known if the Rajikayoginis and the Rajika text are correlated. This episode also lends an additional weight to the thesis that it is most likely a Krama text.

Like its predecessor it also belongs to an age prior to Sitikantha.

1. स्थनुक्षमारस्तेष्य छप्चाणाः सामरस्त्यभुवेन्द्राः, तत्त्र न भौराजिकायाम्—

2. भौरहुरांजामायोऽनंतोऽः स्वभावकन्तः प्रसादेऽ दृग्गेष्तहाराजान तस्थायु...।

   M.P. (S), p 55.

CHAPTER VII
KRAMA'S PLACE IN THE WIDER FRAMEWORK OF KASHMIR SAIVISM WITH AN EYE UPON ITS GENERAL TANTRIC CHARACTER

A synthetic approach to correlation between basic structure of Tantra and Kashmir Saivism vis-a-vis sixfold Artha and fourfold Upaya and its bearing on the Krama system.

I. Overall Perspective of Synthesis between Saiva Metaphysics and Tantricism

Throughout all these pages an attempt has been made to point out and gauge the quantum of the contribution made by the Krama system to the cause of metaphysics and mysticism of monism against the background of its twin personalities condensed into one. These two aspects are its being a part of the philosophical complex known as Kashmir Saivism in the first place and, at the same time, retaining the general Tantric character in the second place. In this section, therefore, our main task would be to see how this synthesis is arrived at. In other words, an effort will be made to examine the perspective in which the sixfold Tantric approach defined by the Arthas is coordinated with or corresponds to the fourfold approach of the Kashmir Saivism spelt by the Upayas. And in so doing the place of Krama is to be determined in this perspective.

2. Jayaratha's Consistent Approach to the Problem

Mahesvarananda and Jayaratha, the two savants of the Krama system, take up the issue. Mahesvarananda regards the Mahartha or Krama system as the ultimate among all the philosophical disciplines and the culminating point of all the
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six stages of Tantric culture. But this is hardly a scientific approach. In fact it is dismissing outright the very issue out of the doctrinal enthusiasm. Jayaratha, on the contrary, is very balanced, logical and to the point. The subsequent observations are, therefore, drawn from him.

3. *Sixfold Artha Defining the Six Approaches to Tantric Understanding*

The six ways or approaches to the understanding of the Tantra, as outlined by the *Yogini-hrdaya*, are - (i) Bhavartha, (ii) Sampradayartha, (iii) Nigarbhartha, (iv) Kaulikartha, (v) Sarvarahasyartha, and (vi) Mahatattvartha. All being technical concepts it is no use rendering them into the English language. Let us see what they stand for.

Jayaratha, at the very outset, cautions that the traditionalists should not look for the reproduction of the orthodox and conventional views. He is approaching them entirely from the point of view of their precise implications. Except the methodology, he toes the line adopted by the *Yogini-hrdaya Tantra*.

---

1. योद्धम महाप्रभुवेभद्व उपचारसी
   भावार्थ: सम्प्रदायविध निग्रास्थित्व कौटिक।
   तथा तत्तत्त्वाविद् महात्त्वार्थ एव न।

2. *V.M.V.*, pp. 136-140.

3. भावार्थ: सम्प्रदायविध निग्रास्थित्व कौटिक।
   तथा सम्प्रदायविध पदार्थार्थविध एव न।

   (Quoted from *Y.H.*, 2.15) *V.M.V.*, p. 136.

4. इह.. इत्यादिकं यथावस्तं प्रतिपादा बौद्ध विद्यायां ग्रन्थस्वस्तराग्नानार्थभवनविधानोऽत्सिन्धावनयः उच्चारे।

   *V.M.V.*, pp. 136-137.

5. यदारमः
   अथात्येष हि भावार्थ: क्षेत्र: परम्परा:।
   सम्प्रदायो गुरुविक्रिया कुमारसन्ति।।
   निग्रास्थिति वहां देवि निस्पर्शस्मोली।।
   कौटिक: साधारणविगर्तत्वविद्यन्त्यस्य।।
   परमार्थाविद्यार्थ: प्रत्येकवाली।।
   महारस्त्राविद्यार्थ: परमार्थदास्त्यत।।
Bhavartha consists in the literal meaning according to the intention of the speaker at the time. It may even belong to the other sciences than the Tantra proper. The same, despite its externality, is to be regarded as Sampradayartha, if it is meant for enlightenment owing to the exposition of self-knowledge etc. The only conditions it must comply with are that it should be consistent with the Saiva teachings and uncensured by the teachers. Vedic passages like "ग्राहया वा रे ग्रात्सनो मन्वयः" and "सहुद्व निवासयोगसवास्माः" furnish fine examples of the same. But there is one difficulty. The self in the above quoted passages is represented to have shone only once (Sakrdvibhata), whereas Siva is a continuously manifest principle. Similarly, these passages depict the self as knowable (Jnattva) and thus reduce it to the status of an object. Consequently it would deserve its reference as 'this' instead of 'I', while the self-luminous Siva is always a subject, an agent. According to Jayaratha no fundamental incongruity is involved here. In fact, Siva, the principle of reality, never forsakes its agenthood even when he manifests the objectivity within because the objective multiplicity is an expression of his unfettered freedom. Since Siva himself becomes an object, there is no discrepancy if he is referred to by 'this' pronoun. The viewing of the manifold variety as essentially one with Siva becomes possible only when objectivity is there. It is why the third type named Nigarbhartha consists in its emphasis on realisation of the internal character of multiplicity as Siva by the pure self which may be Siva, the teacher, or the aspiring self. If this process is continued, a stage comes


1. Cp. स्वतंत्रसाध्यानुमानथर्मन्वान स्वतंत्रदश्यायार्थम्: I
   प्रमुखसाधििसंकल्पनिर्माणी ध्येयार्थम्: II
   J.P.K., 1.8.16.

2. Cp. आत्मिक स्वंदर्ब्धे स्वरूपायमः तृत्तियः: I
   अनिवर्णेष्ठचिदम्: प्रसर्दमः िििि: II
   S.D., 1.2.
when the Universal Self is instinctively realized as principle of self-luminous pure awareness even in our empirical and phenomenal experiences. Since the prius of such awareness is self and the same is technically known as Kula, the fourth type passes by the name of Kaulikartha.

In the above noted stages what happens is that the emphasis is gradually shifted from 'this' to 'I'. In the first instance, the aspirant has to exert himself to realize this identity, whereas in the second this identity of the self with objectivity itself becomes a fact of experience. Here, too, once this process is rigorously pursued further, immediate self-revelation takes place—the objectivity not being identified with but transformed into pure subjectivity. Since it is impossible for an unaccomplished layman to appreciate it, it is termed as Rahasyartha (Secret meaning), the fifth type. When even this stage is transcended and pure, alogical, irrelational immediacy prevails and there being no further destiny, it is designated as Maha-paramatattvartha, the sixth type.

4. Synthesis between six Arthas and four Upayas arrived at

Now, it may be noted that the first two stages, types or approaches obviously find an analogue in the Anava Upaya which, with the aid of external means, tries to unfold the aspirant's real nature. The extrinsic means include, inter alia,
usage of sacred syllables etc. Similarly, Nigarbhartha and Kaulikartha find their counterpart in the Saktopaya because the Saktopaya consists in processes designed to achieve the refinement of Vikalpas (logical constructions). The purification of logical construction or dualistic consciousness, by definition, means a thorough overhauling of the perspective with reference to objectivity. In simple words, the Saktopaya consists in realising 'this' as an expression of 'I' (Sarvo mamayam vibhavah). Yet, despite this transformation, the Vikalpa remains. The Saktopaya elevates the relation of duality into that of unity and harmony, but the relation itself does not vanish. Therefore, then comes Sambhava which corresponds to the fifth type i.e., Rahasyartha or Sarvarahasyartha and consists in the indeterminate self-realization. And the last stage i.e., Mahaparamatattvartha is equalled by Anupaya which is the reality per se - Awareness pure and simple. In fact Sambhava and Anupaya are not generally distinguished because the Anupaya reflects the highest stage of the Sambhava. In that case the Sambhava would stand for both of the final types.

5. Conclusion: Nigarbhartha and Kaulikartha Versus Saktopaya i.e., Krama

Thus we see how the synthesis between the fundamental structure of the Kashmir Saivism and that of the Tantra in general is brought about. It is to be noted that Krama is generally identified with Saktopaya. Hence Saktopaya on the one hand and Nigarbhartha along with Kaulikartha on the other, provide the common ground where the Tantra and Kashmir Saivism meet. It is, however, beyond the scope of this section to go into the intricacies of the Saktopaya etc., because the same is taken up for detailed analysis in the very first chapter of the philosophical study. These lines are, therefore, intended

1. एवं प्रक्षार्दम् विक्षिप्तसहित्यम् पालिताय साक्ष्योपाध्यक्षम्

2. स्वर्धापद्यमंक्ष: श्रास्वयमप्रयासम् परंपरम्
   *V.M.V.*, p. 133.
to serve as a preliminary to the following section. But for Jayaratha it would not have been possible to find out the traditional, yet logical, attitude towards the two independent literatures - Tantra and Kashmir Saivism - which have more points of contact than those of departure.
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Kalīyānikā (825-875)

Vasugupta (800-850 AD)

APPENDIX 'A'

CHRONOLOGICAL TREE OF THE Krama AUTHORS (Preceptorial Lineage)

(DIVYAOUGHĀ—Divine Tradition)

Maṅgalā or Makāra Devī
Sāktā = Khagendranātha (Kṛtyuga)
(Mṛūpa = Kūramāṇa (Tretāyuga)
Maṇḍapī = Meśānātha (Dvāparayuga)
Jāna = Mina or Macchanda (Kaliyuga)

(SIDDHAUGHĀ—Tradition of the Accomplished)

Vāṭālanātha (675-725)
Gandhamādāna (700-750)
Niskriyānanda + Jānānadiṭī (725-775)
Vidyānanda + Raktā (750-800)
Saktyānanda + Mahānandā (800-850)

(MĀNAVAUGHĀ—Human Tradition)

Śivānanda + Samayā (800-850)

Keyōrnāvatī or Kakār Devī

Keyōrnāvatī or Kakār Devī

Madānikā (825-875)
Kalīyānikā (825-875)

Vasugupta (800-850 AD)

APPENDIX 'A'

CHRONOLOGICAL TREE OF THE Krama AUTHORS (Preceptorial Lineage)

(DIVYAOUGHĀ—Divine Tradition)

Maṅgalā or Makāra Devī
Sāktā = Khagendranātha (Kṛtyuga)
(Mṛūpa = Kūramāṇa (Tretāyuga)
Maṇḍapī = Meśānātha (Dvāparayuga)
Jāna = Mina or Macchanda (Kaliyuga)

(SIDDHAUGHĀ—Tradition of the Accomplished)

Vāṭālanātha (675-725)
Gandhamādāna (700-750)
Niskriyānanda + Jānānadiṭī (725-775)
Vidyānanda + Raktā (750-800)
Saktyānanda + Mahānandā (800-850)

(MĀNAVAUGHĀ—Human Tradition)

Śivānanda + Samayā (800-850)

Keyōrnāvatī or Kakār Devī

Keyōrnāvatī or Kakār Devī

Madānikā (825-875)
Kalīyānikā (825-875)

Vasugupta (800-850 AD)

APPENDIX 'A'

CHRONOLOGICAL TREE OF THE Krama AUTHORS (Preceptorial Lineage)

(DIVYAOUGHĀ—Divine Tradition)

Maṅgalā or Makāra Devī
Sāktā = Khagendranātha (Kṛtyuga)
(Mṛūpa = Kūramāṇa (Tretāyuga)
Maṇḍapī = Meśānātha (Dvāparayuga)
Jāna = Mina or Macchanda (Kaliyuga)

(SIDDHAUGHĀ—Tradition of the Accomplished)

Vāṭālanātha (675-725)
Gandhamādāna (700-750)
Niskriyānanda + Jānānadiṭī (725-775)
Vidyānanda + Raktā (750-800)
Saktyānanda + Mahānandā (800-850)

(MĀNAVAUGHĀ—Human Tradition)

Śivānanda + Samayā (800-850)

Keyōrnāvatī or Kakār Devī

Keyōrnāvatī or Kakār Devī

Madānikā (825-875)
Kalīyānikā (825-875)

Vasugupta (800-850 AD)
1. Śrīkanṭha
Durvīṣā
Tryambaka
14 generations of Mānas-puras
Śaṅgamaḍītya
Vṛṣṇi

2. Udayākara
Utpala
Vibhramākara

3. Mahābala
Ācārya Paṇḍita
Dharma Ratha
Amṛta Ratha
Lākaṇa-pagupta

4. Arunādītya
Ananda
Somānanda
Atrigupta (brought to Kashmir from Kānyakubja by Lālitādītiya-

5. Puṇṇamanoratha
(President of Yaśasaka-930 A.D.)
Utpala Ratha I
Prakāśa Ratha

6. (A) Maternal side
Gauradhara
Soma
Rainadhara
Avatāraka
Jagaddhara
Manohara

6. (B) Parental side
Daughter
Yāsodhara
Son
Yodhaka
Śrīkanṭha
Daughter
Arjuna
Daughter
Śītakānta

Sundarakāṇṭha
Śivopādhyāya
(s/o Prakāśopādhyāya)
(Reign of Sukha-jīva)
(1754-1782)

Śvetāmbara
Subhasta Datta = Ojrāṇa = Kalyāṇa
Jayarāṇa
(1125-1175) (1125-1175) (1125-1175)
(1150-1200)

Mahāprakāśa
= Ananta Śāktipāda = Bhaṭṭāraka
(1560-1200)
(1700-1750) (1700-1750)

Mahēśvarānanda
(1173-1225)

[Contemporary of Hasan Shah in
Kashmir (1472-1494) and Mohd. Shah in
Gujarat (1488-1611)]
APPENDIX "B"

CLASSIFIED BIBLIOGRAPHY

ORIGINAL SOURCES*

A. Manuscripts

1. Bhairava-stava-tika Sobhakaragupta, from Vaisnava point of view, *MS* belonging to Dr. K.C. Pandey, Lucknow, Devanagari.


5. Isvarapratyabhijnasutra-vimarsini-vyakhya Of an unknown author, on the *Vimarsini* of Abhinavagupta, *MS* belonging to the collection of Dr. K.C. Pandey, Abhinavagupta Institute of Aesthetics and Saiva Philosophy, Lucknow University, Devanagari. It is different from Bhaskari and equally illuminating. The text has almost been edited by Dr. K.C. Pandey in collaboration with Dr. N. Rastogi and is to be published shortly under the auspices of the Abhinavagupta Institute.

6. Isvarapratyabhijna-vivrti Acarya Utpaladeva, *MS* belonging to Shri Kantha Kaul, V.V.R.I., Hoshiarpur, a Devanagari transcript of which is available in Dr. Pandey's collection at Abhinavagupta Institute, bound with others including Paratrimsika of Rajanaka Lasaka, available in fragments only (33 leaves), Sarada.

* Asterisk has been used to indicate the edition generally referred to in the present work, in case there is more than one edition of the text.

8. **Kula-sutra** (a) Also known as Kaula-sutrani, *M.S.* belonging to BORI, Poona, *MS* No. 445/1875-76, Devanagari.
   
   (b) Another *MS* belonging to Pt. D.N. Yaksa, Alikadal, Bulbul Lankar, Srinagar, Transcribed from Sarada into Devanagari.


10. **Paramartha-sara-samgraha-vivrti** Ascribed to Ksemaraja, but actually identical with its namesake by Yogaraja, *MS* belonging to BORI, Poona, *MS.* No. 459/1875-76, Devanagari.

11. **Paratrisika-laghu-vivrti** (Also called Lasaki), Rajanaka Lasaka, *MS* belonging to Dr. K.C. Pandey, Lucknow, Devanagari.

12. **Paridevita-dvadasika** Rajanaka Jayadratha, *MS* belonging to the Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad, Lucknow, Classification No. 175 (Bhakti), Devanagari.


14. **Sivastaka** Yogaraja, *MS* belonging to Akhil Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad, Lucknow, Classification No. 175 (Bhakti), Devanagari.

15. **Srividyavivarana or Mantraraja** (a) Sivasvamin, *MS* belonging to BORI, Poona. Not numbered but bound with MSS Nos 452, 481 and of 1475-76, Devanagari.
   
   (b) Another *MS* belonging to Sri Dinanatha Yaksha, formerly Head Pandit, Sanskrit Section, Research Deptt., Jammu and Kashmir Government, Srinagar, Sarada.


**B. Exclusive Published Krama Literature**


2. *Cid-gagana-candrika* (C.G.C.)
   *(b)* With 'Divyacakorika' (C.G.C. Coram.) by Karra Agnihotra Sastri, pub. same, Letukuru, East Godavari District, 1943, Two parts.

3. *Krama-stotra* (K.S.)
   *(b)* With Hindi translation by Rajanaka Laksmana, Guptaganga, Srinagar, 1958.


6. *Mahanaya-prakasa* [M.P. (T)] Author unknown, ascribed to Abhinavagupta by the editor K. Sambasiva Sastri (but ascribed to Sivananda II by us), T.S.S. No. CXXX, Shri Citrodaya-manjari Series No. XIX, 1937.

7. *Mahartha-manjari* (M.M.)
   *(a)* Mahesvarananda, with 'Parimala' (M.M.P.) by the same, T.S.S. No. 66, editor Ganapati Sastri, 1919.
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9. *Vatuta Natha Sutra* (V.S. or V.N.S.)

*(a)* Vatulanatha, with 'Vrtti' (V.S.V. or V.N.S.V.) of Ananta Saktipada, edited with English translation and notes by M.R. Sastri, K.S.S. 39. 1923.

*(b)* with the commentary by Ananta Saktipada, edited and translated into French by Lilian Silburn, Institute of Indian Civilization Publication Series No. 8, Paris, 1959.

C. *Texts pertaining to Kashmir Saivism*


2. *Bhairava-stotra*


3. *Bhagavadgītā*

*(a)* With "Sarvatobhadra" by Ramakantha, ed. by M.K. Shastri, K.S.S. No. LXIV, 1943.


*(c)* Under the title "Srimadbhagavadgītā with Sarvatobhadra", critically edited with English and Sanskrit
Introductions etc., by T.R. Chintamani, University of Madras, 1941.
(d) With "Anandavardhini by Anandavardhana (different from the famous author of the Dhvanyaloka), ed. S.K. Belvalkar, BORI, year not available.

4. Bhagavad-guarta-samgraha (Bh. G.S.)
   *(a) A comm. by Abhinava on Gita, edited by Pandit Laksman Raina, Srinagar, 1933.
   (b) Included among eight commentaries under the title "Srimadbhagavadgita" with the commentaries Srimatsamkarabhasya with Anandagiri, Nilakanthi Bhasyotkarsa-dipika of Dhanapati, Sridhari, Gitartha-sangraha of Abhinavagupta, and Gudhartha-dipika of Madhusudana with Gudhartha-tattvaloka of Sridharmadatta Sarma, ed. Vasudev Lakshman Shastri Pansikar, Nirnayasagar, Bombay, 1912.


6. Gurunatha-paramarsa (G.N.P.)


14. Pratyabhijna-hrdaya (P. Hr.)

(b) Ed. J.C. Chatterji, K S.S. No. III, 1911.
(c) With Hindi translation, notes and introduction by Vishal Prasad Tripathi, National Publishing House, Delhi, 1969.
(d) Bound in one with Sat-trimsat-tattva Samdoha and Parapravesika of Ksemaraja, with Hindi translation by Sri Swami Ji Maharaj, Pitambara Pitha, Datia, year not mentioned.
(e) With Hindi commentary called "Tattvabodhini" by S.S. Awasthi, Chowkamba, Varanasi, 1970.
(g) With Hindi translation, introduction and notes by Jaideva Singh, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1973.

16. *Paramartha-sara (P.S.)*
   
   
   


20. *Siva-drsti (S. Dr.)*
   
   *(a)* Somananda, with Vrtti by Utpaladeva, ed. M.S. Kaul, K.S.S. LIV, 1934.
   

21. *Siva-sutra (S.S.)*
   
   *(a)* Vasugupta, with Rjvartha-bodhini of Pitambara-Pithasthanavami, Datia (M.P.), Sam. 2017.
   


24. *Siva-sutra-vimarsini* (S.S.V.)
   (b) English translation by P.T. Srinivasa Iyengar, Allahabad, 1912.
30. *Spanda-pradipika* (Sp. P.)
   *(a) A commentary on Sp. K. by Bhatta Utpala or Utpala Vaisnava, ed. Vamanasastri Islampurkar, 1898, publishers not known.
34. *Svacchanda-tantra* (Sv. T.) With 'Uddyota' (Sv.T.V.), by Ksemaraja, ed. M.S. Kaul, six volumes (Volume 5 in two parts), K.S.S. Nos. XXI (1921), XXXVIII (1923), XLIV (1926), XLVIII (1927), LI (1930), LIII (1933), LVI (1935) respectively.

35. *Tantraloka* (T.A.) Abhinava, with 'Viveka' by Jayaratha (T.A.V.), 37 Ahnikas, 12 parts, Part I edited by M.R. Shastri, and parts II-XII by M.S. Kaul, K.S.S. Nos. XXIII (1918), XXVIII (1921), XXX (1921), XXXVI (1922), XXXV (1922), XXIX (1921), XLI (1924), XLVII (1926), LIX (1938,) LII (1933), LVII (1936) and LVIII (1938). (The author has come to learn that the Tantraloka has been translated by R. Gnoli into Italian, but the author has not been able to see the work.)

36. *Tantrasara* (T.S.)


(b) Under the title "Essenza dei Tantra" translated with notes into Italian by Paolo Boringhieri, with a long introduction by R. Gnoli, 1st edition, Torino, 1960.


39. *Vijnana-bhairava* (V. Bh.)

*(a)* With a commentary by Ksemaraja on V.Bh. upto the 23rd verse and by Sivopadhyaya (V.Bh.V.) onwards, edited with notes by M.R. Shastri, K.S.S. No. VIII,. 1918.

(b) With a commentary called Kaumudi by Ananda Bhatta, edited with notes by M.R. Shastri. K S.S. No. IX, 1918 (bound with the above).

(c) Under the title "Le Vijnana Bhairava" Text and commentary, translated with notes into French by Lilian Silburn, Institute of Indian Civilization Series No. 15, 1961.
(d) With subtitle "Samagra Bharatiya Yogasastra" and two commentaries called Anvayartha & Rahasyartha in Sanskrit & Hindi respectively, by Vrajavallabha Dvivedi, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1978.

40. **Virupaksa-pancasika**
   


D. Texts pertaining to other Tantric Systems

1. **Bhuvanesi-mahastotram** of Prthvidharacarya, with Balabodhini by Padmanabha, Rajasthan Puratana Granthamala No. 54, Ed. Gopal Rai Bahura.

2. **Daksinamurti-stotram** Samkaracarya, with 'Laghu-tattvasudha' by Swayamprakasa Yati and Varttika by Suresvaracarya, Nirnayasagar, Bombay, 1902.


5. **Kama-kala-vilasa** (K.K.V)  
   *(a)* Punyanandana, with Skt. comm. by an unknown author, ed. M.R. Shastri, K.S.S. No. XII, 1918.  
   *(b)* with 'Cidvalli' by Natananandanatha, translated with comm. by A. Avalon, 2nd edition (revised and enlarged), Madras, 1953.

6. **Lalitasahasra-naman** with Bhaskararaya's commentary, translated into English by R.A. Sastry, 3rd edition (revised and enlarged), Madras, 1951.

7. **Luptagama-samgraha** Edited and collected by M.M. Gopinath Kaviraja, Pt. I, Sanskrit University, Saka 1892.


11. **Tripura-rahasya (Jnanakhanda [T.R. (J.Kh.)])**
   (b) (English Translation and a comparative study of the process of Individuation), A.V. Vasavada, with a Foreword by C.A. Meiev, Chowkhamba, Varanasi, 1965.


**E. Other relevant texts**


2. **Bhrma-sutra (Samkara Bhasya)** (B.S.) with the commentaries Bhamati, Kalpataru and Parimala, edited with notes


10. *Lallesvari-vakyani*

   (a) In Kashmiri dialect, Sanskrit rendering by Rajanaka Bhaskaracarya, Srinagar, other particulars not available.


   (c) under the title "The Word of Lalla, the Prophetess", ed. Richard Temple, Cambridge, 1924.


13. *Katha Upanisad* with Bhasya of Samkara and Hindi
translation, Upanisadbhasya Khanda I, Gita Press, Gorakhpur.

   (a) Four editions of R.T. - (i) Kalhana (1138 A.D.),
       (ii) Jonaraja (1402 A.D.) (iii) Srivara (1407 A.D.),(iv) Prajya Bhatta (1550 A.D.) - all bound in one,
       Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, 1885.
   (b) under the title "Kalhana-krta Raja-tarangini", edited
       with translation and commentary by Raghunath Singh, Thesis approved for the Ph. D. Degree of
       B.H.U., Hindi Pracharaka Sansthan, Varanasi, 1970
       (A very detailed work).
   (c) under the title "Rajatarangini of Kalhana" critically
       edited by Vishva Bandhu and others, Woolner Indo-
       logical Series - 5 (Pt. I - Tarangas 1 to 7) and 6
       (Pt. II - taranga 8), Hoshiarpur, 1963 and 1965 re­
       spectively.
   (d) under the title "Rajatarangini of Jonaraja", critically
       edited with an exhaustive introduction in English by
   (e) under the title "Rajataranginis of Srivara and Suka",
       critically edited by Srikantha Kaul, W.I.Series-8,
       Hoshiarpur.
   (f) under the title "Hindi Rajatarangini (of Kalhana),
       Pt. I (tarangas-1-7), translated by G.K.S. Dvivedi,
       Varanasi, Sam. 1998.

J5. *Sarvadarsana-samgraha*
   (a) Sayana-madhava, edited with an original commentary
       in Sanskrit by M.M. Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar,
       2nd edition, Govt. Oriental Series class Z, No. 4,
       BORI, Poona, 1951,
   (b) Translated with Hindi commentary "Prakasa' by
   (c) Translated into English with notes by E.B.Cowell and
       A.E. Gough, Reprint by Chowkhamba, Varanasi,
       1961.

16. *Srikantha-carita* Mankha, with Vrtti of Jonaraja, K.M.
    Series No.III.

18. *Vakyapadiya*
   *(b) with the commentaries, Vrtti and Paddhati of Vrsabhadeva, ed. by K.A.S. Iyer, Deccan College Monograph Series 38 (Kanda I), and 21 (Kanda III, Part I), Poona, 1966 and 1963 respectively.


**SECONDARY SOURCES**

A. Works and Theses pertaining to Kashmir, Kashmir Saivism and Krama System


2. अभिनवगुप्त के रसोद्र : एक अभ्ययन (Unpublished) N. Rastogi, A Dissertation submitted to the Lucknow University for partial completion of M.A. (Final) Examination, 1959.


7. *The Book of the Secrets* Discourses on "Vijnana Bhairava Tantra" (in 5 volumes) by Acharya Rajneesh,


34. *A Short Review of the Research Publications* Kashmir State: (Short Review) M.S. Kaul, Srinagar, year not mention-
35. *Sufism in Kashmir* (From the Fourteenth to the Sixteenth Century) Abdul Qaiyum Rafiqi, Delhi-Varanasi, year not given.


38. *Svatantryadarpāna* B.N. Pandit, Srinagar, other details not given (copy per courtesy of the author).


40. सोमानन्दकृत शिवब्रह्मण का सारांश समीक्षात्मक प्रयोग Sarojini Rastogi, thesis submitted to the University of Lucknow for the degree of Ph. D., 1972.


B. General Sources containing references to the Kashmir Saivism


4. *Darsanodaya* Laksmipuram Srinivasacar, with a Foreword in English by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Mysore, 1933. (pp. 253-55).


**C. Research Papers, Articles and Journals Pertaining to Kashmir Saivism**


2. *Abhinavagupta and Bhagvala* S.N. Tadpatrikar, ABORI, XV, 19S4.


4. रघुनाथ पांडेय द्वारा लिखित अङ्गार्थवाद रघुनाथ पांडेय, S. Su., Vol. 17, Nos. 1-4.

5. द्वार्त्थवादी की प्रमुखवाल और धर्मवालगुप्त N. Rastogi, D.S., Vol, 10, No. 1, 1964.


21. काश्मीरीय संवर्धन की कुछ विद्वेष्कताएं M.M. Gopinath Kaviraj, Kalyana, Śivanka.


30. The Language of the Mahanaya Prakasa : An example of Kashmiri as Written in the Fifteenth Century George A. Grierson, Memoir Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. XI, No. 2, year not given.


33. *Miscellanea Indica* -
   1. *The Bhagavadbhaktistotra* by Avadhutasiddha
   2. *Five unpublished stanzas of Abhinavagupta*
   3. *The Bhairavanukaranastotra* by Ksemaraja


42. *Saivistic Conception of Liberation* B.N. Pandit, Jarnmu and Kashmir University Review, other particulars not mentioned, off-print supplied by the author.

43. ब्रजक्षेत्रविश्वासः Raghunath Pandey, S. Su., other particulars not known, off-print supplied by the author.


54. *Sutasoma's teaching to Gajavaktra, the snake and the tigress* Dr. J. Ensink, pp. 3-4 16, 18,24. Off print supplied by the author. (The portion deals with the concept of Tarka - an important concept of the Krama system).


**D. Works pertaining to tantra and tantricism in general**

1. *मार्लोय संस्कृति घोष साधना* (BS.S.)
   M.M. Gopinath Kaviraj, Bihar Rashtrabhasha Parishad, Patna, Two Parts - Pt. I (1923) and Pt. II (1964).


19. *मृत्तिका तत्त्व* Author unknown, published by M.M. Gopinath Kaviraj, Varanasi, year not mentioned.


22. *The Relevance of Saiva Siddhanta Philosophy* N.M. Mudaliar, with a Foreword by Dr. T.M.P. Mahadevan, Annamalai University, 1968 (Lecture IV, especially pp. 149-158).

23. *अष्टि राधा का कम विकास* S.B. Dasgupta, translated by the same author in Hindi from Bengali, Varanasi, 1956 (Chapters IV and V deal with the concept of Sakti in Pancaratra and Kashmir Saivism).


27. ज्ञानमहापुराण की वाङ्गिनक तथा धार्मिक समालोचना Dr. Ramashanker Tripathi, Varanasi, 1975.

28. *Suryodaya* Special number of Yoga, Bharat Dharma Mahamandal, Varanasi, year not available.


31. तांत्रिक सांस्कृति (A Pamphlet) M.M. Gopinath Kaviraj, published on the occasion of Tantra-sammelana organized by the Sanskrit University, Varanasi, 1965.

32. तांत्रिक बाह्मण में ज्ञात्सत्त्विक M.M. Gopinath Kaviraj, Bihar Rashtra Bhasha Parishad, Patna, 1963.

33. तांत्रिक बोध चान्द और साहित्य Nagendranatha Upadhyaya, with a 'Prakkathana' by M.M. Gopinath Kaviraj, Kashi, Sam. 2015.


E. *Works relating to the systems of Philosophy in general*


3. बौद्ध विचार-संस्करण Acharya Narendra Dev, with a lengthy 'Bhumika' by M.M. Gopinath Kaviraj, Bihar Rashtra-Bhasha-Parishad Patna, 1956.


F. Research Papers and articles relating to the tantric as well as other systems of Philosophy


2. AIOC, 22nd Session, 1965, Presidential Address by Dr. V.S. Agrawal.


11. विदुरासंस्कारपरिविचयः तस्मातस्यः Braj Vallabh Dvivedi, S. Su., Vol. 20, Pt. II Sam., 2022.


G. Lexicons, Bibliographies and Catalogues etc.*

1. Alphabetical Index of Skt. MSS in Adyar Library V.K. Krishnamacharya.

2. Annual Bibliography of Indian History and Indology A. Fernandez Braz, Bombay Historical Society, 1931.

3. Author-Index of Manuscripts in Libraries in South India P.P.S. Shastri. Sn Venkteshwar Institute, Madras.

4. Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS in the Sanskrit College Library Benares, 1011 (Tantra Section).


* While taking notes, the publication years, in some cases, have escaped notice.


16. Index of Papers submitted to the All-India Oriental Conference Sessions
   1. 1917–1944 (Part I)
   2. 1945–1954 (Part II)

   K. Venkateshvara Sarma, The All India Oriental Conference, Poona.


18. व्याक्रिकी (or Dictionary of Technical terms of Indian Philosophy)

   By B. Jhalkikar, ed. V.S. Abhyankar, Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series No. XLIX, Poona, 1928.


APPENDIX 'C

Name Index

Acaryapandita 130, 131, 136, 149
Agarwal, V. S. 124 fn.
Ajladhara 166 fn.
Akbar 98
Alamkara 98, 98 fn, 193 (cf. Lankaka)
Amardaka 32, 107
Amrtananda 187, 197, 199, 205, 244, 245, 246
Amrtandanatha cf. Amrtananda
Amrtraratha 211
Ananda 137
Ananda Caitanya 141
Anandavardhana 216
Ananta 189, 212
Ananta Saktipada 26, 68, 69, 70, 92, 94, 224, 225
Antarnetranatha 89, 106, 107
Arjuna 86, 224
Aufrecht 221
Avantivarman 93, 97, 109, 112, 130
Avarataraka 224
Avarataranatha 83, 104 (cf. Sivananda)
Avalon, A. 141 (cf. John Woodroffe)
Bala-Valabhibhujanga 157
Bilhana 82
Bhanuka 91, 111, 120, 122, 131, 133, 137, 140, 209
Bhartrhari 63, 64, 87, 155
Bhaskara Kantha 99
Bhaskara 94, 110, 112, 115, 116, 118, 123, 127, 130, 131, 139, 142, 144, 145, 146, 156
Bhaskararaya 196, 245
Bhaskaracarya 244
Bhatta Bhaskara 145, 343 (cf. Bhashaka)
Bhatta Damodara 156
Bhatta Divakaravatsa 145
Bhattenduraja 129, 152, 154 (cf. Induraja)
Bhatta Jyogdeva 192
Bhatta Lollata 117
Bhatta Kallata 97, 117, cf. Kallata
Bhatta Raghava cf. Raghava Bhatta,
Bhattacharya, B. 44 fn, 60
Bhatta Utpala cf. Utpala Bhatta
Bhattarakas 225
Bhisag Devaraja 176 fn.
Bhojaraja 94, 177, 179, 181, 182, 184, 187, 188
Bhoja cf. Bhojaraja
Bhudda 198
Bhutiraja I 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 177, 178, 181, 184, 185
Bhutiraja II 154
Bhutirajatanaya 155, 156
Brahma Caitanya 141
Buhler 110, 134
Cakrabhanu 90, 94, 111, 152, 156, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 183, 184, 185, 187, 188, 192, 197, 220 (also cf. Vanama Bhanu)
Cakranatha (cf. Cakrapani)
Cakrapani 176, 185, 186
Cakres 186 (cf. Cakrapani-natha)
Cidbhairava 170
Damodara 157
Damodaragupta cf. Damodara
Dasirajanaka 213
Devabhata (Deva Pani ?) 94, 175, 176, 186, 192
Devaratha 189, 211
Dharmacarya 187, 188
Dharmaratha 211
Dinanatha Yaksa cf. Yaksa, D. N.
Dipakanatha 187, 188
Divakara 145
Dutirajatanaya 155 (cf. Bhutirajatanaya)
Dwivedi, Braj Vallabha 44 fn., 103 fn., 122, 180, 187, 202
Dwivedi cf. Dwivedi, Braj Vallabha
Dwivedi, Mahavir Prasad 223
Ensink, J. 59-60 fn.
Eraka 91, 111, 120, 121, 122, 140
Gandhamadana Siddha 92, 93, 101
Gargesa 166
Gaudapada 141
Gnoli, Raniero 160, 161, 161 fn., 169
Gopinath Kaviraj, M. M. 21 fn.
Gopinath, T. A. 37 fn., 38 fn.
Goraksa 215
Govinda 141, 227
Govinda-Raja 91, 92, 105, 111, 120, 121, 122, 128, 131, 133, 140, 178, 210
Grierson 221
Gunaditya 166
Gunaratha 189, 211
Gungaratha 211
Gupta 199
Haider Shah 223, 224
Hariscandra 223
Harsha Datta 182, 182 fn. 183
Hasan Shah 88, 89, 223, 224
Helaraja 152, 154, 155
Hiuen-tsang 97
Hrasvanatha 90, 94, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 188
Husain Shah 223
Induraja 152, 154, 155 (cf. Bhattenduraja)
Isana 220
Isana 184, 220, 220 fn.
I-tsing 97
Jagaddhara 222, 223
Jainul Abidin (cf. Zainul Abidin)
Jalhana 194
Jayadratha 211, 212
Jayapida 97, 138, 157
Java Simha 96, 98, 181, 193, 198, 206, 210, 211, 212
Jayarasi Bhatta 219
Jnanadipti 91, 101
Jnananetranatha 89, 106, 107
Jona Raja 1 fn., 211 fn.,
John Woodroffe 36 fn., 37 fn., 241
(Also cf. Avalon, A.)
Jyestharatha 211
Kaivalyasrama 138, 191, 199, 219
Kakara Devi 111. (cf. Keyuravati)
Kalidasa 195, 196, 197, 198, 199
Kalhana 97, 98, 98 fn., 109, 112, 138
Kalyana 213
Kalyanika 51, 104, 110
Kamala Datta 212
Kamlakara 138
Kanaka Datta 190
Kane, P. V. 36 fn., 43 fn.
Karna 97, 158
Karra Agnihotra Sastri 195, 196
Katyayana 154
Kavi Cakravartin 196
Kesava 166
Kesava Bhatta 66
Keyuravati 90, 92, 104, 110, 111, 120, 121, 129, 177, 178, 184, 209
Kokil, Ramjiva 159 fn.
Krishnамacarya, V. 65
Krsna 86
Krsnadasa cf. Varadaraja
Kuladhara 139, 156
Kumarila 159
Laksmana cf. Laksmanagupta
Laksmana Desikendra 148, 149
Laksmana Joo 143 fn.
Laksmidatta 212
Laksmana gupta 34 fn., 94, 122, 129, 130, 131, 135, 135 fn., 136, 137, 139, 142, 146, 147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 176
Lalitaditya 96, 97
Lalla 220
Lankaka 186, (cf. Alamkara also) 193, 194
Lankaratha 211
Lasaka, Rajanaka 109
Lollata cf. Bhatta Lollata
Lostaka 194 (cf. Losthadeva)
Losthala 98
Losthadeva 195
Losthadeva 192, 193, 194
Macchanda 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madanika</td>
<td>90, 104, 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhu (Madhava)</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhuraja (cf. Madhuraja Yogin)</td>
<td>166, 173, 174, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhusudan Kaul</td>
<td>101 fn. 146, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. S. Kaul cf. Madhusudan Kaul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahadeva Bhatta</td>
<td>123, 130, 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahananda</td>
<td>91, 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maha Prakasa</td>
<td>87, 174, 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahesvara Nathananda</td>
<td>134, (cf. Mahesvarananda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makaradevi</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammata</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangala Devi</td>
<td>87, 88, 89, 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mankha</td>
<td>1, 97, 98, 157, 181, 186, 192, 194, 198, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manohara</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manoratha</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocaka</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Shah</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monier Williams</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motaka</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukula Bhatta</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukhopadhyaya, Pramatha Nath</td>
<td>42 fn., (cf. Pratyagatmananda Swami)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadopada</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagarjuna</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagarajan, K. S.</td>
<td>109, 146, 163, 164, 168, 169, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadiratha</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natananandanatha</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narayana Bhatta</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natarajan* cf. Nagarajan, K.S.</td>
<td>166, 173, 174, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naveraka cf. Naveraka Natha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naveraka Natha</td>
<td>111, 122, (cf. Eraka also)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niskriyananda Natha</td>
<td>70, 72, 73, 91, 92, 92 fn., 100, 101, 102, fn., 103, 224, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nivasabudha</td>
<td>170 (cf. Srinivasa-budha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojaraja</td>
<td>200, 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padmanabha</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padmakara</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandey, K. C.</td>
<td>19, 80, 135 fn., 155, 163, 166, 168, 169, 174, 175, 181, 205, 220 fn., 230 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandit, B. N.</td>
<td>164 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameshti</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patanjali</td>
<td>58, 59, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pradyumna Bhatta</td>
<td>94, 112, 116, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 146, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prainjarna</td>
<td>123, 130, 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakasaratha</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakasopadhyaya, Svamin</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragalbhacarya</td>
<td>83 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratyagatmananda Swami</td>
<td>42 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayaga (teacher of Ksemaraja)</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prthvidharacarya</td>
<td>140, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punyananda</td>
<td>57, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puma Manoratha</td>
<td>97, 158, 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushp, P. N.</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raghavan, V.</td>
<td>176, 176 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raghava Bhatta</td>
<td>20, 129, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajanaka Lasaka</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajanaka Laksmirama</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajdan Lambodar</td>
<td>152 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajadeva</td>
<td>211 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razdan Somanatha</td>
<td>164 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raja-raja</td>
<td>98, 206, 211, 211 fn. (cf. Jayasimha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raktak</td>
<td>91, 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raktika Bhatta</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramakantha</td>
<td>54, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramyadeva</td>
<td>39, 41, 94, 98, 185, 186, 191, 192, 193, 246, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratnakanta</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratnakara</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesvara</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruyyaka</td>
<td>98, 210, 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahib Kaul</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakraratha</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saktyananda</td>
<td>91, 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samba Misra</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaya</td>
<td>91, 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sankarajnadha</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sankhadhara (Sangadhara)</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambhunathya</td>
<td>34, 140, 141, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammaratha</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sastri, Sambasiva</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauri</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sausuka</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shastri, H. P.</td>
<td>43 fn. 44 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shastri, R. A.</td>
<td>159 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddhapada</td>
<td>220, 243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Actually it is Nagarajan, Nataranjan is a misprint.


Sivananda II 26, 47, 87, 94, 95, 106, 200, 244

Sivananda Yogi 200

Sivaguni 226

Sivaratha 189, 210, 211

Sivasvamin 227

Sivopadhyaya 63, 92, 94, 99, 102, 103, 144, 169, 182 fn., 183, 183 fn., 214, 219, 225, 227

Smith, A. H. 188

Soma 179, 180, 181, 184, 190, 191, 199, 224

Somananda 3, 34, 34 fn., 75, 91, 92, 103 fn., 104, 117, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 135 fn., 137, 147, 148, 176, 179, 180, 230, 231

Somaputra 180, 190

Somaraja 94, 97, 130, 158

Sukhajivana 99, 228

Sumatinatha 27

Sundarakantha 227, (cf. Govinda-guru also)

Surada 213

Suraditya cf. Sura

Suryaratha 211

Sussula 97, 98, 193

Svatmananda 202

Svami Trivikrama Tirtha 196

Tapani 113

Tribhuvana Datta 189, 212

Trivikrama 130, 132, 152

Truyambaka 32, 34, 107, 135 135, fn., 137

Uchala 189, 211

Udbhata 91, 96, 120, 131, 138, (cf. Udbhatta also)

Udbhatta 94, 96, 137, 138

Ujjata 91, 120, 131, 133, 137

Upadhye, A. N. 218


Utpala Bhatta 112, 114, 115 fn., 115, 118, 119, 130, 131, 142, 149, 150, 151, 170, 171, (cf. Utpala and Utpala Vaisnava also)

Utpalacarya cf. Utpala

Utpala Deva 133, 134

Utpalaratha I 211, 293

Utpalaratha II 190; (Minister of king Ananta) 189, 210, 211, 212

Utpala Vaisnava 10, 52, 54, 64, 65, 94, 151, (cf. Utpala Bhatta also)

Uttamaratha 211

Vallabha 97, 130, 158

Vamana 96, 183

Vamanabhanu 187, (cf. Cakrabhanu also)

Vamadeva 166

Vamanatha 122, 183, 183 fn.

Vamananatha 182 fn., 183, 183 fn.

Varadaraja 42, 108, 170, 172, 173, 174, 175

Varadesvara 224


Vasum 148

Vatsalika 158

Vatulanatha 100

Vedanta Desika 65, 65 fn.

Vibhuti Datta 190, 212

Vibhramakara 132, 136

Vidyamandana 91, 97, 103 fn.

Vidyarnava 83 fn.

Vira Tada 181, 183

Visistrara 211

Visvadatta 189, 190, 212

Yaksa, D. N. 102 fn. 164, 222, 226

Yamunacarya 65

Yasaskara 97, 130, 158, 159, 211

Yodhaka 224

Yogaraja 64, 145, 170, 236

Yogananda 192

Yogesvaridatta 158

Zainul Abidin 98, 99, 224
### APPENDIX 'D'

**Work Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhedartha-karika</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhijnana-sakuntala</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advaya-sampatti</td>
<td>182, 182 fn., 183, 183 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advayasampatti-vartika</td>
<td>182 fn., 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advayavartika</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agama-pramanya</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agamarahasya</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajada-pramatr-siddhi</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrama-kallola-karika</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akula-kalika-trimsika</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamkara-sarvasva</td>
<td>210, 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamkarodarana</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaresvarastotra</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amavasyatrimsika</td>
<td>246, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Introduction to Tantric Buddhism</td>
<td>63 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anandalahari</td>
<td>138, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anandatandavilasa Stotra</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anubhavabodha-vidya</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anupratyabhijnah</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anuttara-srigurupankti-paramarsa</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artharatnavali</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrupagarbha-stotra</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-vrtti)</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balabodhini</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balarcanavidhi</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhagavadgita</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhagavadgitartha-samgraha</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhavopahara</td>
<td>41, 185, 186, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-vivarana)</td>
<td>42 fn., 191, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhairavanukarana-stotra</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhairavastotra</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhargasikha</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodhavilasa</td>
<td>182 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhogamoksapradipika</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhuvanesi-stotra</td>
<td>140, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmayamala</td>
<td>229, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brhati-vimarsini</td>
<td>cf. Isvara-pratyabhijnah-brhati-vimarsini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cakresvara-Bhairavastaka</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candrika cf. Cid-gagana-candrika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cidgagana-candrika</td>
<td>44 fn., 140, 141, 142, 177, 179, 180, 181, 184, 188, 190, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 206, 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cidvalli cf. Kamakala-vilasa-cidvalli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chumma-sampradaya</td>
<td>8, 70, 72, 73, 94, 99, 101, 102, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-prakasa)</td>
<td>102, 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehestha-devata-cakra-stotra</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devi-bhujanga</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devika-krama</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devinamavilasa</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devya-yamala cf. Devi-Yamala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviyamala</td>
<td>73, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhvanyalokalocandodyota</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinakrandanastotra</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipika (Yogini-hrdaya Dipika)</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Author of the-)</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divya-krida-bahumanastotra</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvayasampatti cf. Advayasampatti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekayanaveda</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gana Karika</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gita</td>
<td>86, 154, 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Another commentary on-)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurunathaparamarsa</td>
<td>166, 173-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haracarita-cintamani</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haravijaya</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Dharmasastra</td>
<td>37 fn., 43 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrdaya-candrika</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrdaya-sutra</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Footsteps of Buddha</td>
<td>44 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istasiddhi</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isvarapratyabhijnaj-dipika</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isvara-pratyabhijnaj-karika</td>
<td>133, 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-vimarsini)</td>
<td>99, 134 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-vrtti)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-vyakhya)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-tika or vivrtti)</td>
<td>133, 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-vivrti-vimarsini)</td>
<td>110, 133, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-brhati-vimarsini)</td>
<td>134, 158, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isvara-siddhi</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isvara-siddhi-vrtti</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayakhyaj-samhita</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jnana-kriya-dvaya-sataka</td>
<td>80, 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaksya-stotra</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalika-krama</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamakalavilasa</td>
<td>57, 65, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-cidvalli)</td>
<td>65, 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karika 118 (cf. Spanda Karika)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Author of the-)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasmiragama-pramanya</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasmirakusuma</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katangra-vrtti</td>
<td>220, 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Index</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaulasutra 220, 221</td>
<td>Kavya Prakasa 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayyaloka 216</td>
<td>Kiranagama 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komalavallistava 217, 218</td>
<td>Komala-Stava cf. Komalavallistava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krama 217</td>
<td>Krama-bhattacharaka 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krama-dipika 66</td>
<td>Krama-kamala 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramakeli 83, 85, 90, 110, 128, 139, 144, 161, 163, 164, 164 fn.</td>
<td>Krama-malika 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krama-naya-pradipika 143 fn.</td>
<td>Krama-rahasya 232, 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krama-ratna 66</td>
<td>Krama-ratnamala 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krama-sadbhava 143, 145, 233, 234, 235</td>
<td>Krama-samgraha 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krama-sandhana 66</td>
<td>Krama-stotra 11, 167, 168, 242 (Tika on the) 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krama-stuti 66, 138</td>
<td>(Tika on the) 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krama-sutras 11, 167, 168, 242</td>
<td>Krama-vasana 66, 201, 202, 205, 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Author of the-) 167</td>
<td>Kramodaya 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laghu-stava 187</td>
<td>Kramottama 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Author of the-) 187</td>
<td>Krtanta-tanti-santi-stava 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laghu-vrtti 219</td>
<td>Kulacudamani Tantra 43 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laghu-vrtti-vimarsini 173</td>
<td>Kula-kamala 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laksmi-samhita 64</td>
<td>Kulasutra 221, 222, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laksmitantra 64, 65</td>
<td>Kundalabharana 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalita-sahasra-nama 196</td>
<td>Kuttanimatam 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasaki 109</td>
<td>(Author of the-) 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locana 216</td>
<td>Mahartha-manjari 73, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhavakula 73, 74</td>
<td>Madhuvahini 115, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhya-yugina-caritrikosa 146</td>
<td>Mahanayapaddhati 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahanaya-prakasa (S) 87, 90, 99, 177, 207, 220, 221 fn., 222, 243</td>
<td>Mahanaya-prakasa (T) 106, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 244, 246 (The author of the-) 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The author of the-) 2, 23, 95, 99, 220 fn.</td>
<td>Mahakrama-manjari 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The author of the other-) 89</td>
<td>Mahartha-prakasa cf. Mahanayapprakasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharthodaya 216, 218, 219</td>
<td>Malini-vijaya 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malini-vijayavartika 2, 159, 162</td>
<td>Malini-vijayottara-tantra 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malavikagnimitra 195, 199</td>
<td>Mano'nu-sasana-stotra 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantraraja 226, 227</td>
<td>Mantrasara 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manskasa-samgraha-kaumudi 146</td>
<td>Matangistotra 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukundakeli 217, 218</td>
<td>Mimamsa-samgraha-kaumudi 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakhapratapa 217, 218</td>
<td>Netra Tantra 166, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Uddyota on-) 166</td>
<td>Nirmaya 52, 114, 167, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nirnaya-sadasikarnava-tantra 201</td>
<td>Nityasodasikarnava-tantra 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyasa 223</td>
<td>Nyaya-parisuddhi 65 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramatha-samgraha 169</td>
<td>Padarthadarsa 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramarthara-sara-samgraha-vivrti 170</td>
<td>Padyamrta-sopana 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramastotra 217, 219</td>
<td>Panca-krama 62, 63 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramasututti 217</td>
<td>Pancaratra-upanisad 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasurama-kalpa-sutra 219</td>
<td>Pancasatika cf. Devipancasatika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pradipaviveka 160 fn.</td>
<td>Pancika 195, 199, cf. (Cidgagana-candrika also)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramesha-stotramala 208</td>
<td>Paramarthara-samgraha 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakarana-bhakti 208</td>
<td>(Vrtti on-) 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakarana-stotra 244</td>
<td>Paramasotra-samgraha-vivrti 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakrta-trimsika-vivarana 8</td>
<td>Paramasotra-vivarana 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A commentary on—) 168</td>
<td>Prakrta-sahidra-panchakala-sutra 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—Sutra) 205</td>
<td>Prakrasa-panchakala-sutra 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakrta-sa-sauravali 133</td>
<td>Prakrta-trimsika 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratipanava-bala-bodhini 160 fn.</td>
<td>(Vrtti on-) 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratipanava-vivarana 163</td>
<td>Paryanta-panchakala-sutra 162, 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakrta-trimsika-vivarana 8</td>
<td>(Vrtti on-) 169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pratyabhijna Brhati-vimarsini — cf. Isvara-pratyabhijna-brhati-vimarsini
Pratyabhijna-karika 171, 215 (cf. Isvara-pratyabhijna-karika also)
Pratyabhijna-sutra 171, 215
Pratyabhijna-vimarsini — cf. Isvara-pratyabhijna-vimarsini
Prthvirajavijaya 210
Rajika 248
Raja-tarangini 99, 193
Rahasyamayma 65
Rahasyagarbha-stotra 149
Rasamala 223
Rjuvimarsini 44 fn., 58, 84, 169, 187, 201, 201 fn., 204, 205, 207
Sadhanamala 43 fn.
Sakti Sutra 171
Sakti Sutra Bhasya 171
Sakta-vijnana 132
Sambandhasiddhi 138
—vrtti 133
Samba-pancasika 169, 205
Samba-misra-pancasika 169
Samba-misra-pancasika-vrtti 169
Sambhavaikya-dipika 204, 207
Samvada 247
Samvidullasa 216, 218
Samvit Stotra 201, 203, 204, 205, 207
Sarada-tilaka (Tantra) 20, 129, 136, 147, 148, 149
Sardhasatika 143, 232
Sarasvati-kanthabharana 187, 188
Sarika-nityapuja-paddhati 160
Varjnanottara 229
Sattrimsat-tattva-samdoha 169
Saubhagya-bhaskara 196
Saubhagya-hridaya 201
—stotra 202, 207
Saubhagya-ratnakara 103
Saubhagya-sudhodaya 187
—on Ananda Lahari) 219
Setubandha 244
Sekoddesa-tika 60
Siddhanta-candrika 109, 110
Siddha-siddhanta-paddhati 106
Siddhasutra 243, 244
Siva-drsti 132, 136, 215
—vrtti 133
Sivaratrivicara 192
Sivaratri-vicara-vrtti 192
Siva-rava-stotra 191
Sivacandrika 103
Siva-stotra 159, 159 fn., 169
Siva-stotravali 133, 134
Siva-stotravali-vrtti 167, 168
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Siva-sutra(s) 20, 108, 109, 110, 115, 116, 118
—vartika 115, 123, 145, 146, 170, 172, 173
—vimarsini 52, 146, 167, 171, 172, 176, 235, 236
Slokavartika 159
Spandamrita 109
—vrtti on the— 115
Spandanilaya 169
Spandanirnaya—cf. Nirmaya
Spanda-pradipika 65, 109, 114, 115, 130, 142, 150, 151, 152, 171
Spanda-samdoha—cf. Spanda Sandoha
Spanda Sandoha 110, 167, 171, 172
Spanda-sarvasva 118
Spanda-sutra 115, 118
Spanda-vrtti 118, (cf. Spanda-karikas also)
Sri-guhya-samajatantra 59, 60
Srikantacarita 1, 194
Sri-krama-samhita 66
Sri-sastra 147, 149
Srividyavivarana 226, 227
Stava—cf. Pancastavi
Stava-cintamani 171, 172
—Vrtti 172
Stotra 144 (cf. Krama-stotra)
Stotra 169 (cf. Bhairavanukarana-stotra)
Stotra-bhattaraka 203, 204, 206, 207
Stotramala 220, 221
Stuti-kusumanjali 99
Subhagodaya 201, 207
Subhagodaya-vasana 202, 205, 207
—on Ananda Lahari) 219
Sukta 216, 218
Sukti-kusumanjali 99
Svachchanda Tantra 71, 167, 169, 171, 225
(Vrtti on the—) 169
Svachchanda Tantra 71, 167, 169, 171, 225
Vivruti on the— 169
(Uddyota on the—) 167, 171
Svachchandanyaya 169

Taittiriya Aranyaka 80
Tantraloka 2, 4, 5 fn., 32, 37, 42, 46, 68, 73, 87, 113, 122, 135 fn., 140, 144, 154, 158, 159, 162, 164, 165, 189, 209, 215
—viveka 143, 165 (cf. viveka)
Tantraraja 229, 241
Tantraraja-bhattaraka 73, 241
Tantrasara 38, 140, 159, 162, 163, 164, 170
Tantra-vata-dhanika 159
Tantroccyaya 159
Tatparya-dipika—
   (Author of the—) 170
Tattva-prakasika 188
Tattvartha-cintamani 108, 110, 115, 118, 120
Tattvagarbha 122, 124, 124 fn., 126, 128
   (—stotra) 124
Tattvavicara 119
Tattvaviveka 160
Tattvopaplava-simha 219
   (Author of the—) 219
The Saktas 37 fn.
Trika-bheda 20
Trikasutra 160
Tripura-rahasya 170
Tripurasundarimandira Stotra 201, 207
Uddyota—
   (on the Svachchandatantra) 167, 171
   (on the Netratantra) 166
   (on the Vijnana-bhairava) 92, 169
Vakyapadiya 152, 155
Vamakesvarimata 214
   (—vivarana) 214
Vamodaya 169
Vasavi-tika 109
Vatula-natha-sutrani 67, 69, 69 fn., 73, 92, 94, 100, 101, 102, 224
Vijnanabhairava 92, 99, 169, 214, 226, 228
   (Uddyota on the—) 92, 169
   (vrtti on the—) 225
Vimarsini
   (on the Alamkara-sarasva) 210, 214
   (on the Sivasutra) cf. Siva-sutra-vimarsini
Vivarana 144
   (on the Vamakesvarimata) 214
   (on the Tantraloka by Subhata Datta) 213
   (on the Paratrimsika) 162, 163
   (on the Prakarana Stotra) 162, 163
Viveka 143, 165, 209, 212, 213, 248,
   (cf. Tantraloka-viveka also)
Vivekanjana 145
Vivrti (cf. Sivopadhyaya) 182 fn.
Vrtti—
   (on Somananda’s Siva Drsti) 133
   (on Spanda Karika) 117
   (on the Stavacintamani) 167
   (on Vijnanabhairava) 225, 226
Yoga Sutra 59, 60
Yoginihrdaya 205, 250
   (—Tantra) 250
Yogini-hrdaya-dipika 202, 205, 244
APPENDIX 'E'

Subject Index

Abhasa 37 fn.
Abhasavada 51
Abhyanujna—cf. Anujna
Abhyudaya 40
Absolute (Godhead) 7, 11, 25, 30, 48, 53, 75, 76, 77, 78, 235, 237, 240, 247
(Five acts of) 11, 235, 240
Absolutic agency 13, 106
Absolutic dynamism 12, 31, 53, 76, 81, 237
Absolutic functionalism 7, 11, 13, 30, 70, 76, 81, 200
(fourfold—) 10, 12, 13, 51-53, 58, 77-81
Action 126, 147
Adhvan 39
Adyaksara-sampradaya 47
Agama—Throughout
(two categories of—) 75
(Krama—) 75, 229-241
(Sad—) 38
Agamic systems
Agni—cf. Fire
Akara 47
Akraka 15
Alamgrasa 68
Amavasya 246-247
Ambika 123, 125
Anakhya 7, 25, 58, 62-63, 76, 78, 189
(cakra) 20 fn., 46, 78, 80, 105, 121, 143, 231, 232, 234, 243
(krama) 30, 56
(samayesvari) 56
Ananda 77, 78, 79, 80, 89, 157, 204, 219
(cakra) 46
Anava-upaya 252
Anima 243
Antaryaga 49
Anugrahā 7, 11, 77
Anupaya 4, 253
(krama) 17
Anusmiṇti 60, 61
Anuttara-krama 16, 17
Apana 62
Arabic 99
Ardha Trayaṃbaka 8, 32
(mathīka) 32
Arghaputra 233
Artha 23, 249, 250, 252
(satka) 249, 254
Asana 60
Atimarga 27, 28, 29
Atinaya 27-29
Atma 137
Aunmukhya 125
Auttara Artha-tattva 19
Auttara-krama 18-21, 83
Auttara Tattva 19
Ayyaka 64
Awareness—Throughout
Awareness-cycle—cf. Samviccakra
Ayati-krama 88
Bandha 5
Bhadra-kali 231, 235
Bhairava 86, 87, 236
(Cid—) 178
Bhairavi 79, 86, 87
Bhakti 37 fn.
Bhasa 7, 12, 76, 77, 78, 235, 240
(cakra) 175
(samayesvari) 56
Bhatta 227
Bhavana 49, 239
Bhavartha 250, 251
Bhedabheda-vadin 5
Bhedabheda-paya 5
Bhoga 40
Bhoga-moksa-samarasya 6, 42
Bhrumadhya 79
Bhucari 78
Bhuta-suddhi 37 fn.
Bhuvanadhyavan 153
Bija 37 fn.
(Anyta—) 200
Bindu 53, 153
Bodha-krama 16
Brahmavidya 152, 153, 185
Buddha 63
Buddhism 59, 62, 63, 97, 144
Buddhist 61, 62
Buddhist Tantricism 61-66
Cakra 58
(Nava—) 20 fn., 46
(Theory of—) 48
(krama-sampradaya) 46
(Sri—) 57, 83
Caruka 83 fn.
Carya 37 fn., 41, 42
Catustayartha 12, 13 fn.
Chumma 54, 70-73
   (—school of Krama) 67, 70-73
   (Paryanta—) 72
Chummade 71-72
Cit 7, 77
   (—krama) 16
Citta-vrtti 248
Cola 44 fn., 174, 200, 215, 220
Consciousness—Throughout
Creation cf. Srsti

Devata 15 fn., 40
   (—krama) 17
   (—naya) 29-30
Devi 29, 30, 75, 76, 238
   (Krsna—) 41
   (Purna) 41
   (—naya) 29-30, 128
   (Mangala) 87
Dhama 7
   (—krama) 18 fn., 79
Dhavani-sastra 154
Diksa 37 fn.
Dipa 233
Divyauga 79, 84-90
Divine grace—cf. Anugraha
   (Principle of—) 144
Dualistic Saivism 155
Dutiyaga 19, 245
Dynamic Absolutism 53, 163
Five-function theory—cf. Absolutic
   functionalism and Pancartha
Four-function theory—cf. Absolutic
   functionalism and Catustayartha
Freedom—Throughout
Functional cycles 13, 46, 80
Functionalistic doctrine—cf. Absolutic
   functionalism

Gati 81, 217
Ghara 55, 71
Godhead—cf. Absolute
Godly functionalism—cf. Absolutic
   functionalism
Grace—Cf. Anugraha
Grammajaran 75
Guna 37 fn., 134
Guru 37 fn.
   (—pandti) 78, 87
   (Sad—) 38
Hathapaka 68
Hindu (kings) 96-98
Homa 39
Hrt 79
Iccha (volition, will) 78, 126, 247
   (—Sakti) 86, 87

Ignorance 11, 38, 297
Jalandhara 142
Japa 214, 237
Jaya 83, 104
Jnana 41, 42, 78, 81, 88, 153
Kalana 81, 153, 163
Kalana—cf. Kalana
   (five types of—) 81
Kala 14, 29
   (—krama) 14
   (—naya) 29-30
Kali 222, 245
Kalasakti 63, 155
Kalasamkarsini 30, 57, 74, 76, 86, 93,
   121, 147
Kali year 223
Kali(s) 13, 15, 29, 30, 63, 75, 76, 77.
   81, 105, 107, 143, 153, 155, 163.
   165, 232, 234
   (—naya) 30, 75, 128
   (twelve or thirteen—) 13, 30, 45, 56.
   76, 77, 78, 105, 106. 121, 143-44.
   162, 165, 200, 204, 206, 231, 234
   (Srsti) 52, 143, 232
   (—kula) 91 fn.
Kancukas 37 fn.
Kanda 79
Karanesvari 15 fn.
Karana 15 fn.
Kancukas 37 fn.
Karankini 79, 102
Karankini 102
Kashmir Saivism—Throughout
Kashmir 99, 172, 220
Kashmiri 99
Kasthula 227
Kaula 227, 228
Kaulakartha 250, 252, 253
Kaveri 200, 215
Khagendra 87
Khecara 69, 243
Khecari 68, 69, 79, 121
   (—drsti) 69
Kinciducunchata 174
Knowledge (cognition) 126, 237, 238,
   247
Krama—Throughout
   (Pata—) 235, 240
   (—catuska) 10, 58, 74, 106
   (Mudra) 11, 242
   (—naya) 10-16, 75
   (asTryartha) 13 fn.
   (as Catusvatvartha or Pancartha)
   12, 13 fn.
   (Southern school of—) 200
   (—Sakti) 63
Kramodava 57
Kriya 37 fn. 41, 42, 78
Krodhani 79
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ksanikavada</td>
<td>(theory of instantaneous being) 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kespa</td>
<td>81, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ksetra</td>
<td>54, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kula</td>
<td>1, 3, 4 fn., 5, 6, 7, 8, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 42, 56, 70, 83 fn., 91 fn., 101, 165 fn., 189, 248, 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—prakriya)</td>
<td>32, 34, 35, 36, 52, 74 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—yaga)</td>
<td>83 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kundaliniyoga</td>
<td>37 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakulisa Pasupata</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>cf. Vak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lelihana</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokayata</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopamudra Sect</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logos</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maya</td>
<td>37 fn., 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—kosa)</td>
<td>37 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—yoga)</td>
<td>37 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhyama (vak)</td>
<td>78, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhyamikas</td>
<td>62, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahakrama</td>
<td>12, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahanaya</td>
<td>25, 26, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahartha</td>
<td>17, 20, 21-25, 26, 27, 52, 56, 109, 167, 220, 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—krama)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—drsti)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—naya)</td>
<td>10, 21, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—Siddhanta)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—tattva)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—tantra)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahaparamatattvartha</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahasahasara-carca-sampradaya</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahasara</td>
<td>26, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahatattvartha</td>
<td>250, 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahaugha</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahayanic</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makaradevi</td>
<td>45, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mala</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Paurusa—)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bauddha—)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamsa (meat)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manavaugha</td>
<td>85, 87, 89, 90, 100, 179, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manthana</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manthana-bhairava</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantra</td>
<td>36 fn., 37 fn., 40, 43, 80, 88, 153, 204, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—sastra)</td>
<td>37 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mata</td>
<td>54, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—sastra)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matantara</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathika</td>
<td>32, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melapa</td>
<td>79, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mina</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moksa—</td>
<td>6, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudra (s)</td>
<td>37 fn., 40, 43, 54, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—krama)</td>
<td>69, 71, 80, 11,68, 80, 102,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(five — )</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Virabhairava —)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mahavisnmay)</td>
<td>69 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murti (+Cakra)</td>
<td>46, 78, 80, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim rulers</td>
<td>98, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabhi</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nada</td>
<td>53, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natha</td>
<td>90, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nava-cakra-sampradaya</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netra-traya</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigama</td>
<td>259, 230, 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigarbhartha</td>
<td>250, 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nihsreyas</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niyama</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-twelve-deity doctrine</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogha</td>
<td>84, 85, 89-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of Awareness</td>
<td>cf. Samviccakra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovali(s)</td>
<td>54, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mahananda)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kularani — )</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pada-viksepa</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paduka</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palli</td>
<td>55, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancakrtya</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancamakara</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panca-pindas</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancaratra</td>
<td>37 fn., 64-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Samhita — )</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Samkarsana — )</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancartha</td>
<td>12, 13 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancatattvra</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancavaha</td>
<td>76, 78, 79, 157, 168, 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramesvara</td>
<td>29, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parama Siva</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para</td>
<td>125, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraugha</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para Vak</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parvati</td>
<td>229, 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasyanti</td>
<td>78, 125-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pata</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentad</td>
<td>78, 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentadic activity</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—tendency)</td>
<td>78, 79, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitha</td>
<td>43, 44 fn., 54, 55, 56, 73, 74, 84, 89, 107, 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—devis)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kamakhya—)</td>
<td>44 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kamarupa—)</td>
<td>44 fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Oddiyana—)</td>
<td>44 fn., 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Purna—)</td>
<td>44 fn., 84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject Index

(Purnagiri—) 43 fn.
(Purna Matanga—) 43 fn.
(Uttara—) 44 fn., 83, 84

Prajna-paramita 144
Praakasa 20 fn., 39, 46, 48, 76, 78, 80, 89, 204
Prakrti 37 fn., 64, 248
Pralaya 78
Pramat 134
Pranava 153

Praamkhyana—cf. Samkhyan
Pratishtha kala 153
Pratyabhijna 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 20, 21, 33, 34, 35, 48, 176
Puja 40, 43, 243
Puja-krama 143, 231
Punahuti 245
Purusa 37 fn.
Purvataka 80

Raga 245
Rahasya-mudra 150
Rahasya-rajika-yoginis 248
Rahasyarth 252, 253
Raina or Rajana 227, 228
Rajaputra 55, 80
Raktakali 143, 232
Rasa 53
Raudresvari 103

Reality 5, 24, 25, 39, 47, 48, 52, 76, 103, 237, 244, 251
(two aspects, Vacaka and Vacya, of) 23
(Dynamism of)—12-13, 23

Right Logic—cf. Sattarka
Rudakali 143, 182, 231, 235
Rupa 53

Sabda (—brahman) 54
(—purva-yoga) 63
(—Samskara) 63
Sadhana 42

Sadadka-krama-vijnana 33
Sadrsaparinamavada 51
Sahasra 68, 69, 70, 72, 73
(—mudra) 69
(—sub-school of Krama) 67, 69, 70, 101, 103, 224
Saiva 51
Sakta 3, 51-52, 116
(—system) 8, 28, 51, 56, 66
(—Siddha) 88
(—tattva) 23, 51
Saktopaya—Throughout
Samavesa 242
Sambhavopaya—Throughout
Sambhava-siddhas 68, 79
Sambhu-sastra 153

Sakti 3, 4, 4 fn., 37 fn., 48, 52-53, 76, 93, 116, 124-126, 128, 230
(—cakra) 56
(—tattva) 124
(—yad) 124-125
'Sakti is the Supreme'—thesis 128
Saktiman 52, 126
Samaya 49
Samayavida 28, 56
Samayacara 54
Samkarsini 93 (cf. Kala-samkarsini also)
Samadh 61

Samkhya 37 fn., 51
Samkhyan 81
Samkoca 37 fn.
Samskra 5, 52, 218, 221, 242, 244
Samvit 12, 48
(—cakra) 13, 17, 30, 46, 47, 76, 163
(—krama) 18 fn., 143-144, 231, 239
(—devi) 56
Samhara 11, 78
(—cakra) 58, 232
Sampradayarth 250, 254
Santati-krama 136
Saptars (year or era) 174
Sarada 82, 155
Sarada-desa 82
Sarma 71

Sarva-rahasyaarth 250, 253
Sat 48
Sattarka (tarka) 38, 49, 59-62, 91
Sense-d. inity—cf. Karanesvari
Siddha 79, 240
(—Jnana—) 79
(Mantra—) 79
(Melapa) 79
(Sakta—) 79
(Sambhava—) 79
Siddhahaugha 84, 87-90, 100
Siddha-santati 87, 88
Siddhanta (Saivism) 6, 42, 54
Siddhis 243
Sisyaugha 90, 179, 184, 183
Siva 3, 4, 19, 20, 75, 76, 77, 80, 115, 116, 125-128, 229, 230, 233, 238, 239, 247, 251
'Siva is the Supreme'—theory 128
Sixteen-spoked—cf. Sodasara Cakra
Smriti 85
Sodasara cakra 234
Sodasara 234
Sodasara cakra 234
Sodasara cakra 234
Speech—cf. Vak
Sruti 85
Sripitha 78
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sricakra—cf. Cakra</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srishta 10, 11, 30, 46, 78, 85, 235, 240</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—cakra) 58, 78, 175, 232, 243</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srividyanagara 83 fn.</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sthit 11, 46, 78</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—cakra) 55</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—krama) 87, 143, 231</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—kali) 143, 232, 235</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—nasa-kali) —cf. Sthit-kali</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suddhavidya 39, 208</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukali 143, 231</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunyata 62</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunyata-samavesa 70</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunyata 73</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunya 62</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunya 62</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Varna—) 20</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Daksina—) 20</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Siddhanta—) 20</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sukta—) 23</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(characters of—) 38-39</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(four fold division of tantric subject-matter) 41-42</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantric approach 249</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Six stages of—) 250</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantric Philosophy 9</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantra-prakriya 32-34, 36, 74 fn., 55</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattva (category) 37 fn., 51, 126</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteen-deity-doctrine 200</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiki 227, 228</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirodhana 7, 11, 77</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traistubha (metre) 273</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trisandha 32</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(—School) 33, 34 fn.</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trika—Throughout</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinetra (Prakasa, Ananda and Murti cakras) 46</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripura 8, 23, 28, 44 fn., 56, 66, 103, 138, 150, 187, 204, 209, 214, 226</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve-spoked—cf. Dvadasara</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upadhyaya 226-228</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upaya 249, 252</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(four upayas) 42</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(three upayas) 108</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utsava 37 fn.</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttaramnaya 19, 20, 21, 44 fn.</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttara-pitha 19, 83, 84, 90, 104</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vacaka 23
CORRECTIONS

Page  | Foot note if any | Line | For | Read
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
4 |  | 14 | works. The fact | works. Because of the fact
23 |  | 17 | word | Word
30 |  | 7 | Kalinaya | Kalinaya²
39 |  | 11 | tantra | Tantra
52 |  | 3 | the palpitate | to palpitate (delete) (Add after शल्लोनामः)
53 | 1 | 3 | Sp. P., pp. 49-50 | (Add after 'different' :) "Moreover the 2nd Eraka is referred to as father of some Vamanatha while the first one kept celibate throughout his life. As such, their identity appears quite remote."
53 | 2 | 1 | Sp. P., pp. 49-50 | Cf. fn. 2 supra
67 | 2 | 2 | to divergent | to excite divergent etc.⁴ in
70 | 16 |  | etc.⁴ | In
72 | 4 | 1 | cf. fn. 1, p. 55 supra | Cf. fn. 2 supra
96 | 18 | 1149 A.D. | 1155 A.D.
104 | 11 | 1000 A.D. | 1020 A.D.
109 | 1 | 1 | Sp. K. | S.S.
112 | 20 | 960 | 950
114 | 3 | 3 | I.P.V., III, p. 312 | I.P.V.V., II, p. 312
122 | 22 | | | (Add after 'different' :)

122 | 3 | 1 | p. 1:1 | p. 121
132 | 29 | incomplete texts | complete text
143 | 20 | Sardasatika | Sardhasatika
151 | 2 | word | work
167 | 1-2 | it is to single out | it is difficult to single out
171 | 24 | works⁸ | works
171 | 28 | pronouncements | pronouncements⁸
172 | 1 | claim¹. In the last verse of his Spanda Sandoha² | claim. In the last verse of his Spanda Sandoha¹
172 | 10 | Stavacintamani | Stavacintamani² and 1050 —
181 | 9 | and 1075— | Abhi., p. 473
181 | 5 | 1 | Abhi., p. 473 | Abhi., p. 473. Cf. Fn. 2 on p. 178 supra
193 | 11 | Lankata | Lankara
194 | 5 | Losadeva | Losthadeva
205 | 3 | 5 | Y.H.D., p. 68 | 6. Y.H.D., p. 68
209 | 3 | 2 | निरवध | निरवध
210 | 15 | 1151 A.D. | 1155 A.D.
210 | 28 | (See p. 211) | (See p. 212)
212 | 2 | be little | be a little
215 | 3 | 1 | देवींकुस्त्रय | देवींकुस्त्रय
215 | 6 | 2 | रेसाध्या | रेसाध्या
230 | 1 | 6 | भम्म्या हृद्युपण | भम्म्या हृद्युपण
236 | 4-5 | | | शिवानन्द (the author of the Mahānayaprakasa)
236 | | | | (the author of the Mahānayaprakasa(T))