

The Śaiva Literature

Alexis SANDERSON

Those engaged in the study of Śaivism have before them in manuscript collections in the Indian subcontinent and around the world a great abundance and variety of textual sources, providing a rich record of what Śaivas of various persuasions were instructed to do and think as adherents of their religion, beginning from the period between the Maurya and Gupta empires and then increasing to a flood from the fifth century AD onwards, when Śaivism emerges into view as the dominant faith of the Indian subcontinent and large parts of Southeast Asia. During the last four decades our knowledge of this literature and its connections with the related textual traditions of Tantric Buddhism, Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇavism, and the Jaina Mantraśāstra, has increased greatly through the study of the contents of these collections by a growing number of scholars. The progress of this research has been accelerated by two major undertakings. The first is the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (1970–2002) and its continuation, the Nepal-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project (2002–), which, as a result of an agreement between the German Research Council (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) and the Government of Nepal, has microfilmed and made readily accessible to scholars about 140,000 Nepalese and East-Indian manuscripts preserved in the relative isolation and mild climate of the Kathmandu valley, dating in the case of Śaiva manuscripts from the ninth century onwards.¹ The second is the collection amassed from the 1950s onwards by the French Institute of Pondicherry (IFP) of 8600 predominantly Śaiva South-Indian palm-leaf manuscripts and 1144 Devanāgarī paper transcripts, of which the latter, containing approximately 2000 texts, have in recent years been scanned and made available on the internet,² with images of the former to follow. There are many other important collections with substantial holdings of Śaiva manuscripts in India and in Europe. But the task of mapping the literature in those collections has been facilitated by the fact that these two major projects have enabled scholars to acquaint themselves with some rapidity with large quantities of previously unknown texts, or texts known only through citations, and so to identify and classify more readily than might otherwise have been feasible the riches preserved in these other libraries. The work is far from complete, but I offer here

¹See here fn. 183 on p. 49.

²<http://muktalib7.org/IFP_ROOT/access_page.htm>.

as one who has been engaged in this research throughout this period my present understanding of what the Śaiva literature preserved in these various collections contains. I shall be comprehensive, in the sense that I shall cover the literatures of all the major branches of the Śaiva tradition of which I am aware; but I cannot attempt to be exhaustive by mentioning every work that I have seen in all of these. For in the case of many of these branches, especially those that developed or continued to develop from the twelfth century down to the recent past, it is feasible to mention in a survey of this compass only the major among the works that have reached us and, among minor and ancillary texts, such as anonymous ritual handbooks and devotional hymns, only some examples.³ My primary aim is to provide scholars with a chronologically ordered map of the main divisions of the literature and their interlocking religious contexts as they appear to me at present, reporting the regions in which texts were composed where evidence is available.

Lay Śaivism

First there are texts followed by traditions of lay devotion to Śiva. They include in the Śaiva perspective all instruction for the propitiation of the Vedic deity Rudra found in the Vedas and their ancillary corpora.⁴ But the principal sources in this domain are the texts of what may be called the Śivadharma corpus after the work that is probably the earliest and precedes the others in manuscripts that contain all or most of them. These are the *Śivadharma*, *Śivadharmottara*, *Śivadharmasaṃgraha*, *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*, *Uttarottaramahāsaṃvāda*, *Śivopaniṣad*, *Vṛṣasārasaṃgraha*, *Dharmaputrikā*, and *Lalitavistara*.⁵ They advocate the veneration of Śiva and the dedication of a third of one's wealth to the support of his followers, the creation and maintenance of temples and other Śaiva institutions, and donations thereto,⁶ promising the devotee success and security in this life and, after death, the finite reward of ascension to the deity's paradise (*śivalokaḥ*, *rudralokaḥ*), followed, once the merit that earned that reward has been exhausted, by the

³I have excluded from consideration here surviving Śaiva textual materials that were produced outside the subcontinent, on the islands of Java and Bali, and also the numerous belletristic works whose narratives are taken from Śaiva mythology.

⁴See Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha on *Mrgendra*, *Vidyāpāda* 1.2–6 for this perspective and for examples of such Śrauta rites in the corpora of all four Vedas.

⁵These works, up to the *Dharmaputrikā*, are found copied together in this order in numerous early Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts (e.g. ULC MS ADD. 1645, 1694, and 2102). The *Lalitavistara*, not to be confused with the Buddhist text of this name, is found at the end of one of these (ASB MS G 4007). Outside Nepal we find manuscripts of the first two works, which are also those that are quoted in learned Śaiva, brahmanical, and Jaina sources, usually transmitted independently, though a manuscript of AD 1682/3 in the Bengali script (ULC MS ADD. 1599) contains both.

⁶*Śivadharma* N¹ f. 3v6, N² f. 34v2–3, K f. 32r12 (11.13): *vittāt (K : vittās N¹ : vitta N²) *ṭṛtīya-bhāgena prakurvīta śivārcanaṃ | kurvīta vā tadardhena yato 'nityaṃ hi jīvitam* 'He should venerate Śiva with a third of his wealth or [at the very least] with a sixth. For life is fleeting'.

most desirable of incarnations in the human world.⁷ They claim, moreover, that the rewards of adherence extend in various degrees to the devotee's patriline and dependents.⁸

Also in this lay Śaiva domain are certain Purāṇas, notably the *Skandapurāṇa*, *Vāyupurāṇa*, *Liṅgapurāṇa*, *Devīpurāṇa*, and *Śivapurāṇa*, and a great number of short compositions promoting Śaiva sacred sites (*śivakṣetram*, *śivāyatanam*) that have been given the status of scripture by attribution to one of these, most commonly the *Skandapurāṇa*, often in large collections covering whole regions. Thus we have, for example, a *Himavatkhanda*, a *Revākhanda*, an *Avantikhanda*, a *Sahyādrikhanda*, a *Prabhāsakhanda*, a *Nāgarakhanda*, a *Kāśīkhanda*, and a *Paunḍrakhanda* assigned to the *Skanda*.⁹ But perhaps even greater is the number of those that circulated locally and were never redacted into larger wholes, their claim to scriptural status being sustained by no more than an assertion in their colophons that they are parts of some Purāṇa. Examples are the *Nepālamāhātmya* attributed to a *Himavatkhanda* of the *Skandapurāṇa*, the *Pampāmāhātmya* attributed to a *Hemakūtakhanda* of the same, the *Āmardakamāhātmya* attributed to a *Kāverīkhanda* of the *Padmapurāṇa*,¹⁰ and the *Ekaliṅgamāhātmya* attributed to the *Vāyupurāṇa*. In some cases the loci of attribution appear to have had no independent existence. Thus in Kashmir it was conventional to attribute such compositions to the *Bhr̥ṅgīśasamhitā* or *Ādipurāṇa*, though no manuscripts of works bearing these names have come to light, let alone manuscripts of them containing these supposed parts.¹¹

⁷See, e.g., *Śivadharmottara* N¹ f. 44r1–2 (2.115–116): *mahāvīmānaih śrīmadbhiḥ sarvakāmasam-anvitaiḥ | krīḍate paramaṃ kālam rudraloke vyavasthitaḥ || tataḥ kālāt kṣitiṃ prāpya rājā bhavati dhārmikah | surūpaḥ sudvijo vāpi sarvavidyārthaparagah* ‘Established in the world of Rudra he sports there for a vast period of time with splendid great aerial palaces provided with every object of desire. Thereafter he returns to the earth and becomes a righteous monarch or a handsome brahmin who will master the teachings of all branches of learning’.

⁸See, e.g., *Śivadharmottara* N² f. 47r2–3 (2.78c–82): *yāvadaḥsarasaṃkhyānaṃ śivajñānasya pustake || 79 tāvatkalpasahasrāṇi dātā śivapure vaset | daśa pūrvān samuddhṛtya daśa vaṃśyāś ca paścimān || 80 mātāpitṛdharmapatnīḥ svarge sthāpya śivaṃ vrajet | sāntaḥpuraparivārah sarva-bhṛtyasamanvitaḥ || 81 rājā śivapuram gacched vidyādānaprabhāvataḥ | vimānāyānaih śrīmadbhiḥ sarvakāmasamanvitaiḥ || 82 manoramyair asaṃkhyātaiḥ krīḍate kalam akṣayam* ‘A king who donates a manuscript of a scripture of Śiva will dwell in the world of Śiva for as many thousands of aeons as there are syllables in that text. After rescuing [from the hells] ten ascendants and ten descendants in his patriline, and having established his parents and his chief wife in heaven, he will proceed to [the world of] Śiva with the women of his household as his retinue, together with all his officers and servants, through the power of his gift of knowledge; and [there] he will sport for time without end with innumerable splendid, delightful, and palatial aerial vehicles that will be provided with every object of desire’.

⁹See *Skandapurāṇa*_{ABI}, Prolegomena, pp. 3, 8, and 10.

¹⁰DHUMDIRĀJ 1991, p. 1.

¹¹Indeed, the *Vitastāmāhātmya*, which extols the sacred sites of Kashmir along the course of the river Jhelum (Skt. Vitastā), though sometimes attributed in its colophons to the *Bhr̥ṅgīśasamhitā* (*Vitastāmāhātmya* f. 75v8: *iti śrībhr̥ṅgīśasamhitāyāṃ vitastāmāhātmye ...*; also CLAUSON 1912, p. 618: BLO, Stein MSS 155 and 156), is in some manuscripts (CLAUSON 1912, p. 618: BLO, Stein MSS

Since this literature is composed for the laity, it is generally written in undemanding Sanskrit that could be expected to be readily understood by a larger public, but there is also much writing of this kind that recognizes the limitation in this regard of even this simple form of the learned lingua franca by adopting Tamil, Telugu, and other vernacular languages. As for the *Śivadharma* corpus, the same limitation prompts the *Śivadharmottara* to recommend that it be taught to its audiences in the languages of their regions.¹² The text probably envisages its being chanted in Sanskrit with each verse or group of verses followed by an explanation in the vernacular. But it could also be taken as advocating the production of translations. One survives: the Tamil *Civatarumōttaram* authored by Vedajñāna I in the sixteenth century.¹³

Initiatory Śaivism

Then there are the literatures of forms of Śaivism for initiates, which set themselves far above that for the laity by offering the individual alone the attainment of the non-finite goal of liberation (*mokṣaḥ*). This initiatory Śaivism comprises (i) the systems of the Atimārga, namely those of the Pāñcārthika Pāśupatas (Atimārga I), the Lākulas, also known as Kālamukhas (Atimārga II), and the Kāpālikas, also known as Mahāvratins or adherents of the Somasiddhānta (Atimārga III), that arose in that order, (ii) those of the Mantramārga or ‘Tantric Śaivism’ that developed on the basis of the second and third, coexisted with all three, and promised not only liberation but also, for those initiates consecrated to office, the ability to accomplish supernatural effects (*siddhiḥ*) such as the averting or counteracting of calamities (*śāntiḥ*) and the warding off or destruction of enemies (*abhicāraḥ*),¹⁴ and

153, 154, and 252) assigned to a *Kaśmīrakhaṇḍa* of the *Ādipurāṇa*.

¹²*Śivadharmottara* N² f. 45r3–4 (2.3): *samskr̥taih prakṛtair vākyair yaḥ śiṣyān anurūpataḥ | deśabhāṣādyupāyais ca bodhayet sa guruḥ smṛtaḥ* ‘A Guru is one who conveys the meaning [of the text to] his pupils in whatever manner is appropriate to them, using Sanskrit, Prakrit, or such means as the regional languages’.

¹³On the Tamil *Civatarumōttaram* see GANESAN 2009, pp. 36–38.

¹⁴In using the terms Atimārga and Mantramārga to denote these primary divisions of the Śaiva scriptures (*śivaśāsanam*) I am following the usage of the *Niśvāsamukha* (f. 2r3–4) and various later scriptural sources (*Kāmika*, *Pūrvabhāga* 1.17c–18b; *Mṛgendra*, *Kriyāpāda* 8.78–79; *Pauṣkarapārameśvara* quoted in *Mṛgendravṛtti* on *Kriyāpāda* 8.78–79; *Śvacchanda* 11.43c–45b; and *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 1, A f. 302r2–3 [35.72]: *laukikaṃ vaidikādhyātmanam atimārgam athāṇavam | phalabheda vibhinnaṃ ca śāstram evaṃ tu pañcadhā [āṇavam = ‘pertaining to Mantras’ (aṇuḥ)]*), which give these as the two highest of the five levels into which they divide the body of religious injunction relevant to Śaivas, namely (i) *Laukika* (‘mundane’), merit-generating brahmanical religious practice directed to the attainment of heaven (*svargaḥ*), emphasizing the kind of lay Śaiva piety that is seen in the *Śivadharma* corpus as the means of reaching the highest of the heavens, namely that of Śiva [*śivalokaḥ*]), (ii) *Vaidika*, the *vedadharmāḥ* of the four disciplines (*āśramāḥ*) of the Veda-student, the married householder, the hermit, and the renouncer, aiming not only at heaven but also, through the fourth discipline, at liberation, (iii) *Ādhyātmika*, comprising the *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga* systems, (iv) *Atimārga*, and (v) *Mantramārga*.

The division of the Atimārga into three within this pentadic classification is attested in the

(iii) those of the predominantly Śākta Kulamārga, which offered the same goals as the Mantramārga, but propagated distinct ‘Kaula’ methods that have more in common with the practices of Atimārga III than with those of the Mantramārga and indeed, I propose, developed directly from that source, preserving most of its distinctive features.¹⁵

Chronology

The dating of these traditions cannot be determined with any precision from the available data; but we may say that the Atimārga preceded the Mantramārga, beginning probably no later than the second century AD¹⁶ and reaching its third stage not later than the fifth,¹⁷ and that the Mantramārga and Kula-

Siddhāntaparakāśikā of Sarvātmaśambhu, p. 6, A pp. 21–22, B pp. 16–17: *tāni ca śāstrāṇi pañcavi-dhāni laukikam vaidikam ādhyātmikam *atimārgam mātṛam* (AB : *atimārgam amārgam* Ed.) *ceti. ...atimārgam tu śāstram rudrapraṇītāni pāśupatakāpālamahāvratāni* ‘And these teachings are of five kinds: Laukika, Vaidika, Ādhyātmika, Atimārga, and Mantramārga. As for the teachings of the Atimārga, they are the [three bodies of teaching] promulgated by Rudra, [namely] the Pāśupata, the Kāpālika, and the Mahāvraata (= Lākula/Kālamukha)’. It is also seen outside this pentadic classification in the *Mahābhairavamāṅgalā*, which has reached us in a ninth-century Nepalese MS and speaks of the highest revelation as comprising the Śaivasiddhānta with its three divisions (Madhyama [= Saiddhāntika], Vāma, and Dakṣiṇa) together with the Pāñcārthika (*kaivalī*), Lākula, and Somasiddhānta (f. 4v2–4): **icchārūpadharī (icchā corr. : itsā Cod.) devī *icchāsr̥ṣṭipravartanī (icchā corr. : itsā Cod.) | tataḥ sā varṣate vācā *śāstravr̥ṣṭir anekadhā (conj. : śāstravr̥ṣṭir anekathā Cod.) || prathamam śaivasiddhāntam bhedatrayasamanvitam | kaivalī lākulam caiva somasiddhāntam eva ca*. My interpretation of this passage, according to which the non-Atimārgic revelation, here called ‘the Śaivasiddhānta with its three divisions’, refers to the whole Mantramārga, rests on the fact that this work is a satellite of the non-Saiddhāntika *Picumata/Brahmayāmala*, also called *Ucchuṣma* (f. 1v5 [v. 6]: *[ucch]u[sm]ī[y]e mahātantre lakṣapādādihike vibho | sarvatantrasya sāro ’yam siddhāntam paripathyate*), and that a distinguishing mark of that text is that it teaches this classification into three streams (Madhyama [= Saiddhāntika], Vāma, and Dakṣiṇa), for which see here p. 33. My taking *kaivalī* to denote Atimārga I, more specifically the *Pañcārtha* (as expounded in the *Pañcārthabhāṣya*), rests on the fact that the term *kevalārthah* is used with this meaning in the Pāñcārthika *Yamaprakaraṇa*, v. 21, the Tewar stone inscription of Gayākarna (AD 1151), *CII* 4i:58, v. 5c; and *Sarvajñānottara* A f. 37r1–2. For the doctrine that while the Atimārga teaches only the means of liberation the Mantramārga teaches both such means and the means of accomplishing supernatural effects (*siddhiḥ*) see *Tantrāloka* 37.14–16.

¹⁵ See here fn. 220 on p. 57.

¹⁶ See D. R. BHANDARKAR in the introduction to his edition of the Mathura pillar inscription of AD 380/381 (*EI* 21:1, pp. 5–7).

¹⁷ The earliest reference to the Kāpālikas (Atimārga III) may be that in Agastyasimha’s commentary on the Jaina *Dasaveyāliyasutta*, *Gāthā* 237, p. 232 (on followers of bad religious practices [*kupā-saṃdīno*): *abambhacāriṇo kāvāliyādayo rattavaḍādayo ya saṃcaiyā | evamādayo davvabhikkhavo bhavamti* ‘Insincere mendicants are, for example, non-celibate ascetics such as the Kāpālikas and monks with abundant provisions such as the red-robed [Buddhists]’). It will be the oldest if Paul DUNDAS is accurate in claiming that this text “can realistically be dated to around the fifth century CE” (2002, p. 6). However, if that date is based on the fact that Agastyasimha predates the council convened by Devarddhigaṇin at Valabhī, at which the Śvetāmbara Jaina canon is held to have been finally fixed, then all will depend on the accuracy of the dating of that council. That has been placed in 453 or 466, both dates being recorded by Jaina tradition. But it has recently been demonstrated that these dates are first encountered in much later sources, the earliest dated in AD 1307, and then with a great deal of uncertainty as to the event to which they refer (WILES 2006). In

mārga emerged thereafter, the earliest text of the former, the *Niśvāsamūla*, assignable to the period 450–550¹⁸ and Mantramārgic learned exposition on the basis of an already constituted corpus of scriptural texts in evidence not later than the eighth century¹⁹ and at its height in both the Mantramārga and the Kulamārga from the ninth to the twelfth.²⁰ The earliest unambiguous dateable evidence of the Kulamārga is from the early ninth century, in the *Haravijaya* of the Kashmirian Ratnākara.²¹ There may be a reference to followers of the Kulamārga in the description of the temple of the goddess Vindhyavāsini in the Prakrit Kāvya *Gaiḍavaho* of Vākpatirāja, written in the first half of the eighth century; but this is not beyond doubt.²²

the first half of the sixth century we have a reference in the *Bṛhatsamhitā* of Varāhamihira, which mentions as a good omen the approach from a person's southwest of a cow, a person playing, or a Kāpālika: *usrākrīḍakakāpālikāgamo nairrte samuddiṣṭaḥ* (86.22ab). The *Pusa chu tai jing* 菩薩處胎經 (Bodhisattva Womb Sūtra) translated by Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 during the Later Chin dynasty under the Yaos (AD 384–417) refers to misguided ascetics who clothe themselves with bones and make their food vessels out of bones (Taishō 12:1044c14–15), tr. LEGITTIMO 2006, p. 57). This could be taken as evidence of awareness of Atimārga III in the fourth century AD, were it not that the practices described are also typical of Atimārga II.

The claim of LORENZEN (1991, pp. 13–14) that a reference to ascetics carrying skull-bowls and skull-staffs in the Buddhist *Lalitavistara* gives us evidence of Kāpālikas in “the early centuries of the Christian era” rests, I surmise, on the fact that we have a Chinese translation of the *Lalitavistara* made by the prolific Indo-Scythian translator Zhu Fahu 竺法護 (Dharmarakṣa) in AD 308. But it also rests on the assumption that the passage in question, seen by LORENZEN in the Sanskrit text published on the basis of late Nepalese MSS, was already present in the text when it was translated by Zhu Fahu. In fact Fahu's text lacks the reference (and indeed all other Śaiva elements seen later), which appears only in the translation of Dipoheluo 地婆訶羅 (Divākara) completed in 683 or 685. The relevant passages in the two translations are Taishō 3:510c11–27 (tr. Zhu Fahu), corresponding approximately to Taishō 3:580c22–581a26 (tr. Dipoheluo) with the reference to skulls in the latter at 3:581a10–11. I am very grateful to Miyako Notake for her kind assistance in consulting the two Chinese translations in order to ascertain whether, as I suspected, the reference to Kāpālikas is lacking in the earlier. In any case this passage in the later translation could refer to followers of Atimārga II, since the use of skull-bowls and skull-staffs is common to both Atimārga II and Atimārga III.

A mention of Kāpālikas in *Yavanajātaka* 62.25 would give a date much earlier than that attributed to Agastyasimha if PINGREE (1979) were right that the colophonic verses of this work tell us that it was composed in [Śaka] 191, = AD 269/270. However, it has now been shown by MAK (2013), confirming a doubt voiced by FALK (2012, p. 143, fn. 2), that there is no date here. To obtain it we have to (i) believe that the author used the *bhūtasamkhyā* system of rendering numerals in spite of the fact that he does so nowhere else in this number-rich work, (ii) read *nārāyaṇāṅkendumayādi-* where the manuscripts clearly read *nārāyaṇārkendumayādi-*, a reading that conveys appropriate meaning as it stands, and then, in order to obtain the *bhūtasamkhyā* number 191, (iii) accept PINGREE's emendation *nārāyaṇāṅkendumitābda-*, and (iv) accept that *nārāyaṇa-* in the compound denotes the digit 1 even though this usage is not found anywhere else in *bhūtasamkhyā* notation. In the light of this argument we can now say only that the *Yavanajātaka* is earlier than the first dateable citations of it, which are in Bhāskara's commentary on the *Āryabhaṭīya*, composed in AD 629 (MAK 2013, p. 65).

¹⁸GOODALL and ISAACSON 2007, p. 6.

¹⁹I refer to the works of Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati, for whose dating see here fn. 55 on p. 15.

²⁰SANDERSON 2007b.

²¹*Haravijaya* 47.96–99 in the context of the Trika (see also 47.112); see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 18–19, fn. 21

²²*Gaiḍavaho* v. 319, in the hymn to the goddess Vindhyavāsini: *visasijantamahāpasudamṣa-*

The literature of lay devotion began when the Atimārga was already established and continued to grow after the emergence of the Mantramārga. It might be assumed that it was produced by adherents of the initiatory traditions for the guidance of their uninitiated followers. However, while these texts show some awareness of the initiatory traditions, either of the Atimārga alone or of both that and the Mantramārga, and while the initiatory traditions promoted this literature as valid prescription for their lay followers, divergences in matters of doctrine argue against the assumption that they themselves produced it. It is rather the product of an old and widespread tradition that the initiatory systems acknowledged when they rose to promi-

nasambhamaparopparārūdhā | gayane cciya gamdhaiḍim kuṇamti kauḷaṅārīo ‘The Kaula women seem to form a shrine for you in the air as they clamber over each other in their excitement at the sight of a human sacrificial victim being carved up’. I cited this verse in SANDERSON 2001 (p. 11 and fn. 9) as the earliest evidence of the Kulamārga, taking Pkt. *kauḷa-* to be Pkt. for Skt. *kaula-* in the meaning ‘follower of the Kula[mārga]’. But it is less than certain that this is what is intended here. The form *kauḷa-* (rather than *kola-*) for Skt. *kaula-* is seen in this sense in the tenth-century Apabhraṃśa *Mahāpurāṇa* 79.7.5 (*appaṭiṃ aṃbari saṃjoyamāṇu kauḷu vi bhāvai mahumukkaṅāṇu | nicceyaṇi susiri sivattu thavaī pasumāsu khāi mahu sīhu pibai* ‘Gazing into the void the Kaula too meditates, his understanding lost through wine. He installs Śivahood in the sheath [of the vagina], devoid of consciousness [though that is]. He eats the flesh of animals and drinks alcoholic liquor’). But it is a commonplace in descriptions of the cult of this wild goddess that her devotees are said to be the indigenous forest-dwellers of the region; the scene depicted here seems more appropriate to them than to Kaula women, that is to say, to the wives of Kaula initiates or women who are themselves Kaula initiates; and the forest-dwellers inhabiting the hilly regions of central India within which the temple of Vindhyaśinī was located are the tribal people now called Kols (Skt. *kolāḥ* [*Agnipurāṇa* 277.3]). When Sanskrit and Prakrit sources speak of her tribal worshippers they identify them as Śabaras (*Gauḍavaho* v. 336 and 338, *Haravijaya* 47.41, 47.152; *Kathāsaritsāgara* 55.220; and *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* 9.436–439), Pulindas, or Bhillas, these ethnonyms being used interchangeably (*Kathāsaritsāgara* 55.220, 72.3–4, 101.283–284). But Śabara is a generic term that includes the Kols within its reference (MAZUMDAR 1927, p. 26) and the Kol tribes themselves preserve the memory of this name (THAPAR 2000, p. 249). It is at least possible, therefore, that it is Kol women that are being referred to here as *kauḷaṅārīo*.

As for the date of the *Gauḍavaho*, its author Vākpatirāja was a poet of the court of Yaśovarman of Kanyakubja and a pupil of the dramatist Bhavabhūti (*Gauḍavaho* v. 799), and this Yaśovarman is very probably the ruler Yishafumo [Yeshufamo] 伊沙伏磨 mentioned in the encyclopaedia *Cefu yuangui* 冊府元龜 of AD 1005–1013 (Ch. 971, p. 9r; tr. CHAVANNES 1903, pp. 53 and 100) in a passage cited from the *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書 (Old History of the Tang) as a king of central India who sent a Buddhist monk to pay homage to the Chinese court in AD 731. This identification was proposed by PAUTHIER (1840, p. 66, n. 1) in his translation of a section on India containing this notice in the *Gujin tushu jicheng* 古今圖書集成 (Complete Collection of Pictures and Books of Old and Modern Times) of AD 1726–1728, and accepted by LÉVI (LÉVI and CHAVANNES 1895, p. 353, fn.) and CHAVANNES (1903, p. 53, fn. 2). According to Kalhaṇa (*Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 4.131–145), who reports Yaśovarman’s association with Vākpati and Bhavabhūti (4.144), Yaśovarman was dethroned by Muktāpīḍa-Lalitāditya of Kashmir (r. c. 725–c. 762), an event that probably occurred about 740–745 (SMITH 1908, p. 777). His rule must have begun at some time before his embassy to China in AD 731. The year 728 has been proposed (SMITH 1908, p. 784) on the sole ground that the embassy is likely to have occurred shortly after his accession. No epigraphical evidence enables us to date his reign more precisely, there being only one inscription, excavated at Nālandā and undated, that can be assigned to it (*EI* 20:2).

nence, just as they took over pre-existing Śaiva temple cults.²³

The Atimārga

The corpus of texts known to us from the Atimārga is small. From the Pāñcārthika Pāśūpatas (Atimārga I) we have their foundational text, the *Pañcārtha* or *Pāśūpatasūtra*, probably much the earliest of our texts of initiatory Śaivism, perhaps of the second century AD,²⁴ containing practical religious instruction and the Mantras of this system, with the commentary (*Pañcārthabhāṣya*) of Kauṇḍinya. The latter, poorly transmitted in three manuscripts of which only one is complete,²⁵ was probably composed at some time between AD 400 and 550.²⁶ We also have five short verse-texts. Of these the *Samskāravidhi*, the *Pātravidhi*, the *Prāyaścittavidhi*, and the *Anteṣṭividhi*, which have come down to us in a single manuscript,²⁷ are devoted as their titles reveal to the procedure of the initiation ceremony, rules concerning the ascetic's begging bowl, penances, and the procedures for the disposal of the dead, principally burial. The fifth, the *Gaṇakārikā*, arranges the various key elements of the teaching pertaining to initiation and the stages of the post-initiatory discipline contained in the *Pañcārthabhāṣya* under nine sets (*gaṇāḥ*) of items, comprising eight pentads and one triad. This too, together with a commentary, the *Ratnaṭikā*, has reached us through a single manuscript, which was preserved by good fortune in a bundle of Jaina texts in a Jaina library in Pāṭan.²⁸

I consider it probable that these five texts, like the *Pañcārtha*, were taught as revelation rather than as works of human scholarship. For the Sanskrit of the *Gaṇakārikā* and the four *-vidhi* texts does not conform to the norms expected of writing claimed by authors as their own. Rather its transgressions of the rules of the grammarians associate it with the 'Aīśa' register of Sanskrit seen in the surviving early Śaiva scriptures of the Mantramārga.²⁹ In support of the position that the *Gaṇakārikā* was considered

²³For evidence that the Śaiva temple cults were a phenomenon that the initiatory traditions appropriated rather than created see SANDERSON 2004, pp. 435–444.

²⁴For this date see here p. 5.

²⁵See BISSCHOP 2005 for an account of the three manuscripts.

²⁶See HARA 1966, pp. 129–130.

²⁷They were discovered in the Nepalese National Archives by Professor Diwakar Acharya (Kyoto) in an undated palm-leaf manuscript (NAK 1-736, NGMPP B 32/12) whose contents were well concealed since it had been listed under the incomplete and inadequately specific title *Dīkṣāvidhi*. He opines that the manuscript is written in Maharashtra-style Devanāgarī script of around the middle of the fourteenth century (ACHARYA 2007, pp. 27–29).

²⁸The contents of this manuscript bundle are described in GANDHI 1937, pp. 3–5 (MS 3). He reports that it contains 159 folios, and that the Pāñcārthika Pāśūpata works occupy ff. 128–159.

²⁹Note, for example, *trīṇi vṛttayah* (*Gaṇakārikā* 2d, for *tisro vṛttayah*), *ajñānahāny adharmasya hānir* (ibid. 4ab, for *ajñānahānir adharmasya hānir*), *parigrahet* (*Samskāravidhi* 13c, for *parigrhṇīyāt*), *nivedīta* (ibid. 34c, for *nivedayet*), *ālepya-m-īśvaram* (ibid. 61d, for *ālepyeśvaram*), *śūdrād grhya* (*Pātravidhi* 2a, for *śūdrād grhītvā*), *tad grhed* (ibid. 46c, for *tad grhṇīyād*), *grhād grham paryaṭanto*

to be scripture rather than mere human exegesis we may also cite the fact that the author of the commentary on the text presents it as the answer given to a question of a disciple that begins with the words “Is it the case, O Bhagavat ...?”.³⁰ For this is how Kauṇḍinya introduces the *Pañcārtha* in his *Pañcārthabhāṣya*, as the answer given by Śiva as the first teacher (named Lakulīśa in later sources) to a question by Kuśika, his first disciple, which begins with the words “O Bhagavat, is there or is there not a definitive removing of all these forms of suffering?”.³¹ This strongly suggests that the author of the *Ratnaṭīkā* considered the propagation of the *Gaṇakārikā* to be on a par with that of the *Pañcārtha*. Furthermore, the *Prāyaścittavidhi* is said in its first colophon to have been “taught by the Venerable Gārgya”.³² This attribution may be to the Gārgya who was the second of the four disciples of Lakulīśa held to have been the progenitors of the four Pāñcārthika lineages (*gotram*).³³ This is consistent with a belief that the text is revelation, since a tradition seen in the earliest *Skandapurāṇa* holds that these four were created from the four faces of Śiva and instructed to take birth in the world for the salvation of brahmins.³⁴ It is further supported by the colophon’s expression ‘taught by’ (*-upadiṣṭaḥ*) as opposed to ‘composed by’ (*-viracitaḥ*) or the like.

Four other small Pāñcārthika works are contained in the bundle of Jaina manuscripts that contains the *Gaṇakārikā* and its commentary. The first comprises twenty-one verses on the universal ethical principles (*yamāḥ*) of the Pāñcārthikas following the *Pañcārthabhāṣya*, and the second, in thirteen verses, follows obeisance to the twenty-eight incarnations of Rudra, from Śveta to Lakulīśa, with a prayer to the last that the author may master his doctrine. Both inform us that they are the work of an otherwise unknown ascetic

(ibid. 52a, for *grhād grhaṃ paryātan*), *vidvāṃso* (ibid. 60b, for *vidvān*), *nityaṃ so vidhim ācaret* (*Prāyaścittavidhi* f. 13r2, for *nityaṃ sa vidhim ācaret*), *divā retodgame jāte* (ibid. f. 14r5, for *divā retaudgame jāte*), *labdhācāryapadaṃ yena* (*Anteṣṭividhi* 8c, for *labdham ācāryapadaṃ yena*), *yuktir-āgamagarhitam* (ibid. 11d, for *yuktyāgamagarhitam*), *ayaṃ pathaḥ* (ibid. 15d, for *ayaṃ panthāḥ*), *svaśireṇopariṃ *param* (conj. : *parim* Ed.) (ibid. 25d, for *svaśira-upari param*), and *śiropari* (ibid. 34d, for *śira-upari*).

In referring to such forms as *Aiśa*, meaning ‘proper to God’ or ‘uttered by God’ I am adopting the practice of Kṣemarāja and Jayaratha, who speak of the few such forms that have survived the linguistic upgrading characteristic of the Kashmirian transmissions as *aiśa-* (or *aiśvara-*), most commonly with the phrase *ity aiśaḥ pāṭhaḥ*; see, e.g., *Svacchandodyota* on 3.17, 4.234, 4.384, 4.530, 5.64, 6.49, 7.30, and 9.68, *Netrododyota* on 6.49, and *Vāmakeśvarīmatavivaraṇa* on 4.43.

³⁰*Ratnaṭīkā*, p. 2, l. 7: *kiṃ nu bhagavan pañcārthoktasamastaniyogānupālanād eva duḥkhāntaḥ prāpyata iti*.

³¹*Pañcārthabhāṣya* p. 4: *śiṣyaḥ prṣṭavān bhagavan kim eteṣāṃ ...sarvaduḥkhānām aikāntiko 'tyanto vyapoho 'ṣṭy uta neti*.

³²*Prāyaścittavidhi* f. 13v5: *iti gārgyapādopadiṣṭa<ḥ> *prāyaścittasambandhādhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ (prāyaścitta corr. : prāyaścittaḥ Cod.)*.

³³*EI* 1:32, vv. 16–17 (the Cintra Praśasti from Somnāthpattan). The lineage of Gārgya is the only one membership of which is claimed in an inscription (ibid., v. 19ab: **gārgyagotrābharanaṃ [gārgeya corr. : gārgveya Ed.] babhūva sthānādhipaḥ kārṭikarāśinām*).

³⁴*Skandapurāṇa*_B 167.128c–133.

called Viśuddhamuni. The third, in twenty-six Āryā verses, summarizes, without indication of authorship, what Kauṇḍinya teaches in the *Pañcārthabhāṣya* on the nature of Śiva/Rudra as the cause (*kāraṇam*) of all things, the first of the five topics (*padārthaḥ, arthaḥ*) that give the foundational text its name (*Pañcārtha*) and thereby its followers theirs (Pāñcārthika). This is only the first part of a work that summarized the teaching of the *Pañcārthabhāṣya* on all five topics, namely the Cause (*kāraṇam*), the Effect (*kāryam*), the Observance (*vidhiḥ*), Union (*yogaḥ*), and the End of Suffering (*duḥkhāntaḥ*).³⁵ The fourth is a hymn of seven verses in which Rudra is invoked under twenty-one names followed by instruction to the reader that the recitation of these names or even one of them at the end of his worship will lead him to Śiva when he dies and the information that this teaching was given by Rudra in the *Skandapurāṇa* at the request of Gaurī, followed by a verse of obeisance to the Goddess as the Gnosis of the *Pañcārtha* (*pañcārthavidyā*).³⁶

Apart from these sources we have in the Mantramārga's *Niśvāsamukha* a brief versified account of Atimārga I based on the instructional parts of the *Pañcārtha*³⁷ with the addition of a rule that one should offer Śiva only flowers that have withered and fallen to the ground,³⁸ and another in a Purāṇic work from Karnataka, the *Pampāmāhātmya*, which incorporates a modified version of the eight verses of the *Gaṇakārikā* and elaborates the discipline following our known sources,³⁹ but also provides revealing information not found in those, notably that when in the last stage of the Pāñcārthika's ascetic discipline he retires to die in a cremation-ground, it is envisaged that he

³⁵This is apparent from the first line: *śivabhavavidhisūyujyaṃ siddhiṃ cāhaṃ samāsato vakṣye* 'I shall expound in brief Śiva (= *kāraṇam*), the world (= *kāryam*), the observance (*vidhiḥ*), union (= *yogaḥ*), and the attainment of the goal (= *duḥkhāntaḥ*)'. Cf. *Pañcārthabhāṣya*, p. 6, ll. 21–21: *evam *saduhkhāntāḥ* [em. : *saduhkhāntaḥ* Ed.] *kāryam kāraṇam yogo vidhir iti pañcaiva padārthāḥ samāsata uddiṣṭāḥ* 'Thus there are five topics of instruction that have been briefly announced, namely the Cause, the Effect, Union, and Observance, together with the End of Suffering'.

³⁶These four passages have been published by DALAL in an appendix to his edition of the *Gaṇakārikā* and its commentary.

³⁷*Niśvāsamukha* 4.69b–87a (f. 17r3–v2).

³⁸*Niśvāsamukha* f. 17r4 (4.72): *ekavāso hy avāso vā dakṣiṇāmūrtim āsritaḥ | suśīrṇapatitaiḥ puspaiḥ devadevaṃ samar[cayet]*. Cf. *Pañcārtha* 1.9–11: *...-opatiṣṭhet, mahādevasya dakṣiṇāmūrteḥ, ekavāsāḥ, avāsā vā*. The purpose of this requirement that the ascetic should worship with fallen flowers is evidently the avoidance of the sin of injuring sentient beings (*ahiṃsā*), a principle much stressed in the *Pañcārthabhāṣya*. It appears also in the *Devikālottara* (v. 71ab: *svayampatitapuspais tu kartavyam śivapūjanam*). That plants are sentient beings and that therefore ascetics should avoid harming them is one of a number of notions that the Pāñcārthikas shared with and probably adopted from the Jainas; see, e.g., *Dasaveyāliyasutta* 6.9 (p. 144): *jāvaṃti loe pāṇā tasā aduva thāvaraḥ | te jāṇam ajāṇam vā ṇa haṇe ṇo vi ghātae* 'He should not kill or cause to be killed, wittingly or unwittingly, any living being in the world, whether animal or plant'.

³⁹*Pampāmāhātmya*, Adhyāyas 11–12. Adhyāya 11 covers the ascetic discipline as set out in the *Pañcārthabhāṣya* and *Gaṇakārikā*. Adhyāya 12 is the *Prāyaścittavidhi*, a treatment of penances that has much in common with the Pāñcārthika *Prāyaścittavidhi* of Gārgya and may well have drawn on it.

will do so by ending his life through Yoga, by extracting his soul from his body through meditation, a practice only alluded to in the *Pañcārtha* and its commentary but much stressed in the Mantramārga, particularly in the *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, which in its prescriptions for ascetic initiates perpetuates the discipline of the Atimārga.⁴⁰

Pāñcārthika tradition is also reflected in a number of Purāṇic works. These are of uncertain value as evidence of properly Pāñcārthika beliefs and practices, representing rather modifications through accommodation to brahmanical orthopraxy. But the *Pampāmāhātmya* is exceptional in this regard, as is the earliest, and probably original *Skandapurāṇa*, a work whose first redaction, in North India, was probably produced within the period AD 550–650, and which reaches us in manuscripts of which the earliest was penned in AD 810/811.⁴¹ For this contains valuable traditions concerning the early history of this form of Śaivism, its lineages, and sacred sites.⁴²

As for the scriptures of Atimārga II, we have, apart from their titles, only a few verses quoted from one of them, the *Pañcārthapramāṇa*, in a Mantramārgic commentary.⁴³ Knowledge of the textual prescriptions of this tradition can be gained at present only from the account of it given in the Mantramārga's *Niśvāsamukha* and from scattered remarks in other sources.⁴⁴ We also have an account in the *Pampāmāhātmya*; but this, being secondary, is of uncertain reliability in the absence of more detailed primary sources.

The situation with the Kāpālīka/Mahāvratin tradition of Atimārga III, also known as the Somasiddhānta, is much the same, though it is now clear that much of its practice was carried forward into the more antinomian traditions of the Mantramārga and Kulamārga⁴⁵ and that with it may have come textual material of which some, such as the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* incorporated in

⁴⁰This stage, that of cutting [the connection of the soul with the body] (*chedāvasthā*), is covered in *Pampāmāhātmya*, Adhyāya 11.55c–63b. The related material in the *Mataṅgapārameśvara* to which I refer is *Caryāpāda* 9.30–32, which prescribes Yogic suicide in a cremation ground in its chapter devoted to what it calls the *rudravratam*, which is evidently modelled on the Pāñcārthika ascetic discipline, and *Yogapāda* 7.41–48, which details the practice. On the Atimārgic character of this *rudravratam* see SANDERSON 2006a, pp. 202–208, which gives a critical edition and translation of *Caryāpāda* 9.1–13 and 9.18–32.

⁴¹On the date of this *Skandapurāṇa* see YOKOCHI 2013a, pp. 54–58; also YOKOCHI 1999, p. 68; BISSCHOP 2006, pp. 14 and 33. On the North-Indian origin of the Nepalese recension seen in the earliest surviving MSS see YOKOCHI 2013a, pp. 48–50. On the date of the oldest of these MSS see ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER, and ISAACSON 1998, p. 5; YOKOCHI 2013a, p. 3, fn. 1, pointing out that the date is 10 March AD 810 if the year (Samvat 234 of the era of Mānadeva/Aṃśuvarman) is current and 811 if it is expired.

⁴²*Skandapurāṇa*_B 167.118–149 (on the sacred site Kārohaṇa), 182c–183b (on the existence of eight Pāsupata sites in Magadha). The work ends (Adhyāyas 174–183, = *Skandapurāṇa*_{KB} vol. 2, pp. 939–984) with a detailed account of a version of Pāsupata meditation practice.

⁴³For the Lākula scriptures known as the Pramāṇas and this solitary quotation see SANDERSON 2006a, pp. 169–176.

⁴⁴See SANDERSON 2006a, pp. 163–184, 188–199.

⁴⁵See here fn. 220 on p. 57.

the *Jayadrathayāmala*, may have undergone little redactional modification. Here too we have a secondary source of uncertain value in the *Pampāmāhātmya*.

In the prescriptive evidence of the Atimārga the emphasis is on meditative absorption in the deity and counter-cultural asceticism, that is to say, on practices that draw their strength and appeal from their contravention of the norms of conduct imposed by the dominant, brahmanical culture. Nonetheless this is transcendence from within. For initiation and thence the practice of the discipline are stated in our sources to be accessible only to brahmins and only to those who have duly passed through the ceremony that qualifies a boy to begin the study of the Veda.⁴⁶ This requirement excludes women, though we have epigraphic evidence in an inscription of AD 1208/9 from Mt. Ābu that this exclusion was not always enforced.⁴⁷

The Mantramārga

In the texts of the Mantramārga access is extended to Śiva-devotees in all the four caste-classes (*varṇah*),⁴⁸ and also to women, though in the last case usually only as passive beneficiaries of initiation rather than as active initiates with access to office. By “passive beneficiaries” I mean those who have received the form of initiation termed ‘without seed’ (*nirbījā dīkṣā*), in which the destruction of the soul’s bonds effected by the ritual is made to include that of the post-initiatory discipline (*samayapāśah*). Such persons are promised the benefit of initiation, namely liberation at death, but freed of the inconvenience of the ritual obligations that bind ordinary initiates. They are passive beneficiaries, then, in the sense that they do not have to do what ordinary initiates do. They are expected instead to maintain the duties they had as lay Śaivas before their initiation.⁴⁹ Moreover, although meditation and asceticism are carried over into these texts it is the prescription of ritual that now dominates; and this comprises not only ritual worship as the regular duty of initiates but also, and more crucially, the ritual of initiation itself (*dīkṣā*), which, greatly elaborated, is promoted as the means

⁴⁶For Atimārga I see, e.g., *Pañcārtha* 4.20, *Pañcārthabhāṣya* thereon p. 106, ll. 17–18 and p. 8, ll. 5–9, *Skandapurāṇa*_B 167.115, 117, 120, 130, and *EI* 30:3 (Pālḍi inscription of Guhila Arisimha AD 1116), v. 15. In the case of the Kālamukhas (Atimārga II) we have only the testimony of the *Pampāmāhātmya* (*Uttarabhāga* 15 [*Kālamukhamatanirūpaṇa*], v. 3–4b).

⁴⁷*IA* 11, pp. 220–223.

⁴⁸On the caste-inclusivity of the Mantramārga see SANDERSON 2009a, pp. 284–301 and SANDERSON 2009b.

⁴⁹I say women were usually only passive beneficiaries of initiation, because there is an exception. The *Brhatkālottara*, a late Saiddhāntika scripture, probably composed/compiled c. AD 900 and in Kashmir, does introduce in its *Gaurīyāgapāṭala* (ff. 111r2–118v1) a form of initiation through which women as well as men may become active in the Mantramārga, though women are still barred from appointment as officiants and are strictly enjoined not to allow their duties as initiates to take precedence over their duties to their husbands. This is an initiation into the cult of Śiva’s consort Gaurī.

by which Śiva himself chooses to destroy the bonds of souls ripe for liberation, acting through the person of his consecrated officiants (*ācāryaḥ*, *guruḥ*), who alone are empowered to perform the ritual. This shift justifies the giving of initiation to devotees such as women, and also to rulers, who by reason of their duties of governance are not able thereafter to take on any additional ritual commitments. Only for others was initiation promoted as both liberating and qualificatory. The substantial rewards bestowed on officiants for performing such initiations for kings was no doubt among the principal drivers of the growth and spread of the Mantramārga's institutions. In addition the literature sets out rituals for the installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) of Liṅgas, other substrates of worship, and the temples that enshrine them, and for the accomplishment of the supernatural effects mentioned above.⁵⁰

The Saiddhāntika Scriptures

The Mantramārga comprises two main divisions. The first of these came to call itself the Siddhānta ('the definitive doctrine'). Its texts dominate the prescription of the more visible domains of the Mantramārga, presenting its officiants as performing the consecration of Liṅgas and temples where worship was to be performed for the collective benefit of all, holding office as the superintendents of the monasteries (*maṭhaḥ*) commonly attached to them, and taking the office of the King's Preceptor (*rājaguruḥ*), offering the monarch the benefit of Śaiva initiation and consecrating him in his office in a Śaiva variant of the brahmanical ceremony of royal consecration (*rājyābhīṣekaḥ*), thus promoting its officiants as vital to the welfare of the whole society.

Of its early scriptures those that survive completely or substantially are the *Niśvāsa* corpus (*Niśvāsamukha*, *Niśvāsamūla*, *Niśvāsanaya*, *Niśvāsottara*, *Niśvāsaguhya*, and *Niśvāsakārikā*, the last including the *Dikṣottara*), various texts that are or claim to be redactions of the *Kālottara* (*Jñānapāñcāsikā*, *Śatika*, *Sārdhaśatika*, *Dviśatika*, *Sārdhatriśatika*, *Saptaśatika*, *Trayodaśaśatika*, and *Bṛhatkālottara*), the *Sarvajñānottara*, the *Pārameśvara* (*Pauṣkarapārameśvara*), the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*, the *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, the *Kiraṇa*, the *Mṛgendra*, and the *Parākhya*. These scriptural sources are supplemented by two digests, the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Hṛdayaśiva⁵¹ and the *Nityādisaṃgraha* of Takṣa-

⁵⁰See here p. 4.

⁵¹For the date of this compendium—the earliest known manuscript is of AD 1157/8—see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 2–4, fn. 1. Verses found at the end of the work and edited in SANDERSON 2001 (p. 3) tell us that its author, the ascetic Hṛdayaśiva, was the disciple of a certain Īsvaraśiva, described as venerated [as their Guru] by several great kings (*jagatīpatibhir nṛpaiḥ pūjitapādapaṅkajāḥ*), an initiate in the spiritual lineage of an ascetic popularly known as Lambakaṛṇa—we are not given his initiation name—who had moved from the [A]raṇipadraka monastery (at Ranod, 25°04'N 77°52' E, in the old state of Gwalior) to the Gorāṭika monastery in the Paramāra capital Dhārā in Mālava (Dhar in Malwa, Madhya Pradesh, 22°36'N 75°18' E), a distance of about 350 km to the SW across the

kavarta, which preserve for us passages of several scriptures of the Mantramārga that have not otherwise reached us, both Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika.⁵²

The Saiddhāntika Exegesis

We also have a body of learned exegesis on some of these works. On the doctrinal chapters of the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* we have a running

Vindhyas, and there performed the Śaiva initiation of the Paramāra king Sīyaka. This is probably the Sīyaka of that dynasty whose three known inscriptions are copper-plate grants issued in AD 949 and 969 (*IIP* 1–3), with the first known grant of his successor Vākpatirāja II (*IIP* 4) issued in 974. It is possible that the king in question was an earlier ruler of this name mentioned in the Udepur Praśasti of Paramāra Udayāditya (*EI* 2:28, *IIP* 21). That, after naming Upendrarāja as the founder of the dynasty, lists as his successors Vairisimha (I), Sīyaka (I), Vākpatirāja (I), Vairisimha (II), alias Vajraṭa, Harṣadeva (alias Sīyaka [II]), and Vākpatirāja (II), followed by Sindhurāja, Bhojadeva, and Udayāditya. If this Sīyaka I was the king initiated by Lambakarṇa, then the date of the latter would be pushed back in time, perhaps as far as the ninth century. However, there are reasons to doubt the historicity of this Sīyaka I. No other source, epigraphic or literary, mentions him. The panegyric of the dynasty given by Padmagupta in the Mahākāvya *Navasāhasāṅkacarita* begins its continuous genealogy only with Vākpatirāja (I), but does at least report that there were kings who ruled between the founder Upendra and this king, saying that Vākpatirāja (I) became king when Upendra and others after him had passed away (11.80: *tasmīn gate narendreṣu tadanyeṣu gateṣu ca tatra vākpatirājākyah pārthivendur ajāyata*); and the land-grants of Sīyaka (II) (*IIP* 1–2) begin their genealogy from Bappaiparāja (Vākpatirāja I) (→ Vairisimha → Sīyaka [II]) without referring to any early rulers in the line. This silence is not evidence of absence since the Paramāra inscriptions usually do not report the genealogy of the issuing king for more than the three preceding reigns. Thus, for example, the grants of Bhoja (*IIP* 8–15, 18) go back only to Sīyaka (II) (→ Vākpatirāja II → Sindhurāja → Bhoja). More troubling in this regard is the fact that the grants of Vākpatirāja (II) (*IIP* 4–9) give the genealogy as follows: Kṛṣṇarāja → Vairisimha (II) → Sīyaka (II) → Vākpatirāja II, admitting no king between the founder and Vairisimha II. All this suggests confusion and indeed contradiction unless Vākpatirāja was Kṛṣṇarāja/Upendrarāja under another name. It is difficult therefore not to suspect that a gap has been opened after the supposed founder to push the line further back in time and that this gap has been filled in the Udepur Praśasti with doubles of Vākpatirāja I's two successors, Vairisimha and Sīyaka, thus creating two successive triads with the same names. If, then, Lambakarṇa was the initiation Guru of Sīyaka II, the only Sīyaka for whom we have solid evidence, we can determine the date of Hṛdayaśiva's *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* within tolerably narrow limits. For Hṛdayaśiva, we are told, was the successor of Īśvaraśiva and the latter was in the spiritual line of this Lambakarṇa (*tatsantatau*). Īśvaraśiva must therefore have been separated from Lambakarṇa by at least two generations. Hṛdayaśiva, then, is unlikely to have been active before the eleventh century. The Nepalese manuscript of AD 1157/8 sets the lower limit.

I say that Hṛdayaśiva was probably of Mālava because although it is possible that the spiritual descendants of Lambakarṇa had moved elsewhere by the time of Hṛdayaśiva, the emphasis placed on the Gorāṭika monastery and the absence of any mention of relocation makes this unlikely. To my knowledge the Gorāṭika monastery has not been mentioned in any other source.

⁵²See SANDERSON 2001, p. 4 for a list of the scriptures excerpted by Hṛdayaśiva and 2007b, p. 387, fn. 517 for a list of the scriptures and a number of lost Paddhatis excerpted by Rājānaka Takṣakavarta. The latter's digest covers the regular, desiderative, and incidental rituals (*nityakarma*, *kāmyakarma*, and *naimittikakarma*), but not those incidental ceremonies peculiar to officiants, namely initiation (*dīkṣā*), consecration (*abhiṣekah*), and the installation of substrates of worship (*pratiṣṭhā*). Concerning the date of Takṣakavarta I can say only that he postdates the latest of the dateable authors that he cites. This is Somaśambhu, the author of the mid-eleventh-century *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī*; see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 420–421.

prose commentary, the *Svāyambhuvavṛtti*, by Sadyojyotis, also known as Kheṭabāla or Kheṭanandana, and on those of the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* we have the following parts of a commentary (*Rauravavṛtti*) in verse by the same author, transmitted to us as independent treatises: the *Bhogakārikā*, the *Mokṣakārikā*, and the *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā*. We also have his *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* and *Tattvasaṃgraha*, in which he sets out Saiddhāntika ontology following, according to a later authority, the *Svāyambhuvāsūtrasaṃgraha* and *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* respectively,⁵³ and the *Nareśvaraparīkṣā*, a systematic philosophical treatise in which he formulates his understanding of the Siddhānta's doctrines of the soul and God without explicit dependence on any individual scripture. A near contemporary, Bṛhaspati, wrote a *Rauravavṛttika*, a commentary in verse on the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*, and the *Śivatanu*, a verse treatise of unknown scriptural affiliation. But of these two works we now have only citations in the works of others. We have no evidence of where either of these early commentators was active.⁵⁴ As for their date, both lived before the ninth century, probably within the period AD 675–750.⁵⁵

From the Kashmirian Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha we have an exhaustive commentary on the *Mṛgendra*. We know that he also wrote a sub-commentary (*-tippanaka*) on Sadyojyotis' *Svāyambhuvavṛtti* and a long commentary (*br-ḥaṭṭikā*) called the *Śaranniśā* on the same author's *Tattvasaṃgraha*;⁵⁶ but as yet no manuscript of either has been located.

From his son Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha we have elaborate prose commentaries on the doctrinal chapters of the *Kiraṇa* and on the *Sārdhatrisatika* recension of the *Kālottara* and the *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, these covering the whole of those Tantras and therefore not only doctrine (*jñānam*) but also ritual (*kriyā*), meditation (*yogaḥ*), and ascetic discipline (*caryā*). We also have his prose commentaries on four of the works of Sadyojyotis: the *Mokṣakārikā*, the *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā*, the *Tattvatrayanirṇaya*, and the *Nareśvaraparīkṣā*. The last of these, the *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa*, is a work of rigorous philosophical argument in which Rāmakaṇṭha attempts to establish Sadyo-

⁵³That the *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* treats the ontology of the *Svāyambhuvāsūtrasaṃgraha* is stated by Aghoraśiva in his commentary on *Tattvatrayanirṇaya*, v. 2. It has been pointed out (GOODALL et al. 2008, pp. 315–316) that although this connection is plausible and although Sadyojyotis may be implying it when he refers to himself in the final verse as the author of the *Svāyambhuvavṛtti*, there is no clear evidence that Aghoraśiva's judgement is correct.

⁵⁴N. R. BHATT asserts that Sadyojyotis was a Kashmirian (1977, p. xl: *kāśmīryeṣu sadyojyotiprabhṛtidvītyarāmakaṇṭhaparyantācāryeṣu*, as does DAVIS (2000, pp. 191–192). This appears to be based on no more than the fact that the earliest of the other Saiddhāntikas whose works have reached us were Kashmirians.

⁵⁵See SANDERSON 2006b, pp. 45–79, showing that the works of both Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati were familiar to the Kashmirian poet Ratnākara (and his audience) c. 830, and arguing that Sadyojyotis was active after about 675 and before about 725 with Bṛhaspati perhaps a little later, up to c. 750. For evidence that they knew these three Saiddhāntika scriptures see there pp. 46–56 and 77–78.

⁵⁶SANDERSON 2006b, p. 48.

vyotis' Siddhānta against the positions of the Buddhists and others.⁵⁷ He also composed a commentary on the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* (*Svāyambhuvoddyota*), but no manuscript of this has surfaced.⁵⁸ These two Kashmirian authors, father and son, were active in Kashmir and neighbouring Dārvābhisāra during the second half of the tenth century.⁵⁹

Two other Saiddhāntika treatises in verse have been transmitted from the period up to the twelfth century: the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* of Śrīkaṅṭha and the *Tattvaparakāśa* of King Bhojadeva. Śrīkaṅṭha has been assumed to be a Kashmirian and to have been a predecessor in the teaching lineage that produced Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṅṭha and Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha. But there is no evidence that supports or refutes either claim.⁶⁰ If the King Bhojadeva to whom the *Tattvaparakāśa* is attributed is, as seems probable, the Mahārājādhirāja Bhojadeva to whom an important Saiddhāntika Paddhati, the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati*, is attributed, then this work is a product of Mālava and the first half of the eleventh century.⁶¹

From Aghoraśiva, a South-Indian scholar active in Cidambaram around the middle of the twelfth century, who perpetuated the exegetical tradition of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṅṭha and Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha, we have the *Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā*, his sub-commentary on Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṅṭha's commentary on the *Mṛgendra*, commentaries on the *Dviśatika* recension of the *Kālotara*, the doctrinal chapters of the *Sarvajñānottara*, the *Bhogakārikā* and *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* of Sadyojyotis, the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* of Śrīkaṅṭha, the *Tattvaparakāśa* of Bhojadeva—this provides the only firm limit for the date of the last two works—, and the *Nādakārikā* of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha, twenty-five verses extracted from the latter's commentary on 1.5ab of the *Sārdhatrisatika* recension of the *Kālotara*.

We also have in a single South-Indian manuscript a commentary called

⁵⁷On the philosophical content of this text see WATSON 2006, focusing in particular on Rāmakaṅṭha's defense of his doctrine of the self against the Buddhist no-self doctrine.

⁵⁸See SANDERSON 2006b, p. 41.

⁵⁹For the evidence of their date see SANDERSON 2006b, pp. 44–45. On Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha's connection with Dārvābhisāra, a tract under Kashmir's control comprising the lower and middle hills between the Vitastā (Jhelum) and the Candrabhāgā (Chenab), see GOODALL et al. 2008, p. 312. There is, however, no doubt that he was a Kashmirian, since he tells us so in the colophonic verses of his *Tattvatrayanirṇayavivṛti* (*kāśmīrikabhaṭṭarāmakaṅṭhena*).

⁶⁰See SANDERSON 2006b, pp. 41–44.

⁶¹The Paramāra king Mahārājādhirāja Bhoja (Bhojadeva, Bhojarāja) is commonly stated to have ruled c. 1000–c. 1055 in keeping with a verse quoted in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* (AD 1304) of the Jaina Merutuṅga. This prophesizes that Bhoja's reign over the Deccan and Gauḍa will last for fifty-five years, seven months, and three days (p. 22, l. 7: *pañcāśat pañca varṣāṇi māśāḥ sapta dinatrayam | bhoktavyaṃ bhojarājena sagauḍaṃ dakṣiṇāpatham*). The available hard evidence, however, which neither contradicts nor verifies this claim, is that the earliest of his known dated inscriptions is of AD 1011 (IIP 8) and the latest of AD 1046 (IIP 16), and that the latest known inscription of his immediate predecessor Vāḥpati is of AD 986 (IIP 7) and the first of his successor Jayasiṃha of AD 1056 (IIP 19).

Bālabodhinī on some chapters of the doctrinal section (*Jñānakāṇḍa*) of the *Kiraṇa* by an author who is identified in the colophon of the first chapter as Aghoraśiva, in those of the rest as Vyākhyānikācārya, and in the closing verses before the last as Siṃharāja, son of Kāmarūpeśa and pupil of Nīlakaṇṭha,⁶² the pupil of a pupil of a Guru at Āmardakapura (Aumḍhā/Aundah in the Marāṭhavāḍā region of Maharashtra).⁶³

It is followed without any indication that a new work commences by a commentary on the *Kiraṇa*'s section on ritual (*Kriyākāṇḍa*)—only the first nine Paṭalas (13–21) survive in our manuscript—which four of the chapter colophons call the *Cintāmaṇiṭkā* and two attribute to Aghoraśiva. On stylistic grounds it is improbable that the two commentaries are by one individual with the common Saiddhāntika initiation-name Aghoraśiva and very improbable that either author is the Aghoraśiva of Cidambaram whose works have been mentioned above.⁶⁴

We have another commentary on the *Kiraṇa* by a certain Tryambakaśambhu about whom the text contains no further information. It draws on Kṣemarāja's commentary on the *Svacchanda*, which places it after c. 1000,⁶⁵ and the *Vimalāvātī* of Vimalaśiva, which places it after 1101/2.⁶⁶

We may wonder what proportion of the Saiddhāntika commentaries that once existed has reached us. That is impossible to determine for the earliest period, but we are able to know which scriptures could be studied with commentaries by South-Indian Saiddhāntikas in the twelfth century from a review of all the sources of knowledge of the Siddhānta available at that time given by Aghoraśiva's pupil Vaktraśambhu. Distinguishing between

⁶²The name Kāmarūpeśa is, I suspect, a periphrasis of the Saiddhāntika initiation-name Bahurūpaśiva, which is a synonym of Aghoraśiva, *kāmarūpa-* meaning 'taking on any form at will', 'protean', and *bahurūpa-*, a common name of Aghora, the name of the ferocious right-facing face of Sadāśiva, meaning 'taking on many forms'. For the common practice of using synonymous alternatives when referring to initiation names see here fn. 70 on p. 19.

⁶³These details are reported in the closing verses of the *Kiraṇajñānakāṇḍaṭīkā*, pp. 191–193.

⁶⁴On the question of the authorship of the commentaries in this manuscript see GOODALL 1998, pp. civ–cvii. My access to them has been through the Devanāgarī transcript of the IFP.

⁶⁵See GOODALL 1998, pp. cvii–cix. *Svacchanda* 10.356ab and Kṣemarāja's commentary thereon are quoted on p. 32, with attribution to the Tantra under the name *Lalita* (= *Lalitasvacchanda-bhairava*): *tad uktaṃ śrīmallalite: bandhatrayasamāyukto vāmāśaktyā tv adhiṣṭhita iti. asyārtho 'piyam āha kṣemarājah: tsvareṇa nimittena saṃsārava <ma> narūpayā svayaṃ vāmāśaktyādhiṣṭhitaḥ paratantrīkṛtas tata evāṇavādibandhatrayeṇa saṃyuktaḥ samyag ākrānto 'bhibhūta iti.* He also gives (p. 2) without attribution Kṣemarāja's esoteric explanation of the compound *kailāsaśikharāśīnam* ('seated on the peak of Kailāsa') in *Svacchanda* 1. 1a. modifying it slightly to accord with Saiddhāntika dualism.

⁶⁶The passage is as follows (p. 2, ll. 7–11): *tad uktaṃ: ko 'haṃ kimātmakaś ceti kim idaṃ duḥkha*pañjaram* (corr. : *piñjaram* Cod.) | *iti saṃcintya bahuśo mumukṣur gurum anv iyāt || *samārādhyā tatas tuṣṭād* (conj. : *samāsāṣṭād* Cod.) *dīkṣām āsādya *śāṅkarīm* (corr. : *śāṅkaram* Cod.) | **tatkṣaṇād* (corr. : + *kṣaṇām* Cod.) **upabhogād vā* (corr. : *upabhogārthe* Cod.) *dehapatē śivaṃ vrajed iti.* This is *Vimalāvātī* N f. 57r6–v2, except that the latter reads *tam ārādhyā* rather than *samārādhyā*. For the date of the *Vimalāvātī* see here fn. 78 on p. 22.

those scriptures that have received commentaries and those that have not, he gives a closed list of the first. They are the *Raurava[sūtrasaṃgraha]*, the *Svāyambhuva[sūtrasaṃgraha]*, the *Mṛgendra*, the *Kiraṇa*, the *Parākhya*, the *Mataṅga[pārameśvara]*, the *Sūkṣmasvāyambhuva*, the *Dviśatika*, *Sārdhatriśatika*, and *Catuṣśatika* [recensions of the *Kālottara*], the *Sarvajñānottara*, and the *Mohaśūrottara*.⁶⁷ Of these we lack the commentaries on the *Parākhya*, *Sūkṣmasvāyambhuva*, *Catuṣśatika*, and *Mohaśūrottara*. In the case of the *Sūkṣmasvāyambhuva* and *Catuṣśatika* we lack manuscripts of the scriptures themselves. The *Mohaśūrottara* does survive and will be mentioned under another heading.⁶⁸

From early South-Indian authors we also have an independent summary of the Saiddhāntika system in the *Siddhāntadīpikā*, composed in AD 1071/2 by Rāmanātha, abbot of the Eastern Maṭha at Tiruvārūr;⁶⁹ and in the *Siddhāntasamuccaya* and *Siddhāntarahasyasāra* of Trilocanaśiva we have a presentation of the ontology and soteriology of the Siddhānta built around a digest-like compendium of citations from the Saiddhāntika scriptures and the works of Sadyojyotis. The author, who is described in its colophonic verse as the abbot of a Maṭha in Śvetāraṇya (Tiruvēṅkāṭu), may not be the Trilocanaśiva whose works will be mentioned below.⁷⁰ But we can be confi-

⁶⁷*Mṛgendrapaddhativyaḥkhyā* p. 111: *api ca sadyojyoti<h>prabhṛtibhir mahadbhir ācāryair vyākhyāteṣu śrīmadrauravasvāyambhuvamrgendrakiraṇaparākhyamataṅgasūkṣmasvāyambhuvadviśatisārdhatriśaticatuṣśatikāsarvajñānottara*mohaśūrottareṣv avyākṛteṣu* (conj. : *mohaśūrottareṣu vi-vyākṛteṣu* Cod.) *śrīmattarayodaśaśatikāniśvāsādiṣu śrīmatsomaśambhubrahmaśambhubhojarāja-varuṇaśivādyair viracitāsu paddhatiṣu *tadvyākhyāneṣu ca* (conj. : *ca tattadvyākhyāneṣu* Cod.)....

⁶⁸See here p. 26. Note that there is one scripture, the *Mayasaṃgraha*, also to be mentioned under that heading, that has not been included by Vaktraśambhu in his list of Saiddhāntika scriptures that have received a commentary. For we do have a commentary on this text, by the Kashmirian Vidyākāṇṭha. It is probable, then, that Vidyākāṇṭha's work never reached the South. This may surprise in the light of the firm commitment of the early South-Indian Saiddhāntikas to the Kashmirian exegetical tradition. But this is not the only lacuna in the corpus that travelled south from Kashmir. The same may have occurred with Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary on the *Tattvanirṇaya* of Sadyojyotis. It has been pointed out (GOODALL et al. 2008, pp. 311–312) that this is probable in light of the fact that Aghoraśiva's commentary on that text makes no reference to it and comments on a somewhat different recension.

⁶⁹*Siddhāntadīpikā* p. 25: *śakābdake daśaśate samāpte nyūnasaptake | śrīmatpuṣpavanādhīśadhāmaprānmaṭhavartinā || kālenālpēna sarveṣāṃ siddhāntārthaprakāśikā | *subodhā* (em. : *subodha* Cod.) *rāmanāthēna kṛtā siddhāntadīpikā || *abhidhārthābhidhā* (em. : *abhidhārthābhidhāḥ* Cod.) *padyaṣ savīṣṭaticatūśśataiḥ | †śrotre niveśya sasnehaṃ† santataṃ *projjvalatv iyaṃ* (conj. GOODALL : *prājvalantv imāḥ* Cod.) || *iti śrīrāmanāthaviracitā siddhāntadīpikā samāptā* 'May this easy to comprehend *Siddhāntadīpikā*, its title intended literally ('A Lamp for the Siddhānta'), capable as it is of speedily clarifying for all the teachings of the Siddhānta with its 420 verses, composed by Rāmanātha when he was in the Eastern Monastery in the sacred ground of Śiva Puṣpavanādhīśvara, in the year Śaka 993, continue to burn for ever †...†'.

⁷⁰*Siddhāntasamuccaya* p. 174: *śrīlōcanaśivācāryaiḥ sitāraṇyamaṭhādhipaiḥ | sarvāgamāt samud-dhṛtya siddhāntasya samuccayam | sarveṣāṃ śaivamukhyānām asmābhiḥ samyaḡ īritam*; and *Siddhāntarahasyasāra* p. 14: **trilocaneśena* (conj. : *trilocanaśivena* Cod.) *sitāṭavīś<v>a[ra]††itak†ādvaītamāṭhādhipēna | viśuddhaśaivāgamacakravartināpy akāri siddhāntarahasyasārah*. GOODALL (2007, p. 213), considering the *Siddhāntasamuccaya*, has pointed out that the evidence that this Trilocanaśiva

dent that he is a relatively early author, since his work is closely allied with the other South-Indian Saiddhāntika works of this period in the range of its scriptural sources and in its Kashmirian doctrinal stance.⁷¹ To these we may add two others works. The first is the *Śataratnasamgraha* of an Umāpatiśiva of Cidambaram. Though that is undoubtedly a later work than the *Siddhāntadīpikā* and *Siddhāntasamuccaya*, since the sources from which it has been compiled include two scriptures that are never mentioned by these or earlier exegetes and are not transmitted in manuscripts north of the Deccan, namely the *Devikālottara* and the *Viśvasārottara*, it nonetheless adheres strictly, as the earlier treatises do, to the view of the Siddhānta espoused by Sadyojyotis, Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, Aghoraśiva and others, as does its anonymous commentary (*Śataratnollekhanī*, *Śataratnollekha*). The second is the *Siddhāntaparakāśikā* of a certain Sarvātmaśambhu, since that too adheres to the basic dualistic and ritualistic tenets of the classical Siddhānta of the early commentators.⁷²

The later works of this exegetical literature, that is to say, all but the works of Sadyojyotis, add to our knowledge of the scriptural corpus, since they are rich in citations, drawing on more scriptural texts than have survived independently. However, their principal interest for the historian lies in the fact that they follow Sadyojyotis by adhering to a strictly ritualistic reading of the scriptures, holding that only the ritual of initiation, performed by a consecrated officiant, or rather by Śiva through such a person, can effect the liberation of the soul, this being accomplished subliminally at the time of

is the person of that name who was taught by both Jñānaśiva and Aghoraśiva is weak, since in this work, unlike in the commentary on the Paddhati of Somaśambhu and the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, the author does not reveal his spiritual ancestry. The same is true of the *Siddhāntarahasyasāra*. One may add that there is no reference in those two works to their author having been an abbot at Śvetāraṇya.

The fact that he is named Locanaśiva rather than Trilocanaśiva in this passage of the *Siddhāntasamuccaya* is of no consequence. Initiatory names are frequently applied in a number of synonymous variants. Thus it is normal for one and the same person to refer to himself, or be referred to, with a name that ends sometimes in -śiva and sometimes in -śambhu, and sometimes, though less commonly, in -śaṅkara or -īśa; and the same applies to the element that precedes this. Thus this name appears variously and inconsistently as Trilocanaśiva, Tryambakaśiva, Tryambakaśambhu, Tryambakeśa, Netraśiva, Nayanaśiva, and, as we see here, Locanaśiva. Similarly in the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* Somaśambhu uses this name, Somaśiva, and Induśiva to refer to himself; in his *Jñānaratnāvalī* Jñānaśiva identifies himself variously as Jñānaśiva (B p. 165), Jñānaśambhu (B p. 165), and Jñānaśaṅkara (B p. 182); Aghoraśiva calls himself Bahurūpaśambhu in his *Sarvajñānottaravṛtti* (p. 76); Hṛdayaśiva appears as Hṛdayeśa (Gwalior Museum Stone Inscription of Pataṅgaśambhu [MIRASHI 1962], v. 1) and Vyomaśiva as Vyomaśaṅkara, Vyomaśambhu (*Jñānaratnāvalī* B p. 642), Gaganaśiva, and Gaganeśa (*EI* 1:41, v. 39).

⁷¹ Cf. GOODALL 2007, p. 213.

⁷² Sarvātmaśambhu, *Siddhāntaparakāśikā* A, p. 47: *nirvānadīkṣayā parameśvarasāmyarūpaṃ mokṣaṃ prāpnvanti* ‘Through *nirvānadīkṣā* they attain liberation whose nature is a state of equality with Śiva’; and p. 49: *kiṃ tu parameśvaraprasādātmikayā *dīkṣayaiva* (corr.: *dīkṣayāyeva* A) *mokṣaḥ itarair nāsti* ‘But it is only through initiation, that is to say, through the grace of Śiva, that liberation can be attained. It does not come about by [any of] the other [methods, namely knowledge, meditation, and ascetic discipline]’.

initiation and becoming fully manifest only when the initiate is separated from his body through death. The sense of this doctrine in the broader context of the religion is that it constitutes a claim that the gift of liberation is entirely in the hands of the ritualists, extruding the gnostic and visionary tendencies that were present in the early Siddhānta and continued to flourish in the non-Saiddhāntika traditions of the Mantramārga as alternative routes to liberation, and challenging the claims of those traditions to be able to bring about liberation through ecstatic experience before death (*jīvanmuktiḥ*).

One may wonder with good reason at the large span of time, two hundred years at least, that separates Sadyojyotis' and Brhaspati's works from the rest of the Saiddhāntika exegetical literature that has reached us. The reason for this lacuna is not that no such literature was produced in the interim but rather that the Kashmirian exegesis of the tenth to eleventh centuries was a dogmatic return to the strictly ritualistic soteriology of Sadyojyotis after a period during which alternative, more flexible readings of the scriptural corpus had been current. The success of this fundamentalist reformation appears to have ousted alternative readings to the extent that no manuscripts of the commentaries that taught them have come down to us. Indeed we would know nothing of these readings were it not that some non-Saiddhāntika authors have referred to them.⁷³

In addition to commentaries we have a good number of surviving Paddhatis or 'Guides' produced by various Saiddhāntika pontiffs. These go beyond the somewhat discrepant and incomplete prescriptions of the scriptures to provide systematic and comprehensive accounts of the rituals, propagating a simpler and uniform system in the place of the diversity and complexity seen in the scriptures by basing it on the Mantra-system and deity-set of one of these, the *Kālottara* in its *Dviśatika* or *Sārdhatriśatika* recension, and supplementing their parsimonious prescriptions—as their titles declare, the first contains only two hundred verses and the second only three hundred and fifty—by drawing on other scriptural sources. Notable among these Paddhatis are the *Nityakriyānusamdhāna* and *Naimittikakriyānusamdhāna* of the Paddhati of Brahmaśambhu (*Brahmaśambhupaddhati*), the latter completed in AD 937/8,⁷⁴ the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* of Mahārājādhiraḅa Bho-

⁷³For this argument and evidence of early Saiddhāntika commentaries that do not conform to the line of Sadyojyotis and his Kashmirian followers see SANDERSON 2006b, pp. 79–82. For evidence of the view, which this tradition emanating from Sadyojyotis rejected, that ritual is not the only means of access to liberation and a lower way than that of gnosis see SANDERSON 1985, p. 566. See also SANDERSON 1992, pp. 291–292 on the evident non-dualism and gnosticism of the Saiddhāntika scripture *Sarvajñānottara*.

⁷⁴*Naimittikakriyānusamdhāna* f. 103r4–v1: *śrīmanmattaśikhaṅḁīśadeśikānvayajanmanā | gurubhiḥ prathitajñānaiḥ karkaroṅvīśeṣaṅaiḥ || prāpītena param pāraṃ saṃsārāgādhāsindhutaḥ | *dīkṣoḁupam samāropya (conj.: dīkṣoḁupātramāropya Cod.) jñānaśubhram padaṃ mahat || ukto mayaiṣa dviśatārthasaṅgī dīkṣāvidhir mattaśikhīśajena | deyo gurubhyo guruṅādhikāravvyāvṛtta-ye svānvayadīkṣitebhyah || kāle samānām kharasāṣṭasaṃkhye *śākakṣītīśasya (śāka corr.: śākaḥ*

jadeva, composed in Mālava at an unrecorded date during the first half of the eleventh century, the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu, abbot of the major Saiddhāntika monastery at Golaḡī (Gurgi) in the kingdom of the Kalacuris of Tripurī, composed in AD 1048/9,⁷⁵ the *Naṭarājapaddhati* of Rāmanātha of the ‘Southern Golaḡī Monastery’ founded at Tiruvārūr, some 1,500 km to the South, by Brahmaśiva, an East-Indian (*gauḍadeśīyah*) missionary from the original foundation, composed in AD 1057/8,⁷⁶

Cod.) *tithau daśamyām | śaraddvitīyētaramāsikāyām ahīyamānenduvikāsitāyām* ‘Having been taken aboard *the boat of initiation (conj.) and transported across the unfathomable ocean of transmigration to the great goal radiant with enlightenment on its further shore by my Guru of far-famed knowledge and the Karkaronī lineage, I, a [spiritual] son of the lineage of the venerable Guru Mattaśikhaṇḍīśa (= Mattamayūranātha), have declared this [Synopsis of] the procedure of initiation that adheres to the teaching of the Two-Hundred[-verse redaction of the *Kālottara*] on the tenth day of the first month of autumn, caused to expand by the waxing moon, in the year numbered space-flavour-eight [860] of the era of the Śāka king. It should be given [only] by a Guru who is a ‘son’ [in the lineage] of Mattaśikhiśa (= Mattamayūranātha), and [only] to Gurus initiated in his lineage, in order to [pass on and so] terminate his tenure of office’. I am not aware of a complete ms of Brahmaśambhu’s *Nityakriyānusamdhāna*; but a substantial part of it, 346 verses out of an original total of about 500, is found on disordered folios in a composite palm-leaf manuscript of the twelfth century (MS 511 of the Kesar Library). It was, I propose, adopted with some rewriting, re-ordering, and expansion by the redactor of the *Kāmika* as that text’s account of the daily observances (*Pūrvabhāga*, Paṭalas 5–6, and 9–10).

⁷⁵For this new and somewhat earlier date of the composition of Somaśambhu’s Paddhati see SANDERSON 2011, p. 5. For the correction of the name to Golaḡī (formerly referred to as Golaḡī following Tamilian practice), the rejection of the view that it was located at Bheraghat near Tripurī, the capital in the south of the kingdom, and its identification with Gurgi, about 12 miles due east of Rewa Town, in the north of the Kalacuri kingdom, the site of once vast Śaiva ruins, see SANDERSON 2009a, p. 264, fn. 620.

⁷⁶I owe this information to access to passages transcribed from digital photographs taken by the Pondicherry Centre of the EFEO in 2004 of the only known witness of this Paddhati, a modern paper ms preserved in the Śaiva monastery at Tiruvāṭaturai and reported to be a transcript of an old palm-leaf manuscript in the same. This access has been through the draft of an article by Dominic Goodall on the *Naṭarājapaddhati* that he kindly sent to me in November, 2010. There he shows that the work is full of verbal echoes of the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* and transcribes the colophonic verses (ms, p. 92) as follows: *śrīmatpuṣpavanādhiśadhāmaprānmaṭhadesīkaḥ | śśākāḥśa-kābdadaśaśate viṃśativarjite || golaḡīmaṭhaniṣṭhāna + + + vidhāyinīm | paddhatin naṭarājākyām akarot sukhobodhitām*. In spite of the corruptions the core meaning is clear: ‘The Guru of the Eastern Monastery of the temple of the holy Śiva Puṣpavanādhiśvara has composed [this] easily understood *Naṭarājapaddhati* in the Śāka year 980’. For the second half of the first verse I conjecture *śākābdake daśaśate <īte> viṃśativarjite*, considering the parallel in the colophon of this author’s *Siddhāntadīpikā*: *śākābdake daśaśate samāpte nyūnasaptake* (see here fn. 69 on p. 18). The first half of the second verse should probably read *golaḡīmaṭhaniṣṭhānām [śivājñānu]vidhāyinām*, conveying that the Paddhati’s purpose is to guide the practice of the orthoprax ascetics of the Golaḡī monastery. For my conjecture *śivājñānuvidhāyinām* cf. *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 16.20: *itthaṃ guṇavatām evaṃ mumukṣūṇām anugrahaḥ | kartavyo ṅāvikalpena śivājñānuvidhāyinām*; and *Naimittikakriyānusamdhāna* f. 72r3–4 (4.86): *itthaṃ guṇavatām eva mumukṣūṇām anugrahaḥ | bubhukṣūṇān ca kartavyaḥ śivājñānavidhāyinām*. In this connection it should be noted that Rāmanātha tells us in the concluding verses, which I have accessed in this draft, that the Saiddhāntika establishment of Tiruvārūr (Kamalāpurī, Kamalālaya) in the Tañjāvūr district, was known as ‘the Southern Golaḡīmaṭha’, having been founded by a missionary from the original Golaḡīmaṭha far to the north: *teṣv eko *gauḍadeśīyah* (conj. GOODALL: *gauḍadeśe yah* Cod.) *prāptavān kamalālayam | idī-*

the *Kriyāsaṃgrahapaddhati* of Vāladhārin, composed before AD 1090, the date of its only manuscript known to me,⁷⁷ the *Vimalāvatī* of Vimalaśiva, Rājaguru of the ruler of Magadha and resident in Banaras, composed in AD 1101/2,⁷⁸ the *Kriyākramadyotikā* of Aghoraśiva of Cidambaram, composed

śim mūrtim ādāya dakṣiṇāyottitīṣayā || **āgataḥ* (em. GOODALL : *agataḥ* Cod.) *śiva evāyam iti* **lokānumoditaḥ* (Cod. : *loko* 'numoditaḥ' conj. GOODALL) | *padavākyapramāṇajñāḥ śrīmān* **brahmaśivaḥ* (conj. GOODALL : *brahmaśivaḥ* Cod.) *svayam* || *tatra puṣkariṇīṭire* **dakṣiṇe* (conj. GOODALL : *dakṣiṇo* Cod.) **golaḡiṃaṭhe* (*golaḡī* corr. : *golaḡī* Cod.) | *vidvadbhir avasat sārddham agnikalpais tapodhanaiḥ* 'Among those [Ācāryas of the Golaḡiṃaṭha] was the venerable Brahmaśiva, a native of the Gauḍa region, learned in grammar, hermeneutics, and epistemology, who came to Tiruvārūr and resided with fire-like learned ascetics in the Southern Golaḡiṃaṭha on the bank of the Puṣkariṇī, applauded by the people as Śiva himself who had come [to them] after assuming this form in order to rescue the southerners [from transmigration]'.

⁷⁷*Kriyāsaṃgrahapaddhati*, final colophon: *iti* **śrīśrīkaṇṭhāvātāraśrīmadvāladhāriviracite* (*śrīśrīkaṇṭhāvātāra* conj. : *śrīśrīkaṇṭhāvātāre* Cod.) **kriyāsaṃgrahapaddhatau* (*paddhatau* em. : *paddhati* Cod.) *daśamaḥ paṭalaḥ samāptaḥ. samvacchataḍvayadaśamaikādaśena caitraśi....* Vāladhārin, meaning 'the wearer of tresses', is, I propose, a poetic synonym of Vāmaśiva or Vāmadevaśiva, Vāmadeva being the feminine face of Sadāśiva. His Gurus, according to vv. 2–3, were Mūrtiśiva, Nādaśiva, and Praśāntaśiva, probably his Parameṣṭhiguru, Paramaguru, and Guru.

⁷⁸Vimalaśiva tells us that he was the successor of a Dharmāśiva who was the Rājaguru of Jayasīha (= Jayasiṃha), the ruler of Daṇḍabhukti (in Bengal between Dakṣiṇa-Rādhā and Orissa), that he himself was the Rājaguru of Malayasiṃha, the ruler of Magadha, and that he composed his manual in Śaka 1023 while he was residing in Banaras. *Vimalāvatī* N f. 45r5–v5, speaking of himself in the third person: *ito dharmāśambhur mahātmā* | *yo rthī kaśmīram eto mihirahariśivāśambhuvācyāgamaugham śrutvā* **bāṇendulakṣam* (conj. : *dāṣendulakṣam* N) *sakalajanaguror* **gotram* (conj. : *ggauttam* N) *abhyetya jātaḥ* || *tasmin bhikṣuvane vasan surasarittīrasthamuktīśvare śrīmān ugratapā* **narendramukūḍghrṣṭāṅghripadmo vaśī* | *vistāryeśamatam nate hataripau vidvadvinodālaye kīrtistrīdayite dayāḷur abhavat saddaṇḍabhuktīśvare* || *sarvāścaryanidher apāratapaso gambhīravidyāmbudher* **īśasyeva* (conj. : *īśasyaiva* N) *jagādhitāya jagatīm abhyāgatasya svayam* | *ṣaṭtriṃśacchivatatvabhāvanasamudbhūtaprabhūtotamānandāghūrṇitacittavrttivasateḥ satkarmaṇām* **sākṣiṇaḥ* (corr. : *sākṣiṇaḥ* N) || *tasya śrījayasīhanāmanrpater nāthasya śiṣyo* 'dbhutaśthāmnāḥ śrīvimalaḥ śiva<h> śivaparo vārāṇasīsaṃśrītaḥ | yaḥ so 'bhūt sukaviḥ śakakṣitipater lokadvikhaikābdake śaivārcādividheḥ sadarthajaladher *†dvāt†odbhavordhvāmbudhiḥ (conj. : *dvātodbhavordhvāmbadhīḥ* N) || *gurur malayasiṃhasya magadhādhiśvarasya hi* 'Then came the saintly Dharmāśiva. He travelled in search [of knowledge] to Kashmir, and after studying [there] all the Saura, Vaiṣṇava, Śākta, and Śaiva scriptures, *1,500,000 verses (conj.), was [re]born by entering the lineage of Śiva and took up residence in the famous (*tasmin*) hermitage in [the see of] Muktiśvara on the banks of the Ganges. That venerable ascetic, of fierce austerities, his lotus-like feet repeatedly chafed by the crowns of [obeisant] kings, propagated the doctrine of Śiva (*īśamatam*) and showed compassion for the ruler of Daṇḍabhukti [by bestowing initiation on him] when that king, after he had disposed of his enemies, becoming the darling of Fame and the source of happiness to the learned [through his patronage], prostrated himself before him [as his devotee]. [Dharmāśiva] was the inexhaustible source of every variety of miraculous power. His austerities were boundless. He was a deep ocean containing [all] learning. Indeed it seemed that in him Śiva himself had entered the world for the benefit of all. This Guru (*nāthasya*) of King Jayasīha, of wondrous power, witness of the true rites [revealed in the Śaiva scriptures], his consciousness reeling with the vast and unsurpassed ecstasy that had arisen in him through his deep contemplation of the thirty-six reality-levels taught by Śiva, had a disciple Vimalaśiva (*śrīvimalaḥ śivaḥ*), intent on Śiva (*śivaparaḥ*). *An ocean fed by the Upper [current of the Śaiva scriptures] that has arisen from (conj.) †...† (conj.), he became while resident in Banaras and Guru of Malayasiṃha, the king of Magadha, the excellent author of [this manual for] the Śaiva [rituals] beginning with [regular] worship, an ocean of the true teaching, in the year of the Śaka king worlds-two-space-one (*śakakṣitipater lokadvikhaikābdake*) (Śakasamvat 1023, = AD 1101/2)'. The

in AD 1157/8,⁷⁹ the undated *Jñānaratnāvalī* of his contemporary Jñānaśiva, originally from Cidambaram but living in Banaras when he wrote this work,⁸⁰ the *Siddhāntasārāvalī* of the South-Indian Trilocanaśiva, a disciple of both Aghoraśiva and Jñānaśiva,⁸¹ the undated and incompletely transmitted *Tattvaratnāvalī* of Vimalācārya, also called Paramaśrotriya Sadāśiva, whose only known manuscript, written in the Pāla script, is probably of the twelfth century,⁸² the *Siddhāntaśekhara* of Viśvanātha, who was active in Banaras in or close to the first half of the thirteenth century,⁸³ and the *Siddhāntasāra* of the Keralan Īśānaśiva (the *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati*) of uncertain date.⁸⁴ Based on the *Mrgendra* rather than the *Kālottara* we have

Jayasīha of Daṇḍabhukti who was the disciple of Dharmasīva was, I propose, the Jayasiṃha, ruler of Daṇḍabhukti, identified in the anonymous commentary on Sandhyākaranandin's *Rāmācarita* 2.5 as one of the vassals of Rāmapāla (r. c. 1072–1126).

⁷⁹This date is given in *kaṭapaya* notation in a verse found at the end of the *Mahotsavavidhi* (p. 428): *etan nityādikaṃ karma sopapattikaṃ *ādarāt* (corr. : *ācarāt* Ed.) | *śrutvā kriyākramasyaiva dyotikā racitā mayā* || *nādajñeye śakasyābde vartamāne kalau yuge*. See GOODALL 1998, p. xiii–xvii, fn. 24.

⁸⁰For his residence in Banaras (Vārāṇasī/Kāśī) (and his devotion to Viśveśvara, the Śiva of Banaras) see *Jñānaratnāvalī* A, Maṅgala, v. 1ab: *jayaty umāvallabhavallabhā bhūh kāśī prakāśīkṛtavivarūpā*; *Jñānaratnāvalī* B, p. 643: *vārāṇasīvāsīnā | śrīmajjñānaśivena*; B p. 471: **kāśīviśveśvarajyotirmaṇḍalābhogavāsīnā (kāśī conj. : kāryaṃ Cod. • viśveśvara corr. : viśveśvaraṃ Cod.) | śrīmajjñānaśivenātha liṅgalakṣaṇam ucyate*; B p. 182: *śrīviśveśvarapādābjacañcarīkaḥ śivālayaḥ | śrījñānaśaṅkaraś cakre vahnikāryaṃ savistaram*; and B p. 420: *śrīviśveśvarapādābjajaṭpadena vipaścītā | śrīmajjñānaśivenāyam abhiṣekavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ*. His birth in Coladeśa and brahmin caste are stated on B p. 222: *śrīcoladeśa *saṃbhūtabhūsureṇa (saṃbhūta conj. : sambhūnā Cod.) tapodhinā | śrīmajjñānaśivenāyam pavitrakavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ*. At the end of the section on penances he tells us that he is still, though residing in Banaras, a devotee of the Lord of the Dabhrasabhā, that is to say, of Śiva Naṭarāja in Cidambaram (B p. 272): *śrīmaddabhrasabheśvarāṅghrikamaladvandvālīnā dhīmatā | śrīmadvijñānaśivena vedaviduṣā vārāṇasīvāsīnā*.

⁸¹On the identity, oeuvre, and date of Trilocanaśiva see GOODALL 2000, pp. 208–212.

⁸²*Tattvaratnāvalī* f. 46v6–7: *āgamebhyo 'rtharatnāni saṃgrhyātīmanoramā | ekādaśasatair eṣā deśīkālāmṛtiḥ kṛtā. iti śrīparamaśrotriyasadaśivāparanāmnā vimalācāryeṇa nirmītā tattvaratnāvalī samāptā*. The ms as photographed in the collection of the NAK by the NGMPP has twenty-six folios, therefore a little over half the text to judge from the fact that the last folio is numbered 46.

⁸³The date of Viśvanātha is determined approximately from his account of the generations of his patriline from Nārāyaṇa, the grandfather of his great-great-grandfather Nārasīṃha, down to his own father and himself (*Siddhāntaśekhara* 1.1.2–12). According to this his great-great-grandfather Nārasīṃha composed a manual on the worship of Nārasīṃha during the reign of the Cālukya king Pratāpa. This can only be the Cālukya of Kalyāṇī who ruled from 1138 to 1150, (as stated by Sitarama Somayaji, with 1139 as the year of accession, in the Sanskrit introduction to his edition of the *Siddhāntaśekhara*, pp. xxiii, xxiv), that is to say, Jagadekamalla II (V. Raghavan in his foreword to Sitarama Somayaji's edition of the *Siddhāntaśekhara*, pp. iv–v) since that king is distinguished from Jagadekamalla I (Jayasiṃha II) by the addition of the epithet Pratāpacakravartin: MURARI 1977, p. 160. See EC 11 Dg 61 and 85: *satyāśrayakuṭatīlakaṃ cālukyābharaṇam | śrīmatpratāpacakravartī jagadekamalladevara vijayarājyaṃ*; Bollēpalli inscription of Jagadekamalla II, *Journal of the Epigraphical Society of India* 22, p. 48, ll. 13–14: *śrīmaccālukyapratāpacakravartījagadekamalla-*; *SHI* 18:144–150, 152–153, 155 (AD 1139–1149).

⁸⁴Īśānaśiva tells us nothing about himself and any attempt to identify him with a Īśānaśiva whom we can date is therefore an arbitrary guess, since this is an extremely common initiation-name among Saiddhāntikas. There are, for example, twenty-four Īśānaśivas in the series of more than ninety-five

the *Mrgendrapaddhati* of the Aghoraśiva who wrote the *Kriyākramadyotikā* in 1157/8. We also have the brief *Varuṇapaddhati* of Varuṇaśiva, which summarizes the topics of *dīkṣā* and *pratiṣṭhā* in about 200 verses without going into the details of procedure. Its date cannot be determined at present beyond noting that it echoes the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* of AD 1048/9 and is attested by no dateable author before Vedajñāna II of Cidambaram, the sixteenth-century author of a commentary on the text.⁸⁵ This same Vedajñāna composed two digest-like Paddhatis of his own: the *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* and the *Dīkṣādarśa*, both of which have reached us intact.⁸⁶ Also from the sixteenth century we have the Paddhati *Śivārcanacandrikā* of Appayyadīkṣita, written under the patronage of Cinna Bomma Reddi, the ruler of Vellore.⁸⁷

We have commentaries on five of these Paddhatis. On the *Mrgendrapaddhati* we have that of the author's pupil Vaktraśambhu. On the *Kriyākā-*

labelled images of Saiddhāntika officiants in the Rājarājeśvara temple at Tārācuram (HERNAULT 1987, pp.20–21 and 31–35), that is to say, about one in four. This fact fatally undermines the proposal of SWAMY (1975, p. 192) that our author is the Īśānaśiva who was the Rājaguru of the Cōla king Rājarāja I (r. AD 985–1014) and that of BÜHNEMANN (2000, p. 3, fn. 4) that our author is the Īśānaśiva who was the teacher of the Vairocana who wrote the *Lakṣaṇasaṃgraha*. For these rest on the agreement of names alone. We can reject even more confidently a third possibility, which has been proposed by DVIVEDA (1968, p. xli), namely that the Kumāra who cites Īśānaśiva's Paddhati in his commentary on the *Tattvaparakāśa* may be the Kumāraśiva who was the Guru of the Caulukya king Mūlarāja and that if he was that Guru Īśānaśiva can be assigned to the last part of the eleventh century AD. For in this case there is not even identity of names. Names in -śiva are initiation names and those who have them do not drop the element -śiva that declares that status. The only firm evidence for Īśānaśiva's date is provided by those among the works he cites that are dateable. Of these the latest are the Paddhati *Siddhāntasāra* of Bhojarāja (cited in *Sāmānyapāda* pp. 49, 49, 49, 52, and *Kriyāpāda* pp. 75, 78, 79, 97, 122, 137, 146, 178, 199, 207), composed at some date in the early decades of the eleventh century, the Paddhati *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu (cited in *Kriyāpāda* pp. 97, 207, 214, 218, 220), composed thereafter in 1048/9, and the *Prapañcasāra* (mentioned in *Sāmānyapāda*, p. 40), probably of the twelfth century (SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 230–233).

⁸⁵Varuṇaśiva tells us at the end of his work in a verse in the Upajāti metre that he is the Guru of a King Soma: *ity *āharad (B: āhurud A) granthaśata*dvayena (A: dvayīmsa B) śrīso-mabhūbhṛḍgurur āgamebhyaḥ | kāle *ḥjhaṭity ekataram <+> tat tadḥ *bījadvayaṃ (A: tanvīya B) śrīvaruṇābhīdhānaḥ*. Soma here is probably for Someśvara, but this does not allow identification, since there are numerous kings with that name. He was perhaps one of the four Western Cālukya Someśvaras of Kalyāṇī, who ruled from AD 1040 to the late twelfth century. It is possible that the passage that I have enclosed with obeli may be giving the date of composition, perhaps in *kaṭapaya* notation. But the text is, to my mind at least, hopelessly corrupt here. I have given the reading that appears in IFP MS T. 143 of the commentary of Bhaṭṭa Śivottama (p. 58), only because it is almost metrical, merely noting that one syllable is lacking. The MSS of the *Varuṇapaddhati* consulted read *jhaṭityeta īkṣitute* (A) and *kaṭityekaśamrakṣitam* (B). It has been asserted that the *Varuṇapaddhati* predates Viśvanātha since the latter cites it in his treatment of *dīkṣā* in the *Siddhāntasēkhara* (GANESAN 2006, p. 31, fn. 4). The two texts are certainly very closely related. Indeed in *Varuṇapaddhati* 1.15–23 most of the verses are identical with *Siddhāntasēkhara*, pp. 221–222, vv. 26–33. However, I see nothing that indicates that Viśvanātha was the borrower.

⁸⁶For a review of the contents of the *Dīkṣādarśa* and the *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* we have GANESAN 2009, pp. 49–189.

⁸⁷*Śivārcanacandrikā*, pp. 129–130: *veḷūradhīśacinabommavibhor udāre citte ca dhāmani cirāḍ abhivardhamānām | arcāvidhāṃ paśupater amarābhīnandyām itthaṃ samācakalam īśvaraśāsanena*.

ṇḍakramāvalī of Somaśambhu we have that of Trilocanaśiva, the twelfth-century author of the *Siddhāntasārāvalī*. He tells us in that commentary that he also commented on the Paddhati of Brahmaśambhu; but no manuscript of this work has reached us.⁸⁸ It is probable that this Trilocanaśiva is identical with the author of that name who wrote the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, a Saiddhāntika compendium on penances.⁸⁹ On the *Siddhāntasārāvalī* we have a commentary by one Anantaśambhu, concerning whose date I can say only that he postdates Viśvanātha, since he quotes him.⁹⁰ On the *Kriyākramadyotikā* of Aghoraśiva we have a commentary by Nirmalamaṇi, another late South-Indian author, possibly of the sixteenth or seventeenth century but certainly later than Viśvanātha, since he too quotes the *Siddhāntaśekhara*,⁹¹ and another by Kacchapeśvaraśiva of Kāñcī, of whose date I can cite no evidence other than that he, like Nirmalamaṇi, quotes Viśvanātha.⁹² On the *Varuṇapaddhati* of Varuṇaśiva we have in addition to the commentary of Vedajñāna II already mentioned another by a Bhaṭṭa Śivottama, for whose date we have no evidence other than the fact that his commentary is mentioned by Vedajñāna as his guide.⁹³

We also have compendia that prescribe the penances to be undertaken for intentional or accidental infringements of the rules binding initiates, and the rules governing the states of impurity occasioned by a death, and the correct timing of the various rituals, notably the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Hṛdayaśiva,⁹⁴ the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Trilocanaśiva, the *Āśaucacandrikā* of Uttuṅgaśiva, and the *Āśaucadīpikā* and *Śaivakālaviveka* of Vedajñāna

⁸⁸ *Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā*, p. 21: *brahmaśambhupaddhatau ...nimittaṃ cāsmābhir vistareṇa taṭṭīkāyāṃ nirūpitaṃ; brahmaśambhupaddhatau ...etadarthanirūpaṇam asmābhir vistareṇa taṭṭīkāyāṃ uktatvān neha prapañcyate.*

⁸⁹ For the evidence that renders it probable that the Trilocanaśiva who wrote the commentary on the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* also wrote the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* and *Siddhāntasārāvalī* see GOODALL 2000, pp. 208–213.

⁹⁰ *Siddhāntasārāvalīvyākhyā*, pt. 3, p. 62; pt. 4, p. 6, etc.

⁹¹ Nirmalamaṇi, *Kriyākramadyotikāprabhā*, p. 115. According to S.S. JANAKI (1986, p. 6), Nirmalamaṇi was from Tiruvārūr and lived in the 16th-17th centuries. His residence in Tiruvārūr is reported in the colophons of his commentary, which also tells us that he was the son of one Tyāgarājācārya and a product of the Bhaktādhyakṣa lineage (e.g. p. 389) (otherwise unknown to me): *iti śrīmatkamalālayanivāsibhaktādhyakṣasantānaprabhavatyāgarājācāryātmanirmalamaṇiguruviracitāyāṃ asphuṭārthaprakāśikāyāṃ prabhāsamākhyaṃ kriyākramadyotikāvyākhyāyāṃ nityakarmavidhiḥ samāptaḥ.*

⁹² *Kriyākramadyotikāvyākhyā*, pp. 11, 26, 30, 40, 46, 59, 62, 64, 72, 77, etc. That he was a resident of Kāñcī may be inferred from the following: *kāmākṣīpatim*ānato 'smi* (em. : *ātanosmi* Cod.) *satataṃ kāñcīpurānāyakaṃ || sākṣāt sadāśivapurāt svayam eva śambhur bhaktāntarān anugrahītum ihāgato yaḥ | nāmnā sadāśiva iti prathito 'tra kāñcyāṃ asmadguruṃ tam atisaumyaguṇaṃ namāmi* (pp. 1–2).

⁹³ *Varuṇapaddhativilocana*, ed. Ganesan (2006), p. 43: *śrīmadvaruṇapaddhatyā vilocanam idaṃ satām | śivottamena guruṇā leśād vyākhyānam īritam | ahaṃ *tadānugūnyena* (corr. : *tadanugūnyena* Ed.) *vakṣye samkṣīpya yuktitah.*

⁹⁴ See here fn. 51 on p. 13.

II;⁹⁵ and we have treatises that give us systematic analyses of questions concerning the ritual rights and obligations of the various social groups among the Śaivas, such as the *Antyeṣṭiprakaṛaṇa* on the various types of Śaiva cremation ritual and the periods of impurity that ensue,⁹⁶ the *Varṇāśramacandrikā*, which gathers and analyses evidence from Śaiva scriptural sources and Paddhatis bearing on the application of the brahmanical caste-classes and disciplines within Saiddhāntika practice and in particular on the qualification of Śūdras (Vēḷāḷas) to receive Śaiva initiation and consecration to office, and the *Śaivasamnyāsapaddhati* of Śivāgrayogīndra Jñānaśivācārya, which establishes the related qualification of Śaiva Vēḷāḷas to enter the discipline of the renouncer.

The Siddhānta's Pratiṣṭhātantras and Pratiṣṭhāpāddhatis. In addition to the general scriptural works of the Siddhānta we have a number of specialized scriptures called Pratiṣṭhātantras that treat only the rituals of installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) and such ancillary subjects as iconography, iconometry, and the plans of various types of temple, royal palaces, and monasteries. Of scriptures of this kind we have the *Devyāmata*,⁹⁷ the *Mohaśūrottara*,⁹⁸ the *Piṅgalāmata*, and the *Mayasamgraha*.⁹⁹ The first three have reached us in their entirety, while for the *Mayasamgraha* we have at present only a single

⁹⁵For the contents of the *Āśaucadīpikā* and *Śaivakālaviveka* see GANESAN 2009, pp. 190–200 and 216–218.

⁹⁶Its colophon claims that it is part of a Paddhati on personal Śaiva rites (*ātmārthapūjāpaddhatih*), the *Siddhāntācārakaumudī*, composed by a Vāmadevaśiva, disciple of Aghoraśiva, the latter evidently the famous figure of that name who completed his *Kriyākramadyotikā* in AD 1158, since he is further identified like that author as having Parameśvara as another name (*Antyeṣṭiprakaṛaṇa*, p. 44): *śrīparameśvarāparanāmadheyaśrīmadaghoraśivācāryaśiṣyeṇa vāmadevaśivena viracitāyām ātmārthapūjāpaddhatyām siddhāntācārakaumudīsamākhyāyām antyeṣṭiprakaṛaṇam samāptim agamat*. The alternative name Parameśvara is ascribed to the author of the *Kriyākramadyotikā* in the chapter colophons of Nirmalamaṇi's commentary on that text (e.g., pp. 351–352): *iti parameśvarāparanāmadheyaśrīmadaghoraśivācāryaviracitāyām kriyākramadyotikāyām śivapūjāvidhiḥ samāptaḥ*. However, the attribution to a disciple of Aghoraśiva is implausible, since the short treatise uses a range of second-wave Saiddhāntika sources (see here p. 89), a feature not seen in the work of Aghoraśiva and his disciples Trilocanaśiva and Vaktraśambhu, namely scriptural texts such as *Kāmika*, *Kāraṇa*, *Ajita*, and *Suprabhedā*.

⁹⁷The work identifies itself in its colophon as the Pratiṣṭhānta in, that is to say, in the cycle of, the Great Tantra called *Niśvāsa*, in the *Bijabheda*: *niśvāsākhya mahātantra bijabhede mahātape | pratiṣṭhāntam *ākhyātam* (B : *samākhyātam* A) *samāptam śāstram uttamam*. But it is identified in the chapter colophons as the *Devyāmata* (*iti devyāmate*) and it is under this title or *Devīmata* that it is cited in the learned literature. The earliest citations known to me are in the *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi* of the Kashmirian Bhaṭṭa Vidyākāṇṭha, a pupil of the commentator Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha (II) and therefore active around the turn of the tenth and eleventh centuries, where the codex unicus gives the title erroneously as *Divyāmata* (ff. 56v10–11 and 58v4–5).

⁹⁸On the name *Mohaśūrottara* and its variants *Mohacūḍottara* and *Mohacūrottara* see SANDERSON 2004, pp. 441–442, fn. 339. I should add that the work is quoted by Rājānaka Takṣakavarta in his *Nityādisamgraha* with the name *Mohaśūrottara* (A f. 73v6, B f. 138v6: *mohaśūrottare śmābhir dṛṣṭam cedam śivāgame*).

⁹⁹For editions of parts of these works see MILLS 2011.

incomplete witness.¹⁰⁰ We also have the *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*, a commentary, fortunately complete, written on the whole of that work by the Kashmirian Vidyākāṇṭha, a pupil of the Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha who has given us commentaries on the *Kālottara*, *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, and *Kiraṇa*. Commentaries also existed on the *Piṅgalāmata* and the *Mohaśūrottara* by Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha of Kashmir (or his son Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha) and Aghoraśiva of Cidambaram respectively, but neither of these, it seems, has reached us.¹⁰¹

Here too we find a number of Paddhatis, works whose purpose, like that of those that pertain to the whole range of Saiddhāntika rituals, was to provide fuller, more systematic coverage of the rituals, in this case those of installation alone, and of all that pertains to them. Notable in this category are the *Pratiṣṭhāsārāpaddhati* composed in Banaras by a pupil of a Kumāraśiva who was a contemporary of Mūlarāja I, founder of the Caulukya dynasty

¹⁰⁰ The *Lakṣaṇasaṃgraha* of Vairocana reveals that there was once a much larger canon of such texts, counting a total of twenty-one titles (2.179–181): *pratiṣṭhākālpa* <ṃ> *kaumāraṃ kiraṇaṃ piṅgalāmataṃ | devyāmataṃ mayāṃ nandī pratiṣṭhāpārameśvaraṃ || bhāskaraṃ liṅgakālpaṃ ca vidyāpurāṇavāthulam | *śak* <r> *ākhyāṃ (?) vāmadevaṃ ca dvidhā paitāmahaṃ tathā || bāṇa* <ṃ> *gargamataṃ yāmyāṃ haṃsākhyāṃ vaiśvakarmakam | pratiṣṭhātantrāṇy etāni śivoktāny ekaviṃśatiḥ* ‘There are the following twenty-one Pratiṣṭhānttras that have been taught by Śiva: (1) *Pratiṣṭhākālpa*, (2) *Kaumāra* (= *Skandamata*), (3) *Kiraṇa*, (4) *Piṅgalāmata*, (5) *Devyāmata*, (6) *Mayamata* (= *Mayasaṃgraha*), (7) *Nandī[mata]* (= *Nandikeśvaramata* ?), (8) *Pratiṣṭhāpārameśvara*, (9) *Bhāskara[mata]*, (10) *Liṅgakālpa*, (11) *Vidyāpurāṇa*, (12) *Vāthula*, (13) *Śakra[mata]* (?), (14) *Vāmadeva*, (15–16) *Paitāmaha* 1 and 2, (17) *Bāṇa[mata]*, (18) *Gargamata*, (19) *Yāmya*, (20) *Haṃsa*, and (21) *Viśvakarmamata*. Of these the *Devyāmata*, the *Mayasaṃgraha*, the *Piṅgalāmata*, the *Kiraṇa* and the *Vāthula* survive in early Nepalese manuscripts, though the *Mayasaṃgraha* does so incompletely. The *Kiraṇa* and the *Vāthula*, the latter also known as the *Bṛhatkālottara*, are general Saiddhāntika scriptures, whose inclusion in this list is justified by their containing coverage of installation rituals, iconography and the like. The same may be presumed to be the case with the *Vidyāpurāṇa*, from which substantial citations survive in Śaiva digests, notably the *Nityādisaṃgraha* of Takṣakavarta, the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Hṛdayaśiva and the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* of Jayadratha. Of the remaining works we have citations of the *Kaumāra*, the *Nandikeśvaramata*, the *Pratiṣṭhāpārameśvara*, the *Viśvakarmamata*, the *Bhāskaramata*, the *Liṅgakālpa*, the *Bāṇamata*, and a *Paitāmaha* in the *Lakṣaṇasaṃgraha* itself and in such works as the *Mayasaṃgrahavṛtti* (*Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*) of Vidyākāṇṭha, the *Vimalāvatī* of Vimalaśiva, and the *Jñānarātnāvalī* of Jñānaśiva. The *Gargamata* is probably the *Gārgīya* that is listed with the *Kiraṇa*, *Nandimata*, *Pratiṣṭhāpārameśvara*, *Liṅgakālpa*, *Skandamata*, *Haṃsinī* (= *Haṃsa[mata]* ?), and *Svāyambhuva* (= *Paitāmaha* ?) among the nine texts given under the rubric of the *Yakṣiṇīpārameśvara* in the account of the *Pārameśvara* cycle of texts in the *Śrīkaṇṭhī-Srotobheda* vv. 300c–302b (f. 10r8–9): **yakṣiṇīpārameśam* (em. : *yakṣiṇīpārameśam* Cod. : *yakṣiṇī paramēśam* HANNEDER) *ca navadhā paripaṭhyate || kiraṇākhyāṃ nandimataṃ haṃsinī brahmamaṅḍalam | svāyambhuvaṃ skandamataṃ pratiṣṭhāpārameśvaraṃ || liṅgakālpaṃ sagārgīyaṃ navakoṭi-pravistaram*.

¹⁰¹ On the commentary on the *Piṅgalāmata* see SANDERSON 2007b, p. 243. Aghoraśiva’s authorship of a commentary on the *Mohaśūrottara* is reported at the end of his *Dviśatikālottaravṛtti*, p. 85: *yaś cakre śivaśāneṣu vividhā *vṛttir* (corr. : *vṛttir* Cod.) *viśuddhātambhir vāgbhir vākyapadapramāṇa *nipunaḥ* (conj. : + + + Cod.) *śrīmohaśūrādīṣu | pūjāṃ yasya vitanvate nṛpatayaś colendra *pāṇḍyādayo* (conj. : + *thyādayo* Cod.) *vṛttis tena sukhagrahā dviśatikākālottare *nirmitā* (conj. : *kūrtitā* Cod.) ‘[Aghoraśiva,] who, being skilled in Mīmāṃsā, Grammar, and Nyāya, has produced various commentaries on the *Mohaśūr[ottar]a* and other Śaiva scriptures, in compositions free of all defects, and whom the Cōla, Pāṇḍya and other kings revere, has fashioned [this] easily grasped commentary on the *Dviśatikākālottara*’.

of Gujarat, who ruled from AD 941 to 997/8,¹⁰² the *Lakṣaṇasaṃgraha* of the East-Indian Vairocana, probably of the same century,¹⁰³ the *Śaivāgamani-*

¹⁰²*Pratiṣṭhāsārapaddhati*, final colophon: *kumārādiśivaḥ śrīmān mūlarājādivanditaḥ | tacchisyah prathamah kāśyāṃ kṛtavān sārapaddhatim* ‘The first disciple of the venerable Kumāraśiva, who was honoured by Mūlarāja and other kings, has composed [this] [*Pratiṣṭhāsārapaddhati* in Banaras’. The Mūlarāja mentioned here is Mūlarāja I, the founder of the Caulukya dynasty of Aṇahillapattana. The alternative, that he is Mūlarāja II, who ruled c. 1176–c. 1178, is excluded by the date of the codex unicus, which is NS 211 (= AD 1090/1).

¹⁰³The earliest known MS of the *Lakṣaṇasaṃgraha*, also called *Lakṣaṇasamuccaya*, a *Pratiṣṭhāpaddhati* of approximately 3000 stanzas, published as the *Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya*, is dated in AD 1168 (BÜHNEMANN in BÜHNEMANN and TACHIKAWA 1990, p. 12). But it is unlikely to have been written close to that date, since we have evidence that it was already ‘canonical’ by that time in the south of India. For it has been referred to and quoted as an authoritative source under the title *Lakṣaṇasaṃgraha* (used by the author himself in 1.2) by the mid-twelfth-century Tamil Jñānaśiva (*Jñānaratnāvalī*, pp. 96–97 [quoting 7.1c–10], p. 482 [quoting 4.52–53], pp. 492–493 [quoting 4.84–90], and p. 591 [quoting 26.4]). Vaktraśambhu also recognizes it, referring to it as *Lakṣaṇasamuccaya* in his *Mṛgendrapaddhativyākhyā* (pp. 72–73 [quoting 6.261–262b]).

Further evidence that suggests the relative antiquity of this text is the fact that of the surviving Śaiva *Pratiṣṭhānttras* the *Mohaśūrottara* alone is missing from Vairocana’s list of these given above (fn. 100 on p. 27). Since that list claims completeness (*pratiṣṭhānttrāṇy etāni śivoktāny ekaviṃśatiḥ*) it is probable that the *Mohaśūrottara* postdated him. The earliest citation from it of which I am aware is relatively late, occurring in the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu, composed in AD 1048/9. It is also lacking in the *Bhāvacūḍamaṇi*, the citation-rich commentary on the *Pratiṣṭhānttra Mayasaṃgraha* composed c. AD 1000 by the Kashmirian Bhaṭṭa Vidyākāṇṭha.

Finally, there is evidence in Vairocana’s account of his Guru lineage that suggests that he was active in the tenth century. For he tells us that he is the successor of Īśānaśiva who was the successor of a Vimalaśiva in the Mattamayūra lineage, and describes the last as the Guru of Nirbhayabhūmipa (Nirbhayarāja) (32.72): *śrīmanmattamayūrajo harasamah *śaivānvayadyotakah* (conj. : *śaivo ’rjunadyotakah* Ed., citing variant *śaivekuledyotakah*) *prakhyāto vimalādikah śivaparas cācārya *vairyō ’bhavat* (corr. : *varyombhavat* Ed.) | *pūjyo nirbhayabhūmipasya ca gurus tenābhiṣiktah svayam jñānīśānaśivas tadaṅghrijanito vairocana daiśikah* ‘There was the famous and outstanding Ācārya Vimalaśiva, a spiritual son of the Mattamayūra [lineage], resembling Śiva himself, illuminating the Śaiva tradition, the venerable Guru of Nirbhayarāja. He consecrated the self-enlightened Īśānaśiva [as his successor]; and from that most venerable Guru the Ācārya Vairocana took [spiritual] birth’. This king, I propose, is the imperial Gūjara-Pratihāra monarch Mahendrapāla I, who ruled from Kanyakubja over much of India north of the Vindhya from c. AD 885 to 910, and is referred to with the sobriquet (*birudam*) Nirbhayarāja (‘King Fearless’) in the Sanskrit and Prakrit dramas of the poet Rājaśekhara, of whom this powerful monarch was a pupil; see *Bālabhārata, Prastāvanā*, p. 2: *tena ca raghuvamśamuktāmaṇināryāvartamahārājādhirājena śrīnirbhayanarendranandanenādhikṛtāḥ sabhāsadaḥ; Karpūramañjarī* 1.9: *bālakaī kāirāo *ñibbhayarāssa* (Jaina MSS : *ñibhararāssa* South-Indian MSS) *taha uvajjhāo*; and *Bālarāmāyaṇa* 1.5: *nirbhayaguruḥ*. This evidence places Vairocana in the tenth century. I am aware of one other ruler called Nirbhaya. This is Nirbhayadeva of Nepal, to whom we have a reference as the ruling monarch in an inscription of NS 125 (AD 1005) and as ruling in a diarchy (*dvairājyam*) with Rudradeva in a MS colophon of AD 1008 or 1009 (ULC MS ADD. 866) (PETECH 1984, pp. 35–36). He is assigned a reign of five years in the *Vaṃśāvalī* fragment in the Kesar library in Kathmandu, though ignored by the later chronicles (PETECH 1984, p. 35–37). But if it were this ruler that was Vimalaśiva’s patron then Vairocana would be pushed well into the eleventh century. That is not absolutely excluded by the available evidence, but it seems unlikely in the light of the absence of the *Mohaśūrottara* from his list of the *Pratiṣṭhānttras*.

As for Vairocana’s provenance, the *Lakṣaṇasaṃgraha*’s iconography reveals an East-Indian background. I cite one instance of this from several. Vairocana’s Viṣṇu image is flanked by attendant images of Sarasvatī and Śrī/Lakṣmī, a feature that is seen regularly in East-Indian Viṣṇus of the Pāla

bandhana of Murāribhaṭṭa, probably a Keralan,¹⁰⁴ and the *Prayogamañjarī* of the Keralan Ravi, written no later than the fifteenth.¹⁰⁵

Saiddhāntika Liturgical Hymnography

Within the corpus of surviving Saiddhāntika Śaiva sources we have also a small body of hymns (*stavah*, *stutiḥ*, *stotram*) composed for recitation in the course of worship. The earliest will be the *Vyomavyāpistava* if the Rāmakaṅṭha to whom it is attributed by its sixteenth-century commentator Vedajñāna II is the Kashmirian Saiddhāntika Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha. Of certain attribution are the *Pañcāvaraṇastotra* of Aghoraśiva and the *Śivapūjāstava* of his contemporary Jñānaśiva. Closely related is the *Dhyānaratnāvalī* of their pupil Trilocanaśiva, which consists of verses to be recited for the visualization of all the deities of the Saiddhāntika pantheon in the order in which they are worshipped.¹⁰⁶

The scriptures of the non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga

The Siddhānta is strictly Śaiva, in the sense that the regular rites prescribed by its scriptures are focused on Śiva alone (in his mild five-faced and ten-armed Sadāśiva form), worshipped without his consort. The rest of the Mantramārga, which, as we shall see, has been variously classified by the Śaivas, comprises texts that teach cults with a Śākta-Śaiva orientation, whose deities are generally more ferocious in character and who for the most part differ from the Siddhānta's lacto-vegetarian Sadāśiva by requiring offerings such as meat and alcoholic liquor. They are principally (i) the four goddesses Jayā, Vijayā, Ajitā (also called Jayantī), and Aparājītā (with their brother Tumburu), (ii) Svachhandabhairava and his consort (Aghoreśvarī, Bhairavī),

period in the region of modern Bihar, West Bengal, and Bangladesh and, to my knowledge, nowhere else (with the exception of a Javanese Viṣṇu in the Pāla style [KNEBEL 1901, Pl. 1, 3]); and as in those images Vairocana requires that these attendant deities should be depicted carrying a lute (*viṇā*) and a lotus respectively (6.54ab ...57c–58b). For examples of East-Indian images of Viṣṇu with these two goddesses in attendance see *HADDC* nos. 3, 8, 9, 25, 28, 33, 48, 296, 310, 361, 365, etc.

¹⁰⁴On this work see SARMA 2010, pp. 444–445. The text tells us nothing about its author and his name appears only in the colophon: *iti murāribhaṭṭīye śaivāgamanibandhane* ... (p. 382). But the known MSS are Keralan (SARMA 2010, pp. 444, fn. 3).

¹⁰⁵C. K. Unni asserts in his introduction to C. K. Raman Nambiar's edition of the *Prayogamañjarī* that its author was active "between the tenth and eleventh centuries, since Īśānaśivagurudeva has quoted profusely from the work" (p. 5). I am unable to accept the date tacitly assigned to Īśānaśiva on which this inference rests; see here p. 23. The only firm evidence for Ravi's date is that his *Prayogamañjarī* was known to Śaṅkaran Nampūtiri, who quotes it in his commentary on the *Tantrasamuccaya* of his father and teacher Cennās Nārāyaṇan Nampūtiri (*Tantrasamuccayavimarśinī* 1, pp. 47, 48, 55, 56, 58, 76–77 etc.), who tells us that he was born in Kali 4529, i.e. AD 1427/8 (*Tantrasamuccaya* 12.215). It was composed, then, not later than the fifteenth century. But it is not likely to have been written very close in time to Śaṅkaran Nampūtiri, since that author also knows the *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* (*Tantrasamuccayavimarśinī* 1, pp. 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, etc.), which also quotes the *Prayogamañjarī* (*Kriyāpāda*, pp. 65, 97). The *Prayogamañjarī* reaches us with a commentary (*-pradyota*) by Trivikrama (SARMA 2012, p. 445, fn. 4).

¹⁰⁶On these works see GOODALL et al. 2005, pp. 7–16.

(iii) Kapālīśabhairava and his consort Aghorī (Caṇḍā Kāpālīnī), (iv) the triad of the goddesses Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā, with or without their Bhairava consorts, and (v) Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī (/Kālī) and her many variants.¹⁰⁷ In the texts of all but the first of these cults we find to a greater or lesser extent elements of the cremation ground practices found in Atimārga II and III, practices lacking in the Saiddhāntika scriptures with the exception of the very early *Niśvāsa* corpus,¹⁰⁸ in which the polarization of the Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika traditions seems not yet to have emerged.

With these non-Saiddhāntika works Śaiva accounts of the scriptural literature also group texts known as the Gāruḍatantras and Bhūtatantras concerned with therapeutic and exorcistic procedures, which invoke such wrathful Rudra-forms as Nīlakaṇṭha, Khaḍgarāvaṇa, Lohaka, Krodheśvara, Devatrāsa, Aghora, and Jvareśvara. In addition to texts of these traditions we have the *Netra* (also called *Amṛteśavidhāna* and *Mṛtyujit*), which teaches the cult of Amṛteśvarabhairava and Amṛtalakṣmī. This text, which does not appear in any early account of the Śaiva canon and was produced in Kashmir between c. AD 700 and 850, probably after 800,¹⁰⁹ overrides the distinctions between the various branches of the Mantramārga listed here and that between the Mantramārga and the Kulamārga by propagating a form of worship for use by royal officiants that can be inflected as required to take on the character of any of these divisions and indeed of others outside Śaivism.¹¹⁰

The texts of the non-Saiddhāntika traditions for the most part do not enter the territory of worship performed in temples for the public good, their cults being mostly conceived as courses of propitiatory worship to be undertaken by individuals in the private domain for the benefit of none but themselves or their clients.¹¹¹ Moreover, although the scriptures of the Siddhānta taught rituals for the accomplishment of supernatural effects, it was the non-Sai-

¹⁰⁷I use the word ‘cult’ here and throughout in its basic meaning to denote a specific system of ritual observance, without the common connotations of marginality, strangeness, or fashionability.

¹⁰⁸See SANDERSON 1985, p. 565.

¹⁰⁹See SANDERSON 2005b, pp. 293–294.

¹¹⁰On this ‘universal’ (*sarvasāmānya*-) Tantra and its function see SANDERSON 2005b. Related to the *Netra* is the *Netrodbhava*, which has reached us in a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript.

¹¹¹This exclusion of the non-Saiddhāntika cults, that is to say, of the installation and worship of the Mantras of these in external non-mobile substrates, particularly when the latter are anthropomorphic icons, is expressed in, for example, *Tantrāloka* 27.7–8 and *Tantrālokaviveka* thereon, invoking *Netratantra* 18.119c–121. The latter passage refers to the commemorative installation of an image of Bhairava on the spot on which the person to be commemorated has been cremated. The Mantra installed in this Bhairava should be Amṛteśvara, that being among the exoteric Mantras considered non-specific (*sāmānya*-) and therefore able to be used in the domain of external, fixed images (*bahiḥsthirapraṭiṣṭhā*) without transgressing the rule. In this way only the icon, not the Mantra embodied in it, belongs to the non-Saiddhāntika field. However, it is certain that the boundary was breached in certain cases. I have in mind the Śākta Śaiva tradition of the South-Indian Yāmalatantras that will be mentioned below (pp. 40–41 and pp. 50–52).

ddhāntika scriptures that provided the most elaborate accounts of such rituals; and the ferocious character of many of their deities no doubt rendered them particularly appealing to royal and other clients eager to invest in supernatural assistance against enemies and calamities. As a result we may say that in the Mantramārga's engagement with society rather than in the domain of personal religion the Siddhānta came to operate principally in the fields of regular piety, legitimation, and stability, aspiring to subsume and preserve the brahmanical socio-religious order and therefore tending to free itself of the counter-cultural elements of its Atimārgic antecedents, while the non-Saiddhāntika Śākta-Śaiva systems, which maintained and developed those elements, came to the fore in the domain of rituals commissioned to avert danger in response to particular events or as regular, institutionalized programmes of state protection.

This duality of function is not readily observed by reading the insiders' texts, since these belong to one or other of the divisions and all claim to be offering the same goals. But it can be detected not only in the greater emphasis on rituals for supernatural effects in the non-Saiddhāntika corpus but also, for example, in the ruling of the Saiddhāntika *Mṛgendra* that a person may inflect his worship to accomplish supernatural effects by propitiating Śiva in one or other of the secondary aspects of Sadāśiva considered to be the sources of the non-Saiddhāntika traditions,¹¹² and in the Saiddhāntika *Kālottara*'s brief account of how one may use the Saiddhāntika Mantra of the *Kālottara* system in non-Saiddhāntika Sādhanas to attain supernatural effects by propitiating either Bhairava and the Mothers or Tumburu and the Four Sisters, that is to say, the deities of the Dakṣiṇa or Vāma streams respectively.¹¹³

This same duality can be detected in the *Uttarārdha* of the Śaiva *Līngapurāṇa*. For that text in spite of its claim to be a Purāṇa covers Saiddhāntika worship as the norm and adds Bhairava-centred and Śākta rituals specifically for the destruction of the king's enemies and the promoting of his victory in battle.¹¹⁴ Other examples of the role of the non-Saiddhāntika traditions in this domain are the cult of Bhadrakālī for the king's success in war seen in the *Āṅgirasakalpa* corpus of the Paippalādins of Orissa,¹¹⁵ the South-Indian

¹¹²*Mṛgendra*, *Kriyāpāda* 3.46–49d. Compare in this regard the passage in the anonymous commentary on the Saiddhāntika Umāpati's *Śataratnasamgraha* quoted and translated above (see fn. 122 on p. 33), which distinguishes between the Siddhānta and the other four streams by saying that the first bestows liberation and the others the counteracting of poisons (Gāruḍa), the exorcising of dangerous spirits (Bhūtatantra), the subjecting of others to one's will (Vāma), and the destruction of enemies (Bhairava/Dakṣiṇa).

¹¹³*Jñānapañcāśikā* f. 2v3–5 and f. 4r4–v4. These verses up to and including 54 have been edited and translated in GOODALL 2007, pp. 127–128.

¹¹⁴See SANDERSON 2005b, pp. 235–236.

¹¹⁵SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 255–276.

Mātrtantra tradition,¹¹⁶ and the cult of Tumburu and his sisters established for state protection in Cambodia at the beginning of the ninth century.¹¹⁷ We may compare in this regard the commissioning by kings in the brahmanical domain both of status-enhancing Śrauta ceremonies and of Atharvavedic rituals performed by specialists in the office of the royal chaplain for the warding off of dangers of all kinds from the royal household and the kingdom.

Nonetheless, however great the divergence between the Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika cults of the Mantramārga in terms of their primary function or emphasis, they are essentially variants of a single ritual system.¹¹⁸

Classifications of the Mantramārga's scriptures

Five Streams (pañca srotāṃsi). Of the classifications of the Mantramārga's scriptures found in works within it the earliest and most comprehensive divides it into five streams of revelation held to have come forth from the mouths of the five faces of Sadāśiva: the scriptures of the Siddhānta, divided artificially into two sub-canons (the ten Śivabhedas and the eighteen Rudrabhedas) from the upper and upward-gazing Īśāna face—this then is a Saiddhāntika classification—and those of the non-Saiddhāntika systems from the four faces below, which look towards the cardinal directions: the Vāmatantras, teaching the cult of the four Sisters and their brother Tumburu from the north/left-facing mild Vāmadeva face, the Dakṣiṇatantras, teaching cults of Bhairavas and Goddesses from the south/right-facing ferocious Aghora face, the Gāruḍatantras from the front/east-facing Tatpuruṣa face, and the Bhūtantras from the rear/west-facing face of Sadyojāta. We find this classificatory schema in the *Śrīkaṇṭhī-Srotobheda* with long lists of the texts and sub-texts in each category,¹¹⁹ in a shorter passage prefixed to a manuscript of the *Jñānapañcāsikā*, also seen in Vairocana's *Lakṣaṇasaṃgraha*, giving only the primary texts in each division,¹²⁰ in the *Mr̥gendra*, mentioning only one text as an example of each stream,¹²¹ and in a number of other Saiddhāntika sources, both scriptural and exegetical, that merely mention the classification and emphasise the superiority of the Siddhānta that it articulates.¹²²

¹¹⁶SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 277–278.

¹¹⁷SANDERSON 2004, pp. 355–358; 2005b, pp. 223–238.

¹¹⁸On this essential unity and the points of difference see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 237–239.

¹¹⁹*Śrīkaṇṭhī-Srotobheda*, vv. 106c–270b. This account forms the probable basis of the rarified, metaphysical treatment of the Śaiva revelation, modified by the addition of a higher, Kaula revelation, given by Abhinavagupta in *Mālinīślokovārttika* 1.169–370b. On this modification see SANDERSON 2009a, pp. 46–47.

¹²⁰*Jñānapañcāsikā* f. 1v1– f. 3r4, = *Lakṣaṇasaṃgraha* 2.107–128.

¹²¹*Mr̥gendra*, *Caryāpāda* 1.35–36b.

¹²²*Kāmika*, *Pūrvabhāga* 3.20c–21: *teṣv eva mantratantrākhyam sadāśivamukhodgatam || siddhā-*

The three streams: Siddhānta, Vāma, Dakṣiṇa. In the non-Saiddhāntika scripture *Picumata*, also called *Brahmayāmala*, we encounter a modification of this classification evidently designed to express the view that the non-Saiddhāntika traditions are superior to the Saiddhāntika and to push the Gāruḍatantras and Bhūtatantras to the margin. It divides the Śaiva scriptures into three principal streams, central (*madhyamam*), left (*vāmam*) and right (*dakṣiṇam*), as emanations of three corresponding powers of the deity, termed Madhyamā, Vāmā, and Dakṣiṇā, in ascending order,¹²³ assigning the Siddhā-

*ntam gāruḍam vāmam bhūtatantram ca bhairavam | ūrdhvapūrvakuber*āpyayāmyavaktrād yathākramam* (āpya em. as quoted in the commentary on the *Śataratnasamgraha*, p. 9 and Jñānaprakāśa's *Śivāgamādīmāhātmyasamgraha*, p. 11: āsya Ed.) 'Siddhānta, Gāruḍa, Vāma, Bhūtatantra, and Bhairava from the upper, eastern, northern, western, and southern faces respectively'; Śrīkaṇṭha, *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* v. 16: *tad atra kathitam sarvasrotasām jyāyasi prabhoḥ | udakṣeṇordhvavaktreṇa tatas tad avadhārayet* 'That [nature of the self] has been explained by the upward-gazing upper face of the Lord in this, the highest of all the streams. So understand it therefrom'; Aghorasiva thereon: *vāmādisamastāśāstrasrotasām madhyād utkrṣṭe siddhāntākhye srotasi* 'in this stream, called the Siddhānta, which is superior to the Vāma and all the other streams'; Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, *Matāṅgavṛtti*, introducing *Vidyāpāda* 1.1: *anye tu prathamam evotsūtram asya śāstrasya lākulamausulādibhyaḥ śaivatvena viśeṣam tatrāpi ca srotontarebhyo vāmadakṣiṇagāruḍabhūtatantrabhyah siddhāntatayā varṇayanti* 'Others explain at the very beginning [of their exegesis] a matter that is not pertinent to the text [at this point], namely that this scripture is superior to the Lākula, Mausula and related [scriptures of the Atimārga] because it is [part of the] Śaiva [Mantramārga] and within that category is superior in turn to the Vāma-, Dakṣiṇa-, Bhūta-, and Gāruḍatantras, because it is a [scripture of the] Siddhānta'; and in the anonymous commentary on Umāpatiśivācārya's *Śataratnasamgraha*, p. 9, ll. 4–6: *tatra māntrikam pañcavidham api krameṇa ūrdhvapūrvakuberavarūṇayāmyasambandhāt muktupradasiddhāntasarvaviśaharaṇagāruḍasarvavaśīkaraṇavāmabhūtāgrahanivārakabhūtatantraśatrukṣayakarabhairavasamjñakam* 'Among these [five] that of Mantras is of five kinds, namely (i) the Siddhānta, bestowing liberation, (ii) the Gāruḍa, removing all poisons, (iii) the Vāma, subjecting all to one's will, (iv) the Bhūtatantra, which drives out demons and possessing spirits, and (v) the Bhairavatantra, which destroys one's enemies, through association with, respectively, the upper, eastern, northern, western, and southern mouths'. In a passage of the *Siddhāntaparakāśikā* of Sarvātmaśambhu we see the term Mantramārga used with reference to the Siddhānta alone: *māntṛam tu śivapraṇītam siddhāntaśāstram*, and the same in *Kāmika, Uttarabhāga* 24.82: *siddhānto mantratantram syād atimārgam tato 'varam | adhyātmaṃ yat tato nīcam tasmād vaidikam eva ca*. This is in accordance with a tendency in South-Indian Saiddhāntika works to align their adherents more closely with brahmanical orthopraxy by dissociating their tradition from those of the non-Saiddhāntikas. Thus, for example, *Siddhāntaparakāśikā* p. 11: *gāruḍadakṣiṇavāmabhūtāni tv adhaśrotāṃsi* 'the lower streams, [namely those of] the Gāruḍa-, Dakṣiṇa-, Vāma-, and Bhūtatantras'.

¹²³The classification is expounded in the *Picumata*'s 39th chapter (*srotranirṇayapaṭalāḥ*). That *madhyamā* is the source of the Siddhāntatantras is stated in *Picumata* f. 199v1–2 (39.49–55): *sarvakāmikaśāstram tu tathā yogodbhavam priye | acintyaṃ kāraṇam caiva ajitam ca tathāparam || dīptābham caiva sūkṣmam ca sāhasram ca tathāiva ca | aṃśumā suprabham caiva śivabhedāḥ prakīrtitāḥ || madhyamasrotasambhūtā ūrdhvavaktrād vinirgatāḥ | vijayaṃ caiva niśvāsam svāyambhuvam ataḥ param || vāthula<m> candrahāsam ca rauravam mākuṭam tathā | vīreṣam ca tathā cānyam tataḥ ūrdhvam *nibodhata (em. : nibodhataḥ Cod.) || candrajñānam ca bimbam ca prodgūtam lalitām tathā | siddhisamāntakam caiva sarvodgūtam ataḥ param || kiraṇam ca mahādevi pārameśvaram eva ca | rudrabhedāḥ samākhyātā *madhyamāśaktyadhiṣṭhitāḥ (conj. : śaktimācchaktyadhiṣṭhitāḥ Cod.)*. That *vāmā* and *raudrā* (*dakṣiṇā*) are the sources of the Vāma- and Dakṣiṇatantras is stated in the following (f. 200r3 [39.76–77] and 198v5 [39.29]): *vāmāyā preritenātha vāmavaktreṇa caiva hi | śuddhāśuddhavimiśreṣu catuskāśritakāni tu || sanmoham ca tathā proktaṃ *tathā (conj. : bhavā Cod.)*

ntatantras to the first, the Vāmatantras to the second, and the Dakṣiṇatantras, among which it counts itself, to the third. Ascent through this hierarchy is compared to the process of preparing rice. The system of the Śivabhedas and Rudrabhedas, that is to say, the Siddhānta, is likened to the removing of the husks (*tuṣaḥ*) from the grains, that of the Vāmatantras to the cleaning of the grains by the removing of the bran (*kambūkaḥ*), and that of the Dakṣiṇatantras to the cooking of the pure white grains that remain.¹²⁴ The Gāruḍa- and Bhūtatantras, together with a number of other Tantric systems, including the Vaiṣṇava Pañcarātra, are assigned to what it calls the lower stream (*adhaḥsrotaḥ*).¹²⁵

Siddhāntatantras and Bhairavatantras. Later classifications, of which there are two, submerge the Vāma within the Dakṣiṇa and reflect, I propose, a time when the former had become marginal, overtaken and engulfed by the forms of Śākta Śaiva observance found in the Dakṣiṇatantras that carried forward the tradition of Atimārga III. Both classifications leave the Bhūtatantras and Gāruḍatantras out of their account, no doubt for the same reason. The first presents the canon in terms of a simple dichotomy between Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika Tantras, the former comprising ten Śivatantras, eighteen Rudratatantras, and satellites of these,¹²⁶ and the latter listed with evident

caiva nayottaram | śaukram caiva tathā proktaṃ vāmasrotād vinirgataṃ and raudrayā coditenātha śrīkaṅṭhena mahāyaśe | dakṣiṇena tu vaktreṇa dakṣiṇāsrotasambhavaḥ. The form *srotam* appears frequently in the *Picumata*, and also in other early Śaiva scriptural sources such as *Niśvāsottara* 1.1a (*mantrākhye pañcame srotre*) in place of Pāṇinian *srotaḥ* and has therefore been accepted as an Aīśa usage.

¹²⁴*Picumata* f. 198r5–v1 [39.11c–13]: **madhyamā* (Aīśa for *madhyamayā*) *śodhitāḥ śaktiyā *nā-dho yāti* (conj. : *nādyasakti* Cod.) **kadācana* (corr. : *kadācanaḥ* Cod.) || *bahivrīhi*tuṣeṇeva* (em. : *tu-senaiva* Cod.) *viśiṣṭas taṇḍulo yathā | kiṃciccheṣamalāvastho vāmāśrayasamudbhavaḥ || tuṣakāmbūkarahito nirmalo kṣālanādinā | pākamātrakriyāpekṣī viśuddho dakṣiṇāśrayaḥ* ‘Once it has been purified by *madhyamā śaktiḥ* [the soul] will never again descend [into the domain of transmigration]. It is then like the rice grain when it has been separated from the paddy’s outer husk. But it is still in a state in which some impurity remains. When it is reborn through reliance on *vāmā* it is [like the grain of rice] which has been freed of both the husk and the bran and has been purified by washing and so forth. Now pure and awaiting only the action of cooking it resorts to *dakṣiṇā*’. In support of my conjectural emendation of the meaningless *nādyasaktikadācanaḥ* of 11d to *nādho yāti kadācana* I cite *Tantrasadbhāva* f. 10v1 (1.349d–350): *sa yāti paramaṃ padam || tasmim gata varārohe nādho yāti kadācana* and *Svacchanda* 10.610: *nādho yānti punar devi saṃsāre duḥkhasāgare | śivaṃ yānti tatas cordhvaṃ śrīkaṅṭhena samikṣitāḥ.*

¹²⁵*Picumata* f. 191v1–2 (39.87c–92): *adhasrotāsthītāni syus tantrāṇi ca tathā punaḥ || mākoṭam ca vibhūtiṃ ca adhyayaṃ ca tathā param | rudrabhede sthītāni syuḥ kālāgnyadhiṣṭhitāni tu || tantra-trayaṃ adhasrotanirgataṃ varavarāṇi | mākoṭatantrakāni syuḥ yāni tāni śṛṇusva me || nārasimha-vidhānaṃ tu vidhānaṃ kṣetrakalpanā | vivarāntargatāḥ kalpā varāhasya vidhis tathā || pañcarātra-vidhānaṃ tu vaikuṅṭhasya vidhis tathā | kulācārasamopetā evaṃ vai bhairavo ’bravīt || garuḍasya vidhānaṃ tu bhūtatantrādiko *gaṇaḥ* (conj. : *gaṇāḥ* Cod.) | *ośadhīkalpajātaṃ ca rasāyanavidhis tathā.*

¹²⁶On the relation between these twenty-eight texts and the Saiddhāntika canon known to the exegetes and surviving in manuscripts see SANDERSON 2007b, p. 233.

artificiality as the sixty-four Bhairavatantras, divided into eight ogdoads.¹²⁷ Vāmatantras are found among the sixty-four listed in this classification, but the great majority are, or appear to be, works of Dakṣiṇa character.¹²⁸

Mantrapīṭha and Vidyāpīṭha. The second classification, while recognizing this basic dichotomy, subdivides the non-Saiddhāntika category into Bhairava-centred and Goddess-centred texts in works that belong to the latter category. It articulates, then, a Śākta perspective on the canon. It divides the non-Saiddhāntika scriptures, excluding the Bhūtantras and Gāruḍatantras, into two collections termed Pīṭhas: the Mantrapīṭha for the Bhairava-centred tradition and the Vidyāpīṭha for the Goddess-centred.¹²⁹ Texts assigned to the Vidyāpīṭha generally refer to themselves in their colophons as belonging to the Vidyāpīṭha within the Bhairava stream (*bhairavasrotasi*), the latter term evidently denoting the whole non-Saiddhāntika corpus other than the Gāruḍatantras and Bhūtantras.¹³⁰

¹²⁷This classification is seen in the *Śrīkaṅṭhī-Srotobheda*, vv. 271–285 (*sādāśivaṃ cakram aṣṭā-ṣṭakavibhedataḥ*) (quoted in *Tantrāloka*, vol. 1, pp. 41–43) and in *Jayadrathayāmala*, Śaṭka 1, Paṭala 44 (*sadāśivāṣṭāṣṭakanirṇayaḥ*) (A ff. 337v3–340v2). See also *Tantrāloka* 22.40c–41b1: *siddhānte dīkṣitās tanre daśāṣṭādaśabhedini || bhairaviye catuṣṣaṣṭau tān paśūn dīkṣayet ...* ‘He should initiate into the sixty-four [Tantras] of Bhairava those bound-souls who have been initiated into [the scriptures of] the Siddhānta, comprising the ten and eighteen divisions (*-bhedini*)’. The ten and eighteen divisions (*bhedāḥ*) are the ten Śivabhedas and the eighteen Rudrabhedas, as the Saiddhāntika Śivatantras and Rudratanttras are commonly called. *Tantrasāra*, p. 4: *sarvasmāt tu vimocakaṃ parameśvaraśāstram pañcasrotodaśāṣṭādaśavasvaṣṭābhedaḥ* ‘But that which liberates from all [bondage] is the teaching of Śiva, divided into the five streams and the ten, eighteen, and sixty-four divisions’.

¹²⁸These Vāma works are the *Vīṇāśikha*, the *Sammoḥa*, *Śiraścheda*, and *Dāmara* in the list of the *Śrīkaṅṭhī-Srotobheda* (vv. 283–284). In that of the *Jayadrathayāmala* (Śaṭka 1, f. 339r2–4 [44.21c–22c]) they are the *Śukrasaṃhitā* and, perhaps, the *Nandīśikhā*. A detailed analysis of this evidence will be given in a later publication.

¹²⁹We find this classification in the *Jayadrathayāmala*, Śaṭka 1, also called *Śiraścheda* (*/Śiraścheda*) (Paṭala 36; see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 234–237), a text that existed independently before the addition of three additional Śaṭkas (SANDERSON 2002, p. 1, endnote 3), and assigns itself in this account to the Vidyāpīṭha, more specifically to the Śaktitantra division thereof (see below), declaring that unlike the other Śaktitantras, all of which belong to the Dakṣiṇa stream, it embodies both Vāma and Dakṣiṇa streams (40.3: *etāni śaktitantrāṇi santi śūlālayāni tu | savyasrotasi siddhāni śiraśchedid ubhayātmakam*); see SANDERSON 2002, p. 1, endnotes 7–9. The same classification was given in the lost *Sarvavīra* (*Sarvavīrasamāyoga*), another of the Śaktitantras in this account, since we have a verse quoted by Kṣemarāja from that work listing the Tantras of the Mantrapīṭha exactly as here (*Svacchandoddyota*, vol. 1 [Paṭala 1], pp. 109–110: *svacchandabhairavaś caṇḍaḥ krodha unmattabhairavaḥ | granthāntarāṇi catvāri mantrapīṭhaṃ varānane* [cf. *Jayadrathayāmala*, Śaṭka 1, A f. 308v5 (36.12): *svacchandabhairavaṃ caṇḍaṃ krodham unmattabhairavam | *granthāntarāṇi* (em. : *granthāntarāṇi* cod.) *catvāri mantrapīṭhe sthitāni ca*]). It is also seen in Abhinavagupta’s *Tantrāloka*, his exposition of the teachings of the *Mālinīvijayottara*, when he declares that the *Siddhayaogeśvarīmata*, of which the *Mālinīvijayottara* is for him the essence, is the highest revelation in the Vidyāpīṭha, which is itself the highest of the four Pīṭhas in the ascending order Maṇḍalapīṭha, Mudrāpīṭha, Mantrapīṭha, and Vidyāpīṭha (37.23d–25b: *maṇḍalaṃ mudrikā tathā || mantrō vidyeti ca pīṭham utkr̥ṣṭam cottarottaram | vidyāpīṭhapradhānaṃ ca *siddhayaogeśvarīmatam* [em. : *siddhayaogeśvarīmatam* K_{ED}]) || *tasyāpi paramaṃ sāraṃ mālinīvijayottaram*).

¹³⁰See, e.g., *Tantrasadbhāva* f. 14r2: *iti bhairavasrotasi mahātantrē vidyāpīṭhe saptakoṭipramāṇe*

The Mantrapīṭha is dominated by the *Svacchanda*, also known as the *Lalitasvacchanda*, the Tantra of the cult of Svacchandabhairava and his consort Aghoreśvarī. This work is the pre-eminent text of this category in the scriptural accounts. It also the only one that has come down to us in its entirety. The only other works of this category that have reached us through citation or the incorporation of passages in compendia are its satellites: the *Aghoreśvarīsvacchanda*, the *Dvādaśasāhasra-Mantrapīṭhasvacchanda*, and the *Rasasvacchanda*.¹³¹

The importance of the *Svacchanda* is evident (i) from the fact that it has come down to us in manuscripts in widely separated parts of the subcontinent, namely the Kathmandu valley, Kashmir, and Tamilnadu,¹³² (ii) from the survival of various Paddhatis for worship and initiation based on it in the Kathmandu valley,¹³³ and, above all, in Kashmir, where it became, with the *Netra*, the principal basis of the rituals of the region's Śaivas down to

śrītantrasadbhāve; Siddhayantrārṇava f. 13r5–6: *iti bhairavasrotasi mahātantre vidyāpīṭhe mahādevyāḥ saṃmohane umātilake siddhayantrārṇavam parisamāptam; Picumata* f. 363r4r: *iti bhairavasrotasi mahātantre vidyāpīṭhe brahmayāmale ...; Jayadrathayāmala*, Śaṭka 1, B f. 6v2: *iti bhairavasrotasi vidyāpīṭhe śīracchede śrījayadrathayāmale ...; and, without mentioning the Vidyāpīṭha, Hṛdayaśiva, Prāyaścittasamuccaya* f. 89r2: *iti bhairavasrotasi siddhayogeśvarimate sārđhatrisāhasrike*
....

¹³¹The chapters on penances from these three works have been included in his *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* by Hṛdayaśiva (ff. 84r3–90r3, ff. 90r3–93v5, and ff. 101r–102r). Part of a *Rasasvacchanda* survives in Nepal, but it is certainly not the work of this name excerpted by Hṛdayaśiva. For its subject is the concocting of elixirs to defeat old age and death (*rasasiddhiḥ*) (f. 2r5–6: *śodhanam sūtakendrasya pātanaṃ yantramūṣayoh | rasāś coparasāś caiva auśadhīpakṣa[+ + +] baddham ca devadeveśa krāmanaṃ rañjanaṃ tathā | dvandvamelāpakam sūte yathā bhavati taṃ vada*), and it does not mention Svacchandabhairava. The *Vṛddhasvacchanda* that has reached us in Kashmirian MSS is also no part of this corpus, in spite of its name. On that Śākta work see here fn. 173 on p. 46. In the *Svacchandoddyota* on 1.4c–5b Kṣemarāja refers to the existence of other *Svacchanda*-texts believed to be divisions of an original *Svacchanda* in 1000 million verses, giving an open list consisting of the *Koṭarākṣa*-, the *Vyādhībhakṣa*-, and the *Aghoreśvarī*:- **koṭarākṣavyādhībhakṣāghoreśvarīsvacchandādīnā (bhakṣāghoreśvarī em. : bhakṣāghoreśvara κED) bhedānanyena sarpitam*. In the canon of the 32 Dakṣiṇatantras seen in the *Śrīkaṇṭhī-Srotobheda* the *Svacchanda*-texts are subsumed under the 24 sub-Tantras of the first, the *Mahāghora*. Here we see yet others, since the list includes *Lākula[svacchanda]*, *Aghoreśvarīsvacchanda*, *Vidyāsvacchanda*, *Svacchandasāra*, *Rasasvacchanda*, *Rājaputrīyaka[svacchanda]*, *Svacchanda*, *Bindusvacchanda*, and *Nādasvacchanda* (vv. 227–232). The final part of the seventh Paṭala of the *Aghoreśvarīsvacchanda* of the Mantrapīṭha, on the subject of the Kṣetrapālas, has reached us in an undated Nepalese palm-leaf MS preserved in the Royal Library in Copenhagen (MS Nepal 92). I am grateful to Dr. Hartmut Buescher for his kindness in preparing and sending me photographs of this MS in response to my enquiry after the publication of his catalogue of Sanskrit MSS in that collection (2011). The verses preserved in this MS are also found as part of a passage of 38 verses included by Takṣakavarta in his *Nityādisaṃgraha* as from the *Aghorīpañcaśataka* (A ff. 44v1–45v2; B ff. 80r11–82r1).

¹³²For the South-Indian transmission see the IFP MSS T. 507aa, 1032, and 1077. The text was also well-known in Mālava, since it was utilized by Bhojadeva for his *Siddhāntasārapaddhati*, and in eastern India, since Vimalaśiva draws on it in his *Vimalāvatī* of AD 1101/2. It was also known in the Deccan, since its deity is referred to by Someśvara, the Western Cālukya king of Kalyāṇa in 3.731 of his encyclopaedic *Mānasollāsa*, composed in AD 1131.

¹³³See SANDERSON 2001, pp. 20–21, fn. 26.

recent times,¹³⁴ and (iii) from the the fact that it is the unacknowledged source of much of the wording and content of the prescription of the ritual of Saiddhāntika initiation set out by Bhojadeva in his influential *Siddhāntasārāpaddhati*,¹³⁵ stripped, of course, of all non-Saiddhāntika Mantras and deities, these being replaced by those of the Saiddhāntika *Kālotara*.

The Vidyāpīṭha is divided into three sub-collections in the only known account of it, which is contained in the first Ṣaṭka of the *Jayadrathayāmala*: the Vāmatantras, Yāmalatantras, and Śaktitantras. The first of these comprises, according to that source, three lead-texts: the *Nayottara*, the *Mahāraudra*, and the *Mahāsaṃmohana*.¹³⁶ The *Picumata* also recognizes three Tantras in this category: the *Sam̐moha*, the *Nayottara*, and the *Śaukra*.¹³⁷ The Cambodian Sdok Kak Thom inscription of AD 1052 names four Vāma scriptures: the *Śiraścheda*, the *Vīṇāśikha* (*sic* for *Vīṇāśikha*), the *Sam̐moha*, and the *Nayottara*, and implies by referring to them as the four mouths of the four-faced deity Tumburu that they were understood to constitute a complete canon, at least of the tradition's core texts.¹³⁸

Of these texts we now have only the *Vīṇāśikha*, which reaches us in an undated palm-leaf manuscript in a proto-Bengali hand of the twelfth or thirteenth century. Since the *Vīṇāśikha* refers to the *Sam̐mohana/Mahāsaṃmohana*, *Nayottara*, and *Śiraścheda* as its antecedents, we learn that it is the most recent of the four texts and that its absence from the Vāma canons of the *Jayadrathayāmala* and *Picumata* may be because it was not in existence when their accounts of the Śaiva revealed literature were drawn up.¹³⁹

¹³⁴See SANDERSON 2004, p. 240, fn. 20; 2007b, pp. 385–387, 392–397.

¹³⁵For evidence of Bhojadeva's dependence on the *Svacchanda* see SANDERSON 2004, pp. 359–360.

¹³⁶*Jayadrathayāmala*, Ṣaṭka 1, A f. 308r2–5 (36.15–19b) (the fifteen Mūlasūtras of the Vidyāpīṭha: *granthāntarāṅy asaṃkhyāni vidyāpīṭhe sthitāni tu | pañca ca daśa siddhāni mūlasūtrāṅi sundari || *vidyāpīṭhe* (conj. : *vidyāpīṭha* A) *prasiddhāni nāmbhīḥ kathayāmi te | sarvavīrasaṃyogam siddhayogeśvarīmatam || pañcāmṛtaṃ ca viśvāyaṃ yoginījālasaṃvaram | vidyābhedaṃ śiraśchedaṃ mahāsaṃmohanaṃ tathā || nayottaraṃ mahāraudraṃ rudrayāmalam eva ca | brahmayāmalasaṃjñāṃ ca tathānyaṃ viśvayāmalam || daśaturyaṃ smṛtaṃ *skāṇdam aumaṃ* (conj. : *kāṇdam armaṃ* A) *pañcadaśaṃ matam*; and A ff. 317v2–318r1 (40.2–7) (these Mūlasūtras divided into seven Śaktitantras [six in the Dakṣiṇa stream and one that embodies both Vāma and Dakṣiṇa streams], three Tantras in the Vāma, and five Yāmalatantras in the Dakṣiṇa): *sarvavīraṃ triśūlaṃ ca śrīcakraṃ viśvapūrvakam | yoginījālasaṃjñāṃ ca vidyābhedaṃ śirohṛtam || etāni śaktitantrāṅi *santi* (conj. : *saṃnti* A) *śūlālayāni tu | savyasrotasi siddhāni śiraśchid ubhayātmakam || nayottaraṃ mahāraudraṃ mahāsaṃmohanaṃ tathā | trikam etan mahādevi vāmasrotasi nirgatam || vibhinnaṃ koṭibhedena śākhākalitavistaram | yāmye srotasi sūtrāṅi *pañca vai yāmalāni tu* (conj. : *pañcakaṃvaimalāni tu* A) *|| santi viśtrāṇāśākhābhīḥ kathayante tāni nāmbhīḥ | raudraumaṃ vaiṣṇavaṃ cāpi caturthaṃ skandayāmalam || akavyācāram etad dhi catuṣkam api tat smṛtam | brahmayāmalasaṃjñāṃ ca <pañ>camam tat picu-r-matam.*

¹³⁷*Picumata* f. 200r3 [39.77]: *sanmohaṃ ca tathā proktaṃ *tathā* (conj. : *bhavā* Cod.) *caiva nayottaraṃ | śaukraṃ caiva tathā proktaṃ vāmasrotād vinirgataṃ.*

¹³⁸K. 235, v. 28: *śāstraṃ śiraśchedavināśikhākhyam saṃmohanāmāpi nayottarākhyam | tat tumvuror vaktracatuṣkam asya siddhyeva vipras samadarśayat saḥ*; see SANDERSON 2004, p. 355–357; 2005b, p. 237.

¹³⁹*Vīṇāśikha* 4: *śrutam saṃmohanaṃ tantraṃ tathā nayottaraṃ mahat | śiraśchedaṃ ca deveśa*

We may safely assume that *Sam̐moha*, *Sam̐mohana*, and *Mahāsam̐mohana* are variant titles of one and the same work. As for the *Śiraścheda*, the *Jayadrathayāmala* claims this as another name for itself. So might not this, or rather its first Ṣaṭka, which is the original text to which the three subsequent Ṣaṭkas were added, be the Vāmatantra referred to by the Sdok Kak Thom inscription and the *Vīṇāśikha*? The first Ṣaṭka does refer to itself as a Vāma text. But this claim is hardly supported by its contents. For though there are some Vāma elements in the first Ṣaṭka they are incidental and subordinated within a Dakṣiṇa framework. At best we can accept the Ṣaṭka's own characterization of itself in its listing of the Vidyāpīṭha's lead-texts as a Vāma-Dakṣiṇa hybrid.¹⁴⁰ Moreover, that same account speaks of the original *Śiraścheda* revelation's having split into two transmissions of which the available work represents only one. This may well have been intended to account for the existence of another, purely Vāma *Śiraścheda*, now lost.¹⁴¹

We have, then, only one of the core scriptures of the Vāma canon. In addition we have testimony to a lost work whose title may tentatively be reconstructed as **Devītantrasadbhāva* in the form of a two-folio fragment of a birch-bark manuscript, possibly from as early as the mid-sixth century, containing a précis of this text, to be discussed under the heading of Vāma exegesis, and also an incomplete eleventh-century Nepalese manuscript of the *Siddhayantrārṇava* ('The Ocean of Empowered Yantras'), which attributes itself to the *Umātilaka* of the *Sam̐mohana* cycle.¹⁴²

The other two text-groups in the Vidyāpīṭha are the Yāmalatantras and Śaktitantras. The lead-texts of the first are said by the *Jayadrathayāmala* to be five: *Rudrayāmala*, *Brahmayāmala*, *Viṣṇuyāmala*, *Skandayāmala*, and *Umāyāmala*.¹⁴³ The treatment of these in the *Jayadrathayāmala* makes it clear that the *Brahmayāmala* was the pre-eminent work of this class; and indeed it is this alone that has reached us intact, as a work of about 12,000

¹⁴⁰*tvatprasādāt* (corr. : *tvatprasāda* Cod., GOUDRIAAN) *sudurlabham*. See also v. 304: **nayottarāditanreṣu* (em. GOUDRIAAN : *nayottarāṇitanreṣu* Cod.) *kalpokaṭam karma kārayet*. In v. 316 it refers to the first of these texts as the *Mahāsam̐mohana* and mentions another, the *Sarvatobhadra*: *śukreṇa sarvatobhadre mahāsam̐mohane tathā | nirmathya *kathitaṃ* (corr. : *kathito* Cod., GOUDRIAAN) *devi dadhno gḥṛtam ivoddhṛtam*.

¹⁴⁰See here fn. 136 on p. 37 (42.3d: *śiraścheda ubhayātmakam*).

¹⁴¹See SANDERSON 2002, pp. 1–2 and endnotes 7–10.

¹⁴²Colophon: *iti bhairavasrotasi mahātantre vidyāpīṭhe mahādevyāḥ sam̐mohane umātilake siddhayantrārṇavam̐ parisamāptam*.

¹⁴³See the list of the fifteen lead-texts of the Vidyāpīṭha cited here in fn. 136 on p. 37. The same five Yāmalas appear in the related list of Tantras "from the mouth of the Yoginīs" in *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, A f. 69v1–5, B f. 22r3–5 (29.16–19): **asmākaṃ tu* (B : *amsāttaṃ* A) *varād* (conj. : *varām* AB) *etā nirgatā yoginīmukhāt | vīrākhyam̐ siddhasāraṃ ca pañcāmṛtam atah param̐ || *viśvādyam̐* (B : *vimbādyām̐* A) *yoginījālam̐ kālākhyam̐ khacaraṃ tathā | sādhanam̐ *śaṃvaram̐* (conj. : *savaram̐* AB) *caiva tilakaṃ hṛdayam̐ param̐ || *vidyābhedaṃ* (em. : *vidyāpīṭham̐* AB) *śiraśchedam̐ mahāsam̐mohanam̐ tathā | nayottaram̐ mahāraudram̐ rudrayāmalam̐ eva ca || brahmayāmalam̐ anyam̐ ca tathānyam̐ viṣṇuyāmalam̐ | skandayāmalam̐ evam̐ ca umāyāmalam̐ eva ca*.

verses variously entitled *Brahmayāmala*, *Picumata*, and *Ucchuṣma*, surviving in a well-preserved Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript dated in AD 1052. We also have three of its satellite-texts: the *Mahābhairavamaṅgalā*,¹⁴⁴ the *Piṅgalāmata*,¹⁴⁵ and the *Matasāra*, which teaches a cult of the same pantheon as the *Picumata* but with additions that are its signature.¹⁴⁶

The *Brahmayāmala* is strongly Kāpālīka in character, carrying forward into the Mantramārga the antinomian and sanguinary culture of Atimārga III,¹⁴⁷ and the relative antiquity of this current of Mantramārgic Śaivism is

¹⁴⁴The *Mahābhairavamaṅgalā*, which reaches us in an undated Nepalese MS whose Licchavi script suggests that it was penned in the ninth century (VASUDEVA 2004, p. 458), tells us that it is the very essence of the *Ucchuṣmamahātanta*, that is to say, the supposed work of 125,000 verses of which the actual *Picumata/Brahmayāmala* claims to be only a short redaction (f. 1v5 [1.6]): [ucch]u[ṣm]ī[y]e mahātantre lakṣapādādihike vibho | sarvatantrasya sāro 'yaṃ siddhāntam paripathyate. The *Picumata (Brahmayāmala)* refers to itself as *tantram ucchuṣmasaṃbhavam* in 1.3d, 1.8d, 2.14d etc. or *ucchuṣmatantram* (2.455c) and it tells us in its final words that it is a short redaction in 12,000 verses of the *Brahmayāmala* of 125,000 verses, which derives in turn from an original text of 1000 million verses: *brahmayāmalatanredaṃ lakṣapādādihikaṃ gataṃ | śatakoṭyujjvalā<t> tantrāt sārātsāratarottaram || sthitaṃ dvādaśasāhasraṃ pañcasūtrojjvalaṃ matam | mayā te kathitaṃ bhadre bhadrāsiddhipradāyakaṃ*. The *Mahābhairavamaṅgalā* is identified in its colophon as a text in the [cycle of the] *Sārasvatāmata* (f. 22v4: *iti mahābhairavatantre vidyāpīṭhe sārasvatamate mahābhairavamaṅgalākālpikadeśaḥ parisamāptaḥ* 'Here ends one part of the *Mahābhairavamaṅgalākālpa* of the *Sārasvatāmata* of the *Vidyāpīṭha* of the *Mahābhairavatanta*'). The *Jayadrathayāmala*'s account of the Śaiva canon in its first Śaṭka tells us that the *Sārasvatāmata* is the Upatantra of the *Śaṃvarāmata*, the latter being one of the eight *Mata*-texts in the cycle of the *Picumata*. For the passage listing these eight, ending with the *Piṅgalāmata* see SANDERSON 2007b, p. 249, fn. 54.

¹⁴⁵As for the *Piṅgalāmata*, it tells us that it is part of the *Brahmayāmala* corpus, as does the first Śaṭka of the *Jayadrathayāmala*; see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 248–249 and the sources quoted and translated there in footnotes 54 and 55. Though largely concerned with fixed installations of the Saiddhāntika type and therefore much cited by Saiddhāntika authors, it also covers such non-Saiddhāntika matters as the installation of Tūras, skulls into whose outer surface the icons of the deities to be worshipped have been incised (see *Tantrāloka* 27.20c–29), and of Paṭas, cloths on whose gessoed surface the same deities have been painted. In the latter context it covers the deities of the Vāma, Dakṣiṇa, and Trika, and reveals its affiliation with the *Brahmayāmala* by specifying for the Dakṣiṇa the four goddesses of that work: Raktā, Karālī, Caṇḍākṣī, and Mahocchuṣmā (*Piṅgalāmata* f. 28r3–7 [*Citrādhikāra* vv. 16–25]).

¹⁴⁶The *Matasāra* calls its central deity-pair Mahābhairava and Mahālakṣmī (f. 16r3–4: *mahābhairavadevasya* [conj. : *mahābhairavasya* Cod.] *mahālakṣmīyutasya ca*). The circuits of ancillary deities (*parivāradevatāḥ*) are (ff. 16v1–17v3) (1) the three Maṅgalās, (2) the four goddesses Raktā, Karālā, Caṇḍākṣī, and Mahocchuṣmā, (3) the six Lakṣmīs, (4) the eight Vāgīśīs, and (5) the four Dūtīs who stand as guardians in the four gateways of the Maṅḍala (Karālī, Danturā, Bhīmā, and Gajakarṇā). Of these circuits the second and the fifth constitute with the central deity the core Yāga of the *Picumata*. The *Matasāra* acknowledges this by saying of the first four goddesses that they are those of the root-text (*mūlam*), that is to say, the *Picumata* (f. 16v3–5: *raktā karālā caṇḍākṣī mahocchuṣmā varānane | *catuṣpatrasthitā (patra em. : patha Cod.) nityaṃ bhogaṃokṣasya siddhidā<h> || mūlasthā devatā hy etā jñātavyā sādhakottamaiḥ | *smṛtamātrārtiharaṇā (em. : smṛtamātrārttipraṃharaṇā Cod.) mahāyogavibhūtīdā<h>*; and f. 137r4–5: *raktā karālā caṇḍākṣī mahocchuṣmā caturthikā | *catuṣpatre (corr. : catuṣṣaṣṭi Cod.) sthitā hy etā mūlasthā sarvasiddhidā || *nāmamātrārcanād (conj. : nāmamārcanā Cod.) devi matasiddhiphalapradā<h>*).

¹⁴⁷See, e.g., SANDERSON 2009a, pp. 133–134, fn. 311; pp. 179–180, fn. 435; pp. 183–184, fn. 444; p. 238, fn. 544.

evident in many details of its doctrines and prescriptions. As to how old it is, the earliest verifiable citations of the work are found in the *Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta, who was active in Kashmir around the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh centuries AD; but it is mentioned indirectly, together with the *Viṣṇuyāmala* and *Rudrayāmala* in the hymn *Bhairavīvardhamānaka* that survives in a codex of AD 819,¹⁴⁸ and the earliest and probably original *Skandapurāṇa* of the sixth or early seventh century¹⁴⁹ lists seven Mātṛtantras with *-yāmala* titles, beginning with the *Brahmayāmala*, all but two of which are named in accounts of the Yāmalatantras seen in our Mantramārgic sources.¹⁵⁰

Connected with this early *Brahmayāmala* are two texts under this title surviving in South India. These claim to be part of the *Brahmayāmala* and indeed are derived from it to the extent that they share its core pantheon and a number of other formal features; but they differ from it radically in that they prescribe a regular cult of Cāmuṇḍā/Bhadrakālī and the seven Moth-

¹⁴⁸ *Bhairavīvardhamānaka* in *Pārameśvara* MS, 53a1: *tvam brahmayāmālā tvam viṣṇuyāmālā. tvam rudrayāmālā*. The codex is dated in Śaṃvat 252. This is evidently a date of the era of Aṃśuvarman and therefore in AD 819, rather than in 858 as proposed by BENDALL (1883, p. xxxix–li) on the unwarranted assumption that the era is Harṣa's. The manuscript lacks many of its folios and many are damaged. Folio numbers are visible on few. The folio reference, 53a1, given here, is from the pagination added in pencil in modern times.

¹⁴⁹ On the date of this text see here fn. 41 on p. 11.

¹⁵⁰ *Skandapurāṇa*_{KB} 171.127–130ab (Śiva addressing the Mothers at Koṭivarṣa [/Devīkoṭṭa]): *ahaṃ brahmā ca viṣṇuś ca ṛṣayaś ca tapodhanāḥ | mātṛtantrāṇi divyāni mātryajñavidhiṃ *prati* (conj. : *param* Ed.) || 128 *punyāni prakariṣyāmo yajanaṃ yair avāpsyatha | brāhmaṇ svāyambhuvaṃ caiva kaumāraṃ yāmalaṃ tathā* || 129 *sārasvataṃ ṛṣagāndhāraṃ aiśānaṃ nandiyāmalam | tantrāny etāni yuṣmākaṃ tathānyāni sahasraśaḥ || bhaviṣyanti narā yais tu yuṣmān yakṣyanti bhaktitāḥ*. I propose that *yāmalam* should be taken with all six of the adjectives in 128c–129b, from *brāhman* to *aiśānam*, with the result that the passage lists seven Yāmalatantras, as follows: 'I, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and the ascetic sages will compose excellent, holy Mātṛtantras *for (conj.) the rites of worshipping the Mothers, so that you will receive worship: the *Brahmayāmala*, *Svayambhuyāmala*, *Kumārayāmala* (= *Skandayāmala*), *Sarasvatīyāmala*, **Gandhārayāmala* (?), *Isānayāmala*, and *Nandiyāmala*. These Tantras of yours, and others in thousands, will be the means by which men will worship you with devotion'. Of these titles only the *Svayambhu-* and **Gandhāra-* are not found in the Mantramārga's Yāmala-lists. According to Śaṭka 1 of the *Jayadrathayāmala* the *Isānayāmala* is a derivative of the *Viṣṇuyāmala*, and the *Sarasvatīyāmala* of the *Skandayāmala* (ff. 334r3–v1 [42.1–7]): **upayāmalaḥ* (em. : *umāyāmalaḥ* Cod.) *pañca pañcabhyo nirgatāni tu | yāmalebhyaḥ karālābjalocane tāni vacmi te* || 2 *vetālayāmalaṃ devī nirgataṃ *brahmayāmālāt* (corr. : *brahmayāmalam* Cod.) | *Isānayāmalaṃ tantram udbhūtaṃ viṣṇuyāmālāt* || 3 *atharvayāmalaṃ ghoram prasṛtaṃ rudrayāmālāt | sarasvatīyāmalaṃ tu cyutaṃ tat *skandayāmālāt* (corr. : *skandayāmalam* Cod.) || 4 **umāyāmalaḥ sṛṣṭam *viśālam* (conj. : *vitānam* Cod.) **somayāmalam* (corr. : *somayāmālāt* Cod.). As for the *Nandiyāmala*, it is not listed in any of the formal accounts of the canon known to me; but it is mentioned in the strongly Kāpālīka *Yoginīsaṃcāra* in Śaṭka 3 of the *Jayadrathayāmala* in the course of a list of fifty-eight Tantras in which Śiva has taught the topic of *yoginīsaṃcāraḥ*. The thirty-eighth to forty-seventh are Yāmalas (f. 170v7–8 [*Yoginīcakreśvarotpattiṭāla* vv. 37–39b]): *ruruyāmalam atyugraṃ tathānyam rudrayāmalam | umāyāmalam evānyam gaurīyāmalam eva ca | skandayāmalam evānyam tathā bhairavayāmalam | viṣṇuyāmalam eva syān nandiyāmalam eva ca | śukrayāmalam evānyac chakrayāmalam eva ca*. As for the **Gandhārayāmala*, I have found no reference to it anywhere else and find the name implausible, but can propose no emendation that I find compelling.

ers to be conducted before fixed idols in temples by non-brahmin priests of the Pāraśava caste for the protection of the state and its subjects and the enhancement of royal power. The antiquity of this South-Indian variant of what was originally a purely private form of worship undertaken by individual initiates of any caste for their own benefit alone cannot be determined from the surviving manuscripts, but the textual prescriptions of the cult are closely reflected in two Tamil inscriptions that set out the provisions for the funding of the temple of the goddess Kolārammā at Kolār in Noḷambavāḍi, detailing the yearly allowances for the staff, who include a teacher of Grammar and Yāmala, the deities, and the various ceremonies. The first is dated in the second regnal year of Kō-Rājakesarivarma, alias Rājendracoladeva (Kulottuṅga I), that is to say, in AD 1071/2. The second is undated but appears to be the continuation of the first, recording the same witnesses to its provisions.¹⁵¹

The third sub-collection, that of the Śaktitantras, is said by the *Jayadrathayāmala* to contain seven lead-texts: the *Sarvavīrasamāyoga*, the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, the *Pañcāmṛta*, the *Viśvādya*, the *Yoginījālaśaṃvara*, the *Vidyābheda*, and the *Śiraccheda*.¹⁵² Of these, two have reached us: (1) the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, in what is evidently a much shorter redaction than that which is frequently quoted in the Kashmirian exegetical literature, and (2) the *Śiraccheda*,¹⁵³ otherwise known as the *Jayadrathayāmala*, at this stage only the work that would later be the first of four Śaṭkas passing under this title.

These two are at the base of the other two traditions that are well-represented in our surviving sources. The first, taught in the former, is the cult of the goddesses Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā. This gave rise to the *Mālinīvijayottara*, which for Abhinavagupta became the base scripture of the Śākta system known as the Trika, and is part of a larger corpus of scriptures that also includes the *Tantrasadbhāva* and, known for the most part only through citations and other testimonia, the *Triśirobhairava*, the *Devyāyāmala*, the

¹⁵¹EC 10, K1 108 (text: pp. 35–42; translation: pp. 35–40); and K1 106d, (probably a continuation of K1 108) (text: pp. 33–35; translation: pp. 33–34). For a preliminary statement of the textual and epigraphical evidence of this South-Indian Yāmala temple cult see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 277–278 and footnotes 140–143. On the Pāraśava priests, known as *uvaccaṇ* or *ōccaṇ* in Tamil, who officiate in the sanguinary worship in the shrines of the fierce goddesses (*piṭāri*) of the region, see GHOSE 1996, pp. 223–226.

¹⁵²See *Jayadrathayāmala*, Śaṭka 1, 36.15–16c and 40.2–3 edited above, fn. 136 on p. 37; and cf. the Tantras listed in *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* 29.16c–18a edited above, fn. 143 on p. 38.

¹⁵³Of the other five Śaktitantras listed by the *Jayadrathayāmala* only the *Sarvavīrasamāyoga/Sarvavīra* and the *Pañcāmṛta* have been cited in the surviving exegetical literature. There is no trace there of knowledge of the other three. For evidence of knowledge of the *Sarvavīrasamāyoga* and *Pañcāmṛta*, of the reality of the *Yoginījālaśaṃvara* for the redactors of scripture and for evidence that draws the reality of the *Viśvādya* and *Vidyābheda* into question see SANDERSON 2007b, p. 236, footnotes 21–22.

Trikakularatnamālā, the *Trikasadbhāva*, the *Trikasāra*,¹⁵⁴ the *Yogasamcāra*, the *Bhairavakula*, and the *Vīrāvalī*. In addition we have chapters from three other texts of this tradition assigned in their colophons to [the cycle of] the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* in Hṛdayaśiva's *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*: the *Bījabheda*, the *Bhairavodyāna*, and the *Trikasārottara*.¹⁵⁵ We also have the *Parā-triṃśikā/Parātrīśikā* or *Anuttaratrimśikā*, a short work teaching an essentialized form of Trika worship that is directed to the goddess Parā alone, a system also known as the Anuttara or Parākrama. Finally, we have the *Vijñānabhairava*. This scripture is concerned entirely with the outlining of a hundred and twelve meditation exercises, with one verse for each, these being referred to as teachings concerning the Waveless.¹⁵⁶ It does not engage with the specifics of Tantric ritual in a manner that would enable us to conclude that it is a work of the Trika or some other ritual tradition. But its Trika background is apparent from verses in which this transcendence of ritual is formulated as the transcendence of the Trika's ritual. This is, in other words, a Trika work that advocates practices that are free of the specifics of its Mantra-deities.¹⁵⁷

The second surviving Śaktitantra tradition, taught in the *Jayadrathayāmala*, also called *Tantrarāja* and *Tantrarājabhāṭṭāraka*, is that of the cult of the goddess Kālasamkarṣaṇī or Kālī. This, in its expanded form created by the addition of three subsequent Śaṭkas, probably in Kashmir, adds a vast array of Kalpas for the propitiation of variant forms of this goddess and introduces material closely related to the Kaula tradition of Kālī worship known as the Kālīkula, Krama, Mahānaya, Mahārtha, or Devīnaya, whose scriptural sources will be covered below under the literature of the Kulamārga.¹⁵⁸

As for the Gāruḍatantras and Bhūtatantras, pushed into the background by the non-Saiddhāntika classificatory systems, we have lists of titles both in the passage prefixed to a manuscript of the *Jñānapañcāśikā* and seen in Vairocana's *Lakṣaṇasamgraha* and, with lists of sub-texts, in the *Śrīkaṇṭhī-Srotobheda*; but nearly all of this extensive canon seems not to have reached us, the only survivors being two texts in Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts that claim to be parts of the *Trottala*, also known as the *Tottala*, *Trotula*, or *Totula*, a work that appears in the lists of the primary Gāruḍatantras and has been quoted by the Kashmirian scholar Kṣemarāja.¹⁵⁹ These are the *Tvaritāmūla-*

¹⁵⁴An incomplete Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript containing three folios of the *Trikasāra* has reached us. Colophon: *iti vidyāpīṭhe guhyakaulike trkasāre trītyaḥ paricchedaḥ samāptaḥ*.

¹⁵⁵Hṛdayaśiva, *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* ff. 95r4–96r (14 verses), ff. 96r–99r (38 verses), and ff. 99r–100r (14 verses).

¹⁵⁶*Vijñānabhairava*, v. 139: *nistarāṅgopadeśānām śatam uktaṃ samāsataḥ | dvādaśābhyadhikam devi yaj jñātvā jñānavij janah*.

¹⁵⁷See *Vijñānabhairava* vv. 1–17.

¹⁵⁸For evidence that Śaṭkas 2–4 of the *Jayadrathayāmala* were added by Kashmirian redactors see SANDERSON 2005b, pp. 280–283.

¹⁵⁹*Svacchandodyota* on 7.42c–43b and 7.44–46; *Netroddyota* on 19.182.

*sūtra*¹⁶⁰ and the *Tvaritājñānakalpa*.¹⁶¹ We also have the *Kriyākālaguṇottara*. This is not listed in the canonical accounts, but it contains material pertaining to both these streams, has been quoted by Kṣemarāja in his *Netroddyota*,¹⁶² and reaches us complete in a number of Nepalese manuscripts, the earliest penned in AD 1184/5 for the preceptor of a feudatory ruler in the kingdom of Dhavalasrota in the west of Nepal.¹⁶³ The assumption that its exorcistic sections draw on our lost Bhūtatantras is supported by the fact that it includes a *Khaḍgarāvāṇakalpa* and a *Caṇḍāsīdhāarakalpa*, sections devoted to the rites of the Rudras Khaḍgarāvāṇa and Caṇḍāsīdhāra. For Tantras bearing the names of these Mantra-deities are found in the canonical lists.¹⁶⁴ There is evidence of the same kind of its having drawn on the lost Gāruḍatantras.¹⁶⁵ For it also contains a *Devatrāsakalpa* and there is a *Devatrāsatantra* among the listed scriptures of that class.

In addition we have in other Śaiva scriptural sources, particularly the *Jayadrathayāmala*, a quantity of Gāruḍa material, that is to say, prescriptions whose purpose is the removing of poison and the control of snakes, both actual snakes and the mythical Nāgas, and through the latter the control of rainfall, believed to lie in their power, and hence the protection of crops.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁰ *Tvaritāmūlasūtra* B f. 200r5–v1: *ity ādye trottale mahātantre tvaritāmūlasūtre navamapaṭalaha samāptaḥ. maṅgalamahāśrīḥ. samvat 317 śrāvāṇaśuklatṛtīyāyām. śanaīscaravāre. rājādhīrājapara-meśvaraśrīmāllakṣmīkāmade<va>sya vijayarājye*. The date falls in AD 1196/7.

¹⁶¹ Begins: *asmin tu trottale tantre tvaritā nāma yā smṛtā*; f. 10r1–2: *sahasraikādaśasya tu | trottalasya samākhyātā tvaritā sarvakāmādā | dviśatam parimāṇena ślokānām parikīrtitam*. I am very grateful to Michael Slouber, who has done pioneering work on the Gāruḍa textual tradition, for bringing the MSS of these two works to my attention and for sharing with me the e-texts that he has prepared of them. Their Śākta character raises a slight suspicion that they are built on the basis of *Trottala* material rather than genuine parts of the original. But in the absence of stronger counter-evidence I am inclined to accept the latter alternative.

¹⁶² See SANDERSON 2001, p. 14, fn. 13 for the references.

¹⁶³ *Kriyākālaguṇottara* f. 144r2–4: *samāptam ca kriyākālaguṇottaram. nepāladeśīyasamvat 304 jyeṣṭha śudi 13 gurau. dhavalasrotapurē. *mahāsāmantaśrīratnadevarājye (deva corr. : dīva Cod.). maṅgalaṁ mahāśrīḥ. *trikaṣaḍanvayaśivācāryaśrīśrīdhāraarāja *guruṇā (trika corr. : tṛka Cod. • guruṇā corr. : guruṇām Cod.) likhāpitam likhitam dharmādityena*. For the hypothesis that Dhavalasrota was somewhere in Magar territory (*maṅgvaraviṣayaḥ*) in the foothills of the Dhaulāgiri massif to the West of the Kathmandu valley see PANT and SHARMA 1977, pp. 21–24 and PETECH 1984, p. 50, n. 2. The use of -dīva for -deva in Ratnadeva is seen also in the copper-plates of the feudatories Rāmadeva and Rahasyadeva issued from the same district (Maṅgvara) in AD 1100 and 1161 respectively (PANT and SHARMA 1977, p. 7, line 7 and p. 28, line 4).

¹⁶⁴ For these lists see SANDERSON 2001, p. 14, fn. 13.

¹⁶⁵ For the lists of the 28 Gāruḍatantras see *Lakṣaṇasamgraha* 2.112–115 and *Śrīkaṇṭhī-Srotobheda* vv. 152–155 with 66 sub-texts in 156–166.

¹⁶⁶ *Jayadrathayāmala*, Śaṭka 2, ff. 72v1–73r6, gives the Sādhana of Ekatarā, the ninth *varṇadevatā* of the Kālasamkarṣaṇīvidyā. She is said to bring about the destruction of Nāgas (*nāgākṣayaḥ*). She is three-faced with a Garuḍa face on the right. Ff. 124r4–125r9 of the same teach the propitiation of the Netra auxiliary of the Vidyāvidyeśvarī form of Kālasamkarṣaṇī. It enables *nāgasāadhanam*. Śaṭka 3, ff. 96v7–107v1 teach the Sādhana of Matakakreśvarī. Among the effects is the protection of crops of grain (*sasyarakṣaṇam*). A trident is smeared with the five jewels and menstrual blood; the goddess is installed in it and worshipped. It then protects the crops from storms and drives out

The working of such material into the major Tantras may account at least in part for the atrophy of the original sources.

The Non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga's Exegesis

The exegetical literature on the non-Saiddhāntika Tantras may be presented most aptly within the categories given by the *Jayadrathayāmala*, since it is this perception of the components of the Śaiva revelation that the authors of this literature adopted, that is to say, in terms of the dichotomy between the Bhairava-centred Mantrapīṭha and the Devī-centred Vidyāpīṭha, and within the latter between the Tantras of the Vāma stream, the Yāmalatantras, and the Śaktitantras, and within the last, between the Trika and the cult of Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī taught in the *Jayadrathayāmala* itself.

On the *Svacchanda*, the principal scripture of the Mantrapīṭha, we have an extensive and exhaustive commentary (*Svacchandoddyota*) composed by the Kashmirian Kṣemarāja (fl. c. AD 1000–1050). He refers to an earlier commentary on the text by Rājānaka Bhullaka, another Kashmirian, as his title Rājānaka reveals. No manuscript of his work has reached us. We have only its title—Kṣemarāja refers to it as ‘the Long Commentary’ (*Brhaṭṭikā*)—and some of its interpretations, which Kṣemarāja cites to reject.¹⁶⁷ We also have Kṣemarāja’s commentary on the *Netra*, which though not explicitly claimed for the Mantrapīṭha—indeed this Tantra is mentioned to my knowledge in no early account of the Śaiva canon—may nonetheless be considered as an auxiliary text of that division.

snakes. It also enables the Sādhaka to draw a Nāga out of the earth to employ as he wishes, to receive from him Siddhis associated with the underworld, and to destroy or transfer poison. In the *Mudrākośa* section of Śaṭka 4 (ff. 4v4–36v4) the Pannagamudrā eliminates the effects of poison, and stills storms. In ff. 137v7–138v6 of the same the Nāgāśaṇī form of Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī is specifically for the destruction of poisons; she is black, emaciated, with a girdle of snakes, seated on Garuḍa, devouring the Kulanāgas and drinking their blood. When one has accomplished her Sādhana one can devour whole mountains of poison, and when one contemplates her Vidyā all snakes are killed within a radius of 100 yojanas. Ff. 138v6–139v6 of the same Śaṭka teach the Sādhana of Meghakālī. She is black, fleshless, hideous, riding Garuḍa, with corpses as her ear-ornaments, snake-garlanded, snake-destroying, immersed in the enjoyment of the five nectars. The Sādhaka may use her Vidyā to stop clouds while casting mustard seeds and ashes at them. The Vidyā also banishes snakes. If the clouds do not disperse when he has recited it once he should repeat it thrice with furious mind: the head even of the Nāga Kulika will shatter into a hundred fragments. Ff. 157r1–158r5 give the Sādhana of Nāgāntakī Ekatarā. She is four-faced with blazing hair, fierce-eyed, terrifying, adorned with hissing snakes, and crowned with the eight Kulanāgas. She is seated on the corpse of Sadāśiva (*mahāpretāsanā*). She holds a son, a Vajra, a goad, a noose, and a sword, and [with two hands] is eating Nāgas. The purpose of the Sādhana is to bind the Nāgas (*nāgabandhanam*). The use of Gāruḍa Mantra-rites in crop-protection seems to have been common practice; see *Nyāyamañjarī*, p. 605, ll.1–3, *Narmamālā* 2.142cd, and *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 1.233–239.

¹⁶⁷See, e.g., *Svacchandoddyota* vol. 5a, p. 211: *yat tu brhaṭṭikākārarājānakabhullakena ...iti svarucyā vyākhyātām tad asāratvād upekṣyam*; p. 272; vol. 5b, p. 474: *yat tu śrībhullakena vyākhyātām ...tad yuktam ayuktam veti sacetaso jānantī*; vol. 6, p. 125: *yat tu śrībhullakah ...ityādi paṭhitavān tad upekṣyam*; p. 137: *yat tu śrībhullakah ...ity apañhat tad asaṃgatavād upekṣyam*.

We have in addition a substantial body of Kashmirian Paddhatis based on either or both of these two Tantras, though they also incorporate ancillary material from Saiddhāntika and Śākta sources. Notable among these are the *Śiṣyasamskārapaddhati* for the neophyte's initiation (*samayadīkṣā*), the *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati*, originally composed by the Kashmirian Guru Manodadatta/Manoda in AD 1335/6 and subsequently expanded with the development of somewhat divergent versions down to at least the seventeenth century,¹⁶⁸ for the full initiations (*nirvāṇadīkṣā* and *sādhakadīkṣā*) and consecrations to office (*ācāryābhīṣekaḥ*, *sādhakābhīṣekaḥ*, and Śaiva *rājyābhīṣekaḥ*), the anonymous *Agnikāryapaddhati* in full and abbreviated versions for the fire-sacrifice, the *Śivanirvāṇapaddhati* for cremation, usually anonymous but sometimes attributed to a Guru called Manohara,¹⁶⁹ and, commonly transmitted with the last, Paddhatis covering the various rituals that follow cremation, from the offerings of the first ten days to the annual Śrāddha.¹⁷⁰ Based on the *Netra* we have in the *Gurupustikā/Gurupustaka* of Rājānaka Śitikaṅṭha, a Kashmirian who was active c. AD 1375–1425, a comprehensive Paddhati, covering regular worship, penances, initiation, consecration of officiants, and installation.¹⁷¹ In the domain of the regular obligatory worship of

¹⁶⁸ On Manodadatta's *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* see SANDERSON 2004, p. 362, fn. 34. For other Kashmirian Śaiva initiation Paddhatis, now lost, to which that work refers see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 392–397.

¹⁶⁹ *Śivanirvāṇapaddhati* A f. 52v6–7: *ity anteṣṭividhiḥ proktā śāstreṅlōkyā saṅgraham | manohareṇa guruṇā smrtaye 'pi nivāsinām*.

¹⁷⁰ A text of the *Śivanirvāṇapaddhati* and the Paddhatis for the offerings of water to the dead and the subsequent Śrāddhas was published for local use in 1936 and is among the Sanskrit texts republished in photographic reproduction by Lokesh CHANDRA (1984).

¹⁷¹ Śitikaṅṭha, *Gurupustikā* f. 2r14–15: *mrtyujicchāsanaśthasya tattantraprakriyocitam | nityakrtya-vidhiṃ vakṣyāmy antevāsibhir arthitāḥ* 'Entreated by my pupils I shall expound for one who adheres to the teachings of the *Mṛtyujit* (= *Netra*) the procedure for the regular observances in accordance with the system of that Tantra'. On this Śitikaṅṭha see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 394–396, fn. 549 and 2009a, pp. 126–127, fn. 294. In the second publication, written after acquiring scans of the *Gurupustikā* MS, I confirmed the hypothesis of the first that this MS, known to me then only as an item listed in a catalogue, might be the *Gurupustikā* claimed by Rājānaka Ānanda in 1654 in a panegyric on his patriline as the work of his ascendant Śitikaṅṭha commissioned by a king Saṃgrāmasiṃha. To that end I cited a passage in the MS in which the author names himself and one in which he tells his readers that he wrote the Paddhati when a ruler of that name had requested *dīkṣā* from him. I omitted, however, to cite a passage that offers a means of testing my further hypothesis, stated in the first publication, namely that this was the Cāhamāna (Cāuhāna, Chauhan) Saṃgrāmasiṃha of Sāmcōr (Sanchoe, Satyapura) (24°45'11"N 71°46'15"E) in the Jālōr district in the far south of Rajasthan mentioned as the father of Pratāpasīṃha in the latter's stone pillar inscription at Sāmcōr of AD 1387 (*EI* 11:26–27). For in this passage Śitikaṅṭha tells his readers that he performed the Pratiṣṭhā ceremony of the Śiva[liṅga] Harirājeśvara at this king's request (f. 81v12–14: *abhyarthitasya śiṣyeṇa *śrīsaṃgrāmamahābhujā* [em. : *śrīmadrājamahābhujā* Cod.]) *harirājeśasadratanpratiṣṭhāyai mahodyamaḥ. iti sthiraṅga-pratiṣṭhāvidhis samāptaḥ*). Evidence of a Liṅga Harirājeśvara in that former princely state would settle the matter. I also speculated in that earlier publication that this work is identical with the *Gurupustaka* that has been quoted in the *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati*, but omitted to reveal in the later publication whether the MS confirms that hypothesis. So I add here that it does. In *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* (A f. 169r13–15) we read the following verse cited as from the *Gurupustaka*: *tathā ca gurupustake tantre dhāmmo 'nte śodhayāmy astraṃ svāhety ekaikayāhutiḥ | evaṃ sarvatra mūlaṃ tu śatajāpena śodhayed iti*. That

initiates we have a Paddhati for the worship of Svachchandabhairava,¹⁷² and, representing a variant tradition, an anonymous Paddhati setting out Śaiva worship both regular (*nityapūjā*) and on special occasions (*naimittikapūjā*) such as the annual Śivarātri festival, the first centred on Amṛteśabhairava (Netrabhaṭṭāraka) and the second on Sakala-Svacchanda, his consort Aghoresvarī, and Niṣkala-Svacchanda drawn from the *Svacchanda*, culminating in the worship of a new form not found there, namely Mahāsvacchandabhairava, which has its own, post-classical scripture, the *Vṛddhasvacchanda*, and which embodies in one seven-faced and thirty-six armed figure not only Svachchandabhairava but also the Nārasimha and Vārāha faces of the trademark Vaikuṅṭha icon of Kashmirian Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇavism, the face of the Sun (Kulamārtaṇḍabhairava) representing the Saura tradition, and the face of Heruka embodying the Buddhism of the Yoginītantras, an innovation not found in any of the other Kashmirian Paddhatis mentioned here.¹⁷³

Nepal too has preserved *Svacchanda*-based Paddhatis for the worship of Svachchandabhairava, notably the *Svacchandadevārcanavidhi* and *Svacchandadevalakṣahomayāga*,¹⁷⁴ and *Netra*-based Paddhatis for the worship

is found in *Gurupustikā* f. 51v10–12: *dhāmopayuktasaṃskāras teṣāṃ kāryaḥ pṛthak pṛthak | dhāmnō 'nte śodhayāmy astraṃ svāhety ekaikayāhutiḥ | evaṃ sarvatra mūlaṃ tu śatajāpena śodhayet.*

¹⁷²This is found bound with other Paddhatis in ORLS 2376 on folios numbered 10–18. It lacks its beginning and has no colophon, therefore no statement of its title. I have given it the descriptive title *Svacchandabhairavapūjāpaddhati*.

¹⁷³These two Paddhatis are given one after the other in a Śāradā paper MS in the Cambridge University Library, the second beginning on f. 15r14 (*iti pañcāyatanapūjā nityakarma *viṣaye* [em. : *viṣayeṇa* Cod.]. *atha naimittike śivarātrau vāgnikārye vā viṣeṣadine pūjā*), recorded in the library's handwritten list under the title *Lalitaparamarahasya*. The title is a mistake, deriving from the fact that the word *lalitasvacchandaparamarahasya* appears on f. 1r in the manner of a title before the text, which begins on f. 1v. This is not the title of the Paddhatis that follow but the locus of attribution of the first item in the text, namely the *Bahurūpagarbhastotra*, whose recitation became a standard feature at the beginning of Śaiva worship in Kashmir. For that is assigned in its colophon to the “supremely secret *Lalitasvacchanda*” (*iti śrīlalitasvacchande paramarahasye bahurūpagarbhastotraṃ samāptam*, f. 4v4–5). The visualization of Mahāsvacchandabhairava recited in this liturgy is drawn without attribution from *Vṛddhasvacchanda* 4.25–65. I have not mentioned this text above among the satellite Tantras of the *Svacchanda*, because it is predominantly Śākta and indeed its colophons describe it as a Kaula work. The Śāktism here is that of the cult of Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī. Mahāsvacchandabhairava's consort is Vṛddhakālī equated with that goddess and there are textual links with the Krama Kaulism of the *Bhogahasta/Ūrmikaulārṇava*.

¹⁷⁴See SANDERSON 2001, fn. 25, p. 21. In general the Śaiva manuscripts that have survived in the Kathmandu valley from the ninth century down to recent times transmit texts that show no influence or awareness of the Kashmirian exegetical tradition. Here, however, we encounter an exception. For though the work explicitly locates itself in the Kathmandu valley in its Bali text with its invocations of Nepal, Hayagrīva, Paśupati, Vṛkodara (= Bhīmasena), and Guhyeśvarī (*Svacchandadevārcanavidhi* f. 6v1–4: *oṃ pīṭhopapīṭhasaṃdohakṣetropakṣetrasaṃdoha oṃ hūṃ haḥ nepālāya avatara avatara kṣetrapāla mahābala kapilajaṭhābhābhāsvara trinetrojivalamukha gandhadhūpabalipūjā <ṃ> grhṇa grhṇa namo namaḥ. oṃ hayagrīvāya namaḥ. oṃ paśupataye namaḥ. oṃ vṛkodarāya namaḥ. oṃ hram phreṃ guhyeśvaryai* (conj. : *guhyeśvarībhyo namaḥ. oṃ *bhūcarībhyo* [corr. : *bhūcarībhyo* Cod.] *namaḥ. oṃ *bhūvaścarībhyo* [corr. : *bhūvacarībhyo* Cod.] *namaḥ. oṃ *svaścarībhyo* [corr. : *śvaścarībhyo* Cod.] *namaḥ*), it ends with verses of praise of which the first three (f. 7r1–4)

of Amṛteśvarabhairava: the *Apratihata mahādīkṣāsūtippanaka*, also called *Netroddyota*, of Viśveśvara, probably of the twelfth century,¹⁷⁵ and the *Amṛteśvarapūjana* composed by the Nepalese king Abhayamalla (r. 1216–1255). Other relevant Nepalese manuscripts in this category are the *Amṛteśvarapūjāgnikāryavidhāna*, the *Amṛtasūryapūjāvidhi* with drawings of the deities,¹⁷⁶ and the *Pūjākāṇḍa*, which contains an *Amṛtabhairavārcanavidhi* penned in AD 1277/8, an *Amṛtīśabhairavabhaṭṭarakāhnikavidhi*, and an *Amṛtasūryārcanavidhi*.¹⁷⁷

Within the Vidyāpīṭha we have no exegetical material on the scriptures of its Vāma division other than the fragment already mentioned, the first two folios of a work that we may call **Devītantrasadbhāvasāra*—its title is not contained in the surviving portion—because it claims at its beginning to be a précis in the Āryā metre of the key parts (*sāraḥ*) of what it calls *devīnām tantrasadbhāvam* ‘the Essence of the Tantras of the Goddesses’. The latter appears to have been a scriptural work, since our fragment describes it as having been received from Śiva by a sage who is described as the adornment

are the Maṅgala verses of the first three chapters of the *Svacchandodyota* of Kṣemarāja: **viśvairkarūpaviśvātmaviśvasargaikakāraṇam* (*viśvaika* ΚED: *viśvaka* Cod. • *sargaika* Cod. : *sargādi* ΚED) *paraprakāśavapuṣaṃ stumaha svacchandabhairavam || prasaracchaktikallola*jagallaharikelaye* (*jagal* ΚED: *jarāl* Cod.) | *sarvasaṃpannidhānāya bhairavāmbhodhaye namaḥ || *ekaiva* (ΚED: *ekaika* Cod.) *bodhajaladheḥ śaktīśukti<r> jayaty asau | yadantar akhilaṃ bhāti muktāmayam idaṃ jagat.*

¹⁷⁵On the date see SANDERSON 2005b, p. 242. In that publication I referred to this work as the *Amṛteśvarādīkṣāvidhi*, that being an accurate description of the content of the text and the title assigned to this MS in the hand-written catalogue card of the NGMPP. I refer to it here as the *Apratihata mahādīkṣāsūtippanaka* following the statement of the MS itself and the abbreviation *a pra ha ma dī* in the left margins of the versos.

¹⁷⁶The *Amṛtasūryapūjāvidhi* is a short Paddhati for the worship of Amṛteśvarabhairava in the form of the Sun as a preliminary to the worship of Amṛteśvarabhairava himself (f. 3r10–11: *devaṃ saṃtuṣṭaṃ prahrṣṭamanasaṃ saṃbhāvya *sphāṭikākṣamālayā* (conj. : *ārārtikāsītalikām* Cod.) *japaṃ kṛtvā devāya nive[dya praṇa]mya hr̥dā viśr̥jya ca amṛtabhairavārcanaṃ bhajed ity amṛtasūryārcanavidhiḥ*). There is no such preliminary in the account of worship given in the *Netratantra*. This is rather a modification of the tradition derived from that source under the influence of the practice seen in the Saiddhāntika Paddhatis of the worship Śiva as Sūrya (Śivasūrya) before the main worship, for which see SANDERSON 2009a, pp. 55–56, fn. 39, giving the Paddhati from the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* of Bhojadeva. The visualization of Amṛtasūrya in this Paddhati is the second of the two visualizations of Sūrya taught in the *Netratantra* (13.21c–25).

¹⁷⁷For the details of these MSS see the bibliography in SANDERSON 2005b.

of the line of Atri¹⁷⁸ and is therefore probably Durvāsas, the son of Atri,¹⁷⁹ who is widely encountered in the role of the intermediary through whom Śiva's teachings have reached mankind.¹⁸⁰ The identification of the text as a work in the Vāma tradition is secured by its subject-matter, since that is the attaining of supernatural effects (*siddhiḥ*) through the correct formation and modification of the Mantras of Tumburu, his four Sisters, and the secondary deities of that pantheon of worship.¹⁸¹ Though our text claims to be only a précis, and indeed preserves the form of its source to the extent that it begins after the opening verses in the manner of scripture as a dialogue in which Śiva teaches in response to the sage's enquiry, its declaration of intent in the opening verses and the choice of the Āryā metre both suggest that this work wished to be seen as a product of human learning rather than as scripture.

¹⁷⁸ *Devītantrasadbhāvasāra f. 1a1–7 (vv. 1–6): *om svasti. śivam acalam aprameyaṃ carācareśānam avyayam acintyam | pranīpaṭya somam īśaṃ saganendraṃ saparivāraṃ ca || *ekadvitricaturdhā (tri corr. : tr Cod.) navadhā bhūyo py anekadhā bhedaḥ | devībhīś śivamārgaṃ vyāptaṃ tāsāṃ gurūṇāṃ ca || ātreyaṃśatīlakenoktaṃ śarvād avāpya yat pūrvam | suramuninarāsurāṇāṃ devīnāṃ tantrasadbhāvam || tasmād aham apy adhunā vakṣye saṃhṛtya sāram āryābhīḥ | spaṣṭatarākṣara-paṅktibhir aviśāladhiyāṃ *prabodhāya (em. : pravodhāta Cod.) || bhagavañ (corr. : bhagavaṃ Cod.) śivamantrā ye vidyāsrotasy avasthītās te vai | vidhināpy upāśyamānās sidhyante *mantriṇāṃ neha (conj. : mantriṇānyeha Cod.) || dṛṣṭvā *tān vīmanaskān (corr. : tāṃ vīmanaskām Cod.) atīva me manyuvihvalaṃ hṛdayam | siddhyanti *kalau (conj. : cakaloca Cod.) vidhinā yena tam ācakṣva *deveśa (em. : deheśaḥ Cod.) 'Having bowed to Śiva, the unchanging, unknowable master of all that moves and all that does not, undying, and unthinkable, and to Īśa accompanied by Umā, the Gaṇeśvaras, and all his retinue, to the cosmic path that leads to Śiva and is pervaded by the goddesses as one, two, three, four, nine, and beyond even [nine,] in numerous divisions, to those [goddesses themselves], and to the Gurus, I shall now extract the fundamentals of *The Essence of the Tantras of the Goddesses* that was received of old from Śarva by the mark adorning the forehead of the lineage of Atri and taught to gods, sages, men, and titans and declare them in Āryā verses whose lines of syllables will be completely clear in meaning for the instruction of those of limited understanding. "O Lord, the Mantras established in the stream of the Vidyās (*vidyāsrotasī*) are not yielding results for Mantra-masters in this world even though they are being propitiated in accordance with prescription. Seeing them disheartened my heart is overcome by sadness. O Lord of the Gods, teach the procedure that will enable them to achieve success in [this age of] Kali" '.*

¹⁷⁹ See, e.g., *Rāmāyaṇa* 7.50.2: *durvāsā atreḥ putro mahāmuniḥ; Kūrmapurāṇa* 1.12.6c–7b: *anasūyā tathavātrere jajñe putrān akalmaṣān || somaṃ durvāsasaṃ caiva dattātreyam ca yogīnam; Bāṇa, Harṣacarita*, p. 12: *atres tanayas tārāpater bhrātā nāmnā durvāsāḥ*.

¹⁸⁰ See, e.g., *Vimalāvātī* N f. 44r5–v1, A f. 52r2–4, B f. 77r2–5: *daśāṣṭādaśadhā bhinnam *vividhopādihivistaram (N : vividhādhivistaram AB) || parādiṣoḍhāsambandhayuk śrīmacchivabhāṣitam | avatāraguruṃ *krodhamuniṃ (N : krodhaṃ muṇiṃ A : krodhaṃ muṇin B) *durvāsasaṃ (AB : dūrīvāsasaṃ N) kramāt || prāptaṃ so 'pi phaṇīndrasya vāsuker bhuvī viśrute | *śrīmadāmadakasthāne (em. : śrīmadāmandarkasthāne N : śrīmadāmadākasthāne AB) *prathamō 'dhīśvaro 'bhavat (conj. : prathamevīśvarobhavet AB : prathamemīśvarobhavat N^{ac} : prathame īśvarobhavat NP^c) 'The teachings of Śiva, divided into two divisions, of ten and eighteen texts [respectively], further multiplied due to various adventitious factors, passing through their six transmissions, beginning with the Supreme, reached in due course the wrathful sage (Krodhamuni) Durvāsas, the Guru who promulgated them [among men]. He became the *first abbot (conj.) in the renowned See of Āmardaka[pura] in the territory of the Nāga-king Vāsuki'; and in the case of the non-Saiddhāntika tradition of the Śākta Śaivas, *Śivadṛṣṭi* 7.107–122b.*

¹⁸¹ See SANDERSON 2009a, pp. 50–51, fn. 22.

This work reaches us from a very early period in the development of the Mantramārga. For the two birch-bark folios, which were preserved against all odds by inclusion in the famous mass of Buddhist manuscripts, mostly fragmentary, discovered in 1931 by shepherds in a ruined Stūpa near Gilgit in the Gilgit-Baltistan territory of Pakistan, are written in an early variety of the Kashmirian script whose archaic features suggest that it may be as early as the middle of the sixth century AD.¹⁸² In that case it is older by three centuries than what are otherwise our oldest Tantric Śaiva manuscripts, those that have survived from the ninth century in Nepal: *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā*, *Sarvajñānottara*, *Pārameśvara*, and *Mahābhairavamaṅgalā*.¹⁸³

Up to the eighth century at least this tradition enjoyed considerable popularity in the Indian subcontinent, and also in Southeast Asia, where it may have lingered for several centuries. We can infer this popularity from a wide range of evidence found in Buddhist, Jaina, and brahmanical textual sources, and also, in the case of Southeast Asia, in inscriptions.¹⁸⁴

However, evidence from the tenth century and after suggests that by then the Vāma system had faded from view. The surviving works of the Śaiva exegetes of this period make no references to its primary texts in their citation-rich works;¹⁸⁵ and this silence is particularly striking in the case of the digests of Ḥṛdayaśiva and Rājānaka Takṣakavarta. The former's *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* draws extensively on the whole range of the non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga, both Mantrapīṭha and Vidyāpīṭha, but includes no Vāma text. The same applies to Takṣakavarta's *Nityādisaṃgraha*. It includes a long passage from a *Vīṇāśikhottara*, which is a Vāma text if we may

¹⁸²See SANDERSON 2009a, p. 50, in which I report the palaeographical analysis of my colleague, then my student, Dr. Somdev Vasudeva. I chanced upon the first folio (facsimiles 3221–3222) and communicated my finding to him. He then promptly searched through the published facsimiles of the Gilgit manuscripts and found the second (facsimiles 3340–3341). The script of these two folios has a close affinity with that which SANDERSON (1968, pp. 159–161) has called Gilgit-Bamiyan Typ II, which she judged to have been in use in the northwest of the subcontinent during the period from the sixth to the tenth century. In an email communication of 7 December, 2000, Vasudeva assigned the folios to the beginning of this period because of three archaic features: the tripartite *ya* ligature, the occurrence of the old style of *hr*, and of the Gupta-style *ru*. See SANDERSON 2009a, pp. 50–51, fn. 22 for the text of vv. 3–4.

¹⁸³Of these four MSS only the *Pārameśvara* fragments are dated, in AD 829 (HARIMOTO 2012, p. 90). This date, like the date in AD 810/11 assigned to the earliest of the Nepalese MSS of the *Skandapurāṇa* (see here fn. 41 on p. 11), rests on the assumption that the unstated era is that of Mānadeva/Aṃśuvarman. This assumption, accepted by elimination of alternatives, is further justified by palaeographical comparison of these four MSS, both dated and undated, with a Nepalese MS of the *Suśrutasamhitā* (Kesar Library, Kathmandu, Acc. no. 699), which does include mention of this era, giving a date in AD 878 (HARIMOTO 2012, p. 88).

¹⁸⁴See SANDERSON 2001, p. 8, fn. 5, 2004, pp. 355–356 and 373–374, fn. 76, 2009a, pp. 50 and 129–130, also GOUDRIAAN 1973 and 1981 for some of the Buddhist and Southeast Asian evidence. For the sake of brevity and balance a presentation of all the Buddhist and other evidence must await a later occasion.

¹⁸⁵I refer to the *Vīṇāśikha*, *Nayottara*, *Mahāsaṃmohana/Saṃmohana*, and *Śiraścheda*.

judge from its title alone; but it contains nothing that proves or indicates that affiliation.¹⁸⁶ In his detailed presentation of scriptural sources bearing on the regular duties of initiates he illuminates only worship that follows the Siddhānta, the *Svacchanda*, or the *Netra*. Nor to my knowledge have any of the South-Indian authors from the eleventh century onwards cited Vāma scripture. The same absence is seen in the Saiddhāntika Paddhati *Vimalāvati* of the East-Indian Vimalaśiva (AD 1101/2), although he, like the Saiddhāntika Ṛdayaśiva, has cited numerous non-Saiddhāntika works of the Mantrapīṭha, the Vidyāpīṭha, and the Kulamārga.¹⁸⁷

The Yāmala division of the Vidyāpīṭha seems also to have fared poorly in the times of our exegetes, though not as poorly as the Vāmatantras. We have no commentary on the *Brahmayāmala*, and no report of one in our sources. But the text was still well known around the turn of the first and second millennia, since it is cited quite frequently by Abhinavagupta.¹⁸⁸ Moreover, its deities were sufficiently important in Kashmir to enter, albeit as a minor element, the region's *Svacchanda*-based Paddhatis. Its chief goddess Caṇḍā Kāpālīnī is included among the recipients of oblations in the *Agnikāryapaddhati* and the *Śivarātripūjāpaddhati*; and she is worshipped with her four subordinates Raktā, Karālā, Caṇḍākṣī, and Mahocchuṣmā and their attendants (Dūtīs) Karālī, Danturā, Bhīmavaktrā, and Mahābalā as the deities of the Śrāddha lamp in the Kashmirian Śaivas' *śivadīpaśrāddham*.¹⁸⁹

The *Brahmayāmala* materials derived from this source whose context is the South-Indian tradition of temple-based Yāmala worship¹⁹⁰ have also reached us without a commentary. However, we do have the *Māṭṛsadbhāva*, an explanatory work of professed human authorship that sets out to provide a summary account of the rituals of this tradition as found in various Yāmala texts, collating their teachings, which, we are told, are not complete in any

¹⁸⁶*Nityādisaṃgraha*, A ff. 67v10–68v1, B ff. 128r2–129v12. The passage concerns the characteristics through which Sādhakas can be recognized by observation as having a natural affinity with one or other class of supernaturals, from Piśācas (*piśācāṃśah*) to Rudra (*rudrāṃśah*), and of how, alternatively, the Guru should determine through divination whether or not a certain Mantra is suitable for a certain Sādhaka.

¹⁸⁷I have noted the following non-Saiddhāntika works cited with or without attribution in the *Vimalāvati*: *Netra*, *Svatantra/Svacchanda/Lalita*, *Svacchandodyota* of Kṣemarāja, *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, *Mālinīvijayottara/Śrīpūrva*, *Tantrāloka*, *Brahmayāmala*, *Uddāmbhairava*, *Lakṣaṇasaṃgraha*, *Kulārṇava*, *Kubjikāmata*, *Daurvāsika*, *Piṅgalāmata*, *Māṭṛsadbhāva*, *Kośalāmata*, *Subhagāmata*, *Niśisaṃcāra*, *Mānavīvimaśvara*, and *Śikhāmṛta*. His Saiddhāntika sources are as follows: *Mṛgendra/Mṛgendrottara*, *Sārdhaśatika-Kālottara*, *Sarvajñānottara*, *Pauṣkara*, *Līlavatī*, *Maya*, *Mohacūra/Mohacūrottara*, *Svāyambhuvāsūtrasaṃgraha*, *Bṛhatsvāyambhuva*, *Raurava/Rauravottara*, *Mukhabimbaka*, *Bhārgava*, *Liṅgārṇava*, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, *Nāradeśvara*, *Devāmata*, *Bṛhanmaya*, *Yakṣiṇīmata*, *Gaurītantra*, *Bṛhadvidyāpurāṇa*, *Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha*, *Niśvāsaśekhara*, *Bṛhatkālottara*, *Kāmika*, and *Liṅgakalpa*.

¹⁸⁸See SANDERSON 2007c, p. 98, fn. 10 for a list of the places in the *Tantrāloka* at which Abhinavagupta cites this Tantra.

¹⁸⁹See SANDERSON 2007b, p. 237, fn. 23.

¹⁹⁰See here p. 40.

one of these sources, to present a comprehensive, ordered account of the cult of the Mothers.¹⁹¹ When compared to the scriptural texts of this tradition the *Māṭṛsadbhāva* differs primarily not only in its lucid and generally correct Sanskrit but also in its extensive expurgation of most of the strongly Kāpālika elements of this tradition while in spite of this recalling the tradition's roots in Atimārga III by, for example, describing the officiant as 'one who has mastered the Somasiddhānta'.¹⁹² The expurgation of counter-brahmanical elements and the fact that it survives in Kerala and is cited in the Keralan Tantric Paddhati literature inclines me to think that the work was produced in that region among the Nampūtiri brahmins. As for its date, I can say at present only that it predates the fifteenth-century Keralan author Śāṅkaran Nampūtiri, since he refers to it as the principal authority for the Keralan tradition of the worship of Rurujit-Cāmuṇḍā and the Mothers.¹⁹³ However, the text or one or more of the lost Yāmala texts on which it draws, has a wider geographical horizon. For it relates the myth of the conquest of the Daitya enemies of the gods by Cāmuṇḍā/Karṇamoṭī and the other Mothers at Koṭivarṣa in the far north of Bengal,¹⁹⁴ that of the origin of that site's sacred Pool of the Trident (Śūlakuṇḍa) and the drinking of its water, the granting of the boon to the Mothers as the reward for their victory that those who worship them with devotion will attain whatever Siddhi they desire

¹⁹¹ *Māṭṛsadbhāva*, p. 1 (1.2–4): *praṇamya ca gurum vighnaṃ durgāṃ ca kṣetrapālakam | māṭṛsadbhāvanāmnā ca *tantram* (em. : *mantram* Cod.) *etat pravakṣyate || *yāmalāni* (conj. : *yāmaleṣu* Cod.) *samālocya svasāmarthyānurūpataḥ | jagaddhitāya cāsmābhiḥ kriyate sārasaṃgrahaḥ || tāniśvaramukhāmbhoja *samudgīrṇāny* (corr. : *samudgīrṇān* Cod.) *anekadhā | brahmaṇāpi na śakyāni jñātum kim uta māḍṛsaiḥ* 'Having offered obeisance to my Guru, Gaṇeśa, Durgā, and the Kṣetrapāla, I shall declare this Tantra under the name *Māṭṛsadbhāva*. I have examined the Yāmalas and will now, as far as I am able, make a summary of their essentials for the benefit of mankind. Even Brahmā is not able to understand these [texts] that have come forth in various forms from the lotus that is the mouth of Śiva. How much less can such as I?'; and pp. 1–2: (1.10–11): *naikatra teṣu samproktāḥ kriyās tanreṣu śambhunā | māṭṛyāgaṃ samuddiśya na jānīmo 'tra kāraṇam || tasmād ṛpajya tāḥ kartum kriyā lokeṣu naiṣṭhikāḥ† | anukrameṇa vakṣyante saṃgrahaṇa yathāvidhi* 'Śiva did not teach [all] the rituals for the worship of the Mothers in those Tantras in one [place]. The reason for this I do not know. Therefore †...† I shall teach them in summary form in their proper order'. The text is incomplete, breaking off in its 28th Paṭala. But it is unlikely in the light of the list of topics to be covered given in the first Paṭala that much has been lost. I am very grateful to Dr. S. A. S. Sharma (EFEO, Pondicherry) for his kindness in providing me with a scan of this manuscript.

¹⁹² *Māṭṛsadbhāva*, p. 102: *arcayet paramāṃ śaktiṃ somasiddhāntapāragah.*

¹⁹³ *Śeṣasamuccayavimarśinī*, p. 56: *śivaikaberīmāṭṛkṣetrapālānāṃ yaugapadyenaikasminn āyatane sthāpanapradarśanārthaṃ māṭṛsadbhāvādyāgamoktakriyākramaṃ vadan ...* 'Explaining the ritual procedure taught in such scriptures as the *Māṭṛsadbhāva* in order to show how Śiva, Ekaberī [Bhadrakālī/Cāmuṇḍā], the Mothers, and the Kṣetrapāla are to be installed simultaneously in a single temple ...'. A *Māṭṛsadbhāva* is cited by Somaśambhu in his *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* (N, f. 57r1, KED v. 1311ab: **madhyābhāve* [KED : *madhyabhāve* Cod.] *catasro 'pi māṭṛsadbhāvasammatāḥ*) and, following him, by Vimalaśiva in his *Vimalāvatī* (N f. 110r1: **madhyābhāvāc* [em. : *madhyābhāvās* N] *catasro 'pi māṭṛsadbhāvākīrtitāḥ*). But the information attributed to it in those passages is not found in this text.

¹⁹⁴ On the location of Koṭivarṣa/Devīkoṭṭa in the Varendra district see SANDERSON 2001, p. 7, fn. 4, and 2009a, pp. 112–113, fn. 238. On the goddess tradition of Koṭivarṣa see now also YOKOCHI 2013b.

and salvation at death, and the presence there with the Mothers of Śiva as Hetukeśvara.¹⁹⁵ This material, probably in its original form, appears in the *Skandapurāṇa* of the sixth or early seventh century in its account of how Cāmuṇḍā/Bahumāmsā and the other Mothers came to be worshipped with the rites of the Yāmalatantras.¹⁹⁶ The memory of Koṭivarṣa as the source of the tradition is also embedded in the ritual system. For when the Śākta sacred sites are installed one by one in vases on the site of worship Koṭivarṣa is to be in the central vase surrounded in the directions by Prayāga and the rest.¹⁹⁷

In the manuscript in which I have accessed this text the *Māṭṛsadbhāva* is followed by a *Balikalpa*, a prose Paddhati that sets out the procedure for the making of Bali offerings in a temple of the Goddess established following this tradition.¹⁹⁸ There are certainly other Keralan materials of this kind awaiting recognition or close study, such as the *Ruruḥidvidhāna-pūjāpaddhati* governing the procedures for the cult of Cāmuṇḍā and the Mothers and the already published Paddhati of that cult that occupies Paṭalas 7–9 of the *Śeṣasamuccaya* and its auto-commentary composed by Śaṅkaran Nampūtiri in the fifteenth century.

As for exegesis in the Śaktitantra division of the Vidyāpīṭha, we have an abundance in the case of the Trika, the system of worship represented by the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* in the *Jayadrathayāmala*'s list of primary scriptures (*mūlasūtrāṇi*). We have no commentary on that work itself. But on the *Mālinīvijayottara*, which rightly places itself in the cycle of that text, we have in the *Tantrāloka*, *Mālinīśloka-vārttika*, and *Tantrasāra* of the Kashmirian Abhinavagupta, active c. AD 975–1025, what is undoubtedly the most extensive, elaborate, intellectually sophisticated, and influential exegesis in the Śaiva literature. Though these works are formally exegesis of the *Mālinīvijayottara* alone they develop on that base a comprehensive Śākta

¹⁹⁵ *Māṭṛsadbhāva*, pp. 138–149 (Paṭala 19); e.g. p. 144: **koṭivarṣam** iti khyātaṃ yatra devyas sahetukāḥ | tatra **sūlodakam** divyaṃ sarvaṃ + + + + +; p. 145: tataḥ prasādayām āsuś cāmuṇḍām asuradviṣaḥ | pūjayām āsur īśānīm māṭṛyajñena siddhaye || tato maheśvareṇāpi + + + + + | **koṭivarṣe** mahāpūṇye yatra **sūlodaka**<ṃ> *smṛtam (em. : smṛtaḥ Cod.) || **sūlam śilā kapālam tu kūpaṃ** divyaṃ purā kṛtam | mayā stutās tu tās sarvā vedoktenaiva vartmanā || + + + + + yajñena sarvās sampūrṇacetasaḥ | pūjītā viṣṇunā devyaś śakreṇāpi surair api || tāsāṃ tuṣṭo mahādevo devīnāṃ tu varam dadau | pūjayiṣyanti ye bhaktyā martyā bhāvasamanvitāḥ || siddhyanti vāñchitām siddhiṃ parataś ca viśanti mām; p. 146: tatas sampūjya māṭṛñām śakrādyaś tridaśair api | sūlāgrāc ca samutpannam rudrasya tu mahātmanaḥ || **koṭivarṣe** mahāpūṇye pītam māṭṛgaṇaiḥ purā | tena cābhyarcayed devīm vedoktenaiva vartmanā | sudhayā kṣīratoyābhyām yatra **sūlodakam** kṛtam | tatra cābhyarcayed devīm abhīṣṭārthaprasiddhaye.

¹⁹⁶ *Skandapurāṇa*_{KB} 171.78–137. On the date of this *Skandapurāṇa* see here fn. 41 on p. 11.

¹⁹⁷ *Māṭṛsadbhāva* p. 159 (20.75): tīrthāny api ca vakṣyāmi kalaśeṣu yathākramam | madhyame ***koṭivarṣam** tu (corr. : kāṭivarṣan tu Cod.) prayāgādyaś tathāpare. I take *apare* here to mean *apareṣu*. The context is that of the affusion (*abhīṣekah*) of the deity on the fourth day after its installation.

¹⁹⁸ Their exemplars appear to be two palm-leaf manuscripts in the Malayālam script: 1017A and 1017C of SĀMBAŚIVA ŚĀSTRĪ's catalogue (1938).

Śaivism that subsumes within itself the entire Mantramārga, both Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika, and grounds this complex both in the Kulamārga, drawing strongly on the Kālī-focused form of that tradition known as the Krama, and in the doctrine of dynamic non-dual consciousness expounded philosophically by Somānanda, Utpaladeva, and Abhinavagupta himself.¹⁹⁹ We also have an elaborate commentary (*-vivarāṇa*) by Abhinavagupta on the *Parātrimśikā*, the scripture of the Trika sub-system known as the Parākrama or Anuttara. But that lies in the domain of the Kulamārga.

The Trika system expounded in the *Tantrāloka* had a great impact on Śāktā Śaiva theory in Kashmir and throughout the subcontinent in subsequent centuries, but it seems not to have put down deep roots in Kashmir as a system of ritual-based observance. Apart from the vast running commentary of Rājānaka Jayaratha on the whole of this text, written in Kashmir in the thirteenth century,²⁰⁰ we have no other Trika works from that region; and even this commentary suggests that its author was not an initiate in the Trika as a living system of rituals, his own ritual expertise being rather in the cult of the goddess Tripurasundarī,²⁰¹ to which we shall return. The *Kalādīkṣā-paddhati* that guided Śaiva initiation in Kashmir until, in the first quarter of the twentieth century, that ceremony ceased to be performed, recognizes that some initiands passing through its *Svacchanda*-based ceremonies retained a connection with the Trika, probably through family tradition, and so ordains that in their case the officiant should insert during the fire-sacrifice some additional oblations for the Trika's principal Mantra-deities;²⁰² but it is a striking fact that this is one of the very rare evidences of Trika ritual practice in Kashmir. Among the many Kashmirian manuscripts that have reached us I have encountered no Paddhati for the regular worship or initiation ceremonies of this tradition.

On the *Vijñānabhairava*, the Trika scripture concerned with meditation practices, there was a commentary by Abhinavagupta's pupil Kṣemarāja, of which only the commentary on the introductory twenty-three verses is known to have reached us. Śivopādhyāya, a Kashmirian author writing during the governorship of Sukhajīvana (AD 1753–62), tells us that he could find no manuscript that contained more and so composed a work in which he added to the surviving portion of Kṣemarāja's work his own commentary on the remaining verses (24–163).²⁰³ We have another commentary (*Vijñāna-*

¹⁹⁹For this character of Abhinavagupta's Trika exegesis see SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 101–122; and 2007b, pp. 370–379. For the philosophical texts of the doctrine of dynamic non-dual consciousness see here p. 74.

²⁰⁰On the date of Jayaratha see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 418–419.

²⁰¹For this hypothesis that Jayaratha was not an initiated practitioner of the Trika's ritual see also SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 377–378 and 383.

²⁰²See here p. 60.

²⁰³*Vijñānabhairavavivṛti*, p. 143. For the date of Śivasvāmin/Śivopādhyāya see SANDERSON 2007b,

kaumudī), written on the whole work by the Kashmirian Bhaṭṭāraka Ānanda in AD 1672, during the time of Akbar.

As for exegesis on the *Jayadrathayāmala*, the other Śaktitantra that has reached us in manuscripts, its huge extent and encyclopaedic character may have discouraged any aspiration to write a running commentary on the whole. Nonetheless some exegesis on the teachings of this Tantra has reached us. We have the *Bhuvanamālinīkalpaviṣamapadavivṛti* of the Kashmirian Śrīvatsa, a commentary on the chapter of the fourth Śaṭka that gives the Kalpa for the rites of Bhuvanamālinī, also known as Dīkṣādevī, which served among the Śaiva officiants of Kashmir as a brief substitute for the elaborate form of *Svacchanda*-based initiation to be adopted in times of hardship or emergency.²⁰⁴ We also have Nepalese manuscripts of an anonymous *Jayadrathayāmala*prastāramantrasaṃgraha. This work, probably Kashmirian, comments on and decodes the passages of the work that give the Mantras of its numerous deities in encrypted form, covering the whole text, though not exhaustively, and also provides line drawings of some of the encryption diagrams known as *prastāraḥ* referred to in the text. The manuscripts that contain this useful manual preface it with the *Tantrarājatantrāvatārastotra*, a hymn to the tradition of this Tantra by one Viśvāvarta, whose name reveals him to have been a Kashmirian.²⁰⁵ This states the first Śaṭka's view of its position in the Śaiva canon and adores what it takes to be the principal Kālīs of the four Śaṭkas: Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī in the first, Siddhalakṣmī in the second, the three 1000-syllable Vidyās, Trailokyadāmarā, Matakakreśvarī, and Ghoraghoratarā, in the third, and, in the fourth, Siddhayogeśvarī and the Krama's innermost pantheon of the thirteen Kālīs.²⁰⁶ Finally, a section of Abhinavagupta's *Tantrāloka*, though it is a work of the Trika, is a Paddhati following the *Mādhavakula*, a Kaula Kalpa contained in the fourth Śaṭka, though it is not beyond doubt that it was already part of the *Jayadrathayāmala* at that time.²⁰⁷

That the text was influential in Kashmir can be seen in the fact that a number of the forms of Kālī whose Kalpas it teaches were taken into the *Svacchanda*-based *Agnikāryapaddhati* that guided until recent times the fire-sacrifices that were performed in the major Śaiva ceremonies. In the section of that sacrifice in which goddesses are worshipped with oblations of clarified butter (*devīnām ājyahomaḥ*) we find several of the *Jayadrathayāmala*'s deities: Bhuvanamālinī, Pāpāntakāriṇī, Vidyāvidyeśvarī, Vāgbhaveśva-

p. 423, fn. 652.

²⁰⁴On *Bhuvanamālinīkalpaviṣamapadavivṛti* and its author see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 254–255.

²⁰⁵On the Kashmirian character of this and other names in -āvarta, -varta, -āvaṭṭa, or -vaṭṭa see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 256–258.

²⁰⁶On the *Jayadrathayāmala*prastāramantrasaṃgraha and the *Tantrarājatantrāvatārastotra* see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 256–258.

²⁰⁷See SANDERSON 2007b, p. 258–259; also 2002, p. 2.

rī, Vāgīśī, Siddhalakṣmī, Mantramātrkā, Mantraḍāmarikā, Saptakoṭīśvarī, Bhāgyādhirohiṇī and Nityākālī. The sections in the Paddhatis devoted to each of these goddesses use verse passages from the *Jayadrathayāmala*'s Kalpas as recitation-texts for the goddesses' gratification (*tarpaṇaślokāḥ*) when making the oblations to them into the fire, and give their Mantras, both the primary (*mūlamantraḥ*) and the six ancillaries (*ṣaḍ aṅgāni*).²⁰⁸ We also have a Kashmirian *Jayadrathayāmala*-based Paddhati for the worship of Siddhalakṣmī (*Siddhalakṣmīpūjāpaddhati*) and a so-called *Pratyāṅgirāstotra*, which contains materials on the four Pratyāṅgirās of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, namely Siddhalakṣmī, Mantramātrkā, Mantraḍāmarikā, and Saptakoṭīśvarī, giving the Mantras, visualizations, and ritual procedure, drawing on this scripture but also going beyond it. Thus its text for the visualization (*dhyānam*) of Mantraḍāmarikā accords with the prescription of the *Mantraḍāmarikāpaṭala* of the third Ṣaṭka but is an independent composition, and supplements that text by supplying the weapons in four of her sixteen hands, which are unspecified there.²⁰⁹ In the case of Saptakoṭīśvarī it supplies a visualization-verse not found there.^{210,211} These materials exhibit accurate interpretation of the text of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, since while that gives the Mantras in encrypted form the Kashmirian Paddhatis report them as they are.²¹²

The cults of the *Jayadrathayāmala*'s goddesses were by no means restricted to Kashmir. A detailed view of the geographical range of this tradition, as of most Tantric traditions, is not possible from the materials currently known; but we have abundant evidence of the importance of the cult of the goddess Siddhalakṣmī in the kingdoms of the Kathmandu valley down to modern times, where she is generally referred to with a small inaccuracy as Siddhilakṣmī. She was adopted as a royal deity and her worship, in con-

²⁰⁸For the details of the relevant sections of the *Jayadrathayāmala* and the corresponding passages in the *Agnikāryapaddhati* see SANDERSON 2007b, p. 254, fn. 70.

²⁰⁹*Pratyāṅgirāstotra* f. 3r13–16: *gajacarmatumbavīṇe triśūlaṭaṅkau dhvajam ca grdhrasya | naramuṇḍahṛtsaroje cchurikākhaḍgau kapālakhaṭvāṅgau || dvābhyāṃ dvābhyāṃ *dadhatīm* (corr. : *dadatīm* Cod.) *pāṇibhyāṃ kokilālikula*nīlām* (conj. : *mālām* Cod.) | *kharasūkaramukharūpastanagatapāṇi*dvayām* (corr. : *dvayam* Cod.) *atha dvābhyāṃ || dadhatīm yantrasphoṭanam adhyāsita<susita>-sanmahāpretām | aṣṭādaśābhūlatām bhīmāṃ kṛśamūrṭim vikṛtadaṃṣṭrāgrām || phaṇibhūṣaṇām pradīptām praṇaomy ahaṃ mantraḍāmarikām.*

²¹⁰*Pratyāṅgirāstotra* f. 3r16–3v2: *ekā ṭaṅkāṅkamud<r>ā kavalananiratā saptamuṇḍāsanasthā rodbhūṭādhāracakrāt pralayaśikhiśikhā saptadhā *prasphurantī* (corr. : *prasphurantīm* Cod.) | *nādādyantāntarāle dhvaninidhanamahāvvyomavāgīśvarī yā sā devī vyomacaṇḍāpaharatu duriṭam saptakoṭīśvarī nah.*

²¹¹This verse is also found, with some divergent readings (notably *siddhilakṣmīśvarī va<ḥ>* at the end), as the fifth of the *Saptakoṭīśvarīstotra*, a hymn to this goddess appended to a MS of the *Guhyatantra* (f. 38r24), that being a scripture teaching a variant form of the Krama-based cult of Guhyakālī (colophon, f. 37v1–2: *iti mahāguhyatantrākhye *dvādaśāsāhasrasamhitāyām* (conj. : *dvādaśāsamhitāyām* Cod.) *mahottarāmnāye guhyakālikāmahādevyā guhyatantra<m> samāptam.*

²¹²See SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 253–254.

junction with that of Kubjikā, Guhyakālī, and Tripurasundarī, appears in the ritual manuals of the Newars as the constant frame in which other rituals are contained.²¹³ Moreover, of these royal goddesses, Guhyakālī too is *Jayadrathayāmala*-based to the extent that the goddess and her cult, though not found in the *Jayadrathayāmala*, are very much in its spirit and draw heavily upon it.

As for post-scriptural literature in the traditions of the Gāruḍatantras and Bhūtatantras we have a rich tradition of learned exposition among the Nampūtiri brahmins of Kerala in the Mantravāda section of, or rather added to, the *Siddhāntasāra* of the Keralan Īśānaśiva²¹⁴ and in the *Tantrasārasaṃgraha* or *Nārāyaṇīya (nārāyaṇīyo mantravādaḥ)* of Nārāyaṇa of Śivapura with the commentary *Mantravimarśinī* of Vāsudeva, which owes its title according to its author to the fact that it is a summary (*sārasaṃgrahaḥ*) of the teachings of such Tantras as the *Śikhāyoga*, which is one of titles in the canonical lists of the Gāruḍatantras.²¹⁵ We also have the *Samhitāsāra*, a work in fine Prakrit verse by Śaṅkuka, which, as its title and content declare, claims to have extracted the essentials from the Gāruḍa scriptures,²¹⁶ with an anonymous Sanskrit commentary which almost certainly was written by a Kashmirian, probably in the tenth or eleventh century, surviving in an undated but probably early twelfth-century Nepalese manuscript.²¹⁷ The *Yogarātnāvalī* of Śrīkaṅṭhaśambhu, perhaps a Keralan, does the same in Sanskrit for both the Gāruḍatantras and the Bhūtatantras in its first and second chapters respectively.²¹⁸

²¹³On the cult of Siddhilakṣmī and these other goddesses among the Newars of the Kathmandu valley see SANDERSON 2004, pp. 366–372.

²¹⁴Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati, Pūrvārdha, Paṭalas 39–52.

²¹⁵*Tantrasārasaṃgraha* 1.2: yāvatsāmarthyam asmābhiḥ sarvalokahitaiṣibhiḥ | śikhāyogāditantrabhyaḥ kriyate tantrasaṃgrahaḥ.

²¹⁶*Samhitāsāra* v. 2: *eso siraṣamkuamahuaṛeṇa satthāṇa tattamaāraṃdo | gārulasatthojjāne saṃgahio bīakusumesu* ‘Behold, this is the pollen of the essence of the teachings that the bee Śaṅkuka has gathered from the seeds and flowers in the garden of the Gāruḍa scriptures’.

²¹⁷On this text see SLOUBER 2011, which gives us a critical edition of forty of its approximately two hundred verses and their commentary on the basis of this manuscript (NAK 7–3, NGMPP A 44/8 [‘*Garuḍasamhitāsārasaṃgraha*’]). On Śaṅkuka, his date, and his commentator see SLOUBER 2011, pp. 3–5. The view expressed there that this Śaṅkuka is the ninth-century Kashmirian Śaṅkuka who wrote the lost Kāvya *Bhuvanābhyudaya* and the Śaṅkuka whose understanding of aesthetic experience is criticized by Abhinavagupta in his *Abhinavabhāratī* (vol. 1, pp. 274–278, 285, 293) is doubtful, resting as it does only on the fact that the author of the Prakrit *Samhitāsāra* shows poetic skill and the supposed rarity of the name Śaṅkuka. What we do know is that the work was known in Kashmir in the late tenth century, since it is quoted by Kṣemarāja in his *Svacchandodyota* on 7.42 (SLOUBER 2011, p. 4, fn. 1) and that the anonymous commentator subscribed to the Kashmirian non-dualistic Śākta Śaiva doctrine of the identity of Śiva and the soul (p. 24: *āmeśvarādvayavādaḥ*) as the light of non-dual consciousness (p. 22: *advayacitprakāśamayavarūpapratīṣṭha ātmaiva tasya svarūpavyatiriktapadārthāntarābhāvāt*).

²¹⁸*Yogarātnāvalī* p. 1: *yogarātnāvalī nāma hr̥dyā śrīkaṅṭhaśambhunā | kriyate sāram ādāya [pa]kṣirājāditantra[taḥ]*; colophon, p. 266: *iti paramaśaivācāryaśrīkaṅṭhaśivapaṇḍitaviracitāyāṃ yogarātnāvalyāṃ* The *Pakṣirāja* is among the primary Gāruḍatantras of the canonical list and is the first of

The Kulamārga

As for the Kulamārga, its texts share with those of the non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga the counter-brahmanical character of its offerings and observances. But it is more extreme in this regard and also departs markedly by following a distinct ritual system, which was inherited, I propose, with some modifications and additions, from the Kāpālīka Atimārga III.²¹⁹ It is found both in its own independent texts (the Kulaśāstras), such as the *Kulapañcāśikā*, the *Kulasāra*, the *Kulānanda*, the *Kaulajñānanirṇaya*, and the *Timirodghāṭana*, and within texts of Śākta orientation that are assigned to the Mantramārga such as the *Mālinīvijayottara* and the second, third, and fourth Śaṭkas of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, so that in such traditions we are offered two distinct cults of their deities, one following the Mantramārga and the other, seen as more elevated, following the Kulamārga. In the latter, instead of the elaborate and time-consuming process of initiation through offerings into a consecrated fire (*hautrī dīkṣā*) seen throughout the Mantramārga, we see initiation through possession (*āveśaḥ*) by the Goddess and the consumption of ‘impure’ sacramental substances (*caruprāśanam*, *vīrapānam*). We also find sexual intercourse with a consecrated consort (*dūtī*) as a central element of private worship, sanguinary sacrifices, and collective orgiastic rites celebrated by assemblies of initiates and women of low caste.²²⁰ Here

them in the shorter canon of twelve such Tantras given by Śrīkaṇṭhaśambhu in this work: *pakṣi[rājam śi]khāyogaṃ *bindusāraṃ* (em. : *vidhūsāraṃ* Cod.) *śikhāmatam | tottaṃ kālakūṭam ca kṛṣṇāṅgam *tollalottaram* (em. : *tottalottaṃ* Cod.) *| [kaṭā]ḥam *nāgatuṇḍam* (conj. : *nāgaruṇḍam* Cod.) *ca *sugrīvaṃ* (em. : *kuḡrīvaṃ* Cod.) *karkaṭāmukham | etāni viśatantrāni dvādaśāvocad īśvaraḥ*. The second chapter begins as follows (p. 37): *atha vacmi prabhūtasya bhūtanatrasya saṃgraham | grahabhūtajavarakrūrāsākinīsarpaṇigraham*. It then lists a canon of five Bhūtanatras, all found in the longer lists: **bhūtanatranī pañceśaḥ* (conj. : *bhūtanatranī paṭhyeśā* Cod.) **proktavān* (corr. : *poktavān* Cod.) *khaḍgarāvaṇam | bhūtatrasam ca karkoṭam muṇḍamāla<ṃ> karkoṭakam*. On the *Yogaratnāvalī* see SLOUBER 2012, p. 63. I have seen nothing in the work that establishes its date or provenance. The author is, I propose, identical with the Śrīkaṇṭhaśambhu who wrote the *Nidhipradīpa* on the art of discovering buried treasure on the basis, he tells us, of the *Siddhaśābaratantra* (1.1cd: *sāram ādāya *siddhaśābaratantrakāt [A : siddhānām hitakāraṇam* Ed.]). For that begins in a strikingly similar manner: *nidhipradīpanāmāyamaḥ siddhaśrīkaṇṭhaśambhunā | kriyate sāram ādāya siddhānām hitakāraṇam*; and both state their extent in the same way. In the *Yogaratnāvalī* this is *granthe nava-paricchedair mite *hy* (conj. : *ty* Cod.) *aṣṭaśatādhikā | trisahasramitā <saṃ>khyā vijñeyānuṣṭubhām iha* (v. 9); and in the *Nidhipradīpa* it is: **granthe* (em. : *granthaiś* Ed.) *catusparicchedaiḥ padyair ānuṣṭubhair iha | śatāni pañca padyāni*. However, neither gives us any information about the author. Since all the known mss of the *Nidhipradīpa* are Keralan, perhaps Śrīkaṇṭhaśambhu was a Keralan brahmin. The oldest of these mss was judged by the editor to be about 400 years old, that is to say, from the first half of the sixteenth century.

²¹⁹ See here fn. 220 on p. 57.

²²⁰ On the Kaulas’ impure sacramental substances and initiation through consuming them see SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 110–114, fn. 63. The proposition that the essentials of this ritual system were carried forward from the Kāpālīka tradition of the Somasiddhānta (Atimārga III) must be argued in detail elsewhere. Here I merely point out that the salient features of the latter show a marked similarity between the two traditions, setting them apart from the rest of Śaivism. These features are in brief (i) erotic ritual with a female companion, (ii) sanguinary practices for the propitiation of the fierce

we may seem to be in the presence of a purely personal, largely secret, and mystical cult. But, as in the cults of the non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga, the public value of this form of Śaivism for the protection of society and the state is also stressed.²²¹

The texts of the Kulamārga, also called the Kula Teaching (*kulaśāsanam*, *kulāmnāyaḥ*, and the like), or simply the Kula, were focused on the propitiation of the Goddess Kuleśvarī with or without Bhairava (Kuleśvara) surrounded by the eight Mothers, and attended by Gaṇeśa and Vaṭuka, with ancillary worship of the four Yuganāthas (the Siddhas who propagated the tradition in the four Ages) together with their consorts, ending with Macchanda and Koṅkaṇā in the present Age of Kali, and the six non-celibate Rājaputras who were the sons of this couple, together with their consorts,²²² but in course of time this was variously inflected and modified in liturgical systems differentiated most obviously by the identity of the central deity. Thus in an early classification, seen in the *Ciñcīṇmata*, we are given accounts of four systems of Kaula teaching,²²³ called the Āmnāyas (‘Traditions’), assigned to the four directions, east (Pūrvāmnāya), north (Uttarāmnāya), west (Paścimāmnāya), and south (Dakṣiṇāmnāya), each with a distinctive pantheon of worship.²²⁴

gods Mahābhairava/Bhairava and Cāmuṇḍā, (iii) the notion that supernatural powers may be attained through the extraction by Yogic means of the vital essences of living beings (also prominent in the Kulamārga), (iv) initiation through the consumption of consecrated liquor, and (v) the centrality of states of possession (*āveśaḥ*).

²²¹*Netratantra*, on the worship of the Eight Mothers in the Kulamārga (12.6c–8): *sarveṣāṃ eva śāntyarthaṃ prānīnām bhūtim icchatā || bhūriyāgena yaṣṭavyā yathākāmānurūpataḥ | viśeṣād devi yaṣṭavyā bhūbhṛtām api daiśikaiḥ || āsām eva prasādena rājyaṃ nihatakaṇṭakam | bhuñjate sarvarājānaḥ subhagā hy avanītale* ‘The [Mothers] should be worshipped with abundant offerings for the warding off of danger from the whole society [or], by one desiring power, in accordance with his particular aim; and the Gurus of kings, O goddess, should worship them with special lavishness. For it is only by their favour that any king on this earth enjoys sovereignty in good fortune, with all his enemies destroyed’.

²²²For this characterization of the basic form of worship see *Netratantra* 12.1–6b and Kṣemarāja’s commentary thereon. In this case, since it is an ectype of the cult of Amṛteśvara, it has Bhairava as the central deity (Kuleśvara). In the Kaula worship of the Trika’s *Mālinīvijayottara* 11.3–16 we see Kuleśvarī (Kulaśakti) with the eight Mothers and Bhairava with the eight Vīras. In the exegesis of that passage in *Tantrāloka* 29.18–55 we see Gaṇeśa and Vaṭuka, the four Siddhas and their consorts, the first three each with two sons and their consorts and the fourth, Macchanda and Koṅkaṇā, with six sons (the Rājaputras) and their consorts, and with Kuleśvarī (here Parā as Māṛṣadbhāva) as the central deity, with or without Kuleśvara (29.48cd: *ekavīrā ca sā pūjyā yadi vā sakuleśvarā*), surrounded by the eight Mothers or, if she is worshipped with Kuleśvara, by the Mothers and Vīras. The Siddhas and their sons are referred to as -nāthas (e.g. Macchandanaṭha, Guḍikānātha) and the consorts as -ambās (e.g. Koṅkaṇāmbā/Kuṅkaṇāmbā, Illāi-ambā).

²²³Skt. *kaula-* or *kaulika-* are the usual adjectives for whatever pertains to the Kula. I adopt the first alone to express this sense in English.

²²⁴The word *āmnāyaḥ* has two different meanings in Skt.: (i) ‘teaching’ (or more specifically ‘the Veda’) and (ii) ‘lineage’, ‘tradition’. I have preferred the second because the text uses *āmnāyaḥ* and *anvayaḥ* ‘lineage’ interchangeably for the sake of the metre as in *paścimāmnāyo deveśi* (f. 15v2 [7.42c]), **pūrvānvayam anuttamam* (em. : *pūrvāvṛvayam anukramam* Cod.) (f. 15v6 [7.48b]), *pūrvāmnāyam*

Of these the Pūrvāmnāya as outlined in this text appears to be the uninflected, original form of the Kula;²²⁵ and it is closely related to that which was taught for the Trika by the *Mālinīvijayottara* (11.3–16), Abhinavagupta's *Tantrāloka* (29.18–55), and Jayaratha's commentary thereon. Indeed there is textual continuity between this part of the *Ciñciñimata* and the passages of the *Kulakṛīḍāvatāra*, a text that has not otherwise survived to my knowledge, which Jayaratha quotes at length in his commentary on this section of the *Tantrāloka* to provide the scriptural authority that remains unstated in Abhinavagupta's presentation.²²⁶ The only significant difference is that the Trika has superimposed its own distinctive Mantra-deities on to the underlying model.²²⁷

The Kashmirian Śākta Śaiva exegetes of the ninth to eleventh centuries

prakṛititam (f. 16r1 [7.100d]), and *paścimānvayam uttamam* (f. 24v4 [8.1b]), as do other Kaula texts, as in *Kubjikāmata* 2.22ab: *paścimāmnāyamārgo 'yam*; and 2.47d and 10.65b: *paścimānvaye*. It also refers to them with the term *gharāmnāyaḥ* (*pūrvagharāmnāyaḥ* etc.) or, in abbreviated form, *gharam*, as in *śṛṇu devi pravakṣyāmi gharaṃ *pūrvaṃ* (corr.: *pūrvva* Cod.) *suvistaram* (f. 15v2–3 [7.43d]) and *dakṣiṇaṃ gharam uttamam* (f. 16r1 [7.101b]). In this context the term *gharam*, literally 'house' is probably to be understood as a 'lodge', meaning a place for the assembling of members of an initiatory lineage and by extension that lineage itself. The *Ciñciñimata* covers the Āmnāyas one by one as follows: Paścimāmnāya, ff. 1v1–18r1 (1.1–7.37) and ff. 24v4–38v3 (Paṭalas 8–12); Pūrvāmnāya, ff. 15r7–18r1 (7.38–100); Dakṣiṇāmnāya, ff. 18r1–20r8 (7.101–154); and Uttarāmnāya, ff. 20r8–24v3 (7.155–250).

²²⁵We are told the pantheon of worship, essentially Kuleśvarī accompanied by the Siddhas, their sons, and consorts, and given a brief hagiographical account of the six qualified sons of Macchanda and Koṅkaṇā, their lineage names (*ovallyah*), and the sites at which they accomplished their Sādhana.

²²⁶Compare *Ciñciñimata* f. 16v7–9 (7.73–74): *tripurottarasamketa siddhasthānam tu taṃ viduḥ | amarasya varārohe varadevasya *kāmarū* (em.: *kāmadah* Cod.) | *citrasya aṭṭahāsam vai devikoṭam alisya ca | dakṣiṇādiśa vindhyasya kaulagiryāṃ tu gauḍikaḥ* with *Kulakṛīḍāvatāra* quoted in *Tantrāloka* 29.36–39: **tripurottaram* (em.: *tripurottare* ΚΕΔ) *niketaṃ siddhisthānam tu tad viduḥ | amarasya varārohe varadevasya kāmarū | citrasya aṭṭahāsam vai devikoṭam ales tathā | dakṣiṇaṃ caiva vindhyasya *guḍike kaulagiry ata iti* (conj.: *guḍiko kaulagiryatā iti* ΚΕΔ). The use here of the toponym Kāmarū for Kāmarūpa (in Assam) is also seen, for example, in *Piṅgalāmata* f. 3v7 (*kāmarū *kacchakāśmīrau [kaccha* em.: *paccha* Cod.) ' [an Ācārya or Sādhaka] who is a native of Kāmarū, Kaccha (Cutch), or Kashmir', and in Old Bengali/Maithili *kāmaru* (Kukkuripā, *Caryāgīti* 2.4). Its currency is also evidenced in a Chinese itinerary of the late 8th century, which calls the region Gomolu 箇没盧 (PELLIOT 1904, p. 178).

²²⁷*Tantrāloka* 29.45c–46b prescribes that after the worship of the Siddhas and their consorts one should worship Mātrkā and Mālinī and then the Mantracakra. The latter is defined by Jayaratha in his comment on this passage as the three goddesses Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā together with their Bhairava consorts at the three corners of the central triangle of the Maṇḍala and Kuleśvarī and her consort in the centre: *yāgamadhyavartini karṇikāsthānīye trikoṇe. tatra pūrvadakṣiṇāvāmakoṇeṣu sabhairavaṃ parādīdevītrayaṃ madhye ca *kuleśvarāv* (conj.: *kuleśvaram* ΚΕΔ) *iti, yad vakṣyati saṃpūjya madhyamapade kuleśayugmaṃ tv arātraye devīḥ* (= *Tantrāloka* 29.131cd). Kuleśvarī here, Abhinavagupta explains, is either Parā as Mātrāsadbhāva or, by superimposition, either Parāparā or Aparā (29.46c–48b). Jayaratha comments here that the choice among these is determined by the blind casting of a flower by the initiand [at the time of initiation] or some other method, the central goddess being the one revealed thereby to be most suitable for propitiation by that initiand. She may be accompanied by her consort (Kuleśvara) or not (*ekavīrā*) (29.48cd). Outside this core pantheon one is to worship the eight Mothers and their Bhairava consorts (29.52–53).

do not use this classification into Āmnāyas. But later Kashmirian sources do support the close connection between the Trika and the Pūrvāmnāya that I am proposing. The *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* tells us that at a certain point in the preparatory rituals offerings into fire should be made in the case of the Pūrvāmnāya, that is to say, in the case of adherents thereof, to the three Bhairavas (Bhairavasadbhāva, Ratiśekhara, and Navātman), three goddesses (Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā), and Māṭṛsadbhāva. These, as the text of the Mantras that follows this statement shows, are the core Mantra-deities that define the Trika.²²⁸ Likewise in a fragmentary birch-bark manuscript that contains parts of the text guiding the Kashmirian Śivarātri worship as performed by Śaiva initiates we find the Trika's alphabet goddess Mālinī receiving offerings as the goddess of the Pūrvāmnāya after the recitation of a meditation verse that identifies her with the Trika's high goddess as embodied in the three goddesses enthroned on the lotuses on the tips of the trident at the centre of the Trika's initiation Maṇḍala as the non-dual ground of the agent, means, and object of cognition.²²⁹ Mālinī is also worshipped as the goddess of the Pūrvāmnāya in the Kashmirian Śaiva Gurus' *Agnikāryapaddhati*, in the section on the fire-offerings of clarified butter to the goddesses (*devinām ājyahomaḥ*), with a meditation verse addressed to Parā, the Trika's highest goddess, as embodied in her seed-syllable SAUḤ.²³⁰

²²⁸ *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* A f. 61v1–2, E f. 26v12–27r5: *śrīpūrvāmnāye bhairavatrāyadevītrāyamāṭṛsadbhāvabhairavagaṇeśānām homāḥ, yathā: oṃ jhksrūṃ bhairavasadbhāvabhairavāya svāhā 3. oṃ hs<h>phrem māṭṛsadbhāvabhairavāya namaḥ iti sampūjya oṃ hs<h>phrem *māṭṛsadbhāvāya* (corr.: *māṭṛsadbhāvabhairavāya* Cod.) *svāhā 3. ...oṃ hrīm hūṃ phaḥ aparāyai namaḥ <iti sampūjya> oṃ hrīm hūṃ phaḥ aparāyai svāhā 3 iti kecit.* For the Mantras/Vidyās see *Tantrāloka* 30.11–12b (Ratiśekhara- and Navātma-), 16c–18b (Bhairavasadbhāva), 20–27b (the three goddesses), 45c–46 (Māṭṛsadbhāva).

²²⁹ *Śivarātripūjā*, frame 64, ll. 2–5: *atha pūrvāmnāye śrīmālinīdevīpūjanam. Oṃ naumi citpratibhām devīm parām bhairavamālinīm | māṭṛmānaprameyāśāsūlāmbujakṛtāspadām.* This (*naumi ...*) is the second benedictory verse of the *Tantrāloka*, modified for the context by the substituting of the word *-mālinīm* where that has *-yoginīm*. For the Trika's Maṇḍala (*trīśūlābjamaṇḍalam*) see SANDERSON 1986, pp. 171 and 195, where I have translated into line-drawings the instructions given for the design of this and the triple trident Maṇḍala (*trītrīśūlābjamaṇḍalam*) in *Tantrāloka* 31.62–85b and 31.10–41b. Kubjikā, who also receives offerings in the Kashmirian fire-sacrifice, is introduced in the same way: *atha śrīpaścimāmnāye kubjikādevī (Śivarātripūjā*, frame 13, l. 10; cf. *Agnikāryapaddhati* A f. 60r15–16: *anena mantrahomena śrīkubjikā paścimāmnāyadevatā sāṅgā saparivārā savaktrā *prīyatām* [corr.: *prīyamtām* Cod.] *prītāstu*).

²³⁰ *Agnikāryapaddhati* A f. 63r16–20, C f. 39r13–v2, D f. 65r13–16: **atha pūrvāmnāye mālinīmantrapūjanam* (ACD: *atha pūrvāmnāyeśvarī* B f. 92r16). *ātmendudhāmani yugeśanareśaputrācitrām trīśūlābiladhāmani sṛṣṭaśaktim | naisargike ca citidhāmani *pāṇḍurāṅgīm* (conj.: *puṇḍarikām* Codd.) *kāmcit parām trikaparām praṇamāmi śaktim* ‘*Now the worship of the Mantra of Mālinī in the Pūrvāmnāya (ACD: Now the goddess of the Pūrvāmnāya B). I bow before the matchless *white-limbed (conj.) Śakti Parā, who transcends the triad, who, adorned by the Yuganāthas and Rājaputras, emits her power in (i) the moon-centre that is individual consciousness [=s], (ii) the fontanel-centre that is the ‘trident’ [=AU], and (iii) the innate ground of consciousness [=Ḥ]’. For the encrypting of the seed-syllable SAUḤ used here see *Tantrāloka* 3.165c–166 (s = *amṛtam* [= *induh*]); 3.104c–105b (AU = *trīśūlam*); 4.186b–188 and 5.54c–56b (SAUḤ). That the third element, Ḥ (*visargaḥ*) is intended here is evident by elimination but would be explicit if *naisargike*, seen in all the MSS consulted, were

The Trika produced several scriptures with a predominantly or exclusively Kaula orientation. Unfortunately these survive for the most part only in citations in the *Tantrāloka* and Jayaratha's commentary thereon. The principal among them are the *Triśirobhairava*, the *Trikakularatnamālā*, the *Yoga-saṃcāra*, the *Trikasāra*, the *Bhairavakula*, and the *Vīrāvalī*. The citations do not reveal much about the character of these texts on the level of the specifics of ritual; but we can at least see that the *Vīrāvalī* was considered to pertain to a higher form of Kaula practice in which external elaborations were rejected in favour of inner experience. Thus in initiation the *Vīrāvalī* advocated in place of the outer Kula's method of possession (*āveśaḥ*), in which there occurs a paralysis (*stobhaḥ*) of the initiand's physical agency as his body and consciousness are taken over by the Goddess, a higher method of spontaneous fusion of the initiator's and initiand's consciousness (*sāmarasyam*). This evidence of distinction between different levels of practice within the Trika is confirmed by a passage in the *Siddhakhaṇḍa* of the Paścimāmnāya-Kaula *Manthānabhairava*. For that teaches a ladder of higher and higher means of liberation in which the Bhairavatantras are followed in ascending order by the methods of the *Mālinīvijayottara*, the *Bhairavakula*, and the *Vīrāvalī*, with the last transcended in turn by the Krama, and that by the form of Kaula practice espoused by the *Manthānabhairava* itself.²³¹

The Paścimāmnāya, with which the *Ciñciṇīmata* aligns itself, is that of the cult of the goddess Kubjikā and her consort Navātman, a system whose scriptural corpus comprises principally the *Kubjikāmata*, *Laghvikāmnāya*, and *Ṣaṣṣāhasra-Kulālikāmnāya*, but also such works as the *Śrīmatottara*/*Gorakṣasaṃhitā*, *Kularatnoddyota*, and *Manthānabhairava*. The last contains several remarks that reveal its provenance to be the Deccan plateau, more specifically Desh (*deśaḥ*), the central subregion of the modern state of Maha-

an error for *vaisargike*.

²³¹For the relevant passages in the *Manthānabhairava* see SANDERSON 2009a, pp. 47–48, fn. 13. For explicit stating of this hierarchy in the literature of the Trika see *Tantrāloka* 22.40c–42b: *siddhānte dīkṣitās tantre daśāṣṭādaśabhedini || bhairavīye catuḥṣaṣṭau tān paśūn dīkṣayet trike | siddhavīrāvalīsāre bhairavīye kule 'pi ca || pañcadīkṣākramopāttā dīkṣānuttarasamjñitā* 'He may initiate into the [system of the] sixty-four [scriptures] of Bhairava such bound souls as have already been initiated into the [*Siddhānta*] with its ten and eighteen constituent [Śivatantras and Rudratrantras], and those in turn into the *Trika* [= *Mālinīvijayottara*], and the *Bhairavakula*, whose essence is the *Siddhavīrāvalī*. The initiation that we call ultimate is attained by passing successively through these five initiations'. Jayaratha on *Tantrāloka* 13.302 quotes a passage that distinguishes the five initiations as being centred on five different transformative processes: *hautrī dīkṣā tu siddhānte tantre yojanikā smṛtā | trike samāveśavātī kule stobhātmikā matā || sāmarasyamayī kaule dīkṣā pañcavidhoditā* 'Initiation is taught to be of five kinds. In the *Siddhānta* it is [principally] through offerings into the fire. In the Tantras [of Bhairava] it is the fusion [of the soul of the candidate with the deity at the end of the fire-ritual that is crucial]. In the *Trika* [= *Mālinīvijayottara*,] initiation requires [one of the modes of penetration by Rudraśakti known as] *Samāveśa*. In the *Kula* [= *Bhairavakula*] it is a state of automatism (*stobhaḥ*) [in which it is the possessing deity that moves one's limbs]. In the *Kaula* [= *Vīrāvalī*/*Siddhavīrāvalī*] it is a state of spontaneous fusion [with the consciousness of the initiator]'.

rashtra. It tells us that it is in the Deccan (*dakṣiṇāpathaḥ*) that the initiatory tradition (*ājñā*) of the Kubjikā cult is maintained; that it is “here in Desh” that Siddhi can be achieved; that those in the Konkan, the coastal region of Maharashtra, Goa, and Karnataka, should travel up to the Deccan plateau to obtain the scriptures, since without them this tradition will bear no fruit; and that the *Khañjinīmata* of 24,000 verses, which was brought back to earth from the subterranean paradise at the beginning of the current age of Kali, is (already) well-known in the Deccan in the form of the *Kulālikāmata*, its redaction in 3,500 verses. That redaction is surely the *Kubjikāmata* in the principal of its three redactions. That and that alone is of this length; and it is referred to in its colophons with the synonym *Kulālikāmnāya*.²³² That the *Manthānabhairava* was composed in the Deccan is confirmed by its practice of compounding the names of goddesses with -avvā.²³³ This is surely a reflex of the vernacular usage in this region, where goddess-names of this kind are commonplace,²³⁴ *avvā* ‘mother’ being used in Kannaḍa as a feminine title of respect and affection.²³⁵ This feature is also found in the *Kubjikāmata*.²³⁶ It is probable, then, that it too is a product of the Deccan, and therefore that the whole tradition emerged and developed in that region. This should be taken to include the Konkan. For the claim of the *Siddhakhaṇḍa* that those in the Konkan should go to Desh for this Tantra admits that teaching is found in the Konkan too, claiming only that the best tradition is to be found inland. Moreover, the *Ṣaṭsāhasrasaṃhitā* begins with the information that it was at Candrapurī/Candrapura in the Konkan, probably the ancient port town of Goa now called Chandor, that Śrīnātha first propagated this teaching at the

²³² *Manthānabhairava*, *Siddhakhaṇḍa* f. 21v2–3: *omkāre adhikāraṃ tu bhavate dakṣiṇāpathe | ta-thājñā vartate śārvī olimārgatrayeṣu ca*; f. 21v5: *uttaraṃ vighnabahulaṃ siddhasaṃtānavarjitam || tadātra jāyate siddhiḥ śrīdeśe dakṣiṇāpathe*; f. 22r1–2: *koṅkaṇe ca vinā śāstraṃ saṃprāpto 'pi nirarthakam | pāramparya vinā śāstraṃ yaṣṭaṃ bhavati niṣphalam || asmād āgama saṃgrāhyaṃ gatvā śrīdakṣiṇāpathe*; ff. 5v2–6r2: *śrīmatkarālakaṇṭhena ānītam avanītale | caturviṃśatisāhasraṃ durbodham khañjinīmatam || sārthā trīṇi sahasraṇi tumbureṇāvātāritā | tatsāraṃ *kaulike (conj. : kaulikā Cod.) mārge śrīmat*kulālikāmatam (em. : kaulikāmatam Cod.) || ratnasūtram iti proktaṃ prasiddham *dakṣiṇāpathe (conj. : dakṣiṇe pathe Cod.)*.

²³³ In the first twelve folios of the *Siddhakhaṇḍa* manuscript we find the following: Caccikāvṅvā, Raktāvṅvā, Kālikāvṅvā, Maṅgalāvṅvā, Oḍḍāvṅvā, Jālāvṅvā, Pūrṅvā, Kāmāvṅvā, Mahocchuṣmāvṅvā, Kubjikāvṅvā, Khañjikāvṅvā and Tīkṣṇāvṅvā. Moreover, in its chapter colophons the *Manthānabhairava* is said to have been taught in or by the *avvākramaḥ*, the tradition of Avvā or the Avvās (*avvākramabhāṣite*).

²³⁴ See, e.g., Ekāvṅvā, Māyāvṅvā, and Mhākāvṅvā in the index of SONTHEIMER 1989.

²³⁵ Cf. Telugu *avva* ‘a grandmother, a mother; any old or respectable woman’, and Tamil *avvai* ‘mother, old woman, a female ascetic’.

²³⁶ *Kubjikāmata* 7.30a: YASTRĀ-A YAIVVĀNĀNKAKO CCEVI NIKI NIKI, which is KIṆI KIṆI VICCE KOṅKAṆĀVVĀYAI ASTRĀYA in reverse; 7.39a: STRAM-A VVĀNĀNKAKO CCEVI, which is VICCE KOṅKAṆĀVVĀ ASTRAM in reverse; and 18.125b: *siddhāvṅvā*. This feature is carried over into the Paddhatis; see, e.g. *Nityāhnikatilaka* A f. 18r2–3: *asyaiva śaktiḥ śrīgaganāvṅvā śrīcaṭulāvṅvāpā pū*; f. 18r5: *asyaiva śaktiḥ śrīmahāsiddheśvari-avvāpā pū*; f. 18v2–3: *asyaiva śaktiḥ śrīpadmāvṅvāpā pū*; etc. Here -pā pū is an abbreviation for -pādukām pūjayāmi. The same readings are seen in MS B.

beginning of the current Kaliyuga.²³⁷

This evidence establishes, moreover, that the Trika (Pūrvāmnāya) was present in the Deccan, and that it was so before the literature of the Paścimāmnāya was redacted. For the *Kubjikāmata* drew extensively on the Trika's scriptures, embedding the cult of its deities in a modified Trika substrate.²³⁸ Nor is there good reason, in spite of the later prominence of the Trika in Kashmir, to suppose that it must have travelled from Kashmir to the Deccan before it exerted this influence. There is no need, then, to seek a connection with Kashmir to explain the fact that the Jaina Somadevasūri has referred to the Trika in his *Yaśastilaka*, completed in AD 959 at Gaṅgādhārā, near Vemulawada in the Karimnagar District of Andhra Pradesh.²³⁹

The *Ciñciṇīmata*'s account of the Uttarāmnāya shows this to be the system for the worship of the goddess Kālī (/Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī) known variously as the Krama, Mahānaya, Mahārtha, Devīnaya, or Kālīkula that we find in a number of liturgical variants in parts of the *Jayadrathayāmala*'s later Śaṭkas,²⁴⁰ the *Kālīkākulapañcaśataka*, the *Devīdvyardhaśatikā*, the *Kālīkulakramasadbhāva*, the *Yonigahvara*, and, known only through their utilization in the Paddhati *Kālīkulakramārcana* of Vimalaprabodha, the Guru of King Arimalla of Nepal (r. AD 1200–1216), the *Pañcacāmarasēkhara*, *Dvīpamata*, *Dvīpottara*, *Śaktikaulika*, *Kaulakamala*, *Kharapuccha*, and *Mahā-*

²³⁷ *Śaṣṭhasahasraśaṃhitā* 1.2bc: *śrīnāthaṃ candrapuryāṃ ...prathamakaliyuge koṅkaṇe* An inscription of AD 1029 at Sōlandevanhalli in Kannaḍa and Sanskrit (*Epigraphia Carnatica* 9, Nl 1) begins its account of a lineage of -nāthas with the abbot at the Vṛkṣamūla [monastery] in Candrapurī, which, it tells us, is on the coast of the Arabian Sea: *śrīpaścimābdhisthitacandrapuryāṃ*. These -nāthas are in all probability Kaulas following the Paścimāmnāya; but this need not be demonstrated here.

²³⁸ For this dependence see SANDERSON in the discussion that is appended to GOUDRIAAN 1986, pp. 163–164; and SANDERSON 2001, pp. 32–35.

²³⁹ *Yaśastilaka*, pt. 1, p. 43: *sakalajanasādhāraṇe 'pi svadehe trikamatadīkṣitasyeva devabhūyenābhiniṅviśamānasya* 'like an initiate in the Trika doctrine, fully believing in his own body as a god, though it is no different from anyone else's'; and pt. 2, p. 269: *sarveṣu peyāpeyabhakṣyābhakṣyādiṣu niḥśaṅkacittād vṛttād iti kulācāryakāḥ. tathā ca trikamatoktīr madirāmodameduravadanas tarasara-saprasannahṛdayaḥ savyapārśvaviniveśitaśaktiḥ śaktimudrāsanadharah svayam umāmaheśvarāyāmāṇaḥ kṛṣṇayā *śarvāṅīśvaram* (Cod. : *sarvāṅīśvaram* Ed.) *ārādhayed iti* 'The wretched Kulācāryas [maintain] that [liberation comes about] from practice in which the mind is free of inhibition in all matters such as the distinction between permitted and forbidden foods and drinks. To explain: the Trika doctrine teaches that one should propitiate Śarvāṅīśvara at night, with one's mouth full of the fragrance of alcoholic liquor, with one's heart tranquil through [the consumption of] meat-broth, with one's consort placed at one's left side, adopting the Śakti-seal posture, enacting in one's person the [union of] Umā and Maheśvara'. I thank Dr. Csaba Dezső (Budapest) for providing me on request images of the relevant portion of the BORI MS of this text and Prof. Dr. Harunaga Isaacson (Hamburg) for pointing out to me the presence in this passage of the word *tarasa-* in the meaning 'flesh'. I take Śarvāṅīśvara as equivalent to Gaurīśvara, and therefore as a synonym of Ardhanārīśvara, meaning the Śiva form in which the left half of his body is that of his consort. On the location of Gaṅgādhārā see HANDIQUI 1968, pp. xii–xiii.

²⁴⁰ For the location of these variants see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 260, fn. 84.

rthakramabheda.²⁴¹ The *Kālikākulapañcaśataka* and *Kālīkulakramasadbhāva* identify Uḍḍiyāna, that is to say, the Swat valley, in the far northwest of the subcontinent, as the place of their revelation.²⁴² But there are several pieces of evidence that encourage us to suspect that this is myth rather than fact. In Vimalaprabodha's account in the *Kālīkulakramārcana* of the Krama ritual in which male and female adepts are worshipped collectively with offerings of food and drink (*cakrakrīḍā*) he gives a secret jargon (*samayachommakam*) that should be used by the sponsor with all the invited participants to refer to the five phases of the Krama, from Emission (*śṛṣṭiḥ*) to Radiance (*bhāsā*). The expressions are unmistakably Dravidian, and probably from the Kannāḍa- or Tuḷu-speaking areas of the Deccan.²⁴³ The *Manthānabhairava*, a work of the Deccan, knows the Krama, placing it, as we have seen, between the Trika and itself in its ascending hierarchy of revelation, even redacting in its *Siddhakhaṇḍa* a Krama scriptural text of 115 verses of which most are found in the *Devīdyardhaśatikā*.²⁴⁴ Finally, the *Ūrmikaulārṇava*, also called *Bhogahasta*, teaches a version of the Krama that it associates with the sacred site of the goddess Mahālakṣmī at Kolhapur in the Deccan, saying that it had been brought by Siddhas to this place from the site of its original revelation by Śrīnātha in Assam (Kāmarūpa).²⁴⁵

The last of the four, the Dakṣiṇāmnāya, is presented by the *Ciñciṇimata* as the cult of Kāmeśvari surrounded by Kāmadeva and the eleven goddesses known as the Nityās, a tradition of whose literature we now possess only a single incomplete Nepalese manuscript of one work, the *Nityākaula*.²⁴⁶ This

²⁴¹ On the date of Vimalaprabodha see SANDERSON 2007b, p. 282, fn. 168.

²⁴² See SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 261–268. The chapter colophons of the *Kālikākulapañcaśataka* say that it arose in the Uttarapīṭha (=Uḍḍiyāna) and was propagated by Śrīnātha (*śrīmaduttarapīṭhodbhūte śrīśrīnāthāvatārite*). Those of the *Kālīkulakramasadbhāva* say that it was originally from the Uttarapīṭha and propagated by Śrīnātha (*śrīmaduttarapīṭhavinirgate śrīśrīnāthāvatārite*).

²⁴³ See SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 283–284.

²⁴⁴ This Kālīkula text is found in *Manthānabhairava*, *Siddhakhaṇḍa* ff. 179r5–186v.

²⁴⁵ *Ūrmikaulārṇava* f. 27r2–5: *mahākṣetre kāmarūpe śrīnāthena prakāśitam | samsthitaṃ tatra deveśi yoginīguhyaśāsanam || anyaṣaṭkadvayād bhadre *mahākaulārṇavābhīdhāt* (conj : *mahākaulārṇavābhīdham* A) | *kulamadhyā<d> daśaśataṃ bhogahastārṇaveti ca || tasmā<d> dvādaśasāhasrāt sārām etad udāhṛtam | vyākhyātamātram khecarair nītam pīṭhāntaram priye || kaulagiryabhīdhānam tu mahālakṣmīketanam | tasmīn pīṭhavare devī *saṃcarat tu mukhān mukham* (conj. : *saṃcaramī mukhāmukham* A) || *sthitaṃ yogavaram siddham pustake naiva lekhayet*. Kolhapur, in southwest Maharashtra close to the border with Karnataka, appears in our Kaula sources as Kollāgiri, Kolāgiri, Kollā, Kolāpura, and Kollāpura. The form Kaulagiri seen in this passage is probably an artificial sanskritization.

²⁴⁶ The pantheon of the Dakṣiṇāmnāya is detailed by the *Ciñciṇimata* as follows (ff. 18v9–19r3 [7.123–126]): *hrllekhā kledinī nandā kṣobhiṇī madanātūrā | nirañjanā rāgavatī tathānyā madanāvātī | khakalā drāviṇī caiva tathā vegavatī smṛtā | ekādaśaitā devyās tu madano dvādaśaḥ smṛtaḥ | cakravayāptam mahādevi ṣaṭkoṇam vahniṃḍalam | arakair antarālaiś ca pūjayitvā varānane | pārśve tu madanam divyam pūrvārānte vyavasthitam | madhye kāmēśvarīdevīm pūjayed divyamaṇḍale*. Cf. *Nityākaula*, f. 2r7–2v2: *hrllekhā kledinī nandā kṣobhanī madanātūrā | nirañjanā [+ + + + + + + + + + +]danāvātī || khekalā drāvaṇī caiva tathā vegavatī varā | ekādaśaitā devyās te madano dvādaśa smṛtaḥ || ārakeṣv antarā[le]ṣu cakram vyāpya vyavasthitam*. For the related cult of the nine Nityās

cult was eclipsed in time by its own outgrowth, the cult of the goddess Tripurā/Tripurasundarī, which eventually became much the most widespread and popular form of Śākta worship, surviving with some vigour down to the present. This later form, whose primary scriptures are the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* and the *Yoginīhr̥daya*, did not assign itself to the Dakṣiṇāmnāya. Rather it claimed from the beginning that it transcends the Āmnāyas as the essence and embodiment of all four; and this stance was elaborated in the learned exegesis in the claim that the constituent parts of Tripurā's Maṇḍala of nine intersecting triangles, known as the Śrīcakra, are the embodiment of these four, equated with the four phases of emission, stasis, retraction, and the Nameless (*anākhyam*), a tetrad borrowed from the Krama, thus transforming the Maṇḍala into a proof, as it were, of the cult's claim to encompass and surpass all the other Kaula traditions.²⁴⁷

This claim that the four Āmnāyas are embodied in the constituent parts of the Śrīcakra is purely theoretical or rhetorical, since no deities or Mantras from those traditions are incorporated. However, in the *Jñānārṇava*, a scriptural work of this tradition that shows additional elements not found in the system set out in the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* and *Yoginīhr̥daya* and which is no doubt later than both of them for this reason and because it is not cited by the early exegetes,²⁴⁸ an attempt has been made to provide a more graphic expression of this belief by working the goddesses of the four Āmnāyas into the liturgy as subordinates of Tripurā. What is striking in this, however, is not the mere fact that this has been done but the fact that in doing so the redactors of the tradition reveal that by their time while the concept of the four Āmnāyas was alive only the Paścimāmnāya and Uttarāmnāya out of the four identified

see SANDERSON 2009a, p. 47, fn. 13 citing the *Kumārīkhaṇḍa* of the *Manthānabhairava* on 'adepts of the scriptural traditions of the Nine Nityās' (*navanītyāgamajñāh*) and p. 48, fn. 15, citing the *Siddhakhāṇḍa* of the same on that cult. Abhinavagupta refers to adepts of the Nityātantra(s) (*nityātantravidah*) in *Tantrāloka* 28.123b.

²⁴⁷ *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* 1.12cd: *caturājñākośabhūtām naumi śrītripurām aham* 'I venerate Tripurā as the precious core of the Four Āmnāyas'; Vidyānanda thereon, p. 41, ll. 7–8: *iyam ca vidyā caturāmnāyasādhārany api* 'And this Mantra [of Tripurasundarī], although common to [all four Āmnāyas] ...'; and p. 65, ll. 8–9: *pūrvaṃ caturājñākośabhūtām ity uktam. atra sṛṣṭyādīpadena caturāmnāyarūpatvaṃ cakrasya lakṣyate* 'Above it was stated that she is the precious core of the Four Āmnāyas. Here it is indicated that the [Śrī]cakra embodies these same four in the form of [its four segments, namely those of] Emission[, Stasis, Withdrawal,] and [the Nameless]'. See also Bhāskaraṛāya thereon, p. 20, ll. 5–6: *athavā caturājñās catvāra āmnāyāḥ pūrvadakṣiṇapaścimotarākhyās teṣāṃ evottamatvāt prādhānyeneha nirdeśaḥ* 'Or *caturājñā-* means the four Āmnāyas, namely the Pūrva, Dakṣiṇa, Paścima, and Uttara. These are the primary referent here because it is they that are the highest'; and Amṛtānanda, *Saubhāgyasudhodaya* 2.1ab: *saiva mahāvidyātmā mātā caturanvayaikavīsṛāntih* 'This same Mother, who is the Supreme Vidyā, is the single ground in which the Four Anvayas come to rest'.

²⁴⁸ A lower limit of AD 1310/11 will be provided for this work if a manuscript of it in the Nepalese National Archives (NAK 1-1580; NGMPP A 1263/34: *Jñānārṇavanītyātantra*) was indeed completed as has been reported (<<http://catalogue.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de/titlelist>>) in that year (ns 431). I have not yet examined it.

by the *Ciñciñimata* were familiar to them as active traditions. This we can infer from the fact that Kubjikā and Kālī are given there as the goddesses of those two Āmnāyas with their root-Mantras correctly recorded,²⁴⁹ while the other two Āmnāyas are filled in with goddesses and Mantras created or adopted for this purpose without precedent in those traditions as evidenced in early sources, namely with Unmanī in the Pūrvāmnāya and Bhoginī in the Dakṣiṇāmnāya.²⁵⁰ We may surmise that the Dakṣiṇāmnāya had disappeared from view through its transformation into this ascendant cult of Tripurasundarī. As for the Pūrvāmnāya, the earliest and least elaborate of these systems, it had perhaps died out as an independent tradition, outmoded in the face of these later Śākta developments.

Both this claim to transcend the four Āmnāyas and the obsolescence of the old Dakṣiṇāmnāya and Pūrvāmnāya are confirmed by another and independent account of the Āmnāya system found in the *Parātantra*, also referred to as the *Karavīrayāga*, a work probably composed within the Newar community of the Kathmandu valley at some time during the Malla period (AD 1200–1768), probably in its latter half.²⁵¹ It presents the four Āmnāyas as the traditions of the goddesses that preside over them and these goddesses as seated on lion-thrones (*siṃhāsanaṃ*) located in the corresponding cardinal directions. Tripurā is introduced after chapters devoted to those four as the goddess of the upper lion-throne (*ūrdhvasiṃhāsanaṃ*), as venerated in all the Āmnāyas and as embodied in [the teachings of] all four of the cardinal thrones, that is to say, as the goddess of the Ūrdhvāmnāya ‘the Upper Āmnāya’,²⁵² transcending them just as the Siddhānta claimed its superiority within the Mantramārga by making its scriptures come forth from the mouth of Īśāna, the upward-gazing, upper face of Sadāśiva, and the Vāmatantra, Dakṣiṇatantras, Gāruḍatantras, and Bhūtantras, from the mouths of the faces below that look out to the four directions.²⁵³ And here too, as in the

²⁴⁹ *Jñānārṇava* 9.62b–68.

²⁵⁰ *Jñānārṇava* 9.58–62a.

²⁵¹ SANDERSON 2004, pp. 366–372. The alternative name is seen in the final colophon, f. 45v5–6: *iti mahāśrotasi śīracchede mahākavīrayāge parātantra kālīkulakramaḥ samāptaḥ*.

²⁵² *Parātantra* f. 13r2–3 (5.1–2a): *ūrdhvasiṃhāsanaṃ vakṣye trailokyaiśvāryapūrakam | sarvacakreśvarī nityā sarvāmnāyaprapūjitā || sarvasiṃhāsanaṃ*; and the chapter colophon, f. 17v5: *iti śrīparātantra śrīvidyā-ūrdhvāmnāyaḥ*. That the worship of Tripurā is the Ūrdhvāmnāya is standard doctrine among the Newars, as can be seen from such anonymous Paddhatis as the *Ūrdhvāmnāya-pavitṛārohaṇadamanārohaṇapaddhati*.

²⁵³ The doctrine that five rather than four Āmnāyas, from the Pūrvāmnāya to the Ūrdhvāmnāya, came forth from the five faces of Śiva, as in the case of the streams of the Mantramārga, is seen, for example, in the *Paraśurāmakaḥpasūtra* (*Dikṣavidhi, Sūtra 2–3*): *bhagavān paramaśivabhaṭṭārakah ...saṃvinmayyā bhagavatya bhairavyā svātmābhinnayā prṣṭaḥ pañcabhir mukhaiḥ pañcāmnāyān paramārthasārabhūtān *prañināya* (corr. : *prañanāya* Ed.). *tatrāyaṃ siddhāntaḥ* ‘Lord Paramaśiva, questioned by the Goddess Bhairavī, by the awareness that is his own self, promulgated through his five faces the five Āmnāyas as the very essence of ultimate truth. In these what follows is the definitive doctrine’.

Jñānārṇava, it is very clear that the redactor knew only the Paścimāmnāya and Uttarāmnāya as living traditions in the lineage of those outlined in the *Ciñciṇīmata*. It gives an accurate account of the cult of Kubjikā and Navātmabhairava for the first and of those of Siddhalakṣmī and Guhyakālī for the second. But for the Pūrvāmnāya and Dakṣiṇāmnāya it gives us two goddesses Pūrṇeśvarī and Niśeśvarī that have been concocted, it seems, in order to complete the set of four. For these two goddesses appear in the Śaiva tradition only in this text and its Nepalese derivatives.²⁵⁴ I know no evidence of scriptural production that would attest that these traditions existed at any time in their own right and I consider it improbable that any will surface, though I do not exclude the possibility that we may encounter in the ill-explored mass of the Newars' Śākta Paddhatis evidence of the creation of liturgies for their independent worship after their invention in this artificial context. The *Parātantra* itself suggests their fictitious character by reporting that the devotees of these two goddesses dwell on Plakṣadvīpa, Kuśadvīpa, Śākadvīpa, and Puṣkaradvīpa, that is to say, on four of the six concentric island-continents that the cosmographers of the Purāṇas imagined beyond the salt-water ocean that surrounds Jambudvīpa, the central continent centred on Mt. Meru, within whose southern segment they located their known world.²⁵⁵

The Tantras mentioned here as the two principal scriptural authorities of this neo-Śākta tradition, the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* and the *Yoginīhr̥daya*, came to be considered to be the prior and posterior halves of a single work, the *Vāmakeśvara*, the first devoted to external worship and the second to internal worship or rather to the inner meaning of the ritual, awareness of which was claimed to render the outer ritual effective.²⁵⁶ But the two works are of very different character. While the first is free of doctrinal or soteriological subtlety, the *Yoginīhr̥daya* was composed by an author who sought to encode the ritual system of Tripurā worship set out in the earlier work with the metaphysics of the Kashmirian Śaiva non-dualists.²⁵⁷

²⁵⁴See, e.g., *Karmasāramahātantra* ff. 143r2–147r12. This is undoubtedly a product of the Newars of the late medieval period or later.

²⁵⁵See SANDERSON 2004, p. 368.

²⁵⁶See, for example, Bhāskararāya in his commentary *Setubandha* on *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava*, p. 7, ll. 2–3: *tad idaṃ vāmakeśvaratantram pūrvottaracatuḥśatīyugalātmakam eva manyante* ‘[The learned] consider this *Vāmakeśvaratantra* to consist of two [works], each of four hundred verses, the prior and posterior. At the beginning of his commentary on the *Yoginīhr̥daya*, which for him is the second half of this unitary composition, he declares: *evaṃ sārḍhatrimśadadhikacatuḥśataiḥ ślokair bāhyam eva yāgaṃ prapañcyāntaryāgaṃ prapañcenopadeṣṭukāmaḥ paramaśivas tadviṣayakam devīpraśnam avatārayati* ‘Having thus elaborated external worship alone in 430 and a half verses Paramaśiva, wishing to teach at length the internal worship promulgates the question on this matter addressed to him by the Goddess’. On the relationship between external and internal worship in the Śākta literature of Kashmir see SANDERSON 1995.

²⁵⁷Compare, for example, (1) *yadā sā paramā śaktiḥ svecchayā viśvarūpiṇī || sphurattām ātmanah paśyēt* (*Yoginīhr̥daya* 1.9c–10a) with *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā* 1.5.14 (1.45): *sā sphurattā mahāsa-*

Therefore it cannot have been written before the eleventh century. Indeed the earliest attestations of its existence known to me are a citation of it by Maheśvarānanda (c. AD 1275–1325)²⁵⁸ and the commentary on the text by Amṛtānanda (c. AD 1325–1375), who claims, I propose, that he is the first to have written a commentary on the work²⁵⁹ and was active in Andhra c. AD 1350.²⁶⁰ His predecessor Śivānanda, who flourished around AD 1225–1275,²⁶¹ does not cite the text in his commentary on the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava*, and this would be very surprising if the text had already existed in his time. As for the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava*, we can say at present only that it had been existence for an undetermined period before it received a commentary from the Kashmirian Jayaratha, who flourished under Rājadeva, who ruled from AD 1213 to 1236, but probably not much earlier than the eleventh century.²⁶²

Exegetical Literature of the Kulamārga

For exegesis of the Kulamārga of the Pūrvāmnāya as represented in the literature of the Trika we have the Kashmirian Abhinavagupta's *Tantrāloka*, in particular its 28th and 29th chapters, and Jayaratha's commentary thereon. For the Anuttara sub-system of the Trika, based on the *Parātrimśikā*, also known as the *Parātrīśikā* or *Anuttaratrimśikā*, we have Abhinavagupta's *Parātrimśikāvivarāṇa*, and the 22nd chapter of his *Tantrasāra* corresponding to the 29th of the *Tantrāloka*, in which he deviates from the latter by taking the *Parātrimśikā* rather than the *Mālinīvijayottara* as the basis of his Kaula Paddhati. We also have a number of texts from South India written within the conceptual framework of the Kashmirian Trika that show that this sub-system became established in that region in later times. This is the probable provenance of the commentary *Parātrimśikālaghuvṛtti* or *Anuttaravimarśinī*. That too has been attributed to Abhinavagupta; but the two commentaries, this and Abhinavagupta's much longer and more complex *-vivarāṇa*,

ttā deśakālāviśeṣiṇī | saisā sāratayā proktā hr̥dayaṃ parameṣṭhinaḥ; (2) svecchāviśvamayollekha-khacitam viśvarūpakam | caitanyam ātmano rūpaṃ nisargānandasundaram (1.50) and cidātmabhittau viśvasya prakāśamarśane yadā | karoti svecchayā (1.56abc) with Svachhandoddyota on 2.60–61b: viśvollekhabhittibhūtām icchāśaktim āviśya; Mahānayaṣṭakā 3.73ab: etat svollekhavibhavamayaṃ viśvam svabhāvataḥ; and Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya, Sūtra 3: svecchayā svabhittau viśvam unmlayati.

²⁵⁸ *Mahārthamañjarīparimala*, p. 129 (= *Yoginīhṛdaya* 1.38+40cd).

²⁵⁹ *Yoginīhṛdayadīpikā*, Maṅgala v. 7: *ananyodghāṭitam divyāgamakoṣagr̥hāntaram | udghāṭyate mayedānīm mahārtho gr̥hyatām budhaiḥ* 'I shall now unlock the inner treasury of the divine scriptures that no other has unlocked. May the learned grasp its sublime teaching'.

²⁶⁰ SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 412–415.

²⁶¹ SANDERSON 2007b, p. 416.

²⁶² See SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 383–385 and 418–420. There would be much earlier evidence of the tradition if Tirumūlar's *Tirumantiram*, which draws on this tradition, had been written at any of the early dates assigned to him from the second century to the tenth (e.g. BROOKS 1990, p. 47, claiming the sixth). But see GOODALL 1998, pp. xxxvii–xxxix, fn. 85; 2000, p. 213, fn. 27 and 28; and 2004, pp. xxix–xxx. A date before the thirteenth century is very unlikely in the light of the text's fusion of the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta, the Śākta cult of Tripurā, Kuṇḍalinīyoga, and Vedānta.

are of markedly different intellectual quality and diverge not only in their interpretations but also in their readings.²⁶³ That the *-laghuvṛtti* is a South-Indian work is suggested by its manuscript transmission and by the existence of a body of South-Indian material based on it, namely a commentary (*-laghuvṛttivimarśinī*) by Kṛṣṇadāsa, the successor of Madhurāja/Mādhurācārya (‘the Ācārya of Madurai’),²⁶⁴ a verse commentary, the *Parātrīśikā-tātparyadīpikā*, written in Cidambaram and of unknown authorship,²⁶⁵ and Paddhatis and other ancillary texts that attest to the enduring popularity of a tradition based on this commentary among South-Indian Śākta Śaivas: the *Anuttarasamvidarcanācarcā*, the **Parārcanakrama*,²⁶⁶ the **Parākramavāsanā* in the *Paramaśivādvaitakalpatikā* of Śāmbhavānanda,²⁶⁷ the *Pūrvaparāpūjā*, the *Parāpūjā*, and the *Paraparāpūjā* that are chapters 8, 9, and 11 of the *Ānandakalpavallī* of Maheśvaratejānanda, the *Parāpūjāprayoga*, the *Mahārthamūlasamketasūtra* of Paraśambhudeva, the *Anuttaraprakāśapañcāśikā*, also called *Parāpañcāśikā*, attributed to Ādyanātha, the *Parāprāveśikā* of Nāgānanda, also known as *Svarūpaprakāśikā*,²⁶⁸ with a commentary (*Svarūpavimarśinī*) by one Cidānanda, and another (*Nāgānandasūtravivaraṇa*) by Heddase Hariharasarma written for Basavappa Nāyaka of Kēlaḍi in Karnataka (r. AD 1697–1714),²⁶⁹ the *Anuttarapaddhati* of

²⁶³In the 71 lines of the *-vivarāṇa*’s text of the *Parātrīśikā* and the 72 of the *-laghuvṛtti*’s there are 21 divergences in reading and one of line-order (inversion of 4ab and 4cd). The additional line in the *-laghuvṛtti*’s text (*mantravīryasamāveśaprabhāvān na niyantraṇā*) falls between 18b and 18c of the *-vivarāṇa*’s.

²⁶⁴I have yet to examine this ms. The catalogue entry reports that the author is the pupil of Mādhurācārya, and this succession is also seen in Maṅgala v. 17 of Maheśvaratejānanda’s *Ānandakalpavallī: śrīmādhuramaheśāna*sevānirdvandvamānasah (sevā A : śivo B) | avyāhataśivābhāsaḥ kṛṣṇadāsaḥ prasādatu*; see also here fn. 300 on p. 76. This Mādhurācārya is evidently the Madhurāja/Mādhura of the *Gurunāthaparāmarśa*, vv. 39–46, who describes himself there as an adept of the Parākrama (v. 40: *parākramākrāntaviśvadikkakre | madhurāje mayi*). The belief that this Guru of Madurai was a direct disciple of Abhinavagupta is unfounded (SANDERSON 2007b, p. 381, fn. 486).

²⁶⁵See SANDERSON 1990, p. 33. The variant *Parātrīśikā* goes back to Abhinavagupta, who argues (unconvincingly from the philological point of view) in his *-vivarāṇa* (p. 192, ll. 3–14) that it is this rather than *Parātrīśikā* that is the correct title.

²⁶⁶The **Parārcanakrama* is a thorough prose Paddhati following the *Parātrīśikālaghuvṛtti* and is related to, though much more detailed than, the *Anuttarasamvidarcanācarcā*. My access to it has been through an incomplete copy in whose folios no title appears: the title **Parārcanakrama* is roughly descriptive and ascribed by myself. Other closely related and yet more detailed material, partly in verse and also incomplete, is found later in the same codex.

²⁶⁷Śāmbhavānanda can have written this work no earlier than the sixteenth century, since he quotes the Nimbārka-Vaiṣṇava Keśavakāśmīrin’s *Kramadīpikā* (p. 3: *gopāyati sakalam idaṃ ...*) on p. 275 of his work. Keśava’s dates are far from well-established, but he is not likely to have written earlier than the end of the fifteenth century.

²⁶⁸This work is wrongly attributed to the Kashmirian Kṣemarāja in the edition of the KSTS. It is attributed to Nāgānanda in South-Indian sources; see, e.g., *Paramaśivādvaitakalpatikā*, p. 181 (= *Parāprāveśikā*, pp. 7–8), *Kāmakalāvilāsacidvallī*, p. 2 (= *Parāprāveśikā*, pp. 1–2). The title *Svarūpaprakāśikā* is seen in GOML R. 2159. GOML D. 15328 and TRIVANDRUM 1075A, COL. 247A call the work *Svarūpapraveśikā*. The second identifies the author as Bhaṭṭanāga.

²⁶⁹MYSORE E 40751, MS B. 168; see MYSORE vol. 12, Appendix 1, Śaiva, pp 18–19. That gives the

the *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra* with the commentary (*Saubhāgyasudhodaya*) of Rāmeśvara (AD 1831), the parallel *Parāpaddhati* of Umānanda's *Nityotsava* (AD 1745), the *Parāmantramāhātmya*, and the *Parāstuti* of Sahajānanda.²⁷⁰ There is also another probably South-Indian commentary (*-vivarāṇa*) on the *Parātrimśikā*, written by one by Sadānanda.²⁷¹

This tradition also reached Orissa, since it is the content of the *Parājapavidhi* and *Parāmantravidhi* in the *Āṅgirasakalpa* collection of the Oriya Paippalādin Atharvavedins.²⁷² As to whether it reached Orissa through the spread of the tradition from the south up through Andhra or by some other route cannot be settled beyond doubt from the evidence now known to me. But the numerous correspondences in details of procedure between these texts and the South-Indian Parākrama, not least the use of the visualization-verse for the goddess Parā seen in those texts, make the former scenario the more probable.²⁷³ The least probable is transmission from Kashmir, since the part of the *Parātrimśikā* incorporated in the Orissan *Parājapavidhi* agrees with the South-Indian version of the text rather than the Kashmirian transmitted in Abhinavagupta's *-vivarāṇa*.²⁷⁴

For the Uttarāmnāya, including the Krama, we have no running commentaries on its scriptures, but we do have a rich literature of professed human authorship setting out its ritual and meditational disciplines. That composed by Kashmirians, principally the three texts that share the title *Mahānaya-prakāśa* (one anonymous, and the other two by Kulācārya Arṇasiṃha and Rājānaka Śitikaṇṭha) and the *Chummāsamketaparakāśa* of Niṣkriyānanda, has been covered in some detail in another publication.²⁷⁵ From Coḷanāḍu in South India we have the *Mahārthamañjarī* in Māhārāṣṭrī Prakrit with an elaborate Sanskrit auto-commentary (*-parimala*) by Maheśvarānanda (c. AD 1300), and, of unknown provenance, the *Cidgaganacandrikā* of Śrīvatsa.²⁷⁶

title *Svarūpaparakāśikā*. Hariharāśarman states that he wrote 'for the pleasure of king Basava, who was the full moon to the ocean that was Keḷaḍī-Cannamāmbā' (*varakeḷaḍīcannamāmbāmburāśeḥ | pūrṇendos tuṣṭivrdhdyai basavanrpateḥ*). There were three Basavas among the rulers of the Kēḷaḍī Nāyaka dynasty. But the reference to Cannamāmbā reveals that the king in question was the Basava (Basavappa, Basappa) who ruled from 1697 to 1714, since he was the [adopted] son of Cannamāmbā/Cannamā. For his adoptive parentage see SEWELL 1910. From Hariharāśarman we also have a commentary on the *Virūpākṣapañcāśikā*. Concerning Cidānanda, the author of the other commentary, I can at present report no more than his name.

²⁷⁰The *Parāstuti* is included for recitation in the *Parāpaddhati* of Umānanda, p. 151.

²⁷¹Cf. here fn. 294 on p. 75.

²⁷²These Orissan materials have been introduced, edited, and translated with annotation in SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 239–254.

²⁷³For such correspondences see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 242–255, fns 102–106, 108, 110–111, 114–115, 121, 125.

²⁷⁴SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 254–255, fn. 125.

²⁷⁵SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 260–370.

²⁷⁶For the dates of Śrīvatsa, after c. AD 1100 and before c. 1300, and Maheśvarānanda see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 412–416.

From Nepal we have Vimalaprabodha's *Kālīkulakramārcana*, an exhaustive Paddhati for the Krama worship of Guhyakālī, and the *Mahārthakramapañcakamantrapaddhati*, which gives the Mantra-text of this same liturgy.²⁷⁷

For the cult of the goddess Kubjikā in the Paścimāmnāya we have in Nepalese manuscripts practical commentaries on both the *Kubjikāmata* (-*laghuṭippaṇī*) and the *Ṣaṭśahasra-Kulālikāmnāya* (-*ṭippaṇī*)²⁷⁸ and at least three detailed Paddhatis by learned scholars: (1) the *Nityāhnikatilaka* of Jaya, son of Śrīkaṇṭha, which reaches us in Nepalese and East-Indian manuscripts, the earliest dated in AD 1268/9, (2) the *Nityaparakāśa* of Vīracandra, composed in AD 1072/3, with the commentary *Nityaparakāśavivaraṇapañjikā*, also called *Nityakaumudī*, written by his chief disciple Gaṅgādhara at the request of the latter's pupil Śambhudatta, the personal physician of the Pāla monarch Rāmapāla (r. c. 1072–1126);²⁷⁹ and (3) the *Śrīmatapaddhati*, also called *Siddhasamānasopānapañkti*, of Jasorāja (Yaśorājacandra), of which we have an incomplete copy in a composite Nepalese codex of the twelfth century and a copy in an East-Indian manuscript dated in year 144 of the era

²⁷⁷This *Mahārthakramapañcakamantrapaddhati* is contained in ULC MS ADD. 1412 ('*Pūjākāṇḍa*').

²⁷⁸See SCHOTERMAN 1982, p. 13, fn. 12–13 for details of the MSS.

²⁷⁹*Nityaparakāśa* A f. 1v3: *arbudeśimṛṇālākhyāv āryatātau namāmy ahaṃ | guruṃ svarodayaṃ bhaktyā ... ato nityaparakāśo yaṃ vīracandrena likhyate* 'With devotion I bow to my noble parents Arbudeśī and Mṛṇāla, and to my Guru Svarodaya ... Therefore Vīracandra is writing this *Nityaparakāśa*'; *Nityakaumudī* A f. 125r: *caturnavatyuttaranavaśatavarśasaṃkhye śakanṛpatikāle mādhamāse vaiśākhe kṛto 'yaṃ nityaparakāśa<h>* 'This *Nityaparakāśa* was composed in the month Mādhava (= Vaiśākha), in the year 994 of the Śaka king's era'; *Nityakaumudī* B f. 1v: *guroḥ śrīvīracandrasya *paścimānvayasamgraham (samgrahaṃ corr. : samgraha Cod.) | nityaparakāśam vivṛṇomy ahaṃ gaṅgādharaḥ kṛtī || *śrīrāmapālanṛpatiprāñcāryeṇa (nṛpati conj. : nṛpatiḥ Cod.) śambhunā | yācitāḥ śiṣyakṛpayā kṛtavān aham udyamam* 'I, the scholar Gaṅgādhara, shall explain the *Nityaparakāśa*, a compendium of the Paścimānvaya, of the Guru Vīracandra. I have made this effort out of compassion for my pupils, requested by Śambhu[datta], the physician of king Rāmapāla'; *Nityakaumudī* A f. 252v1–2, B ff. 146v4–147r3: **cakre svārodayir (conj. : cekresvarodayir B : cakreśārodayir A) yaṃ ṣaḍavayavaparo *daivavid (em. : devavid A : devavid B) vīracandras *tasyāntevāsīmukhyo (A : tathyāntevāsīmukhyo B) vivaraṇam akarod yatra gaṅgādhārākhyah | *yac chrotā (B : yacchobha A) *gauḍarājapraṇayapadabhiṣak (gauḍarāja conj. : gauḍarājah AB) śambhudatto 'śya śiṣyah so 'yaṃ *śrīśailadevīkulasamayamayah (samaya A : sama B) ko 'pi nityaparakāśah* 'This is the extraordinary *Nityaparakāśa* that embodies the Kula system of [Kubjikā,] the goddess of Śrīśaila, which the astrologer Vīracandra, disciple of Svarodaya, devoted to *[Kubjikā's Mantra] of six parts (conj.), has composed, and on which his chief disciple Gaṅgādhara has composed [this] commentary that his own disciple Śambhudatta, the physician dear to the ruler of Gauḍa, will study'. We learn in *Nityaparakāśa* A f. 1v3 that Vīracandra's Guru was called Svarodaya. I have therefore rejected the readings *svārodayir* and *śārodayir* in *Nityakaumudī* B and A and conjectured *svārodayir*, taking that as a patronymic meaning 'son of Svarodaya' (*svarodayasyāpatyam*) by *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4.1.95 and understanding this as figurative for 'disciple of Svarodaya'. For another case of such a figurative patronymic we have *saumataḥ* in the meaning 'disciple of Sumati' in *Tantrāloka* 37.61: **śrīsaumataḥ (conj. : śrīsomataḥ Ed.) sakalavit kila śambhunāthaḥ*. For the reasons for my emendation of *somataḥ* to *saumataḥ* see SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 132–133, fn. 106. I conjecture that the unidentified entity described here as *ṣaḍavayava*- 'having six parts' is the root-Mantra of Kubjikā, also called the Samayamantra, whose six auxiliary Mantras (*aṅgamantrāḥ*) are formed from its six successive segments. For that Mantra and its auxiliaries see GOUDRIAAN 1986, pp. 142–145.

of Lakṣmana[sena], that is to say, in AD 1263 or 1252.²⁸⁰

From the Dakṣiṇāmnāya as defined by the *Ciñciṇimata*, that is to say, from the cult of Kāmeśvarī attended by Kāmadeva and the eleven Nityās, no exegetical work has come to light. But from the Kaula cult of Tripurasundarī that developed from it have such an abundance of post-scriptural sources that only the most influential will be mentioned. We have commentaries on the *Nityāśodaśikārṇava* by the South-Indians Śivānanda (c. AD 1225–1275) (*-rjuvimarśinī*), and Vidyānanda (*-artharatnāvalī*), probably his near contemporary,²⁸¹ and by the Kashmirian Rājānaka Jayaratha (c. 1250) (*Vāmakeśvarīmatavivarāṇa*), a commentary on the *Yoginīhr̥daya* by the South-Indian Amṛtānanda (c. 1325–1375), and a commentary (*-setubandha*) on both Tantras, presented as the prior and posterior divisions of a single work, the *Vāmakeśvara*, by the Maharashtrian Deśastha brahmin Bhāskararāya (AD 1690–1785). From Nāgabhaṭṭa we have the Paddhati *Tripurāsārasamuccaya*, from Śivānanda, who cites Nāgabhaṭṭa, two Paddhatis, *Subhagodaya* and *Subhagodayavāsanā*, one covering the ritual procedures and the other giving their inner meanings (*vāsanā*), the contemplation of which is held to animate the external actions. We also have a liturgical hymn of his: the *Saubhāgyahṛdayastotra*. From a Vidyānandanātha, who is probably identical with the Vidyānanda who wrote the *-artharatnāvalī*, we have the Paddhati *Jñānadīpavimarśinī* of which we have a Nepalese manuscript dated in AD 1382/3,²⁸² and from Amṛtānanda the Paddhati *Saubhāgyasudhodaya* and a liturgical hymn, the *Cidvilāsa*. From his Guru Puṇyānanda we have the *Kāmakaḷāvilāsa*, with a commentary (*-cidvallī*) by Naṭanānanda.

We also have texts from the Ṣaḍanvayaśāmbhava system of worship, a secondary variant of the Paścimāmnāya, not mentioned by the *Ciñciṇimata*, that flourished in conjunction with the cult of Tripurasundarī.²⁸³ We have its scripture *Śambhunirṇaya* and by way of exegesis a commentary (*-dīpikā*)

²⁸⁰These two manuscripts are MS 511 of the Kesar Library, Kathmandu (NGMPP C 48/2) and NAK 3/401, NGMPP A 998/3. The latter's colophon (f. 58v1–6): *gopātmajaśrīyasorājaviracitāyām siddhasaṃtānasopānapañkyabhīdhānāyām siddhamārgaparakāśikāyām śrīmat<a>paddhatyām dī-ṣṭivijñānavinirṇayo nāma aṣṭādaśamaḥ paṭalāḥ. iti siddhasaṃtānasopānapañkyabhīdhānā śrīmata-paddhati<ḥ> samāptā. bālavāgīśvarākhyasya bālayogīśvarasya ca | śrīyasorājacandrasya kṛtir eṣā mahātmanaḥ || śubham astu. la saṃ 144 āṣāḍhaśudī 11 ravivāre.*

²⁸¹Vidyānanda's account of the Guru lineage ends with Vāsudeva (*-artharatnāvalī*, p. 223), the immediate predecessor of Śivānanda (*-rjuvimarśinī*, p. 224).

²⁸²*Jñānadīpavimarśinī* f. 115v1–3: *ṣaḍāmnāyamahāpadmavānaṣaṇḍavīhāriṇā | śrīvidyānandanā-thena paraḥaṃsena nirmīṭā || jñānadīpavimarśinī samāptā. naipālavatsare yāte tryadhike śatapa-ñcake | bhādrāmāse site pakṣe dvādaśyām kujavāsare || paddha[t]is tripurādevyā jñānadīpavimarśi-ṇī | lekha<ṃ> sampūrṇam āpannā pañcavargaphalaprādā. The identity of this Vidyānanda with the author of the commentary is supported by the evidence that the former shares the latter's Guru lineage exactly, ending with Vāsudeva (the Guru of Śivānanda); see the end of the *Jñānadīpavimarśinī*'s *Dikṣāpaddhati* (Section 21), which agrees in all details and almost verbatim with *-artharatnāvalī*, p. 223, ll. 13–11.*

²⁸³On the Ṣaḍanvayaśāmbhava or Śāmbhava system see SANDERSON 1988, p. 687; and 2002, pp. 2–3.

on that text by Śivānanda, the author of the *Rjuvimarśinī* commentary on the *Nityāśoḍaśikārṇava*. We also have for this system chapter 10 of the *Ānandakalpavallī* of Maheśvaratejānanda, the *Ṣaḍanvayaśāmbhavakrama* of Umākānta, a disciple of Amṛtānanda,²⁸⁴ and the anonymous *Paddhati Śāmbhavapūjāvidhāna*.²⁸⁵

Salvific Alchemy and Procedures for Victory in Battle

Two further categories of Śaiva Tantric literature may be mentioned. One, the *Rasaśāstra*, teaches an initiatory Tantric alchemical cult for the attainment of immortality and liberation through the use of mercurial elixirs, and is found in such Tantras as the *Rasārṇava*, the *Ānandakanda*, and the *Rasaśvacchanda*,²⁸⁶ and such scripture-based works as the *Rasaratnasamuccaya* of Vāgbhaṭa.²⁸⁷ The other teaches rituals and prognosticatory procedures to secure victory in battle. Its fundamental scripture is the *Yuddhajayārṇava*, which reaches us in a manuscript of AD 1061. Based on this source we have Narapati's *Narapatijayacaryāsvarodaya*, completed in Aṇahillapattana, the capital of the Caulukyās in northern Gujarat, during the reign of Ajayapāla (AD 1173/4–1176/7), and the anonymous *Samgrāmvijayodaya*, which claims to have been extracted from the *Yuddhajayārṇava* as its essence.²⁸⁸ Material from this tradition also found its way into the *Agnipurāṇa* as its chapters 123 to 150.

This martial tradition might have been mentioned above in the com-

²⁸⁴This contains quotations bearing on the specifics of this tradition not only from the *Śambhunirṇaya*, but also from a *Kubjikāmata* that is other than the original text of this name, the *Śrīmatapañcaka*, the *Śāmbhavatantra*, and the *Ānandakalpalatikā* (= *Ānandakalpavallī* of Maheśvaratejānanda). See also the *Saubhāgyavardhanī* and other commentaries on *Saundaryalaharī* 14, quoting this same *Kubjikāmata* in the context of the Śāmbhava system.

²⁸⁵The popularity of this system in southern India is evident from that fact that it has been worked into the *Saundaryalaharī*, the famous Smārta Śākta hymn of devotion to Tripurasundarī. The importance of that hymn in the Smārta brahmin community of south India is evident from its attribution to Śaṅkara, the famous Vedāntin seen as the founder of the religious tradition of that community, and from the fact that it has attracted a large number of commentaries. Moreover, the fact that this tradition of Śākta devotion was taken up by the Smārtas in a purified form that removed its non-orthoprax character is strong evidence that these Kaula traditions were far from marginal.

²⁸⁶This tradition offers liberation in life, defined as a state of identity with Śiva experienced by one whose body has become immune to ageing and death through an alchemical transmutation that parallels that of base metals into gold. See, e.g., *Rasārṇava* 1.8cd, defining *jīvanmuktiḥ* as *ajarāmaradehasya śivatādātmyavedanam* 'the experience of identity with Śiva of one whose body has become immortal and unageing'. This claim to bestow liberation is, we may presume, why this form of Śaivism has been included under the heading *Rasaśvaradarśana* in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, Sāyana-Mādhava's fourteenth-century review of India's soteriologies; see p. 205: *na ca rasaśāstram dhātuvādārtham eveti mantavyaṃ dehavedhadhvārā mukter eva paramaprayojanatvāt* 'Nor should one think that *Rasaśāstra* is solely for the occult art of the transmutation of base metals (*dhātuvādah*). For its ultimate purpose is liberation through the transmutation of the body'.

²⁸⁷For an overview of the Tantric alchemical literature see WHITE 1996, pp. 78–170.

²⁸⁸*Samgrāmvijayodaya* 1.6: *yuddhajayārṇavaśāstrād uddhṛtya manāk tato mayāryābhiḥ | kriyate śāstram sārām samgrāmvijayodayaṃ nāma*.

pany of the Bhūtatantras and Gāruḍatantras, since like those traditions it is ancillary to the main Śaiva systems, and indeed is covered with them in the Keralan works *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* and *Tantrasārasaṅgraha*. It has been placed here, as has the tradition of tantric alchemy, because the cultic background on which both draw is that of the Kulamārga. Thus in the *Rasārṇava* and *Rasaratnasamuccaya* Kaula practice is rejected but Kaula terminology is frequently used and the pantheon draws on the Kaula cults. The iconography of Rasabhairava and Rasāṅkuṣā, the central syzygy, reveal them to be ectypes of Svachchandabhairava and Tripurasundarī, and their innermost circuit of attendant deities comprises Mālinī, Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā,²⁸⁹ the core triad of the Trika with Mālinī as the transcendent fourth.²⁹⁰ Also present is the Vidyā of the Paścimāmnāya's goddess Kubjikā.²⁹¹ The *Yuddhajayārṇava* too requires the worship of Kaula deities.²⁹²

Pratyabhijñā and Spanda

The South-Indian authors Śivānanda, Vidyānanda (either one or two), Puṅyānanda, Naṭanānanda, Amṛtānanda, Nāgānanda, Maheśvaratejānanda, Maheśvarānanda, Paraśambhudeva, Śāmbhavānanda, and Sahajānanda, all wrote within the philosophical and soteriological position formulated by Kashmirian Śākta Śaiva scholars during the course of the tenth century and into the early years of the eleventh. That development began with the *Śivadr̥ṣṭi* of Somānanda (fl. c. AD 900–950) and was refined by his pupil Utpaladeva in his commentary on that work, and in four independent treatises, namely the *Siddhitrāyī* (*Īśvarasiddhi*, *Sambandhasiddhi*, and *Ajaḍapramāṭṛsiddhi*), and the *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā*. On the last of these he composed two commentaries: the *Vṛtti*, which survives, and the *Vivṛti*, of which we have only a few fragments. Abhinavagupta, pupil of Utpaladeva's pupil Lakṣmaṇagupta, composed his commentary *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī* on the *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā* and his *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivismarśinī* on the second of Utpaladeva's auto-commentaries. From Abhinavagupta's pupil Kṣemarāja we have the *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya*, in which he relates the doctrine of this philosophical corpus to the non-dualistic practice of his Kaula tradition, drawing primarily on the Krama, which for him is the summit of the Śaiva revelation.²⁹³ On the *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā* we also have a commentary (*Pratyabhijñākaumudī*) by a Bhaṭṭāraka Sundara, a Kashmirian

²⁸⁹ *Rasārṇava* 2.62–73b; cf. *Rasaratnasamuccaya* 6.24–42 (lacking the four beginning with Mālinī).

²⁹⁰ Cf. here p. 60.

²⁹¹ *Rasārṇava* 3.9.

²⁹² *Yuddhajayārṇava* B f. 6v2 (2.4cd): *kaulikaṃ tu kramaṃ pūjya kulakūṭasamanvitam* 'After making offerings to the Kaula [deity-]series together with the Kulakūṭa ...'. In the terminology of the Paścimāmnāya the Kulakūṭa is the Kaula seed-syllable HSKHPHREM; see *Ṣaṭsāhasra-Kulālikāmnāya-ṭippanī* f. 218v6–7: *teṣāṃ maṅḍalānāṃ pūjā kulakūṭena mantreṇa. kulakūṭaṃ hskhphrem.*

²⁹³ *Svacchandodyota* vol. 4 (Āhnikā 8), p. 26, l. 13: *ā *vedebhyaḥ* (em. : *devebhyaḥ* Ed.) *kramāntaṃ nikhilam ...etat | śāstram* 'This entire teaching, from the Vedas to the Krama,'.

devotee of Tripurasundarī, and another by a certain Sadānanda (*Īśvarapratyabhijñātātparyānvayadīpikā*), probably a South-Indian.²⁹⁴ On the *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvīmarśinī* we have two commentaries, one, the *Bhāskarī*, written by the Kashmirian Bhāskarakaṇṭha towards the end of the seventeenth century, and the other, an anonymous *-vyākhyā*.²⁹⁵ The manuscript of the latter does not reveal the author's identity. But he is evidently a South-Indian, since the sources that he quotes closely match those of other works of this tradition in the Tamilian region, such as the *Paramaśivādvaitakalpalatikā* of Śāmbhavānanda and the *Mahārthamañjarīparimala* of Maheśvarānanda; and he quotes South-Indian works not known outside that region until recent times, such as the *Paryantapañcāsikā*, the *Parātrimśikālaghuvṛtti*, and an unnamed work by Vādīpralayabhairava,²⁹⁶ who is no doubt the Vādibhairava mentioned as a propagator of the Pratyabhijñā doctrine and as one of the teachers of the 'Guru of Madurai' in the opening verses of two other works of the Tamil country: the *Ānandakalpavallī* of Maheśvaratejānanda and the *Gurupañktistotra*.²⁹⁷ Since the author of the *-vyākhyā* quotes the *Mahārthamañjarī*, he cannot have been active before the fourteenth century.²⁹⁸

Also influential on those assimilating the Kashmirian Śaiva non-dualism and its terminology were the *Śivasūtra*, the *Spandakārikā*, and their commentaries by Kṣemarāja and others, these texts like the *Pratyabhijñā* corpus representing an attempt to establish a doctrine that transcends the liturgical and devotional specifics of such systems as the Trika and the Krama.²⁹⁹ Among the texts of this corpus is a work by a South-Indian: the *Śivasūtravārttika* of Varadarāja, also called Kṛṣṇadāsa, which is a paraphrase in verse

²⁹⁴I have yet to read this second commentary and report here no more than its title and authorship as recorded in MYSORE vol. 12, Appendix 1, Śaiva, p. 3. The style of its title (*-tātparya...dīpikā*) is common in South India. The author is probably identical with the Sadānanda who wrote the commentary on the *Parātrimśikā* (see here p. 70).

²⁹⁵On the date of Bhāskarakaṇṭha see SANDERSON 2007b, p. 424.

²⁹⁶*Īśvarapratyabhijñāvīmarśinīvyākhyā*, pp. 20–21: ... *iti śrīmadvādīpralayabhairavoktanīyā*. The *Paryantapañcāsikā* is quoted on pp. 2, 43, and 51, and the *Parātrimśikālaghuvṛtti* on pp. 4, 7, 10, and 11. The *Paryantapañcāsikā*, like the *Parātrimśikālaghuvṛtti*, has been ascribed to Abhinavagupta. The only known witness, from which V. Raghavan edited the text, is a palm-leaf ms in the Malayalam script in Trivandrum, and the ascription to Abhinavagupta rests on nothing but a scribal statement in that ms after the last verse: *paripūrṇā kṛtir iyaṃ śrīmadabhinavaguptanāthasya paryantapañcāsikā nāma*.

²⁹⁷*Ānandakalpavallī*, Maṅgala v. 15: *śrīvādibhairavasvāmināyako dayadeśikāḥ (vādibhairava em. : pādabhairava B : vādināthabhairava A • svāmināyako conj. : svādunāyako B : svādunāyiko A) trayo yasya prasannā me *sa prasīdatu mādihurāḥ (conj. : suprasīdantu mādihurāḥ AB); *Gurupañktistotra*: *śrīvādibhairavasvāmināyako dayadeśikāḥ (vādibhairava em. : vādijainava Cod. • svāmināyako dayadeśikāḥ conj. : svāmanāyako bhayadeśikāḥ Cod.) trayo 'pi me prasīdantu pratyabhijñāpravartakāḥ.

²⁹⁸*Īśvarapratyabhijñāvīmarśinīvyākhyā*, p. 43: *attā khu vīsamūlaṃ tattha pamāṇaṃ na kovi *atthei* (corr. : *atthei* Cod.) *iti śrīmahārthamañjarīyām*. This is verse 3ab.

²⁹⁹For a brief survey of the texts of the Spanda literature see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 400–409.

of Kṣemarāja's prose commentary (-*vimarśinī*) on the *Śivasūtra*.³⁰⁰

These doctrines of the Pratyabhijñā and Spanda texts could then be applied, and were applied, to the exegesis of other Tantric traditions in Kashmir and beyond, notably the cults of Svachchanda and Amṛteśvara, the Trika, the Krama, the cult of Tripurasundarī, the Ṣaḍanvayaśāmbhava variant of the Paścimāmnāya, the Vīraśaivism of the *Siddhāntaśikhāmaṇi* of Śivayogin, also called Reṇukācārya, and its commentary *Tattvapradīpikā* by Maritōṅṭa-dārya,³⁰¹ and even beyond Śaivism, in the South-Indian Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇava system seen in the *Lakṣmītantra* and *Ahīrbudhnyasamhitā*.³⁰²

Non-Saiddhāntika Śaiva Hymnography

Also instrumental in propagating the new Śākta Śaiva non-dualism of the Kashmirians among non-Saiddhāntika Śaivas of all liturgical persuasions was a literature of devotional hymns (*stotram*, *stutiḥ*, *stavaḥ*) supported by learned commentaries. Notable are the *Bahurūpagarbhastotra* with the commentary of Anantaśakti, the hymn-collections *Stavacintāmaṇi* of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa and *Śivastotrāvalī* of Utpaladeva, on both of which we have commentaries by Kṣemarāja, the *Sāmbapañcāśikā* with a commentary by the same, and the *Virūpākṣapañcāśikā* with commentaries by Vidyācakravartin and Heddase Hariharaśarman.³⁰³

Later Developments

The map of Śaiva literature outlined here holds for the period up to about the twelfth century, though many of its elements continued, as we have seen, to produce texts long after that. But it should not be thought that the twelfth century marked the end of the Śaivas' capacity for innovation.

In the *Padyavāhinī* of Śaṅkara, a South-Indian work probably of the first half of the fourteenth century, we encounter a novel form of syncretistic Śākta devotion in which the cult of Tripurasundarī, the Anuttara's cult of Parā, the Ṣaḍanvayaśāmbhava variant of the cult of Kubjikā, and the pantheon of the Krama system, that is to say, the elements that as distinct systems constitute the Śākta domain known to Śivānanda and Maheśvarānanda, are woven together into a single course of regular and occasional worship.³⁰⁴

³⁰⁰ *Śivasūtravārttika*, p. 55, vv. 211–215. He describes himself there as the liberated successor of Madhurāja (/Mādhura), an ascetic of Madurai (to whom the *Gurunāthaparāmarśa* is attributed), whom he describes as an adept of the Anuttara sub-system of the Trika: *parākramahathākṛāntaṣaṭ-triṃsattattvasampadām* (v. 212cd). On this succession see also here fn. 264 on p. 69.

³⁰¹ For evidence of this influence see here fn. 344 on p. 84.

³⁰² On the Śākta Śaiva doctrinal base of these two Vaiṣṇava texts see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 35–38.

³⁰³ For the Śaiva hymnography of Kashmir see now STAINTON 2013. On Heddase Hariharaśarman see here fn. 269 on p. 69. On Vidyācakravartin see LAWRENCE 2008, pp. 3–5, proposing his identity with the fourteenth-century poetician Vidyācakravartin at the court of Hoysaḷa Ballāla III (r. 1291–1342).

³⁰⁴ *Padyavāhinī*, p. 1: *śaṅkaro 'yaṃ dvijaḥ kaś cid vītarāgo viviktadhīḥ | karoti paddhatim padyaiḥ srotasām aikyavāhinīm* 'This Śaṅkara, an enlightened brahmin ascetic, is now going to create in

We have evidence of another such syncretistic development in South India in the literature of a cult of the goddess Lalitā/Kāmākṣī of Kāñcīpuram. Here she is worshipped as Tripurasundarī with ancillary cults of Gaṇapati and the goddesses Mātāṅgī (/Śyāmalā), Vārāhī (/Daṇḍinī), and Parā, the last adopted from of the Anuttara form of the Trika. This was prescribed in the *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra*, which pious tradition holds to be the last and shortest of a series of abridgements of an original *Dattasamhitā* of 18,000 verses.³⁰⁵ We have a Paddhati, the *Nityotsava*, composed in AD 1745 following this *-sūtra* by the Maharashtrian Deśastha brahmin Jagannātha (initiated as Umānandanātha), a disciple of Bhāskararāya, who enjoyed the patronage of the Marāṭha of the Bhonsle dynasty then ruling from Tañjāvūr,³⁰⁶ an extensive commentary (*Saubhāgyasudhodaya*) on the *-sūtra* composed in AD 1831 by the Maharashtrian Deśastha brahmin Rāmeśvara (initiated as Aparājītānandanātha), disciple of a disciple of a disciple of Bhāskararāya,³⁰⁷ and another by the Maharashtrian Koṅkaṇastha brahmin Lakṣmaṇa Rānade (*Sūtratattvavimarśinī*), completed in AD 1889.³⁰⁸ There was also a commentary (*Ratnāloka*) by the Deśastha brahmin Bhāskararāya (initiated as Bhāsurānandanātha), the Guru of Jagannātha. But I do not know of any surviving manuscript of this work.³⁰⁹ The system was provided with less ambiguously

verse a Paddhati that will unite the streams'. I propose the fourteenth century on the following grounds. Śaṅkara incorporates the *Saubhāgyahṛdayastotra* of Śivānanda: *saubhāgyahṛdayaṃ guhyam śivānandena yoginā | samārāadhanapūrtiyarthaṃ smṛtaṃ sakalakāmadam* (p. 38); and *śivānandalatopphullam pratibhāmodabrṃhitam | apūrvam idam amlānaṃ stotrapuṣpaṃ vijrmbhate* (p. 39). He also states that he has composed his work after carefully and repeatedly studying the *Hārda* of his Parameṣṭhiguru: *parameṣṭhiguror hārdam ālocyālocya yatnataḥ* (p. 2). If this is the *Saubhāgyahṛdaya* of Śivānanda, as seems very probable, then the term *parameṣṭhiguruḥ* conveys that he was the disciple of a disciple of a disciple of Śivānanda. Since it is probable that Śivānanda was active c. 1225–1275 (SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 412–416), it is probable that Śaṅkara was active in the first half of the fourteenth century. Śivānanda, as shown above, authored works pertaining both to the cult of Tripurasundarī and to the Śaḍanvayaśāmbhava system. Maheśvarānanda declares himself in the opening verses of his *Mahārthamañjarīparimala*, a work of the Krama system, to be the recipient of two Kaula transmissions (*ovallih*): that of the Anuttara and that of the *saubhāgyaśāmbhavasukham* (v. 5). The latter term is evidently a Dvandva compound denoting the pairing of the two cults of Tripurasundarī (Saubhāgya) and Kubjikā (the Śaḍanvayaśāmbhava).

³⁰⁵This myth of derivation is related in *Tripurārahasya*; see Mahadeva Sastri in *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra*, introduction, pp. ix–xi.

³⁰⁶Son of a minister of Venkoji/Ekoji, the first Marāṭha ruler of Tañjāvūr, he also wrote the *Śarabharājavilāsa*, a poem in praise of Venkoji's son and successor Serfoji/Śarabhoji I (r. AD 1675–1728), and the drama *Ratimanmatha*.

³⁰⁷On the dates of Jagannātha and Rāmeśvara and their being Maharashtrian [Deśastha] brahmins see SANDERSON 1990, p. 81. The Tañjāvūr Marāṭha kingdom brought about the migration to this region of many Maharashtrian administrators, scholars, soldiers, and noblemen, and as a result of this Marāṭha hegemony, which lasted from AD 1674 to 1855, when Tañjāvūr was annexed by the British, an archaic dialect of Marāṭhī (Tañjāvūrī Marāṭhī) is still the first language of more than 3% of the population of Kumbhakonam and Tañjāvūr.

³⁰⁸On this commentary, which I have not yet read, see Mahadeva Sastri in *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra*, introduction, pp. ix–x.

³⁰⁹It is referred to by Jagannātha in *Nityotsava*, p. 1: *śrīguruprokte ratnāloke*.

scriptural status in the *Paramānandanātra* and the *Tripurārahasya* with the minor difference that these works have replaced the Anuttara's goddess Parā with the cognate Bālā form of Tripurasundarī.³¹⁰ The former work has reached us with a commentary (*Saubhāgyānandasamdoha*) by Maheśvarānandanātha, a resident of Banaras, written in AD 1828/9,³¹¹ and the latter with a commentary written in AD 1832 by Śrīnivāsabhaṭṭa of Madurai in the Far South.³¹² Also in this tradition, with Bālā in place of Parā, are the eighteenth-century Paddhati *Saubhāgyakalpadruma* of the Drāviḍa brahmin Lakṣmaṇa (initiated as Mādhavānandanātha) and, following it, the *Mahāyāgapaddhati* of the Drāviḍa brahmin Lakṣmīnātha (initiated as Ambikānandanātha) written at the request of Mahārāja Sawāī Rām Singh II of Jaipur (b. 1833, r. 1835–1880). All the literature of this cult is steeped in the tradition of the Kashmirian Śākta Śaiva non-dualists, and the commentaries frequently cite their works.³¹³ How long before its eighteenth- and nineteenth-century exegesis this syncretistic variant of the cult of Tripurasundarī came into existence is uncertain. But it is probably this or a cult very close to it that is referred to in the sixteenth century in a verse that 'Ratnakheṭa' Śrīnivāsabhaṭṭa has a Śākta named Śaktisiddhānta recite in his allegorical drama *Bhāvanāpuruṣottama*.³¹⁴

Another influential development that is probably to be assigned to a date after the twelfth century is seen in the *Kulārṇava*. This expounds a new form of Kaulism that it refers to as the Ūrdhvāmnāya or Upper Tradition, thereby claiming, like the cult of Tripurasundarī, superiority over the forms of Śākta Śaivism that preceded it. This has little in common with the elaborate pantheons and Mantra-systems of the forms of the Kulamārga reviewed up to this point. For it teaches a radically simplified cult of Ardhanārīśvara with an icon that is a variant of the Trika's Parā (4.112c–113b) but, as its name declares, is half Śiva and half the Goddess. This fusion is also expressed in the system's Mantras. For these are the Prāsādaparā (HSAUṢḤ) and the Parāprāsāda (SHAUṢḤ),³¹⁵ which are the result of fusing the Mantra of Parā (SAUḤ), the high goddess of the Trika, with the Prāsāda (HAUṢḤ), the Mantra

³¹⁰On the close connection between Parā and Bālā see SANDERSON 1990, pp. 48–49.

³¹¹*Saubhāgyānandasamdoha*, closing verse 16: *nandapakṣāṅkajaladhimitābdke kalau*.

³¹²*Tripurārahasyatātparyadīpikā*, p. 452, ll. 3–12.

³¹³See, e.g., *Saubhāgyānandasamdoha*, closing verses 19–20. Śrīnivāsabhaṭṭa too cites works of the Kashmirian tradition in his commentary on the *Tripurārahasya*. In the light of the fact that South-Indian MSS of these works must therefore have been available in the South into the nineteenth century it is somewhat surprising, indeed disappointing, that as yet so few South-Indian MSS of these Kashmirian works have come to light.

³¹⁴*Bhāvanāpuruṣottama* 3.44, p. 103: *bālā mātaṅgakanyā vārāhī cāpi*. Śrīnivāsabhaṭṭa was a poet at the court of Sūrappa, the Nāyaka of Senji (Gingee/Señji) in South Arcot, within the Tuṅḍīra/Tonḍai region of northern Tamilnāḍu. Inscriptions recording Sūrappa Nāyaka as the donor are dated from AD 1547 to AD 1567 (KARASHIMA 2001, pp. 22–24, inscriptions 12–22).

³¹⁵See SANDERSON 1990, p. 41 (2.10.3), citing *Kulārṇava* 4.4–5b.

of Śiva in the Saiddhāntika system on which most of the Saiddhāntika Pad-dhatis are based.³¹⁶ However, apart from the Mantra there is no discernible connection with the Trika and certainly no trace of awareness of the distinctive doctrines of the Kashmirian non-dualistic exegesis of that tradition that permeated the South-Indian exegesis of the cult of Tripurasundarī and related systems down to recent times. The latest stratum of the South-Indian Śākta literature takes it into account by including it in a classification of the Mantra-pantheon into six Āmnāyas. In this the *Kulārṇava* tradition is accommodated in the Ūrdhvāmnāya division with a yet higher division, the Anuttarāmnāya ‘the Ultimate Tradition’, ranked above it and populated with Mantras that include those proper to the worship of Tripurasundarī.³¹⁷

It was also during this period that there emerged out of the Kulamārga the tradition later known as the Nāth Sampradāya, comprising lineages of Śākta-Śaiva ‘Kāpālikas’ claiming spiritual descent from Gorakṣanātha (Gorakhnāth), whom they venerate as a disciple of Matsyendranātha, the Macchandanātha of the Pūrvāmnāya, the propagator of the Kulamārga during the present age of Kali.³¹⁸ The literature of this vigorous tradition, which appears to have

³¹⁶This system is that of the *Dviśatika* and *Sārdhatrīśatika* recensions of the *Kālotara*. For its Mūlamantra HAUM, the Niṣkala Prāsāda, see, for example, BRUNNER 1963, p. xxxiii; the Keralan *Tantrasārasaṃgraha* 23.53ab (p. 294), *Śāradātīlaka* 18.49ab and Rāghavabhaṭṭa thereon; *Sārdhatrīśati-Kālotara* 19.4cd and Rāmakaṇṭha thereon; *Jñānarātnāvalī*, p. 10; *Śaivāgamanibandhana* p. 17 (2.2): *sāntaṃ bindusamāyuktaṃ caturdaśakalānvitam | prāsādabījam uddiṣṭaṃ śivasya paramātmanah*.

³¹⁷See the detailed treatment of the Mantras of the six Āmnāyas and Gurumaṇḍala in (i) two chapters attributed to the *Parānandanātra* (IFP MS T. 578i); (ii) two chapters attributed to the *Mahālakṣmīratnakośa*; (iii) the 22nd chapter (Kusuma) and the last section of the 21st (Khaṇḍa 3, ff. 32v3–49r11) of the *Tripurārcanamañjarī* of the Gauḍīya brahmin Gadādharma Bhaṭṭācārya (Jñānānandanātha), a work of some 20,000 verses in 4 Khaṇḍas, completed by the author in Jaipur in AD 1843/4; (iv) *Āmnāyamantrāḥ*; (v) the *Śrīmahātripurasundarīvarivasyā* of Karapātrasvāmin (1905–1980), pp. 237–261 (*Śrīvidyāśarvasabhūtāḥ ṣaḍāmnāyamantrāḥ*); and (vi) *Samayātātra* and *Śrīkramasamhitā* quoted in *Āgamarahasya, Uttarārḍha*, 1.82–121.

³¹⁸On this tradition and its background see BOULLIER 2004 and MALLINSON (2011). The term Kāpālika that I have used here is that employed to identify these Yogins in the doxography of contemporary sects presented in the sixteenth-century South-Indian allegorical drama *Bhāvanāpuruṣottama*. There the personification of this tradition is called Kāpālikasiddhānta and Kāpālika throughout. There is no doubt that he represents what is now the Nāth Sampradāya, because the description of his appearance and attributes is so detailed that all alternatives are excluded. It is sufficient in this regard to cite the following (p. 98): *aye kāpālikasiddhānta saha śiṣyeṇa samāgamyatām. kāpālikaḥ samādher utthāya saśiṣyo buddhasamīpam āgatya gorakṣa gorakṣety uccārayann ātanoti śrṅganādam* ‘“Kāpālikasiddhānta, please approach with your disciple(s)”. The Kāpālika, having emerged from his deep meditation approaches the Buddha with his disciple(s) and calling out “gorakṣa gorakṣa” blows his horn-whistle’. Calling out “gorakh gorakh”, the vernacular equivalent of the Skt. *gorakṣa gorakṣa* reported here, that is to say, calling on Gorakṣa, the founder of the tradition, by repeating his name twice in the vocative, was a signature practice among Nāth Yogis in former times (see MALLINSON 2011, p. 12), as was, and is to this day, the blowing of a horn-whistle. The unusual term *śrṅganādaḥ* that is used for this whistle here is evidently the Skt. corresponding to the Hindī *sīngnād* or *nād* by which the same essential item of the Nāth’s equipment is known today. Worn around his neck attached to a black woollen cord (the *sīngnād-janeū* or *nād-janeū*) he blows it

had its origin in the Deccan,³¹⁹ contains works such as the *Matsyendrasaṃhitā*, probably a South-Indian work of the thirteenth century—this is also the date of the earliest references to Gorakṣanātha—,³²⁰ which combines Kaula materials pertaining to the cults of Tripurasundarī and Kubjikā (particularly in its Ṣaḍanvayaśāmbhāva variant), and many works teaching a system of Yoga that use Kaula terminology and concepts but tend to reject Kaula externals, such as the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa*, the *Gorakṣasāta*, the *Amaraughaprabodha*, *Amaraughaśāsana*, and the *Khecarīvidyā*.³²¹

Related to this meta-Kaula Yoga literature are the *Amṛtasiddhi*, the *Amanaska*, the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra*, the *Śivasamhitā*,³²² and works found variously grouped together in Kashmirian manuscripts alongside the *Gorakṣasāta* and *Amaraughaśāsana*, namely the *Candrajñāna*, *Jñānasāra*, *Niruttaravāda*, *Nirvāṇayogottara*, *Paramārthasāra*, *Prāṇāgnihotra*, *Brahmasaṃdhāna*, *Matsyodarayogaśāstra*, *Sarvajñānottarayogaśāstra*, and *Haṃsasāra*.³²³

In eastern India after the decline of Buddhism in that region, various goddesses not encountered in earlier Kaula/Śākta sources, namely Śyāmā (Dakṣiṇā, Dakṣiṇā Kālī, Dakṣiṇakālī), Tārā, Chinnamastā, Dhūmāvātī, Bagalā or Bagalāmukhī, and Bhuvaneśvarī, made their appearance in a new wave of Kaula scriptural literature, eventually forming with Tripurasundarī (Ṣoḍaśī, Śrīvidyā), Mātāṅgī, Kamalā, and Tripurabhairavī the ten Mahāvīdyās, with three of these the primary focus of devotion: Tripurasundarī, Tārā, and Dakṣiṇā Kālī.³²⁴ Notable Tantras of this East-Indian Śākta tradition are the *Kaṅkālāmālinī*, *Kāmadhenu*, *Kālivilāsa*, *Kubjikā*, *Kumārī*, *Kulacūḍāmaṇi*, *Kaulāvālinirṇaya*, *Guptasādhana*, *Jñānasamkalinī*, *Toḍala*, *Nigamakalpadruma*, *Nigamatattvasāra*, *Niruttara*, *Nirvāṇa*, *Picchilā*, *Phetkāriṇī*, *Bṛhadyoni*, *Bṛhannīla*, *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*, *Muṇḍamālā*, *Yoginī*, *Yoni*, *Rādhā*, *Varadā*, *Vīra*, *Samayācāra*, and *Samṃmohana*,³²⁵ a major early compendium

before and after every ritual act and when prostrating before a senior (MALLINSON 2011, p. 11; BOUILLIER 2004, pp. 22, 37, 65).

³¹⁹MALLINSON 2011, pp. 6b–7a.

³²⁰MALLINSON 2011, p. 5.

³²¹On the *Matsyendrasaṃhitā* and its place in the Śaiva literature see KISS 2007 and 2009. For an overview of the primary sources attributed to the Nāth Sampradāya see MALLINSON 2007, pp. 17–33; 2011, pp. 15b–16b; and MALLINSON 2013, p. 9.

³²²For the probable dates of the texts listed here, from the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* to the *Śivasamhitā*, see BIRCH 2011, p. 528.

³²³I have consulted the following Kashmirian manuscripts that contain these texts: Banaras Hindu University, Accession numbers 4242–4257; ORLS MS 1342 and 1804. On the *Amanaska* or *Amanaskayoga* see BIRCH 2013.

³²⁴See, e.g., *Samṃmohanatantra* f. 3r4 (1.67ab): *śrīvidyā kālikā tārā trividhā triguṇakramāt; Jñānavīpa* quoted in *Sarvollāsatantra* 3.28: *bhāvātītā mahākālī tāriṇī bhāvasamyutā | tripurā sṛṣṭirūpā tu tridhaikaikā tridhā sthitā*.

³²⁵This is clearly not the Tantra of that name listed as one of the primary works of the Vāmasrotas, since it makes no reference to Tumburu and the four Sisters but teaches the tradition of the

drawing on many of these texts and thereby providing those with a *terminus ante quem* is the *Sarvollāsatantra* of Sarvānandanātha, probably compiled c. AD 1400,³²⁶ and important later scriptural sources are the *Śaktisaṃgamatantra*, probably of the seventeenth century, and the *Merutantra*, a work composed or at least completed in its present form after the arrival of the British in India.³²⁷

Notable among numerous later compendia and Paddhatis in this tradition are the sixteenth-century Bengali Brahmānandagiri's *Śāktānandatarāṅgiṇī* and *Tārārahasya*, the former a general Śākta treatise and the latter on the worship of Tārā, his disciple Pūrṇānanda's *Śyāmārahasya* on the worship of Dakṣiṇā Kālī and *Śrītattvacintāmaṇi* on that of Tripurasundarī, the latter completed in AD 1577, the *Mantramahodadhi* of Mahīdhara, a brahmin of Ahicchatra residing in Banaras, completed in AD 1588, the *Tantrasāra* of the Bengali Kṛṣṇānanda Āgamavāgīśa, written in the sixteenth or seventeenth century,³²⁸ the *Śyāmārcanacandrikā* and *Kramacandrikā* of the Bengali Ratnagarbha Sārvabhauma, Guru of Kedār Rāy, the Zamindar of Bikrampur near Dhaka killed in 1603, the *Tārābhaktisudhārṇava* of the Maithila Narasiṃha Ṭhakkura completed in AD 1668, the *Āgamatattvavilāsa* of the Bengali Raghunātha Tarkavāgīśa (AD 1687), the *Puraścaryārṇava* of Mahārāja Pratāp Singh Shāh of Nepal (r. AD 1774–1777), the eighteenth-century *Kālikārcanacandrikā* of the Bengali Keśava Nyāyabhūṣaṇa, the *Tārābhaktitarāṅgiṇī* of the Bengali Kāśīnātha (AD 1815), the *Prāṇatoṣaṇī* (AD 1820) of the Bengali Rāmatoṣaṇa Bhaṭṭācārya,³²⁹ the *Dikṣāprakāśa* of the Maithila Jīvanātha (AD 1869/70), and the *Śāktapramoda* (AD 1889) of Rāja Devanandan Singh, a Zamindar of Muzaffarpur in Bihar.

From late medieval Kashmir we have the syncretistic, Tripurā-centred Śākta tradition of the *Devīrahasya*, also called *Parārahasya*, which adapts this East-Indian tradition in various ways, also working in Śārikā, Śāradā, Rājñī, and Jvālāmukhī, the lineage goddesses (*kuladevī*) of the Kashmirian brahmins. From Sāhib Kaul, the seventeenth-century Śākta scholar of the

Mahāvidyās.

³²⁶See SANDERSON 2007a, p. 236, fn. 89. On the cult of the Mahāvidyās see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 235–236, especially fn. 89.

³²⁷*Merutantra* 35.149–150 refers in a prediction to the British, London, and Christianity. A list of about 100 works of this neo-Śākta canon, including the *Śaktisaṃgamatantra* and *Merutantra*, is given by the Bengali Rāmatoṣaṇa in the early nineteenth century in his *Prāṇatoṣaṇī*, pp. 2–3.

³²⁸See GOUDRIAAN in GOUDRIAAN and GUPTA 1981, p. 139.

³²⁹I thank Dr. Somdev Vasudeva (Kyoto) for ascertaining that the date of composition given in this work (p. 4, ll.14–18) in the Kali and Śāka eras converts according to M. Yano and M. Fushimi's *Pancanga* 3.13 (<http://www.cc.kyoto-su.ac.jp/~yanom/pancanga/>), using the latitude of Ujjain and the longitude of Calcutta, to May 15, AD 1820. I am also grateful to him for detecting a number of typographical errors in my LaTeX file when he was converting its format for publication in this journal. For several such corrections I also thank my colleague Prof. Dr. Harunaga Isaacson and my pupils Paul Gerstmayr and Anna Golovkova.

Kashmirian Kaul lineage that originated in northern Bihar,³³⁰ we have detailed Paddhatis for the regular worship of three deities of this tradition: a *Śyāmāpaddhati* for Dakṣiṇā Kālī, a *Hṛllekhāpaddhati* for Bhuvaneśvarī, and a *Śrīvidyānityapūjāpaddhati* for Tripurasundarī.

Probably from Mithilā, we have the tradition of the *Mahākālasaṃhitā*,³³¹ which, in the context of the East-Indian Śākta tradition of the Mahāvidyās,³³² teaches at great length the cults of two Kālīs, Kāmakalākālī and Guhyakālī, in an expurgated form in which only Śūdras are allowed to offer and consume alcoholic liquor and meat in the worship of the Goddess, the twice-born being required to employ various tame substitutes.³³³

All the works of this East-Indian neo-Śākta tradition lack the doctrinal underpinning provided by the earlier Śaiva and Śākta Śaiva traditions reviewed here, reverting to a Smārta ontology based on the twenty-five Tattvas of the Sāṃkhya system, in which the Goddess (Śakti) is equated with Prakṛti and Śiva with Puruṣa.

Also to be mentioned as major developments of this period are the expurgated and internalized cult that called itself the Samayamata, expounded by Lakṣmīdhara, a courtier of Pratāparudra, the Gajapati ruler of Orissa, in the first decades of the sixteenth century, in his commentary on the Śākta hymn *Saundaryalaharī*, for those who wished to remain within the bounds of brahmanical orthopraxy and orthodoxy,³³⁴ the eclectic, Smārta Tantric tradition, probably originating in Orissa in the twelfth century, of the *Pra-pañcasāra* and *Śāradātilaka*,³³⁵ and, following the latter, such texts as the *Śaivacintāmaṇi* of Lakṣmīdharamiśra, a late-seventeenth-century Vaidika of Bhubaneswar under Gajapati Mukundadeva I.³³⁶ The *Śāradātilaka* reaches

³³⁰For the evidence that the Kashmirian Kauls are, and once recognized themselves to be, the descendants of Maithila brahmins who migrated from Bihar see SANDERSON 2004, pp. 363–364.

³³¹The known manuscripts of the *Mahākālasaṃhitā* are found in Bihar, Banaras, and Nepal and citations from the text appear in the 17th-century *Tārābhaktisudhārṇava* of the Maithila scholar Narasiṃha Ṭhakkura and in the *Puraścaryārṇava* of Mahārāja Pratāp Singh Shāh of Nepal (r. 1774–1777).

³³²*Kāmakalākhaṇḍa*, Paṭala 241.3–4.

³³³See, for example, *Mahākālasaṃhitā*, *Guhyakālīkhaṇḍa* 6.378–457.

³³⁴Lakṣmīdhara tells us in the colophon of his work (*Lakṣmīdharā*, p. 302) that his patron was Gajapati Vīrarudra (=Pratāparudra) (*āśrayikṛtagajapativīrarudreṇa*), who ruled in Orissa from AD 1497 to 1540. In his commentary on v. 31 Lakṣmīdhara rejects the corpus of the sixty-four Tantras (listed in *Nityāśoḍaśikārnava* 1.13–21) as incompatible with brahmanical orthopraxy and accepts as valid guides only five Saṃhitās attributed to the sages Vasiṣṭha, Sanaka, Śuka, Sanandana, and Sanatkumāra (*Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā* etc.). Only in these ‘good (*śubha*-) Tantras’, he declares, is a system of Tantric practice taught that is compatible with the path prescribed by the Vedas (p. 268).

³³⁵SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 230–233. For a refutation of the oft-repeated view that Lakṣmaṇadeśika, the author of the *Śāradātilaka*, is the Lakṣmaṇagupta who was among the Kashmirian Gurus of Abhinavagupta see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 230–232.

³³⁶For the date of this work and evidence of its dependence on the *Śāradātilaka* see SANDERSON 2007a, p. 232–233, fn. 76. The learned literature of Smārta Śaivism is abundant and as yet little explored. Apart from the *Śaivacintāmaṇi* of Lakṣmīdhara and his unpublished *Śaivakalpadruma* we

us in many manuscripts from all over the subcontinent, along with an exhaustive citation-rich commentary composed in Banaras in AD 1494 by Rāghavabhaṭṭa, a Deśastha brahmin whose father had migrated from Maharashtra to Banaras.³³⁷ Both the Samayamata and this tradition of the *Prapañcasāra* and *Śāradātilaka* have alligned themselves with brahmanical orthodoxy by jettisoning the thirty-six Tattva hierarchy of the classical Śaiva systems for that of the Sāṃkhya.

Nor was creativity after the twelfth century limited to the Śākta side of Śaivism. The period from the close of the twelfth century saw the emergence in the Deccan of the movement of the non-brahmin Vīraśaivas, also called Liṅgāyatas, who are now the largest community in Karnataka, forming about fifteen percent of the population overall and up to a third in some areas.³³⁸ This produced its own literature in Kannaḍa, Sanskrit, and, to a lesser extent, in Telugu and Marāṭhī, from the twelfth century down to modern times. The Kannaḍa sources comprise collections of devotional poetic prose (Vacanas) written in simple language by the saints (Śaraṇas) of this tradition, namely Allamaprabhu (Prabhuliṅga), Basava, Cennabasava, Siddharāmayya, and numerous others, including women, such as Mahādeviyakkā, and hagiographical works such as the twelfth-century *Śivagaṇadararagaḷe* of Harihara, the *Somanāthacaritre* and *Siddharāmapurāṇa* of Harihara's disciple Rāghavaṅka, the *Basavapurāṇa* of Bhīmakavi (AD 1369), which is a Kannaḍa translation of the thirteenth-century Telugu *Basavapurāṇamu* of Pāḷkuriki Somanātha, the *Prabhuliṅgaḷile* of Cāmarasa (1430), the *Vīraśaivāmṛtapurāṇa* of Mallaṅṛya (c. 1513), and the *Cennabasavapurāṇa* of Virūpākṣa (AD 1584), the *Śivatattvacintāmaṇi* of Lakkaṇa Daṇḍēśa (1441), general and minister of Devarāya II of Vijayanagara, and the four versions of the *Śūnyasampādane*, by Śivagaṇaprasādi Mahādēvayya (c. 1420), Keṅcavīraṅṇodeyaru or his Guru Halageya Dēvaru (c. 1495), Gummaḷapurada Siddhaliṅgadēvaru (c. 1500), and Gūḷūra Siddhavīraṅṛyaru (c. 1510), in which the Vacanas of the saints are embedded in a narrative framework arranged to portray the stages of spiritual progress.³³⁹

In Telugu notable Vīraśaiva works other than the thirteenth-century *Basavapurāṇamu* of Pāḷkuriki Somanātha mentioned above,³⁴⁰ are the same au-

have such works as the *Śivavākyāvalī* and *Śaivamānasollāsa* of Caṇḍeśvara, and the *Śaivasarvasvasāra* of Vidyāpati, both Maithila brahmins of the fourteenth century. The last four works are known to me only by name: I have yet to read them.

³³⁷ *Śāradātilakapadārthādarsa*, pp. 916–917 (concluding verses 1–5).

³³⁸ See MICHAEL 1992, pp. 181–183. The population is most numerous in North and Central Karnataka. Areas in which more than 25% of the population were found to be Vīraśaiva in the 1931 Census were Sandur State in the current District Bellary (26%), and Districts Belgaum (27%), Bijapur (35%), and Dharwad (34%).

³³⁹ For the successive versions of the *Śūnyasampādane* and a detailed analysis of the last see MICHAEL 1992.

³⁴⁰ English tr. RAO 1990. See pp. 21–23 of Rao's introduction to that work, where he cautiously

thor's *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu*, *Anubhavasāramu*, *Caturvedasāramu*, and *Vṛṣādhipaśatakamu*, the *Śivatattvasāramu* of Paṇḍitārādhyā, the *Haravilāsamu*, *Bhīmeśvarapurāṇamu*, also called *Bhīmakhaṇḍamu*, *Śivarātrimāhātmyamu*, *Kāśīkhaṇḍamu*, and *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu* of Śrīnātha (AD 1365–1440),³⁴¹ and the *Kālahastīsvaramāhātmyamu* and *Kālahastīsvaraśatakamu* of Dhūrjati in the early sixteenth century.³⁴²

Notable among Vīraśaiva works in Marāṭhī are the sixteenth-century Śāntalinga's *Karṇahastakī*, *Vivekacintāmaṇi*, and *Śāntabodha*, and the *Paramarahasya*, *Jñānabodha*, *Anubhavānanda*, and other works of Manmatha (AD 1560–1613).³⁴³

The Sanskrit sources, which dominate in the areas of ritual and theological doctrine, comprise scriptural works such as the *Kāraṇa*, *Candrajñāna*, *Makūṭa*, *Pārameśvara*, *Vātulaśuddha*, and *Vīra (Vīrottara)*—these have the names of early Saiddhāntika scriptures in spite of their Vīraśaiva content, which is for the most part the detailed prescription of the rituals of daily worship and initiation—, the doctrinal *Anubhavasūtra* of Māyideva, which claims to transmit the teaching of the scripture *Vātulottara*, and exegetical works such as the *Kriyāsāra* composed by Nīlakaṇṭhaśivācārya at some time between c. 1350 and 1530, when, he says, Śiva himself had appeared to him in a dream and commanded him to produce a summary of all the Śaiva scriptures, the *Siddhāntaśikhāmaṇi* of Śivayogin, probably of the thirteenth or early fourteenth century, together with its seventeenth-century commentary by Maritōṅṭadārya, both following in their metaphysics the non-dualistic doctrine of the Kashmirian Śākta Śaivas,³⁴⁴ Śrīpati's *Śrī-*

assigns Somanātha to the period 1200 to 1300, rejecting the arguments advanced by various Telugu scholars for more precise dates.

³⁴¹On the works of Śrīnātha see RAO and SHULMAN 2012.

³⁴²The first work is known to be his from its colophon. The second is attributed to him by tradition. For the latter we have the poetic English translation of HEIFETZ and RAO (1987).

³⁴³For further bibliographical information on Marāṭhī Vīraśaiva literature see TULPULÉ 1979, p. 373.

³⁴⁴See, for example, the distinctively Kashmirian terms *saṃvitprakāśaḥ*, *parāhantā*, and *vimarśaḥ* in *Siddhāntaśikhāmaṇi* 20.7–8, 29–33: ...*viśvadhāramahāsaṃvitprakāśaparipūritam | parāhantāmayam prāhur vimarśam paramātmanah*. The approximate date of the *Siddhāntaśikhāmaṇi* is established by its referring to Basava and being referred to by Śrīpati in the *Śrīkarabhāṣya*, his Vīraśaiva commentary on the *Brahmasūtra*, when on 1.1.1 he speaks of the distinctively Vīraśaiva practice of carrying a Liṅga on one's person at all times (*liṅgadhāraṇam*) (p. 10: *uta pavitraṃ te iti ṛgvedamantrasya siddhāntaśikhāmaṇau reṇukācāryeṇa liṅgadhāraṇatvena nirdeśāt*). The *Śrīkarabhāṣya* was composed c. AD 1400 (RAO 1936, vol. 1, pp. 7–24, 29–33). It certainly postdates Madhvācārya (probably AD 1238–1317), since it refers to him on 2.3.18. It predates Mallanārya, since that author, whose *Vīraśaivāmṛtapurāṇa* was completed c. AD 1513, mentions Śrīpati in his *Bhāvacinītaratna* of AD 1513 (RAO 1936, vol. 1, p. 17). The commentary of Maritōṅṭadārya is fully conversant with the background of Śivayogin's doctrine, quoting the *Śivadṛṣṭi* of Somānanda (1.37c–38b) on 18.11 (p. 428), the *Īsvaraṇṣṭi* of Utpaladeva (1.5.7) on 5.39 (p. 80), the *Parātrimśikā* (vv. 24c–25b, 5–8b [in the South-Indian recension followed by the *Parātrimśikālaghuvṛtti*]) on 20.41 (p. 518), the *Virūpākṣapañcāśikā* (2.1 and 3.27) on 20.41 (p. 518) and on 18.34 (p. 438), and the

karabhāṣya, a Vīraśaiva commentary (c. AD 1400) on the brahmanical *Brahmasūtra*, the *Śivayogapradīpikā* of Cennasadāśivayogin (15th century), the seventeenth-century *Liṅgadhāraṇacandrikā* of Nandikeśvara, the *Pañcaratna* of Vīraṇārādhyā and its commentary by Sosale Revaṇārādhyā (c. AD 1650), the latter's *Pramathagaṇapaddhati*, the *Anādivīraśaivācārasaṃgraha* of Sampādanasiddha-Vīraśaivayogin (c. AD 1600), the Paddhati-like *Vīraśaivācārasāroddhārabhāṣya* of Somanātha, the *Vīramāheśvarācārasaṃgraha* of Nilakaṇṭhagaṇanātha, the *Vīraśaivasiddhāntottarakāumudī* of Vīrabhadrārādhyā, and the *Vivekacintāmaṇi* of Liṅgarāja. This later literature is heavily dependent on the doctrinal sources of the Saiddhāntikas, both their scriptures and such exegetical or secondary works as the *Tattvaprakāśa*, the *Siddhāntaśekhara*, and the *Siddhāntasārāvalī*, but it also looks for support to the *Śivadharma*, the Śaiva Purāṇas, the Upaniṣads, and works on Yoga such as the *Yogabīja* and the *Yogatārāvalī*.³⁴⁵

The period after the twelfth century also saw significant innovations among the Śaivas of the Tamil-speaking region. Here too we find a body of devotional poetry in the vernacular, but one whose earliest and most venerated collections predate that of the Vīraśaivas by several centuries. By the eleventh century a closed canon of Śaiva devotional literature in Tamil had been established. Arranged in twelve books, known as the Sacred Treatises (*tirumurai*), it comprises primarily collections of Tamil hymns attributed to a number of poet-saints, expressing devotion (*bhaktiḥ*) to Śiva as manifest to these devotees in numerous sacred sites throughout the region. Books 1–3 contain the poems of Tiruṇāṇacampantamūrtti (Campantar), books 4–6 those of Tirunāvukaracu (Appar), book 7 those of Cuntaramūrtti (Cuntarar)—the hymns of these three poets are known collectively as the Tēvāram—, book 8 those of Māṇikkavācakar, and books 9 and 11 those of twenty-one other devotees, among them Nampiyāṇṭār Nampī and the poetess Kāraikkālammaiṅār. To these collections were added the soteriological treatise *Tirumantiram* of Tirumūlar as book 10 and the *Periyapurāṇam* of Cēkkiḷār as book 12. The last, composed during the reign of the Coḷa Kulottuṅga II (r. AD 1133–1150), is a hagiographical narrative of the lives of these and other Tamil Śaiva saints, the sixty-three Lords (*nāyaṇmār*),³⁴⁶ of whom, according to this account, less than a fifth were brahmins and three

Samvidullāsa of Maheśvarānanda (as quoted in *Mahārthamaṅjarīparimala* on v. 10, p. 32) on 15.39 (p. 79).

³⁴⁵For the date of the *Yogabīja* (14th/15th century) see BIRCH 2011, pp. 528, 533–534, 542; for that of the *Yogatārāvalī* (15th/16th century) see BIRCH 2011, pp. 528–529, fn. 19. Dependence on Saiddhāntika literature is particularly strong in Revaṇārādhyā's exegesis of the *Pañcaratna*.

³⁴⁶The names of sixty-two of the *nāyaṇmār* are listed in a hymn of Cuntarar, the *Tiruttoṅṭattokai* ('The List of the Holy Devotees'). The total of sixty-three, seen in the *Periyapurāṇam* ('Great Purāṇa'), also called *Tiruttoṅṭarpurāṇam* ('The Purāṇa of the Holy Devotees'), of the hagiographer Cēkkiḷār, is reached by the addition of the *nāyaṇār* Cuntarar himself. Cēkkiḷār tells us that he wrote the *Periyapurāṇam* during the reign of Anapāya. This is a name of Kulottuṅga II (SASTRI 1984, p. 349).

were women.

It is widely held that Appar and Campantar lived in the seventh century, Cuntarar and Māṅikkavācakar in the ninth, and, even earlier than these, Kāraikkālamaiyār in the sixth. It is at least clear that Cuntarar, who refers with reverence to both Campantar and Appar, was living before AD 913, the last year of Pallava rule, since he refers to Śiva as punishing rulers who refuse to pay tribute to these kings.³⁴⁷ The *Tirumantiram* has been assigned various early dates, but its contents render a date long before the closure of this canon in the twelfth century very unlikely.³⁴⁸

After this corpus of sacred texts had been constituted there developed a body of neo-Saiddhāntika theological writing in Tamil, eventually forming a canon of fourteen texts known as the Śāstras of Meykaṇṭār (*meykaṇṭa-cāttirāṅkaḷ*). The first two works, the *Tiruvuntiyār* of Tiruviyalūr Uyyavantatēvanāyanār, and its expansion, the *Tirukkaḷiṟruppaṭiyār* of Tirukkatavūr Uyyavantatēvanāyanār, are transitional between the devotional poetry of the *Tirumuṟai* and the twelve theological treatises that followed. These are the *Civañāṇapōtam* of Meykaṇṭār,³⁴⁹ the *Civañāṇa-cittiyār* of Aruṇanti, a treatise elaborating the new doctrine, which attracted a number of Tamil commentaries, his *Irupāvīrupakṭu*, the *Uṇmaiivilakkam* of Maṇavācakaṅkaṭantār, and eight works by Umāpatiśiva: the *Civappirakācam*, *Tiruvāruṭpaṇ*, the *Viñāvenpā*, the *Porrippakroṭai*, the *Koṭikkavi*, the *Neṅcuviṭutūtu*, the *Uṇmainerivilakkamtukaḷarupōtam*, and the *Caṅkarpanirākaraṇam*.³⁵⁰ Dates have been assigned to all fourteen texts, beginning with AD 1147 for the *Tiruvuntiyār* and 1177 for the *Tirukkaḷiṟruppaṭiyār*. But the authority for the dates assigned to the first thirteen works is obscure. Only the last, the *Caṅkarpanirākaraṇam*, is securely dated, in AD 1313.³⁵¹

This Tamil corpus and its exegesis were complemented in the sixteenth century by Sanskrit works along the same lines, notably the *Pauṣkarabhāṣya* of another Umāpatiśiva on the *Pauṣkarajñānapāda*,³⁵² the latter claiming

³⁴⁷ *Tirumuṟai* 7.90.4 (916); tr. SHULMAN 1990, p. 569. For the view that the poems of Kāraikkālamaiyār are the earliest see, e.g., GROS in KARAVELANE 1982, pp. 96–102. On the dating of Appar, Campantar, and Cuntarar see GROS, introduction to IYER 1984, pp. viii–xiv/xl–xlvi; and SHULMAN 1990, pp. xxxv–xliv, pointing to Cuntarar’s mention of those who fail to pay their taxes to the Pallavas.

³⁴⁸ See here fn. 262 on p. 68.

³⁴⁹ There is both a Tamil and a Sanskrit version (*Śivajñānabodha*) of this text, both of twelve verses; see DHAVAMONY 1971, pp. 327–334, for both with English translations. It is claimed (ibid.) that the Sanskrit version is an extract from the Saiddhāntika scripture *Raurava* (op. cit. p. 327), which amounts to a declaration that the Tamil version is a translation of the Sanskrit.

³⁵⁰ This date, actually that of a debate after which the text was written, is reported by Umāpatiśiva in the introduction to his *Caṅkarpanirākaraṇam*; see GOODALL 2000, p. 211, fn. 20. For summary analyses of the contents of each of these fourteen texts see DHAVAMONY 1971, pp. 175–324.

³⁵¹ On the dubiousness of all these dates except the last see GOODALL 2004, p. xxxii.

³⁵² The *Pauṣkarabhāṣya* has commonly been attributed to the Umāpatiśiva who composed the Tamil *Caṅkarpa-nirākaraṇam*, which tells us that it was written in AD 1313. But this attribution has been shown to be impossible by SHARMA (1938), by drawing attention to the fact that the

to be the doctrinal section of the *Pauṣkarapārameśvara*, one of the early Saiddhāntika scriptures,³⁵³ the *Śaivaparibhāṣā* of Śivāgrayogīndra Jñānaśivācārya, the same author's *Samgrahabhāṣya* and *Vistarabhāṣya* on the *Śivajñānabodha*,³⁵⁴ and, of uncertain date, the *Devīkālottara*, a short text claiming scriptural status as a redaction of the *Kālottara*, though of very different content and spirit from the early *Kālottara* versions, which are genuine redactions of a single work, probably the *Sārdhatrīśatika*.³⁵⁵

This new tradition in Tamil and Sanskrit propagated a rapprochement with the language of Vedāntic non-dualism,³⁵⁶ shifted the emphasis from rites to devotion and liberating knowledge, claiming that the latter alone can complete the soul's liberation,³⁵⁷ stressed the neo-Siddhānta's congruence with brahmanical orthopraxy, and accordingly condemned as delusive the

Pauṣkarabhāṣya cites with attribution a verse of the *Nyāyāmṛta* of Vyāsarāya/Vyāsatīrtha (AD 1478–1539). It also knows Pakṣadhara and Rucidatta, the Navya-Naiyāyikas of the early sixteenth century (COLAS-CHAUHAN 2002, p. 306; 2007, pp. 3–4). Moreover, GOODALL (2004, pp. cxiii, cxv, cxviii) has concluded from doctrinal divergences that the authors of the *Caṅkaṣpanirākaraṇam* and the *Pauṣkarabhāṣya* must have been different Umāpatīs.

³⁵³On the dubiousness of this claim see GOODALL 2004, p. xlv–xlvi.

³⁵⁴Śivāgrayogīndra Jñānaśivācārya tells us in his *Śaivasamnyāsapaddhati* that he wrote under the Vijayanagara emperor Sadāśivarāya while Cinna Cevappa was Nāyaka of Tañjāvūr (JAYAMMAL 1993, pp. xviii–xix). Sadāśivarāya was crowned in 1543 and was still alive in 1575 (STEIN 1989, pp. 114 and 120). Cinna Cevappa governed Tañjāvūr from 1532 until 1563 (VRIDDHAGIRISAN 1995, p. 34).

³⁵⁵The work, of only 84 verses, presents itself in its colophon as the 65th Paṭala of the *Jñānakāṇḍa* of the *Devīkālottara* of 24,000 verses. But there is no evidence that any other Paṭalas existed. Two commentaries, which comment on this 'chapter' alone, have reached us, one by Nirañjanasiddha, following, he tells us, a commentary in Kannaḍa, and the other by an author whose name is not reported but who refers us to his commentary (-vṛtti) on the *Siddhāntasārāvalī* for definitions of the [five] states of the soul (from waking to the state beyond the fourth) (*Devīkālottaravyākhyā*, p. 1873: *avasthālakṣaṇam sarvam asmābhis siddhāntasārāvalīvṛttau pravistareṇoktam. tata evāvadhāryam*). The only commentary on the *Siddhāntasārāvalī* that has reached us is that of Anantaśambhu, who does indeed define the five states in that work, in his comment on v. 125. But that proves nothing, since the verse itself defines these states and therefore any commentator might have done so when commenting on this verse.

³⁵⁶The neo-Siddhānta is not non-dualistic in the sense of the Advaitavedānta or the Pratyabhijñā. For it continued to adhere to the doctrine of the plurality of souls and the reality of the material universe. However it rephrased the Saiddhāntika definition of Śiva's causality in a manner that enabled it to appear to escape the criticism of Śaivism enshrined in the *Brahmasūtra* (2.2.35: *patyur asāmañjasyāt*), namely that it claims that Śiva is only the efficient cause of the universe (*nimittakāraṇam*) and not also its material cause (*upādānakāraṇam*). We are now told that Śiva is both causes, being the former per se and the latter through association with the two Māyās that provide the matter of the pure and impure universes. See *Śaivaparibhāṣā*, pp. 36–41.

³⁵⁷See, for example, *Śaivaparibhāṣā*, pp. 132–148. This gnostic re-orientation is already apparent in what is said to be the earliest of the *meṅkaṅṅacātīraṅkaḷ*, the *Tiruvuntiyār*; see DHAVAMONY 1971, pp. 175–182. There is another respect in which the neo-Siddhānta comes closer to Smārta doctrine. For it has redefined liberation not as the manifestation (*abhivyaktiḥ*) of the soul's equality with Śiva (*śivasāmyam*), the doctrine of the Kashmirian Saiddhāntikas and their South-Indian followers, but as the direct experience of the bliss of Śiva through oneness with him; see *ibid.* p. 159: *tasmān na śivasāmyam muktiḥ. kiṃ ca śivaikābhāvena śivānandānubhava eva mokṣaḥ*; p. 132: *eteṣāṃ ca pāśānām asaṃsparśe śivaikyena śivānandābhivyaktīlakṣaṇām muktiṃ krameṇāyam ātmā prāpnoti*.

Atimārga and the non-Saiddhāntika forms of the Mantramārga.³⁵⁸ In all these ways it sought to draw itself closer to the dominant Smārta Śaiva tradition of the region. It also reached out to the uninitiated majority by shifting the emphasis from the Siddhānta's Tantric Mantras, accessible only to initiates, to the universal Śaiva Mantra advocated for lay devotees in the Śivadharma corpus and the Śaiva Purāṇas, namely the Pañcākṣara (five-syllable) *NAMAḤ ŚIVĀYA*, a feature that the neo-Siddhānta shares with the Vīraśaiva movement.³⁵⁹

It was no doubt in the same spirit that in the sixteenth century Vedajñāna I translated the *Śivadharmottara* and Śivayogīndra Jñānaśivācārya the *Devīkālottara* and *Sarvajñānottara* into Tamil,³⁶⁰ and that Tamil was used for many of the Sthalapurāṇas, texts in praise of particular sacred sites, that were composed during this period, such as the *Kōyirppurāṇam* of Umāpatiśiva glorifying Cidambaram, the *Kamalālayaccirappu* and *Arunakiripurāṇam* of Vedajñāna I in praise of Tiruvārūr and Tiruvaṇṇāmalai,³⁶¹ the *Tiruvaiyyārruppurāṇam* of Nānakūttār, and the numerous such works produced by Ellappa Nāvalar in the seventeenth century.³⁶² We may note also that Vedajñāna I produced the *Caivasamayaneṛi* and other works in Tamil on aspects of Śaiva observance,³⁶³ thus ending the monopoly of Sanskrit in

³⁵⁸See, for example, *Śivajñānabodhasaṃgrahabhāṣya*, p. 16, citing *Kūrmapurāṇa* (=2.37.145–146): *...vāmaṃ pāśupataṃ caiva lākulaṃ caiva bhairavam | na sevyam etat kathitaṃ vedabāhyam tathetarat* 'It has been declared that these should not be followed: the Vāma, the Pāśupata, the Lākula, and the Bhairava, and whatever other [system of religious practice is outside the Veda]'.
³⁵⁹With the addition of *OM* at its head it is known as the Ṣaḍakṣara ('the [Mantra] of six syllables'). See *Śivadharmottara* N¹ f. 3–5 (1.35–38) (→ *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* 30.19c–22b). The form with *OM* is for the use of brahmins, that without for the use of others (*Caivasamayaneṛi* 3.469 as reported in GANESAN 2009, p. 16). This Mantra is distinguished from the Mūlamantras of the Mantramārga by the absence of a *bījamantraḥ* and the fact that *NAMAḤ* precedes the name in the dative case. In the Mantramārga the order is *OM* + *bījamantraḥ* + name in the dative + *NAMAḤ*, e.g. *OM HAUM ŚIVĀYA NAMAḤ*. For the centrality of the Pañcākṣara/Ṣaḍakṣara in the Tamil Śaiva tradition see, for example, the hymns of Appar and Campantar translated in VISWANATHAN PETERSON 1991, pp. 217–218; Maṇavācakaṅkaṭantār, *Uṇmaivilakkam* 3.31–40; and the eleventh chapter of Umāpaticivācāriyār's *Tiruvārupayaṇ* ('The Fruit of Divine Grace') (tr. POPE 1900, pp. xxxix–xlii; PECHILIS PRENTISS 1999, pp. 189–209; SMITH 1996, pp. 128–131); and *Tiruvācakam*, pp. 1, 56, and 69. For the role of this Mantra in Vīraśaivism see the *Pañcākṣarīsthala*.

³⁶⁰See R. Ramasastrī in *Śaivaparibhāṣā*, Skt. introduction, p. 22. He also wrote a commentary, apparently lost, on the *Sarvajñānottara* (*Śaivaparibhāṣā*, p. 160: *sarvajñānottaravyākhyāne śmābhiḥ pratipāditam*). That scripture, unlike the *Devīkālottara*, is ancient, surviving in an early Nepalese palm-leaf ms and well-known to the Śaivas of Kashmir in the tenth/eleventh century; but it assumed special importance at this time in the Tamil region because unlike the great majority of the early Saiddhāntika scriptures it contains passages supporting the gnostic doctrines in favour among these neo-Saiddhāntikas (SANDERSON 1992, pp. 291–292, fn. 42). See, for example, the citations from both these works in *Śaivaparibhāṣā*, pp. 30, 37, 144, and 159–160.

³⁶¹These two works are dated in AD 1548 and 1555 and he died in 1563 or 1564; see DAGENS 1979, pp. 6–7.

³⁶²For an account of some Tamil Sthalapurāṇas (*talapurāṇam*) and their function see SHULMAN 1980.

³⁶³For summaries of these works see GANESAN 2009, pp. 1–28.

this domain too.

During the same centuries the Sanskrit Saiddhāntika literature of the Tamil zone expanded greatly through the creation, redaction, or compilation of numerous scriptures such as the *Aṃśumat*, *Ajita*, *Kāmika*, *Kāraṇa*, *Candrajñāna*, *Cintyaviśvasādākhya*, *Dīpta*, *Makuṭa*, *Yogaja*, *Raurava*, *Vijaya/Vijayottara*, *Vīra*, *Śarvottara*, *Samtāna*, *Sāhasra*, *Siddha*, *Suprabheda*, and *Sūkṣma*. These too, like the Sanskrit scriptures of the Vīraśaivas, have titles contained in the old lists of the Tantras of the Siddhānta found in our early sources; but they too are unlikely to be, or are certainly not, works of that period.³⁶⁴ There is no trace of them in the North Indian and Nepalese manuscript collections and where an early work under one of these titles has been cited or excerpted in the early exegetical literature, as is the case with the *Kāmika*, *Makuṭa*, and *Sāhasra*, the text passages so preserved do not establish identity with the works assigned the same titles in late southern sources. Moreover, the manifest purpose of much of this material is to provide scriptural authority for the specifics of the tradition of Śaiva temple worship that had developed in that region under the Tamil Ādiśaiva priesthood, whose hereditary and exclusive right to officiate in the temples of Śiva is much stressed in this literature.³⁶⁵

Nonetheless, one should not conclude that the traditions reflected in these materials are entirely South-Indian. For instance, the *Kāmika*, probably among the earliest of these neo-Saiddhāntika Tantras, is aware also of an East-Indian context, ruling in its coverage of temple worship that devotional songs should be sung either in the Gauḍa language or the Drāviḍa, that is to say, in the vernacular of Bengal or Tamil.³⁶⁶ This prescription may be understood in the context of textual and epigraphic evidence that East-Indian (*gauḍadeśīya*-) Saiddhāntikas were involved in the propagation of the Saiddhāntika tradition in Tamilnadu, a phenomenon of which we have seen an example above in the ascetic Brahmaśiva who carried the Saiddhāntika tradition of the Golaḡīmaṭha in Central India south to Tiruvārūr.³⁶⁷

The corpus of Śaiva literature from the Tamil-speaking region also in-

³⁶⁴See GOODALL 2000, pp. 212–213.

³⁶⁵SANDERSON 2009a, pp. 278–279. An excellent account of this priesthood, as observed in the Mīnākṣīsundareśvara temple in Madurai, has been provided by FULLER (1984, pp. 23–35, 49–71).

³⁶⁶*Kāmika*, *Pūrvabhāga* 6.437c–438b: *tadūrdhvaṃ gauḍabhāṣādyair gānaṃ dhūpāntam ācaret || ūrdhvaṃ *drāviḍabhāṣāṅkaṃ (āṅkaṃ conj. : āṅgaṃ Ed.) gānaṃ nr̥ttayutaṃ tu vā* ‘Thereafter he should engage in singing in the Gauḍa or [related] languages until the burning incense is finished, or in singing in the Drāviḍa language, together with dancing’. The practice of singing Tamil devotional songs in the region’s Śiva temples as a regular part of the programme of worship, which has continued down to the present, finds its first epigraphical attestation in an inscription of the Pallava Nandivarman III of c. AD 863 at the Bilvanātheśvara temple of Tiruvallam not far from the Pallava capital recording a grain allowance for the servants of the temple who are “singers of the sacred hymns” (*tiruppatiyampāṭuvār*); see IP 132, ll. 31–32, and for a review and analysis of the epigraphical analysis of provision for such singing see SWAMY 1972.

³⁶⁷See here fn. 76 on p. 21.

cludes works that accommodate a more Śākta perspective. This trend, which may be correlated with the widespread construction throughout the region from the twelfth century onwards of separate temples known as *kāmakkoṭṭam* for Śiva's consort in Śaiva temple complexes, a phenomenon that has been thought to be a consequence of the growing influence of the non-brahmin, Vēḷāḷa agriculturalist castes as patrons of religion during this period,³⁶⁸ appears in one of the Tamil *Tirumuṟai*, namely the *Tirumantiram* of Tirumūlar, and also in such Sanskrit works as the *Jñānasiddhyāgama* and the *Siddhāntapaddhati* of a certain Jñānaśivācārya, all showing a similar admixture of the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta, Śāktism, and Vedānta. A Śaiva-Śākta-Vaidika fusion is also enacted in the system of worship followed in the Cidambaram temple by its Dīkṣita (non-Ādiśaiva) priesthood seen in their Paddhatis for regular and festival worship, namely the *Cidambareśvaranītyapūjāsūtra* and *Citsabheśotsavasūtra* of the *Cidambarakṣetrasarvasva*. In this system the priests worship first Sadāśiva, then his consort Manonmanī, then, above them, Naṭarāja, and then Tripurasundarī as Naṭarāja's consort.³⁶⁹

The desire of certain South-Indian Śaivas to increase their acceptability in the eyes of the Smārtas may also account for the *Śrīkaṇṭhabhāṣya*, a Śaiva commentary on the *Brahmasūtra* composed by Nīlakaṇṭha, also called Śrīkaṇṭha. For this work goes beyond the stance of the Tamil neo-Saiddhāntikas to expound a Vedantic Śaiva non-dualism in which Śiva qualified by his power of consciousness (*cicchaktiviśiṣṭaśivādvaitam*) is said, in keeping with Vedantic orthodoxy, to be both the efficient and the material cause of the world, drawing for this purpose not only on the usual brahmanical sources but also on the works of the Kashmirian Śākta Śaivas, quoting the *Īśvarapratyabhijñānikārikā* of Utpaladeva and the *Bodhapañcadaśikā* and *Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta, though without identifying the authors or works by name.³⁷⁰ In the sixteenth century Appayadīkṣita wrote the *Śivārkamaṇi-*

³⁶⁸This hypothesis has been proposed in STEIN 1994, pp. 237–241.

³⁶⁹See *Cidambarakṣetrasarvasva* vol. 1, pp. 69–93: ...*liṅgamastake...sadāśivarūpaṃ vibhāvya* (p. 72)...*tatas saṃcintayet tasya vāmbhāge manonmanīm* (p. 74)...*sabhāpatiṃ sadāśivopari āvāhanamudrayāvāhya* (p. 77)...*sabhāpativāmbhāge śrītripurasundarīm* (p. 78)...*dhyātvā* (p. 79)...; vol. 2, pp. 138–146.

³⁷⁰*Īśvarapratyabhijñānikārikā* 1.38 is quoted thrice, on 1.2.1 (as *abhiyuktoktiḥ*), 2.1.18 (as *āptavacanam*), and 2.2.30; and *Bodhapañcadaśikā* v. 3 is quoted on 1.2.1 (as *abhiyuktasūktiḥ*). On 4.4.17 Nīlakaṇṭha quotes a passage of two verses as *āptavacanam*, of which the first is a somewhat corrupt version of *Tantrāloka* 3.203c–204b and the second is *Tantrāloka* 6.268. Nīlakaṇṭha's second benedictory verse glorifies Śiva as the supreme self on the surface of whose innate power the whole picture of the universe has been created (*nijaśaktibhittinirmitanikhilajagajjālacitrānikurumbah | sa jayati śivaḥ paramātmā sakalāgamasārasarvasvam*). With this compare *Īśvarapratyabhijñānikārikā* 2.3.15: *viśvavaicitryacitrasya samabhittitalopame | viruddhābhāvasaṃsparśe paramārthasatīsvare*; the benedictory verse of Utpaladeva's *Śivadṛṣṭyālocana* (*cidākāśamaye svāṅge viśvālekhyavidhāyine ...*), *Stavacintāmaṇi* 9 (*nirupādānasambhāram abhittāv eva tanvate jagaccitraṃ namas tasmai ...*); and Kṣemarāja's *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya*, Sūtras 1–2 (*citiḥ svatantrā viśvasiddhihetuḥ, svecchayā viśvaṃ svabhittau viśvam unmīlayati*).

dīpikā, an elaborate commentary on this work, and an independent treatise, the *Śivādvaitanirṇaya*, in which he contended that Nīlakaṇṭha's doctrine is ultimately indistinguishable from the pure non-dualism (*śuddhādvaitam*) of the Smārtas. This interpretation is implausible and it was not universally accepted: it was resisted by Brahmavidyādhvarīndra in his *Vedāntasarvasvaśivadarpaṇa*. But whatever the truth of this, we learn that it was possible at this time to be a Saiddhāntika in one's ritual life while adhering to Smārta orthodoxy in one's metaphysics. For Appayyadīkṣita, as we have seen above, was also the author of an exhaustive Saiddhāntika Paddhati, the *Śivārcanacandrikā*.³⁷¹

Non-prescriptive Evidence

In this survey of the Śaiva literature I hope to have shown something of the richness and diversity of our surviving textual record and its great range both in time and geographical distribution.³⁷² But I cannot end without pointing to this record's limitations as evidence of the traditions that produced it. The foremost of these is that the sources are almost entirely prescriptive. This means that they tell Śaivas what to do and what to think (and sometimes why they should do so) but disclose very little about the prevalence of the practices and beliefs that they advocate, of where or when they originated, of where and when they spread, or of the institutional infrastructure and patronage that enabled and sustained these developments. Anyone undertaking the study of this literature with an historian's perspective should be aware of this problem and work towards its alleviation by confronting the texts with various forms of non-prescriptive evidence.³⁷³

Some of this evidence is to be found within the texts themselves, especially in those of professed human authorship, in the form of accounts of lineages and institutional affiliations and in reports of what other groups were actually doing and thinking. There is also a certain amount of information that can be gleaned outside the Śaiva literature, from portrayals of Śaivas in dramas, historical Kāvya, local chronicles, satirical works, narrative fiction, and reports of their practices and beliefs in non-Śaiva religious literature.

But we also have non-literary evidence. We have the material evidence provided by what survives of temples, monasteries, and images of deities

³⁷¹ See here fn. 87 on p. 24.

³⁷² A fuller account of Śaiva and Śākta literature than I am competent to attempt would also review not only Śaiva texts from Java and Bali but also the substantial bodies of non-prescriptive texts, principally hymns and devotional narratives, written in North-Indian vernaculars, notably Bengali, Maithilī, Hindī, Rājasthānī, and Kashmīrī. For a brief account of this literature in the first four of these languages see GUPTA in GOUDRIAAN and GUPTA 1981, pp. 172–213. In Old Kashmīrī we have the *Mahānayaṅprakāśa*, and verses transmitted with the *Chummāsaṃketaparakāśa*, and in the later language the Vākhs of two female mystics, Lal Dēd/Lalleśvarī (fourteenth century) and Rūp Bhavānī/Alakṣyeśvarī (AD 1625–1721).

³⁷³ See SANDERSON 2013b.

in the various regions; we have ethnographic records of Śaiva groups from the nineteenth century onwards; and above all we have the evidence of the very numerous inscriptions on stone and copper plates found in the subcontinent and Southeast Asia that record donations made by rulers and others to religious beneficiaries, establishing temples and installing deities, and providing endowments to finance their worship and the support of ascetics and priests. These data, material, ethnographic, and epigraphic, enable us to learn much more than the prescriptive texts reveal about the date, spread, and patronage of the Śaiva movements in India and beyond, to gain insight into their relative strength in various regions and periods, and to see important elements of these traditions and their institutions that are not mentioned in the prescriptive literature or if mentioned are not emphasized, and in some cases to find in our texts evidence whose significance is not evident until the texts are re-read in the light of the non-prescriptive record.

The most effective work on Śaivism will be that which not only transcends the long prevalent limitation of focusing on one artificially constructed territory such as ‘Kashmir Śaivism’ or ‘South Indian Śaivism’ to the exclusion of others, not to mention neglect of the position of these coexisting and often co-functioning traditions in the broader picture of brahmanical, Buddhist, and Jaina religion, but also transcends the limitation that has tended to separate those able to read and understand the prescriptive and theoretical literature of religious traditions from those who concentrate their attention on epigraphic and material or ethnographic data. It is only by attempting to encompass all these forms of evidence that we can hope to escape to some extent at least from the limitations of each.

Abbreviations

ac	the reading of the manuscript before correction (<i>ante correctionem</i>)
ASB	Asiatic Society of Bengal
ASI	Archaeological Survey of India
BKI	<i>Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde</i> , formerly (1853–1948) <i>Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië</i>
BLO	Bodleian Library, Oxford
BORI	Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune
CII 4	MIRASHI 1955
Cod.	the reading of the manuscript
conj.	conjecture (mine, if followed by no name)
corr.	correction (mine, if followed by no name)
EC	<i>Epigraphia Carnatica</i>
Ed.	reading of the edition
EFEO	École française d’Extrême-Orient
EI	<i>Epigraphia Indica</i>

em.	emendation (mine, if followed by no name)
FOGG MS	photocopy made in 1995 of a paper manuscript in the Devanāgarī script then in the possession of Sam Fogg Rare Books & Manuscripts, London
fl. c. AD ...	floruit circa (flourished around) AD ...
GOML	Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Chennai
GOS	Gaekwad's Oriental Series
HADDC	<i>The Huntington Archive, Digital Database Collection.</i> < http://huntingtonarchive.osu.edu/database.php >
IA	<i>Indian Antiquary</i>
IFI	Institut français d'Indologie
IFP	Institut français de Pondichéry
IFP MS T.	manuscript transcript, Institut français de Pondichéry
IJJ	<i>Indo-Iranian Journal</i>
IIP	<i>The Inscriptions of Imperial Paramāras</i> → MITTAL 1979
IP	<i>Inscriptions of the Pallavas</i> → MAHALINGAM 1988
ISMEO	Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente
JRAS	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland</i>
K	Khmer inscription, numbered as in CÆDÈS 1966
KED	reading given in the edition of the KSTS
KSTS	Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies
LKA	<i>Licchavikālakā Abhilekha.</i> → VAJRĀCĀRYA 1996
MIA	Middle Indo-Aryan
MS, MSS	manuscript, manuscripts
MS T.	manuscript transcript
NAK	National Archives, Kathmandu
NGMPP	Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, Reel No.
NS	Nepālasaṃvat, the Newari era of AD 879
ORLS	Oriental Research Library, Srinagar, Kashmir
OUP	Oxford University Press
pc	the reading of the manuscript after correction (<i>post correctionem</i>)
Pkt.	Prakrit
r. c.	ruled circa
SII	<i>South-Indian Inscriptions</i>
SBB-PK, OA	Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung
Skt.	Sanskrit
Taishō	The Taishō edition of the Chinese Buddhist Tripiṭaka → TAKAKUSU and WATANABE 1924–1932
tr.	translated by
TSS	Trivandrum Sanskrit Series
ULC	University Library, Cambridge, England

Works Cited

Sanskrit and Prakrit Texts

- Agnikāryapaddhati*. A = ORLS MS 781; B = ORLS MS 1641; C = Göttingen, Cod. MS Mu. 1, 134; D = ORLS MS 1697ii. All are paper MSS in the Śāradā script.
- Agnīpurāṇa*, ed. Baladeva Upādhyāya. Kashi Sanskrit Series 174. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1966.
- Aghoreśvarīśvacchanda*, Paṭala 7. Copenhagen, The Royal Library, MS Nepal 92 (BUESCHER 2011, p. 79): palm-leaf; proto-Bengali script; a disordered fragment (ff. 8r–9v).
- Anādivīraśaivācārasaṃgraha: Śaivasamgraha* of Saṃpādanāsiddha-Vīraśaivayogin. IFP MS T. 355.
- Anuttarapaddhati*. = *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra, Khaṇḍa* 8.
- Anuttaraprakāśapañcāśikā* of Ādyanātha, ed. Mukunda Rāma Śāstrī. KSTS 14 iii. Bombay, 1918.
- Anuttaravimarśinī*. → *Parātrimśikālaghuvṛtti*.
- Anuttarasamvidarcanācārcā*. UNIV. TRIVANDRUM, MS COL 247A: a Devanāgarī library transcript.
- Anteṣṭividhi* → ACHARYA 2010.
- Antyeṣṭividhiprakaraṇa* attributed to Vāmadevaśiva. IFP MS T. 948, pp. 28–44.
- Apratihata mahādīkṣāsuṭippaṇaka* of Viśveśvara. NAK MS 5-4867, NGMPP A 231/17: paper; modern Devanāgarī transcript.
- Amṛtasūryapūjavidhi*. NAK MS 693-1713, NGMPP A 425/29: thyāsaphu; Newari script; with 4 drawings.
- Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*, ed. Vrajavallabha Dvivedī. Yogatantra-granthamālā 12. Varanasi: Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, 1988.
- Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini. → BÖHTLINGK 1887.
- Āgamarahasya, Uttarārḍha* of Sarayūprasāda Dviveda, ed. Gaṅgādhara Dvivedin. Rājasthāna Purāṭana Granthamālā 220. Jodhpur: Rājasthān Prācyavidyā Pratiṣṭhān, 1969.
- Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* of Vedajñāna II. IFP MS T. 55.
- Ānandakanda*, ed. S. V. Radhakrishna Sastri. Madras Government Oriental Series 59. Tanjore: S. Gopalan, Tanjore Maharaja Serfoji's Sarasvati Mahal Library, 1952.
- Ānandakalpavallī* of Maheśvaratejānandanātha. A = GOML MS D 5561, pp. 1–262: modern paper; Telugu script; B = GOML MS R 1698 ('*Ānandakalpalatikā*'): paper; Grantha script; transcribed in 1915–16 from a MS of M. R. Ry. Anappiṇḍi Śivarāmayagāru of Anathavaram in East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh.
- Āmnāyamantrāḥ*. IFP MS T. 1027c (pp. 49–70 and 92–97).
- Āśaucacandrikā* of Uttuṅgaśiva. IFP MS T. 948, pp. 12–22.
- Āśaucadīpikā* of Vedajñāna II. IFP MS T. 370, pp. 326–400.
- Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati (Siddhāntasāra)* of Īśānaśiva, ed. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī. 4 parts. TSS 60, 72, 77, and 83.
- Īśvarapratyabhijñānikārikā* of Utpaladeva with the author's own commentary (-vṛtti). → TORELLA 1994.
- Īśvarapratyabhijñātātparyānvayadīpikā* of Sadānanda. MYSORE E 40719, MS B 167: palm-leaf; Telugu script; 133 folios; complete.
- Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī: Īśvarapratyabhijñānikārikā* of Utpaladeva with the commentary (-vimarśinī) of Abhinavagupta, ed. Mukund Rām Shāstrī. 2 volumes. KSTS 22 and 33. Bombay, 1918 and 1921.
- Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī* of Abhinavagupta with the commentary (*Bhāskarī*) of Bhāskarakaṇṭha, ed. K. A. Subrahmanya Iyer and K. C. Pandey. 2 volumes. Allahabad: Superintendent, Printing and Stationery, United Provinces, 1938 and 1950.
- Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī* of Abhinavagupta with an anonymous South-Indian commentary (-vyākhyā). Pondicherry, IFP MS T. 762.
- Īśvarapratyabhijñāvṛttivimarśinī* of Abhinavagupta, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Shāstrī. KSTS 60, 62, and 65. Bombay: 1938, 1941, and 1943.
- Uṇmaivīlakkam*. → NALLASWAMI PILLAI 1981.
- Ūrdhvāmnāyapavitrārohaṇādamānārohaṇapaddhati*. NGMPP G 23/15: thyāsaphu; Newari script; AD 1795.

- Ūrmikaulārṇava*. NAK MS 5-5207, NGMPP B 115/9: incomplete; paper; Newari script; NAK MS 1-194, NGMPP B 135/36 ('*Mahākaulārṇava*'): paper; Newari script.
- Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva, ed. Paṇḍit Jagadīś Lāl Śāstrī. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.
- Karpūramañjarī* of Rājaśekhara. → KONOW 1901.
- Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu. KSTS 73, Srinagar, 1947.
- Karmasāramahātantra*. NGMPP E 53/1: paper; Newari script.
- Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* of Manoda. A = BORI MS 157 of 1886–92; B = ORLS MS 810; C = BORI MS 1147 of 1886–92; D = ORLS MS 1697; E = ORLS MS 922. All are written in the Śāradā script, and all on paper, except for B, which is written on birch-bark.
- Kāmakalāvīlāsa* of Puṇyānanda with the commentary (*-cidvallī*) of Naṭanānanda, ed. Sadāshiva Mishra. Tantrik Texts 10. Calcutta & London: Āgamānusandhāna Samiti and Luzac, 1922.
- Kāmikāgama: Pūrvabhāga*, 1975; *Uttarabhāga*, 1988. No editor accredited: published by C. Swaminatha Sivacarya. Madras: South-Indian Arcakas' Association.
- Kāraṇāgama* (Vīraśaiva): *Kāraṇāgamaḥ Kriyāpādaḥ* (*Kāraṇāgame Uttarabhāge Kriyāpādaḥ*). *Translation with Notes*, ed. Rama Chandra Paṇḍeya. Varanasi: Shaiva Bharati Shodha Pratisthanam, 1994.
- Kālikākulapañcaśataka*. NAK MS 5-358, NGMPP B 30/26: palm-leaf; Newari script.
- Kālikulakramasadbhāva*. NAK MS 1-76, NGMPP A 203/23: paper; Newari script; incomplete (up to 7.2); probably seventeenth-century.
- Kālikulakramārcana* of Vimalaprabodha. NAK MS 3-314, NGMPP A 129/9: paper; Newari script.
- Kālottara*. NAK MS 1–1114, NGMPP B 25/7: palm-leaf; Pāla script; contains *Jñānapañcāśikā*, *Ekaśatika* (→ GOODALL 2007), *Dviśatika*, *Sārdhatriśatika*, and *Trayodaśaśatika* recensions; NAK 2-226, NGMPP B 25/13: palm-leaf; Newari script; contains only the *Saptaśatika* recension. NAK 1-1583, NGMPP A 39/11: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete; contains the *Sārdhatriśatika* recension.
- Kiraṇa*. NAK MS 5-893, NGMPP A 40/3: palm-leaf; Licchavi script; AD 924.
- Kiraṇa* with the commentary (*Kiraṇavṛtti*) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II on *Vidyāpāda*, Pāṭalas 1–6. → GOODALL 1998. IFP MS T. 290, a transcript of GOML MS D 17160, contains the whole commentary, on *Vidyāpāda*, Pāṭalas 1–12.
- Kiraṇa* with the commentary (*Kiraṇaṭikā*, *Kiraṇajñānakāṇḍaṭikā* called *Bālabodhinī*) of Siṃharāja / Aghoraśivācārya / Vyākhyānikācārya on some chapters of the *Jñānakāṇḍa*, and the commentary of Aghoraśivācārya (*Kiraṇakriyākāṇḍaṭikā* called *Cintāmaṇi*) on nine chapters of the *Kriyākāṇḍa*. IFP MS T. 322.
- Kiraṇa* with the commentary of Tryambakaśambhu (*Kiraṇavṛtti* called *Śiśuhitā*) on the opening chapters of the *Jñānakāṇḍa*. IFP MS T. 1102.
- Kubjikāmata*. → GOUDRIAAN and SCHOTERMAN 1988.
- Kubjikāmatalaghuṭtippanī*. Kathmandu, Kesar Library MS 34, NGMPP C 3/14: palm-leaf; Newari script; AD 1384/5.
- Kulapañcāśikā*. NAK MS 1-1076, NGMPP A 40/13: palm-leaf; Newari script; probably twelfth century.
- Kularatnodayota*. NAK 1-16, NGMPP A 206/10: paper; Newari script; AD 1633/4
- Kulasāra*. NAK MS 4-137, NGMPP 4-137: palm-leaf; early Nāgarī script.
- Kulānanda*. NAK MS 1-1376, NGMPP A 40/6: palm-leaf; Newari script.
- Kulārṇavatantra*, ed. Tārānāth Vidyāratna. Tantrik Texts 5. London: Luzac & Co., 1917.
- Kūrmapurāna*, ed. Anand Swarup Gupta. Varanasi: All-India Kashiraj Trust, 1971.
- Kaulajñānanirṇaya: Kaulajñāna-nirṇaya and Some Minor Texts of the School of Matsyendranātha*, ed. Prabodh Chandra BAGCHI. Calcutta Sanskrit Series 3.d Calcutta: Metropolitan, 1934.
- Kramadīpikā* of Keśavakāśmīrin Bhaṭṭācārya with commentary (*-vivaraṇa*) of Govinda Bhaṭṭācārya, ed. Deviprasada Sarma Sukla. 3 vol. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 233, 236, 254. Banaras: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1917–1919.
- Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu. N = ULC MS ADD. 1406: palm-leaf; Newari script; probably 12th century. KED = *Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī*.
- Kriyākālaguṇottara*. NAK MS 3-392, NGMPP B 25/32: palm-leaf; Pāla script; AD 1184/5. Chapters 1–7, 30, and 34 critically edited in SLOUBER 2012.
- Kriyākramadyotikā* of Aghoraśivācārya with the commentary *Prabhā* of Nirmalamāṇi, ed. Rāmasāstrin and Ambalavānajñānasambandhaparāśaktisvāmin. Cidambaram, 1927.

- Kriyākramadyotikā* of Aghoraśivācārya with the commentary *-vyākhyā* of Kacchapeśvaraśiva. IFP MS T. 109.
- Kriyāsamgrahapaddhati* of Vāladhārin. Kathmandu, Kesar Library, MS 63; NGMPP C 5/3: palm-leaf; Nepalese Bhujimol script; AD 1091/2.
- Kriyāsāra* of Nīlakaṇṭhaśivācārya, ed. R. Ramasastry and N. S. Venkatanathacharya (vol. 1), and S. Narayanaswamy Sastry (vols 2–3). Oriental Research Institute Publications, Sanskrit Series 95, 99, 1000. Mysore: University of Mysore, 1954, 1957 1958.
- Gauḍavaho* of Vākpati with the commentary of Haripāla, ed. Shankar Pandurang. Bombay Sanskrit Series 34. Bombay: Government Central Book Depôt, 1887.
- Gaṇakārikā* with the commentary (*-ratnaṭikā*), ed. C. D. Dalal. gos 15. Baroda: Central Library, 1920.
- Gilgit Manuscript Facsimiles: Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*. Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra. Śata-piṭaka, Indo-Asian literatures, v. 10, parts 1–10. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1959-.
- Gurunāthaparāmarśa* of Madhurāja, ed. P. N. Pushp. KSTS 85. Srinagar, 1960.
- Gurupaṅktistotra*. GOML MS D 15332.
- Gurupustikā* of Rājānaka Śitikaṇṭha. Banaras Hindu University, Sayaji Rao Gaekwad Central Library MS CN 4115: paper; Śāradā script.
- Guhyatantra*. NAK MS 1-86, NGMPP A 151/3: paper; Newari script.
- Caturvargacintāmaṇi* of Hemādri, ed. Bharatacandra Śiromaṇi, Yajñeśvara Smṛtiratna, Kāmākhyānātha Tarkavāgīśa, and Pramathanātha Tarkabhūṣaṇa. 4 volumes bound as 7. Kashi Sanskrit Series 235. Varanasi: Caukhambha Sanskrit Sansthan, 1985.
- Candrajñāna* (Viraśaiva): *Candrajñānāgama, Kriyāpāda & Caryāpāda. English Translation and Notes*, ed. Vajravallabha Dwivedi, tr. and annot. Rama Ghose. Varanasi: Shaiva Bharati Shodha Pratisthanam, 1995.
- Caryāgīti* with the commentary of Munidatta. → KVÆRNE 1986.
- Ciñciṇimata: Ciñciṇimatasaśrasamuccaya*. NAK MS 1-767, NGMPP B 157/19: paper; Newari script; AD 1754.
- Cidambarakṣetrasarvasva*, comprising the *Cidambareśvaranīyapūjāsūtra* (vol. 1) and the *Ciṭṣabheśotsavasūtra* (vol. 2), both attributed to Patañjali, ed. Somasethu Dikshitar. Chidambaram: M. S. Trust, 1977 and 1982.
- Cidgaganacandrikāstava* of Śrīvatsa, ed. Trivikrama Tirtha. Tantrik Texts 20. Calcutta: Āgamānusandhāna Samiti, 1937.
- Cidvilāsastava* of Amṛtānanda. → *Nityāśoḍaśikārnava*.
- Chummāsamketaprakāśa* of Niṣkriyānandanātha. SBB-PK, OA HS OR. 11387 (‘*Triṃśaccarcārahasya*’): paper; Śāradā script. Sayaji Rao Gaekwad Central Library, Banaras Hindu University, MS CN 491: paper; Śāradā script.
- Jayadrathayāmala*, Śaṭka 1. A = NAK MS 3-358, NGMPP A 995/6–996/1: palm-leaf; Pāla script. B = NAK MS 5-4650, NGMPP B 122/7: paper; Nepalese Devanāgarī; AD 1925 from a palm-leaf exemplar.
- Jayadrathayāmala*, Śaṭka 2. NAK MS 5-4650, NGMPP B 153/3: paper; Nepalese Devanāgarī; AD 1925 from a palm-leaf exemplar.
- Jayadrathayāmala*, Śaṭka 3. NAK MS 5-1975, NGMPP A 152/9: paper; Newari script; AD 1686/9.
- Jayadrathayāmala*, Śaṭka 4. NAK MS 1-1468, NGMPP B 122/4: paper; Newari script; AD 1626/7.
- Jayadrathayāmalaprastāramantrasamgraha*. A = NAK 1-258, NGMPP A 152/8, ff. 3v3–64r5: paper; Newari script; AD 1642/3. B = NAK 1-1514, NAK 1-1514, NGMPP A 1267/3: paper; Newari script; AD 1584/4.
- Jñānadīpavimarśinī* of Vidyānanda. NAK MS 4-753, NGMPP B 26/12: palm-leaf; Newari script; AD 1382/3.
- Jñānapañcāśikā*. → *Kālottara*.
- Jñānaratnāvalī* of Jñānaśivācārya. A = MYSORE E 40723, MS P. 3801/7: palm-leaf; Nandināgarī script. B = IFP MS T. 231.
- Jñānasiddhyāgama*. IFP MS T. 507, pp. 395–481.
- Jñānārṇava: Jñānārṇavatantra*, ed. Gaṇeśaśāstrī Gokhale. Ānandāśramasamskṛtagranthāvalī 69. Pune: Ānandāśrama, 1952.
- Tattvatrayanirṇaya* of Sadyojyotis with the commentary (*-vṛtti*) of Aghoraśiva. → *Aṣṭaprakarana*.

- Tattvatrayanirṇayavivṛti* of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha → GOODALL et al. 2008.
- Tattvapraṅkāśa* of Bhojadeva with the commentaries of Aghoraśivācārya (-*vṛtti*) and Kumāra (-*tātparyadīpikā*). → *Aṣṭaparakaraṇa*.
- Tattvaratnāvalī* of Vimalācārya, also known as Paramāśrotriya Sadāśiva. NAK MS 1-1697, NGMPP B 26/17: palm-leaf; Pāla script; probably 12th century; incomplete (26 out of 46 folios).
- Tattvasaṃgraha* of Sadyojyotis with the commentary (-*vṛtti*) of Aghoraśiva. → *Aṣṭaparakaraṇa*.
- Tantrarājatantrāvatārstotra* of Viśvāvarta. A = NAK 1-258, NGMPP A A152/8, ff. 1v1–3v1. B = NAK 1-154, ff. 1v1–3v7. On these MSS see here *Jayadrathayāmalapraśtāramantrasaṃgraha*.
- Tantrasadbhāva*. NAK MS 1-445, NGMPP A 44/2; palm-leaf; Newari script; AD 1096/7.
- Tantrasārasaṃgraha* of Nārāyaṇa of Śivapura with the commentary (-*mantravimarśinī*) of Vāsudeva of Svarṇagrāma, ed. N. V. P. Unithiri. Calicut University Sanskrit Series 15–16. Calicut: University of Calicut, 2002.
- Tantrasārasaṃgraha* of Nārāyaṇa of Śivapura with an anonymous commentary (-*bhāṣya*), ed. M. Duraiswami Aiyangar. Vrajajivan Prachyabharati Granthamala 62. Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, 1992.
- Tantrasamuccaya* of Cennās Nārāyaṇan Nampūtiri with the commentary (-*vimarśinī*) of his son Śaṅkaran Nampūtiri, ed. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī with an introduction by N. P. Unni. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1990. Reprint. Originally published: Trivandrum, 1919–1921.
- Tantrasāra* of Abhinavagupta, ed. Mukund Rām Śāstrī. KSTS 17. Bombay, 1918.
- Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta with the commentary (-*viveka*) of Rājānaka Jayaratha, ed. Mukund Rām Śāstrī. KSTS 23, 28, 30, 35, 29, 41, 47, 59, 52, 57, 58. Bombay and Srinagar, 1918–38.
- Tantrāloka* MSS: A = ORLS MS 2550; B = ORLS MS 1716; C = ORLS MS 1352; D = ORLS MS 2201; E = ORLS MS 1792.
- Timirodghāṭana*. NAK MS 5-690, NGMPP A 35/3: palm-leaf; Licchavi script.
- Tiruvācakam* of Māṅikavācakar. → POPE 1900.
- Trikasāra*. NAK MS 1-1693, NGMPP A 997/4: palm-leaf; a fragment (3 damaged folios) containing the colophon of the third Pariccheda. NAK 1.1693, NGMPP A 997/4: 3 palm-leaf folios; Newari script.
- Tripurārahasya* with the commentary (-*tātparyadīpikā*) of Śrīnivāsabhaṭṭa, ed. Gopinath Kaviraj. Sarasvatī Bhavana Granthamālā 15, Varanasi, 1965.
- Tripurārcanamañjarī* of Gadādhara Bhaṭṭācārya (Jñānāndanātha). FOGG MS.
- Tripurāsārasamuccaya* of Nāgabhaṭṭa with the commentary (-*sampradāyadīpikā*) of Govindācārya, ed. Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara. 2nd edition. Calcutta: 1897.
- Tvaritājñānakalpa*. NAK MS 4-304; NGMPP A 59/15: palm-leaf; Nepalese Bhujimol script; NAK MS 1-226. NGMPP B 26/14(1): palm-leaf; Newari script.
- Tvariāmūlasūtra*. A = NAK MS 5-4852, NGMPP B 126/9: palm-leaf; complete; B = Kathmandu, Kesar Library MS 70, NGMPP C 6/7: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete; dated in AD 1196/7.
- Dikṣottara*. → *Niśvāsakārikā*.
- Darśanasāra* of Devasena. → UPADHYE 1934.
- Dasaveyāliyasutta* [*Daśavaikālikasūtra*]: *Dasakāliasuttaṃ* with the commentary (-*niryukti*) of Bhadrabāhu and the commentary (-*cūrṇi*) of Agastyasiṃha, ed. Muni Puṇyavijaya. Prakrit Text Society Series 17. Ahmedabad: Prakrit Text Society, 2003.
- Dikṣādarśa* of Vedajñāna II. IFP MSS T. 76 and 153.
- Devikālottara*, with the commentary of Nirañjanasiddha, ed. Gopinatha Kaviraja. Varanasi: Shaiva Bharati Shodha Pratishthanam, 2000.
- Devikālottara*, with the commentary of the author of a commentary on the *Siddhāntasārāvalī*, perhaps Anantaśambhu. IFP MS T. 371c, pp. 1848–1907.
- **Devitantrasadbhāvasāra*. A text on the cult of the Śaiva *vāmasrotah* by an unnamed author. *Gilgit Manuscript Facsimiles*, 3221–3222 and 3340–3341: birch-bark; proto-Śāradā script (Gilgit/Bamiyan type 2); incomplete (the first two folios only).
- Devīdyardhaśatikā*. NAK MS 1-242. NGMPP A 161/12: paper; Newari script; probably 17th century.
- Devīrahasya* with Pariśiṣṭas, ed. Ram Chandra Kak and Harabhaṭṭa Shastri. Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, 1993. Reprint. Originally published: Srinagar, 1941.
- Devyamata*. A = NAK MS 1-279; NGMPP A 41/15 ('*Niśvāsākhya mahātāntra*'): palm-leaf; Newari script; AD 1060 (see PETECH 1984, p. 44); B = NAK MS 1-1003; NGMPP B 27/6 '*Pratiṣṭhātāntra*'; palm-

- leaf; Newari script; AD 1134 (see PETECH 1984, p. 59).
- Dviśatikālottaravṛtti* of Aghoraśiva. Pondicherry, IFP MS T. 176.
- Dhātupāṭha*, ed. N. L. WESTERGAARD in BÖHTLINGK 1887.
- Dhyānaratnāvalī* of Trilocanaśiva. IFP MS 42976.
- Naṭarājapaddhati* of Rāmanātha of Tiruvārūr. A modern transcript in the Śaiva monastery at Tiruvāvaṭuturai, near Kumbhakonam.
- Narapatijayacaryā*, also called *Svarodaya*, of Narapati with the commentary (*-jayalakṣmī*) of Hari-vaṃśa Pāṭhaka. Lithograph edition. Banaras: Kāśisamskṛtamudrāyantr, 1882.
- Nareśvaraparīkṣā* of Sadyojyotis with the commentary (*-prakāśa*) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shastri. KSTS 45. Srinagar, 1926.
- Narmamālā* of Kṣemendra. → BALDISSERA 2005.
- Navasāhasāṅkacarita* of Padmagupta alias Parimala, ed. Vāmanaśāstrī Islāmapurakara. Bombay Sanskrit Series 53. Bombay: Education Society Press, 1895.
- Nāgānandasūtravivarāṇa* by Heddase Hariharaśarman. MYSORE E 40751, MS B. 168: paper; Telugu script.
- Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharatamuni with the commentary (*Abhinavabhāratī*) of Abhinavagupta, ed. Manavalli Ramakrishna Kavi. 4 vols. GOS 36, 68, 124, 145. Baroda: Central Library (vol. 1), Oriental Institute (vols 2–4), 1926–1964.
- Nādakārikā* of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II with the commentary of Aghorasiva. → *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*.
- Nityakaumudī*. → *Nityaprakāśa*.
- Nityakriyānusamdhāna* of Brahmaśambhu. In MS 511 of the Kesar Library (Kathmandu), NGMPP Reel C 48/2 (*‘Kālotara; Agnīdhāna; Śrīmatapaddhati’*): 14 disordered folios numbered 1–3, 5–7, 9, 11, 14–18, and 20; palm-leaf; no date, but two other texts in this composite MS in what appears to be the same hand are dated in AD 1152 and 1162.
- Nityaprakāśa* of Vīracandra with the commentary *Nityakaumudī (Nityaprakāśavivarāṇapañjikā)* of Gaṅgādhara. A = NAK MS 6-8, NGMPP A 963/4: palm-leaf; Newari script; AD 1206/7; B = NAK MS 4-324, NGMPP B 35/26: palm-leaf; East-Indian Devanāgarī.
- Nityākaula*. NAK MS 2-226, NGMPP B 26/21: palm-leaf; Newari script; badly damaged and incomplete (ff. 2–3 and 6–13), breaking off in the sixth Paṭala.
- Nityādisamgraha* compiled by Rājānaka Takṣakavarta. A = BORI MS 76 of 1875/76: paper; Śāradā script; wrongly catalogued as *Bhṛṅgeśasamhitā*; B = BLO MS Stein Or. d. 43 (*‘Nityādisamgrahābhīdhānapaddhati’*): paper; Śāradā script; an apograph of A.
- Nityāhnikatilaka* of Jaya. A = NAK 5-854, NGMPP B 26/2: palm-leaf; Newari script; AD 1268/9; B = NAK 1-1320, NGMPP B 26/10: palm-leaf; proto-Bengali script.
- Nityāśoḍaśīkārṇava* with the commentaries of Śivānanda (*Rjūvimarśinī*) and Vidyānanda (*Artharatnāvalī*), ed. Vrajavallabha Dvivedi, Varanasi: Sampurnananda Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, 1985. [Includes also the *Tripurasundarīdaṇḍaka* of Dīpakanātha (pp. 279–283), the *Subhagodaya* (pp. 284–296), *Subhagodayavāsanā* (pp. 297–303), and *Saubhāgyahṛdayastotra* of Śivānanda (pp. 304–305), and the *Saubhāgyasudhodaya* (pp. 306–321) and *Cidvilāsastava* (pp. 312–328) of Amṛtānanda].
- Nityotsava* of Umānandanātha, ed. A. Mahadeva Sastri, revised and enlarged by Swami Trivikrama Tirtha. 3rd. ed. GOS 23. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1948.
- Nidhipradīpa* of Śrīkaṇṭhaśambhu, ed. Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī. TSS 17. Trivandrum, 1930. A = MYSORE 51996, MS B. 139, MYSORE vol. 17, Appendix, pp. 368–369.
- Niśisamcāra*. NAK MS 1-1604, NGMPP B 26/25: palm-leaf; Newari script.
- Niśvāsakārikā*. A = IFP MS T. 127 (pp. 1–162: *Niśvāsakārikā-Dīkṣottara*, Paṭalas 1 [from v. 35] to 19; pp. 162–493: *Niśvāsakārikā*, Paṭalas 12–61; pp. 493–497: *Niśvāsakārikā-Dīkṣottara*, Paṭala 1, vv. 1–34; pp. 497–506: incomplete at the beginning and end; not yet identified); B = IFP MS T. 17 (pp. 1–794: *Niśvāsakārikā*, Paṭalas 12–61; pp. 795–1152: *Dīkṣottara* [complete, Paṭalas 1–19]).
- Niśvāsattvasamhitā* NAK MS 1-277, NGMPP A 41/14: palm-leaf; Licchavi script; c. AD 850–900. Comprises the following works: *Niśvāsamukha*, *Niśvāsamūla (Mūlasūtra)*, *Niśvāsottara (Uttarasūtra)*, *Niśvāsanaya (Nayasūtra)*, and *Niśvāsaguhya (Guhyasūtra)*.
- Niśvāsamukha*. = *Niśvāsattvasamhitā*, ff. 1v–18v.

- Niśvāsamūla*. = *Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā*, ff. 18v–23v.
Niśvāsottara. = *Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā*, ff. 24r–29r.
Netratantra with the commentary (*Netroddyota*) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 46, 59. Bombay, 1926 and 1939.
Netrodbhava. MS 539 of the Kesar Library (Kathmandu), NGMPP c 114/22 (9ii): palm-leaf; Newari script; AD 1058/9.
Naimittikakriyānusaṃdhāna of Brahmaśambhu. Calcutta, ASB MS G 4767: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete; probably 11th century.
Nyāyamañjarī of Jayanta, 2 vols. ed. K.S. Varadacharya. Oriental Research Institute Series 116 and 139. Mysore: University of Mysore, 1969 and 1983.
Pañcaratna of Virañārādhyā with the commentary (*-pañcikā*) of Revañārādhyā. IFP MS T. 658.
Pañcākṣarīsthala. MYSORE E 41006, MS P. 9264/15: palm-leaf; Kannaḍa.
Pañcārtha, *Pañcārthabhāṣya*. → *Pāśupatasūtra*.
Pañcāvaranastava of Aghoraśiva. → GOODALL et al. 2005.
Padyāvāhinī of Śāṅkara, son of Somānanda. Pondicherry, IFP MS T. 639.
Pampāmāhātmya, *Uttarabhāga*, Adhyāyas 11–16, ed. FILLIOZAT 2001, pp. 96–152.
Paramaśivādvaitakalpalatā of Śāmbhavānandanātha. IFP MS T. 594.
Paramānandatāntra with the commentary (*Saubhāgyānandasam̐doha*) of Maheśvarānandanātha, ed. Raghunātha Miśra. Yogatantragranthamālā 9. Varanasi: Sampurnananda Vishvavidyalaya, 1985.
Paramokṣanirāsakārikā of Sadyojyotis with the commentary (*-vṛtti*) of Rāmakaṅṭha II. → *Aṣṭapra-karaṇa* and WATSON et al. 2013.
Paraśurāmakalpasūtra with the commentary (*-vṛtti*) of Rāmeśvara, ed. A. Mahadeva Sastri, revised and enlarged by Sakarlal Yajneswar Sastri Dave. gos 22. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1979.
**Parākramavāsana*. = *Paramaśivādvaitakalpalatikā* of Śāmbhavānandanātha, pp. 211, l. 14–214, l. 2.
Parātriṃśikālaghuvṛtti, also called *Anuttaravimarśinī*, attributed to Abhinavagupta, ed. Jagaddhara Zadoo. KSTS 68. Srinagar, 1947
Parātantra. Calcutta, ASB MS G 4775: paper; Newari script.
Parātriṃśikāvivarāṇa of Abhinavagupta → GNOLI 1985.
Parātriṃśikāvivarāṇa of Sadānanda. MYSORE E 40761, MS B. 170/2: paper; Kannaḍa script.
Parātriṃśikālaghuvṛttivimarśinī of Kṛṣṇadāsa. TRIVANDRUM MS 1074D (vol. 6).
Parātriṃśikāitāparyādīpikā, ed. Jagaddhar Zadoo. KSTS 74. Srinagar, 1947.
Parānandatāntra, *Mantrakhaṇḍa*, *Pāda 2*, chapters 15 and 16. IFP MS T. 578i (pp. 2–14).
Parāpaddhati. *Nityotsava* of Umānandanātha, pp. 147–152.
Parāpūjāprayoga. GOML MS D 5677: paper; Telugu script.
Parāprāveśikā of Nāgānanda [attributed to Kṣemarāja], ed. Mukunda Rāma Śāstrī. KSTS 15. Bombay, 1918. See also *Nāgānandasūtravivarāṇa* and *Svarūpavimarśinī*.
Parāmantramāhātmya, the 53rd Kalpa of the *Tripurasundarītāntra*. IFP MS T. 621, pp. 111–113.
**Parārcanakrama*. IFP MS T. 307 (*‘Aghoraśivācāryapaddhati’*), frames 148–157 [= ff. 138–144 of its exemplar], and, after a lacuna [ff. 145–146 are missing in its exemplar], 158–166 [= ff. 147–153r of the exemplar]. Other closely related and yet more detailed material, partly in verse, begins on frame 250 and breaks off incomplete on 253 [= ff. 58–60 of the exemplar].
Paryantapañcāsikā attributed to Abhinavagupta: *The Paryanta Pañcāsikā of Abhinavagupta*, ed. V. Raghavan. *Annals of Oriental Research* 8. Madras, 1950–51.
Pātravidhi → ACHARYA 2011.
Pārameśvara. ULC MS ADD. 1049 (*‘Pārameśvaratantra’*): palm-leaf; Licchavi script; incomplete; [Aṃśuvarman’s era] Saṃvat 252 = AD 819.
Pārameśvara (Vīraśaiva): *Pārameśvarāgama*, ed. Vrajavallabha Dwivedi. Varanasi: Shaiva Bharati Shodha Prtatishthanam, 1995.
Pāśupatasūtra (= *Pañcārtha*) with the commentary (*Pañcārthabhāṣya*) of Bhagavat Kauṇḍinya, ed. R. Anantakrishna Sastri. TSS 143. Trivandrum: University of Travancore, 1940.
Piṅgalāmata. NAK MS 3–376, NGMPP A 42/2; palm-leaf; Newari script; AD 1173/4.
Picumata (= *Brahmayāmala*). NAK MS 3–370, NGMPP A 42/6; palm-leaf; Newari script; AD 1052.

- Pūjākānda*. ULC MS ADD. 1412: thyāsaphu; Newari script. The codex contains (i) one side of a *Kubjikāpaddhati*; (ii) the second half of a *Mahārthakramapañcakamantrapaddhati*, beginning with the last of the Mantras of the Jñānasiddhas; (iii) an incomplete *Amṛtabhairavārcanavidhi* dated in AD 1278; (iv) the first half of the *Mahārthakramapañcakamantrapaddhati*; (v) a *Tripurabhairavīpūjācakravīdhi*; (vi) an *Amṛtīśabhairavabhaṭṭārakāhnikavidhi*; and (vii) an *Amṛtasūryārcanavidhi*.
- Pratiṣṭhāsārapaddhati* of a disciple of Kumāraśiva. Calcutta, ASB MS G 2465 [5651].
- Pratyāṅgirāstotra*. On nine and a half unnumbered folio sides at the end of ORLS MS 1214: paper; Śāradā script.
- Pratyabhijñākaumudī* of Bhaṭṭāraka Sundara, a commentary on the *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā* of Utpaladeva. ORLS MS 1089: paper; Śāradā script.
- Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* of Kṣemarāja, ed. Jagadish Chandra Chatterji. KSTS 3. Srinagar, 1911.
- Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅgācārya, ed. Jinavijayamuni. Singhi Jaina Series 1. Śāntiniketan: The Adhiṣṭhātā, Singhī Jaina Jñānapīṭha, 1933.
- Pramathagaṇapaddhati* of Sosale Revaṅārādhyā, MYSORE E 41014, MS P. 5077/1: palm-leaf; Nandināgarī.
- Prayogamañjarī* of Ravi, ed. C. K. Raman Nambiar with an introduction by N.P. Unni. Śrīravivarmasamskr̥tagranthāvalī. Śivapura, Kerala: Maṅgalodaya Printing Press, 1953–1954.
- Prāṇatoṣaṇī* of Rāmatoṣaṇa Bhaṭṭācārya. 3rd. printing. Calcutta: Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara Bhaṭṭācārya, 1898.
- Prāyaścittavidhi* taught by Gārgyapāda. In *Dīkṣāvidhi*, NAK MS 1-736, NGMPP B 32/12 (palm-leaf; Devanāgarī script), ff. 12r–.
- Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Trilocanaśiva. IFP MS T. 15C.
- Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Hṛdayaśiva. ULC ADD. 2833: palm-leaf; Newari script; dated AD 1157/8.
- Balikalpa*. Oriental Manuscript Library, University of Kerala, T. 792 (paper; Devanāgarī), pp. 246–279.
- Bahurūpagarbhasottra* assigned to the *Lalitasvacchanda*, with the commentary (*-viśamapada-saṃketa*) of Anantaśakti, ed. Śambhunāth Rāzdān. New Delhi: Śrī Lāl Bahādur Śāstrī Kendriya-Samskr̥ta-Vidyāpīṭh, 1986.
- Bālabhārata* of Rājaśekhara, ed. Paṇḍita Durgāprasāda and Kāśinātha Pāṇḍuraṅga Paraba. Kāvyaṃālā 4, Pt. 2. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgara, 1887.
- Bālarāmāyaṇa* of Rājaśekhara, ed. Govinda Deva Śāstrī. Banaras: Medical Hall Press, 1869.
- Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* of Kṣemendra, ed. Śivadatta and Kāśināth Pāṇḍuraṅga Parab. Kāvyaṃālā 69. Bombay: Pāṇḍuraṅga Jāvajī, 1931.
- Bṛhatkālottara*. NAK MS 4-139, NGMPP A 43/1: palm-leaf; Pāla script; AD 1161.
- Bṛhatsaṃhitā* of Varāhamihira, with the commentary of Bhaṭṭotpala, ed. Sudhākara Dvivedī. 2 parts. Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series 10. Banaras: Lazarus, 1895.
- Brahmayāmala*. → *Picumata*.
- Brahmayāmala*. A = IFP MS T. 522: a South-Indian *mātrpratiṣṭhātāntram* in 69 Paṭalas. B = UNIV. TRIVANDRUM MS 11170: paper; Devanāgarī transcript; an incomplete South-Indian *mātrpratiṣṭhātāntram*, breaking off in the fifth Paṭala.
- Bhāvacūdāmaṇi*, the commentary of Bhaṭṭa Vidyākāṇṭha on the *Mayasaṃgraha*. Raghunath Temple MSS Library, Jammu, MS 5291: paper; Kashmirian Devanāgarī.
- Bhāvanāpuruṣottama* of ‘Ratnakheṭa’ Śrīnivāsabhaṭṭa, ed. S. Swaminatha Sastri with a Sanskrit introduction. Tanjore Sarasvati Mahal Series 167. Thanjavur: D. Gangappa, 1979.
- Bhuvanamālīnīkalpaviśamapadavivṛtti* of Śrīvatsa. SBB-PK, OA HS OR. 12231: paper; Śāradā script.
- Bhairavīvardhamānaka*, a hymn to Bhairavī on 51a and 53a–b of the Cambridge *Pārameśvara* codex of AD 819.
- Bhogakārikā* of Sadyojyotis with the commentary (*-vṛtti*) of Aghoraśiva. → *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*.
- Makuṭa* (Vīraśaiva): *Makuṭāgama: Kriyāpāda & Caryāpāda*, ed. Vrajavallabha Dvivedī, English translation and notes by Rama Ghose. Varanasi: Shaiva Bharati Shodha Pratishthanam, 1996.
- Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama (Vidyāpāda)* with the commentary (*Mataṅgavṛtti*) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II, ed. N. R. Bhatt. Publications de l’IFI 56. Pondicherry: IFI, 1977; *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama (Kriyāpāda, Yogapāda et Caryāpāda)* with the commentary of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II, ed. N. R.

- Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI 65. Pondicherry: IFI, 1982.
- Mataṅgavṛtti* → *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama*.
- Matasāra*. NAK MS 3-379, NGMPP B 28/16: palm-leaf; Pāla script; probably 12th century.
- Manthānabhairava, Siddhakhaṇḍa*. Scans courtesy of Sam Fogg Rare Books & Manuscripts, London; palm-leaf; Pāla script; 491 folios; probably 12th century. Present location unknown.
- Mayasaṃgraha*. NAK MS 1-1537, NGMPP A 31/18: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete.
- Mahākālasaṃhitā, Kāmakalākāṇḍa*, ed. Gopīnātha Kavirāja, Allahabad: Gaṅgānāth Jhā Kendriya Saṃskṛt Vidyāpīṭh, 1971; *Guhyakālīkhaṇḍa*, ed. Kīśornāth Jhā, 3 parts, Allahabad: Gaṅgānāth Jhā Kendriya Saṃskṛt Vidyāpīṭh, 1976, 1977, 1979.
- Mahānayaṃprakāśa* by an unknown Kashmirian author, ed. K. Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī. TSS 130, Citrodaya-maṅjarī 19. Trivandrum, 1937.
- Mahānayaṃprakāśa* of Kulācārya Aṃśasimha. NAK MS 5-358, NGMPP B 30/26 ('*Kālīkākulapañcaśataka*'), ff. 103v1–130r5: palm-leaf; Newari script.
- Mahānayaṃprakāśa* of Śitikanṭha in Old Kashmiri with a Sanskrit commentary, ed. Mukunda Rāma Śāstrī. KSTS 21. Bombay, 1918.
- Mahāpurāṇa* of Puṣpadanta, ed. P. L. Vaidya. 5 parts. Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Granthamālā, Apabhraṃśa Grantha 15–18, 23. 2nd edition with a Hindi tr. by Devendra Kumāra. New Delhi: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha, 1979–1999. First published 1937–1941.
- Mahābhārata*, ed. V. S. Sukthankar et al., since 1943 S. Belvalkar. 19 volumes. Pune: BORI, 1927–1959.
- Mahābhairavamāṅgalā*. NAK MS 1-687, NGMPP B 27/21: palm-leaf; Licchavi script; probably 9th century.
- Mahāyāgapaddhati* of Lakṣmīnāthaśāstrin (Ambikānandanātha). FOGG MS.
- Mahārthakramapañcakamantrapaddhati*. → *Pūjākāṇḍa*.
- Mahārthamaṅjarī* of Maheśvarānanda with auto-commentary (*-parimala*), ed. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī. TSS 66. Trivandrum, 1919.
- Mahārthamūlasaṃketasūtra* of Paraśambhudeva. IFP MS T. 1027, pp. 90–91.
- Mahālakṣmīratnakośa*, Adhyāyas 82–87. IFP MS T. 578ii (pp. 14–40). On the Āmnāyamantras.
- Mahotsavavidhi* of Aghoraśiva, ed. C. Swaminatha Sivacarya. Madras: South-Indian Archakar Association, 1974.
- Māṭṛsadbhāva*. Oriental Manuscript Library, University of Kerala, T. 792: paper; Devanāgarī; 2800 granthas; incomplete; no date. It comprises the *Māṭṛsadbhāva* from its beginning but breaking off incomplete in the 28th Paṭala (pp. 1–246). See also *Balikalpa*.
- Mānasollāsa* of Someśvara, ed. G. K. Shrigondekar. 3 volumes. Gos 28, 84, 138. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1925, 1929, 1961.
- Mālinīvijayottaratantra*, ed. Madhusūdana Kaula Śāstrī. KSTS 37. Srinagar, 1922.
- Mālinīślokovārttika: Mālinīvijayavārttika* of Abhinavagupta, ed. Madhusudan Kaul. KSTS 32. Srinagar, 1921. See also HANNEDER 1998.
- Mudrālakṣaṇa* (cited in Nirmalamāni's commentary *Prabhā* on the *Kriyākramadyotikā* of Aghoraśiva), ed. S. S. Janaki. Mayiladuturai: International Institute of Śaiva Siddhānta Research, 1986.
- Mrgendra, Vidyāpāda* and *Yogapāda*, with the commentary (*-vṛtti*) of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, ed. Madhusudan Kaul. KSTS 50. Srinagar, 1930; *Kriyāpāda* and *Caryāpāda*, with the commentary (*-vṛtti*) of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, ed. N. R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI 23. Pondicherry: IFI, 1962.
- Mrgendravṛttidīpikā* of Aghoraśivācarya on Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha's *Mrgendratantravṛtti*, ed. Nā. Kṛṣṇaśāstrin and K. M. Subrahmaṇyaśāstrin. Śivāgamasiddhāntaparipālanasaṅgha Publications 12. Devakottai: Śivāgamasiddhāntaparipālanasaṅgha, 1928.
- Mrgendrapaddhati* of Aghoraśiva with the commentary (*-vyākhyā*) of Vaktraśambhu IFP MS T. 1021.
- Merutantra*, ed. Raghunāthaśāstri Ojhā. Bombay: Khemarāja Śrīkṛṣṇadāsa, 1990. First published in 1908.
- Mokṣakārikā* of Sadyojyotis with the commentary (*-vṛtti*) of Rāmakaṇṭha II. → *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*.
- Mohacūrottara*. NAK 5-1977, NGMPP A 182/2: paper; Nepalese Devanāgarī.
- Mohaśūrottara*. → *Mohacūrottara*.
- Yamaprakaraṇa* of Viśuddhamuni, ed. C. D. Dalal, as an appendix of his edition of the *Gaṇakārikā*-

- ratnaṅkā*, pp. 24–25.
- Yavanajātaka* of Sphujidhvaja. → PINGREE 1979.
- Yaśastilaka* of Somadevasūri with the commentary of Śrutadevasūri, ed. Śivadatta, Vāsudeva Laxman Śāstrī Paṇāśikar, and Kāśīnātha Pāṇḍuraṅg. Kāvyaṃālā 70. Bombay: Nirṇayasāgar. 1903–1916. Cod. = BORI MS 230 of 19012–1907: paper; Devanāgarī.
- Yāmalatantra*. IFP MS T. 142b (pp. 20–28).
- Yuddhajayārṇava*. A = Kesar Library 69, NGMPP C 6/6: palm-leaf; Newari script; AD 1061; B = NAK MS 1-72, NGMPP B 27/6: palm-leaf; Newari script.
- Yogarātnāvalī* of Paramaśaivācārya Śrīkaṅṭhaśambhu. IFP MS T. 993: copied from a palm-leaf MS of c. AD 1700 written in the Tuḷu script from the Udipi District of Karnataka.
- Yoginīhṛdaya* with the commentaries of Amṛtānanda (*-dīpikā*) and Bhāskararāya (*-setubandha*). ed. Gopinath Kaviraj, 2nd ed. (Sarasvatī Bhavana Granthamālā 7), Varanasi: Varaneya Sanskrit Vishwavidyalaya, 1963.
- Yonigahvara*. ASB G 1000; palm-leaf; Newari script.
- Ratnaṅkā*. → *Gaṇakārikā*.
- Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* of Śrīkaṅṭha with the commentary (*Ratnollekhinī*) of Aghoraśiva. In *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa* ed. Vrajavallabha Dviveda (Varanasi: Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, 1988), pp. 147–202.
- Rasaratnasamuccaya* of Vāgbhaṭa, ed. Puruṣottam Govind Rānade. Ānandāśramasamskṛtagranthāvalī 115. Poona: Ānandāśrama, 1941.
- Rasavacchanda*. NAK MS 1-248, NGMPP A 222/6: thyāsaphu; Newari script; fragment (10 folios); no date.
- Rasārṇava*, ed. P. C. Ray and Hariscandra Kaviratna. Bibliotheca Indica 174. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1910.
- Rājatarāṅgiṇī* of Kalhaṇa, ed. M. A. Stein. Reprint. Delhi: Munshi Ram Manohar Lal, 1960. First published in 1892.
- Rāmācarita* of Sandhyākaranandin with a commentary of unknown authorship → SHASTRI and BASAK 1969.
- Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki, ed. G. H. Bhatt et al. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1960–1975.
- Rudrasānti*. NGMPP A 256/44 ii (f. 8v6–26v8; ends: *iti śrīrudrasānti mahāmāridurbhikṣaprasāntividhiṃ samāptā*).
- Ruruvidvidhānapūjāpaddhati*. GOML MS R 3365, SR 1865: paper; Malayalam script; transcribed in 1920–1921 from a MS of the Raja of Chirakkal.
- Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*. Edited as chapters of the *Vidyāpāda* in *Rauravāgama*, ed. N. R. Bhatt (3 vols, Publications de l'IFI 18. Pondicherry: IFI, 1961–1988), vol. 1, pp. 1–16 and 175–194.
- Lakṣaṇasaṃgraha: Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya* of Vairocana, 2 parts, ed. Dāmodaraśarma and Bābukṣaśarma. Kathmandu: Rāṣṭriyābhilekhālaya, Vikrama 2023 and 2025 [AD 1966 and 1968].
- Lakṣmīdharā*: the commentary of Lakṣmīdhara on the *Saundaryalaharī*. In *Saundaryalaharī of Śaṅkarabhagavatpāda with Commentaries*, ed. A. Kuppaswami (Delhi: Nag), 1991.
- Laghvikāmnāya*. NAK MS 5-877/57, NGMPP A 41/3: palm-leaf; Newari script; AD 1037/8.
- Lalitaparamarahasya*. ULC MS ADD. 2477: paper; a cursive Śāradā script. Thus wrongly titled in the library's handwritten list of uncatalogued MSS. Contains a Paddhati for regular Śaiva worship (*nityapūjā*) followed (f. 15r) by a Paddhati for Śaiva worship on festal days (*naimittikapūjā*).
- Liṅgadhāraṇacandrikā* of Nandikeśvara with the commentary of Śivakumārasāstrin, ed. Vrajavallabha Dvivedī with a Hindī translation by Svāmi Śivānanda. Śivadharmagranthamālā 31. Vārāṇasī: Śaivabhāratī Bhavana, 1988.
- Varuṇapaddhati* of Varuṇaśiva with the commentary (*-vṛtti*) of Bhaṭṭa Śivottama. IFP MS T. 143.
- Varuṇapaddhati* of Varuṇaśiva with the commentary (*-vilocana*) of Vedajñāna II. IFP MS T. 1034. Ed. T. Ganesan (*Dikṣāprakarāṇa* only): *Varuṇapaddhatiḥ varuṇaśivaviracitā nigamajñānadesīkaviracitavilocanākhyaṅkhyāśahitā (dikṣāprakarāṇam)*. Pondicherry: French Institute, 2006.
- Varṇāśramacandrikā*, anon. IFP MS T. 533, pp. 1–114.
- Vātulaśuddha* (Vīraśaiva): *Vātulaśuddhāgama*, ed. H. P. Malledevaru. Mysore: Oriental Research Institute, 1983.

- Vāmakeśvarīmata* with the commentary (-*vivarāṇa*) of Rājānaka Jayaratha, ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shastri. KSTS 66, Srinagar, 1945.
- Vijñānakaumudī*: the Vijñānabhairava with the commentary (*Vijñānakaumudī*) of Bhaṭṭāraka Ānanda, ed. Mukunda Rāma Śāstrī KSTS 9. Bombay, 1918.
- Vijñānabhairava* with the commentary (-*uddyota*) of Kṣemarāja on vv. 1–23 and the commentary (-*vivṛti*) of Śivopādhyāya on the rest, ed. Mukund Ram Sastrī. KSTS 8. Bombay, 1918.
- Vitastāmāhātmya*. MS photographically reproduced in CHANDRA 1983, pp. 556–698 (paper; Śāradā script; no date).
- Vimalāvati* of Vimalaśiva. N = NAK MS 1-1536, NGMPP B 28/7: palm-leaf; Newari script; A = NAK MS 1–131, NGMPP A 186/10: paper, Newari script. B = NAK MS 8-586, NGMPP A 187/1: paper; Newari script.
- Virūpākṣapañcāśikā* with the commentary of Vidyācakraṅgartin, ed. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī. TSS 9. Trivandrum, 1910.
- Virūpākṣapañcāśikāṭṭparyānvayadīpikā* of Hariharaśarman. MYSORE E 40819, MS B. 169/2: paper; Telugu script.
- Vivekacintāmaṇi* of Liṅgarāja. MYSORE E 41038, MS P. 4945: palm-leaf; Telugu script.
- Vīṇāśikha* → GOUDRIAAN 1985; A = NAK MS 1-1076, NGMPP A 431/13: palm-leaf; proto-Bengali script; probably twelfth or thirteenth century; B = NAK MS 5-1983, NGMPP B 145/7: paper; Devanāgarī; AD 1925/6 (a library copy of A).
- Vīramāheśvarācārasāroddhārabhāṣya* of Somanātha. IFP MS T. 330.
- Vīramāheśvarācārasaṃgraha* of Nīlakaṇṭhagaṇanātha. MYSORE E 41047, MS A. 564: paper; Kannaḍa script.
- Vīraśaivasiddhāntottarakāumudī* of Vīrabhadraṅgadhya. IFP MS T. 342 and 343.
- Vīrottara* (Vīraśaiva): *Vīrāgamottara*, ed. H. P. Malledevaru. Mysore: University of Mysore, Oriental Research Institute, 1983.
- Vṛddhasvacchanda*: *Vṛddhasvacchandasaṃgrahantram*, ed. Prakash Pandey. Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha Text Series 50. Allahabad: Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha, n.d. [2001?].
- Vedāntasarvasvaśivadarpaṇa* of Brahmavidyādhvaṅdra. ADYAR 888 E, TR 286: paper; Devanāgarī script.
- Śataratnasamgraha* compiled by Umāpatiśivācārya with an anonymous commentary (-*ullekhinī*), ed. Pancanan Sastrī. Tantrik Texts 22. Calcutta, 1943.
- Śambhunirṇaya* with the commentary (-*dīpikā*) of Śivānanda. GOML MS 14695 (R 3203c [*Śambhunirṇaya*, pp. 77–131] and 3203d [-*dīpikā*, pp. 132–164]): modern paper; Devanāgarī; transcribed in 1919–1920 from a MS belonging to Tippan Nambūdirippād of Ponnūrkoṭṭamana, Perumbavūr, Travancore (GOML R. 3203c,d).
- Śarvātāra*. BLO MS Stein Or. d. 48 (i): paper; Kashmirian Devanāgarī. An apograph of BORI MS 94 of 1875–76 (paper; Śāradā script).
- Śāmbhavapūjāvidhāna*. GOML MS D 14695.
- Śāradātilaka* of Lakṣmaṇadeśika with the commentary (-*pādārthādarśa*) of Rāghavabhaṭṭa, ed. [Sir John George Woodroffe] Arthur Avalon. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982. First published in 1933 as Tantrik Text Series 17, Madras: Ganesh & Co.
- Śivajñānabodhasaṃgrahabhāṣya* of Śivāgrayogīndra Jñānaśivācārya, ed. B. Balasubrahmanian, V. K. S. N. Raghavan, and G. Mishra. Madras: Dr. S. Radhakrishnan Institute for Advanced Study in Philosophy, University of Madras, 1992.
- Śivadṛṣṭi* of Somānanda with the commentary (-*vṛtti*, -*ālocana*) of Utpaladeva, ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shāstrī. KSTS 54. Srinagar, 1934.
- Śivadharmā*. N¹ = ULC MS ADD. 1645: palm-leaf, Nepalese script, AD 1139/40; N² = ULC MS ADD. 1694²¹: palm-leaf, Nepalese script (both contain *Śivadharmā*, *Śivadharmottara*, *Śivadharmasaṃgraha*, and other works of the *Śivadharmā* corpus); B = ULC MS ADD. 1599: paper, Bengali script, AD 1682/3 (contains *Śivadharmā* and *Śivadharmottara*); K = ORLS MS 1467: paper, Śāradā script (*Śivadharmā* only).
- Śivadharmottara*. → *Śivadharmā*.
- Śivanirvāṇapaddhati*, ed. Pandit Kesho Bhat Zūtish in *paṇḍitakeśavabhaṭṭajyotirvidā saṃskāra-*

- saṃśodhanābhyāṃ saṃpāditam sāṅgopāṅgaviṣṇubalisāṅgaśaivakriyātmakam karmakāṇḍam. caturthapustakam*, Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1936, pp. 205–292; A = ORLS MS 2199: paper; Śāradā script; AD 1897/8.
- Śivapūjāstava* of Jñānaśiva. IFP MS T. 567. Edition: *Śivapūjāstavaḥ savyākhyah jñānaśambhuśivaviracitaḥ*, ed. K. M. Subrahmaṇyaśāstrin. Śivāgamasamghaprakāśita granthasamkhyā 19. Devakoṭṭai, 1935.
- Śivarātripūjāpaddhati: Śivarātripūjā*. SBB-PK, OA HS OR. 11279: birch-bark; Śāradā script; fragmentary and disordered. The title given here is based on the subject matter and the abbreviation *śivarā pū* in the few surviving lower left margins of the versos.
- Śivasūtravārttika* of Bhāskara, ed. Jagadish Chandra Chatterji. KSTS 4. Srinagar, 1916.
- Śivasūtravārttika* of Varadarāja, also called Kṛṣṇadāsa, ed. Madhusudan Kaul. KSTS 43, 1925.
- Śivastotrāvalī*, a compilation of the devotional verse of Utpaladeva, with the commentary (-*vivṛti*) of Kṣemarāja, ed. Rājānaka Lakṣmaṇa. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1964.
- Śivāgamādīmāhātmyasamgraha* of Jñānaprakāśa of Śālivātipura (Jaffna). IFP MS T. 1059.
- Śivādvaitanirṇaya* of Appayadīkṣita, ed. S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri with introduction, translation, and notes. Madras University Philosophical Series 22. Madras: University of Madras, 1929.
- Śivārkamaṇḍīpikā* → *Śrīkaṇṭhabhāṣya*.
- Śivārcanacandrikā* of Appayadīkṣita, ed. Kālīśvarasivācārya et al. Devakoṭṭai: Śivāgamasiddhānta-paripālanasaṅgha, 1922.
- Śiṣyasamskārapaddhati: Śiṣyasamskāra*. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Sanscrit 505c: paper; Śāradā script.
- Śeṣasamuccaya* of Śaṅkaran Nampūtiri with the auto-commentary *Vimarśinī*, ed. P. K. Narayana Pillai. TSS 166. Trivandrum: University of Travancore, 1951.
- Śaivakālaviveka* of Nigamajñānaśivācārya (Vedajñāna II) with the commentary (-*vyākhyā*) of Gaṇapatibhaṭṭa. Devakoṭṭai: Śivāgamasiddhānta-paripālanasaṅgha, 1934.
- Śaivaparibhāṣā* of Śivāgrayogin, ed. H. R. Rangaswamy Iyengar, and R. Ramasastri. Oriental Research Institute Publications Sanskrit Series 90. Mysore: University of Mysore, 1950.
- Śaivāgamanibandhana* of Murāribhaṭṭa. IFP MS T. 379.
- Śyāmāpaddhati* of Sāhib Kaul. FOGG MS.
- Śrīkaṇṭhabhāṣya* of Nīlakaṇṭha, also called Śrīkaṇṭha, with the commentary *Śivārkamaṇḍīpikā* of Appayadīkṣita, ed. Hālāsyānāthaśāstrin. Delhi: Nāg, 1986.
- Śrīkaṇṭhī-Srotobheda*. The chapter on the Śaiva and other scriptural canons, excerpted from the lost scripture *Śrīkaṇṭhī (Śrīkaṇṭhasamhitā)* in *Nityādisamgrahapaddhati* A ff. 3r9–19v12; edited in HANNEDER 1998, pp. 240–268, from B. The title given here has been taken from the excerpt's colophonic half-verse: *itthaṃ śivena śrīkaṇṭhyāṃ srotobhedah pradarsītaḥ* (f. 19v12).
- Śrīkarabhāṣya* of Śrīpati. → RAO 1936.
- Śrīmatottara*. NAK 2-220, NGMPP A 194/2 : paper; Newari script; AD 1608/9.
- Śrīmahātripurasundarīvarivasyā* of Karapātrasvāmin [Hariharānanda Sarasvatī, 1905–1980], ed. Paṭṭābhīrāmaśāstrin, Calcutta: Sumitrādevī and Ayodhyāprasāda Bhārgava, 1962.
- Śrīvidyānityapūjāpaddhati* of Sāhib Kaul. BLO MS Chandra Shum Shere e.264 (“Tantric Collectanea”), ff. 226v-: paper; Śāradā script; ASB MS G 6345: paper; Śāradā script.
- Ṣaṣṭhasra-Kulālikāmnāya*. ASB MS G 8329: palm-leaf; Licchavi script; incomplete; 12th century. NAK 5-428, NGMPP A 1298/3: palm-leaf; Nāgarī script; complete.
- Ṣaṣṭhasra-Kulālikāmnāyaṭippaṇī*. NAK 1-30, NGMPP B 121/6: paper; Newari script; AD 1699/70.
- Ṣaḍanvayaśāmbhavakrama* of Umākānta. London, Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, Sanskrit MS β 353: paper; Devanāgarī; AD 1673.
- Saṃgrāmaṅvijayodaya*, anon., ed. K. Śāmbaśiva Śāstrī. TSS 123. Trivandrum, 1936.
- Saṃmohanatantra*. NAK MS 4-1519, NGMPP A 203/8: paper; Devanāgarī; AD 1891/2.
- Saṃskāraavidhi*. → ACHARYA 2007.
- Saṃhitāsāra* of Śaṅkuka. → SLOUBER 2011.
- Saptakoṭīśvarīstotra*. Ff. 37v4–38v7 of *Guhyantra*, NAK MS 1-86, NGMPP A 1150/23: paper; Newari script.
- Sarvajñānottara*. A = NAK MS 1-1692, NGMPP A 43/12: palm-leaf; Licchavi script; incomplete; no date but probably ninth century. Chapter and verse numbers are from an e-text of a draft of a critical

- edition by Dominic Goodall.
- Sarvajñānottaravṛtti* of Aghoraśiva. IFP MS T. 176.
- Sarvadarśanasamgraha* of Sāyaṇa-Mādhava with a Sanskrit commentary by Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar, ed. T. G. Mainkar. 3rd edition. Government Oriental Series A1. Poona: BORI, 1978.
- Sarvollāsatantra* of Sarvānandanātha, ed. Rāsamohana Cakravartin. 2nd ed. Calcutta: Herambacandra Bhaṭṭācārya, 1953
- Sāmbapañcāśikā* with the commentary of Kṣemarāja, ed. Paṇḍit Kedārnātha and Wāsudeva Laxman Shāstrī Paṇashīkar. Kāvyaṃālā 13. Bombay, 1910.
- Sārdhatriśatika* = *Sārdhatriśatikālottara* with the commentary (-vṛtti) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II, ed. N. R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI 61. Pondicherry: IFP 1979.
- Siddhayantrārṇava*, claiming in its colophon to be part of the *Umātilaka* of the Vāmatantra *Sammo-hana*. NAK MS 1-781, NGMPP A 39/17 ('*Umātilaka*'): palm-leaf; Newari script; AD 1028/9.
- Siddhayogeśvarīmata*. A = Calcutta, Asiatic Society of Bengal, MS G 5465: paper; Newari script; dated in AD 1372/3. B = NAK MS 5-2403, NGMPP A 203/6: paper; Devanāgarī; no date; a modern library transcript, but not of A. Also → TÓRZSÓK 1999.
- Siddhalakṣmīpūjāpaddhati*. ORLS MS 2375, ff. 58r14–62r2: paper; Śāradā script. Colophon: *iti samkṣiptā siddhalakṣmīpūjāpaddhatiḥ samāptā*.
- Siddhasaṃtānasopānapanīti* of Yaśorāja (Jasorāja). Kathmandu, Kesar Library MS 511, NGMPP C 48/2: palm-leaf; Newari script; mid-twelfth century. NAK MS 3-401, NGMPP A 998/3: palm-leaf; Maithila script; dated in Lakṣmaṇa Saṃvat 144 (= AD 1263 or 1252).
- Siddhāntadīpikā* of Rāmanātha. IFP MS T. 914.
- Siddhāntapaddhati* of Jñānaśivācārya. IFP MS T. 507, pp. 374–394.
- Siddhāntaprakāśikā* of Sarvātmaśambhu, ed. T. R. Damodaran in *The Journal of the Tanjore Maharaja Serfoji's Sarasvati Mahal Library* 33 (1984). A = IFP MS T. 433.
- Siddhāntasikhāmaṇi* of Śivayogin with the commentary (-*tattvapradīpikā*) of Maritōṅṭadārya, ed. Candrasekharaśivācārya with a Marāṭhī tr. by C. S. Kāpāle, Śaraṇayyā Śāstrī, and Ś. D. Paśārkar. Vārāṇasī: Śaivabhāratī Bhavana, 1993.
- Siddhāntaśekhara* of Viśvanātha, ed. K. Sītārāma Somayājīn and Śiva Śrī Talakāḍu Āgamika Kṛṣṇadīkṣita. Manonmanīgranthamālā 20. Mysore: K. Sītārāma Somayājīn, 1971.
- Siddhāntaśekhara* of Jñānaśivācārya. Pondicherry, IFP MS T. 570Ac and T. 57.
- Siddhāntasamuccaya* of Trilocanaśiva. Pondicherry, IFP MS T. 284, pp. 127–174.
- Siddhāntasāra*. → *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati*.
- Siddhāntasārapaddhati* of Mahārājādhirāja Bhojadeva. A = NAK MS 1-1363, NGMPP B 28/29: palm-leaf; Newari script; AD 1077/8. B = NAK MS 5-743, NGMPP B 8/19: palm-leaf; Newari script; AD 1111/2.
- Siddhāntasārāvali* of Trilocanaśiva with the commentary (-*vyākhyā*) of Anantaśiva (/Anantaśambhu), ed. A. A. Ramanathan et al., *Bulletin of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras* Vol. xvii, 1 (1965), pp. 1–48 (vv. 1–32); xviii, 1 (1968), pp. 1–68 (vv. 33–59); xviii, 2 (1968), pp. 1–64 (vv. 60–109); xix, 1 (1969), pp. 53–34 (vv. 110–130); xix, 2 (1972), pp. 1–48 (vv. 131–150); xx, 2 (1972), pp. 49–71 (vv. 151–169).
- Siddhitrayī* of Utpaladeva, ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shastri. KSTS 34. Srinagar, 1921.
- Subhagodaya* of Śivānanda. → *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava*.
- Subhagodayavāsanā* of Śivānanda. → *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava*.
- Sūtratattvavimarsinī* of Lakṣmaṇa Rāṇade. ADYAR MS TR 587.1–2.
- Setubandha* of Bhāskararāya, a commentary on the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* and *Yoginīhr̥daya*, ed. Kāśmīnātha Śāstrī Āgāṣe, Poona: Ānandāśrama, 1908.
- Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā* of Trilocanaśiva. Pondicherry, IFP MS T. 170.
- Saundaryalaharī*, ed. A. Kuppaswami. Delhi: Nag, 1991.
- Saubhāgyakalpadruma* of Lakṣmaṇa (Mādhavavānandanātha). FOGG MS.
- Saubhāgyavardhanī*, the commentary of Kaivalyāśrama on the SAUNDARYALAHARĪ. In *Saundaryalaharī*, ed. A. Kuppaswami. Delhi: Nag, 1991.
- Saubhāgyasudhodaya* of Amṛtānanda. → *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava*.
- Saubhāgyahṛdayastotra* of Śivānanda. → *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava*.
- Saubhāgyānandasamdoha* → *Paramānandatantra*.

- Skandapurāṇa*_{ABI} (Crit. ed. of *Ambikākhaṇḍa*, Adhyāyas 1–25) → ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER, and ISAACSON 1998.
- Skandapurāṇa*_B (Crit. ed. of *Ambikākhaṇḍa*, Adhyāya 167) → BISSCHOP 2006.
- Skandapurāṇa*_{KB}: *Skandapurāṇasya Ambikākhaṇḍaḥ*, ed. Kṛṣṇaprasāda Bhaṭṭarāi. Mahendraratna-granthamālā 2. Kathmandu, 1988.
- Stavacintāmaṇi* of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa with the commentary (-*vivṛti*) of Kṣemarāja, ed. Mukunda Rāma Śāstrī. KSTS 10. Srinagar, 1918.
- Spandakārikā* with the commentary (-*vivṛti*) of Rāmakaṇṭha, ed. J. C. Chatterji. KSTS 6. Srinagar, 1913.
- Svacchanda*: *Svacchandatantra* with the commentary (*Svacchandoddyota*) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 31, 38, 44, 48, 51, 53, 56. Bombay, 1921–35.
- Svarūpavimarśinī*, a commentary by Cidānanda on the *Parāprāveśikā*, also called *Svarūpaprakāśikā*, of Nāgānanda. ADYAR 957E, MS 67595: palm-leaf; Telugu script; incomplete.
- Svacchandadevārcanavidhi* and *Svacchandadevalakṣahomayāga*. NAK MS 5-744, NGMPP B 31/38: palm-leaf; Newari script.
- **Svacchandabhairavapūjāpaddhati*. Bound with other Paddhatis in ORLS MS 2376 on folios numbered 10–18: paper; Śāradā script. It lacks its beginning and has no colophon, therefore no statement of its title.
- Svāyambhuvavṛtti* of Sadyojyotis. → FILLIOZAT 1994.
- Svāyambhuvasūtrasamgraha*, ed. Venkaṭasubrahmaṇyaśāstrī, Mysore: Rājakīyaśākhāmudrālaya, 1937.
- Haracaritacintāmaṇi* of Rājānaka Jayadratha, ed. Paṇḍita Śivadatta and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Kāvyaṃālā 61. Bombay, 1897.
- Haravijaya* of Ratnākara with the incomplete commentary of Alaka, ed. Durgāprasāda and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Kāvyaṃālā 22. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sagar Press, 1890.
- Harṣacarita* of Bāṇa with the commentary (-*śaṅketa*) of Śaṅkarakavi, ed. A. A. Führer. Bombay Sanskrit Series 66. Bombay: Government Central Press, 1909.
- Hṛllekhāpaddhati* of Sāhib Kaul. BLO MS Chandra Shum Shere g.27: paper; Śāradā script.

Other Sources

- ACHARYA, Diwakar. Ed., transl. 2007. The Saṃskāra-vidhi: A Manual on the Transformatory Rite of the Lakulīśa-Pāśupatas. In GOODALL and PADOUX 2007, pp. 27–48.
- . Ed. transl. 2010. The *Anteṣṭividhi*: A Manual on the Last Rite of the Lakulīśa-Pāśupatas. *Journal Asiatique* 298, pp. 133–156.
- . Ed. transl. 2011. The Pātravidhi: A Lakulīśa Pāśupata Manual on Purification and Use of the Initiate's Vessel. In *Saṃskṛtasādhitā: Studies in Honour of Professor Ashok N. Aklujkar*, edited by C. Watanabe, M. Desmarais, and Y. Honda, pp. 1–28. New Delhi: D. K. Printworld.
- ADRIAENSEN, R., H. T. BAKKER, and H. ISAACSON. 1998. *The Skandapurāṇa. Volume 1. Adhyāyas 1–15 Critically Edited with Prolegomena and English Synopsis*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- ADYAR: *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Adyar Library*, by K. Madhava Krishna Sarma, under the supervision of C. Kunhan Raja. 13 vols. Adyar, Madras: Adyar Library, 1942–.
- BALDISSERA, Fabrizia. 2005. *The Narmamālā of Kṣemendra. Critical Edition, Study and Translation*. Beiträge zur Südasienforschung, Südasien-Institut, Universität Heidelberg 197. [Würzburg]: Ergon.
- BENDALL, Cecil. 1883. *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge, with Introductory Notices and Illustrations of the Palaeography and Chronology of Nepal and Bengal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BHATT, N. R. 1977. → *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama*.
- . 1979. → *Sārdhatriśatika*.
- . 1982. → *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama*.

- BIRCH, Jason. 2011. The Meaning of Haṭha in Early Haṭhayoga. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 131, pp. 527–554.
- . 2013. *The Amanaska: King of All Yogas. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation with a Monographic Introduction*. D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford.
- BISSCHOP, Peter C. 2005. Pañcārthabhāṣya on Pāsupatasūtra 1.37–39 Recovered from a Newly Identified Manuscript. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 33, pp. 529–551.
- . 2006. *Early Śaivism and the Skandapurāṇa: Sects and Centres*. Groningen Oriental Series 21. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- BÖHTLINGK, Otto. 1887. *Pāṇini's Grammatik, herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen*. Leipzig: Haessel.
- BOUILLIER, Véronique. 2004. *Itinérance et vie monastique: Les ascètes Nāth Yogīs en Inde contemporaine*. Paris: Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
- BROOKS, Douglas Renfrew. 1990. *The Secret of the Three Cities: An Introduction to Hindu Śākta Tantrism*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- BRUNNER, Hélène. Ed. and transl. 1963. *Somaśambhupaddhati. Première Partie: Le rituel quotidien dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu*. Publications de l'IFI 25. Pondicherry: IFI.
- BUESCHER, Hartmut. 2011. *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts*. Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts, Xylographs, etc. in Danish Collections, Vol. 7. Copenhagen: Der Kongelige Bibliothek.
- BÜHNEMANN, Gudrun. 2000. *The Iconography of Hindu Tantric Deities. The Pantheons of the Prapañcasāra and the Śāradātilaka*. Gonda Indological Studies 9. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- BÜHNEMANN, Gudrun and Musashi TACHIKAWA. 1990. *The Hindu Deities Illustrated according to the Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya*. Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum 3. Tokyo: The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies.
- CHANDRA, Lokesh. 1983. *Sanskrit Texts from Kashmir, Volume 5*. Śāta-piṭaka Series, Indo-Asian Literatures, No. 329. New Delhi: Sharada Rani.
- . 1984. *Sanskrit Texts from Kashmir, Volume 7*. Śāta-piṭaka Series, Indo-Asian Literatures, No. 333. New Delhi: Sharada Rani.
- CHAVANNES, Édouard. 1903. *Notes additionnelles sur les Tou-Kiue (Turcs) occidentaux*. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, Adrien Maisonneuve.
- CLAUSON, Gerard L. M. 1912. Catalogue of the Stein Collection of Sanskrit mss. from Kashmir. *JRAS* 1912, pp. 587–627.
- CÆDÈS, George. 1937–1966. *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. 8 vols. Paris: EFEO. 1937 (vol. 1), 1942 (vol. 2), 1951 (vol. 3), 1952 (vol. 4), 1953 (vol. 5), 1954 (vol. 6), 1964 (vol. 7), 1966 (vol. 8).
- COLAS-CHAUHAN, Usha. 2002. Umāpati on Prāmāṇya. An annotated Translation. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 30, pp. 305–338.
- . 2007. *Umāpati's Commentary on the Pauṣkaratantra, Chapter 7: Pramāṇa. An Annotated Translation*. Sri Garib Das Oriental Series 311. Delhi: Satguru.
- DAGENS, Bruno. 1979. *Le Florilège de la Doctrine Śivaïte: Śaivāgamaparibhāṣāmañjarī de Vedajñāna. Édition critique, traduction et notes*. Publications de l'IFI 60. Pondicherry: IFI.
- DAVIS, Richard H. 2000. Sadyojyoti's Tattvatrayanirṇaya. *Journal of Oriental Research, Madras* 68–70, pp. 191–206.
- DEZSŐ, Csaba. ed. 2007. *Indian Languages and Texts through the Ages. Essays of Hungarian Indologists in Honour of Prof. Csaba Tóttösy*. Delhi: Manohar.
- DHAVAMONY, Mariasusai. 1971. *Love of God according to the Śaiva Siddhānta. A Study in the Mysticism and Theology of Śaivism*. Oxford: OUP.
- DHUMĀIRĀJ, K. Bālakṛṣṇa Rṣī (Aumḍhekar). 1991. *Śrī Āmardak Mahātmya Kathāsār arthāt Jyotirlingam Aumḍhā Nāgnāth Āmardak Mahātmya yā mūl saṃskṛt gramthācā anuvād (Marāṭhavādā Vibhāgācyā Nakāśāsaha)*. Aumḍhā (Nāgnāth): Adhyakṣ, Śrī Nāgnāth Viśvast Maṃḍal. [A Marāṭhī translation of the Sanskrit Āmardakamāhātmya].
- DUNDAS, Paul. 1992. *The Jains*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- DVIVEDA, Vajravallabha. 1968. → *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava*.
- EPIGRAPHIA CARNATICA. 1885–1965. Mysore Archaeological Department, Madras/Banga-

- lore/Mysore.
- EPIGRAPHIA INDICA. 1892–1978 (vols. 1–42) and 2011 (vol. 43, part 1). Calcutta/Delhi: ASI.
- FALK, Harry. 2012. Ancient Indian Eras: An Overview. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, N.S. 21 (2007), pp. 131–145.
- FILIOZAT, Pierre-Sylvain. 1994. ed. and trans. *Svāyambhuvasūtrasamgrahaḥ, vidyāpādaḥ, sadyo-
jyotiskṛtaṭīkāśahitaḥ. Le Tantra of Svayambhū, Vidyāpāda with the Commentary of Sadyojyoti.*
Kālāmūlaśāstra Series 13. Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts & Motilal Banarsidass.
- FILIOZAT, Vasundhara. 2001. *Kālāmukha and Pāśupata Temples in Dharwar*. Chennai: The Kuppuswami Research Institute.
- FULLER, C. J. 1984. *Servants of the Goddess: The Priests of a South Indian Temple*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GANDHI, L. B. 1937. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Jain Bhandars at Pattan, Compiled from the Notes of the Late Mr. C.D. Dalal with Introduction, Indices and Appendices, Vol. 1: Palm-leaf MSS.* gos 76. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- GANESAN, T. 2006. → *Varuṇapaddhati*.
- . 2009. *Two Śaiva Teachers of the Sixteenth Century: Nigamajñāna I and his Disciple Nigamajñāna II*. IFP Publications Hors Série 9. Pondicherry: IFP.
- GHOSE, Rajeshwari. 1996. *The Lord of Ārūr: The Tyāgarāja Cult in Tamilnāḍu: A Study in Conflict and Accommodation*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- GNOLI, Raniero. 1958. *Miscellanea Indica. East and West* 9, pp. 215–226.
- . 1985. *Il Commento di Abhinavagupta alla Parātriṃśikā (Parātriṃśikāvivarāṇa). Traduzione e Testo.* Serie Orientale Roma 58. Rome: IsMEO.
- GOODALL, Dominic. 1998. *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra. Volume I: chapters 1–6. Critical edition and annotated translation.* Publications du département d'Indologie 86.1. Pondicherry: IFI / EFEO. Revised edition of the author's D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1995.
- . 2000. Problems of Name and Lineage: Relationships between South-Indian Authors of the "Śaiva Siddhānta". A Review Article of *Somaśambhupaddhati. Rituels dans la tradition śivaïte selon Somaśambhu. Quatrième partie: rituels optionnels: pratiṣṭhā* by Héléne Brunner-Lachaux. *JRAS* 3:10, pp. 205–216.
- . 2004. *The Parākhyatantra: A Scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation.* Collection Indologie 98. Pondicherry: IFP / EFEO.
- . 2007. A first edition of the [Śatika-]Kālajñāna, the shortest of the non-eclectic recensions of the Kālottara. In GOODALL and PADOUX 2007, pp. 125–166.
- GOODALL, Dominic, Nibedita ROUT, R. SATHYANARAYANAN, S. A. S. SARMA, T. GANESAN, and S. SAMBANDHASIVACARYA. 2005. *Pañcāvaraṇastavaḥ: The Pañcāvaraṇastava of Aghoraśivācārya: A twelfth-century South Indian prescription for the visualisation of Sadāśiva and his retinue. An annotated critical edition.* Collection Indologie 102. Pondicherry: IFP / EFEO.
- GOODALL, Dominic and Harunaga ISAACSON. 2007. Workshop on the Nisvāsattvasaṃhitā: The Earliest Surviving Śaiva Tantra? *Newsletter of the Nepal-German Cataloguing Project, Number 3*, pp. 4–6.
- GOODALL, Dominic and André PADOUX. Eds. 2007. *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner / Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner.* Collection Indologie 106. Pondicherry: IFI / EFEO.
- GOODALL, Dominic, Kei KATAOKA, Diwakar ACHARYA, and Yuko YOKOCHI. 2008. A First Edition and Translation of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's *Tattvatrayanirṇayavivṛti*, A Treatise on Śiva, Souls and Māyā, with Detailed Treatment of Mala. *South Asian Classical Studies* 3, pp. 311–384.
- GOUDRIAAN, Teun. 1973. Tumburu and His Sisters. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 17, pp. 49–95.
- . 1981. Two stanzas of Balinese Sanskrit located in an Indian Tantra. *BKI* 137, pp. 477–479.
- . 1985. *The Viṇāśikhatantra. A Śaiva Tantra of the Left Current Edited with an Introduction and Translation.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- . 1986. Kubjikā's Samayamantra and Its Manipulations in the Kubjikāmata. In PADOUX 1986,

pp. 144–168.

- GOUDRIAAN, Teun and Sanjukta GUPTA. 1981. *Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature*. A History of Indian Literature II.2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- GOUDRIAAN, T. and J. A. SCHOTERMAN. 1988. *Kubjikāmatatantra. Kulālikāmnāya version. Critical Edition*. *Orientalia Rheno-traiectina* 30. Leiden: Brill.
- HANDQUI, Krishna Kanta. 1968. *Yāsastilaka and Indian Culture*. Jīvarāja Jaina Granthamālā 2. Sholapur: Jaina Saṃskṛti Saṃrakshaka Sangha.
- HARA, Minoru. 1966. *Materials for the study of Pāśupata Śaivism*. Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University.
- HARIMOTO, Kengo. 2012. In Search of the Oldest Nepalese Manuscript. In *The Study of Asia between Antiquity and Modernity, Proceedings of the first Coffee-Break Conference*, edited by E. Freschi et al., *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, NS 84 [2011], pp. 85–106.
- HEIFETZ, Hank and Velcheru Narayana RAO. 1987. *For the Lord of the Animals. Poems from the Telugu: the Kālahastīśvara Śatakamu of Dhūrjaṭi*. Berkeley, London: University of California Press.
- HERNAULT, Françoise. 1987. *Darasuram. Epigraphical Study, Étude Architecturale, Étude Iconographique. Tome 1 - Text*. Paris: EFEO (Publications de l'EFEO. Mémoires Archéologiques 16).
- IYER, T. V. Gopal. ed. 1984. *Tevāram. Hymnes śivaïtes du pays tamoul, édition établie par T. V. Gopal Iyer, sous la direction de François Gros*. 2 volumes. Publications de l'IFI 68. Pondicherry: IFP.
- KVÆRNE, Per. 1986. *An Anthology of Buddhist Tantric Songs: A Study of the Caryāgīti*. 2nd ed. Bangkok: White Orchid. First published in 1977.
- JANAKI, S. S. 1986 → *Mudrālakṣaṇam*.
- JAYAMMAL, K. 1993. *The Śivajñānabodha-saṅgrahabhāṣya of Śivāgrayogin. English Translation with Introduction and Indexes*. Madras: Radhakrishnan Institute for Advanced Study in Philosophy, University of Madras.
- KARASHIMA, Noboru. 2001. *Nāyaka Rule in North and South Arcot Districts*. In Noboru KARASHIMA, *History and Society in South India, The Cholas to Vijayanagar* (New Delhi: OUP), pt. 2, pp. 15–42. First published in 1985 as 'Nāyaka Rule in North and South Arcot Districts in South India during the Sixteenth Century' in *Acta Asiatica* (Tokyo) 48, pp. 1–25.
- KARAVELANE. 1982. *Chants dévotionels tamouls de Kāraikkālammaiār. Édition et traduction*. Publications de l'IFI 1. Pondicherry: IFI.
- KAVIRAJ, Gopinath. 1963. → *Yoginīhr̥daya*.
- KISS, Csaba. 2007. Notes on *Matsyendrasaṃhitā*. In DEZSŐ 2007, pp. 147–184.
- . 2009. *Matsyendranātha's Compendium (Matsyendrasaṃhitā): A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of Matsyendrasaṃhitā 1–13 and 55 with Analysis*. D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford.
- KNEBEL, J. 1901. Beschrijving de Beelde in de Chineesche Kerk bij Goenoeng Sari, te Weltevreden. *Rapporten van de Commissie in Nederlandsch-Indië voor Oudheidkundig Onderzoek op Java en Madoera*, pp. 18–34.
- KONOW, Sten. 1901. *Rāja-ṣekhara's Karpūra-mañjarī, a Drama by the Indian poet Rājaṣekhara (about 900 A.D.) critically edited in the original Prākṛit, with a glossarial index, and an essay on the life and writings of the poet by Sten Konow, and translated into English with notes by Charles Rockwell Lanman*. Harvard Oriental Series 4. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- LAWRENCE, David Peter. 2008. *The Teachings of the Odd-Eyed One: A Study and Translation of the Virūpākṣapañcāśikā, with the Commentary of Vidyācakraṣartin*. Ithaca, NY: State University of New York Press.
- LEGITTIMO, Elsa I. 2005 and 2006. Synoptic Presentation of the *Pusa chu tai jing (PCJ)* 菩薩處胎經 *the Bodhisattva Womb Sutra* PART I (Chapters 1–14) and PART II (Chapters 15–38). *Sen-gokuyama Journal of Buddhist Studies* [仙石山論集] 2, pp. 260–150 (1–111), and 3, pp. 300–126 (1–175).
- LÉVI, Sylvain and Edouard CHAVANNES. 1895. Voyages des pèlerins bouddhistes: l'itinéraire d'Oukong (751–790). *Journal Asiatique* 6, pp. 341–384.
- LORENZEN, David N. 1991. *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas. Two Lost Śaivite Sects*. 2nd, revised edition. New Delhi: Thomson.

- MAJUMDAR, R. C. 1931. Nālandā Stone Inscription of Yaśovarmadeva. *Indian Historical Quarterly* 7, p. 664.
- . 1932. Nālandā Stone Inscription of Yaśovarmadeva. *Indian Historical Quarterly* 8, pp. 371–373.
- MAHALINGAM, T. V. 1988. *Inscriptions of the Pallavas*. New Delhi/Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research/Agam Prakashan.
- MAK, Bill M. 2013. The Last Chapter of Sphujidhvaja's *Yavanajātaka* critically edited with notes. *SCIAMVS* 14, pp. 59–148.
- MALLINSON, James. 2007. *The Khecarīvidyā of Ādinātha: A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of an Early Text of Haṭha Yoga*. London: Routledge. Revised version of the author's D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 2003.
- . 2011. Nāth Sampradāya. In *Brill's Encyclopaedia of Hinduism*, edited by Knut A. Jacobsen, Hélène Basu, Angelika Malinar, Vasudha Narayanan (Leiden: Brill), vol. 3, pp. 1–20.
- . 2013. The Yogīs' Latest Trick. *JRAS*, pp. 1–16. A review article concerning *Sinister Yogis* by David Gordon White (Chicago: Chicago University Press. 2009).
- MAZUMDAR, B. C. 1927. *The Aborigines of the Highlands of Central India*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.
- MICHAEL, R. Blake. 1992. *The Origins of Vīraśaiva Sects. A Typological Analysis of Ritual and Associated Patterns in the Śūnyasaṃpādane*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- MILLS, Elizabeth. 2011. *Dating and Placing early Śaiva texts through Prāsādalakṣaṇa: A Study of prāsādalakṣaṇa material in six early Śaiva texts: the Bṛhatkālottara Mahātantra; the Nīsvāse Mahātantre Pratiṣṭhāntara, also titled the Devyāmata; the Kiraṇāgama; the Mohacūrottara Pratiṣṭhāntara; the Mayasaṃgraha, with its commentary, the Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi; and the Brahmāyāmala Jayadrathādhikāra Piṅgalāmata*. D.Phil. Thesis, University of Oxford.
- MIRASHI, Vasudev Vishnu. 1955. *Inscriptions of the Kalachuri-Chedi Era. CII 4. 2 Parts*. Ootacamund: Government Epigraphist for India.
- . 1962. Gwalior Museum Stone Inscription of Pataṅgaśambhu. *Journal of the Madhya Pradesh Itihasa Parishad* 64, pp. 3–13.
- MITTAL, A. C. 1979. *The Inscriptions of Imperial Paramāras*. L. D. Series 73. Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology.
- MURARI, Krishna. 1977. *The Cālukyas of Kalyāṇī (from circa 973 A.D. to 1200 A.D.)*. Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
- MYSORE: *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Oriental Library, Mysore*, by M. S. Basavalingayya and T. T. Srinivasagopalachar. 17 vols. Mysore: Oriental Research Institute, 1937–.
- NALLASWAMI PILLAI, J. M. ed., tr. 1946. *Uṇmai viḷakkam: Āṅkila molīpeyarppuṭaṅ*. Tarumapuram: Tarumapura Ātīṅam, 1946.
- PADOUX, André. 1986. ed. *Mantras et diagrammes rituelles dans l'hindouisme*. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- PANDEY, Kanti Chandra. 1963. *Abhinavagupta. An Historical and Philosophical Study*. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 1. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.
- PANT, Mahes Raj and Aishvarya Dhar SHARMA. 1977. *The Two Earliest Copper-plate Inscriptions from Nepal*. Nepal Research Centre Miscellaneous Papers 12. Kathmandu: Nepal Research Centre.
- PAUTHIER, G. 1840. *Examen méthodique des faits qui concernent le Thian-tchu ou l'Inde traduit du chinois*. Extrait du *Journal Asiatique*. Paris: Imprimerie Royale.
- PECHILIS PRENTISS, Karen. 1999. *The Embodiment of Bhakti*. New York, Oxford: OUP.
- PELLIOT, Paul. 1904. Deux Itinéraires de Chine en Inde. *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 4, pp. 131–413.
- PETECH, Luciano. 1984. *Mediaeval History of Nepal, c. 750–1482. Second, thoroughly revised edition*. Serie Orientale Roma 54. Rome: IsMEO.
- PINGREE, David. 1979. *The Yavanajātaka of Sphujidhvaja*. Harvard Oriental Series 48. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- POPE, G. U. 1900. *The Tiruvāçagam or 'Sacred Utterances' of the Tamil Poet, Saint, and Sage Mānikka-vāçagar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- RAO, Hayavadana. 1936. *The Śrīkara Bhāshya, being the Vīraśaiva Commentary on the Vedānta-Sūtras by Śrīpati*. 2 vol. [Vol. 1: Introduction; vol. 2: Edition]. Bangalore City: Bangalore Press.
- RAO, Velcheru Narayana, tr., assisted by Gene H. Roghair. 1990. *Śiva's warriors: the Basava Purāṇa of Pālkuriki Somanātha*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- RAO, Velcheru Narayana and David SHULMAN. 2012. *Śrīnātha: The Poet who Made Gods and Kings*. New York: OUP.
- SĀMBAŚIVA ŚĀSTRĪ, K. 1938. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in H. H. the Maharajah's Palace Library, Trivandrum. Vol. IV: Jyotiṣa, Vaidyaka, Mantra, Tantra, Śilpa, and Stuti*. Trivandrum: Government of H. H. the Maharajah of Travancore.
- SANDER, Lore. 1968. *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung*. Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 8. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- SANDERSON, Alexis. 1985. Review of BHATT 1982. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 48, pp. 564–568.
- . 1986. Maṇḍala and Āgamic Identity in the Trika of Kashmir. In PADOUX 1986, pp. 169–214.
- . 1988. Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions. In *The World's Religions*, edited by S. Sutherland et al. (London: Routledge), pp. 660–704. Reprinted in *The World's Religions. The Religions of Asia*, edited by F. Hardy (London: Routledge, 1990), pp. 128–172.
- . 1990. The Visualization of the Deities of the Trika. In *L'Image Divine: Culte et Méditation dans l'Hindouisme*, edited by A. Padoux (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique), pp. 31–88.
- . 1992. The Doctrine of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra. In *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism. Studies in Honour of André Padoux*, edited by T. Goudriaan (Albany: State University of New York Press), pp. 281–312.
- . 1995. Meaning in Tantric Ritual. In *Essais sur le Rituel III: Colloque du Centenaire de la Section des Sciences religieuses de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études*, edited by A.-M. Blondeau and K. Schipper (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences Religieuses, Volume CII. Louvain-Paris: Peeters), pp. 15–95.
- . 2001. History Through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras. In *Les sources et le temps. Sources and Time. A Colloquium, Pondicherry, 11–13 January 1997*, edited by François Grimal, pp. 1–47. Publications du département d'Indologie 91. Pondicherry: IFP / EFEO.
- . 2002. Remarks on the Text of the Kubjikāmatatantra. *IJJ* 45, pp. 1–24.
- . 2004. The Śaiva Religion Among the Khmers, Part I. *Bulletin d l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 90 (2003–2004), pp. 352–464.
- . 2005a. A Commentary on the Opening Verses of the *Tantrasāra* of Abhinavagupta. In *Sāmarasya. Studies in Indian Arts, Philosophy, and Interreligious Dialogue*, edited by Sadananda Das and Ernst Furlinger (New Delhi: D.K. Printworld), pp. 89–148.
- . 2005b. Religion and the State: Śaiva Officials in the Territory of the Brahmanical Royal Chaplain with an Appendix on the Provenance and Date of the *Netratantra*. *IJJ* 47 (2004), pp. 229–300.
- . 2006a. The Lākulas: New Evidence of a System Intermediate Between Pāñcārthika Pāsupatism and Āgamic Śaivism. *Indian Philosophical Annual* 26 (2003–2005), pp. 143–217.
- . 2006b. The Date of Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati. In *Tantra and Viśiṣṭādvaitavedānta*, edited by Marzenna Czerniak-Drożdżowicz (Cracow Indological Studies 8. Kraków: Jagiellonian University, Institute of Oriental Philology), pp. 39–91.
- . 2007a. Atharvavedins in Tantric Territory: The *Āngirasakalpa* Texts of the Oriya Paippalādins and their Connection with the Trika and the Kālīkula, With critical editions of the *Parāṅgavidhi*, the *Parāmantravidhi*, and the **Bhadrakālīmantravidhiprakaraṇa*. In *The Atharvaveda and its Paippalāda Śākhā: Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic Tradition* edited by Arlo Griffiths and Annette Schmiedchen (Aachen: Shaker Verlag), pp. 195–311.
- . 2007b. The Śaiva Exegesis of Kashmir. In GOODALL and PADOUX 2007, pp. 231–442 and

- (bibliography) pp. 551–582.
- . 2007c. Swami Lakshman Joo and His Place in the Kashmirian Śaiva Tradition. In *Samvidul-lāsaḥ*, edited by Bettina Bäumer and Sarla Kumar, New Delhi: D.K. Printworld, 2007, pp. 93–126.
- . 2009a. The Śaiva Age: An Explanation of the Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period. In *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, edited by Shingo Einoo (Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo), pp. 41–349.
- . 2009b. Handout for ‘Tantric Śaivism and Caste’, lecture, Institut für Südasiens-, Tibet- und Buddhismuskunde, University of Vienna, 7 June 2009, pp. 1–12. <<http://www.alexissanderson.com/uploads/6/2/7/6/6276908/2009viennasaivismmand.pdf>>.
- . 2011. Handout for ‘The Appropriation of Śaiva Sources and Models in the Production of Jain Ritual Paddhatis from the 10th to the 15th Century’, lecture, Abteilung für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets, Asien-Afrika-Institut, University of Hamburg, 4 July 2011, pp. 1–25. <http://www.alexissanderson.com/uploads/6/2/7/6/6276908/2011_hamburg_handout_sanderson.pdf>.
- . 2013. The Impact of Inscriptions on the Interpretation of Early Śaiva Literature. *IJJ* 56, pp. 211–244.
- SARMA, S. A. S. 2010. Why Have the Later Ritual Manuals of Kerala Forgotten ‘Initiation’? *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 63, pp. 443–454.
- SASTRI, K. A. Nilakanta. 1984. *The Cōlas*. 2nd edition reprinted. Madras: University of Madras.
- SEWELL, R. The Kelaḍi Rājas of Ikkēri and Bednūr. 1910. *JRAS*, pp. 487–489.
- SHARMA, B. N. K. 1938. The Date of Umāpati’s Pauskarabhāṣya. *Poona Orientalist* 3, pp. 65–68.
- SHASTRI, Haraprasad and Radhagovinda BASAK. 1969. *Rāmacarita of Sandhyākaranandin* edited by MM. Haraprasad Shastri, revised with English translation and notes by Dr. Radhagovinda Basak. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society.
- SHULMAN, David Dean. 1980. *Tamil Temple Myths: Sacrifice and Divine Marriage in the South Indian Śaiva Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 1990. *Songs of the Harsh Devotee: the Tēvāram of Cuntaramūrttināyanār*. Philadelphia: Dept. of South Asia Regional Studies, University of Pennsylvania.
- SLOUBER, Michael. 2011. *Śaṅkuka’s Samhitāsāra: Edition and Translation of Verses 1–5, 75–85, and 129–154 with an Anonymous Commentary*. Wissenschaftliche Hausarbeit zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades “International Master of Arts in South Asian Studies” der Universität Hamburg. <http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/savifadok/1967/1/GSS_ThesisWeb.pdf>.
- . 2012. *Gāruḍa Medicine: A History of Snakebite and Religious Healing in South Asia*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley. <<http://www.escholarship.org/uc/item/8rz8t2w7.pdf>>.
- SMITH, David. 1996. *The Dance of Śiva: Religion, art, and poetry in South India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SMITH, Vincent A. 1908. The History of the City of Kanauj and of King Yaśovarman’. *JRAS*, pp. 765–793.
- SONTHEIMER, Gunther-Dietz. 1989. *Pastoral Deities in Western India*. Translated by Anne Feldhaus. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989. Original: *Birobā, Mhaskobā und Khaḍobā: Ursprung, Geschichte und Umwelt von Pastoralen Gottheiten in Mahārāṣṭra*. Schriftenreihe des Südasiens-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg 21. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1976.
- SOUTH-INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS. Madras/Delhi: ASI, 1890–.
- STANTON, Hamsa. 2013. *Poetry and Prayer: Stotras in the Religious and Literary History of Kashmir*. Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Columbia University. <<http://hdl.handle.net/10022/AC:P:20485>>.
- STEIN, Burton. 1989. *The New Cambridge History of India 1.2: Vijayanagara*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1994. *Peasant State and Society in Medieval South India*. Delhi: OUP.
- SWAMY B. G. L. 1972. The Four Śaivite Samayacharyas of the Tamil Country in Epigraphy. *Journal of Indian History* 50, pp. 95–128.
- . 1975. The Gōlaki School of Śaivism in the Tamil Country. *Journal of Indian History* 53,

- pp. 167–209.
- TAKAKUSU, Junjiro and Kaigyoku WATANABE. 1924–1932 (Taishō 13–Shōwa 7). *Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō* [Taishō Revised Tripiṭaka]. 73 volumes. Tōkyō: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai.
- THAPAR, Romila. 2000. *Cultural Pasts: Essays in Early Indian History*. New Delhi: OUP.
- TORELLA, Raffaele. 1994. *The Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā of Utpaladeva with the Author's Vṛtti. Critical edition and annotated translation*. Rome: ISMEO.
- TŐRZSÓK, Judit. 1999. *The Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits: A critical edition of selected chapters of the Siddhayogeśvarīmata(tantra) with annotated translation and analysis*. D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford.
- TRIVANDRUM: *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Curator's Office Library, Trivandrum*, by K. Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī et al. 10 vols. Trivandrum: Government of H. H. the Maha Rajah of Travancore, 1937–1941.
- TULPULE, Shankar Gopal. 1979. *Classical Marāṭhī literature, from the beginning to A.D. 1818*. History of Indian Literature 9iv. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- UNIV. TRIVANDRUM: *Alphabetical index of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum*, by Suranad Kunjan Pillai. Trivandrum: University of Kerala. 1957.
- UPADHYE, A. N. 1934. Darśanasāra of Devasena: Critical Text. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 15 (1933–34), pp. 198–206.
- VAJRĀCĀRYA, Dhanavajra. 1996 [Vikramasamvat 2053]. *Licchavikālakā Abhilekha* [Inscriptions of the Licchavi Period] [Nepali]. Kathmandu: Nepāla ra Eśiyālī Anusandhāna Kendra, Tribhuvana Viśvavidyālaya.
- VASUDEVA, Somadeva. 2004. *The Yoga of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra, Chapters 1–4, 7, 11–17. Critical Edition, Translation & Notes*. Collection Indologie 97. Pondicherry: IFP / EFEO. Revised version of the author's D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 2000.
- VISWANATHAN PETERSON, Indira. 1991. *Poems to Śiva. The Hymns of the Tamil Saints*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- VRIDDHAGIRISAN, V. 1995. *The Nayaks of Tanjore*. Annamalai University Historical Series 3. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services. Originally published: Annamalainagar: Annamalai University, 1942.
- WATSON, Alex. 2006. *The Self's Awareness of Itself: Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Arguments against the Buddhist Doctrine of No-Self*. De Nobili Research Library 32. Vienna: Inter Press. Revised version of the author's D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 2003.
- WATSON, Alex, Dominic GOODALL, and S. L. P. Anjaneya SARMA. 2013. *An Enquiry into the Nature of Liberation: Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Paramokṣanirāsakārikāvṛtti, a commentary on Sadyojyotiḥ's refutation of twenty conceptions of the liberated state (mokṣa), for the first time critically edited, translated into English and annotated*. Collection Indologie 122. Pondicherry: IFP / EFEO.
- WHITE, David Gordon. 1996. *The Alchemical Body: Siddha Traditions in Medieval India*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- WILES, Royce. 2006. The Dating of the Jaina Councils. In *Studies in Jaina History And Culture: Disputes and Dialogues*, edited by Peter Flügel (London: Routledge), pp. 61–85.
- YOKOCHI, Yuko. 1999. Mahiṣāsūramardini Myth and Icon. Studies in the *Skandapurāṇa* II. In *Studies in the History of Indian Thought* 11, pp. 65–103.
- . 2013a. *The Skandapurāṇa, Volume III. Adhyayas 34.1–61, 53–69. The Vindhyavāsini Cycle. Critical Edition with an Introduction and Annotated English Synopsis*. Supplement to the Groningen Oriental Series. Groningen and Leiden: Egbert Forsten and Brill.
- . 2013b. The Development of Śaivism in Koṭīvarṣa, North Bengal, with Special Reference to the Koṭīvarṣa-Māhātmya in the *Skandapurāṇa*. *IJ* 56, pp. 295–324.