The Proof of Bindu as the Source of Determinate Knowledge. *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* 45–70ab with a Critical Edition of an Unpublished Anonymous Commentary

Akane Saito[1] · Francesco Sferra[2]

Abstract The paper covers a topic that sits between theology and philosophy of language and is based on completely unpublished material. The bulk of the paper consists in the critical edition and annotated translation of a section of an unpublished and anonymous commentary on the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* by Śrīkaṇṭha. This section describes the transition of the indeterminate knowledge to the determined one according to the early Śaiva Siddhānta perspective. The introduction contains parts that are more "philological" or "historical" and others that are more "philosophical". The paper contains one appendix on the significant variant readings of the *mūla* text.

Keywords Śaivasiddhānta · Philosophy of Language · Śaiva Theology · Śrīkaṇṭhasūri · Ratnatrayaparīkṣā

✉ Akane Saito
  akane.Saito@oeaw.ac.at;
  nekonokuni85@yahoo.co.jp

  Francesco Sferra
  frasferra@gmail.com;
  fsferra@unior.it

[1] Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, Austria

[2] Universtà di Napoli L'Orientale, Naples, Italy

Introduction[1]

1. In 2006, Dominic Goodall most kindly put at the disposal of F. Sferra some excellent digital photographs, taken by Kei Kataoka, of a composite multiple-text palm-leaf manuscript in Nandināgarī script kept in the Oriental Research Institute Library of Mysore and bearing the signature MS ORlas P 269. Among several Śaiva works in Sanskrit, with one exception in Kannada, this manuscript was considered to contain a copy of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* by Śrīkaṇṭhasūri (9th–10th cent. ?)[2] and of its commentary (*Ullekhinī*) by Aghoraśiva (12th cent.).[3] At the time, Sferra was reading and studying these two texts with some students in Naples. After a quick analysis, however, it became clear that the part of the manuscript thought to contain the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* and the *Ullekhinī* only coincided with the latter (with negligible differences) in the exegesis of stanza 1 and the *avataraṇikā* of stanza 2. In fact, the text is a commentary that until then had been completely unknown. In general, it is more sophisticated and complex than Aghoraśiva's *Ullekhinī*. We have provisionally called it **Vyākhyāna*. The commentary starts immediately after the salutation formula and the quotation of the *mūla* text's first stanza; unusually there are no *maṅgalaślokas*[4]:

> [fol. 71v_3] *śrīśivāya namaḥ* |
> **namaḥ śivāya śaktyai ca bindave śāśvatāya ca |**
> **gurave ca gaṇeśāya kārtikeyāya dhīmate ||**

atra ca pūrvārdhena prakaraṇapratipādyaṃ ratnatrayaṃ prastāvayan praṇamati |
uttarārdhena sakalasaṃhitānām avatārakatvena guruṃ [fol. 71v_4] *bhagavantaṃ*
śrīkaṇṭhanāthaṃ sarvavighnāpahārakaṃ[a] *ca gaṇapatiṃ siddhāntaśāstraśravaṇavi-*
śeṣitajñānaṃ ca kārtikeyam asyaivāvighnaparisamāptyartham abhivandate |

---

[2] On Śrīkaṇṭhasūri (also known as Śrīkaṇṭha), see Sanderson (2006, pp. 41–44).

[3] On the life and dates of Aghoraśiva, see Bhatt (1977, pp. ix–x), Gengnagel (1996, pp. 14–18), Davis (1992), and especially Goodall (1998, pp. xiii–xvii, note 24), and Goodall (2000).

[4] The *Ullekhinī* does contain a *maṅgalaśloka*.

tato[b] *vastutrayaṃ vyākhyeyatayā pratijānīte*

[a]sarvavighnāpahārakaṃ **Vyākhyāna*] sarvavighnāpahaṃ *Ullekhinī*
[b]tato **Vyākhyāna*] tad eva *Ullekhinī*

Unfortunately, the part of MS ORlas P 269 (henceforth M^Y) containing this commentary is incomplete: the text of the work ends abruptly while quoting the first *pāda* of st. 322. The last folio is missing (or possibly the last two folios) and thus we are not able to gather any information about its author—if any was mentioned—from the colophon.

Recently, in July 2018, R. Sathyanarayanan identified another manuscript containing the same commentary in the Tiruvāvaṭuturai Manuscript Library. It is a Grantha manuscript and is listed in the library catalogue as MS No. 15 (henceforth T). This manuscript is also incomplete: it begins with the last word of st. 3b, continues to the end, but breaks off at the beginning of the commentator's own genealogy, just after a discussion of the verse numbered 321cd–322ab in Dvivedī's edition of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* (see below for further information).

After a careful collation of M^Y and T, it is evident that their scribes consulted two distinct exemplars. M^Y is usually quite correct and it shows very few typos or grammatical errors and almost no eye-skip. Its readings are therefore often consistent and preferable. However, even though in general T contains abundant mistakes and its copyist does not appear to have been a well-educated Sanskritist, it exhibits significant and sometimes recurrent variants that are not merely attributable to transmissional errors, variants that we believe sometimes represent an older stage of the text.

2. The absence in both manuscripts of a final colophon opens the problem of the text's authorship. A possible candidate could be the Kashmirian Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha (second half of the 10th cent.),[5] the celebrated Saiddhāntika master son of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha who, according to Alexis Sanderson, might have composed a *vṛtti* on the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*. Sanderson (2006, pp. 42–44) provides arguments supporting this hypothesis; for the time being we limit ourselves to referring the reader to his paper. Suffice it here to say that a stanza that, starting with the *editio princeps* of 1925, was printed as the final stanza of the *mūla* text, actually seems to be part of the *Ullekhinī*. In this stanza the author states that he has followed the celebrated Saiddhāntika predecessor (*śrīrāmakaṇṭhasadvṛttiṃ mayaivam anukurvatā | ratnatrayaparīkṣārthaḥ saṅkṣepeṇa prakāśitaḥ ||*). This issue is taken again and discussed in more detail by Sathyanarayanan and Goodall (2020, pp. 518–525). They strengthen Sanderson's hypothesis and come to the conclusion that the two Rāmakaṇṭhas mentioned in stt. 321 and 322 are two different persons, with Aghoraśiva, the real author of st. 322, referring to Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II, and Śrīkaṇṭha, in st. 321 (the final stanza of the work), probably referring to Rāmakaṇṭha I. However, we can dismiss the attribution of the **Vyākhyāna* to Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha: the style, vocabulary and manner of thinking are hardly those of

---

[5] On the dates of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha (sometimes referred to in secondary literature as Rāmakaṇṭha II), see Bhatt (1977, pp. xii–xiii), Sanderson (1985, pp. 566–567), Torella (1994, pp.483–484), Goodall (1998, pp. xiii–xviii), Watson (2006, pp. 114–115), and Sanderson (2006, pp. 44–45).

this famous Kashmirian master.[6] Regarding stylistic features, we note, for instance, that objections are sometimes introduced with the verb *astu*, and that conjunctions with asyndeton are not uncommon. A more in-depth analysis of the *modus operandi* and *modus cogitandi* of our anonymous commentator will only be possible when his entire work has been studied and a critical edition published. It can be noted *en passant*, however, that whenever Śrīkaṇṭha starts a new argument, our commentator gives a precise definition of each term appearing in the stanza or that is needed for a better understanding of the topic. It is not a word-by-word commentary: when he finds the *mūla* text clear enough, he does not dwell on it. And yet he writes digressions and extensive explanations if he finds it worthwhile.

Fortunately, the author of the **Vyākhyāna* refers to himself at two points in his work. These references will no doubt be useful for his identification. In fact, from them it seems certain that our commentator previously wrote a gloss on the *Svāyambhuva(vṛtti)*, perhaps entitled *Padavivaraṇa*.

The first reference is found at the end of the commentary on stt. 31cd–32ab (M^Y fol. $76r_{3–4}$, T fols. $21v_8$–$22r_1$):

samastādhvaśuddhyanantarabhāvitvāt[a]paramamokṣasyeyaṃ[b]bhaṇitir[c]āyuṣmataḥ[d] "*śrīmatsvāyambhuvamataṅgāditantrāṇi puruṣārtham ācakṣāṇo bhagavān na paramamokṣam ādiṣṭavān*" *iti tatparihāraprakāraḥ svāyambhuvavṛttāv[e]* **evāsmābhir** *nirūpita iti tata evāvaseyaḥ* ‖

> [a] samastādhva° M^Y] samastadhva° T ◊ °śuddhy° T] °śudhy° M^Y
> [b] paramamokṣasyeyaṃ em.] paramamokṣasyāyaṃ M^Y; paramokṣasyāyaṃ T
> [c] bhaṇitir M^Y] bhuvanavaṇitir T
> [d] āyuṣmataḥ em.] āyuṣmat M^Y, āyuṣmān T
> [e] svāyambhuvavṛttāv T (svāyaṃbhuvavṛttāv)] svāyaṃbhuvaprakāvṛttāv M^Y

"Since the highest emancipation [necessarily] happens immediately after the purification of all the Paths, the manner to refute the following words of an honorable [master, namely,] 'The Bhagavān [Śiva] when teaching scriptures such as the venerable *Svāyambhuva* and the *Mataṅga* for the sake of individual souls did not teach ultimate liberation,' has been described by me exactly in the [commentary on the] *Svāyambhuvavṛtti*. It is from this [commentary] that it should be ascertained."[7]

The second reference appears in the commentary on stt. 274–275ac (M^Y fol. $98v_{10–12}$, T $68r_{8–12}$), where the author apparently quotes five stanzas he composed himself:

---

[6] For some considerations on Rāmakaṇṭha's style, see Goodall (1998, pp. xxviii–xxx).

[7] Unfortunately, at this point the readings of both manuscripts are a bit shaky and thus not completely reliable. We have emended the text in two places, trying to limit our intervention as much as possible. Of course the text could be emended in other ways, as for instance by reading °*mokṣasyāyaṃ bhaṇaty āyuṣmān*, partly following M^Y, partly T, and correcting *bhaṇitir*/°*vaṇitir* into a finite verb. While the syntax would not be completely smooth, we could tentatively translate the sentence as follows: "This honorable [master] states: 'The Bhagavān [Śiva] who is teaching the scriptures such as the venerable *Svāyambhuva* and *Mataṅga* for the individual souls did not instruct the ultimate emancipation.' Since the highest emancipation [necessarily] happens immediately after the purification of all the Paths, the manner to refute these words has been ascertained by me in the commentary on the *Svāyambhuvavṛtti*."

yad uktaṃ svāyaṃbhuvavṛttau padavivaraṇe **'smābhir** —

īśānam īśitā[8] viśvabhāvādhiṣṭhātṛtāguṇaḥ[9] |
sa eva mūrdhā[10] mūrdheva[11] yasya so 'yaṃ tathāvidhaḥ ||
yat pūrṇam[12] uttamaṃ[13] śaivaṃ jñānaṃ tatpuruṣāhvayam |
bindukṣobhād yato vakti[14] tat tejo vaktram aiśvaram ||
aghaso bandhasantānād alaṃ harati yan naram |[15]
patitvaṃ[16] ca diśaty asmai tadaghorahṛdīśvaraḥ ||
avaty[17] aśeṣatattvāni devatvāt krīḍayā yataḥ |
tad asya guhyavad guhyaṃ[18] tejaḥ sarvavilakṣaṇam ||
sadyaḥ[19] śaktyanuvedhena[20] guhyādyarthān[21] karoti yat |
tad[22] idaṃ śuddhavidyādāv[23] ajātā śaktir[24] aiśvarī[25] ||

[The energy called] Īśāna is the supremacy (*īśitā*), [namely, it] is the property of being the presider over all beings. This is [called] the "head," [in the sense that it is] like the head. The one [= Śiva] who has that [head] is so described.

That full (*pūrṇa* > *pur*), supreme (*uttama* > *u*) Śaiva (*śaiva* > *ṣa*) knowledge, which is called Tatpuruṣa (*pur-u-ṣa*), through which He [= Śiva] speaks after/through the activation of Bindu, that energy is [called] the Lord's "mouth."

---

[8] *īśitā* M^Y] *iśivatā* T*pc*; *iśivātā* T*ac*; the text could be emended with *īśatā*, which is quite frequent, but *īśitā* is also attested (see, e.g., *Ajaḍapramātṛsiddhi* 24d, *Parākhyatantra* 14.91d)

[9] *guṇaḥ* M^Y] *guṇāḥ* T

[10] *mūrdhā* M^Y] *mūrdha* T (a bit broken)

[11] *mūrdheva* M^Y] *mūrdhe* T (a bit broken)

[12] *yat* (*yad*) *pūrṇam* T] *yat pūrnam* M^Y

[13] *uttamaṃ* M^Y] *āttamaṃ* T

[14] *bindukṣobhād yato vakti* em.] *bindukṣo*{.. .. .. ..}*kti* M^Y; *bindukṣobhād yato vakta* T

[15] This line is missing in T.

[16] *patitvaṃ* T] *patitaṃ* M^Y

[17] The reading *avaty* might sound a bit odd here where the names of the five faces of Śiva are etymologically explained. One could tentatively emend *avaty*, which is shared by both M^Y and T, to *vamaty*, as has been suggested to us by Goodall, which might better explain the name Vāmadeva and provide a closer parallelism with the other explanations.

[18] *guhyaṃ* M^Y T*pc*] *gu..hyaṃ* T*ac* (the *akṣara* that is cancelled after *gu* is undecipherable)

[19] *sadyaḥ* M^Y] *sadyataś* T

[20] *śaktyanuvedhena* em.] *śaktyanuve*{.. ..} M^Y; *śaktyānuvedhena* T

[21] *guhyādyarthān* em.] {.. ..}*dyarthān* M^Y; *guhyādyarthaṃ* T

[22] *tad* em. Goodall] *yad* M^Y T

[23] *śuddhavidyādāv* T] *śuddhavidyā*{..} M^Y (the lower part of the *akṣara*s is broken off)

[24] *ajātā śaktir* T] {.. .. ..}*r* M^Y (only small tips of the *akṣara*s are visible); cf. *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* 94cd and *Parākhyatantra* 3.74–75 (pp. 222, 465).

[25] *aiśvarī* M^Y] *īśvarī* T

The [energy] that entirely (*alam*) removes (*harati*) the soul from sin (*aghas*),[26] [which is to say] from the unbroken sequence of bondage, and gives to that [soul] the property of being the Lord: Īśvara [= Śiva] has such Aghora as his "heart."

That from which [Śiva] impels (*avati*) all the Tattvas playfully, because of [His] nature of being God (*div = krīḍ*), that energy [= Vāmadeva] is [called] His "organ of generation," [in the sense that it is] like the organ of generation (lit. "that which must be hidden"), which is kept apart from everything [because it is to be hidden] (*sarvavilakṣaṇa*).

The [energy] that in the Śuddhavidyā, etc., creates the objects beginning with the organ of generation [= all the other body parts] immediately (*sadyas*), by means of a penetration of Power, that is the "unborn" (*ajāta*) Śakti of the Lord [= Sadyojāta].

These verses would deserve a thorough explanation, since they apparently contain issues that deviate from the usual Śaiva mainstream exegesis. Unfortunately, at present we are only able to propose a tentative translation and are unable to provide the reader with a detailed analysis.

Further relevant information about the author is found in the incomplete colophon of his **Ratnatrayaparīkṣāvyākhyāna*, unfortunately only available in T:

> gurur netraguruḥ[a]śrīmān āyāto[b] gauḍadeśa(79v₉)taḥ |
> netā śivāgamārtthānām <.. .. .. ‖>
> (*80r₁) praṇavaṃ pañcabhedāni[c] vyākṛtakabheda {.. ..} ṣaṇmukha [d]|
> sākalyaṃ śāṃbhavaṃ saukhyaṃ sā{..}(*80r₂)śyaṃ sāyuj<y>aṃ tathā |
> ete caiva pañcabhedāni pañcavaktreṣu codbhavam[e] |[27]

[a] *netraguruḥ* em.] *netraguru* T
[b] *āyāto* em.] *āyato* T
[c] *pañcabhedāni* em.] *pañcabhedaṃ* T ◊ this *pāda* is unmetrical
[d] *vyākṛtaka*° em.] *vyākkta*° T
[e] *codbhavam* standardization] *cotbhavaṃ* T

---

[26] We assume that *aghasaḥ* is the ablative of *aghas*, even though this stem is not attested. One might also consider to correct the reading *aghaso* to *aghaśo*. In this case, a possible rendering could be: 'The [energy] that entirely (*alam*) removes (*harati*) the soul from the unbroken sequence of bondage in connection with every sin (*aghaśaḥ*) […].'

[27] The last three metrical lines belong to fol. *80r. We are not sure that these lines are intended to be the continuation of the colophon beginning on fol. 79v. It is also possible that fol. *80 was added later from another manuscript with the function of protecting our text, or that these lines were added by someone else on a blank leaf, again put at the end of the manuscript for protective reasons. The lack of an original Grantha number on fol. *80 supports this hypothesis. Moreover, the *ductus* is different and thus the last three lines were probably the work of another copyist. At the very end of a manuscript, we usually expect an independent benediction or some information from the copyist about himself; the statement of the sacred syllable we find in this case does not match the normal usage. If this passage is really a part of the same colophon, as D. Goodall has tentatively suggested to us, it might be the case that the five portions (*pañcabhedāni*) of the sacred syllable mentioned there, beginning with *sākalyam* and ending with *sāyuj<y>am*, are probably to be connected with five gurus.

The extant portion of the colophon is uncertain and some emendations are no doubt needed. For instance, we are not completely certain that the word *netraguru(ḥ)* (note that the *visarga* before the palatal *ś* is often dropped in Grantha script) is correct and should be interpreted as a personal name. In fact we do not have any evidence of a master called Netraguru. One possible emendation, albeit tentative, might be *gurunetā guru(ḥ)* instead of *gurur netraguru(ḥ)*. Such an emendation would imply that the name of the guru was present in the missing last quarter of the first stanza or in the other lines following it. What seems to be certain is that the first three *pāda*s refer to a master who came from Gauḍadeśa (present day Central Bengal). This toponym occurs in other South-Indian Saiddhāntika works referring to the birthplace of important masters of the *guruparamparā*. For instance, we find it in the concluding section of the *Naṭarājapaddhati* by Rāmanātha (11th c.), where the lineage of his masters is given in metrical form.[28] According to stanza 6 of this panegyric, the master who came from Gauḍadeśa is Brahmaśiva. In the Gotrasantati of his *Kriyākramadyotikā*, Aghoraśiva mentions a master named Dhyānaśiva who also originated from Gauḍadeśa.[29] As pointed out by Dominic Goodall, in *Pūrvakāmika* 4.437c–438b there is a reference to *gauḍabhāṣā*, which again might suggest a special link between Bengal and the Tamil-speaking South between the 10th and 12th centuries.[30] We thus can infer that relevant information about a master coming from Gauḍadeśa and his lineage up to our commentator was originally present in the missing portion of the above colophon.

3. There is a third place where at first sight it appears the author is referring to himself. This reference is found in the commentary on stt. 91–94ab:

> *tatra tāvan nivṛttivyāptiṃ saṃhārakrameṇāha* — [stt. 91–94ab] *tatra rudranāmāny eva bhuvanānām api nāmāni | bhuvanādayaś ca paddhaty <ām>* **asmābhir** *vivicya vistareṇa darśitāḥ | granthavistara*[line 11]{± 21 *akṣara*s are broken}*tipadā devī pratisargapadakramāt | saṃhārakrameṇānti-mapraṇavād ārabhyāṣṭāviṃśatipadair atu* (sic for *atra*) *nivṛttikalāyāṃ vyavasthitā | kiṃ ca* — [stt. 94cd–95ab] (M^Y fol. 81v$_{10–11}$).

This passage is present only in M^Y; it is totally absent in T. We suspect it was added by the copyist of M^Y or by one of his predecessors in that line of manuscript transmission, due to his apograph (or one of the apographs) being damaged and his trying to cover the gap by copying from the *Ullekhinī*,[31] or due to him (or of one of his predecessors) feeling that the text needed some explanation but had unusually been left uncommented. Our supposition is supported by comparing the introductory words of this passage as transmitted in

---

[28] The entire panegyric has been edited and translated into English in Goodall (2014).

[29] The relevant passage is introduced, edited and explained in the introduction to the *Kiraṇavṛtti* by Goodall (1998, pp. xiii–xvii).

[30] See Goodall (2015, p. 41, n. 57). See also Davis (1992, p. 370).

[31] *tatra rudranāmāny eva bhuvanānām api nāmāni | bhuvanādayaś ca paddhatyām eva*smābhir *vivicya darśitāḥ | granthavistarabhayāt paddhatyantareṣu bahuśaḥ prasiddhatvāc ca nātra likhyate ||* [stt. 93cd–94ab] *ekāśītipadā devī vyomavyāpilakṣaṇā śaktiḥ | sā ca pratisargapadakramāt saṃhārakrameṇāntyapraṇavādārabhyāṣṭāviṃśatipadair atra nivṛttikalāyāṃ vyavasthitā || kiṃ ca* — [stt. 94cd–95ab] (*Ullekhinī* p. 165).

the two codices. The *avataraṇikā* in T (fol. 29v_{8-9}) runs as follows: *atha vyāptiprakāram āha*—"*nivṛttā* (sic for *nivṛttau*) *pārthivaṃ tattvam*" *ityādinā* "*vyāpako bhuvanādīnam* (sic for *bhuvanādīnām*)" *ityantena granthasandarbheṇa*, whereas in M^Y it is simply: *tatra tāvan nivṛttivyāptiṃ saṃhārakrameṇāha*. It is striking that here T shows—as would be expected—an independent text, but M^Y repeats exactly the words of the *Ullekhinī*. We find it therefore very plausible that someone copied the passage cited above from the *Ullekhinī* into the *Vyākhyāna and not the other way around. We also know that Aghoraśiva actually composed a *Paddhati*, the *Kriyākramadyotikā*, where he gives a detailed description of the *bhuvana*s (pp. 277–289) that supports the expression *asmābhiḥ* […] *vistareṇa darśitāḥ* found in this passage. We cannot completely rule out the possibility that also the author of the *Vyākhyāna wrote a *Paddhati*, but for the time being this cannot be verified.

In the light of the above, we also suspect that a similar thing occurred at the beginning of the work (see above, "section 1 of the Introduction"), for which we unfortunately only have M^Y. Here, too, it is probable that the beginning of the apograph of M^Y, or of one of the manuscripts in its line of transmission, was damaged and so the corresponding words from the *Ullekhinī* were copied in order to offer a complete text to the reader.

We believe that these similarities must be considered a product of interpolations introduced during the text's transmission and that, notwithstanding appearances, they do not demonstrate any direct connection of our text with the commentary and interpretation of Aghoraśiva. In fact, although we see no substantial differences regarding doctrinal presuppositions between the *Vyākhyāna and the *Ullekhinī*, the two works do differ in several ways. We see, for instance, that (1) the way of dividing the verses of the *mūla* text differs; (2) the text of the *Vyākhyāna is generally more verbose; (3) there is a tendency in the *Vyākhyāna to lean more on scriptural sources (and the quoted stanzas are generally different from those mentioned in the same places by Aghoraśiva); and (4) often the *Vyākhyāna makes a possible debate with an objector or questioner more explicit.

Differences in interpretation between the *Vyākhyāna and the *Ullekhinī* are sometimes visible and quite significant. This is based on a variety of reasons, ranging from the simple interpretation of single words or compounds, to differences in the reading of the *mūla* text. We limit ourselves to providing the reader with just a few such instances. *Ad* stt. 41cd–44, where Śrīkaṇṭha enumerates six reasons ("impure insentience" and so forth) why Māyā is the material cause of the Impure Path, according to Aghoraśiva these are qualifications of the Impure Path, whereas in our commentator's gloss they qualify Māyā. *Ad* stt. 166cd–168cd, where Śrīkaṇṭha defines Bindu as *parigrahaśakti*, the word *uditā* (167d) is understood by Aghoraśiva as the past participle of *vad*, meaning "stated," whereas our commentator takes it as derived from the root *ud-i* ("to arise"). In st. 168b, Aghoraśiva interprets the text on the basis of the reading *pāśatvena* instead of *paśutvena*, the one followed by our commentator.

We note also that, even where our commentator's interpretation does not differ from Aghoraśiva's, he often goes into more detail and provides a more in-depth analysis. For instance, he gives quite a bit of importance to those Śaivas who claim that Bindu is the same as Śiva's Kriyāśakti and therefore inheres in Him, a viewpoint presented by Śrīkaṇṭha in stt. 126cd–134a. In support of their view, our

commentator quotes various passages from scriptural sources such as the *Sarvajñānottara* and the *Kiraṇa* (*ad* stt. 134b–139ab), as well as from non-scriptural treatises such as the *Tattvaprakāśa* (*ad* stt. 126cd–134a). In contrast, Aghoraśiva's discussion remains quite superficial, briefly explaining Śrīkaṇṭha's words and not providing a real picture of the opponent's viewpoint. This suggests that in Aghoraśiva's time or in his environment (or at least in his region) there were no opponents who maintained the above-mentioned "heretical" doctrine and that he thus had no reason to be concerned about them. Seemingly, this identification of Bindu with Kriyāśakti had some circulation between the 9th and the 11th centuries and was felt worthy of criticism. Also Rāmakaṇṭha refers to and criticizes this viewpoint in stanza 18 of his *Nādakārikā*. It is worth noting that Aghoraśiva's commentary thereon is again quite short, and provides no information about the *padavid*s (lit. "knowers of the words") who are mentioned by Rāmakaṇṭha as the holders of this view.[32] The same attitude is also found in other parts of Aghoraśiva's commentary on the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*, for example in his explanation of stt. 166cd–168cd, which deal with the topic of *parigrahaśakti*. Here, again, he does not give any deeper analysis, whereas our commentator deals with the subject at length.

All of the recognized quotations in the *Vyākhyāna appear to be from texts and authors that predate the 12th cent. (see below, "section 4 of the Introduction"). This consideration, in addition to the fact that our commentator does not seem to allude to Aghoraśiva or echo his style, suggests that he may have been relatively early. In view of the above, we believe that it is plausible that our commentator may have predated Aghoraśiva (or lived during the same period without knowing him), with his estimated timeframe possibly spanning from the 11th cent., when Bhojadeva was active, to the 12th cent., when Aghoraśiva lived. It is also worth noting that Sathyanarayanan and Goodall (2020, pp. 523–524) have pointed out that Aghoraśiva claims to have known an earlier exegesis of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*, which might of course be only a literary trope. Therefore it is not impossible that he was referring to the *Vyākhyāna, even if he did not actually study it closely.

Further considerations on the relationship and the differences between the two commentaries (as well as a more accurate assessment of the differences in the transmission of the *mūla* text) can be made with greater precision when the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* and these two commentaries have been edited critically and translated with annotations. Both projects are currently underway: Sathyanarayana Sarma (EFEO, Pondichéry) and T. Ganesan (IFP) are working on a new critical edition of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* and the *Ullekhinī* by Aghoraśiva (personal communication, 3 January 2024), while we are preparing the complete *editio princeps* of the anonymous commentary. An excerpt thereof is being published here. An annotated English translation of the *Vyākhyāna, authored by A. Saito alone, will later appear in the volume of our edition of the entire text.

4. As one might expect, the commentary contains several quotations from Saiddhāntika scriptures. Those that are most frequently cited, and mentioned by name, are the *Kiraṇa*, the *Mataṅga* and the *Svāyambhuva*. Less frequently we find

---

[32] See *Nādakārikāvyākhyā* ed. p. 243.

citations from the *Sarvajñānottara*, the *Sārdhatriśatikālottara* (referred to simply as *Kālottara*) and other Śaiva scriptures. Among the latter we also find silent quotations of verses that we know as belonging to the *Kāmika* and the *Mṛgendra*.[33] These are introduced with phrases such as *yad uktam* (*ad* stt. 254cd–255ab) or *tad āhuḥ* (*ad* stt. 164cd–166ab), or they are simply embedded in the prose and marked with an *iti* at the end (*ad* st. 7ab). Saiddhāntika scriptures such as *Kiraṇa, Mṛgendra*, *Pauṣkarāgama*, and *Sārdhatriśatikālottara* are often referred to as Śivāmnāya (on one occasion, simply as *āmnāya*), a word that, to the best of our present knowledge, is not used in this way by other Śaiva exegetes.[34] Occasionally, like Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha and Rāmakaṇṭha, our commentator cites stanzas also from the *Mālinīvijay[ottar]a* (e.g., st. 2.60ab [*ad* 26cd–29ab], st. 3.5 [*ad* 276–278ab]),[35] as well as a verse from the lost *Bhārgavottara* (*ad* 23b).[36]

Among scriptural but non-Śaiva sources, we find only one sentence from *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 3.19 (*ad* 185ab), which is labelled *āmnāyaḥ*.

Among the non-scriptural sources, we find stanzas 24cd–25ab from the *Tattvasaṅgraha* (*ad* st. 38, 251cd); stanza 55 from the *Paramokṣanirāsakārika* (*ad* 23b) and stanzas 45b, 101, and 111 from the *Mokṣakārikā* (*ad* stt. 7ab, 17cd–18)[37] by Sadyojyotis (*ca.* 675–725)[38]; stanzas 28–30, 33abc from the *Tattvaprakāśa* (*ad* 126–134ab₁) by Bhojadeva (11ᵗʰ cent.); and stanzas from works by other masters, such as Brahmaśambhu (first half of the 10ᵗʰ cent.)[39] (*ad* st. 6cd).

The only non-Saiddhāntika texts that are quoted are *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 3b (*ad* st. 38a₂d) and 10 (*ad* st. 35ab), *Vākyapadīya* 3.9.50 (*ad* stt. 35cd–36c), *Ślokavārttika* Sambandhākṣepaparihāra 110 (*ad* stt. 146–149ab) and *Pramāṇaviniścaya* 1.55ab (*ad* stt. 219–220ab). However, in all these cases it is possible that the quotations are not taken directly from the original sources, but indirectly from other works, since they appear to be part of a set of stanzas that is frequently quoted in Śaiva doxographical literature.[40]

It is worth noting that in his *Siddhāntasārāvalivyākhyā*, Anantaśambhu (14ᵗʰ cent. ?) quotes and briefly explains some stanzas of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*. When he

---

[33] A relatively large number of verses in the *Kāmika*, both in the *Uttara-* and in the *Pūrva-Kāmika*, have now been found in Brahmaśambhu's *paddhati*, which our commentator also cites (see Sanderson 2012–2013, p. 21, n. 74). So the *Kāmika* citations might actually not be from the *Kāmika* itself.

[34] We have rendered this compound, which occurs 12 times in total in this commentary, as "Śiva's transmitted doctrine" or "Śiva's scriptural tradition."

[35] This is a further confirmation that albeit this tantra is deemed by Śaivādvaita masters, Abhinavagupta *in primis*, as one of the main *advaita* scriptures, "it contains certain clear indications that it followed the dualism of the mainstream Śaivism of the Siddhāntas" (Sanderson 1992, p. 293).

[36] It should be noted, however, that also in this case the name of the text is not given by our commentator, who introduces the stanza with the words *yad uktam*. The identification is instead provided by Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha in his *Mṛgendravṛtti ad* 1.2.11.

[37] Note that stt. 101 and 111 are wrongly attributed to Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha.

[38] See Sanderson (2006, p. 79).

[39] See Sanderson (2012–2013, p. 20).

[40] For instance, *Sāṅkhyakārikā* st. 3 is quoted in the *Mṛgendravṛtti ad* Vidyāpāda 1.2.15ab; *Sāṅkhyakārikā* st. 10 in the *Mataṅgavṛtti ad* Vidyāpāda 1–3; the citation from the Kālasamuddeśa in the *Pauṣkaravṛtti* (transcript p. 498); *Ślokavārttika* Sambandhākṣepaparihāra 110 in *Kiraṇavṛtti* 1.14 (see Goodall, 1998, p. 192, n. 102); *Pramāṇaviniścaya* 1.55 in the *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa ad* 1.10ac.

explains stanzas 73–77,[41] in particular, his sentences recall or are partly identical with the words of our commentator. For the time being we are not certain about the direction of dependence between the two texts. This should be investigated more carefully in the future.[42]

Unfortunately, we are unable to identify a number of quotations, some referred to as Śivāmnāya; approximately fifteen remain untraced.

5. Before introducing the content of the passage that is presented here for the first time, we will describe the two manuscripts used for this edition.
Mysore ORlas P 269 was first described by H.P. Malledevaru in 1987 in vol. XII of the Oriental Library's *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts* (henceforth Cat.). More recently, Alex Watson, Dominic Goodall, and S.L.P. Anjaneya Sarma, who used this manuscript for their edition and translation of the *editio princeps* of the *Paramokṣanirāsakārikāvṛtti* by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, have corrected Malledevaru's description in several points (2013, pp. 81–83). Here follows a further description of the manuscript mainly focused on as yet unpublished information.

The leaves of the codex show common features. They are all produced from the same species of palm, have the same measurements (Malledevaru states that each leaf is *c.* 38cm 5cm),[43] and are all pierced by two string-holes whose position is the same on each leaf. However, MS ORlas P 269 is likely a composite of at least three originally independent manuscripts, each written by a different copyist.

Let us start by saying that the codex can be divided into three parts. The first two parts start with new foliation (fols. 1r–115v; fols. 1r–64v),[44] whereas the third consists in 26 leaves beginning with fol. 288 (fols. 288r–315v).[45]

The first part of the codex, which contains several Saiddhāntika works, can in its turn be divided into two sections. In the first section we have eight texts followed by a commentary; the second section contains seven *mūlapāṭha* texts. Those two sections are referred to here with the siglum M^Y and the siglum M^Y_M, respectively:[46]

$$M^Y$$

Fols. $1r_1$–$12r_3$:	*Tattvaprakāśa* of Bhojadeva with the *Vṛtti* [Cat. *Tattvaprakāśavyākhyā*] by Aghoraśiva (complete) [Cat. Serial numbers E 40729, E 40731]
Fols. $12r_3$–$23r_6$:	*Tattvasaṃgraha* of Sadyojyotis with the *Dīpikā* (aka *Ṭīkā*) by Aghoraśiva (complete)[47] [Cat. Serial number E 40736]

---

[41] This section of the text, which deals with the levels of the "word" (*vāc*), is edited in Sferra (2007, pp. 469–473).

[42] For references to these parallels, see Sferra (2007, p. 473).

[43] Cf. Malledevaru (1987, pp. 163, 167, 173, 175, 195, 209, 233).

[44] Since two folios of the second part bear the number 56, the actual number of leaves of this part is 65.

[45] Fol. 292 has not been digitally reproduced and is probably missing.

[46] These sigla have already been used to refer to these two parts of MS ORlas P 269 by Sferra (2007), by Watson et al. (2013), and by Kataoka (2015).

[47] In Filliozat 1988, this part of the manuscript is referred to with the siglum G.

Fols. 23r_6–27r_6:   *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* of Sadyojyotis with the *Vivaraṇa* (aka *Vṛtti*) by Aghoraśiva (complete)[48] [Cat. Serial number E 40728]

Fols. 27r_6–41v_7:   *Bhogakārikā* of Sadyojyotis with the *Vṛtti* [Cat. *Bhogakārikāvyākhyā*] by Aghoraśiva (complete)[49] [Cat. Serial numbers E 40790, E 40792]

Fols. 41v_7–47r_{10}:   *Śaivasiddhāntadīpikā* of Sarvātmaśambhu (complete) [Cat. Serial number E 40926]

Fols. 47v_1–58v_{11}:   *Mokṣakārikā* of Sadyojyotis with the *Vṛtti* by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha (complete) [Cat. Serial number E 40803]

Fols. 59r_1–71v_2:   *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā* of Sadyojyotis with the *Vṛtti* by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha (complete)[50] [Cat. Serial number E 40759]

Fols. 71v_3–102v_{12}:   *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* [Cat. *Ratnatrayodyotaḥ*] of Śrīkaṇṭhasūri with an anonymous commentary [Cat. *Ratnatrayodyotavyākhyā*] (incomplete) [Cat. Serial numbers E 40804, E 40806]

$$\mathrm{M}_M^Y$$

Fols. 105$r_{1–13}$:   *Tattvasaṃgraha* by Sadyojyotis (incomplete)[51] [Cat. Serial number E 40735]

Fols. 105$v_{1–13}$:   *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* by Sadyojyotis (complete)[52] [Cat. Serial number E 40727]

Fols. 105v_{13}–107v_{11}: *Bhogakārikā* by Sadyojyotis (complete)[53] [Cat. Serial number E 40791]

Fols. 108r_1–109v_{13}: *Mokṣakārikā* by Sadyojyotis (complete)[54] [Cat. Serial number E 40801, 40802]

Fols. 110r_1–111r_7:   *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* by Śrīkaṇṭhasūri (incomplete)[55] [Cat. Serial number E 40805]

---

[48] In Filliozat 1991, this part of the manuscript is referred to with the siglum M.

[49] This part of the manuscript has been used by Fabio Boccio for his new edition of the text (PhD thesis, University of Rome "La Sapienza," unpublished).

[50] This part of the manuscript has been used by Watson, Goodall and Sarma for their edition of the *Paramokṣanirāsakārikāvṛtti* (2013).

[51] The text is presently acephalous, the beginning likely found on the missing fol. 104. It starts abruptly with the fourth *akṣara* of st. 29 (*bhu ca malena hy anādisaṃruddhadṛkkriyaṃ tattvam* |). This part of the manuscript was not used by P.-S. Filliozat for his edition and translation of the *Tattvasaṃgraha* by Sadyojyotis and its commentary by Aghoraśiva (Filliozat, 1988).

[52] This part of the manuscript was not used by Filliozat (1991).

[53] After the last stanza of the text, there is no colophon (the rest of the folio is blank).

[54] The text ends with two double *daṇḍa*s; after this we find the following verse: *kṛpāluḥ paripūrṇo māṃ rugbaṃdhananivartakaḥ* | *karmamāye ca saṃbaddhya dāse*[line 14]*yaṃ pātu {śaṃkaraḥ}* || After this stanza, one *akṣara* is partly visible; then the edge is broken off, a space that could have contained (but did not necessarily contain) about 13 to 14 syllables.

[55] The title given in Malledevaru (1987, p. 174) is *Ratnatrayodyotaḥ*. Folio 110r (formerly 108r) begins with the salutation formula *śrīśivāya namaḥ* and includes stt. 1–41a (*pāda*s 1bc are broken). Folio 110v (formerly 108v) contains stt. 41a–77b1. Folio 111r contains stt. 77b2 (the *akṣara*s °*napā*° are almost totally broken; the *akṣara*s °*yinī* are partly legible, their upper half being partly broken)–99c (the last words are *avyaktam api*). Stanzas 82ab, and 94–95ab are missing. The folio contains some blank space

Fols. 112r_1–113r_5:   *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā* by Sadyojyotis (complete)[56] [Cat. Serial number E 40758]

Fols. 115r_1–115v_7:   *Śataratnasaṃgraha* (*mūla* only) by Umāpatiśivācārya (incomplete)[57] [not identified by Malledevaru]

After fol. 102, folios 103 and 104 are apparently missing. We cannot be fully certain of this, since folio 105 is broken on the left margin and only the upper edge of a number, likely a 5, is partially decipherable. Since the numbers 106–110 of the following leaves have been written above earlier numbers 104–108, which are still partially visible, this could lead us to believe that only one leaf, namely, fol. 103, was originally missing. Fol. 114 is missing and fols. 111v and 113v are blank.

The second and third parts of the codex contain two Vīraśaiva works, namely:

Fols. 1r_1–64v_8:   *Dīpikā* by Vīraṇācārya[58] on the *Daśagranthi* (complete; in Kannada)[59] [Cat. Serial number E 40997-98: *Daśagranthivyākhyā*]

Fols. 288r_1–315v_2:   *Śrīvīraśaivadharmanirṇaya Siddhāntaśikhāmaṇi* by Śivayogin (also known as Reṇukācārya, probably *fl.* 13th–14th cent.; incomplete)[60] [Cat. Serial number E 41138]

There is no clue in the extant parts of the codex regarding the contents of the missing first 287 leaves of the third part, although we might presume that they contained Vīraśaiva works. It is possible that 224 folios are missing (if we presume the foliation of the third part continued from the codex's second part), or only 173 (if it continued from the codex's first part), but this is less likely.

While variations in the *ductus* are slight, in some *akṣara*s they are quite apparent, sometimes strikingly so (e.g., see below the syllables *tra* and *hā*). Differences are

---

Footnote 55 continued

and a further salutation formula, perhaps written by a different hand, in the last and eighth line whose *akṣara*s have been carved but not filled with ink: *śrīśivāya namaḥ śrīmadagastyaliṃgāya namaḥ*.

[56] After the last stanza of the text there is no colophon. The remaining portion of the folio is blank.

[57] The text starts with the first stanza but without a salutation formula at the beginning of fol. 115r; it ends with the following words: *āhur eva jagat sarvaṃ prabuddhaṃ śabdavṛttibhiḥ | na hi śabdā*[line 7]*d ṛte puṃsaḥ pratyayo sti kadācana* || 50 || *śabdānuviddham eveha viśvajñānaṃ pradṛśyate* || 51 || *etā eva paro baṃdhaḥ paśūnāṃ paramārthataḥ* | (cf. Addendum in the edition of the text on p. 118). The remaining portion of the folio is blank.

[58] The author is defined as "Son of the master Viśvanātha" (*viśvanāthācāryaputa*); cf., e.g., fols. 25$v_{8–9}$, 46r_3, 55v_{11}, 64v_8.

[59] The text consists of seven *āhnika*s; colophons are found on fols. 8r [1], 17v [2], 25v [3], 35r [4], 46r [5], 56 (ka)r [6], 64v [7]. After the final colophon, the copyist has filled the leaf with the following words in Sanskrit and Kannada: || *śubham astu* || [line 9] *karakṛtam aparādhaṃ kṣaṃtum arhaṃti saṃtaḥ* || || *śrīsadāśivāya namaḥ* | *śrīgurubhyo namaḥ* || *śrīnaṃḍuṃḍaliṃganegati* || || *śrīmadekākṣaragaṇapataye namaḥ* | *bālāṃvikāyai namaḥ* ||. The text is rich in quotations in Sanskrit from Saiddhāntika scriptures (e.g., *Pauṣkara* and *Mataṅga*).

[60] The manuscript contains 20 *pariccheda*s; the last *pariccheda* of the work, the 21st, is lacking completely, since the final folio is partly broken; its last three lines (one line on fol. 315r and two lines on fol. 315v) are almost illegible. Malledevaru (1987, p. 233) states that the manuscript contains only chapters 5–20.

sometimes visible also in how numbers are written on the left margin of the *recto*, especially the numbers 4 and 5, and to some degree also the numbers 8 and 9. Here follows a comparison of certain letters, clusters and numbers whose differences are most noticeable.

	Part 1	Part 2	Part 3
initial *i*	(fol. $8v_3$)	(fol. $3r_5$)	(fol. $293v_1$)
initial *e*	(fol. $6v_8$)	(fol. $14v_{11}$)	(fol. $294v_8$)
ṇa	(fol. $80r_2$)	(fol. $42r_3$)	(fol. $310v_6$)
tra	(fol. $80r_7$)	(fol. $25v_4$)	(fol. $303v_{10}$)
na	(fol. $87v_5$)	(fol. $52v_7$)	(fol. $291v_8$)
pa	(fol. $32r_{10}$)	(fol. $51v_8$)	(fol. $303v_8$)
la	(fol. $88v_3$)	(fol. $43r_6$)	(fol. $305v_4$)
hā	(fol. $79v_7$)	(fol. $3r_9$)	(fol. $298r_7$)
4	(fol. 4r)	(fol. 4r)	(fol. 304r)
5	(fol. 15r)	(fol. 35r)	(fol. 305r)
8	(fol. 68r)	(fol. 48r)	(fol. 298r)
9	(fol. 9r)	(fol. 9r)	(fol. 289r)

The number of lines contained in each leaf varies in the three parts of the codex. Most of the leaves contain 10–11 lines, but there are some with only 8 lines (e.g., pt. 3, fol. 310v), some with 9 lines (e.g., part 1, fols. 1r, 4r; part 2, fol. 64rv; part 3, fol. 288r), others with 12 lines (e.g., part 1, fol. 102rv), 13 lines (e.g., part 1, fol. 107r) or even 14 lines (e.g., part 1, fol. 110r). It is worth noting that the leaves of the first

part never contain less than 9 lines and leaves in the third part rarely have more than 9 lines.

In the first two parts, the average number of *akṣara*s in each line fluctuates considerably, from between 71 and 99 (e.g., pt. 1, fol. 41*v*, 77–79 *akṣara*s, fol. 101*v*, 91–99 *akṣara*s; pt. 2, fol. 4*v*, 72–82 *akṣara*s, fol. 56*v*, 71–75 *akṣara*s, fol. 59*v*, 81–95 *akṣara*s). In contrast, in the third part the leaves rarely exceed 70 *akṣara*s per line (e. g., fol. 292*v*, 64–66 *akṣara*s, fol. 308*r*, 67–71 *akṣara*s).

Unfortunately, in none of the three parts is there a copyist colophon and thus we lack any direct reference to place(s) or date(s) of the copying. No doubt a deeper study of the codex (for instance, a consideration of how corrections and additions have been made) and the works contained in it may shed light on other aspects regarding the production and use of this document.

The Tiruvāvaṭuturai Manuscript Library MS No. 15 is also a palm-leaf manuscript. As mentioned above, it is in Grantha script and incomplete. Each page contains two string holes and has 9 to 11 lines per side. On the cover the following misleading information is given:

> *ratnatrayaparīkṣā — śrīkaṇṭharacitā*
> *aghoraśivācāryakṛtavyākhyāsahitā*
> RATNATRAYAPARĪKṢĀ *of* ŚRĪKAṆṬHA
> *with the commentary of Aghoraśivācārya*

The folios of the manuscript are numbered on the left *recto* margins in three different ways:

(1) The original Grantha numbers, starting with 2. The second folio also bears the number 2 (the leaf is partly broken at this point). Here we have thus labelled the first folio 2^{ka} and the second folio 2^{kha}. Some folios are damaged and the number 10 in Grantha characters is broken. Numbers 2^{kha}, 23, 34 and 35 are partly broken.

(2) A second set of Grantha numbers, added starting with fol. 48*r*. Strangely, this second set begins with the number 31 and ends abruptly with 60 (= fol. 77*r*). Some numbers of this second set are also partly broken: 36, 40–41, 43–45.

(3) Arabic numbers. These are mainly written in the left margin; in a few cases they are on the right (i.e., 96–98, 104–110, 117–120).

On the left margin of fol. 2^{ka} *recto*, we read, in Grantha script, *ratnatrayavyākhyānam.*

The missing portion at the beginning of the text is quite short and would not cover the space of an entire verso side of the missing fol. 1. This might be a clue that this manuscript was the last work of a multiple-text manuscript, with each text having its own foliation; it might also indicate that a long portion of text is missing from the beginning. The first legible words are: *tataḥ kṣantum arhati tat santo nāsūyā paricārake* |, which correspond to *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* st. 3cd. The end of this manuscript has already been discussed above (see "section 2 of the Introduction") and by Sathyanarayanan and Goodall (2020, pp. 522–523). The blank protective leaf

at the beginning of the bundle contains a title, in Grantha script, in two lines: *ratnatraya/viyākhyānaṃ* (sic).

6. The extant portion of the *mūla* text contained in M_M^Y, T and the *mūla* text embedded in M^Y are not always consistent. However the major part of the differences between them can be explained as transmissional mistakes. Conversely, it is worth noting that they all show several significant variants with respect to the *mūlapāṭha* text of the extant printed editions (E_1 and E_2). As regards the portion of the work edited here, the most striking variant can be seen in stanzas 66 and 67 (see below). Usually, with only some exceptions, the *mūla* readings of T match those we find in M_M^Y and M^Y. In Appendix, we have recorded all the significant variant readings between M_M^Y, M^Y, T and E_1 and E_2.

Three other things are also worth noting:

(1) in some cases the sequence of the stanzas differs between the available editions and the *mūla* text of our manuscripts (M^Y, M_M^Y and T). The sequence in M^Y and T is: 1 → 218, 220cd–221ab, 223–225, 219–220ab, 222, 226 → 251ab, 253ab, 251cd → 252, 253cd → 321;

(2) st. 94ab is missing in M^Y, M_M^Y and T, and stt. 207ab and 221cd are missing in M^Y and T;

(3) in M_M^Y the stanzas are sometimes numbered, but their numbers do not exactly correspond to those of the printed editions of the work.[61] For the time being we have preferred to keep the numbers of the stanzas in accordance with those of the work's edition by Vrajavallabha Dvivedī in order to facilitate comparisons with it.[62]

7. The portion of the text edited and translated below makes up part of the description of Bindu, which starts from stanza 22, where Śrīkaṇṭha proclaims that it is the cause of the Pure Path and speech, and, according to our commentator, ends with stanza 176ab. The main topic of the portion we present here is about the relationship between indeterminate and determinate cognition in the Pure Path. In Śaivasiddhānta theology and philosophy, this is a quite important topic, intertwined with cosmology.[63] Saiddhāntika sources explain the creation of the universe in terms of a gradual appearance of Tattvas (Principles, Ontological Realities), Bhuvanas (Worlds) and Kalās (Sections, Segments, Divisions). However, at some point in the development of this tradition, thinkers came to the conclusion that the creation of these entities, and consequently of all items within them, is possible *only*

---

[61] For the portion edited here, in M_M^Y we find the number 47 after st. 46ab of the edited text, the number 50 after st. 49ab, the number 53 after st. 52ab, the number 59 after st. 58ab, the number 65 after st. 64ab, the number 67 after st. 66ab, and the number 68 after st. 67ab.

[62] In the edition by Kṛṣṇaśāstrī, the stanzas are not always numbered; starting with stanza 53 (p. 23) their numbers do not correspond with those in the edition by Dvivedī.

[63] In contrast to the topic of the part of the text being discussed in this paper, which is about the pure universe and the souls at the higher level, including transcendent Śiva, later in the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* (stt. 202cd–264) Śrīkaṇṭha deals with the ordinary souls' (i.e. bound souls') conceptual/non-conceptual cognition, as well as with erroneous cognition.

if these become the object of conceptual cognition, or, to be more precise, if they are initially determined conceptually by a creator. Conceptualization requires speech, which in turn needs the mental organs and therefore a body. But Āgamas teach that bodies are a product of *māyā*. We therefore have a vicious circle: In order to activate and thus differentiate *māyā*, we need Tattvas such as Buddhi, Manas, and Ahaṃkāra. But these are only produced after the activation of *māyā*. As far as we know at present, it was Śrīkaṇṭha who contributed to solving this circle by proving in his *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*, based on several reasonings, that Bindu is the cause of both the Pure Path and speech, and that it also provides body and conceptualization to the Vidyeśvara Ananta, the conscious agent responsible for the activation of *māyā*. Antecedents to Śrīkaṇṭha's viewpoint were already visible in earlier Śaiva writings, although expressed in a less coherent and precise way. It is very probable that he was the first to have attempted to give this nexus of notions a more philosophically respectable rigour.

In stanzas 45–49, Śrīkaṇṭha shows that none of the possible candidates (including *māyā*, Śiva, individual souls, and their Śaktis) but Bindu can be the material cause of the Pure Path. As already pointed out in stanzas 41cd–44, *māyā* is the material cause of the Impure Universe, it is subject to transformation, connected to defilements, and pervaded by the higher insentient entity, i.e. Bindu. This Bindu is essential for Ananta to acquire speech at all levels, which is indispensable for him to grasp objects, i.e. to conceptualize the universe. Following 48cd, Śrīkaṇṭha interrupts his direct discussion of the issue of conceptual cognition and his focus moves to transformation. Since Śiva, the individual souls, and their Śaktis are conscious, in accord with a Sāṃkhya tenet that is fundamentally accepted by all Saiddhāntikas, they cannot be subject to any kind of change and for this reason they also cannot be the material cause of the Pure Path. Let us note here that in this regard, Śrīkaṇṭha differentiates between two kinds of change: transformation (*pariṇāma*), which is the attainment of another state by abandoning the previous state, as we see when milk becomes yogurt; and modality-change (*vṛtti*), which is the attainment of another state without abandoning the previous one, as we see cloth becoming a tent.[64]

In stanzas 50–56, Śrīkaṇṭha identifies another piece of evidence for the existence of Bindu in the variety between the individual souls who dwell in the Pure Path: Their Śaktis and states differ from each other but, as we have just seen above, they are conscious and never undergo change, because change is a quality only of insentient entities. Variety of souls and their Śaktis, as well as the variety of experience, cannot be explained only on the basis of past action, which, indeed, is what usually gives account for variety in common experience. Thus Śrīkaṇṭha concludes that those varieties must be the result of the imposed attribute that is Bindu.

In stanzas 57–62ab, Śrīkaṇṭha establishes two things: first, that Bindu is the "ether" (*ambara*), that is, the locus, of the souls who dwell in the Pure Path; second, coming back to the issue of conceptual cognition, that Bindu becomes "conceptualization" (*vikalpa*) and thus speech, which develops in accordance with its own

---

[64] See below, nn. 317, 319.

modalities.[65] From this point of view, Bindu can be defined—as our commentator does—as the "assistant" (*upakāraka*) of all souls, namely, also of those who dwell in the Impure Path. In fact, Bindu exists in all beings when assuming its various modalities of speech. It is precisely at this point that Śrīkaṇṭha feels the need to clarify that conceptual cognition cannot be equated with latent impressions or with the *tanmātra* sound. In fact, latent impressions are imperceptible whereas conceptual cognition is perceptible. The *tanmātra* sound is not present in the Pure Path, but Ananta, who lives there, requires conceptualization for creation.

In stanzas 62cd–70ab, Śrīkaṇṭha summarizes the point of view of other, not identified Śaiva masters who prove Bindu in a different way. They believe that Ananta, as being an agent-creator (*kartṛ*) but nonetheless inferior to the autonomous Śiva, should not be responsible for the same level of creation as Śiva is. Their unique assumption seems to be that one who acts on things subject to transformation is himself/herself subject to transformation (*vikṛta*), while one who does not possess conceptual constructions (*nirvikalpa*) impels without modification (see below, "Śiva Creates Things by Non-conceptual Cognition, While Ananta does so by Conceptual Cognition" and "Modality-Change Belonging to Bindu Requires Only Non-conceptual Cognition" sections). Referring to the previously mentioned difference between modality-change and transformation, they claim that Ananta cannot be the agent of modality-change, but only of transformation, inasmuch as he is endowed with conceptual cognitions. In fact, Śiva does not possess conceptual cognitions: if he had them, their cause would be needed and that would entail a *regressus ad infinitum*. Thus, these masters conclude that Śiva is the agent only of modality-change—he activates Bindu without conceptual cognition and Bindu is subjected only to modality-change. Aiming at avoiding the risk of infinite regress, Śrīkaṇṭha agrees with these masters that Śiva does not possess conceptual cognitions. The disagreement between them is that for Śrīkaṇṭha, modality-change is not necessarily produced by an agent without conceptual cognitions; for instance, the change of a piece of cloth into a tent also requires an agent endowed with conceptual cognitions.

Śrīkaṇṭha and our commentator do not clearly explain to what extent they consider Bindu to be subjected only to modality-change. On the basis of other passages in the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* and its two commentaries, it seems that Bindu is mainly subject to modality-change, but for the production of things in the Pure Path, such as Tattvas, Worlds and so forth, it is also subject to transformation. However, in the section of the text that is edited and translated in this paper, the focus is only on Bindu's modality-change. Its being subject to modality-change means that, as a material cause, it changes only its function and structure. In this regard, Śrīkaṇṭha and his commentators give the above-mentioned example of cloth turning into a tent, without providing the reader with a more detailed explanation. Therefore, not all the implications of this example are completely clear. One might speculate, for instance, that, with respect to transformation, modality-change is reversible—a tent,

---

[65] The modalities of speech, i.e. *nāda*, *bindu*, and *arṇa*, or in other terms, Sūkṣmā, Paśyantī, Madhyamā, and Vaikharī, which are implicitly referred to here, are discussed by Śrīkaṇṭha in stanzas 72–78ab (for a preliminary edition of this section, see Sferra, 2007). In the commentary on st. 22, our commentator also clarifies the correspondence between *nāda* (= Sūkṣmā), *bindu* (= Paśyantī and Madhyamā), and *arṇa* (= Vaikharī).

for instance, can again become a piece of cloth or turn into something else, like a carpet or a floor cloth, in dependence on the agent who, while handling a piece of cloth, thinks of a tent, a carpet, etc. and then acts in order to produce those items using that cloth. In the place of the piece of cloth, we could perhaps think of the sky, which remains the same even though its state changes according to the light in the morning, the afternoon, the evening, etc. In contrast, transformation is irreversible: we cannot, for instance, recover milk from yogurt. Transformation implies a change in the essence, whereas functional change implies the essence remaining the same. From this point of view, Bindu and its modalities—i.e. speech like Sūkṣmā and the phases of Śiva that are later called Kalādhvan, the locus of all the other Paths— share the same essence. That's why Bindu is compared to the "space" (*avakāśa*) or the "locus" (*adhiṣṭhāna*) that pervades everything by providing it the place to exist. This metaphorical definition is backed by another well-known name of Bindu, "the imperishable ether" (st. 57), as our commentator explains: "as that [gross sky] gives the space for the celestial bodies, this [imperishable super ether] does so too."

8. The part of M^Y containing the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* and its commentary is fairly correct. Each leaf is damaged slightly on the upper edge above the left string-hole, with the result that often the first line of the *recto* and the last of the *verso* are missing an average of about fifteen *akṣara*s. The damage is most grievous for fols. 81–82, with a little more than a quarter of each leaf broken off on the left end, and fol. 98, with about a tenth of the leaf broken off also on the left end. In the section edited here (M^Y 1st part, fols. $77v_{10}$–$80r_5$), in both fol. $79r_1$ and fol. $80r_1$ circa ten *akṣara*s are broken. Manuscript T is not broken, but heavily damaged by worms. Moreover, as noted above, its copyist was quite inaccurate, with the text suffering from trivial mistakes and frequent eyeskip.

As for the editorial polices adopted here, the reader should keep in mind that sandhi has been standardized and that punctuation (namely, *daṇḍa*s, commas, em-dashes, the use of bold, indentation of stanzas, and division into paragraphs) reflects our interpretation and does not reproduce the copyists' choices. There are no *avagraha*s in either of the manuscripts. They have been added when we felt them necessary for easier understanding. We have inserted short titles into the text and translation that provide the reader with brief summaries of the topic under discussion.

For this paper and the edition of the excerpt below, the following symbols, abbreviations and sigla have been used:

{ }   contain *akṣara*s or parts of *akṣara*s that are damaged or partly broken in the MSS; one dot corresponds to a part of an *akṣara*, whereas two dots correspond to one *akṣara*

[ ]   contain references to the pagination of the MSS

( )   contain stanza numbers, short comments, and readings of the MSS with or without the application of sandhi that require a special attention

<   contain *akṣara*s, letters, or spaces that should be occupied by *akṣara*s which

>   have been restored on the basis of the context

◊   separates the commentary on different lemmas within the same compound,
         or within series of words that are graphically connected
ac   *ante correctionem*
conj.   conjecture
deest   absent
em.   emendation
pc   *post correctionem*
r   *recto*
v   *verso*
A_T *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*: The Adyar Library, MS TR 285 (paper MS; Devanāgarī
         script; incomplete [stt. 63b–148 are absent, as folios 20–23 of the exemplar
         are missing; stt. 207ab, 219cd–220 are omitted]; copied by V.
         Krishnamachari on 6 March 1901).
E_1 *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* with the *Ullekhinī*: ed. in *Aṣṭaprakaraṇam*, 2 vols., ed. by
         Kṛṣṇaśāstrī, Śivāgamasiddhāntaparipālanasaṅgraha Publications, Devakōṭṭai
         1923, 1925, vol. 2, pp. 1–108.
E_2 *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* with the *Ullekhinī*: ed. in *Aṣṭaprakaraṇam*, ed. by
         Vrajavallabha Dvivedī, Varanasi 1988, pp. 147–202.
M^Y *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* with the **Vyākhyāna*: Mysore, Oriental Library, MS
         P 269, fols. 71*v*–102*v*.
M^Y_M *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*: Mysore, Oriental Library, MS P 269, fol. 110*rv*.
T   *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* with the **Vyākhyāna*: Tiruvāvaṭuturai Manuscript
         Library, MS 15.

Text

evam[66] prokta[T 15v_9]hetubhyo māyā kalādi[M^Y 77v_{11}]niṣpattau[67] śarīra-
vatkartṛpūrvā **suvarṇa**vad[68] iti ||

    sādhyāntaram āha —

        saivaṃ[69] **vikalpa**[T 15v_{10}]**vijñānagocaraiva satī ca yat**[70] |
        kṣobhyate 'nantanāthena kumbhakāreṇa mṛd[71]**yathā** || (45)

iti | **evam** ity evaṃviśiṣṭe[T 16r_1]ṇa[72] śarīravat**ānantanāthena**[73] **yad** yasmāt[74] **kṣo**-
[M^Y 78r_1]**bhyate** māyā[75] tasya **vikalpavijñānagocare**ti[76] ||

────────────

[66] *evaṃ* T] *eḍavaṃ* M^Y

[67] *kalādiniṣpattau* M^Y] *kālādiniṣpātto* T

[68] *suvarṇavad* M^Y] *suvarṇavid* T

[69] *saivaṃ* M^Y_M M^Y] *saiṣā* T E_1 E_2

[70] *yat* M^Y E_1 E_2] *yet* T

[71] *mṛd* $M^Y$$E_1$$E_2$] *trad* T

[72] °*viśiṣṭeṇa* M^Y] °*viśiṣṭe*{..} T

[73] *śarīravatānanta*° M^Y] *śarīravant*{..}*nanti*° T

[74] *yasmāt* M^Y] *yat syāt* T

[75] *kṣobhyate māyā* T] *kṣo*{.. .. .. ..} M^Y

[76] *tasya vikalpa*° em.] *tasyādvikalpa*° T; {.. .. ..}*kalpa*° M^Y

nanu   māyā[T   16r_2]kṣobhakasya   śarīravattvavikalpajñānavattvavarṇanāc[77]
chuddhādhvānaṃ prati māyānupādānatve[78] kim āyātam ity a[T 16r_3]trāha —

> savikalpaṃ ca[79] [M^Y 78r_2] vijñānaṃ[80] citeḥ śabdānuvedhataḥ[81] |
> sa tu śabdaś caturdhā vāg[82] vaikharyādivibhedataḥ[83] || (46)
> jāyate [T 16r_4] bindusaṅkṣobhād anantasyārthadarśane |
> vidyāśarīro bhagavān anantaḥ kṣobhako[84] mataḥ || (47)
> māyāyāḥ sā ca vidva[T 16r_5]dbhir baindavaṃ tattvam ucyate |

ayam   arthaḥ—aviśuddhajaḍatvādibhyaḥ[85]   pūrvo[M^Y 78r_3]ktahetubhyo[86]   māyā
śarīrādima[T   16r_6]ntaṃ[87]   vikalpajñānopetaṃ[88]   svaprerakam   ākṣipati |
vikalpajñānātmakaśabdasya[89] ca hetutayānya[T 16r_7]d yad[90] upādānam[91] ākṣipati[92]
tad eva[93] śuddhādhvopādānaṃ[94] bindur ity aṅgīkartavya iti bhāvaḥ ||

evaṃ māyā[T 16r_8]nupādānatvam upasaṃhṛtya,[95] īśva[M^Y 78r_4]rānupādānatvam
apy upakṣipati —

> ato na māyopādānaṃ tathaivā[T 16r_9]yaṃ maheśvaraḥ || (48)

iti ||

tatra hetūn ācaṣṭe —

> cetanatvād avṛttitvād apariṇāmataḥ[96]

---

[77] °vikalpa° M^{Y}Tpc] °vijña Tac

[78] °dānatve M^Y] °dānatvena T

[79] savikalpaṃ ca M^Y_M M^Y T (savikalpañ ca)] savikalpaka° E$_1$ E$_2$

[80] vijñānaṃ M^Y] vijñānāñ T

[81] Cf. Vākyapadīya 1.131 (ed. Rau, p. 29): na so 'sti pratyayo loke yaḥ śabdānugamād ṛte | anuviddham iva jñānaṃ sarvaṃ śabdena bhāsate ||.

[82] caturdhā vāg E$_1$ E$_2$] caturdhā vā M^Y_M M^Y; caturdhaiva T

[83] vaikharyādivibhe° M^Y_M T E$_1$ E$_2$] partly broken in M^Y

[84] kṣobhako M^Y M^Y_M E$_1$ E$_2$] kṣobhakṣo T

[85] °jaḍa° M^{Y}pc T] °jaḍā° M^{Y}ac

[86] °ktahetubhyaḥ M^Y] °ktahetubhyaṃ Tpc; °ktahetutu Tac

[87] śarīrādimantaṃ M^Y] śarīrādiva{ta?}ṃ T

[88] °jñānopetaṃ M^Y] °jñānenā{pe?}taṃ T

[89] °kaśabdasya M^Y] °kam api śabdasya T

[90] yad T] ya M^Y

[91] upādānam M^Y] upādānānim T

[92] ākṣipati T] ākṣipatīti M^Y

[93] eva M^Y] evaṃ T

[94] śuddhādhvopādānaṃ M^Y] śuddhvāddhvopādāna T

[95] upasaṃhṛtya M^Y] upasaṃ{.. ..} T

[96] apariṇāmataḥ M^Y_M M^Y (°ta) (sic metri causa)] apariṇāmataḥ T (°ta) (contra metrum); pariṇāmāt tatas E$_1$ E$_2$

iti | **cetanatvād** iti | na hi cetanasyā[T $16r_{10}$]cetanaṃ[97] praty[98] upādānatvam,[99] atyantavailakṣaṇyāt | yasmād atyantavailakṣaṇyaṃ[100] yayor na[101] ta[$M^Y 78r_5$]yoḥ kāryakāraṇabhāvo yathā tantughaṭayoḥ[102] | [T $16v_1$] kiṃ **cāvṛttitvād** iti | vṛttis tv atirohitapūrvāvasthasyaivopādānasyāvasthāntarāpattir[103] yathā[104] paṭa[T $16v_2$]sya kuṭyavasthā[105] | śivasyānīdṛśasvabhāvatvāc[106] ca nopādānatvam | **aparīṇāmata**[107] ity aparo he[$M^Y 78r_6$]tuḥ |

athavā [T $16v_3$][108] cetanatvenāvṛttitvā[T $16v_4$]pariṇāmitvābhyāṃ[109] hetubhyāṃ śivasyānupādānatvam uktam[110] | na[111] hi cetanasya vṛttiḥ pariṇāmo [T $16v_5$] vā[112] dṛśyate, acetaneṣv eva tadubhayadarśanāt |

pariṇāmo 'citaḥ[113] proktaś cetanasya[114] na yujyate | [a]

i[$M^Y 78r_7$]ti [T $16v_6$] śivāmnāyāt[115] pariṇāmaniṣedhaś ca ||
atha prastutāṇuśaktyanupādānatvam[116] apy uktahetvati[T $16v_7$]deśenāha[117] —

tathā |
ātmā[118] śaktiś ca vijñeyau[119]

---

97 °*cetanaṃ* M^Y] °*canaṃ* T

98 *praty* M^Y] *prāty* T

99 *upādānatvam* M^Y] *upādanatvaṃ* T

100 °*vailakṣaṇyāt | yasmād atyanta*° M^Y] *deest* in T ◊ °*vailakṣaṇyaṃ* M^Y] °*vailakṣiṇyaṃ* T

101 *na* M^Y] *deest* in T

102 *tantughaṭayoḥ* M^Y] *tantupaṭayoḥ* T

103 *atirohitapūrvāvasthasyaivopā*° M^Y] *parohitapūrvatvasthasyopā*° T

104 *yathā* M^Y] *yethā* T

105 Cf. *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* 68ab: *vṛttir eva matā bindoḥ paṭasyeva kuṭī tataḥ |.*

106 *śivasyānīdṛśasva*° M^Y] *śivasthānedṛśasya*° T

107 *aparīṇāmata* M^Y] *apariṇāmita* T

108 Here T has "*cetanatvād avṛttitvād apariṇāmata iti cetanatvād iti na hi cetanasyācenaṃ*" but it is crossed out using parentheses.

109 *cetanatvenāvṛttitvāpariṇāmitvābhyāṃ* M^Y_{pc}] *cetanatvo* M^Y_{ac}; *cetanatvenapibhutvāpariṇāmitābhyāṃ* T

110 °*nupādānatvam uktam* M^Y] °*nupadānatvāt ukta* T

111 *na* M^Y] *ne* T

112 *vā* M^Y] *hi* T

113 *'citaḥ* M^Y (*citaḥ*)] *citam* T

114 *proktaś cetanasya* $M^Y pc$ T] *proktaḥ śce* $M^Y ac$

115 *śivāmnāyāt* M^Y] *śivāmnāyāti* T

116 °*śaktyanupādā*° M^Y] °*śākyānupādā*° T

117 *uktahetvati*° $M^Y pc$] *uktadeśetvati*° $M^Y ac$; *uktyahetvati*° Tpc; *ukyahetvati*° Tac

118 *ātmā* M^Y T E_1 E_2] *ātma* M^Y_M

119 *vijñeyau* E_1 E_2; M^Y T *vijñeyāv*] *vijñeyā* M^Y_M

iti | evam uktahetubhir[120] māyeśvarātmatacchaktīnām[121] upādānatvāyo[T 16v_8] gāc[122] chuddhādhvano [M^Y 78r_8] bindur evopādānam iti siddham[123] ‖

atha tad[124] eva prapañcayitum upakramaḥ —

vistaro [T 16v_9] **'traiva**[125] **vakṣyate**[126] ‖ **(49)**

iti ‖

atha[127] vijñānākalādicetananānātvena[128] binduṃ[129] sādhayati —

ito 'pi lakṣyate [T 16v_{10}] **bindur aṇuvaiṣamyadarśanāt |**
dṛśyante[130] **pudgalāḥ kecid alpajñānakriyānvi**[M^Y 78r$_9$]**tāḥ ‖ (50)**
tebhyo 'dhikāḥ pare [T 17r_1] **cānye**[131] **sarvajñā balaśālinaḥ |**
pudgalāś cetanā nityā vikārarahitā matāḥ[132] **‖ (51)**
vikāritve jaḍānityabhāvaḥ syād [T 17r_2] **ghaṭakuḍyavat**[133] **|**
tathaiva citiśaktiś ca[134] **tayor apy avikāriṇoḥ ‖ (52)**
bahudhā yad avasthānaṃ tad upādhivaśād bhavet |
sampṛ[M^Y 78r$_{10}$; T 17r_3]**ktā**[135]**cid aṇor yena māyādyarthāvalokane ‖ (53)**
yadupādher vicitrā ca sa bindur bahuvṛttikaḥ |

iti | **pudgalā** [T 17r_4] ātmānaḥ[136] | **kecid alpajñānakriyā**bhyām **anvitā** vidyātattvavartino[137] 'pi **dṛśyante**[138] | anantādyapekṣay**ālpajñā**[T 17r_5]**nakriyānvitāḥ**[139] | te cānantādayas[140] tadapekṣayā [M^Y 78r$_{11}$] **adhika**padā[141]

---

[120] *ukta*° M^Y] *ukti*° T

[121] *māyeśvarātmatac*° em.] *māyeśvarātmavatac*° M^Y; *māyeśvaratac*° (°*ratach*°) T

[122] °*tvāyogāc* M^Y] °*tvāyoyogāt* T

[123] *siddham* M^Y] *siddhāntād* T

[124] *atha tad* M^Y] *deest* in T

[125] *'traiva* M^Y E$_1$ E$_2$] *tatraiva* T

[126] *vakṣyate* M^Y T E$_1$ E$_2$] *lakṣyate* M$_M^Y$

[127] *atha* M^Y] *athā* T

[128] °*cetananānātvena* M^Y] °*cetananāmamgatvena* T

[129] *binduṃ* M^Y (*biṃduṃ*)] *bindu* T

[130] *dṛśyante* M^Y E$_1$ E$_2$] *dṛśyate* M$_M^Y$ T

[131] *'dhikāḥ (dhikāḥ) pare cānye* M$_M^Y$ M^Y T] *'dhikāḥ pare 'nye tu* E$_1$ E$_2$

[132] *pudgalāś cetanā nityā vikārarahitā matāḥ* M$_M^Y$ M^Y T] *pudgalaś cetano nityo vikārarahito mataḥ* E$_1$ E$_2$

[133] *ghaṭakuḍyavat* M^Y M$_M^Y$ E$_1$ E$_2$] *ghaṭaḍyavat* T

[134] *tathaiva citiśaktiś ca* M$_M^Y$ M^Y T] *tathaiva ca citiḥ śaktis* E$_1$ E$_2$

[135] *saṃpṛktā* M$_M^Y$ M^Y E$_1$ E$_2$] *saṃpṛktāc* T

[136] *ātmānaḥ* M^Y] *ātmānam* T

[137] *vidyātattvavartino* (*vidyātatvavartino*) M^Y] *vidyātvavarttino* T

[138] *'pi dṛśyante* em.] *vidyante* M^Y; *pi dṛśyate* T

[139] *'nantādyape*° M^Y] *anantātmape*° T ◊ °*nakriyānvitāḥ* M^Y] °*nākriyānvitāṃ* T

[140] *cānantādayas* M^Y] *cānantāyadayas* T

[141] °*padā* M^Y] °*pada* T

īśvarasadāśivapadaprāptāḥ[142], **sarvajñā**[143] [T 17r_6] **balaśālinaś**[144] ca **dṛśyante** tantreṣu | uktaṃ ca śrīmatsvāyambhuve[145] —

atha devādhidevasya[146] śivasyāmitateja[T 17r_7]saḥ[147] |
sarvānugrāhikā śaktir amoghā balaśālinī ‖
ekānekavibhāgena saṃsthitau [M^Y 78v_1] śivecchayā | [T 17r_8]
tayodbalitasāmarthyāḥ[148] sarvasya prabhaviṣṇavaḥ |
anānteśādividyeśā[149] babhūvuḥ kāraṇecchayā[150] ‖
tebhyo 'mita[T 17r_9]balāś[151] cānye tebhyaś cānye niyoginaḥ[152] | **b**

iti | nāyaṃ pudgalānāṃ svabhāvas tadvikāro vā, yatas te [T 17r_{10}] **cetana**tva**nitya**tvādidharmair ekasvabhāvā[153] **vikā**[M^Y 78v_2]**rarahitāś** ca sarvatra śrūyante | **vikāritve** ca teṣāṃ **gha**[T 17v_1]**ṭā**der iva **jaḍa**tva**ānitya**tvaprasaṅgaḥ |

yady evam ātmaśakter[154] eva nānāvasthānam astu | tadartham āha[155] — **tathaiva citiśaktiś ca** | tataś ca[156] **tayo**[T 17v_2]**r** ātmaśaktyor[157] **bahudhāvasthānam**[158] **upādhi**m antarā na bhavatīti kenāpy upādhi[M^Y 78v_3]nā bhavitavyam |

nanu dṛkkriyayor evāva[T 17v_3]raṇanivṛttiprakāravaicitryeṇa[159] bahudhāvasthā-nam, na tadyuktasyātmanas, tasya svapratibhāsarūpatvena vai[T 17v_4]citryāyogāt |

satyam,[160] śakter eva nānātvam, ātmani vyavahāras tūpacārāt | ata eva — **sampṛktā cid aṇor yene**[M^Y 78v_4]**ti** [T 17v_5] | **aṇor** anantāder ātmanaś cicchaktir **māyādi**pad**ārthāvalokane**[161] yena **sampṛktā** samarthā bhavati sa [T 17v_6] **bahuvṛttiko binduḥ** | na hy atyantasūkṣmo[162] māyādipadārtho

---

[142] °padaprāptāḥ M^Y] °prāpitaḥ T

[143] sarvajñā M^Y] sarvajña T

[144] bala° M^Y] bali° T

[145] śrīmatsvāyambhuve (°ṃbhuve) M^Y] śrīmanmataṃge T

[146] atha devādhidevasya M^Y] adhidevādhidevasya T; atha devādidevasya ed. Filliozat

[147] śivasyāmita° M^Y Tpc] śivasyamāmita° Tac

[148] tayodbalitasāmarthyāḥ M^Y] tayorbbalitasāmarthyāt T

[149] °vidyeśā M^Y] °vidyeśa T

[150] °ecchayā M^Y] °ecchayaḥ T

[151] 'mita° (mita°) M^Y] nanta° T

[152] niyoginaḥ (niyogina) M^Y] vyomina T

[153] °svabhāvā M^Y] °svabhāvaḥ T

[154] °śakter M^Y] °śaktir T

[155] āha conj. (see also below, avataraṇikā ad 59cd)] deest in M^Y and T

[156] tataś ca M^Y] deest in T

[157] ātma° M^Y] ātmā° T

[158] °sthānam M^Y] °sthāna T

[159] °vaicitryeṇa M^Y] °vaicitreṇa T

[160] satyam M^Y (satyaṃ)] deest in T

[161] māyādipadārthāvalokane M^Y] māyāpadārthopālokane T

[162] na hy atyantasūkṣmo M^Y (na hy atyaṃta°)] nābhyāntasūkṣmo T

viśiṣṭakāraṇasamparkavidhurāyā[T 17v_7]ḥ[163] śakter gocaro bhavati[164] | tac ca kāraṇaṃ śuddhavidyai[M^Y 78v_5]va[165] binduvṛttiḥ | uktaṃ ca śrīmanmataṅge —

> viveko 'yaṃ[166] su[T 17v_8]śuddhānāṃ mantrāṇāṃ sarvatomukhaḥ[167] ||
> vivekāt[168] tat svarūpeṇa[169] vidyātattvam iti[170] smṛtam | **c**

iti | **yadupādher vici**[T 17v_9]**trā ce**ti kiñcijjñatvakiñcitkartṛtvarūpaṃ[171] vaicitryaṃ bindūpādhikaṃ[172] bhavi[M^Y 78v_6]tum arhati nānya[T 17v_{10}]theti bhāvaḥ ||
śuddhādhvany[173] asya vaicitryasya[174] karmaiva[175] kāraṇam astu, na[176] bindur iti | tatrocyate —

> **na karma**[T 17v_{11}]**ṇāṇor vaicitryam anapekṣeṇa jāyate || (54)**

yatrāśuddhādhvani[177] karmāṅgīkriyate **na** tatrāpy **aṇu**cai[T 18r_1]**tanyavaici-tryaṃ**[178] **karma**mā[M^Y 78v_7]treṇa, pralayākaleṣv api[179] prasaṅgāt | na hi saty api karmaṇi pralayākale[T 18r_2]ṣu jñātṛtvādivaicitryaṃ śrūyate | kiṃ tu[180] pratyuta[181] tadabhāva eva | tathā ca śrīmatsvāyambhuve —

> acetano [T 18r_3] vibhur nityo guṇahīno 'kriyo 'prabhuḥ |
> vyāghātabhāg aśaktaś ca śo[M^Y 78v_8]dhyo bodhyo 'kalaḥ paśuḥ || **d**

iti | tataś ca ta[T 18r_4]dvaicitryāpādakatvena[182] kalādinevātrāpi[183] binduvṛttyā bhavitavyam[184] ||

---

[163] *viśiṣṭakāraṇasam°* M^Y (*°saṃ°*)] *viśiṣṭakaraṇaṃ sam°* T (*°saṃ°*)

[164] *bhavati* M^Y] *na bhavati* T

[165] *°vidyaiva* M^Y] *°vidyau* T

[166] *'yaṃ* M^Y (*yaṃ*) T (*yaṃ*)] *yat* Bhatt's edition

[167] *°mukhaḥ* M^Y] *°mukhe* T

[168] *vivekāt* M^Y] *vivekās* T

[169] *svarūpeṇa* M^Y] *tarūddhvapreṇa* T

[170] *iti* M^Y T] *ataḥ* Bhatt's edition

[171] *kiñcijjñatvakiñcitkartṛtvarūpaṃ* em.] *kiṃcitjñatvakiṃcitkartṛtvasarvajñatvarūpaṃ* M^Y; *kiñcijjñatvaṃ sarvajñatvasarvakartṛtvarūpaṃ* T

[172] *°ūpādhikaṃ* T] *°ūpādhikam iti* M^Y

[173] *śuddhā°* M^Y] *śuddhvā°* T

[174] *vaicitryasya* M^Y] *vaicitryakāraṇasya* T

[175] *karmaiva* M^Y] *karmeva* T

[176] *na* M^Y] *deest* in T

[177] *yatrāśuddhā°* M^Y] *yatra śuddhā°* T

[178] *°vaicitryaṃ* M^Y] *°vaivicitryaṃ* T

[179] *api* M^Y] *iti* T

[180] *tu* M^Y] *tuta* T

[181] *pratyuta* T] *pratyukta* M^Y

[182] *°katvena* M^Y] *°kagatve* T

[183] *kalādinevātrāpi* em.] *kalādinaivātrāpi* M^Y; *kalādivaicitryāpi* T

[184] *bhavitavyam* M^Y (*-vyaṃ*)] *bhavitavya* T

evaṃ[185] bhogavaicitryam api na karmamātreṇe[T 18r_5]ty[186] āha —

> **vaicitryam api bhogasya sāpekṣeṇaiva tena yat**[187] |
> **karmopabhogaṃ**[188] **kurute vai**[T 18r_6]**citryaṃ canda**[M^Y 78v_9]**nādayaḥ**
> **|| (55)**

atrānupapattim āha —

> **tad eva**[189] **yadi tat**[190] **kuryāt kiṃ tair iti vilupyatām**[191] |
> **pra**[T 18r_7]**vṛttiḥ sarvabhūtānāṃ tyāgopādānakāraṇam**[192] **|| (56)**

iti subodhaḥ[193] | tataś ca sakalāṇūnāṃ[194] candanādikam[195] ivānantādī[T 18r_8]nām api bhogavaicitryasya sādhanasāmagrīhetutayā bin[M^Y 78v_{10}]dur eṣṭavya[196] iti bhāvaḥ ||

athaiṣām[197] anantādīnāṃ ku[T 18r_9]tracid avasthitānām[198] eva bhogādaya ity[199] ādhāratayā bindur eṣṭavya ity āha —

> **kiṃ cātiśāyakaṃ**[200] **prāhus tam ambaram**[201] **a**[T 18r_{10}]**naśvaram** |
> **śivānām asamaiśvaryabhājāṃ bhogādhikārayoḥ || (57)**
> **jyotirgaṇānām**[202] **ākā**[M^Y 78v_{11}]**śam iva bhūtādi**[T 18v_1]**kāraṇam**[203] | ᵉ

asamaiśvaryabhājāṃ vidyātattvakrameṇaiśvaryatāratamyam anubhavatām[204] **bhogādhikārā**rtha[T 18v_2]m avakāśapradāyi | ata ev**ātiśāyakam**[205] **anaśvaram**

---

[185] *evaṃ* M^Y] *eva* T

[186] *karmamātre°* M^Y] *karmātre°* T

[187] *yat* M^Y] *yet* T

[188] *karmopabhogaṃ* M^Y T E$_1$ E$_2$] *karmāpabhogaṃ* M^Y_M

[189] *tad eva* M^Y_M T E$_1$ E$_2$] *tadaiva* M^Y

[190] *tat* M^Y T E$_1$ E$_2$] *yat* M^Y_M

[191] *vilupyatām* M^Y M^Y_M E$_1$ E$_2$] *lupyatām* T*pc*; *lupyatatāṃ* T*ac*

[192] *°kāraṇam* M^Y M^Y_M E$_1$ E$_2$] *°karaṇam* T

[193] *subodhaḥ* M^Y] *subodha* T

[194] *sakalāṇūnāṃ* M^Y] *sakalāṃganāñ* T

[195] *°ādikam* M^Y] *°ādi kim* T

[196] *eṣṭavya* M^Y] *eṣṭavyam* T*pc*; *eṣṭavya{..}* T*ac* (the *ante correctionem* reading is unclear)

[197] *athaiṣām* M^Y] *tathaiṣām* T

[198] *avasthitānām* M^Y*pc*] *avasthānatānām* M^Y*ac*; *avasthitārām* T

[199] *°ādaya ity* M^Y] *°ādayad* T

[200] *°ātiśāyakaṃ* M^Y_M] *°ātisāyakaṃ* M^Y; *°ādiśāyakaṃ* T; *°ātiśāyikaṃ* E$_1$ E$_2$

[201] *ambaram (aṃbaram)* M^Y M^Y_M (*aṃbaram*) E$_1$ E$_2$] *aṃparam* T

[202] *°gaṇānām* M^Y T*pc* E$_1$ E$_2$] *°gaṇānam* T*ac*

[203] *bhūtādi°* M^Y_M E$_1$ E$_2$] *bh{..}tādi°* M^Y; *bhūtādhi°* T

[204] *°myam anubhavatāṃ* M^Y] *°myanubhavatāṃ* T

[205] *evāti°* M^Y] *evādi°* T

ambaraṃ taṃ binduṃ **prā**[M^Y 79r_1]**huḥ**[206] santa iti | **bhūtādir** ahaṃkāraḥ,[207] tat **kāraṇa**[T 18v_3]**ṃ**[208] śabdatanmātravyavadhānena yasya tad **bhūtādikā-raṇaṃ**[209] sthūl**ākāśam** | taj **jyotirgaṇānām** avakāśaṃ yathā prayacchati, [T 18v_4] evam etad apīti[210] ‖

na cāyaṃ śuddhādhvaniṣṭhānām evopakārakaḥ,[211] kiṃ tu sarveṣām apīty āha — [M^Y 79r_2]

> **bindur eva** [T 18v_5] **vikalpākhyāṃ savikalpakabuddhiṣu ‖ (58)**
> **svavṛttibhedasambhedair ullikhan**[212] **labhate citim**[213] |

savikalpaka[T 18v_6]**buddhiṣv** amukteṣu sarveṣv[214] apy ātmasu **svavṛttibhe-dā**nāṃ[215] sūkṣmādivāgvṛttīnāṃ **sambhedaiḥ** sambandhaiś[216] **citim** ātmanaḥ [T 18v_7] śaktim **ullikhan** pravartayan śabda[M^Y 79r_3]rūpīkurvan **bindur eva vikalpākhyāṃ** vikalpajñānam[217] iti sañjñāṃ **labhata** [T 18v_8] iti sarvaprāṇigata eva binduḥ svīkartavyaḥ[218] | tathā ca[219] śivāmnāye —

> nādākhyaṃ yat[220] paraṃ bījaṃ sarvabhūteṣv avasthita[T 18v_9]m[221] | **f**

iti |

> āgopālāṅganābālā mlecchāḥ prākṛtabhāṣiṇaḥ ‖ [M^Y 79r_4]
> antarjalagatāḥ[222] sattvās te 'pi nityaṃ bruvanti tam | **g**

iti [T 18v_{10}] ca[223] ‖

nanu pūrvānubhavajanitasaṃskāro[224] hi kāraṇaṃ vikalpapratyayasya, kiṃ bindunā |

---

[206] *prāhuḥ* M^Y] *prāhup* T

[207] *ahaṃkāraḥ* M^Y (°*kāras*)] *a{..}ṃkāra* T

[208] *tatkāraṇaṃ* M^Y] *tiktāraṇañ ca* T

[209] *śabdatanmātravyavadhānena yasya tad bhūtādikāraṇaṃ* em.] *śabdatamātravidhānena yasya tat bhūtādikāraṇaṃ* T; *śabdatanm{.. .. ..}ūtādikāraṇaṃ* M^Y

[210] *apīti* M^Y] *ipitā* T

[211] *evopakārakaḥ* M^Y] *eva upakāraḥ* T

[212] *ullikhan* M^Y E$_1$ E$_2$] *ullikhal* T

[213] *citim* M^Y (*citiṃ*) E$_1$ E$_2$] *cidaṃ* T

[214] *amukteṣu sarveṣv* M^Y] *deest* in T

[215] *svavṛtti°* T] *vṛtti°* M^Y

[216] *sambandhaiś* M^Y (*saṃbaṃdhaiś*) T*pc* (*saṃbandhaiś*)] *saṃbandheś* T*ac*

[217] *vikalpa°* M^Y] *savikalpaka°* T

[218] *svīkartavyaḥ* M^Y] *svakarttavya* T

[219] *tathā ca* M^Y] *tayā śī* T

[220] *yat* T] *yata* M^Y (perhaps the *akṣara ta* was actually intended as *t°*; the space after *ta* is in fact very small)

[221] *avasthitam* M^Y] *a{..}sthitam* T

[222] *antarjala°* M^Y] *antajalpa°* T

[223] *ca* M^Y] *deest* in T

[224] *pūrvānubhavajanita°* M^Y] *pūrvānujanita°* T

tad asat | saṃskārasya śabdārthasaṅketasmṛtimātrodbodhakatvena
sahakārikāraṇatvam eva, na tu śabdātmakavikalpa[M^Y 79r_5]janakatvam iti
taddhetutayā bindur eṣṭavyo na tu saṃ[T 19r_1]skāraḥ[225] |

   astu tarhi kalpanālāghavabalāt saṃskāra eva kālena vikalpapratyaya iti
   tadartham āha[226] — [T 19r_2]

na cāyaṃ bhāvanāsañjñaḥ saṃskāro 'dhyakṣabhāvataḥ || (59)

na cāyaṃ vikalpapratyayaḥ **saṃskāro** [M^Y 79r_6] bhavitum[227] arhati, [T 19r_3]
vikalpapratyayasy**ādhyakṣa**tvāt | naivaṃ[228] saṃskāraḥ | kutaḥ —

saṃskārāḥ smṛtiliṅgā[229] **hi nāsmatpratya**[T 19r_4]**kṣagocarāḥ** |

na hi saṃskārāḥ pratyakṣāḥ, kiṃ tu **smṛtiliṅgāḥ** smṛtyānumeyā[230] iti katham
saṃskāra [T 19r_5] eva vikalpapratyayaḥ ||

   ya[M^Y 79r_7]dy evam, mā bhūt saṃskāro[231] vikalpapratyayaḥ, kevalam ahaṃkāra
[T 19r_6]sya pariṇāmo bhavatu | ahaṃkārād dhi[232] śabdo[233] jāyata ity atrāha —

nāpi buddheḥ parīṇā[T 19r_7]**mo**[234] **māyordhvam api sambhavāt || (60)**

iti | **nā**yaṃ śabdātmako vikalpo 'haṃkāravyavadhānena **bu**[M^Y 79r_8]**ddheḥ pari**[T
19r_8]**ṇāmaḥ** śabdatanmātralakṣaṇo[235] bhavitum arhati | kutaḥ | **māyordhvam api
sambhavād** iti | na hi sarvasyāpi kāryasya [T 19r_9] svakāraṇātikrameṇānya-
trāvasthānam[236] upapadyate[237] ||

   katham upari savikalpajñānāstitvam ity atrāha[238] — [T 19r_{10}]

tathā vidyeśva[M^Y 79r_9]**ro 'nanto māyām ākramya tejasā |**
tataḥ[239] **sṛṣṭiṃ prakurute**[240] **savikalpakabodhavān**[241] [T 19v_1] **|| (61)**

---

[225] *tad asat | saṃskārasya śabdārthasaṅketasmṛtimātrodbodhakatvena sahakārikāraṇatvam eva, na tu śabdātmakavikalpajanakatvam iti taddhetutayā bindur eṣṭavyo na tu saṃskāraḥ* M^Y] *nanu saṃskāraḥ | kutas saṃskāraḥ* T

[226] *tadartham āha* M^Y] *tadarttha āha* T

[227] *saṃskāro bhavitum* em. (Torella)] *saṃskārībhavitum* M^Y; *saṃskāra bhavitum* T

[228] *naivaṃ* M^Y] *naiva* T

[229] *smṛtiliṅgā* M^Y T*pc* (*smṛtiliṃgā*)] {..}*smṛtiliṃgā* T*ac* (the *ante correctionem* reading is unclear)

[230] *smṛtyānu°* T] *smṛtyanu°* M^Y

[231] *saṃskāro* M^Y] *saṃskārāt* T

[232] *dhi* M^Y] *va (ca ?)* T

[233] *śabdo* M^Y] *śalo* T

[234] *nāpi buddheḥ parīṇāmo* M^Y_M M^Y (*metri causa*)] *nāpi buddheḥ pariṇāmo* T; *na buddheḥ pariṇāmo vā* E$_1$ E$_2$

[235] *°lakṣaṇo* T] *°lakṣaṇā* M^Y

[236] *svakāraṇāti°* M^Y] *svakaraṇād iti°* T

[237] *upapadyate* M^Y] *upadyate* T

[238] *atrāha* M^Y] *atrāhā* T

[239] *tataḥ* M^Y E$_1$ E$_2$] *titas* T

[240] *prakurute* M^Y M^Y_M E$_1$ E$_2$] *prakurite* T*pc*; *prakurita* T*ac*

[241] *°bodhavān* M^Y E$_1$ E$_2$] *°bodhanāt* T

> **aṇutve sati kartṛtvād**[242] **asmatpreṣyo yathā janaḥ** |

iti | aṇutvaṃ dehendriyādyupādhisaṅko[T 19v_2]cenāvyāpakatvam[243] | **aṇutve sati kartṛtvād** ity arthaḥ | yadvāṇutvaṃ paraprerya[M^Y 79r_{10}[244]]tvam | ye tv aṇavas te parapre[T 19v_3]ryā[245] eva | parapreryatve **sati ka**[M^Y 79r_{11}]**rtṛtvād** ity arthaḥ | **savikalpakabodhavān ananto māyām ākramya** karoti ceti [T 19v_4] | dvayam atra sādhyam | kim idam ākramya karaṇam | sva**tejasā**dhikāreṇopādānaṃ[246] vikṣobhya **tataḥ** kāryotpā[T 19v_5]danaṃ[247] karoti ||

nanu vyarthaviśeṣaṇo 'yaṃ hetuḥ, preryaḥ[248] prerako vā yaḥ [M^Y 79r_{12}] kartā tasyāsmadā[T 19v_6]dīnāṃ[249] iva vikalpajñānāpekṣatvāt | īśvarasyāpi tadapekṣāyāṃ satyāṃ[250] tatkā[T 19v_7]raṇabhūtakāryakaraṇādisambhāvanāyāṃ[251], tatkāraṇabhūtabindvantarakalpanena tatprerakakartrantarakalpa[T 19v_8]nena[252] ca anavasthāpattir[253] ity atra matāntara[M^Y 79v_1]vyājena parihāram āha —

> **anye vṛttipariṇāmabhedavādaviśāra**[T 19v_9]**dāḥ**[254] || **(62)**
> **guravaḥ kathayanty enam anyathoktaviśeṣaṇam**[255] |
> **pariṇāmasya**[256] **kartāyaṃ**[257] **na tu vṛttes tatas tathā** || **(63)**
> **ida**[T 19v_{10}]**m evaṃ**[258] **mayā kṣubdham iṣṭaṃ sampādayed dhruvam** |
> **iti jānāti yaḥ śa**[M^Y 79v_2]**ktaḥ**[259] **sa kartā pariṇāminām**[260] || **(64)**
> **pariṇā**[T 20r_1]**miṣv ayaṃ dharmo vṛttimatsv anyathā bhavet** |
> **tathā hi sarvo nirdhūtavikalpam avalokayan** || **(65)**
> **vastu lo**[T 20r_2]**ko vijānāti savikalpakam anyathā**[261] |

---

[242] *kartṛtvād* M^Y] *kartṛtvādid* T*pc*; *kartṛtvādi{..}d* T*ac* (the *ante correctionem* reading is unclear)

[243] °*upādhi*° M^Y] °*upadhi*° T ◊ °*nāvyāpaka*° M^Y] °*navyāpaka*° T

[244] In M^Y this line is shorter than usual.

[245] *parapreryā* M^Y] *paraṃ preryā* T

[246] °*ādhikāreṇo*° M^Y] °*ādhikaraṇo*° T

[247] *kāryotpādanaṃ* M^Y] *kāryopādanaṃ* T

[248] *preryaḥ* M^Y] *prerya* T

[249] *tasyāsmadādīnām* M^Y] *tasyātmādānena prerakam* T

[250] *satyāṃ* M^Y] *taṃ śaktyān* T

[251] *tatkāraṇabhūta*° M^Y] *tatkāryakaraṇabhūta*° T*pc* (the correction is indicated through the insertion of brackets); *tatkāryakaraṇopādānaṇabhūta*° T*ac* ◊ °*karaṇādisambhāvanāyāṃ* em.] °*karaṇādisaṃbhavanāyāṃ* M^Y; °*kāraṇādisaṃbhāvanayāṃ* T

[252] °*bindvantarakalpanena tatprerakakartrantarakalpanena* M^Y] °*vidvantarakalpakakartrantarakalpenena* T

[253] °*āpattir* M^Y] °*āpatir* T*pc*; °*āpari{..}* T*ac* (the *ante correctionem* reading is unclear)

[254] °*pariṇāma*° *metri causa* for °*pariṇama*° ◊ °*bheda*° M^Y T E$_1$ E$_2$] °*hetu*° M$_M^Y$ ◊ °*viśāradāḥ* M$_M^Y$ T E$_1$ E$_2$] °*viśāpradāḥ* M^Y

[255] *anyathokta*° M^Y T$_{pc}$ E$_1$ E$_2$] *anyatho{..}* T$_{ac}$ (the *ante correctionem* reading is unclear)

[256] *pariṇāmasya* M^Y T$_{pc}$ E$_1$ E$_2$] *pariṇa{..}āmasya* T$_{ac}$ (the *ante correctionem* reading is unclear)

[257] *kartāyaṃ* M$_M^Y$ M^Y T (*karttāyaṃ*) E$_2$] *kartā yan* E$_1$ (perhaps a typographical mistake)

[258] *evaṃ* M^Y T E$_1$ E$_2$] *eva* M$_M^Y$

[259] *śaktaḥ* M$_M^Y$ M^Y E$_1$ E$_2$] *śaktiḥ* T

[260] *pariṇāmināṃ* M^Y T E$_1$ E$_2$] *pariṇāminān* M$_M^Y$

[261] *anyathā* M^Y T*pc* E$_1$ E$_2$] *anyathāthā* T*ac*

jñānānavasthā[262] śabdānuviddhavijñānapūrvakam || **(66)**
sarvaṃ [M^Y 79v_3] **ced iha vi**[T 20r_3]**jñānam**[263] **iṣyetāto**[264] **maheśvaraḥ** |
nirvikalpamatir nityam evam eṣa karoti ca[265] |
savikalpaṃ vijānāmīty avabodhā[T 20r_4]**bhidhānataḥ**[266] || **(67)**
vṛttir eva matā bindoḥ paṭasyeva kuṭī tataḥ |
nirvikalpakabodho[267] **'pi bindum īśo 'dhitiṣṭha**[T 20r_5]**ti** || **(68)**
naivaṃ vidyeśva[M^Y 79v_4]**ro māyām**[268] **eṣā hi pariṇāminī** |

"aṇutve sati kartṛtvāt" [h] ity **uktaviśeṣaṇam**[269] **e**[T 20r_6]**naṃ** hetum **anye** punar
anyathā kathayanti | katham | **pariṇāmasya kartāyam** iti pariṇāmakartṛtvād ity
arthaḥ [T 20r_7] | **tato** 'yaṃ **na vṛtteḥ** kartā | tad evopapādayati — **tathe**ti | **ma**[M^Y
79v_5]**yedam evaṃ kṣubdhaṃ** kṣobhitaṃ[270] **dhruvam iṣṭaṃ** sampā[T 20r_8]dayatīti
yo jānāti sa pariṇāmināṃ[271] **kartā** dṛṣṭaḥ | **ayaṃ dharma** iti savikalpajñānavat-
preryatvalakṣaṇo[272] dharmaḥ [T 20r_9] | sa ca **pariṇāmiṣv**[273] eva dṛṣṭaḥ | tasmād
ayaṃ pariṇāmavanmāyākartā na[274] tu [M^Y 79v_6] vṛttimatkarteti[275] | **vṛttimatsv**[276]
anya[T 20v_1]**the**ti vṛttimatsūpādāneṣv[277] anyathā[278]
nirvikalpakajñānavadadhiṣṭheyatvam iti | tad evopapādayati — **tathā hī**ti[279] | [T
20v_2] **sarvo**[280] hi **loko nirdhūtavikalpaṃ** nirvikalpakaṃ **vastu** pūrvam **avalokayan**
paścād vyutpa[M^Y 79v_7]ttikāle[281] āptato [T 20v_3] 'nvayavyatirekābhyāṃ ca
savikalpakaṃ jānāti[282] |

---

[262] *jñānānavasthā* M$_M^Y$ M^Y T] *anantenāpi* E$_1$ E$_2$

[263] *vijñānam* M$_M^Y$ M^Y T] *viñātam* E$_1$ E$_2$

[264] *iṣyetāto* M^Y] *īṣyetāto* M$_M^Y$; *iṣyatāto* T; *iṣyetaiṣa* E$_1$ E$_2$

[265] *maheśvaraḥ | nirvikalpamatir nityam evam eṣa karoti ca* M$_M^Y$ M^Y] *maheśvara | nirvikalpakamitin-nityām evam eṣa karoti ca* T; *karoti ca* E$_1$ E$_2$

[266] °*ābhidhānataḥ* M$_M^Y$ M^Y T] °*ābhimānataḥ* E$_1$ E$_2$

[267] °*bodho* M$_M^Y$ M^Y T] °*bodhe* E$_1$ E$_2$

[268] *māyām* M$_M^Y$ T E$_1$ E$_2$] *māyā* M^Y

[269] °*viśeṣaṇam* M^Y T*pc*] °*viśe{..}ṣaṇam* T*ac* (the *ante correctionem* reading is unclear)

[270] *kṣobhitaṃ* M^Y] *kṣobhanibha* T

[271] *sa pari*° M^Y] *svapari*° T

[272] °*jñānavatpreryatva*° M^Y] °*jñānaṃ preryat*° T

[273] *pariṇāmiṣv* M^Y] *pariṇāmeṣv* T

[274] *na* M^Y T*pc*] *na na* T*ac*

[275] °*matkarteti* M^Y] °*matktateti* T

[276] *vṛttimatsv* M^Y] *vṛttiḥ sv* T

[277] °*matsūpādāneṣv* M^Y*pc*] °*matsūpādānoṣv* M^Y*ac*; °*masūpādānāneṣv* T

[278] *anyathā* T] *anyatho* M^Y

[279] *hīti* M^Y T*pc*] *bhahīti* T*ac*

[280] *sarvo* M^Y] *sarvā* T

[281] *vyutpatti*° conj.] *utpatti*° M^Y T

[282] *savikalpakaṃ jānāti* M^Y] *savikalpakajñānādi* T

tatrāsmadādayo[283] 'smatpitṛpitāmahādibhyaḥ[284], te ca[285] ṛṣibhyaḥ, te ca[286] de[T 20v_4]vebhyaḥ, te ca[287] brahmādibhyaḥ, te cānantādibhyaḥ[288], te ca[289] parameśvarād ity anantasambandhino nirvikalpaka[M^Y 79v_8; T 20v_5]jñānasya[290] savikalpakatvaṃ parameśvaraprasādādhīnasaṅketapūrvakam[291] iti nirvikalpakabodhe[T 20v_6]nāśarīra eva jānāti karoti ca[292] sarvam ādikartā bhagavān **maheśvara** iti svīkartavyam | **anyathā** parame[T 20v_7]śvarajñānasyāpi **śabdānuviddhavijñāna**[M^Y 79v_9]**pūrva-katve**[293] **jñānānavasthā** tadupādānāntarādyabhyupagamenāni[T 20v_8]vāraṇīyā[294] | tataś ca "preryaḥ[295] prerako vā yaḥ kartā tasyāvaśyaṃ[296] savikalpakajñānena bhavitavyam" ity etad anā[T 20v_9]daraṇīyam[297] | kiṃ tu pariṇāmavatkartur[298] vikalpajñānavattvaṃ vṛ[M^Y 79v_{10}]ttimatkartur[299] nirvikalpajñānavattvaṃ[300] cādaraṇī[T 20v_{10}]yam | na kevalam ayam anantaḥ[301] savikalpakajñānavān[302] eva, kiṃ tu **karoti ca**, svayaṃ ca [T 21r_1] vyāpārayogena[303] vikṛtaḥ san karoti[304] |

atha keyaṃ vṛttiḥ, ko vā taddharmavān[305], kathaṃ vā bhagavān avikṛta[306] [T 21r_2] eva [M^Y 80r_1] taṃ[307] prerayatīty atra **vṛttir eve**ti | aparitya-ktapūrvāvasthasyopādānasyāvasthāntaraprāptir[308] **i** vṛttiḥ, yathā [T 21r_3] **paṭasya**

---

[283] *tatrāsmadādayo* M^Y] *te cāsmadātayo* T

[284] °*pitṛpitā*° M^Y] °*pittatripitā*° T

[285] *ca* M^Y] *deest* in T

[286] *ca* M^Y] *deest* in T

[287] *ca* M^Y] *ja* T

[288] *cānantā*° M^Y] *jānantā*° T

[289] *ca* M^Y] *deest* in T

[290] *nirvikalpaka*° M^Y Tpc] *nirvikalpa{..}ka* Tac (the *ante correctionem* reading is unclear)

[291] °*sādādhīnasaṅketapūrvakam* em.] °*sārādhīnasaṃketapūrvakam* M^Y; °*sādādhīnasaṃśepūrvakam* T

[292] *ca* em.] *sa* M^Y; *deest* in T

[293] *vijñāna*° M^Y] °*jñāna*° T

[294] °*gamenānivāraṇīyā* M^Y] °*gamena nivāraṇīya* T

[295] *preryaḥ* M^Y] *prerya* T

[296] *tasyā*° M^Y] *nasyā*° T

[297] *etad anādaraṇīyam* M^Y (*anādaraṇīyaṃ*)] *etan nādaraṇīyaṃ* T

[298] °*vatkartur* M^Y] °*karttā* T

[299] °*kartur* M^Y] °*karttā* T

[300] °*jñāna*° M^Y] °*jñā*° T

[301] *ayam anantaḥ* M^Y] *yam antaḥ* T

[302] °*jñānavān* M^Y] °*jñānavan* T

[303] *vyāpāra*° M^Y] *vyāpara*° T

[304] *karoti* M^Y] *karoti ca* T

[305] *taddharmavān* M^Y] *ddharmavān* T

[306] *avikṛta* M^Y] *vikṛta* T

[307] *eva taṃ* M^Y] *epantaṃ* T

[308] °*āvasthasyopādānasyāvasthāntaraprāptir* em.] °*āvasthasya upādānasyādhastaraprāptir* T; °*āvastha {.. .. ..}rāptir* M^Y

kuṭyavasthā | sā[309] ca **bindor** dharmaḥ, tatprakāreṇa[310] binduḥ[311] kāryātmanā bhidyate | tam imaṃ **binduṃ nirvikalpakabodha** [T 21r_4] ev**ādhitiṣṭhati**, avikṛta eva saṃnidhimā[M^Y 80r_2]treṇa prerayati | **na c**ai**vaṃ vidyeśvaro** 'nantaḥ kartuṃ śaktaḥ[312] [T 21r_5] | **hī**ti hetau, yasmād **eṣā** māyā[313] **pariṇāminī**ty uktārthaniga-manam ∥

evaṃ prakārāntareṇa binduṃ sādhayitvāsmin pakṣe **vṛttipariṇāmābhyāṃ** yaḥ **kartṛbhedaḥ** kathitaḥ — "nirvikalpakajñānavān vṛttikartā [M^Y 80r_3] savikalpaka-jñānavān pariṇāmakartā" iti, sa tv anādaraṇīya ity āha —

> na **vṛttipariṇāmābhyāṃ**[314] **kartṛbhedo 'vadhāryate ∥ (69)**
> kurvato 'pi[315] **kuṭīṃ buddhiḥ savi**[T 21r_6]**kalpā hi dṛśyate** |

"vṛttikartā nirvikalpakajñānavān pariṇāmakartā savikalpakajñānavān" iti [T 21r_7] **kartṛbhedo**[316] [M^Y 80r_4] **nāvadhāryate** na[317] niścīyate, yataḥ[318] paṭaṃ **kuṭīṃ**[319] **kurvato 'pi buddhiḥ savikalpo**palabhyate[320] | paṭa[T 21r_8]sya kuṭībhāvo hi vṛttiḥ | kiṃ tarhy atrādaraṇīyam[321] | bindur vṛttimān[322] pariṇāmavān vā[323] bhavatu | ādyasṛṣṭir avaśyaṃ nirvikalpa[T 21r_9]kajñānavacchivādhiṣṭhānavyāptetīdam[324] e [M^Y 80r_5]vādaraṇīyam | ato nānavasthādoṣaḥ[325] ∥

Notes to the Text

[a]This verse corresponds to *Pauṣkarāgama*, Vidyāpāda 2.4cd (cit. also in *Śataratno-llekhanī* [sic] *ad* st. 15). A similar verse, which is probably the source of this line, can be found in *Kiraṇa* 2.26ab: *pariṇāmo 'cetanasya cetanasya na yujyate* (cit. also in *Spandanirṇaya ad* 1.3, p. 14).

[b] *Śrīmatsvāyambhuva* 3.1–2ab, 3–4ab.

---

[309] *kuṭyavasthā sā* M^Y] {.. ..}*sthāsyāś* T

[310] *tatprakāreṇa* M^Y] *prakāreṇa* T

[311] *binduḥ* M^Y] *bindu* T

[312] *śaktaḥ* M^Y] *śakte* T

[313] *māyā* M^Y] *deest in* T

[314] °*pariṇāmābhyāṃ* M^Y E$_1$ E$_2$] °*pariṇābhyāṃ* M^Y_M; *pariṇāminīmābhyāṃ* T ◊ the words *ty uktārthanigamanam ∥ evaṃ prakārāntareṇa binduṃ sādhayitvāsmin pakṣe vṛttipariṇāmābhyāṃ yaḥ kartṛbhedaḥ kathitaḥ — nirvikalpakajñānavān vṛttikartā savikalpakajñānavān pariṇāmakartā iti, sa tv anādaraṇīya ity āha — na vṛttipariṇā* are missing in T, probably due to a *saut du même au même*.

[315] *'pi (pi)* M^Y E$_1$ E$_2$] *hi* T

[316] *kartṛbhedo* M^Y] *tatkartṛbhede* T

[317] *na* M^Y] *deest in* T

[318] *yataḥ* T] *tataḥ* M^Y

[319] *kuṭīṃ* M^Y] *deest in* T

[320] *savikalpo*° M^Y] *savikalpako*° T

[321] *atrādaraṇīyam* M^Y] *nādaraṇīyaṃ* T

[322] *vṛttimān* M^Y] *vṛttivān* T

[323] *vā* M^Y] *deest in* T

[324] °*vacchivādhiṣṭhānavyāptetīdam* M^Y] °*vān śivādhiṣṭhānavyāptoti | idam* T

[325] *nānavasthādoṣaḥ* M^Y] *nānāvasthādoṣaṃ* T

^{c}*Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama*, Vidyāpāda 7.3cd–4ab (with the variant readings *yat* instead of *'yaṃ* and *ataḥ* instead of *iti*). Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary, which is quoted here with slight changes (ed. p. 236), runs as follows: yad *yasmāt tasmin vidyātattve sthitānāṃ* mantrāṇāṃ vivekaḥ sarvatomukhaḥ *sarvajñatvaṃ bhavati* | śuddhānām *iti nivṛttāśuddhīnām* | ataś ca samalānām^a *vijñānakevalinām satāṃ mantrāṇām apy adhikāra iti siddham* | ato vivekāt *samānād dhetos tena mantra*svarūpeṇa saha tad vidyātattvam *ucyate* | *tattvadīkṣāyāṃ mantraiḥ saha etat^b tattvaṃ śodhyam^c ity arthaḥ* || (ᵃ *samalānāṃ* Pune MS, fols. 185r_{24}–185v_1] samalānāṃ vijñānām ed. ◊ ᵇ etat ed.] deest in Pune MS ◊ ᶜ śodhyam ed.] śodhanam Pune MS). Note that Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary supports the reading *yat* instead of *'yaṃ* and perhaps also *ataḥ* instead of *iti*.

^{d} *Śrīmatsvāyambhuva* 1.6. Quoted in *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati*, p. 22, and *Śataratnasaṃgraha* 35.

^{e} Cit. in Nirmalamaṇi's *Prabhāvyākhyā ad Kriyākramadyotikā* Bhūtaśuddhi section (ed. p. 71$_{37–39}$), with the readings *cātiśāyikaṃ* (57a) and *bhogāpavargayoḥ* (57d) instead of *cātiśāyakaṃ* and *bhogādhikārayoḥ*.

^{f} *Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama* 1.5ab.

^{g} *Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama* 1.6cd–7ab (= *Pauṣkarāgama* 2.27cd–28ab); cit. also in *Nādakārikāvyākhyā ad* st. 15.

^{h} See above, st. 62a.

^{i} Cf. the following passage of the *Śaivasiddhāntaparibhāṣā* by Śivāgrayogin (16th cent.): *yathā paṭasya kuṭyavasthā aheś ca kuṇḍalāvasthā apracyutapūrvarūpasyaivāvasthāntaraprāptirūpatvād vṛttis tathā jagad api śivādhiṣṭhitaśuddhāśuddhamāyayor vṛttir eva* (2.22). See also above, comm. *ad* st. 49ab$_1$: *vṛttis tv atirohitapūrvāvasthasyaivopādānasyāvasthāntarāpattir yathā paṭasya kuṭyavasthā* |.

Translation

Thus, due to the reasons that have been stated above, Māyā presupposes an agent[326] equipped with a body in order to produce [the realities] beginning with Kalā, just like "gold."[327]

---

[326] The word *kartṛ* occurs in the following text with different, but sometimes overlapping meanings. We have translated it as "agent," "creator," and even "agent-creator," on the basis of the context.

[327] This sentence is still part of the commentary on st. 44. It is reproduced here to understand the context: in st. 39 Śrīkaṇṭha states that Bindu must be admitted as the material cause (*upādāna*) of the Pure Path (*śuddhādhvan*) because Māyā, Śiva, Śakti or souls cannot perform this function. In st. 40 he states that *māyā* is the material cause of the Impure Path (*aśuddhādhvan*) and in stt. 41–44 he gives six reasons for that (1. *māyā* is impure and insentient; 2. It leads us to illusory phantom; 3. It is connected with suffering; 4. It is connected with the three defilements [*māyeya-*, *kārma-*, *āṇava-mala*]; 5. It transforms for the purpose of the *sakala*-souls' enjoyment; 6. It is pervaded by another insentient entity, i.e. Vidyākalā). Inasmuch as it is the material cause of the Impure Path, *māyā* needs a conscious agent endowed with a body, i.e. Ananta, who acts like a goldsmith in the action of making a crown from gold (see st. 44cd).

Māyā is in the Domain of Ananta's Conceptual Cognition

[Śrīkaṇṭha] relates another topic to be proved:

> And this [i.e., māyā] is in the domain of the conceptual cognition, since (yat)
> [it] is shaken [i.e., activated] by the lord Ananta, who is such (evam),[328] just as
> clay [is in the domain of a potter's conceptual cognition because it is activated]
> by a potter. 45

"Because (yat = yasmāt) by the lord Ananta who is such," [namely,] who is
characterized in this way, [in other words] who is endowed with a body, māyā "is
activated," [it] "is in the domain of" his "conceptual cognition."

Ananta's Conceptual Cognition is Caused by Bindu

Since the one who activates māyā is described as being endowed with a body as well
as endowed with conceptual cognition, māyā is ot the material cause of the Pure
Path, so what is attained? In view of such [implicit objection, Śrīkaṇṭha] says:

> Conceptual cognition[, which Ananta requires for activation, comes about
> only] on the basis of penetration of consciousness with speech.[329] 46ab
> As for speech, which [consists in] the fourfold speech (caturdhā vāk) according
> to the distinction of Vaikharī[, Madhyamā, Paśyantī, and Sūkṣmā], it arises on
> the basis of activation of Bindu for the purpose of Ananta's seeing the
> objects.[330] 46cd–47ab
> [In the scripture,] Bhagavān Ananta whose body is Vidyā (vidyāśarīraḥ) is
> considered to be the activator of māyā. And such [Vidyā] is taught by learned

---

[328] We translate the word evaṃ on the basis of the commentary. Two readings are available at this point
of the text (see also below, Appendix): saivaṃ and saiṣā; both are plausible. If saivaṃ was the original
reading of Śrīkaṇṭha, it is possible that he used the word evaṃ in the more usual meaning of "in this way,"
"thus," etc. Unfortunately, Aghoraśiva's commentary does not deal with this word and thus we cannot
determine which of the two readings was available to him.

[329] Here Śrīkaṇṭha is echoing Vākyapadīya 1.131: na so 'sti pratyayo loke yaḥ śabdānugamād ṛte |
anuviddham iva jñānaṃ sarvaṃ śabdena bhāsate || ("In this world there is no cognition that is not
pervaded by speech. Every cognition appears as if it is penetrated by speech."), which he silently embeds,
with slight differences, later in the Ratnatrayaparīkṣā (stt. 84cd–85ab).

[330] With some hesitation we have adopted the reading caturdhā vāg of the printed editions (caturthā vāk
of A_T is simply a corruption of this reading). In its place, T has the reading caturdhaiva, which is no doubt
smoother but perhaps, precisely for this reason, to be considered a secondary attempt to improve the text.
In light of this reading, the stanza could be rendered as follows: "As for speech, which has precisely the
fourfold [modes] according to the distinction of Vaikharī[, Madhyamā, Paśyantī, and Sūkṣmā], it arises on
the basis of activation of Bindu for the purpose of Ananta's seeing the objects." M^Y and M_M^Y read caturdhā
vā (incidentally, we note that this reading is also present in MS Adyar Library No. 71471, fol. $209r_{11}$),
which, in its turn, is not an impossible reading, the particle vā being interpreted with an emphatic value,
but which could also be the result of either a corruption of caturdhā vāg (more plausibly) or even of
caturdhaiva.

[Saiddhāntikas] to be a Baindavaṃ tattvam ("reality consisting in Bindu").[331]
47cd–48ab

The following is what is meant: by the various reasons that were stated before, such
as impure insentience of [māyā], māyā makes [us] understand its activator, who has
a body and so forth, and who is endowed with conceptual cognition. Furthermore,
[the existence of] a material cause which [māyā] makes [us] understand as the cause
of speech that consists in conceptual cognition is nothing but Bindu, which is the
material cause of the Pure Path. This [Bindu] must be accepted. — This is the
intended meaning.

Śiva is Not the Material Cause of the Pure Path for Three Reasons

Thus, [Śrīkaṇṭha,] after having summarized that māyā is not the material cause [of
the Pure Path], commits to [prove] also that the Lord [Śiva] is not the material
cause:

> Therefore, māyā is not the material cause [of the Pure Path], just as
> Maheśvara is not,[332] 48cd

 He states the reasons for this:

(1) for [He is] a sentient being, for [He] does not have any modality-change,[333]
     [and] due to [His] absence of transformation.
(2) for [He] does not have any modality-change [and] is not subject to transfor-
     mation, since [He] is a sentient being. 49ab[334]

"For [He] is a sentient being"—for a sentient being cannot be the material cause of
an insentient thing, because [they] are totally different. For, of those two that are
totally different, there is no relationship of cause and effect—as in the case of a
piece of thread and a pot. Furthermore, "for [He] does not have any modality-
change." As for the modality-change, it is when the material cause attains another
state without concealing [its] previous state—as when a piece of cloth becomes a

---

[331] On the basis of the Saiddhāntika tenet according to which māyā does not consist in Bindu and of the
usage of the word baindava in the present work, mostly referring to products of Bindu (see, e.g., comm.
ad 164cd–166ab: mantrapadavarṇānāṃ tv akṣarātmanāṃ baindavatve 'pi […], "As for those consisting
in syllables, i.e., Mantra, Pada, and Varṇa, even though they consist in Bindu […]"), here we interpret sā
as referring to vidyā and not to māyā, even if this might be grammatically possible. Ananta is endowed
with a body made of the power of the language of mantras (vidyā), that is, of word (śabda, vāc), which is
produced by Bindu (see Sferra, 2010, pp. 332–334). On the concept of vidyā, see Goodall (2016,
pp. 100–105).

[332] Lit. "Maheśvara is exactly in the same way." In other words, also Maheśvara is not the material cause
of the pure universe.

[333] In this context, we have rendered the word vṛtti with "modality-change." Elsewhere in the text, the
word simply means "modality" or "state." See for instance below, in the commentary on st. 53, where the
commentator uses the compound binduvṛtti clearly in the sense of "modality of Bindu."

[334] The text is translated here in two ways in accordance with the two interpretations provided by the
commentary. See below.

tent.[335] But Śiva cannot be a material cause because [He] does not have such a nature. Another reason is "due to [His] absence of transformation."

Alternatively, it is stated [in the stanza] that Śiva is not a material cause, because of the [two] reasons: "for [He] does not have any modality-change" and "for [He] is not subject to transformation" inasmuch as [He is] a sentient being. For, one does not observe in a sentient being either modality-change or transformation, because both of them are perceived only in insentient things. Furthermore (*ca*), [His] transformation is refuted on the basis of Śiva's scriptural tradition.

> Transformation is proclaimed [to exist] in an insentient thing; [it is] not logically applicable for a sentient being.[336]

Soul and Śakti are Not the Material Cause of the Pure Path

Now, by extending the range of application of the reasons that have been stated, [Śrīkaṇṭha] claims what has been introduced [above], namely, that also the individual soul and the Śakti are not the material cause[337]:

> *The individual soul and the Śakti should be known in the same way. 49bc*

In the same way, by the reasons which have been stated it has been proved that only Bindu is the material cause of the Pure Path because it is illogical [to claim] that *māyā*, the Lord, the individual soul, and [their] Śaktis are the material cause.

Now, [Śrīkaṇṭha] commits to explain in more detail the same thing:

> *The detail will be explained from now on. 49d*

---

[335] The definition of *pariṇāma* was already given in stt. 35cd–36abc: *pariṇāmo hi vastūnāṃ pūrvāvasthāparicyuteḥ ‖ avasthāntarasaṃprāptiḥ kṣīrasya dadhibhāvavat | dadhnaś ca takravat*, "For transformation means [the process] by which entities attain a different state after having lost their previous state, just as milk becomes yogurt and yogurt becomes buttermilk." The distinction between *pariṇāma* and *vṛtti*, where instead the previous state is not abandoned/concealed (*vṛttis tv atirohitapūrvāvasthasya upādānasya avasthāntarāpattiḥ*), is the controversial point of discussion up to stt. 68–70ab.

[336] On this verse, which is found verbatim in the *Pauṣkarāgama* Vidyāpāda 2.4cd, see above note *a* to the text. On the *Pauṣkarāgama(s)* and its/their relationship with other Saiddhāntika scriptures, see Goodall (2004, pp. li–liii), where also other references are indicated.

[337] The commentator is pointing out that the verses about to be quoted and commented on have already been referred to in stt. 39cd–40ab: *na māyā neśvaro nāṇur na śaktiḥ śuddhavartmanām ‖ upādanam ato binduḥ pariśeṣeṇa labhyate |*, "It is neither *māyā* nor God (Śiva) nor an individual soul nor Śakti that is the material cause of the [six] Pure Paths. Therefore, by elimination Bindu is understood [as their material cause]." In the commentary thereon it is clarified that the word *śakti* must be intended here as a reference to both the Śakti of Śiva and the power of the individual soul: *atra śaktir iti śivaśaktir ātmaśaktiś ca vivakṣitā, tayor ubhayor upādānatvasyopariṣṭān nirākariṣyamāṇatvāt*, "Here, by [the word] *śakti* Śiva's power and an individual soul's power are intended, because [Śrīkaṇṭha] will refute later on that both of them would be the material cause [of the Pure Path]."

Bindu is Proved to Exist Because of the Variety of Souls

Now [Śrīkaṇṭha] proves [the existence of] Bindu by the fact that sentient beings such as Vijñānākalas are of various kinds:

> *From the following fact, too,*[338] *[the existence of] Bindu is known (*lakṣyate*): for [we] observe inequality of individual souls. [In scriptures] it is seen that some individuals are endowed with less [power of] knowledge and action; others are superior compared to them;*[339] *[and some others] are omniscient; [and some others] are omnipotent.*[340] *50–51ab*
>
> *The individuals[, however,] are considered to be sentient, eternal, and free from changes. If [they were to] undergo changes, they would be insentient and impermanent, like a pot or a wall. 51cd–52ab*
>
> *The power of consciousness (*citiśakti*), too, is exactly in the same way [= sentient, eternal, and free from change]. Of both of them, which do not undergo changes, the various states must be caused by an imposed attribute. 52cd–53ab*
>
> *Bindu is that with which the consciousness of the individual soul gets in contact in order to grasp [conceptually all the] objects beginning with* māyā*, and that on the basis of which as the imposed attribute [the consciousness of the soul appears to be] variegated; such [Bindu] has multiple modalities. 53cd–54ab*

Variety of Souls and Powers is Caused by an Imposed Attribute

"Individuals" [means] souls. (1) "Some endowed with less [power of] knowledge and action are seen" [in the scriptures] also as those who abide in Vidyātattva. [Those Vidyā souls] are endowed with less [power of] knowledge and action in comparison with [the Vidyeśvaras] beginning with Ananta. And (2) those Ananta and the others who, in comparison to them[, namely, to the Vidyā souls], are at the "superior" level, reached the level of Īśvara or Sadāśiva[341]; (3) [the souls] who "are

---

[338] The word *api* ("too"), which is used here by Śrīkaṇṭha to introduce a further reason for the existence of Bindu, clearly refers back to the other proofs that were previously discussed: stt. 32cd–33ab (Sadāśiva, Īśvara, and [Śuddha]vidyā, as well as the souls located in those *tattva*s, require a material cause); stt. 40cd–41ab (*māyā* is not the material cause of the Pure Path); stt. 46–48ab (Ananta's conceptual cognition is caused by Bindu).

[339] We have followed the reading of the available manuscripts (*tebhyo 'dhikāḥ pare*). However, the commentator paraphrases these words by using the compound *adhikapadāḥ*, which might reflect a different reading in the *mūla* text: 1) *adhikapadāḥ* (suggested by H. Isaacson), or 2) *adhikapade* (suggested by D. Goodall), which could be rendered as: "others [live] at a level that is superior in comparison to them."

[340] We consider the omniscient ones (*sarvajña*) and the omnipotent ones (*balaśālin*) as two groups of souls in accordance with *Kiraṇavṛtti ad* 3.27cd (see Goodall, 1998, pp. 89, 299): *sarvajñaḥ śuddhadehaś ca sarvajñānaprakāśakaḥ* ॥. Rāmakaṇṭha's comm.: *īśvarād ayaṃ kartṛtvenaiva kalayā nyūno na tu jñatvenāpīty arthaḥ | śuddhadehaś ca na māyāgarbhādhikārivad aśuddhadehaḥ | sarveṣāṃ ca daśāṣṭādaśabhedabhinnānāṃ śivajñānānām upadeṣṭṛtvena sthitaḥ na tu gurvantaravat katipayānām iti* ॥ (Goodall's translation: "In their powers of action alone this [group] is slightly inferior (*kalayā nyūnaḥ*) to Īśvara, but not in their powers of knowledge. This is what is meant. And their bodies are pure, not impure like those of the souls invested with office within the realm of primal matter. And they are teachers of all the ten [*Śivabheda*s] and eighteen [*Rudrabheda*s that are the] divisions of the [Śaiva] scriptures, not just of some of them, as other teachers are.")

omniscient" and (4) [the souls] who "are omnipotent," [all these] "are seen" in the scriptures.[342] And [this] has been taught in the venerable *Svāyambhuva*:

> Now, the Śakti of Śiva, who is the foremost God of gods [and] who has infinite radiance, bestows [her] grace to all [souls]; she is invincible, omnipotent, [and] exists with multiple divisions because of Śiva's [Power of] will, [even though she is] one.[343]
>
> Those whose capacity has been increased by her, namely, by the [Power of] will [of Śiva] that is the cause, who are powerful over everything, became Vidyeśvaras, beginning with the Lord Ananta. There are other [souls] who have more infinite powers[344] compared to them and other [souls = the Mantras] who are employed by them [= Vidyeśvaras][345]

Such [variety] is neither the innate nature of the individual souls nor their transformation, because all [the scriptures] teach that they have a unitary nature with [their] properties such as being "sentient" and "eternal," and that [they are] "free from changes." Furthermore, "if [they] undergo changes," they undesirably would be "insentient" and "impermanent" just like "a pot" and so forth.

If that is the case [= if the variety cannot be the property of the souls], let indeed the Śakti of the individual souls have the various states! In order to [answer] to such [an objection, Śrīkaṇṭha] says: "The power of consciousness, too, is exactly in the same way." And therefore, there should be some kind of imposed attribute, given that "the various states of both of them," [namely,] of the individual soul and [its] power, do not arise without "an imposed attribute."

Not Souls but Their Śakti has Variety, Which is Caused by Bindu

[Objection:] It is [the power of] knowledge and action that has multiple states by means of the variety of degrees of the blockage of the obstacle; and not an individual soul connected with them,[346] for it[, i.e., the soul] is not connected with the variety inasmuch as [its] nature is [only] self-illumination.[347]

---

[341] At the very end of his commentary on chapter 4 of the *Mataṅga* Vidyāpāda, stt. 53cd onwards (p. 99 ff.), Rāmakaṇṭha describes the world of Sadāśiva, which is equivalent to the state of Sadāśiva, and explains how the Vidyeśvaras like Ananta attain that state and become Sadāśivas.

[342] In the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*, Śrīkaṇṭha already described the souls at the level of Vijñānakevalin, i.e., Vidyā (stt. 24cd–26ab), Vidyeśvara (stt. 26cd–29ab), and Paśusadāśiva (stt. 29cd–31ab).

[343] *Svāyambhuva* 3.1ab–2ab. For another translation, see also Filliozat (1994, p. 65).

[344] Our translation is based on the reading 'mitabalāḥ, which is supported by the commentary by Sadyojyotis (see Filliozat, 1994, pp. 68–70). However, it is not impossible to read the compound without the avagraha, i.e., as mitabalāḥ ("[who have] limited powers"). Possible support for this reading is the fact that in the previous sentence, the *Svāyambhuva* explains the Vidyeśvaras beginning with Ananta as "those who are powerful over everything," which could imply that they are the most powerful souls, with all others endowed with more limited powers.

[345] *Svāyambhuva* 3.3ab–4ab. For another rendering, see also Filliozat (1994, p. 69).

[346] According to a well-known Saiddhāntika doctrine, the Power of all the individual souls is covered by maculation (*mala*) since a beginningless time, except for Śiva, whose Power is stainless. The more the maculation is removed, the closer individual souls get to Śiva's state. Therefore, the variety of degrees of blockage of the obstacle (*āvaraṇanivṛtti*) brings about the variety of Powers of the individual souls. See

[Response:] That is true. It is Śakti that has the variety. As for speaking [of variety] about a soul, it is in a figurative sense. Precisely for this [reason, Śrīkaṇṭha states:] "with which the consciousness of the soul gets in contact."[348] "Bindu," which "has multiple modalities, is that with which" the power of consciousness "of the individual souls," [namely,] of the souls beginning with Ananta, "gets in contact" [and as the result of which the power of consciousness] is empowered "in order to grasp [conceptually all] objects (*artha* = *padārtha*) beginning with *māyā*." For, entities such as *māyā* that are extremely subtle are not in the scope of the power [of the souls in the Pure Path] if [their power] is devoid of contact with a special cause[, namely, Bindu].[349] And that cause is nothing but Śuddhavidyā, which is a modality of Bindu. And [this] has been taught in the venerable *Mataṅga*:

This [power of] knowledge, which belongs to the very pure *mantra*s[, i.e., the souls who reside in the Pure Path], faces all directions. Because of [this] knowledge, this is traditionally taught as the Reality of Vidyā, together with the nature [of those *mantra*s].[350]

What is meant by [the phrase] "and that on the basis of which as the imposed attribute [the consciousness of the soul appears to be] variegated" is that the variety, which consists in a limited power of cognition and a limited power of action, must have Bindu as [its] imposed attribute, [and] it cannot be otherwise.

Footnote 346 continued

Kiraṇavṛtti 2.26c–33d (Goodall, 1998, pp. 55–60, 255–260); cf. also *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa ad* 3.150ab (ed. p. 255).

[347] The individual souls are held to be consisting in self-illumination (*svapratibhāsarūpa*) and are single entities, unaffected by maculation. Their Powers, in contrast, are manifold; their variety depends on the degrees of how much they are affected by maculation. See the previous fn. 346 for references.

[348] With the words *sampṛktā cid aṇor yena*, Śrīkaṇṭha would have been emphasizing that it is not the individual soul, but its Śakti that is in contact with Bindu.

[349] With the compound *māyādipadārtha* ("entities such as *māyā*"), the commentator emphasizes that the topic here is not any kind of soul, but only the Vidyeśvaras and the souls who reside in the Pure Path, like Ananta. In order to create the universe, these souls first have to grasp *māyā* and modify it. It is only due to contact (*samparka*) with Bindu, and hence due to dependence on it, that their powers, which are variegated, become able to perform their actions.

[350] These lines correspond to *Mataṅga* Vidyāpāda 7.3cd–4ab, with two differences with respect to the critical edition by Bhatt (p. 235): 1) *viveko 'yaṃ* (*yaṃ* in M^Y and T) instead of *viveko yat*, and 2) *iti smṛtam* instead of *ataḥ smṛtam*. On the basis of the printed edition and in light of Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary (see above, note *c* to the text), these lines could be translated as follows: "Since [the power of] knowledge belonging to the very pure *mantra*s[, i.e., the souls who reside in the Pure Path,] faces all directions, this is traditionally taught as the Reality of Vidyā together with the nature [of those *mantra*s] due to [this] knowledge."

It is worth noting that Rāmakaṇṭha does not clarify the exact value of the pronoun *tat* in *pāda* 7.4a. His commentary leaves two possibilities open: of interpreting *tat* either in compound with *svarupeṇa* (= *tatsvarūpeṇa*, "together with that nature"), or as a separate word connected with *vidyātattvam* (*tad vidyātattvam*, "this Reality of vidyā"). A third possible, albeit less probable, interpretation of the word *tat*, not supported by Rāmakaṇṭha, could be to take it with the value of *tasmāt*. This stanza contains an etymological analysis (*nirvacana*) of the word Vidyātattva—it is called Vidyātattva because of knowledge (*viveka* = *vidyā*) of the Vidyās and Vidyeśvaras. For further information on Śuddhavidyā and its connection with *mantra*, see above, fn. 331.

Past Action Alone Cannot be the Cause of Variety of Souls

Let the cause of this variety in the Pure Path be only [past] action, but not Bindu.[351] To such [an opinion, Śrīkaṇṭha] answers:

The variety of the souls does not arise by [their past] actions independently [from other reasons, such as Bindu]. 54cd

Even in the Impure Path, where [past] action is accepted [as being existent], "the variety" in the consciousness "of the souls does not" [arise] just "by [their past] actions," for [if that were the case], there would be the undesirable consequence that even in the case of Pralayākalas [there would be diversity caused by their past actions]. For, in the case of Pralayākalas, even though [they have past] actions, scripture does not teach that they have the variety of omniscience and so forth; but rather [it teaches] exactly absence of that [variety].[352] And accordingly [it has been taught] in the venerable *Svāyambhuva*:

The bound soul without Kalā is insentient,[353] all-pervading, eternal, free from [the three] guṇas, bereft of action, wanting power, subject to the obstacle[, i.e., occultation by Śiva], having no capacity, fit for purification, and fit for awakening.[354]

And because of this, just as there should be Kalā and the rest as that which brings about their variety [in the Impure Path], here [in the Pure Path], too, there should be the modality of Bindu [as the cause of the variety of the souls].

Past Action Cannot be the Cause of Variety of Experience

In the same way, also the variety of experience does not [arise] just by [past] action. Thus [Śrīkaṇṭha] says:

---

[351] The idea that past action is the cause of variety can be read for instance in *Abhidharmakośa* 4.1a (*karmajaṃ lokavaicitryaṃ*); cf. *Yogasūtra* 4.7 and its *Bhāṣya*. See also *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa* II, pp. 60–62.

[352] While the Sakala souls (= fully bound souls) are connected with *mala*, past actions, and *māyā*, the Pralayākala souls (= those who become *akala* at the time of *pralaya*), even though connected with *mala* and past actions, become unobstructed at the time of the cosmic dissolution, when their variety disappears. This means that the opponent's claim that variety is produced *only* by past action is unjustifiable in the case of the Pralayākala souls. For further details, see *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa* III, pp. 536–537.

[353] In the light of *Svāyambhuva* Vidyāpāda st. 1.5, which refers to three kinds of souls, namely, *kevala* (= *pralayākala* and *vijñānakevala* souls), *sakala*, and *amala* (= liberated souls), the word *akala* in this stanza refers to both *pralayākala* souls and *vijñānakevala* souls, who are beginninglessly tied with *mala* and completely enveloped by it (the *māyeya* type of obstacle is for them totally removed). As a consequence of this, they are "insentient" in the sense that they are "not fully conscious" — their knowledge, which is obstructed by *mala*, is not complete and does not apply to objects: *caitanyaṃ jñānakartṛtvarūpaṃ balam ātmanaḥ | tan nityam | tad atra jñānamātraṃ vivakṣitam | na sakalaṃ tad asya malena saṃniruddhatvāt | tan nārtheṣu pravartata ity acetanaḥ |* (Sadyojyotis' commentary, ed. p. 14).

[354] *Svāyambhuva* Vidyāpāda 1.6. For another translation, see Filliozat (1994, p. 15).

The variety of experience, too, [arises] from that [past action] only when [the latter is] dependent [on something else (= Bindu)], because the action[355] brings about the experience, [while] sandalwood, etc., [bring about its] variety.[356] 55

[Śrīkaṇṭha] explains the logical incongruity in that case:

If only [past action] were to generate that [variety], what would be the use of them [= sandalwood, etc.]? So the undertaking of the action of all the beings, which is the cause of taking and leaving, would [all] cease.[357] 56

[This stanza] is easy to understand. And because of this, just like sandalwood for the Sakala souls, Bindu must be accepted as the cause[, i.e., source] of the totality of means that realize the variety of experience also for Ananta and so forth. This is what is meant.

Bindu is Necessary as the Locus of Experience of Ananta, etc.

Now [Śrīkaṇṭha] states that experience and so forth belonging to [the souls] such as Ananta are [possible] only when [the latter] is located at some place; and therefore, one must accept Bindu as [their] locus:

Furthermore, [virtuous people] proclaim that [Bindu] as the imperishable ether that is beyond [the ordinary sky][358] for the experiences and duties of the

---

[355] In the previous passage and also in the first line of this stanza, where referred to by means of the pronoun *tena*, the word *karman* means "past action." Here, in *pāda* c, however, it is to be taken simply as "action," without any further qualification.

[356] The point is that not only the variety of the souls (see the discussion above), but also the variety of experience is not caused by action, whether past or present, but by something else that cannot but be Bindu. In fact, action brings about only experience, while sandalwood — an example of an object of experience (*bhogya*) — brings about the variety/flavor of that experience (with the variety ascribed to the *bhogya*); and Bindu is the fundamental cause of all the *bhogya*s. Sandalwood is given as an example of *bhogya* by Aghoraśiva in the *Bhogakārikāṭīkā ad* st. 49: *sa ca bhogaḥ srakcandanādibhogyaṃ vinā na syād iti* (p. 215), and in the *Tattvasaṃgrahalaghuṭīkā ad* st. 13/15: *adhyavasitasrakcandanādiviṣayā, ata eva sukhaduḥkhamohādhyavasāyarūpā buddhir eva puṃsaḥ samāsataḥ saṃkṣepeṇa bhogyam, tasyā eva sākṣād bhogyatvāt |* (ed. Dvivedī, p. 121; ed. Kataoka, p. 251).

[357] This statement echoes the beginning of the *Nyāyabhāṣya*: *pramāṇena khalv ayaṃ jñātārtham upalabhya tam artham abhīpsati jihāsati vā | tasyepsājihāsāprayuktasya samīhā pravṛttir ity ucyate |* (pp. 4–5).

[358] According to Śaiva doctrine, the element *ākāśa* ("sky") is not imperishable: it will be destroyed at the time of the cosmic dissolution. Therefore, by saying *atiśāyakam ambaram anaśvaram* ("imperishable ether that is beyond [the ordinary sky]"), Śrīkaṇṭha is underlining the special ontological status of Bindu.

*Śivas who possess unparalleled superhuman powers, like the sky — whose
cause is "the origin of the elements"*[359] *— for the celestial bodies.*[360] *57–58ab*

There is [something] which bestows the space for the purpose of "experiences and
duties" belonging to "[the Śivas] who possess unparalleled superhuman powers," i.
e., those who are enjoying superhuman power to different degrees in accordance
with [the place where they live,] beginning with Vidyātattva. Exactly because of
this, virtuous people[361] "proclaim" [the existence of] "that," i.e., Bindu, which is
"the imperishable ether that is beyond [the ordinary sky]." "The origin of the
elements" is the ego-factor; what has that as "the cause" through the intermediary of
the *tanmātra* sound is that "whose cause is 'the origin of the elements,'" namely, the
gross "sky." In the same way as that [gross sky] gives the space "for the celestial
bodies," this [imperishable super ether,] too, does [so].

Bindu Assists All Souls, Not Only Those in the Pure Path

And this [Bindu] does not only assist [the souls] located in the Pure Path, but rather
all [kind of souls]. Thus, [Śrīkaṇṭha] states [the following]:

*It is precisely Bindu that gets the name "conceptualization," while inscribing
the consciousness in those who are endowed with conceptual cognitions with
the combinations of its own various modalities [beginning with Sūkṣmā and
ending with Vaikharī].*[362] *58cd–59ab*

---

[359] Here Śrīkaṇṭha adopts Sāṃkhya terminology, according to which the ego-factor (*ahaṃkāra*) is the
origin of the *tanmātra*s (see, e.g., *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 22). In fact, the word *bhūta*, lit. "element(s)," refers here
to the *tanmātra*s and not to the *mahābhūta*s. Our translation reflects the interpretation of the commentary
below, which suggests a *bahuvrīhi* interpretation of the compound *bhūtādikāraṇam*. It is worth noting,
however, that Aghoraśiva interprets st. 58ab in a different way: *yathā hi pañcabhūtādibhūtam ākāśam
avakāśadāyitvena sthūlaśabdābhivyañjakatvena ca sūryādīnāṃ jyotiṣāṃ bhogādhikārayoḥ kāraṇam,
evaṃ* […], "For, just as the sky, which is the first of the five elements, is the cause of the experiences and
roles of the celestial bodies, inasmuch as [it] provides the space and makes manifest the gross sound, in
the same way […]." Thus, according to Aghoraśiva, who takes *bhūtādi* as separate from *kāraṇam*, the
mūla text should be translated as follows, "[…] just as the sky, which is the first element, is the cause of
[the experiences and roles of] the celestial bodies."

[360] Namely, the sun, the moon, the stars and the planets, which, in their turn, have unequal brightness.

[361] Very probably, in this context "virtuous people" are to be intended as the authoritative Saiddhāntikas,
as Aghoraśiva explains in his commentary: […] *āgamajñāḥ prāhuḥ* (p. 159).

[362] Aghoraśiva interprets the compound *savikalpakabuddhiṣu* as a *karmadhāraya* instead of as a
bahuvrīhi (*bindur eva śabdopādānānatvāt sūkṣmādivaikharyantaśabdātmaka*savavṛttibheda*saṃbandhād
ghaṭo 'yaṃ lohitaḥ parivartula ityādiparāmarśavikalpollekhanena* savikalpa*jñāneṣv ātmanaś* citiṃ
*savikalpakānubhavam utpādayati | śabdānuvedhena hi jātyādiviśeṣaṇaviśiṣṭaṃ savikalpakajñānam
utpadyate* | […], p. 159). Accordingly, the *mūla* text could be rendered as follows: "It is precisely
Bindu that brings about the [Soul's] consciousness called 'conceptualization' in the conceptual cognitions
while inscribing [it] with the combinations of its own various modalities [beginning with Sūkṣmā and
ending with Vaikharī]."

While our commentator explicitly states that Bindu becomes *vikalpa*, Aghoraśiva is hesitant to do so,
preferring to say: "Bindu brings about consciousness, that is, the cognitive experience endowed with
vikalpa." Broadly speaking, the difference between the two interpretations is not huge in this regard and
involves no unsolvable theoretical issues. It is possible that in addition to these two interpretations, there
are two other ways of defining *vikalpa*, i.e., as "speech" (*śabda*), as our commentary seems to suggest, or

"While inscribing," i.e., activating, [or rather] turning into speech, "the consciousness," i.e., the power of the soul, "in those who are endowed with conceptual cognitions," namely, in absolutely all the unliberated souls, "with the combinations (*sambheda* = *sambandha*) of its own various modalities," i.e., the modalities of speech beginning with Sūkṣmā, "it is precisely Bindu that gets the name 'conceptualization,'" namely, the label "conceptual cognition." Thus, one must accept that Bindu exists in all beings. And accordingly [it has been taught] in Śiva's transmitted doctrine:

> The highest seed called *nāda* is rooted in all beings.[363]

and

> All beings, starting with cowherds, women and children, barbarians, Prakrit users, [and even] those creatures that live in the water always speak that [*nāda*].[364]

A Latent Trace Cannot be Conceptual Cognition

[Objection:] It is indeed the latent trace produced by a previous experience that is the cause of conceptual cognition, [so] what is the use of Bindu?

[Response:] That is wrong. A latent trace is nothing but a co-operating factor, because it calls forth mere memory of the conventional relation between a word and [its] object, but it does not generate conceptual cognition consisting in speech. Thus, as the cause of [conceptual cognition] one must accept Bindu but not a latent trace.[365]

Footnote 362 continued

as "distinction" (*bheda*), as is likely intended by Aghoraśiva. This topic is discussed in a few Vedāntic works produced between the 9th and the 11th centuries (see, e.g., Sarvajñātman's *Pramāṇalakṣaṇa* p. 5: *vikalpo bhedaḥ | saha vikalpena vartata iti savikalpakam | yathā dharmipratiyogigrahaṇapūrvakam arthendriyasamprayogāt pṛthivyādibhinnavastujñānam | anye punar āhuḥ — vikalpaḥ śabdaḥ; tena saha vartata iti savikalpakaṃ śabdollikhitaṃ vijñānam, śabdollekhavikalaṃ tu nirvikalpakam iti |*).

[363] *Sārdhatriśatikālottara* 1.5ab.

[364] *Sārdhatriśatikālottara* 1.6cd–7ab (later included in the *Pauṣkarāgama*, stt. 2.27cd–28ab). Alternatively, this stanza could be rendered in a slightly different way with the following words: "[Even those] who speak Prakrit, up to cowherds, women and children, [as well as] barbarians, [and] even those creatures that live in the water, [all of them] always speak that [*nāda*]."

D. Goodall pointed out to us (personal communication) that in the *Dviśatikālottaravṛtti*, Aghoraśiva gives a quite unique interpretation of this stanza. According to the latter, *gopāla* refers to the Vidyeśvaras such as Ananta; *aṅganā*, *mleccha*, etc. also refer to a particular level of souls: *gopālādayaḥ prasiddhāś ca | gāṃ sadāśivoktiṃ śāstrarūpāṃ pālayantīti* gopālā anantādayaḥ | aṅganāḥ *saptakoṭisaṃkhyā vidyāḥ* | bālā *maṇḍalyādayaḥ paramantreśāḥ* | mlecchāḥ *sāñjanāgahaneśādayo bhuvaneśāḥ* | prākṛtabhāṣiṇo *guṇatattvasthā{ḥ}yogino buddhitattvasthā devayonayaś ca* | antargatā *brahmāṇḍāntasthā brahmādayaḥ* | jalagatā *jalopalakṣitajalādyāvaraṇasthāḥ pañcāṣṭakā rudrāḥ* <| sattvās> *tattadbhuvananivāsinaḥ* | evaṃ *śuddhāśuddhabhuvananivāsinaḥ sarva evātmānas* taṃ nādam abhidheyabuddhihetutvena parā- marśātmakaṃ pratyātmaniyataṃ bruvanty antaḥ svayam uccaranti dhārayantīty arthaḥ | (comm. *ad* st. 1). Following Aghoraśiva's interpretation, Jñānaprakāśa gives a similar explanation in his *Pauṣkaravṛtti* (IFP T.110, p. 162).

[365] This objection with its answer is an original contribution of our commentator; it is not found, either explicitly or implicitly, in Śrīkaṇṭha's text and consequently is also not found in Aghoraśiva's *Ullekhinī*. Our commentator refers to the difference between two kinds of causes, the co-operating or efficient cause

For the sake of not requiring so much postulation, then let [us admit that] a latent trace itself becomes conceptual cognition in time.[366] In order to [respond to] such [an implicit objection], [Śrīkaṇṭha] says:

> And this [conceptual cognition] is not the latent trace (saṃskāra) called bhāvanā, because it is directly perceived.[367] 59cd

"And this" conceptual cognition can "not" be a "latent trace," because conceptual cognition "is directly perceived." A latent trace is not like that. Why?

> For, latent traces have memory as [their] inferential mark[; they] are not in the domain of our direct perception. 60ab

"For, latent traces are not" directly perceivable, but rather "have memory as [their] inferential mark," [namely, they] are inferred by memory. So how can it be possible that a latent trace becomes conceptual cognition?

Conceptual Cognition Exists Above Māyā

If this is the case, conceptual cognition is certainly not a latent trace, but instead (kevalam) [it] is a transformation of the ego-factor. For, speech (śabda) is produced from the ego-factor. In view of such [an implicit objection, Śrīkaṇṭha] says:

> Also [conceptual cognition] is not a transformation of the intellect, because [it exists] even above māyā. 60cd

This conceptualization consisting in speech (śabda) can "not" be "a transformation of the intellect" by the intermediary of the ego-factor, which is known as the tanmātra "sound" (śabda).[368] Why? "Because [it exists] even above māyā." For, no

---

effect at all can be justified as existing elsewhere than within the range of its own cause.

Conceptual Cognition is Required Above Māyā for the Purpose of Ananta's Creation

How can it be possible that conceptual cognition exists above [māyā]? In view of such [an implicit question, Śrīkaṇṭha] says:

> That being the case, the Vidyeśvara Ananta, endowed with conceptual cognition, after bestriding māyā through [his] radiance, thereafter[369] undertakes the creation, for [Ananta] is a creator while being an individual soul,[370] just like a servant employed by us.[371] 61–62ab

The fact of "being an individual soul" is the fact of being non-pervading, which is due to the contraction of the limiting conditions such as body and sense-organs. What is meant [in the verse] is: "For [Ananta] is a creator while being an individual soul," [i.e. while being non-pervading]. Alternatively, the fact of "being an individual soul" is the fact of being impelled by someone else. As for the individual souls, they are indeed impelled by someone else. What is meant [in the verse] is: "For [Ananta] is a creator while being impelled by someone else." "Endowed with conceptual cognition, Ananta, after bestriding māyā," also does the creation (karoti ca). Here, two [things, i.e., bestriding and creation] are accomplished [by him]. What is the act of creation after bestriding? [He,] after activating the material cause

---

[369] Or: "from that [māyā]." Both interpretations of tataḥ are possible; the commentary is of little help.

[370] We interpret the locativus absolutus (aṇutve sati) as a concessive force ("when," "even though," etc.). The entire clause (aṇutve sati kartṛtvāt), however, might also be interpreted as a causal force ("since," "because," etc.). In that case it might be rendered in the following way: "For he is a creator, since he is an individual soul," the assumption being that only someone who is endowed with limitations (a body, sense-organs, etc.), and inasmuch as he is endowed with them, can act — no action is possible for an agent who is not limited, i.e., endowed with instruments for acting.

[371] As Śrīkaṇṭha indicates in Ratnatrayaparīkṣā 149cd–150ab, Ananta is the instigated agent (prayojyakartṛ) who is under the control of the instigator (causative agent), i.e., Śiva. Usually, from a grammatical point of view, what is autonomous (svatantra) is called the grammatical agent, and the instigated agent is not counted as part of it (A 1.4.54; see also Vākyapadīya 3.7.101–102). However, Ananta is a special soul, a Vidyeśvara, who possesses a limited autonomy unlike the souls of lower levels. This may indicate that the servant (*preṣyajana-) referred to in the stanza is not to be compared simply to a slave, but to a willing worker employed by an owner. Indeed, Manusmṛti 7.125 states that a servant (preṣyajana) is employed by a king with a certain fixed allowance (rājakarmasu yuktānāṃ strīṇāṃ preṣyajanasya ca | pratyahaṃ kalpayed vṛttiṃ sthānakarmānurūpataḥ ||, 'He should fix a daily allowance for women in the royal service and for menial servants in accordance with their rank and duties'; Olivelle (2005, p. 161). Both the Ullekhinī and our commentary do not explain the words asmatpreṣyo yathā janaḥ, which clarify the words aṇutve (= avyāpakatve, parapreryatve) sati kartṛtvāt. The idea may be that Ananta, like a servant, performs some activities even though he is not as powerful as his master (= Śiva) who employs him. Alternatively, if we interpret aṇutve sati with a causal force (see the previous fn. 370), the idea might be that Ananta is like a servant who can perform actions only because he is directed by his master. Taking the role of the instigated agent into consideration, however, aṇutve sati with a concessive force might be more likely than that with a causal force.

by [his] own "radiance[," i.e. his own] duty and privilege (*adhikāra*), "thereafter" undertakes the production of the effects.

Another View: Ananta is the Agent of Transformation

This logical reason [i.e. *aṇutve sati kartṛtvāt*] has a meaningless thing as [its] qualifier, since an agent-creator, whether he is impelled or [himself] impels, requires conceptual cognitions just like [ordinary people] like us. If the Lord [Śiva] also requires them, in order to make possible a body, sense-organs, etc.,[372] that are the cause of those [conceptual cognitions], one [must] postulate another Bindu as the cause of those [bodies, sense-organs, etc.], and one [must] postulate another agent-creator who activates this [further Bindu]—thus there would be infinite regress. In view of such [an implicit objection, Śrīkaṇṭha] states a refutation under the pretext of [introducing] another opinion:

> *Other masters, who are proficient in claiming the distinction between modality [-change] and transformation, explain differently that [reason] which has the above-stated qualifier [i.e.* aṇutve sati kartṛtvāt*]: 62cd–63ab*
> *This [Ananta] is the agent of transformation and therefore [he is] not [the agent] of modality[-change].*[373] *To explain, any competent and efficient (*śakta*) person, who cognizes that "This [thing] activated by me in this way surely will bring about the desired [object]," is the agent of things subject to transformation.*[374] *This property[, i.e., the property of being impelled by one who has conceptual cognition, which is observed] in things subject to transformation, is present in a different way in things that are subject to modality[-change].*[375] *63cd–65ab*

---

[372] The compound *kāryakaraṇa* (lit. "effects and instruments") is attested in Śaiva literature as a technical term to refer to the body (the "products" of *māyā*) and organs (of sense and action), or simply to the body. See, for instance, *Kiraṇavṛtti ad* 1.19 (see Goodall, 1998, pp. 25, 214).

[373] We follow our commentator's interpretation of the words *na tu vṛttes tatas tathā*. Śrīkaṇṭha's original intention, however, may be different and rendered as follows: "This [Ananta] is the agent of transformation, but (*tu*) not of modality[-change]. Therefore (*tataḥ*), in the same way…" / "[Since]…, therefore (*tataḥ*), this [Ananta] is the agent of transformation, but (*tu*) not of modality[-change]. To explain…"

[374] By rendering *pariṇāmin* as "thing[s] subject to transformation," we have tried to express the dynamic aspect of this word, which of course encompasses also entities that have been already transformed, like a pot, which, in turn, is subject to further transformation, for instance, into *kapāla*.

[375] We follow our commentator's interpretation of st. 65ab, in particular of the words *ayaṃ dharmaḥ*. Again, Śrīkaṇṭha's original intention may have been different. The line could be rendered as follows: "This property [i.e., the property of being the agent] with respect to things subject to transformation is present in a different way with respect to things that are subject to modality[-change]." Aghoraśiva's short comment possibly supports the latter interpretation (*vṛttikartus tu na tadapekṣā*, "The agent of modality[-change], however, is not dependent on such [a property]," ed. p. 160).

To be more precise, every person perceives an entity without conceptualization and then cognizes [it] with conceptualization. Otherwise,[376] *if all the cognitions in this world were admitted as presupposing cognition penetrated by speech, [there would be] an infinite regress of cognition.*[377] *Therefore, Maheśvara always has non-conceptual cognition, and in the same way he (*eṣa*) creates, [and] in the same way this (*eṣa*) [= Ananta] also creates [the world]*[378] *on the basis of the verbalization of [his] awareness: "I cognize [it] conceptually." 65cd–67*

Bindu is considered to have only the modality[-change], just like a piece of cloth that has [the state of] tent.[379] *Therefore, even though [his] cognition is non-conceptual, the Lord [Śiva] presides over Bindu. [But] the Vidyeśvara does not [do] the same to* māyā, *because this latter is subject to transformation. 68–69ab*

Ananta is the Agent of Transformation, Because His Cognition is Conceptual

"Others," however, "explain differently that" logical reason "which has the above-stated qualifier[," i.e.,] *aṇutve sati kartṛtvāt*. Why? [Because] "this [Ananta] is the agent of a transformation." It means because [Ananta] is the agent of a transformation. "Therefore," he is "not" the agent "of modality[-change]." [Śrīkaṇṭha] justifies precisely this—"To explain…" It is actually seen that one "who cognizes that 'This [thing] activated (*kṣubdha* = *kṣobhita*) by me in this way surely' brings about 'the desired [object]' is the agent of [things] subject to transformation." "This property" is the property of being impelled by one who is endowed with conceptual cognition. And it is observed only "in [things] subject to

---

[376] It should be noted that the word *anyathā*, which we have rendered in accordance with our commentator's interpretation, could be more naturally construed with st. 66ab: "Every person… cognizes [it] in a different way, i.e., with conceptualization."

[377] It is worth noting that M^Y and T, and also our commentator, support the reading *jñānānavasthā* instead of *anantenāpi* in st. 66c (see also below, Appendix). The latter reading is found in the printed editions of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* and, possibly, but not at all certainly, is the reading that was available to Aghoraśiva.

[378] Two things should be noted here: first of all, that the words *ato maheśvaraḥ | nirvikalpamatir nityam evam* are attested only in M^Y, T, and our commentary, but they are absent in earlier editions of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* and very probably in the text that was available to Aghoraśiva (see below, Appendix). Second, our commentator suggests a double interpretation of the pronoun *eṣa* in the clause *evam eṣa karoti ca*, in one case standing for Maheśvara, and in the other case standing for Ananta. Also the conjunction *ca* has been interpreted with two slightly different functions. See below, "Śiva Creates Things by Non-conceptual Cognition, While Ananta does so by Conceptual Cognition". Accordingly, we have translated this sentence twice.

[379] The commentary does not provide a clear explanation of the word *kuṭī*, which we have rendered as "tent" ("hut" might be a possible alternative translation). The same example occurs in st. 70ab, where again the commentators are silent. Even though we do not know the exact meaning of the word *kuṭī* in this context, the overall meaning of the example is clear: a substance can be used in several ways without changing its form. Although we give it specific names in accordance with its various functions, no real change occurs to it. A piece of cloth, for instance, can be used as a tent and is then called "tent," even if it still remains a piece of cloth and at a later time might be used for another function and be given a different name. Thus, *vṛtti* ("modality-change") means that something changes its function without changing its nature. For a parallel, see above, note *i* to the text.

transformation." Therefore, he[, i.e., Ananta] is the agent-creator [in the realm] of
Māyā, which is subject to transformation, but not the agent-creator [in the realm] of
[something] that is subject to the modality[-change]. "[It is present] in a different
way in things subject to modality[-change]," namely, in the material causes that are
subject to modality[-change], [it happens] in a different way, which means that [the
latter] are presided over by [someone] whose cognition is non-conceptual.
[Śrīkaṇṭha] justifies precisely this—"To be more precise …" For, "every person
perceives" first "an entity without conceptualization," i.e., in a non-conceptualized
way, then at the time of language acquisition "cognizes [it] with conceptualization"
on the basis of [language usage of] reliable persons and through positive and
negative concomitance.

Śiva Creates Things by Non-conceptual Cognition, While Ananta does so by Conceptual Cognition

Among them, [ordinary people] like us [cognize an entity with determinate cognition]
on the basis of [the usage of] our father, grandfather, etc.; they [did the same] on the
basis of [the usage of] the seers; the latter [did the same] on the basis of the deities; the
latter, in their turn, [did the same] on the basis of Brahmā, and so forth; the latter [did
the same] on the basis of Ananta, etc.; and the latter [did the same] on the basis of the
Supreme Lord. Thus, non-conceptual cognition belonging to Ananta becomes
conceptual in connection with the linguistic convention that depends first on the favor
of the Supreme Lord. Therefore, one must accept that it is precisely without a body
and by using non-conceptual cognition that the primordial creator Bhagavān
"Maheśvara" cognizes and creates everything. "Otherwise," if even the cognition
of the Supreme Lord presupposes "cognition penetrated by speech, the infinite regress
of cognition" would be unavoidable, because [we must] accept another material
cause, etc., for that [i.e., for Śiva's speech]. And because of this, this [criticism]: "An
agent-creator, whether he is impelled or [himself] impels, must have conceptual
cognition" is not worth considering. Rather one should consider that the agent of
things subject to transformation has conceptual cognition, while the agent of things
subject to modality[-change] has non-conceptual cognition. This Ananta is not only
possessed of conceptual cognition, but he "also creates," i.e., he himself also creates
[the world], while being transformed (*vikṛtaḥ san*) by means of [his own] activity.

Modality-Change Belonging to Bindu Requires Only Non-conceptual Cognition

But what is this modality[-change]? Who has it as [his] property? How does
Bhagavān (= Śiva) impel it without undergoing any change (*avikṛta eva*)? In view of
such [an implicit question, it is stated in the stanza][380]: "only the modality[-

---

[380] It should be noted that the more common expression would have been *ity atrāha* and not *ity atra*, as
we find in M^Y and T. Of course, we cannot exclude that *āha* was dropped in transmission. We have
preferred not to emend the text, considering that *āha* is in any case understood and could have been
intentionally omitted in order to make it clear that this part is still representing the viewpoint of the
opponent and is not Śrīkaṇṭha's own idea.

change,]" [etc.] Modality[-change] occurs when a material cause attains another state without abandoning [its] previous state, just like "a piece of cloth that has" the state of "tent." And that [modality-change] is the property of "Bindu," [that is to say,] Bindu is divided/classified as [various] products due to the degree of "that [modality-change]." Only [the one] whose "cognition is non-conceptual presides over" this "Bindu"; [that is to say,] only the one who does not undergo change impels [Bindu] by [his] mere presence. But "the Vidyeśvara" Ananta can "not" do "the same." [The word] "because" is in the sense of a logical reason, [i.e., it means] because "this" Māyā "is subject to transformation." Thus, the topic exposed [by other scholars] has been concluded.[381]

Response: Even the Agent of Modality-Change Needs Conceptual Cognition; Only Śiva is the Exception

Thus, after first proving Bindu in another way, the "distinction of agent-creators according to whether it is a case of modality[-change] or of transformation" has been explained in this view [in the following way:] "The agent of modality[-change] has non-conceptual cognition, while the agent of transformation has conceptual cognition." This [distinction] is, however, not worthy of consideration. Thus, [Śrīkaṇṭha] says:

> [Response:] A distinction of agent-creators is not determined according to whether it is a case of modality[-change] or of transformation, for it is observed that even [a person] who is making a tent [using a piece of cloth] is endowed with conceptual cognition. 69cd–70ab

"A distinction of agent-creators" [in the form:] "The agent of modality[-change] has non-conceptual cognition, while the agent of transformation has conceptual cognition" "is not determined," i.e., not ascertained, since people experience that "even [a person] who is making a tent" from a piece of cloth "is endowed with conceptual cognition." Becoming a tent out of a piece of cloth is indeed [a case of] modality[-change].

What then is to be considered in this case? [Answer:] Let Bindu be subject to either modality[-change] or transformation[382]; the only thing worth considering is that the first creation is inevitably pervaded by the supervision of Śiva who is

---

[381] The word *nigamana* in the clause *ity uktārthanigamanam* could be interpreted in various ways: in the sense of "conclusion" or "end," as reflected in the translation above (and for which we can find parallels in other works, such as *Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā* [intro. *ad* 12.52] and *Pādmasaṃhitā* [intro. *ad* 5.30]), or in the sense of "quote." In the latter case, the clause might be rendered as follows: "Such is the quote of what has been exposed [by the other scholars]."

[382] In the commentary on this stanza, Aghoraśiva explains that Bindu is subject to both modality-change and transformation, which our commentator also later accepts (see above, Introduction, "section 7 of the Introduction"). See *Ullekhinī ad* 69cd–70ab: *etac ca paramatābhyupagamanadūṣaṇam uktam, na tu siddhāntatayā, bindor api tattvabhuvanādirūpeṇa pariṇāmaśruter vṛttipariṇāmayor atyantabhedābhāvāc ca ǁ* "And this has been stated [only] as the criticism against the acceptance of the other opinion, but not as the settled view, because, since scripture teaches that Bindu, too, is subject to transformation in the form of Tattvas, Bhuvanas, and so forth, there is no absolute distinction [regarding it] between modality[-change] and transformation."

endowed with non-conceptual cognition.[383] Therefore, there is no fault of infinite regress [of cognition].[384]

Declarations

Appendix

The following is a list of the main differences (we do not systematically record the scribal mistakes) between the variant readings of M^Y, M^Y_M, T, and those of the printed editions of the *mūla* text, as well as of A_T, which sometimes shows/confirms the same reading of M^Y, M^Y_M and T.[385]

Stanza	M^Y / M^Y_M	T	Printed editions / A_T

---

[383] In the light of the distinction between transformation, in the case of conceptual cognition, and modality-change, in the case of non-conceptual cognition, the objector's viewpoint is that Śiva's act of creation is modality-change because it is performed by him without conceptualization. Śrīkaṇṭha disagrees with this viewpoint because he believes that this distinction cannot be applied to Śiva (whose non-conceptual cognition is beyond any classification), and that conceptuality is required even in the mundane modality-change shown by the example of cloth and tent.

[384] The opponent pointed out this possible logical defect in st. 66c.

[385] In the case of A_T, only the variants related to the stanzas mentioned in the table have been recorded. *Ante correctionem* and *post correctionem* readings have been registered only when they seemed relevant. We are aware of the existence of other manuscripts containing the *mūla* text of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* within the *Ullekhinī* by Aghoraśiva, including: (1) Adyar Library MS 71471 (a palm-leaf manuscript in Grantha script, incomplete and numbered with Arabic numbers added later on the right margin); and (2) a transcript from the collection of the IFP (reproduced from IFI, RE 45959), No. 1134. Variants from these manuscripts have not been recorded here.

[386] *chreyaso sti vidhāyakaḥ* M^Y_{pc}] *chreyaso sti vidhānataḥ* M^Y_{ac}

[387] In M^Y_M, st. 12a is identical with st. 20a.

[388] Note that st. 12cd is copied twice in M^Y_M.

Stanza	M^Y / M_M^Y	T	Printed editions / A_T
4a	rājanāt	rājānat	rañjanāt / rājānat
4d	dhiyā	tayā	dhiyā / dhiyā
7ab	bījadvayaṃ	bījadvayaṃ	bījaṃ trayaṃ / bīja trayaṃ
7d	nityaṃ	nitya°	nitya° / nityaṃ
10d	chreyaso sti vidhāyakaḥ[386]	chreyaso pi vidhoyakaḥ	chreya āptividhāyakaḥ / śreyaso sti vidhāyakaḥ
11c	āgamāḥ	āptas tu	āptas tu / āgamāś
11d	śivo nye	śivo nye	śivānye / śivo nye
12a	sevyate / sevitaḥ[387]	sevyate	sevyate / sevyate
12c	kāmakāribhir anyais tu[388]	kāmakāribhir anyais tu	kāmakāritayānyais tu / kāmakāritayānyaiś ca
13c	hetor vā	hetor vā	hetubhiḥ / hetor vā
13c	kiṃ ca	kiṃ ca	kiṃ tu / kiṃ tu
21a	mayā hy	mayā hy	mayāpy / mayāpy
24c	pūrve / sarve	pūrve	pūrve / pūrve
27c	°saṃparka° / °saṃsparśa°	°saṃparka°	°saṃparka° / °saṃsparśa°
29ab	āsann apy	(missing)	āsan nāpy / āsan apy
34a	vināśotpattimatvena	vināśotyatimatvena	vināśotpattimattvābhyāṃ / vināśotpattimatvābhyāṃ
37c	tadavasthāpi[389]	tadavasthā yiva	sadavasthaṃ hi / tadavasthāvi
39d	śuddhavartmanāṃ	śuddhavarṇmātmanāṃ	śuddhavartmanaḥ / śuddhapadmajaḥ
41ab	kalādikṣitiparyantatatvajātam / kalādikṣitiparyantatatvajātam	kalādikṣitiparyantatatvajātam	jalādikṣitiparyantaṃ tattvajātam / kalādikṣitiparyantaṃ tatvajātam
42b	°malānvayāt	°malānvayāt	°malānvayaiḥ / °malānvayaiḥ
42c	°pabhogyāya	°pabhogyāya	°pabhogyatvāt / °pabhogyatvaṃ
42d	pariṇāmodayād	pariṇāmodayād	pariṇāmodayair / pariṇāmodayair
45a	saivaṃ	saiṣā	saiṣā / saiṣā
46a	savikalpaṃ ca	savikalpañ ca	savikalpaka° / savikalpakañ ca
46c	caturdhā vā <g>	caturdhaiva	caturdhā vāg / caturthā vāk
49b	aparīṇāmata(s) / aparīṇāmatas	aparināmata(s)	pariṇāmāt tatas / apariṇāmātmanas
49c	ātmā śaktiś ca vijñeyau / ātmaśaktiś ca vijñeyā	ātmā śaktiś ca vijñeyau	ātmā śaktiś ca vijñeyau / ātmā śaktiś ca vijñeyau
49d	vakṣyate / lakṣyate	vakṣyate	vakṣyate / lakṣyate
51a	pare cānye	pare cānye	pare 'nye tu / pare nye tu
51c	pudgalāś cetanā nityā	pudgalāś cetanā nityā	pudgalāś cetano nityo / pudgalacetano nityo
51d	vikārarahitā matāḥ	vikārarahitā matāḥ	vikārarahito mataḥ / vikārarahito mataḥ
52c	citiśaktiś ca	citiśaktiś ca	ca citiḥ śaktis / śivaśaktiś ca
56a	tadaiva yadi tat / tad eva yadi yat	tad eva yadi tat	tad eva yadi tat / tad eva yadi tat
57a	cātisāyakaṃ / cātiśāyakaṃ	cādiśāyakaṃ	cātiśāyikaṃ / cātiśāyakaṃ
60c	nāpi buddheḥ pariṇāmo	nāpi buddheḥ pariṇāmo	na buddheḥ pariṇāmo vā / na buddheḥ pariṇāmo vā
62d	°bheda° / °hetu°	°bheda°	°bheda°
64a	evaṃ / eva	evaṃ	evaṃ
64c	śaktaḥ	śaktiḥ	śaktaḥ
66c	jñānānavasthā	jñānānavasthā	anantenāpi

[389] The text here should likely be emended with *tadavasthaṃ hi*.

[390] *iṣyetāto* M^Y] *īṣyetāto* M_M^Y

[391] This reading could either be a mistake for *vidhṛte*, which is found in the other sources of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* and also in *Pauṣkarāgama* 2.22a, or for *vivṛte*, which is accepted in Rau's edition of *Vākyapadīya* 1.165a (p. 36; in Iyer's edition, where this verse is part of the *vṛtti* and not of the *mūla* text, the accepted reading is *vidhṛte*, whereas, in its commentary, Vṛṣabhadeva seems to support the reading *vivṛte* [pp. 218–219], which is probably the original reading).

Stanza	M^Y / M^Y_M	T	Printed editions / A_T
67a	vijñānam	vijñānam	vijñātam
67b	iṣyetāto[390] maheśvaraḥ ‖ nirvikalpamatir nityam evam eṣa karoti ca		iṣyatāto maheśvara	nirvikalpakam iti nityām evam eṣa karoti ca		iṣyetaiṣa karoti ca	
67d	avabodhābhidhānataḥ	avabodhābhidhānataḥ	avabodhābhimānataḥ
68c	°bodho pi	°bodho pi	°bodhe 'pi
69a	māyā / māyām	māyām	māyām
71a	paro	paro	parā
71c	eva	eva	evaṃ
71d	vyomānāhata	vyomānāhata	vyomānāhatam
73c	vidhṛte	vavṛtau[391]	vidhṛte
74d	krama°	krama°	kramād
76b	saṃhṛtakramā	saṃhṛtakramāt	saṃhṛtikramāt
78c	kevalaḥ	kevalaṃ	kevalaḥ
78d	nityoditaprabhaḥ	nityoditaprabhaḥ	nityoditaḥ prabuḥ
80c	tam / tām	tam	tām
82b	śrutiḥ	stutiḥ	śruteḥ
83b	°samudyoge tu	°samudyoge tu	°samudyogeṣu
84a	viśuddheva	viśuddhe pi	viśuddheva
85a	iva	iva	iha
85c	saiṣā / saivaṃ	saiṣā	saiṣā
86d	śāṃtis tathaiva ca	śāṃtis tathaiva ca	śāntiś ca pañcamī
87a	śāṃtyatītakalā yābhir	śāṃtyātītakalā yābhir	śāntyatītāḥ kalā etā
87b	vyāpto dhvā paṃcadhā sthitaḥ	vyāpto dhvā pañcadhā sthitaḥ	yābhir vyāpto 'dhvapañcakam
87d	varṇādhvādhvā	varṇādhvā ca	varṇādhvā ca
91d	aṃtaraṃdasya	antareṇāsya	anantāṇḍasya
92a	prācyādikṣu daśasvaivā / prācyādikṣu daśasvaiva	prācyāndikṣu daśasv evāsv	prācyādikṣu daśasv āsan
98b	avaniṃ	avaniṃ (°van° is partly broken)	avanīṃ
103c	pratiṣṭhā ca	pratiṣṭhā	pratiṣṭhito
105b	paramādibhuvanānāṃ	paramādibhuvanānāṃ	māyādibhuvanānāṃ ca
108c	tatpralīnā°	tatra līnā°	tatpralīnā°
111c	ṣaṭkoṇoditakalpānta°	ṣaṭkoṇoditakalpānta°	ṣaṭkoṇoditam alpānta°
112b	śakti°	śakti°	śaktir
112c	tatpralīnā°	tatra līnā°	tatpralīnā°
114b	tatpuruṣo syādhidevatā	(missing)	puruṣas tv adhidevatā
115c	varṇā visargapūrvaya	varṇāni sarvapūrvāya	varṇā visargapūrvā ye
116a	paraṃ mantraḥ	paramaṃ mantraṃ	paaṃ mantrāḥ
116b	śivāstreśānaśabditaḥ	śivasvīśānasaṃjñakaḥ	śivāstreśānaśabditaḥ
116c	sā śāntyatītā	sā śantyakatvā	śāntyatītā ca
120c	anyatrānyasya	anyatrānyasya	anyasyānyatra
121d	parātmani vidhānataḥ	parātmani vidhānataḥ	paramātmavidhānataḥ
122c	dinaceṣṭāyāṃ	dinaceṣṭāyāṃ	dinaceṣṭānām
124d	pariṇāmavatā	pariṇāmavatā	pariṇāmitayā
126a	sa	sa	sā
127d	jñānakriyātmake	jñānakriyātmane	jñānakriyātmike
128a	tatrādyā	tatrādyā	ādyā tu
129c	na tābhyāṃ	na tābhyāṃ	tābhyāṃ na
130c	īśo dhika°	īśorik°	īśā'dhika°
134a	śaktir bindur	śaktir bindur	bindur
138a	yas tv evaṃ	yas tv evaṃ	yas tv enaṃ
139c	kriyayā	kriyāyā	kriyayā
140b	matiḥ	matiḥ	matam
140c	jāyetādhvā	jāyetādhvā	jāyate 'dhvā
144ab	nekaśaktimān	nekaḥ śaktimān	naikaśaktimān
144c	na	na	tu
149b	viśuddhādhvopabhuktaye	viśuddvāddhvopabhuktaye	śuddhādhvā copabhuktaye /

---

[392] °saṃyuktakartāraṃ $M^Y pc$] °saṃyuktartāraṃ $M^Y ac$

[393] The reading *ante correctionem* of st. 164d in A_T is *māyā madhyaṃ ca naśvarama*.

Stanza	M^Y / M_M^Y	T	Printed editions / A_T śuddho dhvā copabhuktaye
154c	kalāpy āpta°	kalāvyāpta°	kalāvyāpta° / kalāvyāpta°
157d	sā	sā	yā / yā
158c	kāryātmikāsau māyeya°	kāryātmikāsau māyeya°	kāryātmikā sā māyeyaṃ / kāryātmikā sā māyeyaṃ
159a	°saṃyuktakartāraṃ[392]	°sāyuktakarttāraṃ	°saṃyuktaṃ kartāraṃ / °saṃyuktaṃ kartāraṃ
164d	adhvasv anaśvarām	adhvasv anām	adhvasv anaśvarīm / adhvān amīśvaram[393]
165c	vyāptiś	vyāptiś	śuddhiś / vyāptiś
168b	paśutvena	paśu{..}śutvena	pāśatvena / pāśatvena
170b	avivekataḥ	(missing)	avivecitā / api yecitā
171a	viṣayābhogaṃ	viṣayābhogaṃ	viṣayābhoga° / viṣayābhoga°
171b	prati lālasacetasaṃ	prati lālasacetasaṃ	prītilālasacetasaḥ / prītilālasacetasaḥ
173d	śuddhavartmanāṃ	śuddhavartmanāṃ	śuddhavartmanaḥ / śuddhavartmanaḥ
175a	aśuddhaivaṃ	aśuddhaiva	aśuddhaiva / aśuddhevā
176a	māyāviveke tu yathā	māyāviveke tu yathā	māyāpuruṣaviveke tu[394] / māyāpuruṣaviveke tu
183a	nityoditānavacchinna°	nityoditānavacchinnā	nityoditānavacchinnā / nityoditānavacchinnā
184a	°saṃbheda°	°saṃbheda°	°sambandha° / °saṃbheda°
185b	°prakāśā	°prakāśā	°prakāśyā / °prakāśyā
187c	yayaitayā°	yayau tayā	tayaitayā° / tayaitayā°
189a	sarasvān	sarasvān	saridvān / saridvān
189c	lola°	lola°	lolaiḥ / lola°
190d	vibhidyate	vibhidyate	vibhāvyate / vibhāvyate
192b	kriyāṃ tathā[395]	kriyāṃ tathā	kriyā tathā
192c	asya (the upper side is broken)	asya	yasyāḥ / yasya
193a	tadatadrūpiṇī	tadatadrūpiṇī	tad etadrūpiṇī / matattadrūpiṇī
196d	vā	vā	ca / ca
198a	evāpadeśābhyāṃ	evāpadeśābhyāṃ	evopadeśābhyāṃ / evopadeśābhyāṃ
201b	śāśvataḥ	sāśvataḥ	śāśvatī / śāśvatī
201c	idam asiddhir	itamam asiddhir	jagataḥ siddhir / jagatas siddhiḥ
204b	pratyayaty api	prayaty api	prathayaty asau / pratyayaty asau
204c	jñānamātrā	jñānamātrā	jñānamātraṃ / jñānamātrā
206a	bandho badhyo	baddho bandho	bandho bandho (E_1) / baddho bandho (E_2) / baddho baddho (A_T)
206cd	°ānaṃtā saṃvid	°ānantā saṃvid	°ānantasaṃvid / °ānantā saṃvid
208d	°tulyaiṣā°	°tulyā°	°tulyaivā° / °tulyovā°
217d	hetuḥ	hetuḥ	hetu° / hetu°
220d	°viśeṣaṇaiḥ	°viśeṣaṇaiḥ	°viśeṣataḥ / (missing)
221a	°jāta°	°jāta°	°jātaṃ / °jāta°
224d	tu	tu	na / na

[394] This unmetrical reading (*māyāpuruṣaviveke tu* is probably to be read *māyāpur_uṣaviveke tu*, namely, with a silent or quick *u*) is also the one that was available to the author of the *anubandha*, an anonymous commentary on the *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama*, who quotes stt. 175cd–176ab *ad Vidyāpāda* 14.18 (ed. p. 610). This gloss is likely a southern composition produced after the 12th cent. The attribution of the *anubandha* to Rāmakaṇṭha in Sferra (2007, p. 453) is simply wrong.

[395] *kriyāṃ tathā* $M^Y pc$] *kriyāṃ yathā* $M^Y ac$

Stanza	M^Y / M^Y_M	T	Printed editions / A_T
226c	vyāvṛtta°	vyāvṛtti°	vyāvṛtti° / vyāvṛtta°
228b	nopajāyate	nopapadyate	nopapadyate / nopapadyate
229c	°saṃbuddhe	°saṃbuddhe	°saṃbandhe / °saṃbuddhe
230c	bhedasiddhe tathānanya°	bhedasiddhe ta{..}manya°	bhedaḥ sidhyed athānanya° (E_1) / bhedaḥ siddhyed athānanya° (E_2) / bhedasiddhyai tathānanya° (A_T)
232a	rajjur	rajjur	rajjor / rajju
234d	samīkṣita	samīkṣyata	samīkṣate / samīkṣate
236d	tathā cāsana°	tathā cāśana°	yathā vāsana° (E_1) / yathā vāñjana° (E_2) / yathā vāsana° (A_T)
236b	kvārthyamāne pi	kvārthyamāne pi	kvathyamāne ca / kvathyamāne ca
237b	saṃvid	saṃvid	samyag / saṃvid
238a	jñānānivartyaṃ	jñānānivartyaṃ	jñānāni vṛttiṃ (E_1) / jñānānivṛttiṃ (E_2) / jñānān nivartyaṃ (A_T)
239a	nivarteta	nivartyeta	nivartyeta / nivarteta
241b	sādhitaḥ purā	sadhitaṃ purā	eva sādhitaḥ / eva bādhitaḥ
243a	°saṃbaṃdho	°saṃbandhe	°saṃbaddhaś / °saṃbandha°
245d	svātmānaṃ	svaśaktyā	svātmānaṃ / sāmānyan
246d	api	api	ataḥ / ataḥ
247b	baṃdha°	bandha°	mala° / bandha°
248c	°bhedā	°bhedā	°bhedo (E_1) / °bhedā (E_2) / °bhedā (A_T)
251b	prārthyate / prāryate	pāryate	vāryate / vā yute
255b	śivasyeva	śivasyeva	śivasyaiva / śivasyeva
255d	citir	citir	śaktir / śaktir
256b	sā pradarśayet	sādhu darśayet	sā tu darśayet / sādhu darśayet
257c	atra muktās tu	atra muktās tu	ato vimuktāḥ / ato vimuktās
258c	ye	ye	hi / hi
258d	hi	hi	ca / ca
259ab	°saṃkṣobhaśabda°	°saṃkṣobhaśabda°	°saṃkṣobhāc chabda° / °saṃkṣobhaśabda°
260b	°mokṣataḥ[396]	°mokṣataḥ	°mokṣajā / °mokṣataḥ
261a	yathā	tathā	yadā / yadā
261b	bhāvī ca te	bhāvī ca taṃ	bhāvi ca tat / bhāvi ca tat
261c	°sthiti	°sthiti	°sthiti (E_1) / °sthitiṃ (E_2) / °sthiti (A_T)
261d	avyayaḥ	avyayā	avyayā / avyayā
262b	hi	hi	yat / yat
262d	gamyate	gamyate	vidyate / vidyate
269c	cicchaktir	(missing)	tacchaktir / tacchaktiḥ
271a	śānti°	śānti°	śāntiḥ / śāntiḥ[397]
272a	avibhāgo yaḥ	avibhāgo yaḥ	avibhāgo 'yaṃ / avibhāgo yaṃ
273d	sādākhyaṃ tattvam	sadākhyan tatvam	sādākhyā tanur / sādākhyaṃ tatvam
274d	śivānām amalātmanām	aṇūnā{.. ..}latmānāṃ	nirmalānāṃ śivātmanāṃ / aṇūnāṃ nirmalātmanāṃ
275a	°jñāna°	°jñāna°	°sthāna° / °sthāna°
276c	°ākhyā	°ākhyā	°ādyā / °ādvārāt
277d	sabhogāḥ sādhikārakāḥ	sabhogās thātakārakāḥ	subhagāḥ svadhikārakāḥ / saṃbhogās sadhikāragāḥ
278a	saikā	{.. ..}	seyaṃ / seyaṃ
281b	°kalārcitaḥ	°kalārccitaḥ	°kalānvitaḥ / °kalānvitaḥ
283b	avyabhicāriṇī	avyabhicāriṇī	apy avikāriṇī / apy avikāriṇī
285b	pi śerate	viśerate (or perhaps pi śerate)	viśerate / viśerate
285d	aparā	apara	apare / apare
286a	°saṃsparśa°	°saṃsparśa°	°saṃparka° / °saṃparka°
286c	paraṃ vyoma	paravyoma	paravyoma / paravyoma

---

[396] °*mokṣataḥ* $M^Y pc$] the *ante correctionem* reading is uncertain (it might be °*mokṣajaḥ*)

[397] *śāntiḥ* $A_T pc$] *śānti*° $A_T ac$

[398] *kāraṇaṃ* $A_T pc$] *karaṇaṃ* $A_T ac$

Stanza	M^Y / M_M^Y	T	Printed editions / A_T
287a	pamcakṛtyāni kurvanti	pañcakṛtyāni kurvanti	kurvanti pañcakṛtyāni / kurvate pañcakṛtyāni
287b	ājñāniyogataḥ	ājñāniyogataḥ	ājñānuvartinaḥ / ājñānuvartinaḥ
289b	karaṇaṃ	karaṇaṃ	kāraṇaṃ / kāraṇaṃ[398]
291c	parānapekṣarūpaṃ	parānapekṣārūpaṃ	parānapekṣaṃ rūpaṃ / parānapekṣārūpaṃ
292a	śaktiḥ parāpekṣa°	śaktiḥ parāpekṣa°	śaktiṃ parāpekṣaṃ / śaktiḥ parāpekṣaṃ
292c	°saṃvitter	°saṃvitter	°saṃvittir / °saṃvitteḥ
294a	°ādi	°ādi	°ādau / °ādau
295c	parāpekṣā	(missing)	parāpekṣaṃ / parāpekṣaṃ
296a	nirviṣayajñānaṃ	nirviṣayaṃ jñānaṃ	nirviṣayaṃ jñānaṃ / nirviṣayaṃ jñānaṃ
296b	tadaiva	tadaiva	tad eva / tad eva
297c	yan	yan	tan / tan
299d	kriyāt karte cen matiḥ	(missing)	kurvan kartā bhaved iti / kurvan kartā bhaved iti
300a	eṣā na yuktaiva	(missing)	eṣām ayuktaiva / eṣām ayuktaiva
301d	karaṇa°	karaṇa°	kāraṇa° / karaṇa°
302a	puruṣo pi	puruṣo pi	puruṣo vā / puruṣo vā
303d	aiśvarī	īśvarī	iṣyate / iṣyate
304a	masūrān maṅguṣṭho	masūro maṃguṣṭho	masūrā tv aṅguṣṭhān[399] / masūrām aṅguṣṭho
304b	na bhinnaḥ proktahetutaḥ	nibhinnaḥ {..}ktahetutaḥ	nāpi bhinnoktahetubhiḥ / nāpi bhinnoktahetubhiḥ
307a	vikāryasya	vikāryasya	'pi kāryasya / vikāryasya
308ab	sṛṣṭaprapaṃco	sṛṣṭiḥ prapañco	sraṣṭṛprapañca° / sṛṣṭaṃ prapañco
309b	yataḥ	yata	yathā / yathā
309d	cūrṇam	cūrṇam	pūrvam / pūrṇam
311b	yathārkaḥ	yathārkaḥ	yathokta° / yathārka°
311c	bodha°	bodhi°	bheda° / bheda°
313c	dṛtatā°	tṛdā°	dravatā° / mṛtatā°
317a	vimuktātmā	vimuktātmā	vimukto 'sau / vimukto 'sau
317b	śivājñayā	śivājñayā	śivecchayā / śivecchayā
321b	°dāyine	°dāyine	°dāyinām / °dāyinām

References

Primary Sources

Ajaḍapramātṛsiddhi by Utpaladeva: Edited in *Siddhitrayī* by Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 34, Srinagar 1921.

Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā: *Ahirbudhnya-saṃhitā of the Pāñcarātrāgama*. Edited by M.D. Ramanujacharya under the supervision of F.O. Schrader. Revised by V. Krishnamacharya, The Adyar Library and Research Centre, Adyar 1986[2] [1st ed. 1916].

Abhidharmakośa by Vasubandhu: *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Deciphered & Edited by Prahlad Pradhan. Revised with Introduction & Indices by Aruna Haldar, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 8, Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna 1975[2] [1st ed. 1967].

Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati by Īśānaśivagurudeva: *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati*. 4 vols. Edited by T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 69, 72, 77 and 83, Trivandrum 1920, 1921, 1922, 1925.

---

[399] In E$_2$, Dvivedī proposes the following emendation: *masūras tv aṅguṣṭhān*.

Kiraṇāgama: 1) *Il "Kiraṇāgama". Testo e traduzione del "Vidyāpāda"*. A cura di Maria Pia Vivanti, Supplemento n. 3 agli *Annali*, vol. 35 (1975), fasc. 2, Napoli. 2) For the first six chapters and their *Vṛtti*, see Goodall 1998.

Kriyākramadyotikā by Aghoraśivācārya: *Kriyākramadyotikā of Aghoraśivācārya with the commentary (Prabhāvyākhyā) of Nirmalamaṇi*. Edited by Rāmaśāstrin and Ambalavānajñānasambandhaparāśaktisvāmin, Chidambaram 1927.

Tattvasaṃgrahalaghuṭīkā by Aghoraśivācārya: 1) Edited in *Aṣṭaprakaraṇam* by Vrajavallabha Dvivedī, Varanasi 1988, pp. 115–136. 2) See Kataoka (2015).

Dviśatikālottaravṛtti by Aghoraśivācārya: 1) Draft edition of D. Goodall made on the basis of a transliteration made by Yang Mei of two manuscripts: a) University of Travancore, Oriental Manuscripts Library, No. 4509, IFP T.176; b) a copy of Madras GOML MS R 16814. 2) For the conclusion of the text, see Goodall 1998: xiii–xvii, n. 20.

Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa by Rāmakaṇṭha: *Nareśvaraparīkṣā of Sadyojyotis with the commentary (-prakāśa) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha*. Edited by Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 45, Srinagar 1926.

Nādakārikā by Rāmakaṇṭha: See Filliozat (1984).

Nādakārikāvyākhyā by Aghoraśivācārya: See Filliozat (1984).

Nyāyabhāṣya by Vātsyāyana: *Nyaya-Darshana. The Sūtras of Gautama And Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana With Two Commentaries (1) The Khadyota – by Mahāmahopādhyāya Gaṅgānātha Jha And (2) The Bhāṣyachandra – by Raghūttama – up to Adhyāya iii, Ahniha ii, Sūtra 17 only, with notes by Ambadās Shastri*. Edited by Gaṅgānātha Jha and Dhundhirāja Shastri Nyāyopādhyāya, Fasciculus 1 to 10, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 281, 282, 288, 295, 302, 308, 318, 323, 332, 336, Benares 1925: Vidya Vilas Press.

Paramokṣanirāsakārikāvṛtti by Rāmakaṇṭha: See Watson, Goodall, and Sarma (2013).

Parākhyatantra: See Goodall (2004)

Pādmasaṃhitā: *Padma Samhita*. 2 vols. Edited by S. Padmanabhan and R.N. Sampath, Pāñcarātra Pariṣodhanā Pariṣad Series 3–4, Madras 1974–1982.

Pauṣkaravṛtti by Jñānaprakāśācārya: IFP T.110. Paper transcript in Devanāgarī.

Pauṣkarāgama (Jñānapādaḥ): Edited by K. Ramachandra Sarma, The Adyar Library Pamphlet Series 50, Adyar 1995.

Pramāṇalakṣaṇa by Sarvajñātmayati: Edited by T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar and T. R. Chintamani, Madras Oriental Series No. 7, Madras, 1936: The Journal of Oriental Research.

Pramāṇaviniścaya by Dharmakīrti: *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya. Chapters 1 and 2*. Critically edited by Ernst Steinkellner, Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region Series No. 2, Beijing/ Vienna 2007: China Tibetology Publishing House/Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.

Praśastapādabhāṣya by Praśastapāda: Johannes Bronkhorst & Yves Ramseier, *Word Index to the Praśastapādabhāṣya. A Complete Word Index to the Printed Editions of the Praśastapādabhāṣya*, Delhi 1994: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

Bhogakārikāṭīkā by Aghoraśivācārya: Edited in *Aṣṭaprakaraṇam* by Vrajavallabha Dvivedī, Varanasi 1988, pp. 203–244.

Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama: See Bhatt (1977, 1982).

Mataṅgavṛtti by Rāmakaṇṭha: 1) See Bhatt (1977, 1982). 2) Pune MS BORI No. 235. In Śāradā script.

Mṛgendratantra (alias *Mṛgendrāgama*): 1) *Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā of Aghoraśivācārya*. Edited by Kṛṣṇaśāstrī and K.M. Subrahmaṇyaśāstrī, Śivāgamasiddhāntaparipālanasaṅgraha Publications No. 12, Devakōṭṭai 1928. 2) *Śrī Mṛgendra Tantram (Vidyāpāda & Yogapāda) with the Commentary of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha*. Edited by Pt. Madhusudan Kaul Shāstrī, The Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 50, Bombay 1930. 3) *Mṛgendrāgama (Kriyāpāda et Caryāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha*. Édition critique par N.R. Bhatt, Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No. 23, Institut Français d'Indologie, Pondichéry 1962.

Mṛgendravṛtti by Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha: See *Mṛgendratantra*.

Yogasūtra: *Yogasūtras of Patañjali With the Scholium of Vyâsa and the Commentary of Vâchaspatimiśra*. Edited by Rajram Shastri Bodas. Revised and Enlarged by the addition of the Commentary of Nâgojî Bhaṭṭa by Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series No. XLVI, Bombay 1917.

Ratnatrayaparīkṣā by Śrīkaṇṭha: See above "Past Action Alone Cannot be the Cause of Variety of Souls" section.

Ratnatrayaparīkṣollekhinī by Aghoraśiva: See above "Past Action Alone Cannot be the Cause of Variety of Souls" section.

Vākyapadīya by Bhartṛhari: 1) *Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari with the Commentaries Vṛtti and Paddhati of Vṛṣabhadeva, Kāṇḍa I*. Edited by K.A. Subramania Iyer, Deccan College Monograph Series 32, Pune 1966. 2) Wilhelm Rau (†), *Bhartṛharis Vākyapadīya Versuch einer vollständigen deutschen Übersetzung nach der kritischen Edition der Mūla-Kārikās*, hrsg. von Oskar von Hinüber, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz 2002: Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart.

Śataratnasaṃgraha by Umāpatiśivācārya: *Śataratnasaṅgraha of Śrī Umāpati Śivācārya*. With an Introduction, Translation and Explanation in English by P. Thirugnanasambandhan, Madras University Philosophical Series 20, Madras 1973.

Śataratnollekhinī (anonymous): *Saṭīka Śataratna-Saṃgrahaḥ Śaivatantra-svatantra-Śrīmad Umāpati Śivācārya-saṃgṛhitaḥ*. Edited by Pañcānan Śāstrī, Tantraprakāśa-granthamālā 22, Calcutta 1944: Bishwamitra Press.

Śaivasiddhāntaparibhāṣā by Śivāgrayogin: *Śaivasiddhāntaparibhāṣā* by Śivāgrayogin, Oriental Research Institute, Sanskrit Series 90, University of Madras, Madras 1950.

Ślokavārttika by Kumārila: *The Mīmāṃsāślokavārttikam with the commentary Kāśikā [by Sucarita Miśra]*. Vols. 1–2 edited by K. Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 90 and 99; vol. 3 edited by Rāmasvāmī Śāstrī, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 150. Trivandrum 1926, 1929, 1943.

Sāṃkhyakārikā by Īśvarakṛṣṇa: *The Sāṃkhyakārikā With an Exposition Called Chandrikā by Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha and Gauḍapādācārya's Commentary*, edited by Bechanarama Tripathi, Benares Sanskrit Series 9, Benares 1883: Braj B. Das & Co.

Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama: *Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha*. Édition critique par N.R. Bhatt, Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No. 61, Institut Français d'Indologie, Pondichéry 1979.

Siddhāntasārāvalivyākhyā by Anantaśambhu: "*Siddhāntasārāvalivyākhyā*, Part. II." Edited by R.K. Parthasarathi and T.H. Viswanatham Siromani, *Bulletin of the Government Oriental Manuscript Library* 17.2 (1965): 1–48.

Spandanirṇaya by Kṣemarāja: *The Spandakārikās of Vasugupta with the Nirṇaya by Ksemaraja*. Edited with preface, introduction and English translation by M.S. Kaul Shastri, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies No. 42, Śrīnagar 1925.

Svāyambhuva: *Le Tantra de Svayaṃbhū, vidyāpāda, avec le commentaire de Sadyojyotiḥ*. Ed. and tr. par Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat, Geneva 1991: Librairie Droz S.A. [*Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 1.1-4.7 with the *Svayambhuvavṛtti* thereon].

Secondary Sources

Bhatt, N. R. (Ed.). (1977). *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama (Vidyāpada) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha*, Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie 56. Institut Français d'Indologie.

Bhatt, N. R. (Ed.). (1982). *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama (Kriyāpāda, Yogāpāda et Caryāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha*, Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie 65. Institut Français d'Indologie.

Davis, R. H. (1992). Aghoraśiva's Background. *The Journal of Oriental Research Madras (Dr. S.S. Janaki Felicitation Volume), 56–62*(1986–1992), 367–378.

Filliozat, P.-S. (1984). Le Nādakārikā de Rāmakaṇṭha. *Bulletin De L'ecole Francaise D'extreme-Orient, 73*, 223–255.

Filliozat, P.-S. (1988). Le Tattvasaṃgraha 'Compendium des essences' de Sadyojyoti. *Bulletin De L'ecole Française D'extrême-Orient, 77*, 97–163.

Filliozat, P.-S. (1991). Le Tattvatrayanirṇaya 'La Détermination des trois essences' de Sadyojyoti avec le Commentaire d'Aghoraśivācārya. *Bulletin De L'ecole Française D'extrême-Orient, 78*, 133–158.

Filliozat, P.-S. (1994). *The Tantra of Svayaṃbhū vidyāpāda. With the commentary of Sadyojyoti*, Kalāmūlaśāstra Series 13. Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts, New Delhi and Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

Gengnagel, J. (1996). *Māyā, Puruṣa und Śiva. Die dualistische Tradition des Śivaismus nach Aghoraśivācāryas Tattvaprakāśavṛtti*. Wiesbaden.

Goodall, D. (1998). *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭa's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra. Vo. I: Chaps. 1–6*. Critical edition and annotated translation by D. Goodall. Institut Français de Pondichéry/Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient, Publications du Département d'Indologie 86.1.

Goodall, D. (2000). Problems of Name and lineage: relationships between South Indian authors of the Śaiva Siddhānta. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Series 3, 10*(2), 205–216.

Goodall, D. (2004). *The Parākhyatantra. A scripture of the Śaivasiddhānta. A critical edition and annotated translation*. Institut Français de Pondichéry/École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Collection Indologie 98.

Goodall, D. (2014). Saiddhāntika *paddhati*s I. On Rāmanātha, the earliest southern author of the Śaivasiddhānta of whom works survive, and on eleventh-century revisions of the *Somaśambhupaddhati*. *Cracow Indological Studies, 16*, 169–201.

Goodall, D. (2015). Introduction. In *Śaiva rites of expiation. A first edition and translation of Trilocanaśiva's twelfth-century Prāyaścittasamuccaya (with a transcription of Hṛdayaśiva's Prāyaścittasamuccaya)*, by R. Sathyanarayanan (pp. 15–63). Institut Français de Pondichéry/École Française d'Extrême-Orient,

Goodall, D. (2016). How the Tattvas of Tantric Śaivism Came to Be 36: The Evidence of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*. In D. Goodall and H. Isaacson (Eds.), *Tantric studies: Fruits of a Franco-German project on Early Tantra*, Pondichéry (pp. 77–111).

Kapani, L. (1992). *La notion de saṃskāra I*. Collège de France, Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Fascicule 59. Diffusion de Boccard.

Kataoka, K. (片岡啓). (2015). *Tattvasaṃgrahalaghuṭīkā* —和訳と原典— [*Tattvasaṃgrahalaghuṭīkā*: Translation and Text]. 南アジア古典学 / *South Asian Classical Studies, 10*, 173–280.

Malledevaru, H. P. (General Editor). (1987/Cat.). *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts. Volume XII Viśiṣṭādvaita (drāviḍa), Śaiva, Vīraśaiva*. Oriental Research Institute Sanskrit Series No. 160. Oriental Research Institute, University of Mysore.

Olivelle, P. (2005). *Manu's code of law. A critical edition and translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sanderson, A. (1985). Review of N.R. Bhatt: *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama (Kriyāpāda, Caryāpāda et Yogapāda), avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. Édition critique.* (Publications de l'Institut Français de l'Indologie, No. 65), Pondichéry 1982; Idem: *Rauravottarāgama. Édition critique, introduction et notes.* (Publications de l'Institut Français de l'Indologie, No. 66), Pondichéry 1983. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, 48*, 564–568.

Sanderson, A. (1992). The doctrine of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra. In T. Goudriaan (Ed.), *Ritual and speculation in early Tantrism. Studies in honor of André Padoux* (pp. 281–312). State University of New York Press.

Sanderson, A. (2006). The date of Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati. In M. Czerniak-Drożdżowicz (Ed.), *Tantra and Viśiṣṭādvaitavedānta*. Cracow indological studies 8 (pp. 39–91). Jagiellonian University, Institute of Oriental Philology.

Sanderson, A. (2012–2013). The Śaiva Literature. *Journal of Indological Studies* (Kyoto), Nos. 24 & 25 (2012–2013) (actually published in 2014), 1–113.

Sathyanarayanan, R., & Goodall, D. (2020). South-Indian Śaiva Colophons. In E. Wilden & S. Anandakichenin (Eds.), *Colophons, prefaces, satellite stanzas: Paratextual elements and their role in the transmission of Indian texts* (pp. 511–541). Indian and Tibetan Studies 10.

Sferra, F. (2007). Materials for the study of the levels of sound in the Sanskrit sources of the Śaivasiddhānta. *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* 22, 70c–86b, 171c–173b and its *Ullekhinī*. With excerpts from an unpublished commentary. In D. Goodall & A. Padoux (Eds.), *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner/Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner* (pp. 443–474). Collection Indologie 106. Institut Français de Pondichéry/Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, Pondichéry.

Sferra, F. (2010). The *Nāda* theory of language. A Śaivasiddhānta perspective on verbal communication. In N. N. Chakraborty (Ed.), *Language, thought and reality* (pp. 308–358). Rabindra Bharati University.

Tāntrikābhidhānakośa: Vol. I—Brunner, H., Oberhammer, G., & Padoux, A.(Eds.), *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa : dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique*, 2000. Austrian Academy of Sciences Press; Vol. II—Brunner, H., Oberhammer, G., & Padoux, A.(Eds.), *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa : dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique*, 2004. Austrian Academy of Sciences Press; Vol. III—Goodall, D., & Rastelli, M. (Eds.), *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa : dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique*, 2013. Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.

Torella, R. (1994). On Vāmanadatta. In P.-S. Filliozat, S. P. Narang, & C. P. Bhatta (Eds.), *Pandit N.R. Bhatt felicitation volume* (pp. 481–498). Motilal Banarsidass.

Watson, A. (2006). *The self's awareness of Itself*. Publications of the De Nobili Research Library.

Watson, A., Goodall, D., & Anjaneya Sarma, S. L. P. (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*. Institut Français de Pondichéry, École Française d'Extrême-Orient.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.