

Alexis Sanderson
(All Souls College, Oxford)

The Date of Sadyojyotis and Br̥haspati

Students of Indian religion in the early medieval period are by now familiar with the fact that the literature of the Śaiva Mantramārga is broadly divided into two streams. On the one hand there was that based on the purely Śaiva scriptures known collectively as the Siddhānta or Śaivasiddhānta. This was dedicated to the propitiation of Śiva, remained for the most part within the parameters of purity established by the brahmanical substrate, extended beyond the domain of private worship by individuals for their own benefit or that of individual clients into the public domain of the consecration and worship of fixed idols in temples for the welfare of society and the state, and for the most part adhered to a soteriology in which ritual, above all the ritual of initiation in the presence of the Maṇḍala of Śiva, was declared to be the sole means of the soul's salvation at death, a benefit which thereby remained entirely within the gift of its institutions, since only duly consecrated officiants could perform that ritual. It also sought with widespread success to place its most senior figures in the office of Royal Preceptor in numerous kingdoms both in the subcontinent and Southeast Asia, to have these give Śaiva initiation to their monarchs, to follow this with a Śaiva modification of the brahmanical ceremony of royal consecration *rājyābhiṣekaḥ* in which the king together with his chief queen was to be empowered to fulfil his divinely ordained role as the guardian of a Śaiva-brahmanical socio-religious order, and to provide the specialized officiants who would consecrate the royal temples whose foundation marked and validated the reigns of all but the weakest and most ephemeral rulers.

On the other hand there was a range of ritual systems of a more Śākta or completely Śākta character dedicated to the propitiation of Bhairava or the Goddess. These required in varying degrees forms of observance that transgressed brahmanical criteria of purity; they were for the most part restricted to personal worship or worship for the benefit of individual, typically royal patrons, who looked to them for assistance in the face of danger rather than validation, and in their more esoteric developments tended away from the strict ritualism of the Siddhānta towards a gnostic quest for enlightenment before death through transcendence of the contracted self immersed in conformity to the rules of brahmanical society. The Siddhānta, then, was the broad base of the Śaiva Mantramārga; and the Śākta Śaiva systems, claiming to enact higher, more esoteric forms of practice, tended to see themselves accordingly as areas of restricted recruitment from within the Siddhānta itself.

The Siddhānta has survived in recent centuries only in the Far South, but while the Tamils developed this tradition and enriched and modified it in many ways over the centuries, it was certainly not a Tamil creation. Its earliest scriptures appear to have been written to the north of the Dravidian zone and its institutions to have spread to most parts of the subcontinent and beyond it into Southeast Asia from the seventh century onwards.¹

Much the greater part of its learned exegesis was produced in Kashmir during the tenth century by members of a single preceptorial lineage and the manuscripts of their works that have survived have been transmitted both there and in the South, principally in Mysore and Tamilnadu, where such figures as Aghoraśiva, Jñānaśiva, and Trilocanaśiva, while drawing in the domain of ritual on the Paddhatis

¹ On the history of the Siddhānta and its later South Indian developments and the error of seeing it as a uniquely Tamilian phenomenon that originated in the twelfth century – an error that has persisted in some general surveys of ‘Hinduism’ long after specialists in this field have refuted it – see GOODALL (2004, pp. xiii-xxxiv).

of such non-Kashmirian Saiddhāntika authorities as Brahmaśambhu, Bhojadeva, and Somaśambhu, continued the Kashmirian tradition, holding it in the highest reverence, though in course of time local developments overtook it in the South. This learned Kashmirian exegesis of Saiddhāntika scripture comprised exhaustive commentaries by Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha on the *Mrgendra*, by his son Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha [II] on the *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, the *Svāyambhuvasūtra-saṃgraha*, the *Kālottara* in its three hundred verse recension, and the first twelve chapters of the *Kiraṇa*, and by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's pupil Bhaṭṭa Vidyākaṇṭha II on the Saiddhāntika Pratiṣṭhāntara *Maya-saṃgraha*. All these works survive, except the commentary on the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*,² but the commentary on the *Mayasaṃgraha* and the commentary on the last six of the first twelve chapters of the *Kiraṇa* remain to be published.

Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha tells us that he was the pupil of a Bhaṭṭa Vidyākaṇṭha [I] who was a pupil of a [Bhaṭṭa] Rāmakaṇṭha [I].³ The lineage therefore goes back through two more generations.

We also have the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* of Śrīkaṇṭha, a verse treatise of unknown scriptural affiliation. Now Śrīkaṇṭha tells us at the end of this work that he was able to compose it because his mind had been purified by the *ālokaḥ* produced by Rāmakaṇṭha.⁴ The most plausible interpretation of this ambiguous expression is that it refers to a text, probably a commentary, called *-āloka*.⁵ But the identity of the

² Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha refers to this commentary, the *Svāyambhuvoddyota*, in his *Nareśvaraparīkṣapṛakāśa* on 1.51, pp. 88-89: *iti vipaṅcitam asmābhiḥ svāyambhuvoddyote. tata evāvadhāryam.*

³ *Mrgendravṛtti*, introductory verse 4.

⁴ *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* 321: *rāmakaṇṭhakṛtālokanirmalikṛtacetasā | ratnatrayaparīkṣeyam kṛtā śrīkaṇṭhasūriṇā.*

⁵ Exegetical works with titles ending in *-āloka* are not infrequent. Examples are the *Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandavardhana, the *Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta, the *Abhisamayālaṅkāraloka* of Haribhadra, the *Madhyamakāloka* of Kamalaśīla, and the *Nyāyatattvāloka* of Vācaspatimiśra. This interpretation, in which an author reports another's work as the source of the

Rāmakaṅṭha who wrote it is uncertain. It has been asserted that he was Śrīkaṅṭha's Guru and that he is identical with Rāmakaṅṭha I. It has also been asserted on the strength of what has been taken to be the next and final verse of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* that the work composed by this Rāmakaṅṭha must have been a commentary on an unnamed Saiddhāntika scripture.⁶ But in fact all these assertions are dubious. Śrīkaṅṭha does not say that the Rāmakaṅṭha who composed the *-āloka* was his Guru, nor is there any evidence that this Rāmakaṅṭha was Rāmakaṅṭha I. Indeed I know of nothing that establishes beyond doubt that Śrīkaṅṭha was a member of this lineage, though that is surely

illumination that has enabled him to compose his own, has the support of a parallel within this corpus of Saiddhāntika texts in the final verse of the *Tattvasaṃgrahaṭīkā* of Aghoraśiva (p. 136): *śrīmatkheṭakanandanārka-kiraṇaiḥ sadvṛttivākyātmakair dhvastājñānatamaścayena gurunāghorādinā sambhunā | tattvajñānabubhutsubhiḥ budhavaraiḥ samprārthitenādarāt tattvānām atisaṃgrahasya vivṛtir laghvī sphuṭam nirmītā* 'The Guru Aghoraśiva, the dense darkness of whose ignorance was destroyed by the rays that are the sentences of the *Sadvṛtti* [*Rauravavṛtti*] emitted by the sun that is the venerable Kheṭakanandana, eagerly requested by the best of the learned desiring to realize the knowledge of the Tattvas, has composed clearly a short analysis of [his] condensed summary of the Tattvas [the *Tattvasaṃgraha*]'.

⁶The assertions are Bhatt's (1977, pp. xxxix-xl; also GOODALL 1998, pp. ix-x): *so 'yaṃ vidyākaṅṭhaguruḥ prathamah śrīrāmakaṅṭhah śrīkaṅṭha-nātha iva mahān śaivācārya āsīd iti nārāyaṇakaṅṭhas tasmīn eva śloke pratipādayati. anena rāmakaṅṭhena racitā kācana sadvṛttiḥ, yāṃ anusṛtya tacchiṣyeṇa śrīkaṅṭhena ratnatrayākhyam prakaraṇam racitam iti tatprakaraṇopasaṃhāraslokena jñāyate. syād iyaṃ sadvṛttiḥ kasyacid āgamasya vṛttiḥ* 'Nārāyaṇakaṅṭha tells us in this same verse [*Mrgendravr̥tti*, introductory verse 4] that this Rāmakaṅṭha I, the Guru of Vidyākaṅṭha, was a great Śaiva Ācārya comparable to Lord Śrīkaṅṭha himself. This Rāmakaṅṭha composed a certain *sadvṛttiḥ*, following which his disciple Śrīkaṅṭha composed his treatise called *Ratnatraya*, a fact conveyed by the concluding verse of that treatise. This *sadvṛttiḥ* must be a commentary on one of the scriptures'.

probable, or even that he was a predecessor of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha and Rāmakaṇṭha I, since there are no citations of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* in their surviving works. As for the claim that the Rāmakaṇṭha who inspired Śrīkaṇṭha was the author of a *sadvṛttiḥ*, that rests upon the following statement, which has been printed as the final verse (322) of Śrīkaṇṭha's treatise:

322 *śrīrāmakaṇṭhasadvṛttiṃ mayaiṣam anukurvātā |*
ratnatrayaparīkṣārthaḥ saṃkṣepeṇa prakāśitah |

Thus closely following the excellent commentary (*sadvṛttim*) of the venerable Rāmakaṇṭha I have briefly clarified the meaning of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*.

But these cannot be the words of Śrīkaṇṭha. For how could he have described himself as having clarified the meaning of his own work? They must belong to the commentary of the twelfth-century South Indian Saiddhāntika Aghoraśiva with which this edition of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* has been published, as the first of two closing verses of that commentary rather the last of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* itself. The error was facilitated by the fact that Aghoraśiva felt it unnecessary to comment on 321, so that his closing verses follow 321 without intervening prose. So the prose colophon *ratnatrayaparīkṣā samāptā* 'Here ends the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*' that appears in the edition after the first of Aghoraśiva's verses should have been placed before it. The inference that '322' is not Śrīkaṇṭha's is confirmed, if confirmation is needed, by the introductory verse of Aghoraśiva's commentary, which exactly mirrors the verse in question. For in that he says that he *will* briefly clarify the meaning of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*,⁷ and here at the end he is saying that he *has* done so.

⁷ Aghoraśiva, *Ratnatrayollekhinī*, v. 1: *śivaṃ śivakaraṃ natvā sid-
dhāntārthaprakāśakaḥ | ratnatrayaparīkṣārthaḥ saṃkṣepeṇa prakāśyate*
'Having bowed to Śiva, the cause of salvation, I shall briefly clarify the

It is merely possible, then, that Śrīkaṇṭha was a pupil of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha I and a fellow-pupil of the Vidyākaṇṭha who taught Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha. As for the *sadvṛttiḥ* that Aghoraśiva claims to have followed in writing his commentary on the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*, it is not inconceivable that its author was Rāmakaṇṭha I. But there is another possibility, namely that it was the work of Rāmakaṇṭha II. Moreover, since Aghoraśiva says that he has written his commentary following it, literally ‘imitating’ (*anukurvatā*) it, it is more probable that the commentary was on the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* itself. One may not object that there would be no reason for Aghoraśiva to write his commentary if one had already been composed by his distinguished Kashmirian predecessor. For we have commentaries by both Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II and Aghoraśiva on the *Tattvatrayanirṇaya*. So while the Kashmirian record shows five generations of Saiddhāntika Gurus, from Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha I, through Bhaṭṭa Vidyākaṇṭha I, Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, and Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II to Vidyākaṇṭha II, we have no work that is definitely from the first and second generations and only the probability of a lost *-āloka* in the first.

The dates of these Kashmirian authors can be determined approximately from two facts. Firstly, the summary-verses at the end of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha’s commentary on the 23rd chapter of the *Vidyāpāda* of the *Mataṅgapārameśvara* have been reproduced without attribution by the Kashmirian Abhinavagupta in his *Tantrāloka* (8.428-434b), which we know to have been composed at some time before his *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivismarśinī*, which was completed in A.D. 1015;⁸ and secondly, Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha’s father Nārāyaṇa-

meaning of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* that has illuminated the meaning [teaching] of the Siddhānta’. The edition has *siddhāntārthaprakāśakam*. If that were sound then Aghoraśiva would be venerating Śiva as the clarifier of his own scriptures. I have therefore emended.

⁸ The date of the completion of this work, on the last day of Mārgaśīrṣa in Laukika [40]90 / Kali 4115, which fell in A.D. 1015, is given at its end (vol. 3, p. 407, v. 15): *iti navatime ’smin vatsare ’ntyē yugāṃṣe tithiśaśijaladhisthe mārgaśīrṣāvasāne | jagati vihitabodhām īśvarapra-*

kaṅṭha has quoted the *Īśvarasiddhi* of Utpaladeva (fl. c. 925-975) in his commentary on *Mṛgendra*, *Vidyāpāda* 1.11, and we know that Utpaladeva was the teacher of Abhinavagupta's teacher Lakṣmaṇagupta. Both father and son, then, will have been active during the second half of the tenth century, and Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha's disciple Bhaṭṭa Vidyākaṅṭha will have been approximately contemporary with Abhinavagupta.

But theirs are not the earliest post-scriptural works of Saiddhāntika Śaiva learning that are known to us. That distinction belongs to Bṛhaspati and Sadyojyotis (also known as Kheṭapāla, Kheṭakabāla, and Kheṭakanandana)⁹ whom Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha II acknowledges at the beginning of two of his works as the founding fathers of his exegetical tradition:

yābhyāṃ prakāśitaṃ vartma siddhānte siddhabhāvataḥ |
gurūṅāṃ api tau vandyau sadyojyotirbṛhaspatī |

A: *Mataṅgapārameśvaravṛtti*, *Maṅgala* 2; B: *Mokṣakārikāvṛtti*, *Maṅgala* 1.

tyabhijñāṃ vyavṛṇuta paripūrṇāṃ preritaḥ sambhupādaiḥ 'Instigated by [his] venerable [Guru] Śambhu[nātha Abhinavagupta] has completed his explanation of the *Īśvarapratyabhijñā* that has enlightened the world, complete [with its auto-commentary], in this 90th year, in year 4115 of the last of the Yugas, at the end of Mārgaśīrṣa'. The *Tantrāloka* preceded this work, because it is quoted in it (vol. 1, pp. 33, 159 [= *Tantrāloka* 3.6], 164, 165, 268, etc.).

⁹ **Kheṭapāla**: Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha, *Tattvatrayanirṇayavivṛti*, f. 116v 10-11, glossing *svāyambhuvasya vṛttikṛtā* in v. 32: *svāyambhuvasya vṛttikṛtā kheṭapālena*; *Śivadr̥ṣṭi* 3.13c and 3. 64a; *Tantrāloka* 9.262c; 9.275c; *Svacchandoddyota* vol. 3, p. 84, l. 10; **Kheṭakabāla**: Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha, *Mataṅgapārameśvaravṛtti*, *Vidyāpāda*, p. 72, l. 4; and **Kheṭakanandana**: Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṅṭha, *Mṛgendravṛtti*, *Kriyāpāda*, p. 155, l. 6; *Vidyāpāda*, p. 69, l. 13; Kṣemarāja, *Svacchandoddyota*, vol. 4, p. 23, l. 19; and the closing verse of the *Tattvasaṃgrahaṭikā* of Aghoraśiva.

api tau Eds. : *agrato* BORI MS of A.

Among [all] the teachers [of our tradition] it is to Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati that we owe [our greatest] veneration. For they, Siddhas that they were, have revealed [to us] the true path [of understanding] in [the study of] the Siddhānta.

From Sadyojyotis¹⁰ we have works of exegesis on two early Saiddhāntika scriptures, the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* and the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*. On the first we have three expositions in verse that formed parts of his *Rauravavṛtti*, namely the *Bhogakārikā*,

¹⁰ The primary evidence is not unanimous in its transmission of the stem-form of this name, sometimes showing it consonantal (Sadyojyotis), and sometimes vocalic (Sadyojyoti). The vocalic form is seen in this Maṅgala verse as given in the South Indian Grantha manuscripts of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha's *Mataṅgapārameśvaravṛtti* collated by Bhatt (1977): these have either *sadyojyotibrhaspati*, the reading adopted in Bhatt's edition (it is also that of BORI 235 of 1883-1884, the only known Kashmirian Śāradā manuscript that preserves this passage, not collated by Bhatt), or *sadyojyotiṃ brhaspatim*. The vocalic stem also appears in a South Indian manuscript of Vaktraśambhu's commentary on the *Mrgendrapaddhati* (p. 111: *sadyojyoti-prabhrtibhir*). It is this that has been adopted by the Devakoṭṭai edition of the *Bhogakārikāvṛtti* (p. 109), and by Bhatt (1977, p. xli): *śrīsadyojyotiṃ*; thence Sadyojyoti in the French version of his introduction, (p. xi). But in three other places in that manuscript of Vaktraśambhu's commentary it is the consonantal form that has been transmitted (p. 187: *sadyojyotiṣpādair*; p. 209: *śrīmatsadyojyotiḥpādair*; p. 235: *sadyojyotiḥpādair*), and we see the same form in the Devanāgarī manuscript of the *Mataṅgapārameśvaravṛtti* from Calcutta (Bhatt's manuscript 'ai'), in the Devakoṭṭai edition of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha's *Mokṣakārikāvṛtti*, both reading *sadyojyotirbrhaspati* in this Maṅgala verse, in Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṅṭha's *Mrgendravṛtti* on *Vidyāpāda* 10.23 and 11.15 (*sadyojyotiḥpādaiḥ*), and in the Paṭala colophons of Sadyojyotis' *Svāyambhuvavṛtti* (*sadyojyotiṣkṛtā ṭikā*). I have preferred the consonantal form because it is this that is grammatically correct (WHITNEY § 418).

Mokṣakārikā, and *Paramokṣanirāsakarikā*.¹¹ On the second we have the *Svāyambhuvavṛtti*, his prose commentary on the principal part of its doctrinal section. We also have his *Tattvasaṃgraha* and *Tattvatrayanirṇaya*, two short works in verse in which he sets out the ontology of the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* and *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* respectively. Finally, we have his *Nareśvaraparīkṣā*, a philosophical treatise in which he propounds his view of Saiddhāntika ontology and soteriology and defends it against the contrary positions of the Mīmāṃsakas, Naiyāyikas, Sāṃkhyas, Vedāntins, Pāñcarātrikas, Pāśupatas, and Buddhists. From Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II we have commentaries in prose on the *Mokṣakārikā*,

¹¹ That these are parts of a single commentary, in other words that the *Rauravavṛtti* is not simply a collective term for a series of independent treatises on certain elements of the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*'s teachings, is at least probable. Of the *-kārikā* texts that have survived the *Bhogakārikā* and *Mokṣakārikā* form a whole: the first alone has an opening Maṅgala verse, the second alone has concluding verses, and the topic is said to be that of both texts both at the beginning of the first (*Bhogakārikā* 2b: *bhogamokṣau sasāadhanau*) and at the end of the second (*Mokṣakārikā* 155b: *bhogamokṣau sasāadhanau*). The *Paramokṣanirāsakarikā* too has neither a Maṅgala verse at the beginning nor a verse at the end to indicate that an independent work has been completed. Furthermore, it begins in a way that shows that it is the sequel of a lost section covering the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*'s treatment of the ancillaries of the initiation ritual, that is to say, explains Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha in his comment on this verse, such topics as the laying on of Śiva's hand (*śivahastavidhiḥ*): *satsaṃskārasya yasyedam aṅgajātaṃ nirūpitam | tatphalavyatirekāya yad uktaṃ phalasāadhanam* '[Next] an account of the rewards taught [in other systems] as opposed to that of the true initiation whose various ancillaries have [just] been described'. These topics are not treated in the ten Paṭalas of the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* that have been preserved and published. Clearly we have only part of the whole text; and this is confirmed by citations of other passages of the text in such works as Takṣakavarta's *Nityādisaṃgrahapaddhati*. On other, lost parts of Sadyojyotis' *Rauravavṛtti* and their lost exegesis by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II see GOODALL (1998, pp. xix-xxvi).

the *Paramokṣanirāsakarikā*, the *Tattvatrayanirṇaya*, and the *Nareśvaraparikṣā*. His father Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha wrote a commentary (*-tippanaka*) on the *Svāyambhuvavṛtti*,¹² and the *Śaranniśā*, a long commentary (*brhaṭṭikā*) on the *Tattvasaṃgraha*,¹³ but no manuscript of either has surfaced.

Bṛhaspati has fared less well. To my knowledge, no manuscript of any work by him has been located. All we have are citations from his *Rauravavārtika*, a commentary in verse on the *Rauravasūtra-saṃgraha*, and from the *Śivatānu*, a verse treatise of unknown scriptural affiliation. In spite of the veneration for Bṛhaspati expressed by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha we know of no commentaries on his works and there are few references to them in Saiddhāntika sources, the great majority of the quotations and paraphrases occurring in the non-Saiddhāntika works of the Śākta Śaiva Abhinavagupta, and in the commentary on his *Tantrāloka* written by Jayaratha in the thirteenth century.

The evidence that Bṛhaspati wrote the first is as follows. Abhinavagupta paraphrases verses of a *Rauravavārtika* in *Tantrāloka* 8.92 and 8.183. Jayaratha quotes them in his commentary but does not

¹² Mentioned by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha on *Nareśvaraparikṣā* 3.62, p. 216, ll. 5-8: ... *tattippa<ṇa>ke* The emendation *tattippaṇake* for the edition's *tattippake* is the suggestion of Jürgen Hanneder (GOODALL 1998, p. x).

¹³ Mentioned by Aghoraśiva in the introductory verses of his commentary on the *Tattvasaṃgraha*: 3 *tattvasaṃgrahacandrasya prakāśāya vitānitā* | *śrīnārāyaṇakaṇṭhena brhaṭṭikā śaranniśā* | 4 *tathāpi khinnabud-dhinām brhaṭṭikāpravistare* | *hitāya laghuṭikātra mayeyam uparacyate* 'Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha composed the long commentary *Śaranniśā* ('Autumn Night') so that the moon that is the *Tattvasaṃgraha* might shine [more clearly]. Nonetheless, I am composing this short commentary on it, for the benefit of those whose capacity to understand is exhausted in the great expanse of that text.' The point of the first verse is that the moon shines more brightly in autumn in India, when the sky is free of moisture after the end of the monsoon.

name their author.¹⁴ In *Tantrāloka* 8.101 Abhinavagupta refers to a statement of ‘the venerable Guru on the *Rauravaśāsana*’, that is to say, on the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*. Jayaratha identifies this Guru as Br̥haspati and quotes the statement to which he refers but does not name its source.¹⁵ Similarly, in *Tantrāloka* 9.40cd Abhinavagupta

¹⁴ *Tantrāloka* 8.92 *pum̄sām̄ sitāsītāny atra kurvatām̄ kila siddhyataḥ | parāparau svarnirayāv̄ iti rauravavārtike* ‘In the *Rauravavārtika* it is stated that according to scripture the higher and the lower, heaven and hell, come about for persons who do pure and impure [actions] in this [world]’. Jayaratha: *kim atra pramāṇam. ity uktam̄ rauravavārtika iti. tad uktam̄ tatra: “pum̄sām̄ sitāni karmāṇi kurvatām̄ asitāni ca | siddhyataḥ svarganirayāv̄ atra kṣipram̄ parāparau”*. *Tantrāloka* 8.183 *śrīkaṇṭhādhiṣṭhitās te ca sṛjanti saṃharanti ca | īśvaratvaṃ diviśadām̄ iti rauravavārtike* ‘In the *Rauravavārtika* it is said that those [Rudras] over whom Śrīkaṇṭha presides give and withdraw the lordship of the gods’. Jayaratha: *atra ca kiṃ pramāṇam. ity uktam̄ iti rauravavārtika iti. tad uktam̄ tatra: “pañcāśītir yojanānām̄ niyutānām̄ tathā parā | koṣṭh ca tanniveśasya vistārah̄ parikīrtitaḥ”* iti *“śrīkaṇṭhādhiṣṭhitās te ca devānām̄ manasepsitam̄ | aiśvaryam̄ saṃpracyacchanti haranti ca mahaujasah̄”* iti ca ‘He says “In the *Rauravavārtika* it is said” in order to state his evidence of this. This is taught there [as follows]: “The extent of the world of [each of] these [Rudras] is 11,058,000 leagues” and “Under the leadership of Śrīkaṇṭha these beings of great vigour grant and withdraw the lordship desired by the Gods”’.

¹⁵ *Tantrāloka* 8.101: *niryāntrāṇi sadā tatra dvārāṇi bilasiddhaye | ity etad gurubhir̄ gītam̄ śrīmadrauravaśāsane* ‘On the *Raurava* the Guru has declared that on that [mountain Vidyutvat to the south of the ocean of salt water] there are entrances [to the subterranean paradises] that are always unbarred, so that one can achieve *bilasiddhiḥ* [there with ease]’. Jayaratha: *gurubhir̄ iti br̥haspatipādaiḥ. yad uktam̄ tatra: “yojanānām̄ sahasrāṇi samatikramya viṃśatim̄ | vidyutvān̄ iti vikhyātaḥ samudre dakṣiṇe sthitaḥ | sahasrāṇy āyatas trīṇi tāvān̄ evocchrito ’calaḥ | sahasravipulas tatra ṛṇa-parṇaphalāśīnaḥ | malopacitadigdhāṅgā dīrghaśmaśūśīroruhāḥ | godharmāṇo janā nagnā vatsarāśītijīvinaḥ | tatrāyantrabiladvārapraveśāḥ purasampadaḥ”* ‘The Guru [to which he refers here] is the venerable Br̥haspati. As the latter has stated in that [work]: “20,000 leagues out in the southern ocean is the mountain called Vidyutvat, 3,000 leagues long, the same in

refers to the view that the *Raurava[sūtra]saṃgraha* teaches that both the Tattvas Kalā and Avyakta come forth directly from the Tattva Māyā: *māyāto 'vyaktakalayor iti rauravasamgrahahe*. Jayaratha quotes the verses of the *Rauravasūtrasamgraha* (2.14-15) on which this view was based and identifies the view as Bṛhaspati's, saying that the word *tataḥ* in *avyaktaṃ ca tataḥ* within that scriptural passage (2.15c) was taken by him to refer to Māyā ('and from that [, i.e. from Māyā, came the birth] of Avyakta'):

*atra ca avyaktaṃ ca tata iti tacchabdena māyāparamārśa iti
bṛhaspatipādāḥ. yad uktam: māyāto 'vyaktakalayoḥ kalāto rāga-
vidyayor iti*

And here the venerable Bṛhaspati takes the pronoun *tataḥ* to refer to Māyā. As he has stated: “[The birth] of Avyakta and Kalā is from Māyā and [that] of Rāga and Vidyā from Kalā”.¹⁶

Now, in *Tantrāloka* 9.217 Abhinavagupta gives another view of this same passage of the *Rauravasūtrasamgraha*:

*nanu śrīmadrauravādau rāgavidyātmakaṃ dvayam |
sūte kalā hi yugapat tato 'vyaktaṃ iti sthitiḥ |*

height, and 1,000 from front to back. On it are people who live on grass, leaves, and fruit, their bodies thickly caked with dirt, with long beards and hair, living like cows, naked, with a lifespan of 80 years. On it are found unbarred entrances to the caves through which one may enter the splendid world [beneath the earth]”. The term *bilasiddhiḥ* denotes the supernatural accomplishment of gaining access to the underworld through such caves; on these see SANDERSON 2005, pp. 280-282. The aim is to use one's Mantra-ritual to destroy the magical seals that bar these entrances; see, e.g. *Niśvāsaguhya*, f. 82v4 (10.125ab): *bilapraveśe japataḥ sarvayantrāṃ praṇāśayet*.

¹⁶ On this occasion, then, Abhinavagupta is quoting rather than paraphrasing Bṛhaspati.

Surely in such texts as the *Raurava* the position is that Kalā simultaneously creates the pair Rāga and Vidyā and thereafter Avyakta.

and Jayaratha explains that in this interpretation the pronoun *tataḥ* in *avyaktaṃ ca tataḥ* is understood to mean ‘thereafter, next’ rather than ‘from that [same Māyā]’, attributing this view to ‘the author of the *Vṛtti*’ (*vṛttikāraḥ*) – the *Vṛtti* that he intends is undoubtedly that of Sadyojyotis, since he explains the view expressed here by citing it¹⁷ – and the other, stated in 9.40cd, to ‘the author of the *Vārtika* (*vārtikakāraḥ*)’.¹⁸

Evidently, then, in all four passages (*Tantrāloka* 8.92, 8.101, 8.183, and 9.40) Abhinavagupta is referring to a *Rauravavārtika* by Br̥haspati that was a commentary on the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*.¹⁹

¹⁷ *Tantrāloka*viveka, vol. 5, p. 174, ll. 5-8: *tata itī rāgavidyāyugma-prasarād anantaram ity arthaḥ. tad uktam: “skandho ’paraḥ kalāyās tu yasmād etāḥ prajājñire | vidyārāgaprakṛtayo yugmāyugmakrameṇa tu”* ‘The word *tataḥ* [in *tato ’vyaktam*] means ‘immediately thereafter [, i.e. immediately after] the emanation of the pair Rāga and Vidyā. This has been taught [in the *Mokṣakārikā* section of the *Rauravavṛtti*] as follows: “But there is a second division of Kalā and from this Rāga, Vidyā, and Prakṛti [Avyakta] are born, [the first two] in tandem and [the third] on its own [thereafter]”. Sadyojyotis gives the same interpretation of the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*’s order of emanation in *Tattvasaṃgraha* 24ab: *avyaktarāgavidyāḥ kalāsamutthāḥ kalā ca māyājā* ‘Avyakta, Rāga, and Vidyā arise from Kalā, and Kalā from Māyā’.

¹⁸ *pūrvam punar vyākhyātr̥bhedam avalambya māyāto ’vyaktakalayor ityādy uktam. tatra his vārtikakāras tacchabdena māyāṃ vyākhyātavān. vṛttikāras tv ānantaryam itī.* ‘But when [Abhinavagupta] quoted above the passage that begins *māyāto ’vyaktakalayoḥ* he did so with the difference between the [two] commentators in mind. For the author of the *Vārtika* interpreted the pronoun *tataḥ* to refer to Māyā, whereas the author of the *Vṛtti* took it to mean next’.

¹⁹ For this conclusion see also GOODALL (2004, pp. lx-lxi, footnote 104).

Further proof that the *Rauravavārtika* was the work of Bṛhaspati is to be found in a verse quoted by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha in his commentary on *Mokṣakārikā* 93 and attributed by him to ‘the author of the *Vārtika*’ (*vārtikakāraḥ*). Here too we learn that this author differed from Sadyojyotis on a point of doctrine. The latter held that when the Vidyeśvara Ananta comes to the end of his term of office at the time of the great dissolution all eight Vidyeśvaras attain liberation. Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha takes this to mean that they do so simultaneously and opposes this to the view of the author of the *Vārtika* that when Ananta vacates his position for liberation the second Vidyeśvara moves up to take his place, the third the second’s, and so on, the position of the last and lowest Vidyeśvara being filled by a new Rudra whom Śiva selects for this role so that there are always eight in place:

*atra sūkṣmādinām ca mantrāṇām ca tadīśānām api
vīrabhadrādinām anantoparamakāla eva sarveṣāṃ yugapac chiva-
samatā parā muktīḥ. yac chrūyate: “anantoparame teṣāṃ mahatām
cakravartinām | vihitam sarvakartṛtvakāraṇam paramam padam |”
iti. ata eva na tu krameṇa yathā vārtikakāra āha: “anantoparame
sthānam tat tu sūkṣmo ’dhitīṣṭhati | padāt padam vicarato hy
ekaikasya mahātmanah | <> | sthāne śikhaṇḍinas tv anyam
rudrāṇām kurute śivaḥ |” iti.*

Line 2 *anantoparame* em. : *ananto parame* Ed. **Line 4** *anantoparame
sthānam* em. : *ananto parame sthāne* Ed.

Here all [these, namely] Sūkṣma and the other Vidyeśvaras, the Mantras, and Vīrabhadra and the other Mantreśvaras, simultaneously achieve equality with Śiva, the highest liberation, at the very moment when Ananta relinquishes his office. As Śiva has taught in his scripture: “It has been ordained that when Ananta retires those great Cakravartins attain the highest domain, the cause of the agency of all [beings]”. So [they are] not [liberated] one by one as the author of the *Vārtika* has claimed [in the verse]: “When Ananta retires Sūkṣma takes over his rank. As each great-souled [Vidyeśvara] ascends from

one rank to the next < the one below him takes his place >.²⁰ As for Śikhaṇḍin, [the most junior of the Vidyeśvaras, when he ascends to the next rank] Śiva appoints one of the [lower] Rudras to take his place”.

The same two views are also attributed by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha to the authors of the *Vṛtti* and *Vārtika* respectively in his unpublished commentary on the *Tattvatrayanirṇaya*:

mahāpralaye sarvānyatattvopasaṃhāre 'py etat tattvatrayam avasiṣyata ity arthaḥ. nanv etan nityatvābhīdhānād eva gatam. satyam. vipratipattinivṛttyarthaṃ tu punar uktaṃ yataḥ kaiścid rauravavārtikakārādibhir mahāpralaye 'nantopasaṃhāre vidyeśvarāntarāṇām anupasaṃhāra iṣyate. tat tv ayuktaṃ yugapanmuktiśruter iti darśitaṃ rauravavṛttau guruṇā. proktaṃ hi raurave "anantoparame teṣāṃ mahatāṃ cakravartinām | vihītaṃ sarvakartṛtvakāraṇaṃ paramaṃ padam" | iti.

MS f. 107v3-5.

Line 3 *mahāpralaye 'nantopasaṃhāre em. : mahāpralayanantopasaṃhāro* Cod.

The meaning [of verse 3cd] is that even at the time of the great dissolution, when all other Tattvas have been withdrawn, these three Tattvas [Śiva, souls, and Māyā] remain. It may be objected that we have already understood this from the fact that he has referred to them as eternal [in 3ab]. That is true. But the repetition has the purpose of eliminating a contrary view. For some, such as the author of the *Vārtika*, hold that when Ananta is withdrawn at the time of the

²⁰ I have conjectured that a whole half-verse has been lost at this point, since this seems to be the most economical hypothesis to account for the lack of syntactic and semantic completeness in the passage as published. The English within these angled brackets expresses what I infer from the context to be the gist of this conjectured lacuna.

great dissolution the other Vidyēśvaras are not. But the Guru [Sadyojyotis] has shown in his *Rauravavṛtti* that that [position] is incorrect because there is scriptural testimony that they are liberated simultaneously. For Śiva has taught in the *Raurava[sūtrasaṃgraha]*: “It has been ordained that when Ananta retires those great Cakravartins attain the highest domain, the cause of the agency of all [beings]”.

Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha does not state that the *vārtikakāraḥ* in these passages is Bṛhaspati; but there can be no reasonable doubt that he is, since exactly the view attributed here to the *vārtikakāraḥ* is attributed to Bṛhaspati’s *Śivatānu* in *Tantrāloka* 8.348-349 in a passage that is part paraphrase and part quotation of that text. Moreover, Abhinavagupta introduces this passage by saying that this is what the venerable Guru has said ‘in such Śāstras as the *Śivatānu*’ and Jayaratha explains that the Śāstras other than the *Śivatānu* of which Abhinavagupta is speaking are ‘such as the *Ruruvārtika*’, that is to say, the *Raurava-vārtika*,²¹ the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* also being referred to in our sources as the *Ruru*, *Rurusiddhānta*, or *Rurusamhitā*.²²

²¹ *Tantrāloka* 8.345ab: *uktaṃ ca gurubhir itthaṃ śivatānvādyeṣu śāsaneṣv etat*; Jayaratha thereon: *ādiśabdād ruruvārtikādi*.

²² See, e.g., *Tantrāloka* 1.46b: *svāyambhuve rurau*; *Tantrālokaviveka* thereon: *śrīrurāv api: yajanti vividhair yajñair...* (= *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* 2.21c-22b); Sadyojyotis, *Bhogakārikā* 2: *rurusiddhāntasaṃsiddhau bhogamokṣau sasādhanau | vacmi sādhakabodhāya leśato yuktisaṃskṛtau*; Takṣakavarta, *Nityādisaṃgrahapaddhati* f. 34r4-7: *tallakṣaṇaṃ ca rurusamhitādāv uktaṃ: uttānau tu karau kṛtvā hr̥ddeṣe susamāhitaḥ | aṅguṣṭhaṃ ca nipīḍyeta madhyato vinatāṅgulih | āvāhane prayoktavyā devadevasya cārcane | nipīḍayet tathāṅguṣṭhau hastayor ubhayor api | natau cābhimukhau kuryān niṣṭhurāyās tu *darśane* (conj.: *darśanā* Cod.) (= *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* 5.10cd, 11c-13b).

As for the *Śivatanu*, that is certainly by Bṛhaspati,²³ and considerably more of this work has survived. I know of only three verses that have been cited from it in Saiddhāntika sources, but some ninety lines are found at various points in Jayaratha's *Tantrāloka-viveka*. All are in the Āryā metre. There is more of the text in the *Tantrāloka* itself in the form of Āryā paraphrases or mixtures of quotation and paraphrase.²⁴

²³ See Jayaratha on *Tantrāloka* 1.104ab (*iti nirvacanaiḥ śivatanuśāstre gurubhiḥ smṛto devaḥ*): *gurubhir iti bṛhaspatipādaiḥ smṛta iti*; and, introducing *Tantrāloka* 8.230 (*uktaṃ ca śivatanāv idam ... guruṇā*): *etac ca bṛhaspatipādair evaṃ svagranthe vyākhyātam*; and Aghoraśiva on *Bhoga-kārikā* 120c-121b: *tad uktaṃ bṛhaspatipādaiḥ: api sarvasiddhavācaḥ kṣīyeraṇ dīrghakālam udgīrṇāḥ | māyāyām ānanyān nocyate srotasāṃ saṃkhyā | iti* (identically attributed by Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha on *Mṛgendra, Vidyāpāda* 9.1 and 13.177, and Trilocanaśiva in his *Siddhāntasamuccaya*, A, p. 167; B, p. 103). This is quoted from the *Śivatanu* in a close paraphrase in *Tantrāloka* 8.314.

²⁴ See (1) *Tantrāloka* 1.104ab: *iti nirvacanaiḥ śivatanuśāstre gurubhiḥ smṛto devaḥ* (the first and last lines of this passage are given by Jayaratha); (2) 8.230c-235a; (3) 8.264-271; (4) 8.273c-277; (5) 8.298c-299 (nine lines quoted by Jayaratha; emend *yac cakram* to *yaś cakram* in p. 206, l. 3); (6) 8.300cd (five lines quoted by Jayaratha); (7) *Tantrāloka-viveka*, vol. 5, p. 208, ll. 1-10 (five verses); (8) *Tantrāloka* 8.303-313b, 314-316 (paraphrase-cum-quotation; Jayaratha quotes three verses; the verse paraphrased in 314 has been quoted by Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha on *Mṛgendra, Vidyāpāda* 9.1 and 13.177); (9) 8.345-353b (paraphrase-cum-quotation; Jayaratha quotes four verses); (10) 9.206-212b (paraphrase-cum-quotation; emend *anayā vidvasya* in 9.209a to *anayāviddhasya*; Jayaratha quotes four verses; emend *śivaśāsinah* in p. 167, l. 5 to *śivaśāsinah*); (11) *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtī-vimarśinī*, vol. 3, p. 271, ll. 1-6 (three lines quoted; the source is given here under the variant title *Śivabrahmatanu: anyair iti śaivavyākhyātrbhiḥ. tathā hi śivabrahmatanugranthe gurupādair nirūpitam*). Two more verses in the Āryā metre and attributed to Bṛhaspati, therefore in all probability from the *Śivatanu*, have been quoted by Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha in *Mṛgendravṛtti, Vidyāpāda*, pp. 96 and 112.

Now, no manuscripts have been located of works that can be assigned to a time between these founding fathers and the Kashmirians of the tenth century; and therefore, since a long interruption in exegetical activity is implausible, we might be tempted to assume that Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha was acknowledging Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati as authors of the recent past. The principal purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that this assumption is wrong²⁵ and to offer in conclusion an explanation of the apparent absence of Saiddhāntika scholarship during the long period of time that I shall argue to have intervened between our two authors and the Kashmirian exegesis.

Within the Śaiva literature I know of no reference to Bṛhaspati earlier than those already mentioned in the works of authors of the latter half of the tenth century. Sadyojyotis, however, is cited by Somānanda. In 3.13c-14b of his *Śivadr̥ṣṭi* he refers to a statement made by ‘the Guru Khetapāla’ in his commentary on the *Svāyambhuva* in a passage that he identifies minimally as that which begins with the word *bādham*.²⁶ In his commentary on the *Śivadr̥ṣṭi* Utpaladeva gives the passage in full,²⁷ and this is fortunate because

²⁵ Most of the evidence for the date of Sadyojyotis that I shall present here in detail has been outlined with due acknowledgement by my former pupil Alex Watson (2006, pp. 111-114) following an early draft of part of this paper.

²⁶ *tathā cāha khetapālaḥ śabdarāśer viśeṣatām | svāyambhuvasya ṭikāyām bādham ityādinā guruḥ* ‘And to the same effect the Guru Khetapāla speaks of the syllabary in a special sense in his commentary on the *Svāyambhuva* in the [passage] that begins “Indeed”’.

²⁷ Utpaladeva, *Śivadr̥ṣṭivṛtti*, p. 103, II. 11-14: *khetapālaguruḥ śrīsvāyambhuvaśāstraṭikāyām “kiṃ śabdarāśer viśeṣo ’sti” ity ākṣipyā “bādham. ekaḥ śivātmako ’nyaś ca pāsātmakaḥ” ityādinā paratvena śabdarāśer mantrarūpasya karṭṛśaktāv avasthānād viśiṣyamānatām āha na tu śabda ity eva kṛtvā śabdarāśer nirviśeṣatvam* ‘In his commentary on the scripture *Svāyambhuva* the Guru Khetapāla speaks of the syllabary not in its common sense, that is to say, as simple audible sound, but in its special sense as transcendental [sound] since it resides within the power of the agent in the

otherwise it would have been a hard task to locate it in Sadyojyotis' *Svāyambhuvavṛtti*, since the text at this point has lost the word *bāḍham* through corruption in the two South Indian manuscripts that were available for the preparation of the edition. With Utpaladeva's assistance it is easily located in the commentary on 1.3.²⁸ Somānanda also mentions Sadyojyotis in *Śivadr̥ṣṭi* 3.64a; and 64bcd or 64b-65b are a quotation of his words, though these do not appear in his surviving works.²⁹ This permits us to say that Sadyojyotis was active at some time before the early tenth century. For Somānanda is unlikely to have been active before the first half of that century, since he was the Guru of Utpaladeva, who taught Lakṣmaṇagupta, who taught Abhinavagupta, of whom we have three dated works, completed in A.D. 991 (*Kramastotra*), 993 (*Bhairavastotra*), and 1015 (*Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivimarśinī*).

However, outside the Śaiva literature there is, I propose, much earlier evidence of knowledge of both our authors. I find it in the Mahākāvya *Haravijaya* of the Kashmirian poet Rājanaka Ratnākara,

form of the Mantra. He does so in the passage that begins after the challenge "Does the syllabary have a special nature?" with the words "Indeed [it has]. There is one [form of the syllabary] that is identical with Śiva and another that is a bond [of the soul]".

²⁸ Filliozat's edition of the *Svāyambhuvavṛtti* gives (p. 10, ll. 4-5): *kiṃ ca śabdarāśer viśeṣaś cābādhitaḥ śivātmakaḥ anyataraś ca pāsātmakaḥ*. This is evidently a corruption of the passage known to Somānanda and Utpaladeva, which we may assume by comparison was *kiṃ śabdarāśer viśeṣo 'sti. bāḍham. ekaḥ śivātmakaḥ anyāś ca pāsātmakaḥ*. Utpaladeva's reading *anyāś ca* is found in one of the editor's two manuscripts.

²⁹ *Śivadr̥ṣṭi* 3.64-65b: *tad aikyaṃ khetapālo 'pi prāha: yā kācana sthitā | śaktiḥ padārthajātasya devadevasya sākḥilā | śaktiśaktimatām uktā sarvatraiva hy abheditā* 'Even Khetapāla has taught this unity, saying that all powers of all things are entirely the power of Śiva. For in all [the Śaiva scriptures] we are told that powers and their holders are one'. Utpaladeva does not identify the source. It is perhaps one of the lost parts of the *Rauravavṛtti*.

composed around A.D. 830.³⁰ This contains in its sixth chapter a long hymn to Śiva (6.13-187) in which the poet has Spring praise that deity as the true nature of the diverse highest realities venerated in India's religious systems, using the terminology of each and working in paraphrases of formulations found in their authoritative texts. Among these systems is the Siddhānta, though nothing so prosaic as an explicit statement to this effect is allowed to compromise the obliquity required of fine verse composed for the delectation of the court. In the verses of the hymn that draw on the Siddhānta we can detect echoes of the scriptures *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*, and *Mataṅgapārameśvara*,³¹ and also of Sadyojyotis' *Svāyambhuvavṛtti* and Bṛhaspati's *Śivatānu*.

The evidence of Ratnākara's knowledge of the *Svāyambhuvavṛtti* is as follows. In *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 3.16 we read:

dharmād dharmāntaravyaktau satyāṃ loke gataṃ yathā |
procyate vaṭaparṇādi vastu tadvat pumān api |

F = ed. Filliozat 1991; V = ed. Venkaṭasubrahmaṇyaśāstrī 1937; N = NAK 1-348, f. 4v3.

16c *vaṭaparṇādi* em. : *paṭaparṇādi* FVN

Just as it is said that in the world a thing such as the leaf of a banyan goes, a new property appearing after another, so too the soul.

In his *Svāyambhuvavṛtti* Sadyojyotis makes sense of this obscure and awkward statement as follows:

³⁰ For this date see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 5-6, footnote 3.

³¹ See SANDERSON 2001, pp. 5-6, footnote 3 for the details of these borrowings.

*dharmād ekasmād apagatād dharmāntaravyaktau satyām loke
nīlatām vihāya pītatām gatam iti yathā procyate vaṭaparnādi vastu
tadvat pumān api paśvavasthām vihāya patyavasthām gata ity
āśayaḥ.*

Line 2 *vaṭaparnādi* em. : *paṭaparnādi* F

The idea of the verse is that just as it is taught that in the world a thing such as a banyan leaf becomes yellow [literally ‘goes to yellowness’] after losing its greenness, so too a person attains the condition of the Lord [literally ‘goes to the condition of the Lord’] after losing that of the bound, there being after one property that has disappeared the manifestation of another.

With this compare *Haravijaya* 6.161:

*apahāya yadvad iha nātha nīlatām
vaṭapādapacchada upaiti pītatām |
paśūtām apojjhya tava śāsane sthītaḥ
śivatām sureśa kila tadvad ety aṇuḥ*

O Lord, just as the leaf of a banyan tree in this world (*iha*) loses its greenness and becomes yellow, so, O Lord of the gods, the one established in your religion throws off, we are taught (*kila*), his condition as a bound soul and attains Śivahood.

The fact that this comparison of the metamorphosis of the soul with that of the banyan leaf occurs nowhere else in the Śaiva literature to my knowledge and the precise verbal correspondences between the core of Sadyojyotis’ gloss and Ratnākara’s verse show beyond reasonable doubt that the latter is based on the former, a conclusion strengthened by evidence that Ratnākara has polished his source for the sake of poetic elegance. He has jettisoned the awkward locative absolute phrase (‘there being after one property that has disappeared the manifestation of another’) and the expressions ‘thing such as’ (*-ādi*

vastu) and the *api* (after *pumān*), all of which are unnecessary; and he has adjusted three awkward features that Sadyojyotis has preserved out of fidelity to the scriptural source. The first concerns the expression *loke* ‘in the world’, which appears in the subordinate clause in the original, and remains there in Sadyojyotis’ gloss, with nothing in either to match it in the main clause. Ratnākara substitutes *iha* (= *iha loke*) for *loke* in the subordinate and adds ‘in your religion’ (*tava śāsane*) to balance it in the main, implying that this though not explicit in the original should be supplied to complete the intended sense. The second is his treatment of the word *procyate* ‘it is taught’. Ratnākara rightly sees that it makes no good sense in the subordinate clause – we don’t need to be taught that leaves turn yellow – but is appropriate in the main clause, since the liberation of the soul through the disappearance of its bondage and the manifestation of its Śivahood can be known by no means other than scripture. So Ratnākara has transferred the meaning of *procyate* to the main clause in the form of the particle *kila*, implying, in the terminology of the commentators, that he takes *procyate* to be *bhinnakramaḥ*, out of the position it would occupy in the unconstrained word order of prose. The third is the tenseless use of the participles *gatam* and *gataḥ*, an Aiśa feature of the original that Sadyojyotis simply reproduces in his gloss. Ratnākara has removed this deviation from high Sanskrit usage by substituting the present tense forms of synonymous verbs (*eti* and *upaiti*). For the rest he has simply accommodated it to the Mañjubhāṣiṇī metre by using synonymous expressions and adjusting the word-order: *nīlatām vihāya* → *apahāya ... nīlatām*; *pītatām gatam* → *upaiti pītatām*; *yathā ... tadvat* → *yadvat ... tadvat*; *vaṭaparṇ[ādi vastu]* → *vaṭapāda-pacchadaḥ*; *pumān* → *aṇuḥ*; *paśvavasthām vihāya* → *paśūtām apojjhya*; *patyavasthām gataḥ* → *śivatām ... eti*.

As for the *Śivatānu* of Bṛhaspati, a passage echoed by Ratnākara is found in 9.211c-212b of the *Tantrāloka*:

evam avidyāmalinaḥ samarthitas trividhakañcukabalena |
 212 *gahanopabhogagarbhe paśur avaśam adhomukhaḥ patati |*

211d *trividhakañcukabalena* em. following Jayaratha's lemma (*Tantrāloka*viveka, vol. 6, p. 169, II. 12-13: *trividhakañcukabaleneṭi trividhasya kalāvidyārāgātmanaḥ kañcukasya balena*) : *triguṇakañcukabalena* Ed.

Thus contaminated by nescience [and] animated by the triple force of the shrouds the bound soul falls head-down into the midst of the experience of [the abyss of] Māyā without the power to resist.

This, I propose, is the source of the first and third lines of *Haravijaya* 6.127-128:

trividhena kañcukamalena rūṣitān
gahanopabhogakuharābhipātinaḥ |
apakṛṣya pudgalagaṇān guhābilād
avadātātāṃ nayasi dūram icchayā |
 128 *avaśātmano viṣayaśaspamaṇḍalim*
abhilāṣukāṃś ciram adhomukhasthitin |
tvam anugrahonmathitapāsasamcayān
na paśūn pramocayasi pañcadharmaṇaḥ |

128a *avaśātmano viṣaya* em. Isaacson : *avaśān manoviṣaya* Ed.³²

³² This emendation, suggested to me by Prof. Harunaga Isaacson as a solution to the unsatisfactory idea conveyed by the edition's reading that bound souls graze on the grass not only of the objects of the senses but also of the mind (*manoviṣaya*-), has the virtue of the most compelling conjectures, namely that it substitutes the apposite for the impossible by postulating a minor and readily explained scribal error. For the conjuncts *tma* and *nma* are easily confused in the Kashmirian (Śāradā) script in which this text has been transmitted. I have subsequently found it confirmed by the reading of the Bodleian Library's manuscript of the text, which though also corrupt at this point gives *tma* rather than the edition's *nma* (f. 24r6): *aviśātmano*.

Having drawn up souls from the aperture of the abyss when, smeared with the triple impurity of the shrouds, they have fallen into the heart of the experience of Māyā through your will [alone], you lead them in the long ascent to the purity [of liberation]. [128] The bound remain for aeons without the power to resist, in thrall to the five qualities, their heads down [like cattle] desiring only to graze on the grassy sward of the objects of the senses. Yet do you not release them, destroying their bonds through your favour?

Of the parallels here, between *gahanopabhogagarbhe ... patati* and *gahanopabhogakuharābhipātinah*, between *avaśam adhomukhaḥ* and *avaśātmano ... adhomukhasthitin*, and between *samarthitas trividhakañcukabalena* and *trividhena kañcukamalena rūṣitān*, the third is weaker than one would expect in the light of the first two. However, I conjecture that the reading seen by Ratnākara was not *samarthitas trividhakañcukabalena* as given in the edition of the *Tantrāloka* and supported by Jayaratha's gloss but *samañjitas trividhakañcukamalena*, which, meaning 'smeared with the triple impurity of the shrouds', is exactly synonymous with his paraphrase. The confusion of *rth* and *ñj* is readily explained if a scribe had the latter before him in the orthographic variant *m̄j*, since *j* and *rth* are similar in shape in the Śāradā script of Kashmir. This error might then have prompted a scholarly 'correction' of *balena* to *malena* to provide better sense.³³

That a Kashmirian scribe should have written *aviśātmano* for *avaśātmano* is also readily explained, by the fact that the two words are indistinguishable in the Kashmirian pronunciation of Sanskrit.

³³ The reading of the *Tantrāloka* with *samarthitaḥ* and *balena* is probably the original, since it is in keeping with Śaiva doctrine; see, e.g., *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 1.10-11: *kalodbalitacaitanyo vidyādarśita-gocaraḥ | rāgeṇa rañjitaś cāpi buddhyādikaraṇais tataḥ | māyādyavani-paryantatattvabhūtātmavartmani | bhunkte tatra sthito bhogān bhogaikarasikaḥ pumān*; Sadyojyotis, *Svāyambhuvavṛtti* thereon: *kalayā karṭṛbhūtayā upodbalitaṃ samarthitam abhivyañjitaṃ caitanyaṃ yasyeti*; *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 3.3a: *tayodbalitasāmarthyāḥ*; *Svāyambhuvavṛtti* thereon: *tayā*

As for Ratnākara's memorable addition of the likening of bound souls immersed in the pleasure of their senses to animals with their heads down grazing on grass, that is most probably his own, prompted by the ambiguity of the term *paśuḥ*, which though used by Br̥haspati here in its technical Śaiva sense for the soul in the state of bondage also means in its common sense cattle or other tethered animals.³⁴

Dependence on the *Śivatānu* is also evident in the distinctive image of Śiva's drawing souls up and out through the entrance of the abyss [of Māyā] in the second line. This draws on another verse of the text cited in *Tantrāloka* (8.304):

dharmān aṇimādiguṇāñ jñānāni tapaḥsukhāni yogāṃś ca |
māyābilāt pradatte puṃsām niṣkṛṣya niṣkṛṣya |

After drawing them up and up out through the entrance of Māyā he bestows on souls the [four positive] qualities [of the intelligence], minuteness and the other [supernatural] attributes, the joys [that are the rewards] of asceticism, and the absorptions of meditation.

From these parallels we can be sure, therefore, that the works of both Sadyojyotis and Br̥haspati were in existence by the early ninth century, about a century earlier than the earliest reference to Sadyojyotis in the Śaiva literature, and about a hundred and fifty years

kāraṇecchayodbalitasāmarthyāḥ samarthitasāmarthyāḥ; ibid. on 1.12 (samarthitacaitanyaḥ): kalāsamarthitacaitanyaḥ; Kīraṇa, Vidyāpāda 1.16bcd: samāyāti śivāt kalā | tayodbalitacaitanyo vidyākhyāpitagocaraḥ; Mataṅgapārameśvara, Vidyāpāda 6.104c: tadudbalitavīryo 'nur bhūṅkte prakṛtjñān guṇān; Utpaladeva, Īśvarapratyabhijñānākārikā 3.2.11ab: kalodbalitam etac ca cittattvaṃ kartṛtāmayaṃ.

³⁴ A further case of dependence may be *Haravijaya* 6.139. This is based on *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 3.11-13; but Ratnākara's *dvidhā sthitā* may be drawing on *dvirūpā* in Sadyojyotis' gloss, since nothing corresponds to this in the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* itself.

before Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II acknowledged both as the founding fathers of his exegetical tradition.

Let us now consider what may be said concerning the date after which these works were composed. A prior limit for Sadyojyotis is established by the wording of his attacks on the Mīmāṃsakas. For there are five places in the *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* in which Sadyojyotis presents Mīmāṃsaka objections to theism and emanationism in terms that echo those used by Kumārila in his *Mīmāṃsāsloka-vārtika*:

(1) *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* 2.22:

*anukampāparatvāc ca sukhādy eva sṛjaty asau |
mohaduḥkhādi yat puṃsāṃ kurute tan na yujyate |*

Let [God] create happiness and the like because he is intent on compassion. [But] it is not reasonable that [such a being] brings about delusion, suffering, and the like for souls.

cf. *Mīmāṃsāsloka-vārtika*, *Sambandhākṣepaparihāra* 52cd:

sṛjey ca śubham evaikam anukampāprayojitaḥ |

If motivated by compassion he would create only what is good.

(2) *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* 2.28cd:

asvātantryaprasaṅgaḥ syān nanu karmādyapekṣiṇaḥ |

If he were dependent [when creating the world] on such [factors] as the [past] actions [of souls] there would be the undesired consequence that he would lack autonomy.

cf. *Mīmāṃsāsloka-vārtika*, *Sambandhākṣepaparihāra* 54:

tathā cāpekṣamāṇasya svātantryaṃ pratihanyate |

If he is dependent in his respect his autonomy is contradicted.

(3) *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* 2.75ab:

bījakarmāṇubhiḥ kecid atrāhuḥ siddhasādhyatām |

Some say that this [hypothesis suffers from the logical defect that it is redundant, because] it accounts for what has already been accounted for by primal matter, the actions [of souls], or atoms.

cf. *Mīmāṃsāsloka-vārtika*, *Sambandhākṣepaparihāra* 75, arguing for this redundancy on the basis of the actions [of souls]:

*kasya cid dhetumātratvaṃ yady adhiṣṭhārtocyate |
karmabhiḥ sarvajīvanām tatsiddheḥ siddhasādhanam*

If to be the controlling power of something is merely to be its cause then the hypothesis is redundant, because that [causality] has already been accounted for by the actions of all souls.

(4) *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* 3.2cd on the Mīmāṃsakas' objection to the Vedāntins' view that Brahman can create the world out of his own substance in the manner in which a spider spins a web from out of its own body:

yato lālākuvindo 'pi stambhādikam apekṣate

[No.] Because the spider too requires other [factors, in order to spin its web,] such as a pillar [to which to attach it].

cf. *Mīmāṃsāsloka-vārtika*, *Sambandhākṣepaparihāra* 51:

*nādhāreṇa vinā sṛṣṭir ūrṇanābher apīsyate |
prāṇinām bhakṣaṇāc cāpi tasya lālā pravartate*

Nor do we accept that a spider can emit [its skein] without a base [to which to attach it]. Moreover, the spittle [that becomes that skein] comes into existence as a result of its eating [other] living creatures.

and (5) *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* 3.50ab:

aśeṣakarmanāśe ca punaḥ sṛṣṭiḥ kutaḥ sthitā

sthitā conj. : *sthitih* Ed.

And if all the actions [of souls] cease to exist [at the beginning of a great dissolution] how could the world be created again [at its end]?

cf. *Mīmāṃsāslokaṅkāra*, *Sambandhākṣepaparihāra* 71ab:

aśeṣakarmanāśe ca punaḥ sṛṣṭir na yujyate

And if all the actions [of souls] cease to exist [at the beginning of a great dissolution] [the world's] being created again [at its end] is impossible.

In his commentary on the *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha shows that he is aware of these parallels by quoting all but the first two when explaining the relevant verses.

Finally, in his *Svāyambhuvavṛtti* on 4.5a Sadyojyotis tackles the view that the Śaiva scriptures' claim to be the word of Śiva is vitiated by the logical defect of mutual dependence:

*nanu ca śivenāgamah kṛtaḥ āgamāc ca śivo jñāyata itaretarāśra-
yatā syāt.*

Moreover, surely there would result mutual dependence, namely that [you say that] Śiva authored the scriptures and [at the same time] that these same scriptures are our [only] evidence of his existence.

The same objection had been raised by Kumāriḷa with respect to the theistic theory of the validity of the Vedas in *Mimāṃsāślokavārtika*, *Sambandhākṣepaparihāra* 61abc:

*evaṃ vedo 'pi tatpūrvas tatsadbhāvādibodhane |
sāśaṅko na pramāṇaṃ syāt*

Moreover, if you say that the Vedas originate from Prajāpati we would be bound to doubt their testimony as to his existence and attributes. So they would no longer be a valid means of knowledge.

It seems to me clear from these parallels that Sadyojyotis knew the *Ślokavārtika* of Kumāriḷa. This gives us a prior limit around the middle of the seventh century, since Kumāriḷa has been shown to be approximately contemporary with the Buddhist epistemologist Dharmakīrti.³⁵ Dharmakīrti cannot have been alive after about 660, since he is mentioned as a distinguished Indian scholar of recent times by the Chinese pilgrim Yijing, who was in India at the Nālandā monastery between 673 and 685. The only sure prior limit to Dharmakīrti's life is provided by our knowledge that he followed Dignāga, who belongs to the years 480-540³⁶ or 470-530,³⁷ and was the teacher of Dharmakīrti's teacher, Īśvarasena.³⁸ However, Erich Frauwallner argued that within this period of approximately one hundred years from the middle of the sixth to the middle of the seventh century we

³⁵ See KRASSER 1999. For the position that Kumāriḷa was an older contemporary of Dharmakīrti see STEINKELLNER 1997, p. 637.

³⁶ FRAUWALLNER 1961, pp. 134-37.

³⁷ HATTORI 1968, pp. 4-6.

³⁸ CHIMPA and CHATTOPADHYAYA 1997, p. 229; OBERMILLER 1986, pt. 2, p. 152; and FRAUWALLNER 1961, p. 141.

should discount the first half because Dharmakīrti was not mentioned by Xuanzang, who was in India about forty years earlier, from 629 to 641. He reasoned that if Dharmakīrti had been earlier than Xuanzang the latter could not have failed to speak of him.³⁹ Though this is an argument from silence, and therefore inconclusive, it does carry a fair degree of plausibility. We may conclude, therefore, that Dharmakīrti was active at some time between about 550 and 660, probably in the latter half of this period.

We can be sure, then, that Sadyojyotis was active at some time between the early seventh century, since he knows Kumāriḷa, and the early ninth, since he is known to Ratnākara.

Now, since the works of Sadyojyotis claim no more than human authorship, the fact that they are used by Ratnākara in this hymn on a par with the Saiddhāntika scriptures themselves suggests that they were already held in high esteem in his time, just as they were by later Saiddhāntikas, who refer to Sadyojyotis as a Siddha,⁴⁰ that is to say, as a human who had attained a superhuman status that entitled his utterances to have virtually the same authority as scripture itself. It is unlikely, then, that they were recent compositions in the time of Ratnākara. I know of no hard evidence that would enable us to determine how much earlier Sadyojyotis was writing. But there is some that supports the idea that he was nearer to Kumāriḷa's time than to Ratnākara's. This is the fact that when Sadyojyotis attacks Vedāntic monism he shows that he is unaware of the fundamentally revised form of that doctrine promoted by Maṇḍanamiśra and Śāṅkara, namely that the core teaching of the Upaniṣads and therefore of the

³⁹ See FRAUWALLNER 1961, pp. 137-139.

⁴⁰ We have seen Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha II refer to both Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati as Siddhas (p. 48). Sadyojyotis is referred to as 'the Siddha Guru' (*siddhaguruḥ* or *siddhaguravaḥ*, with the plural of respect) by the same in *Sārdhatriśatikālotṭaravṛtti* on 4.1c-2b (*siddhagurubhiḥ*), by Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṅkaṅṭha on *Mrgendra, Vidyāpāda*, 1.5, by Aghoraśiva on *Tattvaparakāśa* 58 (*siddhaguruṅā*) and *Ratnatrayaparikṣā* 176ab (*siddhagurubhiḥ*), and by Trilocanaśiva in *Siddhāntasamuccaya* A, p. 142; B, p. 73 (*siddhagurubhiḥ*).

Vedas is that the plural world of conscious and unconscious entities is an illusion (*māyā*) superimposed on an eternally undifferentiated and inactive Brahman, and that the liberation of the soul is the simple cessation of the ignorance (*avidyā*) that produces the illusion of the soul's differentiated reality. The Vedānta known to Sadyojyotis is the earlier doctrine according to which the plural world of conscious and unconscious entities is the real transformation (*pariṇāmaḥ*) of the supreme soul (*paramātmā*), and that liberation is the individual soul's dissolution (*layaḥ*) into that all-encompassing reality.

Sadyojyotis presents and rejects the doctrine of the Vedāntins in *Mokṣakārikā* 18c-25b and 131c-134b, *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā* 2b and 49-52, *Svāyambhuvavṛtti* on 2.2, and *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* 1.4ab. In *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā* 2b we find 'dissolution into the supreme soul' (*vilayaḥ paramātmani*) in a list of the definitions of liberation that he will refute in this section of his *Rauravavṛtti*. In 49-52 we find that refutation, the essential point of which is stated in 49:

upādānatvasamsiddhir vedānte paramātmanaḥ |
upādāne pralīnasya dhruvaṃ prāgvan nivartanam |

It is generally held that in the Upaniṣads [it is taught that] the supreme self is the material cause [of everything that exists]. If [liberation were that the soul] dissolves into this material cause then inevitably it would return as before [when creation begins again after the period of dissolution].

He makes the same point in his commentary on *Svāyambhuvāsūtra-saṃgraha* 2.2:

ye paśumatapraṇītā mokṣāḥ te tasminn avyucchinna eva bhavanti.
atas te kṣayadharmiṇaḥ. katham. ye tāvat paramātmādiṣūpādāneṣu
līnāḥ te teṣu pariṇamatsu punar nivartayiṣyante.

The liberations taught in the doctrines of non-Śaivas come about without the cessation of that [Impurity] and so they are transient. How? In the first place if people are [liberated by being] dissolved into some primal source such as the supreme soul (*paramātmā*) they will be reincarnated when that source undergoes transformation.

Finally, in *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* 1.4ab he presents the Vedāntins as holding that all things are one and attacks this monism by arguing that in that case there could be no means of knowing this to be true, since, he implies, knowing entails the duality of the act and its object:

sarvaikatvaprāsiddhau tu pramāṇam nāsti kiṃcana |

As for the established view [of the Aupaniṣadas that the Upaniṣads teach] that everything is one, [that is false, because in that case] there is no means of knowing it.

Now these doctrines that the supreme self (*paramātmā*) is the material cause (*upādānakāraṇam*) of all conscious and unconscious entities, that all these are therefore ephemeral transformations of that one cause (*sarvaikatvam*), and that liberation is the dissolution (*layaḥ, vilayaḥ*) of the individual soul (*jīvaḥ, jīvātmā*) into the supreme self are attributed to Bhartṛprapañca, the author of a commentary on the Upaniṣad *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*. No manuscript of that commentary has come to light; but its views are discussed by Sureśvara in his *Vārtika* on his teacher Śaṅkara's *Bhāṣya* on that Upaniṣad, and there are direct quotations in Ānandagiri's commentary on the *Vārtika* that show an exact correspondence to the Vedānta attacked by Sadyojyotis.⁴¹ Thus on *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣyavārtika* Ānandagiri quotes:

sarvaikatvaṃ paraṃ brahma paramātmā.

⁴¹ For the surviving citations from Bhartṛprapañca's commentary see HIRIYANNA 1924.

It is the oneness of all that is the highest Brahma, the supreme soul.

ibid., p. 1012:

sa paramātmakadeśaḥ kila.

According to the scriptures (*kila*) the [transmigrant soul (*jīvaḥ*)] is a particle of the supreme soul.

ibid., p. 1375:

dvidvidho mokṣo 'sminn eva śarīre sāksātkṛtabrahmā mukta ity ucyate na brahmaṇi līnaḥ. tasya śarīrapātottarakālaṃ brahmaṇi layo dvitīyo mokṣaḥ.

Liberation is of two kinds. A person is said to be liberated when he has had direct experience of Brahma while still alive. But he has not dissolved in Brahma. The second liberation is his dissolution (*layaḥ*) in Brahma after his death.

and *ibid.* p. 1241:

asya hi vijñānātmanaḥ paramātmany apyayo vaktavyaḥ.

For it must be said that [liberation is] the dissolution (*apyayaḥ*) of the consciousness-self into the supreme self.

Bhartṛprapañca's commentary on the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* has plausibly been assigned to the middle of the sixth century;⁴² and Maṇḍana and Śāṅkara, who introduced the doctrine of illusory transformation and of liberation through the cessation of that illusion, must have been near contemporaries living around the turn of the seventh and eighth centuries, shortly after Dharmakīrti and

⁴² NAKAMURA 1983.

Kumārila.⁴³ Their views had a major impact, pushing into obscurity the earlier doctrines of real transformation and dissolution associated with Bhartṛprapañca and attacked by Sadyojyotis, and once they had taken hold Sadyojyotis' critique of Vedāntic monism was evidently outmoded. It certainly seemed so to Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. In his commentary on *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā* 2b, where Sadyojyotis states the Vedāntic view of liberation for later refutation, Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha anticipates by presenting Sadyojyotis' target as the Vedāntic doctrine of illusory transformation (*māyāvādaḥ*). He then admits that the refutation in 49-52 shows that Sadyojyotis' target is not this but the doctrine of real transformation, the *pariṇativedāntaḥ*, as he will show in due course in his commentary on those verses. But he justifies his deviation on the grounds that the leading Vedāntins do not – we should rather say 'no longer' – consider real transformation to be the principal teaching of the Upaniṣads:

*nanv atra vṛttikartuḥ pariṇativedāntamatir evoddeśyatayābhimatā
na māyāvādamatiḥ. saiva upādānatvasaṃsiddhir iti vakṣyamāṇa-
dūṣanānusāriṇī. satyam. tadanusāriṇī. kiṃ tu naiṣā vedānteṣv
adhyātmavitpravarair mukhyatvena gīyate.*

Surely the author of the *Vṛtti* intends the Vedāntic doctrine of real transformation rather than that of illusion to be the topic mentioned here for later analysis. For it is that doctrine alone that agrees with

⁴³ For the period during which these two Vedāntins were active I accept the conclusion of Thrasher (1979). He shows that the prior limit of Maṇḍana is set by the fact that he quotes Dharmakīrti and Kumārila, both of whom were active during the second half of the seventh century, and the posterior limit by the facts (1) that Umbeka comments on him and (2) that Umbeka's commentary on Kumārila's *Mīmāṃsāślokavārtika* is quoted by Kamalaśīla (c. A.D. 740-95). He concludes that Śaṅkara was a near contemporary of Maṇḍana by combining the fact that Śaṅkara's disciple Sureśvara knew Maṇḍana, with an argument from a comparison of text-parallels that Maṇḍana was influenced by Śaṅkara.

the refutation that he will give below in the words “It is well known that [in the Upaniṣads the supreme self] is the material cause [of the universe]”. True. That is the [doctrine] with which it agrees. But this is not the position that the best Vedāntins declare primary in the Upaniṣads.

It is hard to believe, then, that Sadyojyotis, committed as he was to defending his religion against all serious opposition, would have omitted to attack the illusionist Vedānta once it had established itself in the orthodox brahmanical community. Thus while we have no firm evidence of the limits of Sadyojyotis’ life beyond the facts that he knew Kumārila (c. 600[?]-650) and was known to Ratnākara c. 830, it is likely that he was active towards the beginning of this period, at some time from c. 675 to c. 725.

Certain other facts, while not proving this early date, become less surprising if it is accepted. I have already mentioned one, namely the fact that Ratnākara treats Sadyojyotis as an authoritative source of Saiddhāntika doctrine on a par with the scriptures themselves. I see three others. The first is the name Sadyojyotis. Saiddhāntika scriptural sources teach that initiates may belong to any one of four Gocaras ‘initiation lineages’ and that their induction into these determines the second, final member of the name they receive at the time of initiation (the first being that of one of the aspects or subordinates of Śiva). The four lineages are the Śiva, the Jyotis, the Śikhā, and the Sāvitra. Thus:

(1) *śivo jyotiḥ śikhā caiva sāvitraś ceti gocarāḥ |*
caturdhā bhedaṃ āyānti punaś cāśramabhedaḥ |

...

(2) *yena ye dikṣitās te ’pi tadgocarasamākhyaḥ |*
khyātās tv āśramadharmās ca svecchāsamkalpato bhavet |
(3) *etās saṃjñā dvijāgryāṇāṃ rājādīnāṃ gaṇāṅkitāḥ |*
śaktisaṃjñās tu vai strīṇāṃ sarvāsāṃ parikīrtitāḥ |

*Vidyāpurāṇa*⁴⁴ quoted in *Nityādisaṃgrahapaddhati*, f. 63v12, f. 64r12-13

[3c] *tu vai conj.* : *tu vā Cod.*

The Gocaras are Śiva, Jyoti, Śikhā and Sāvitra. Each is subdivided in accordance with the division between the disciplines [of the Brahmacārin, Gṛhastha, Vānaprastha and Bhikṣu]. ... Persons carry the name of the Gocara of those who have initiated them, while the religious regimes of the [four] disciplines [adopted within each] are a matter of personal choice. These names [ending in -śiva, -jyotis, etc.] are proper to brahmins. The names of Kṣatriyas [, Vaiśyas] and [Śūdras] are distinguished by the [ending] -gaṇa, while all women are required to have names [ending] in -śakti.

Treatments of these four Gocaras and their internal subdivisions according to the brahmanical disciplines are also found in Paṭala 39 of the *Kiraṇa*, in the manual *Kriyāsaṃgrahapaddhati* of Vāladhārin, and in the *Gotrasaṃtati* of Aghoraśiva.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ This is a Saiddhāntika scripture in spite of its title.

⁴⁵ The 39th chapter of the *Kiraṇa* in the Nepalese recension is devoted to describing the sixteen divisions of these four Gocaras, four within each according to the four disciplines, but does not list the four Gocaras themselves. But in the South Indian recension seen in the Devakōṭṭai edition this passage is preceded by the following (*Caryāpāda* 9.2-3b): *śivaś śikhā tathā jyotis sāvitraṃ ceti gocaram | gocaram kulam ity uktaṃ tac cihnaṃ śivaśāsane | cihnitās tena cihnena śaivā jñeyānyathā na vā*. The *Gocara-paṭala* of the *Brhatkālottara*, which incorporates the definitions of the sixteen as taught in the *Kiraṇa*, opens as follows (vv. 1-2b): *punar eva pravakṣyāmi caturdhā śivagocaram | śivaḥ śikhā tathā jyotiḥ sāvitrāś ceti gocarāḥ | gocaram tu kulaṃ jñeyaṃ tena jñeyas tu dikṣitaḥ*. Vāladhārin, *Kriyāsaṃgraha*, ff. 90v-92v: *tatas tu śrāvayet tasya śivākhyam bhāvam uttamam | gocaram pūrvakam jñeyaṃ tadvihīnam na śaśyate | gocaram ca kulañ cihnaṃ śaśane śivasamjñake | lakṣyante yena te śaivā nṛpavat saṃsthitā<ḥ> kṣitau | śiva<ḥ> śikhā tathā jyoti<ḥ> *sāvitrī (em. : sāviti Cod.) guṇabhe-*

Now the initiation names of a great many Saiddhāntika Śaivas are preserved for us in Śaiva literature and epigraphy. But among these I have seen only three that end with -jyotis. Two are our Sadyojyotis (= Sadyojātajyotis) and Ugrajyotis (= Aghorajyotis), whom Sadyojyotis acknowledges as his Guru at the end of the *Nareśvara-parīkṣā* and *Mokṣakārikā*. The third is an Aghorajyotis mentioned in an inscription of the reign of Mahāśivagupta Bālārjuna, the Pāṇḍu-vaṃśin king of Dakṣiṇa Kosala, who ruled *c.* 590-650.⁴⁶ All other names encountered end in -śiva or its synonym -śambhu. Moreover, the *Pauṣkarapārameśvara*, one of the early Saiddhāntika scriptures, contains a passage which says that only those with names in -śiva are pure Śaivas, whose food one may accept.

śaivasyānnaṃ na bhoktavyam avijñāya tu gocaram |
śivāṅkaṃ nāma yeśāṃ tu śuddhaśaivās tu te smṛtā

Pauṣkarapārameśvara in *Nityādisaṃgrahapaddhati*, f. 115v7

One may not eat a Śaiva's food unless one has first learned his Gocara. It is those whose names are distinguished by [the ending] śiva that are held to be the Pure Śaivas.

dataḥ. Aghoraśiva, *Gotrasaṃtati*, p. 419: *gotraṃ śivaṃ śikhā jyotiḥ sāvi-tryākhyam iti smṛtam.*

⁴⁶ An abstract of the inscription has been published by Ajay Mitra Shastri (1995, Pt. 2, p. 382). In his chronology Mahāśivagupta Bālārjuna ruled *c.* 740-800. But to accept that dating we have to accept his argument that the Sūryavarman who was the father of Vāsaṭā, wife of the nephew of Tivaradeva and mother of Mahāśivagupta Bālārjuna, was not the Maukhari prince of that name who issued the Haraha inscription in A.D. 554. Bindeshwari Prasad Sinha (1977, pp. 116-19) has shown the invalidity of this denial and Hans Bakker (1994, pp. 1-66) has followed his lead to propose that Mahāśivagupta Bālārjuna ruled *c.* 590-650, observing that this is fully consistent with the archaeological dating of the monuments in Sirpur built by him and his mother Vāsaṭā.

It is probable, then, that the Jyotis Gocara was marginalized if not eliminated at an early date.

The second fact that fits an early date for Sadyojyotis is his concern to differentiate his Mantramārgic tradition from that of the earlier Śaiva systems of the Atimārga. He does not mention them by name, but he states and rejects their doctrines of the nature of liberation in *Mokṣakārikā* 118-124b and 129c-131b, and *Paramokṣa-nirāsakārikā* 7, and 13-42.

Thirdly, it is striking that in his presentation and refutation of Buddhist doctrines there is no evidence of his being familiar with the works of Dharmakīrti.⁴⁷ That he should know the *Mīmāṃsāśloka-vārtika* of Kumāriḷa but not the works of Dharmakīrti, though these two were contemporaries and though both became the pre-eminent representatives of their traditions in subsequent doctrinal debates, may surprise. But it is conceivable that Dharmakīrti was slower than Kumāriḷa to attain his central position, perhaps because of the exceptional difficulty of his works. His earliest commentators, Devendrabuddhi (c. 630-690), Śākyabuddhi (c. 660-720), and Vinīta-deva (c. 710-770), are mere clarifiers of his often opaque and difficult Sanskrit, and it is only from well into the eighth century that we have the philosophical commentaries of Arcaṭa (c. 730-790), Dharmottara (c. 730-790), and Prajñākaragupta (c. 800). Nonetheless, Dharmakīrti was not so slow to achieve fame that he escaped the attention of Maṇḍanamīśra at the beginning of the eighth century and the Naiyāyika Śaṅkarasvāmin in its second half.⁴⁸ So this third factor too is consistent with Sadyojyotis' having been active in the period c. 675-725.

⁴⁷ This point was made to me by Dr. Kei Kataoka (then of the University of Tokyo) while he, others, and I were reading the *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* and Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary on it in my Oxford classes of 1998.

⁴⁸ See WATSON 2006, p. 113, footnote 190, drawing on correspondence from Prof. Steinkellner.

As for Br̥haspati, it is much less clear how much earlier than Ratnākara he lived. The only prior limit that I can see at present is very early: in his *Śivatanu* he draws on the *Mataṅgapārameśvara*,⁴⁹

⁴⁹ (1) *Śivatanu* quoted by Jayaratha on *Tantrāloka* 8.348 in which he sets out the doctrine of the rise of souls through the ranks of the Vidyeśvaras (*tatparate 'nante paripātyā nāyakās tadadhikāram | kurvanti saṃcarantaḥ padāt padam śāsanāt patyuh | uparamati patir anantas tatpadam adhiṣṭhāti prabhuh sūkṣmaḥ | sūkṣmapadam api śivottama eṣa vidhiḥ sarvamantrāṇām | vāmādyān nava vibhāvān bhagavān nijatejasah samuddiyotyā | anugrhyānum apūrvam sthāpayati patiḥ śikhaṇḍinaḥ sthāne* ‘When among these Ananta has retired the [other] Vidyeśvaras take over his office moving up from position to position one by one by the command of the Lord. The Lord Ananta retires. Lord Sūkṣma occupies the position [he has vacated] and Śivottama the position of Sūkṣma. This is the way for each of the Mantras. Then the Lord favours a new soul by illumining the nine [Śaktis] beginning with Vāmā that are the] expansions of his radiance and places him in the [vacated] position of Śikhaṇḍin [the lowest of the eight Vidyeśvaras]’) ← *Mataṅgapārameśvara, Vidyāpāda* 5.8-15 (8 *teṣām athāgrāṇiḥ sūrah samarthaḥ parameśvaraḥ | jyeṣṭho 'dhikārī viśvātmā vṛto rudraiḥ sahasradhā | 9 yataḥ so 'rhati kartṛtve niyogo 'sya tataḥ śivāt | paripātyāgrataḥ prāptaḥ sa ca tasmai samarpite | 10 nirvāti kṛtakṛtyatvād ananto 'nanta-viryavān | tatas tasmīn samārūḍhe pañcamantratanuḥ śivaḥ | 11 dadāty ājñāṃ susūkṣmasya vidyeśasya mahātmanah | sa ca prāptavaraḥ śrīmān bhartur ājñānuvartakah | 12 tattantraḥ padam ānantam adhiṣṭhāya mahāyāsāḥ | nivartayaty adhaścakram yat tan māyātmakaṃ jagat | 13 evaṃ śivottamasyāpi sūkṣmasyoparame śivaḥ | pradadātīśasamghasya kāraṇatvam aninditam | 14 padāt padam vicarato hy ekaikasya mahātmanah | yāvat sā paramā kāṣṭhā tāvac cakrasya kāraṇam | 15 avyucchedāya rudrāṇām kṛtvā śaktibalānvitam | niyunakti pade tasmīn yavīyāmsam śikhaṇḍinam); (2) *Śivatanu* cited in *Tantrāloka* 9.210c-211b (*rāgaś ca kalātattvāc chucivastrakaṣāyavat samutpannaḥ | tyaktuṃ vāñchati na yataḥ saṃsṛtisukhasamvidānandam*) ← *Mataṅgapārameśvara, Vidyāpāda* 11.2-4b (*tasmād evāśayād rāgaḥ sūkṣmarūpo 'bhijāyate | yenāsau rañjitaḥ kṣipram bhogabhug bhogatatparaḥ | prītiṃ badhnāti sahasā yayā teṣu nimajjati | ānandāhladakatvena tanmayo na vibhāvyate | notsaheta parityaktuṃ bhogān snigdhatayā sadā*) and *Vidyāpāda* 8.40c-41 (*tato 'bhibhūyate gādham**

and that Tantra must have been written after the end of the fifth century and probably not before the second half of the sixth because it has borrowed the definition of valid sense-perception formulated by the Buddhist Dignāga (c. 480-550) in his *Pramāṇasamuccaya*.⁵⁰ I am able to say, therefore, only that he lived at some time between Ratnākara in the early ninth century and the redaction of the

rāgeṇātibalīyasā | niyamyate yathā pañkaḥ sakaṣāye 'pi vāsasi); (3) Śīvatānu quoted in *Tantrāloka* 9.208c-209b (*tasya dvitīyacitir iva svacchasya niyujyate kalā ślakṣṇā | anayāviddhasya paśor upabhogasamarthatā bhavati*) ← *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Vidyāpāda* 11.1 (*athānor visṛtasyāsyā kalāviddhasya vegataḥ*), *Vidyāpāda* 9.9ab (*iśadunmilitātmānaḥ kalayāviddhamūrtayaḥ*), *Vidyāpāda* 9.28a (*tathānuḥ kalayāviddho bhogāñ śaknoti vāsitum*); and *Vidyāpāda* 9.19ab (*samarthikṛtya kalayā bhogeṣu vinipātyate*); and (4) Śīvatānu quoted in *Tantrāloka* 9.211cd (*evam avidyāmalinaḥ samarthitas trividhakañcukabalena*) ← *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Vidyāpāda* 11.33c-34b (*rāgavidyākālākhyena kañcukatritayena vai | pracchāditaḥ samarthātmā kṣetrī kṣetraphalaṃ prati*).

⁵⁰ The text-place is *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Yogapāda* 4.15c-16a: *anirdeśyam asaṃdigdhaṃ kalpanāpoḍhagocaram | pratyakṣam* ‘Sense-knowledge is unobjectifiable, free of doubt, and free of imagination.’ This rests on the definition *pratyakṣam kalpanāpoḍham* given by Dignāga in the *pratyakṣaparicchedaḥ* of his *Pramāṇasamuccaya* (HATTORI 1968, pp. 25, 82, note 1.25). It might be urged that the distinctive part of this definition, the expression *kalpanāpoḍham* ‘free of imagination’, is also in the revision of that definition proposed by his grand-pupil Dharmakīrti (600[?]-660) in the *Nyāyabindu* 1.4: *pratyakṣam kalpanāpoḍham abhrāntam*, ‘Sense-knowledge is free of imagination and non-erroneous’; and that therefore the prior limit must come down to the seventh century at the earliest. But the fact that the definition in the Tantra does not reflect the additional element in the revised version, namely that sense-knowledge should be not merely free of imagination but also ‘non-erroneous’ (*abhrāntam*), suggests that this new definition had not yet been formulated or, if it had, that Dharmakīrti’s work was sufficiently new for it not to have been widely known. The new definition is adopted in the fourth *Ṣaṭka* of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, f. 212v2 (64.22c-23b): *indriyavyavasāyaṃ ca kalpanāpoḍham eva ca | abhrāntam iti pratyakṣam pramāṇaṃ pravacāritam*.

Mataṅgapārameśvara, which cannot have taken place before the sixth. If we allow time for Dignāga's doctrine of perception to become common knowledge among the learned, for the *Mataṅgapārameśvara* to be propagated and accepted as one of the principal Saiddhāntika scriptures, and for Bṛhaspati's works, like Sadyojyotis', to attain a position of such influence, then we may place his life within the period *c.* 650-750. This is a guess, but it is not likely to be far from the truth.

We have, then, an astonishingly long gap in the transmitted literature of Saiddhāntika exegesis, one which may have extended from *c.* 700 to the first Kashmirian exegetes *c.* 900 and which cannot possibly cover less than a hundred years, since Ratnākara's knowledge of Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati *c.* 830 provides an absolute limit *c.* 800. How are we to explain this lacuna?

Consider the following verse in the opening of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha's commentary on the *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, in which he plays on two meanings of the word *mātaṅgaḥ*: 'the [Siddhānta] taught to [the sage] Mataṅga', that is to say, the *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, and 'elephant':

*4 kaiścid vedāntanītau kuladr̥ṣi tu parair nyāyadr̥ṣṭau tathānyais
tyaktvā siddhāntasiddham guruvaragaditam vartma nītaḥ kumārge |
mātaṅgo 'yaṃ yato 'taḥ kumativihataye 'nena vṛtṭyaṅkuśena
kṣeptum mārgē pravṛttās tam iha nanu vayaṃ granthavidbhiḥ
parīkṣyāḥ*

4a *vedāntanītau* BORI MS, f. 119r : *vede 'nunītaḥ* Ed. (also GOODALL 1998, p. xxxi)⁵¹ • *dr̥ṣṭau tathānyais* BORI MS : *dr̥ṣṭāv athānyais* Ed. **4b**

⁵¹ I have rejected the reading *vede 'nunītaḥ* because it entails a double of *nītaḥ* in *nītaḥ kumārge* that is both awkward as such and lexically odd, and because the variant *nītau* in *vedāntanītau* matches *dr̥ṣi* and *dr̥ṣṭau*. Moreover, *vedānta-* is appropriate in the context, which is clearly that of metaphysical doctrine rather than theory of ritual, since while the Kaula view could influence Saiddhāntika Śaiva ritual the Nyāya could not. The syllables *nta*

siddhāntasiddham Ed. : *siddhāntam siddham* BORI MS **4c** *vena* BORI MS : *yena* Ed. **4d** *tam iha* BORI MS : *tad iha* Ed. • *granthavidbhiḥ* Ed. : *guruvidbhiḥ* BORI MS.

Leaving the highway established in the Siddhāntas⁵² and declared by the foremost of Gurus, this Tantra of Mataṅga (/this elephant) has been led down wrong paths, by some towards the doctrine of the Upaniṣads, by others towards the Kaula doctrine, and yet others towards that of the Nyāya. I therefore aim here to use the elephant-goad of this commentary to drive it back on to its proper path so that [these] wrong views may be eliminated. Surely [, then,] I deserve to be carefully examined by those who know [this] text.

The reason for the long lacuna, then, cannot have been that exegetical activity was absent during this intervening period, since Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha himself testifies to its existence in this verse. Moreover, we have evidence of commentaries on the *Mataṅga* which, though never mentioned by the Kashmirian Saiddhāntikas, are cited by their Kashmirian Śākta Śaiva contemporaries. Thus Somānanda refers to one by a Vyākhyāni in his *Śivadr̥ṣṭi*;⁵³ and Abhinavagupta

and *nu* are readily confused in the Kashmirian script. The reading *vede* or another referring to the Veda rather than the Vedānta seems, however, to have been well established, at least in the Far South, since when Aghoraśiva paraphrases this verse in one of the introductory verses of his commentary on the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* of Śrīkaṇṭha the false views are said to be those of the Veda, Kula, and Nyāya: *kaiścid vedadr̥ṣāparaiḥ kuladhīyā nyāyānuvṛṭtyetarair anyaiś ca svamanīṣayā malinitam mohena ratnatrayam* ‘In their delusion some have contaminated the *Ratnatraya* with the doctrine of the Veda, others with that of the Kula, others by following the Nyāya, and yet others with ideas of their own’.

⁵² The Siddhāntas (*siddhāntāḥ*) are the scriptures of the Siddhānta. For the term in this sense see SANDERSON 1992, p. 281, footnote 3.

⁵³ *Śivadr̥ṣṭi* 3.14c-15b: *tathā mataṅgaṭīkāyāṃ vyākhyāniguruṇoditam | mantrāṇām paraśabdānām uktaṃ vāco na jātucit* ‘Likewise the Guru Vyākhyāni has declared in his commentary on the *Mataṅga* that [this special

to another by an Aniruddha in his *Tantrāloka*; and in the second at least we see a doctrine concerning Śiva's power to liberate that is more in keeping with Abhinavagupta's position than that of the Kashmirian Saiddhāntikas.⁵⁴

character] is that of the Mantras and transcendental sounds and never of [the faculty of] speech'. Utpaladeva comments on this, quoting Vyākhyāni: *tathā vyākhyānīsaṃjñakena guruṇā mataṅgaṭīkāyām evam eva viśiṣṭa<tvā>m uktam. tathoktam: pramāṭṛbhūmigatānām mantrāṇām parabhūmigatānām ca śabdānām na tu vāgindriyasya kadācit. vāgindriyaṃ hi māyāpada eva sthitam. śabdā tu paratanmātrarūpaḥ paravyomamahābhūtamayaḥ parameśvarasya pañcabrahmanyāse vaktram ucyate* 'The Guru named Vyākhyāni has taught exactly this superior character in his commentary on the *Mataṅga*. Thus he has said: "... of the Mantras at the level of the agent of cognition and of sounds on the highest level, never of the faculty of speech. For that is limited to the level of Māyā. Sound, however, if it has the form of the transcendental sense-datum, being one with the element ether in its transcendental nature, is what is meant by the 'face' of the Supreme Lord in the [formulas of the] installation of the five Brahma[mantras]". Vyākhyāni refers here to the Mantra element TATPURUṢAVAKTRĀYA in the sequence ĪŚĀNAMŪRDHĀYA/ĪŚĀNAMŪRDHNE TATPURUṢAVAKTRĀYA AGHORAHRDAYĀYA VĀMADEVAGUHYĀYA SADYOJĀTAMŪRTAYE in the Vyomavāpimantra; see *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Kriyāpāda* 1.72c-76b; and *Parātrīśikāvivarāṇa* on *Parātrīśikā* 26ab (*mūrdhni vaktre ca hrdaye guhye mūrtau tathaiva ca | nyāsaṃ kṛtvā*): *mūrdhādīni bāhye tathocitarūpāni. vastutaḥ paraṃ brahmarūpābhihitapañcātmaḥ paravyomādīdharāṇyantasatattveśānādisāracid-unmeṣecchājñānakriyārūpāny eva mantralingād yathā mantrā* ĪŚĀNAMŪRDHNE TATPURUṢAVAKTRĀYA AGHORAHRDAYĀYA VĀMADEVAGUHYĀYA SADYOJĀTAMŪRTAYE *iti*.

⁵⁴ *Tantrāloka* 13.293c-295b: *śrīmatāpy aniruddhena śaktim unmīlinīm vibhoḥ | 294 vyācakṣāṇena mātaṅge varṇitā nirapekṣatā | sthāvarānte 'pi devasya svarūponmilanātmikā | 295 śaktiḥ patantī sāpekṣā na kvāpīti suvistarāt* 'The venerable Aniruddha too has taught that [Śiva's liberating power] is autonomous when commenting on the Lord's 'power that awakens' in the Tantra of Mataṅga [the *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Vidyāpāda* 4.44], explaining at great length that when the power of the Lord descends it is beholden to nothing, being an unfolding of the nature of the self that can take

Reading Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's castigation of deviant exegesis of the *Mataṅga* in the light of the verse already cited from the same introduction, in which he identifies Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati as those who 'have revealed [to us] the true path [of understanding] in [the study of] the Siddhānta' (*yābhyāṃ prakāśitaṃ vartma siddhānte*),⁵⁵ I consider it to be overwhelming probable that 'the foremost of Gurus' (*guruvara-*) of the former are the founding fathers of the latter. I propose therefore that Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha saw the purpose of his commentary to be to return the Siddhānta to the principles set out by these much earlier authorities.

We now have an explanation of the absence in the works of the Kashmirian Saiddhāntikas of any citations of predecessors other than Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati. It is not that there were no such authorities to cite but rather that there were none that they, as revivalists seeking to return the Siddhānta to the doctrinal purity of an earlier age, were prepared to cite. That no manuscripts of the works that they rejected should have come down to us is hardly surprising. For it was their exegesis that prevailed, and it was this that was taken up in the twelfth century in the South. The Śākta Śaiva successors of Abhinavagupta might have had reason to preserve some of these works of earlier Saiddhāntika scholarship through repeated copying if only because they may have been less distant, as Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha suggests, from their own positions and therefore might have been preferred as support for their desire to minimize the gulf that the revivalist exegesis had opened up between the doctrinal positions of the two schools. But the Saiddhāntika tradition lost ground and disappeared in Kashmir in subsequent centuries and once this had happened there can have been little reason to continue to copy the works of its less famous authors.

place even in the extreme case of immobile life-forms'. Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha would not have approved of this position, being concerned to limit the operation of Śiva's *śaktipātaḥ* to meritorious mature human beings; see *Kiraṇavṛtti* on *Vidyāpāda* 6.11d-12.

⁵⁵ See p. 47-48 for text and translation.

ABBREVIATIONS

BLO	Bodleian Library, Oxford
BORI	Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune
Cod.	The reading of the manuscript
conj.	My conjectural emendation
corr.	My correction
Ed.	The reading of the edition
em.	My emendation
IFP	Institut français de Pondichéry
KSTS	Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies
NAK	National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu
NGMPP	Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project Reel Number
T	Transcript

REFERENCES

SANSKRIT TEXTS: MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS

Aṣṭaparakarṇa, ed. Kṛṣṇāstrī. Devakōṭṭai: Śivāgamasiddhāntaparipālanasaṅgha, 1923 (the *Tattvaparakāśa* of Bhojadeva, and the *Tattvasaṅgraha* and *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* of Sadyojyotis, with the commentaries of Aghoraśiva) and 1925 (the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* of Śrīkaṇṭha, the *Bhogakārikā* of Sadyojyotis, and the *Nādakārikā* of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, with the commentaries of Aghoraśiva; and the *Mokṣakārikā* and *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā* of Sadyojyotis with the commentaries of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha).

Īśvarapratyabhijñānakārikā: Īśvarapratyabhijñānakārikā of Utpaladeva with the author's vṛtti, ed. R. Torella. Serie Orientale Roma 71. Rome, 1994.

Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivismarśinī of Abhinavagupta, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul. KSTS 60, 72, 75. Bombay, 1938-43.

Kiraṇa. NAK 5-893, NGMPP A40/23; palm-leaf; Licchavi script; incomplete; penned in A.D. 924.

Kiraṇa, Vidyāpāda 1-6 with the commentary (-*vṛtti*) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. → GOODALL 1998.

Kiraṇatantra, ed. Ti. Rā. Pañcāpageśaśivācārya and K.M. Subrahmanyaśāstrī. Śivāgamasiddhāntaparipālanasaṅgha 16. Devakōṭṭai, 1932.

Kriyāsaṃgrahapaddhati of Vāladhārin. Kathmandu, Kaiser Library 63, NGMPP C5/3; palm-leaf; Nepalese Bhujimol script; penned in A.D. 1090/1.

Gotrasaṃtati of Aghoraśiva. = *Mahotsavavidhi*, pp. 419-23.

Jayadrathayāmala, Śaṭka 4. NAK 1.1468, NGMPP B122/4; paper; Newari script; penned in A.D. 1626/7.

Tattvaparakāśa of Bhojadeva with the commentary (-*vṛtti*) of Aghoraśiva. → *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*.

Tattvatrayanirṇayavivṛti of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. Lucknow, Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad, 2390; paper; Śāradā script.

Tattvasaṃgraha of Sadyojyotis with the commentary of Aghoraśiva. → *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*.

Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta with the commentary (-*viveka*) of Rājānaka Jayaratha, ed. Mukund Rām Śāstrī. KSTS 23, 28, 30, 35, 29, 41, 47, 59, 52, 57, 58. Bombay and Srinagar, 1918-38.

Nareśvaraparīkṣā of Sadyojyotis with the commentary (-*prakāśa*) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 45. Srinagar, 1926.

Nityādisaṃgrahapaddhati of Rājānaka Takṣakavarta. BORI 76 of 1875-76 ('*Bhṛṅgeśasaṃhitā*'); paper; Śāradā script.

Niśvāsaguhya. NAK 1-227, NGMPP A41/14 ('*Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*'), ff. 42r5-114v. Palm-leaf; Licchavi script; penned c. A.D. 900.

Nyāyabindu of Dharmakīrti, with Dharmottara's *Ṭikā* and Durvekamiśra's *Dharmottarapradīpa*, ed. Dalsukh Malvania. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 2. Patna, 1955.

Paramokṣanirāsakārikā of Sadyojyotis with the commentary (-*vṛtti*) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. → *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*.

Parātrīśikāvivarāṇa of Abhinavagupta: *Il commento di Abhinavagupta alla Parātrīśikā*, ed. Raniero Gnoli. Serie Orientale Roma 58. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1985.

Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣyavārtika of Sureśvara with the commentary (-*sāstraprakāśikā*) of Ānandagiri, ed. Kāśīnātha Śāstrī Āgāse. Poona: Ānandāśrama Press, 1937

Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi of Bhaṭṭa Vidyākaṇṭha II, a commentary on the *Mayasaṃgraha*. Jammu, Shri Raghunath Temple MSS Library, 5291, now in the collection of the Ranbir Research Institute, Jammu; paper; Kashmirian Devanāgarī.

Bhogakārikā of Sadyojyotis with the commentary (-*vṛtti*) of Aghoraśiva. → *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*.

Mataṅgapārameśvara, Kriyāpāda, Yogapāda, and Caryāpāda, with the commentary (-*vṛtti*) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha on *Kriyāpāda* 1.1-11.13, ed. N.R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFP 65. Pondicherry: IFP, 1982.

Mataṅgapārameśvara, Vidyāpāda, with the commentary (-*vṛtti*) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. → BHATT 1977.

Mataṅgapārameśvaravṛtti of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. BORI 235 of 1883-1884; paper; Śāradā script. Not collated in BHATT 1977.

Mahotsavavidhi ascribed to Aghoraśiva. Printed as the sixth part of Aghoraśiva's *Kriyākramadyotikā* by Mayilai-Alakappa Mudaliyār (no editor reported). Madras: Civañānapotayantracālai. 2nd edition, 1910.

Mīmāṃsāsāśloka-vārtika of Kumārila with the commentary (*Nyāyaratnākaravyākhyā*) of Pārthasārathimīśra, ed. and rev. Svāmī Dvārikādāsa Śāstrī. Vārāṇasī: Tara Publications, 1978.

Mṛgendra, Vidyāpāda and Yogapāda, with the commentary (-*vṛtti*) of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shāstrī. KSTS 50. Srinagar, 1930; *Kriyāpāda* and *Caryāpāda*, with the commentary (-*vṛtti*) of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, ed. N. R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFP 23. Pondicherry: IFP, 1962.

Mṛgendrapaddhatiṭikā of Vaktraśambhu. IFP T. 1021; paper; Devanāgarī.

Mokṣakārikā of Sadyojyotis with the commentary (-*vṛtti*) of Rāmakaṇṭha. → *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*.

Ratnatrayaparīkṣā of Śrīkaṇṭha with the commentary (*Ratnatrayollekhinī*) of Aghoraśiva. → *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*.

Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha. → *Rauravāgama*.

Rauravāgama, ed. N.R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFP 18. 3 volumes. Pondicherry: IFP, 1961, 1972, and 1988. Volume one includes the surviving chapters of the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*, published here as the *Vidyāpāda* of the *Rauravāgama*.

Śivadr̥ṣṭi of Somānanda with the commentary (*-vṛtti*) of Utpaladeva, ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shāstrī. KSTS 54. Srinagar, 1934.

Sārdhatriśatikālottara with the commentary (*-vṛtti*) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, ed. N. R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFP 61. Pondicherry: IFP, 1979.

Siddhāntasamuccaya of Trilocanaśiva. IFP T. 284, pp. 127-174 (A) and IFP T. 206, pp. 56-111 (B). Unpublished edition prepared by Dr. Dominic Goodall.

Svacchanda and *-uddyota* of Kṣemarāja, ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shāstrī. KSTS 31, 38, 44, 48, 51, 53, and 56. Bombay, 1921, 1923, 1926, 1927, 1930, 1933, 1935.

Svāyambhuvavṛtti of Sadyojyotis. → FILLIOZAT 1991.

Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha. NAK 1-348, NGMPP A 30/6. Palm-leaf; Nepalese Kuṭīla script; incomplete.

Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha, ed. Venkaṭasubrahmaṇyaśāstrī. Mysore. 1937.

Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha [1.1-4.7] with the commentary (*Svāyambhuvavṛtti*) of Sadyojyotis. → FILLIOZAT 1991.

Haravijaya of Ratnākara. BLO Stein Or. d. 52; paper; Śāradā script.

Haravijaya of Ratnākara with the incomplete commentary of Alaka, ed. Durgāprasāda and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab. *Kāvya-mālā* (reprint) 22. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Sansthan, 1982. Originally published: Bombay, Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1890.

MODERN AUTHORS

BAKKER, Hans. 1994. Observations on the History and Culture of Dakṣiṇa Kosala (5th to 7th centuries A.D.). In *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn*, edited by Nalini Balbir and Joachim K. Bautze, pp. 1-66.

BHATT, N.R., ed. 1977. *Mataṅgapārameśvara (Vidyāpāda)* avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. Publications de l'IFP 56. Pondicherry: IFP.

CHIMPA, Lama and Alaka CHATTOPADHYAYA, transl. 1997. *Tāra-nātha's History of Buddhism in India*. Delhi. First published in 1970.

FILLIOZAT, Pierre-Sylvain, ed. and trans. 1991. *Le Tantra de Svayambhū, vidyāpāda, avec le commentaire de Sadyojyotiḥ*. Geneva: Librairie Droz S.A. [*Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 1.1-4.7 with the *Svayambhuvavṛtti* thereon].

FRAUWALLNER, Erich. 1961. Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie für das indologische Institut der Universität Wien* 5, pp. 125-148.

GOODALL, Dominic. 1998. *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra. Volume I: chapters 1-6. Critical edition and annotated translation*. Publications du département d'Indologie 86.1. Pondicherry: IFP/École française d'Extrême-Orient.

- . 2004. *The Parākhya Tantra, a Scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta. A critical edition and annotated translation.* Collection Indologie 98. Pondicherry IFP/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- HATTORI, Masaaki. 1968. *Dignāga, On Perception, being the Pratyakṣapariccheda of Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya, from the Sanskrit fragments and the Tibetan versions.* Harvard Oriental Series 47. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- HIRIYANNA, M. 1924. Fragments of Bhartṛprapañca. In *Proceedings of the Third All-India Oriental Conference 3*, pp. 439-50. Reprinted in M. Hiriyanna, *Indian Philosophical Studies*, Vol. 2, Mysore, 1972, pp. 6-16.
- KRASSER, Helmut. 1999. Dharmakīrti's and Kumāriḷa's Refutations of the Existence of God: a Consideration of their Chronological Order. In *Dharmakīrti's Thought and Its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy. Proceedings of the Third International Dharmakīrti Conference. Hiroshima, November 4-6, 1997*, edited by Shoryu Katsura, pp. 215-223. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- NAKAMURA, Hajime. 1983. *A History of Early Vedānta philosophy*, translated into English by Trevor Leggett. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.
- OBERMILLER, E. trans. 1986. *The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet by Bu-ston.* 2nd ed. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1986. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica, 26. Originally published: Heidelberg, 1932.
- SANDERSON, Alexis. 1992. The Doctrine of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra. In *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism. Studies*

in Honour of André Padoux, edited by T. Goudriaan, pp. 281-312. Albany: State University of New York Press.

———. 2001. History Through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras. In *Les sources et le temps. Sources and Time. A Colloquium, Pondicherry, 11-13 January 1997*, edited by François Grimal, pp. 1-47. Publications du département d'Indologie 91. Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.

———. 2005. Religion and the State: Śaiva Officiants in the Territory of the King's Brahmanical Chaplain. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 47 (2004), pp. 229-300.

SHASTRI, Ajay Mitra. 1995. *Inscriptions of the Śarabhapurīyas, Pāṇḍuvamśins, and Somavamśins*. 2 volumes (Part I: Introduction; Part II: Inscriptions). Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research and Motilal Banarsidass.

SINHA, B.P. 1977. *Dynastic History of Magadha, cir. 450-1200 A.D.* New Delhi: Abhinav Publications.

STEINKELLNER, Ernst. 1997. Kumāriḷa, Īśvarasena and Dharmakīrti in Dialogue. A New Interpretation of Pramāṇavārttika I 33. In *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḷ. Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by Petra Kieffer-Pūlz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

THRASHER, A.W. 1979. The Dates of Maṇḍana Miśra and Śāṅkara. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 22, pp. 117-137.

WATSON, Alex. 2006. *The Self's Awareness of Itself: Bhaṭṭa Rāma-kaṇṭha's Arguments against the Buddhist Doctrine of No-self*. Publications of the De Nobili Research Library 32. Vienna.

WHITNEY, William Dwight. 1960. *Sanskrit Grammar: Including both the Classical Language, and the Older Dialects, of Veda and Brahmana*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Originally published: 1889.