A First Edition and Translation of
Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha’s Tatvātārayanirṇayavivṛti,
A Treatise on Śiva, Souls and Māyā, with Detailed Treatment of Mala

Dominic Goodall,
Kei Kataoka, Diwakar Acharya, Yuko Yokochi

南アジア古典学 第3号 別刷
South Asian Classical Studies, No. 3
2008年7月 発行
A FIRST EDITION AND TRANSLATION
OF BHAṬṬA RĀMAKAṆṬHA'S TATTVATRAYANIRṆAYAVIVṛTtb IN
A TREATISE ON ŚIVA, SOULS AND MĀYĀ,
WITH DETAILED TREATMENT OF MĀLA

BY
Dominic GOODALL, Kei KATAOKA, Diwakar ACHARYA, Yuko YOKOCHI

Introductory Note

This article presents a first edition and translation of the commentary of the tenth-century Saiddhāntika theologian Bhaṭṭa Rāmaṇāṭha II, an older contemporary of the Kashmirian theologian Abhinavagupta, on the Tattvatrāyanirṇaya of Sadyojoyotī. Sadyojoyotī was probably active between 675 and 725 AD\(^1\) and is the first systematising theologian of the Śaiva Siddhānta of whom works survive. The three entities alluded to in the work’s title are God, souls and primal matter (māya), but much of the work is devoted to determining the nature of a fourth entity, an innate impurity (mala) that afflicts all souls and that determines the relations between the three entities of the title.

Although Rāmaṇāṭha was a Kashmirian, a number of his works survive only in the South of India. Exceptions are the Mataṅga-vṛtti, which is transmitted both in South Indian sources and in Kashmirian ones, and the Naretvaraparikṣāprakāśa, which is transmitted almost exclusively in Kashmirian sources. The Tattvatrāyanirṇayavivṛti, transmitted in a single Śāradā manuscript, now joins Rāmaṇāṭha’s oeuvre. Like the Naretvaraparikṣāprakāśa, it appears not to have been transmitted in South Indian sources.

Another, shorter commentary on the Tattvatrāyanirṇaya survives, by the well-known twelfth-century follower of Rāmaṇāṭha’s theological school, Aghoraśiva, and this was printed along with the first edition of the kārikās (E\(_D\)), as well as in both subsequent editions, that of Vrajavallabha Dwivedī (1988: E\(_V\)) and Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat (1991: E\(_F\)). Aghoraśiva’s commentary departs from that of Rāmaṇāṭha both in its interpretations and in its readings of Sadyojoyotī’s work, and it seems a reasonable assumption that Aghoraśiva, who knew and echoed Rāmaṇāṭha’s commentaries on the Kīraṇa, the Mataṅga, the Sārdhatriśātikālottara, the Mokṣakārikā and the Paramokṣanirūsakārikā, did not know Rāmaṇāṭha’s commentary on the

\(^1\)See SANDERSON 2006, the conclusions of which regarding Sadyojoyotī’s date are to be found on p.76.
Tattvratrayanirṣaya.\textsuperscript{2} It is possible that the work never reached the South of India. Furthermore, we are aware of no reference in any other work of the Śaiva Siddhānta to the existence of the Tattvratrayanirṣayavivṛti.

One might conjecture that one reason for the work’s limited spread is that it was written in a relatively remote place. Rāmakaṇṭha’s concluding verse mentions that he composed it while in Dārvābhīṣāra, a place that might have been outside his usual working area. But we are not certain of where Rāmakaṇṭha usually lived. The concluding verse of the Kiraṇavṛtti reveals that he began to write that work in Vijayapura (see Goodall 1998:xi–xii), on the bank of the Vitastā, and finished it on the bank of a river called the Candrabhāga. As Peter Bisschop has pointed out to us,\textsuperscript{3} Dārvābhīṣāra was delimited by these two rivers according to Stein.\textsuperscript{4} Since the Kiraṇavṛtti too was composed in Dārvābhīṣāra and actually survives in South India, it is possible that others of Rāmakaṇṭha’s works were also written there, in other words that this was in fact Rāmakaṇṭha’s regular working area, and that the merest chance dictated that the Tattvratrayanirṣayavivṛti never came to be transmitted in the South.

Although preserved in just one manuscript, the work seems relatively well transmitted and we found the task of constructing a readable text less difficult than we had feared. A similar project (undertaken by S. L. P. Anjaneya Sarma, Alex Watson and Dominic Goodall) to edit and translate Rāmakaṇṭha’s Paramokṣanirāsakārikāvṛtti has taken years of work to approach completion: that work is admittedly longer, more wide-ranging and philosophically richer, but the principal reason why it has taken so much longer to work through is that it is transmitted poorly and in a large number of

\textsuperscript{2}Sanderson, to whom we provided a first draft of the edition, rather implies (2006:44) that Aghoraśīva might have known the Tattvratrayanirṣayavivṛti, but he is there defending the proposition that Aghoraśīva might have composed a commentary on the Ratnaratrayaparikṣā in spite of knowing that a commentary by Rāmakaṇṭha on the same work existed. It is similarly conceivable that Aghoraśīva knew of the existence of the Tattvratrayanirṣayavivṛti when he wrote his own Tattvratrayanirṣayavivṛti, but we think that it can be reasonably assumed that he had not studied the Tattvratrayanirṣayavivṛti, nor does Aghoraśīva make reference to it in any of his surviving commentaries.

\textsuperscript{3}In an undated letter to Dominic Goodall.

\textsuperscript{4}Stein (1979:32–33, annotation to Rājataraṅgiṇī 1:180) identifies the area as follows: ‘From the evidence available it appears that Dārvābhīṣāra as a geographical term comprised the whole tract of the lower and middle hills lying between the Vitastā and Candrabhāga. [The Candrabhāga seems to mark the eastern limit of the territory in the passage of the Viṣṇupur., iv. p. 223.] From Rājat. viii. 1531 and the topographical point discussed in note viii.1861, it is clear that the hill-state of Rājapurī (Rajauri) was included in Dārvābhīṣāra.’
sources. Editing Rāmakaṇṭha’s Tattvatrayanirṇavativṛti has seemed vastly easier (which is not to say that we feel confidence in having resolved all its problems).

The commentary of Aghoraśīva on the Tattvatrayanirṇaya, reedited and translated into French by Filliozat (1991), is, by contrast, a very much simpler composition. In general Aghoraśīva follows, imitates and echoes Rāmakaṇṭha’s interpretations quite closely, but, as we have mentioned above, it seems to us unlikely that Aghoraśīva had access to Rāmakaṇṭha’s Tattvatrayanirṇavativṛti. Unlike, Rāmakaṇṭha, whose style is more discursive and whose interpretations seem often distortive, Aghoraśīva seems to stick extremely closely to commenting on Sadyojyotih’s verses. We had therefore at first thought that it would be interesting to compare Rāmakaṇṭha’s interpretations of the Tattvatrayanirṇaya with those of his twelfth-century epigone Aghoraśīva; but we found that for much of the work the readings of Aghoraśīva’s text are simply different from those of Rāmakaṇṭha: the two exegetes were not commenting on the same wording. Our edition is therefore significant also as a fresh testimony for a part of Sadyojyotih’s œuvre. Given that Rāmakaṇṭha is nearly two centuries closer in time to Sadyojyotih, we would expect his text to be better, and this expectation seemed occasionally confirmed (e.g. verse 19). In at least three places, however, we suspected Aghoraśīva’s text to be superior (verses 6, 27 and 31). In other places, neither text seemed unquestionably better than the other. As for our policy in constituting the mālāpātha, it was simply to put what Rāmakaṇṭha read, but, wherever his commentary did not make clear what wording he was following, we followed the readings of our sole manuscript, L, as long as they were metrical and interpretable.

It has been rewarding to find in this work another body of evidence that helps us to reconstruct Rāmakaṇṭha’s thought and its place in the development of Saiddhāntika theology. Of particular interest in this regard, perhaps, is the discussion of pralaya in his commentary on verse 3, which furnishes further evidence about the virtually forgotten Saiddhāntika exegete Bṛhaspatipāda and his relation to Sadyojyotih and to the Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha. The primary focus of the Tattvatrayanirṇaya, however, despite its title, is the innate impurity of souls (mala) and, more particularly, a justification of the tenet that the ripening of this impurity (malaparipāka) is required to account for the attainment of liberation by different souls at different moments.

Here follows a brief outline of the topics treated in the text (verse numbers appear in the right-hand column):
1 upodghātaḥ
   1.1 namaskāraḥ 1
   1.2 saṁbandhāhāhidheyaprayojanāni 2
   1.3 tattvatrayam 3-4

2 īśāḥ
   2.1 sādharmyam 5a
   2.2 pārameśvaraḥ 5b
   2.3 muktēśvarāḥ 5cd
   2.4 sakalākālaprabhedaḥ 6

3 puruṣāḥ
   3.1 mañランドhaḥ 7
   3.2 antiṣṭatam 8
   3.2 śīvavasākāraḥ 9

4 maḷaḥ
   4.1 mokṣavaicitryam 10
      4.1.1 punābalanītyatvam
      4.1.2 maḷaśaktayaḥ 11
      4.1.3 maḷapariṇātataḥ 12
      4.1.4 sādhanād udayabhedaḥ 13
      4.1.5 sādhanānanyam 14-16
   4.2 maḷapariṇāmāḥ
      4.2.1 srṣṭisthitikāle 17-19
         4.2.1.1 maḷapariṇāmakaḥ
         4.2.1.2 muktiyogasādhanam 20-21ab
      4.2.2 svāpakāle 21cd
   4.3 iśvarasya svātāntaryam
      4.3.1 sthitikāle 22
         4.3.1.1 svatantraśaṅtipātavādīnam praty uttaram
         4.3.1.2 karmabhogaḥ 23-25
         4.3.1.3 pūrvapakṣīṇaḥ punaruttarābhidhānam 26abc
         4.3.1.4 siddhāntinaḥ pariḥāraḥ: ubhayatra samānam 26d-27
      4.3.2 svāpakāle 28
      4.3.3 punanāśrṣṭikāle 29-30ab
   4.4 maḷopasamhāraḥ 30cd-31

5 prakaraṇopasamhāraḥ 32
According to Aghoraśiva’s commentary on verse 2, Sadyojyotih’s *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* elaborates the *Śvāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*’s presentation of doctrine, in contrast to the *Tattvasaṅgraha* (among other texts), in which Sadyojyotih expounds that of the Raurava: śrīmadrauravasiddham arthasadbhūvan tattvasaṅgrahena saṃkṣepāḥ prakāśya, śrīmadśvāyambhuvasiddham anena prakāśayati. It may be that Sadyojyotih himself makes the same point in *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* 32, where he describes himself as the author of the commentary (vr̥ti) on the *Śvāyambhuva*, but we cannot be certain that he means to express thereby that the *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* is an exposition of the doctrines of the *Śvāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*.

It does seem, however, that Sadyojyotih’s theology in general depends to a greater extent on the *Śvāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* than on the other Siddhāntatantras that we may assume him to have known. The only two Saiddhāntika scriptures that we know him to have known are the *Śvāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*, on which he wrote a partial commentary, and the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, on which his Bhogakārikā, Mokṣakārikā and Paramokṣani rāsakārikā are commentaries.\(^5\) Among the other Siddhāntatantras that survive, the *Niśvāsa* and the shorter non-eclectic recensions of the *Kāloṭṭara* (*Dviśatikāloṭṭara* and *Śārdhatriśatikāloṭṭara*) appear conceptually less developed and so likely to be earlier still.\(^6\) Within this small group of early scriptures, the most advanced doctrinally is unquestionably the *Śvāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*: not only is it the only one in whose cosmography the ladder of worlds (*bhuvanādhvāna*) has been mapped on to the ladder of *tattvas* (*tattvādhvāna*),\(^7\) but it is also the only one which makes mention of innate impurity (*mala*).

Now *mala* is absolutely central to Sadyojyotih’s system, just as it is for those of all the known works of the Śaiva Siddhānta that postdate him. Furthermore, it is in the *Śvāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* that Sadyojyotih can find what may be the only early (if oblique) allusion to the doctrine that is the focus of our text, namely the ripening of impurity (*malaparipāka*), which he detects in *Śvāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 1:17 (quoted several times by Rāmakāṇṭha in the course of our text). It would therefore not be surprising if Sadyojyotih meant to imply, in verse 32, that his *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* was an exposition of an important nexus of doctrines that is presented in

---


\(^6\)For some indication of why we believe the *Niśvāsa* may be the earliest Śaiva tantra to survive, see Goodall and Isaacson 2007.

\(^7\)On this matter, see Tāntrikābhidhānakosā III [forthcoming] s.v. *tattvādhvāna*. The *Dviśatikāloṭṭara* and *Śārdhatriśatikāloṭṭara* cannot be compared on this point, since they present no cosmography.
the Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha. Filliozat (1991:134) expresses this in the following way:

Sadyojoyoti laisse entendre que ce présent ouvrage sur le mala et les trois entités qu’il relie entre elles a une relation particulière avec un des grands Tantra de son école, le Svāyambhuva. Il a composé le présent opuscule après avoir écrit un commentaire de cet āgama. Il le dit dans le vers final. Il y a une parenté certaine entre les deux textes. La relation n’est pas celle d’un ouvrage de base et d’un résumé. Auteur du commentaire du Tantra, Sadyojoyoti a repensé la matière qu’il avait expliquée pas à pas en suivant le texte canonique. On ne peut donc reconnaître de concordance phrase à phrase ou section à section entre les deux textes. Mais on ne relève non plus aucune contradiction, aucune divergence entre eux.\(^8\)

Remarks on the Manuscript

Kei Kataoka remarked some years ago upon the existence of the sole surviving MS of this work in Lucknow and Dr. Imre Bangha kindly helped us to obtain a copy of only the relevant pages of the manuscript: Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad, Accession No. 2390.\(^9\)

The manuscript is on paper and written in Śāradā script of no special calligraphic merit. The writing occupies 11 lines to a side and a generous margin surrounds the text. The text of the Tattvāranyārayaṇavivṛti covers only a few pages (ff. 106r–118r) and follows upon the text of the Śivasūtra-vimāsini of Kṣemarāja, the colophon of which occupies the bottom lines of f. 105v. Immediately after the colophon to the Tattvāranyārayaṇavivṛti, which ends on line 3 of f. 118r, there appears the following verse:

\[ \text{sandhyāvandana bhadram astu bhavato bho śnāna tadbhyan namo} \]

\(^8\) Sadyojoyotiḥ implies that the present work on impurity and the three entities that it connects has a special link with one of the major tantras of his school, the Svāyambhuva. He composed the present small work after having written a commentary on that āgama. He says so in the final verse. There is certainly a relationship between the two texts. The relationship is not that of a base-text and a résumé. As the author of a commentary on the Tantra, Sadyojoyotiḥ has rethought the subject-matter that he had expounded step by step and following the canonical text. It is therefore not possible to identify a sentence-by-sentence or section-by-section correspondence between the two texts. But one cannot discover any contradictions or divergences between them either.

bho devaḥ pitaraś ca tarpāṇavidhau nāham kṣamaḥ kṣamyatām
duḥṣaṃsārawikārabhāśkarakaraprabhārabhāroddhatām
cetāḥ samprati citsudhājalanidhau pūrṇe śive majjatu.¹⁰

After that follows what appears to be a Vedantic discussion of suṣupti that begins with the words suṣuptāv ahaṅkārabhāve pi tadvāsaṅvāsitājanābhāsakasya caītanyasya svatāḥ.... The discussion breaks off, just as it starts, in media re, and so there is no label to identify the work; but an argument in it is identified with the tag iti madhusūdīnāyam. If this is a reference to a work of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, the manuscript could not have been copied before the eighteenth century. It seems to us to be unlikely to be as early as that, but our limited experience allows us to compare it with only a few handfuls of manuscripts in Śrāda script. One relatively late feature of the script that we have seen in many other Śrāda documents is not to be found in this manuscript: our manuscript marks no distinction between śṭa and śṭha. The regularly spaced marked lacunae in some parts of the text (e.g. in verse 7 and in the commentary thereon) suggest that it descends from an exemplar that had damaged corners.

As we have indicated above, the text seems to have been rather well transmitted with relatively few copying errors. Typical Kashmirian copying errors connected with Kashmirian pronunciation (confusion of a and ā; ā and e; da and dha, etc.) appear to be rare. If there is one kind of error that predominates, it is the accidental dropping of portions of text. Clear cases, by way of example, are to be found in the quotation of Mātānāvidyāpāda 25:62c at the end of the commentary on verse 3 and in the quotation of Kīraṇa 2:26ab towards the end of the commentary on the first half of verse 4. In most cases, we think, the bits of text that have been dropped are just a few syllables long, but we have in a few places judged that longer units of text have been accidentally missed out and, where we felt confidence in being able to reconstruct the argument, we have supplied what we think

¹⁰This appears to be an adaptation of Vilvamaṅgaḷa’s Kṛṣṇakarpūraṇṭa 2:107:

sandhyāvandana bhadrām astu bhavato bhoḥ smāna tubhyaṁ nāmo
bho devaḥ pitaraś ca tarpāṇavidhau nāham kṣamaḥ kṣamyatām
yatā knāp niśīḍya yuddvākukotātmanasya kamaṁvāya
smāraṇaṁ smāraṇaṁ agraḥam harāmi tād aḷāṁ mānya kīm anyena me.

Relatively late dates have in the past been proposed for this work and doubt has been cast on the authenticity of its second and third āśvāsa, but the presence of a verse inspired by it in our manuscript is after all of no great use to us as a means of dating our manuscript, for Kunjuṇni Raja’s detailed discussion (1958:31–51) convincingly dates the Kṛṣṇakarpūraṇṭa to not later than 1300 AD (1958:44) and shows that suspicion about the authenticity of the second and third āśvāsa is not particularly well-founded (1958:34–40).
would have been conveyed in double angled brackets. With such diagnostic conjectures we are of course unlikely to have hit upon the exact wording that Rāmakanṭha used.

Who did what?

Since this is an edition prepared by many hands, we add here a word about our working procedure. The work was first typed in from the manuscript by Dominic GOODALL and read over once rapidly by Dominic GOODALL and Diwakar ACHARYA together in 2004 at the Pondicherry Centre of the École française d’Extrême-Orient. The above two then proposed a month-long meeting with Kei KATAOKA to finalise together a critical text and English translation. With the gracious financial aid of the Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science, Dominic GOODALL was able to come to Japan for the month of March in 2008. This team of three was then able to read through and discuss the text together in long, uninterrupted daily sessions, first in the Indology Department of Kyushu University, Fukuoka, and then at Kyoto University. At almost all of these sessions in both cities, Yuko YOKOCHI was also able to participate. A draft English translation was prepared by Dominic GOODALL and circulated for discussion, and, at the same time, a draft Japanese translation was prepared by Kei KATAOKA, which was circulated among the Japanese participants who sat in on the reading sessions (Dr. Yasunori HARADA and Mr. Kazuho YAMASAKI in Fukuoka, and Professor Masato FUJI, Dr. Kazuo KANO, Dr. Makoto KITADA, Dr. Werner KNOBL, Dr. Taisei SHIDA, and Miss Junko SHINODA in Kyoto).\footnote{Dominic GOODALL also read and discussed the first few pages of the work in Pondicherry in February 2008 with Alberta FERRARIO and Dr. Marzena CZERNIAK-DROŻDZOWICZ. And a considerable number of important last-minute corrections and suggestions were made by e-mail by Professor Harunaga ISAACSON, to whom we are most grateful.} Our interpretation—and therefore our punctuation, choice of readings, and all our proposed emendations—resulted from these stimulating group sessions and the edition is therefore very much a joint effort.

We conclude this brief introduction with a word of thanks to the Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad, Lucknow, for granting us access to the manuscript.
तत्त्वत्त्वविरङ्गविवृत्ति: ||
शम्भो यदा भवदुप्रादकप्रकोऽवलिभयो विमलं भवन्तम्।
पर्यन्त्यक्षणदेवतां ननु वादभाजों भेदाविभेदधनमा विकला तदानीम्॥

3 इह हि तत्त्वसंग्रहादायके दिन पश्चिमश्लस्त्रविचरणे प्रकाशम्मत्व भोक्तृगमभोगे-
गदात्तनस्तत्त्वतत्त्वत्त्वतंत्यात्लोकं तत्त्वात्त्विरास्म साध्वत्वम्ववभक्ष्यत्वसाध्व-
निर्माणायात्र प्रकरणान्तं वक्तृविष्ण्य तत्त्वसंग्रहप्रणामः॥

पुन्यः फलं विचित्रं ददाति संविश्वकथनम् वनि-वैचित्रियम्।
स्मामहानानादुयो यो नमस्तम्मे॥ ॥

यो वनस्य वामायाः वरस्य वैचित्र्यम् ज्ञाता शूकिषुकितत्त्वसंग्रहसम्भृत-
लक्षणं फलं विचित्रमेव पुरुषमायो ददाति तस्मै नमः।। तत्र बालस्य भोगदायन-
क्षमत्ववैचित्र्यम् ज्ञाता तत्त्वदेशामायीयोः: कलाविलक्ष्यत्वत्त्वसंग्रहसम्बन्ध-
व कालाक्षण्याहृतम् मातत्त्वसंग्रहसम्बन्धवेदन्तवेदन्तज्ञानज्ञातिविभागः: शरीर-
रूपविश्लेष्टत्त्वतात्मज्ञेयोः। सम्बन्धः विचित्रः भोगं तत्त्वसंग्रहसम्बन्धः ददाति।

6 तदा तस्मैव विज्ञानयोगसंस्कृतसेमागाद्वा क्षयलक्षणं वैचित्र्यम् ज्ञाता सम्यं-
प्रलयेन च सम्बंदं प्रत्यक्षेवलन्तसम्पादिता फलमिति। (f.106") आणवस्य तु परिपालनम् वैचित्र्यम् ज्ञात्वात्त्वविश्लेष्यादिकदीर्घवेदन्तिविभागमिति।

9 तद्भ स्मामहामेव तत्त्वसंग्रहसम्बन्धेन ददाति न तु व्ययित्वकोन करणात्तरं, तदुपादने दिन शक्तेवेत तितवन्तरं। तचा अनादिद्यं: स्मामहामेव तत्त्वसंग्रहसम्बन्धेन ददाति।

1b. संविश्व य E_P; संविश्व L 1d. यो नमस्तम्मे E_P(unmetrical)?; नमस्तम्मे E_P; नमस्तम्मे E_P

1.6 Cf. Paramoksanitārakārikā 55cd: विज्ञानयोगसंस्कृतसेमागाद्वा करणं: क्षयात्।

0.1 शम्भो | em.; स्तवस्ति || ऑ नम: गिताय || ऑ शम्भो L 0.4 "भोगदायनं" | conj.; "भोगदायनं" L 0.5 व्रजापिराज्यं | conj.; व्रजापिराज्यं L 1.1 वैचित्र्यम् | em.; वैचित्र्यम् L 1.3 "ऋक्षमत्ववैचित्र्यम्" | conj.; "ऋक्षमत्ववैचित्र्यम्" L 1.5 भोगं | conj.; भोगं L 1.5 "तत्संग्रहात्मम्" | conj. Isaacson; "तत्संग्रहात्मम्" L 1.7 सम्बंदं | conj.; सम्बंदं L 1.8 ज्ञात्वात्त्वविश्लेष्यादिविभागं | conj.; ज्ञात्वात्त्वविश्लेष्यादितीय | 1.9 करणात्तरं | conj.; करणात्तरं L
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पूर्वान्तको यस्य, तथाभूतं। अनालीमुक्त इत्यर्थः। ॥ १॥
अधुना नमस्कारादन्तः विशिष्टपुरुषापिकारपूर्वस्य प्रकरणस्य से
म्यधाभिषेक्यप्रयोजनानि।
अथ नित्यभाजस्तन्ये संक्षेपितकांशकिवर्तस्यावम्।
वक्षेि ज्ञातं गुरुत: हिताक्तः कथभिन्नो मन्दिरुद्वीणाम्। ॥ २॥
हे निंदभाजो नमस्काराहाँ गुरवं, अर्थसज्जाय जनन्दक्षयमाण तत्वतं
साध्येवभाष्यर्विविधं यथाविषये इत्यतद्विधभेयमस्यत्रये। तत् ‘ज्ञातं
गुरुत्’ इति परमेश्वरप्रचारोपदेशेऽपरमपरम्येण प्रातिमिति सम्बन्धकयम्। ॥ ३॥
तन्त्रे १५ममादुद्वीणाम् जीवितानामेव हिताक्तेऽस्य विशेषाधिकारिगतस्या
स्य प्रयोजनकत्रम्। ॥ २॥
अयस्मसी अर्थसज्जाय उच्चयते—
अभिन्नो पुर्वेरो माया नित्यं विभुम ज्ञातेशिकायुक्तं च।
सुसे उपि विकृतिज्ञाते त्रित्यं जागरिति तत्वानाम्। ॥ ३॥
अभिन्नो—पर्षः (९.१०७)मेशिव: सह मुक्तिवेचि: सदाविन्द्रस्तव्यक्तेन च—शि
वत्तच्छ। यद्यक्ष्यति—
नित्यभाजेः: कृतिवर्गस्तेन स्वामिन्ननाविस्ंसिद्ध।
सकलाकारप्रभेदो गीतो वक्ष क्रियाविषयः। इति।
पुरुमस्तु पूर्वे वुद्वीत्तर शयनाहः। यथासंधिक्षमः खुंब्जनवद्वृ—पुषुः
तत्तत्त्वाः।
मायापिन पराठरा। परा मन्त्रमेश्वरनिवासो विश्वात्तच्छ।।।।।।। ॥ ६॥
यदुः श्रीमत्वार्यमुखे—
तस्मात्त्वकलसे रागविवाच्यं कुर्मणानिन्त्याः।

2b. कवित्वद्वेगः ] L; कवित्वद्वेगः E_D E_F 3d. विधायेह् ] E_F E_D; विधायेह् L
3.3–४ नित्यभाजे:—क्रियाप्रभेदः; Tattvratyanirgaya 6.
3.९–११ तस्मात्त्वकलसे...सूर्यो मुखः Svāyambhuvasūtraśātra 2:9–१०b.
1.११ अनालीमुक्त] conj.; अनालीमुक्त L 2.४ तन्थे उलिम्न] conj.; तन्थे उलिम्न L
3.५ पूर्वे वुद्वीत्तर] conj.; पूर्वे वुद्वीत्तर L
बुद्धित्वादहजुरारस्तनमाणायीनिद्रायणिः च।
तन्मानवेष्येश्वर पूर्वत् च कर्मो ।

12 तदेवतत्त्वां मद्यालितृतत्त्वमेव नित्यम्: अन्वत्तत्त्वमित्यत्त्वम्। किं च वि-

15 न च सदाशिब्रेष्ठरस्तनमेव विपुष्योऽर्थौर्फऽपरः। केषालमाञ्चलमेव कर्त्तृत्वम्। कर्त्तृत्वानुपस्यमेव नित्यम्।

18 प्रवृत्ती वा नित्वृत्ती वा कारकाणां य ईश्वरः।

अप्रवृत्त: प्रवृत्तो वा स कर्ता नाम कारकः। इति।

21 मन्मोनेश (f.107v) राणाशी तुरूवे दिपि तेषां पुरुषविशेषात्मकम्बा कारणाय विनित्यम्।

24 एवं कलादीनां कारणां तु दुर्योग सकिर्तुष्ण मायाया एव

27 कर्णाय जित्यविमोऽपि तत्त्वात् विपुष्योऽर्थौ विभाजनम्।

30 अनलोपमेव तेषां महतां चक्रव्यतिनाम्।

विविधतः सर्वकर्त्तव्यकारणं परमं पदम्। इति।

श्रीमद्वेदः दिपि

3.18–19 प्रवृत्ती वा नित्वृत्तीस्य कर्ता नाम कारकः Source unknown. Also quoted ad Naresvarparikṣa 1:56, ad Mātagavīdyāpāda 6:31 and ad Bhogakārikā 72c–73b.

3.29–30 अनलोपमेव तेषां...पदम् inserted in the edition of the Rauravasūtra
saṅgraha between 4:21 and 4:22, but not to be found there in M or the other MSS: it is in fact Rauravasūtraśaṅgraha 2:13 as read by MS B776.

3.16 वक्ष्माणाचैत्वत्त्वमेव | conj. | वक्ष्माणाचैत्वत्त्वमेव L 3.18 कारकाणां | conj. | कारणाम् L 3.26 अत्रस्य अनलोपसारस्य | conj. | अत्रस्य अनलोपसारस्य L 3.27 अपसारस्य | em. | अपसारस्य L
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शुद्धाध्वकत्यो देवा मन्नानामोऽध्यक्षः। ।
समाप्य स्वप्निकारान्ते प्रायात्तित । परमं पदम्॥
इत्यिविरोधः॥ ॥
एवमेनेन धर्मंजातेनास्य तत्त्वपृथच्यं साध्वमर्य तत्त्वार्दशं स्वाधम्यमुक्षम्।
अधुना परस्परते ५पि तदुभवमुख्यते—

शिवपुरुषावतिसंस्कृतः प्रसवविहीनी चिता समेतो च।
शिवस्तायः ॥१०८॥ नुक्लीविपुत्रासाध्वात च सन्त।। शिवसमत्वेव वाहो-
क्षेरो न तु तत्त्वः। पुरुषो ५पि सह्यायान्त। पुरुषसहुत्वस्येवायुगमात्रातु,
तस्यैव स्वसंवेदने पुरुषार्दशेवदत्ताया च सिद्धंः। न तवाल्लकेवधेयुक्तः
न्त्राय। नन्यं कलादिरिपि प्रतिपुरुषं भ्रत्रस्वादसाध्वं एव। यदुकं भोगाकोशः—
...कलांग्रामान्ता भोगासाध्षान्त्वतः।।
नियता प्रतिभोकारम्। इति। ।
सत्यम्। अत ॥एव तद्॥पि वक्ष्यति। इह तु मायात एव वैधम्र्ये प्रतिपादः।
न तत्त्वार्दशं इत्यिविरोधः। इति किं च प्रसवविहीना।वित्ति द्रविनेता-
वयरिषामिनी। तथात्वे हि ॥मुद्‌द्वद्वद्वद्वदेवनी।
यदुकं श्रीकिरणेः—
परिणामो ॥चेतनस्य चेतनस्य न युञ्जते। इति।
चिता समेतो च। चिद्धपावोवच्यते। न तु मनःसंयोगादिना चेतनी। यदुकं
श्रीमत्त्वः—

3.32–33 शुद्धाध्वक यो देवा...परमं पदम॥ Mataṅgavidyopāda 25:62cd and 63cd, in
which the edition reads प्रायात्तित पदमत्तमम्, for which it records no variant. The
intervening line reads: न सीद्धिनः न लुप्तः च चेतनाू न च केनचित्
4.5–6 वस्तुपतिक्तात्प्रक्षा भोगासाध्वसंहतः।। नियता प्रतिवोकारां परिणेतया मन्नानिमिः॥
Bhogakārikā 105c–106ab.
4.11 परिणामो ॥चेतनस्य चेतनस्य न युञ्जते। Kirapa 2:26ab.

3.32 शुद्धाध्वकत्यो देवा | em.; शुद्धाध्वकत्यो L(unmetrical) 4.3 शुद्धाध्वकत्यो देवा | conj.; शुद्धाध्वकत्यो देवा | conj.
तया L 4.7 अत एव तदपि | अत ल J-4]-|; पि L 4.8 अत एव तदार्वद्विहीवातित | conj.;
किं च हेयमुरुक्तेत्वा | J[4-4]-|; विति L 4.9 मुरुक्तेत्वा | conj.; मूल J-4]-|; L 4.11 परिणामो
वस्तुपतिक्तात्प्रक्षा | em.; परिणा मुरुक्तेत्वा L(unmetrical) 4.12 चिता समेतो च |
em.; चिता समेतो च L.
चित्रेषितसह धर्मः। इति।

अथ मायायां एताः सैव श्रमे मूल्यपते—

एकं प्रसवित्वयुक्त मायात्वं चिता विहीनं च। ॥ ४ ॥
एकेषां मायात्वकः पुरुषस्तवेये वेत्ते प्रमाणाभावात्। मोहनेकाननस्य भावस्थेनेकते करणां सिद्धं यत्। प्रसवित्वयुक्त हरिश्चं परिणामयुक्तम् कथम्। कलापः पादनकारणात्वेकः सिद्धः। अत एव चार्यभन्न मूदाविवत्। एतः (f. 108°) छ परस्याः अर्जु मायायां बोद्धव्यम् ॥ ५ ॥
अथ विवेत्तुरूपातिवित्त्वं श्रवणोऽस्मातः विद्याच्या ईश्वरा वहवः प्रो-कालेषामिच्छ सारम्येव श्रमे मूल्यपते—

ईशा: प्रवृत्तावृत्तास्तैको नादिसिद्धगुणविभवः।
मुक्तेष्वरेनात्मकं सर्वोऽभासः दृढः ये च ततः ॥ ५ ॥
तत्र प्रवृत्तावृत्तास्तिकं सर्वोपयुक्तात्मकं सत्यात्मकं सर्वे-शामीकरणां समानस्म। प्रागवधानकुलस्तु विज्ञेयः। परमेश्वरस्यानादिसिद्धं गुणेषु वैभवं प्रभुत्वम्। मुक्तेश्वराः तु वन्यसन्यस्ति: शिववाभिब्यक्तिः ततः परमविवादित्या ॥ ६ ॥

यत् एवं—

नमस्तूर्व: कृत्वावर्गस्तन स्वामिन्यनादिसिद्धाः।
सकलाकालप्रभेदो गीतो यश्च निया विषयः। ॥ ६ ॥

ten kaśren naṁ: parijāta: puruṣamādi yaśca kārṇamastu śāmikātikamত তাশ্চাত্যঃ সার্থেষ্যসম্ভাবনাযঃ। স কার্যবাস্তসমিষ্টিবামিনি পরমশ্চ ॥ নাদিসিদ্ধাঃ।

ন তু মুক্তিবিদ্যাঃ, आदिसिद्धवात्। यश्च सकलाधित्य: कार्यविषयः। सो

5b. *विभवः [ L E_D; *विभवः E_P(unmetrical) 6a. कृति: [ L; कृति: E_D E_P
6b. *सर्विद्धाः [ L; *सर्विद्धाः E_D E_P

पुरुषाणामपि गुणजातं सर्वखंस्मवन्यमपि, ज्ञातव्यूः
त्वसभवकावत्यं 
ईश्वरस्य यस्य शाम्येतत्, सर्वस्य निर्धारितात्रस- 
पुरुषः, धीरजं तत्तत्रजातं पुनः यस्माभ्येन यस्मात्
समयं तत्रसमयं निर्दत्तात्, समयं निर्दत्तात्
एवं च मलेनादिदिर्घास्तवभावानादेव मलस्यायनिदियेन

7.b. पुरुषाणामपि सर्वसंगतं किं तु] \( E_P \); पुरुषां \([-7-] \) \( \text{किं तु} \) \( L \); पुरुषां सर्वसंगतं किं तु \( E_D \)
7.c. एकौन्त्य हि तेषां \( L \); \( \text{एकौन्त्य हि सर्वेषां} \) \( E_D E_P \)

6.9 शक्तिषुः प्रवृत्तधर्म किं तु धीरजेष्ठं इत्यते Source unknown. Also quoted elsewhere, e.g. ad Kīrāṇa 3:13, ad Mātānāgavīdyāpāda 3:20. And note that this half-line is plainly alluded to in Ratnātārayaṇatikṣā 265 and then expounded in Ratnātārayaṇatikṣā 266–82.

6.11 ईश्वर: सर्वकावेऽ शान्त: कृत्येकद्विभिः यस्माभ्येन Kīrāṇa 3:13cd.


6.14 शिवपुष्पावतिसेवी प्रसवविद्विहीनो वितां समेतो च Tattvātārayaṇ-airnaya 4ab.

7.1 शिवपुष्पवद्व] \( \text{conjunction} \); \([-6?]-] \( L \) 
7.2 यथेष्ठमायेतत्, सर्वस्येत् \( \text{conjunction} \); \([-6?]-] \( L 
7.3 सर्वस्येत् \( L 
7.4 मलेनादिदिर्घास्तवभावानादेव मलस्यायनिदियेन \) \( \text{conjunction} \); मलेना \([-5?-] \) \( \text{स्वरूप} \) \( L \)
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सिद्धम्। एकवम् तु मलस्यानादिबन्धकल्वान्नाथानुपपपस्येव, अनेकवे हि
तत्त्वात् (I.109)इवतन्यात्मकारणपूर्वकव्येव दलादर्वित्वादित्वादवास्नात्नानुपप- पि:। न हि निवुत्तमस्य शिवस्येव वन्धः सम्भवतीति॥ ७॥
तत्। प्रकृतो जिम्? उच्च्यते—
तेन अतो तस्सी त्रा निवम्परारा विन बल्याकिम्।
अतो तस्स्तत्त्वात्मकारणात्तु पुमांसो इन्नीश्चा:। अनभिव्यक्तकालि—
ल्यवल्यत्वृत्तव तदभिध्यक्योऽ। अत एव—
न च शक्तस्तु स्वं स्वं
बलमलं सर्वं स्वात् कतुः॥ ८॥

इस्तत्वात्म्यानाकोटे्शुभार्मस्येव पटलादेवन्त्यानात्रूति: सम्भवति, ये—
नात्मात्मादवात्मामायवसायात्मो बौद्धम्यानस्य निवुत्तविव पुरुषाणां
साम्ये श्यातिदिच्च श्रृणृव्यापारेण पटलाद्वेशयवपारेणेव दीक्षालक्ष—
णं तत्व निवृत्तितिर्युक्तं श्रीमव्यक्तव्र—
न मोक्षं याति पुरुषः स्वसाम्यात्मका्दा्चन। इति।
श्रीमायण्यमुखे दृश्या—

दीक्षीवं मोचयत्वृढः श्रेष्ठं धाम नवत्ययि।
इत्यदेव॥ ८॥
एवच—

8a. तेतः तस्सी त्रा निवम्परारा इस्तत्वात्मकारणात् कुच्छ तानात्रूति: सम्भवति, ये—
नात्मात्मादवात्मामायवसायात्मो बौद्धम्यानस्य निवुत्तविव पुरुषाणां
साम्ये श्यातिदिच्च श्रृणृव्यापारेण पटलाद्वेशयवपारेणेव दीक्षालक्ष—
णं तत्त्वात्म्यानाकोटे्शुभार्मस्येव पटलादेवन्त्यानात्रूति: सम्भवति। ये—
नात्मात्मादवात्मामायवसायात्मो बौद्धम्यानस्य निवुत्तविव पुरुषाणां
साम्ये श्यातिदिच्च श्रृणृव्यापारेण पटलाद्वेशयवपारेणेव दीक्षालक्ष—
णं तत्त्वात्म्यानाकोटे्शुभार्मस्येव पटलादेवन्त्यानात्रूति: सम्भवति॥ ८॥

8.7 न मोक्षं याति पुरुषः स्वसाम्यात्मका्दा्चन Quoted and attributed to the Pauśkara in
the Mṛgendravr̥tti ad vidyāpāda 2:28 and in the Nareśvaraparikṣāprakāśa ad 3:150cd.
The line occurs in the South Indian Pauśkara: 1:90ab (Adyar ed.).

8.9 दीक्षीवं मोचयत्वृढः श्रेष्ठं धाम नवत्ययि स्वयम्प्त्वसुत्रासाग्रहा 2:24cd.

7.5 अनेकवे | conj.; अनेकवे L 7.6 इवतन्यात्मकारणपूर्वकव्येव | conj.; इवतन्यात्मका—
रणप्ररक्तवेन L 7.7 कलादुर्ययिदि | conj.; कलादुर्ययिदि L 8.1 पुमांसो | em.;
पुमांसो L 8.4 स्याथव्यसायात्मो | em.; स्याथव्यसायात्मो L 8.5 स्यापा—
रेणेव | em.; स्यापारेणेव L
मलसरोधात्तेशामकृता हि शिववशीकारः।
पत्युस्ति ततो रूथ्या वध्या: शोध्या: प्रशोध्यां॥ ९॥

यथेव तेषामानादि मलकृतमानीशरवतादि, तद्देवशेषो तनानिद्रेव शिवस्य
समतन्थी वर्षीकारो द्विघीयत्यत्माः। अति (f.110°) एव मलसंस्गादेवलोकांग्रीवा
गतो रूथ्या वामाया मलाधिनानेन, वध्याय मायीयेक्षेत्राने, शोध्याय शीख्याय,
प्रशोध्याय ज्ञानाविधिम्॥ ९॥

अत्र व्यतिरिक्तमलप्रतिशिवेण पूवैः पश्चः—

नितेये ज्ञानाविषवले मलाधिपिरिकल्यं ननु ज्यायाः।

ननु इत्यकृतवात्स्ये बले नितेये पुच्छः स्वभावत्या सिद्धे सति तत्स्तय तद्
वस्यायं सर्वं अविवत्याधिकार्याय मलपिरिकल्याम युक्तिमती बकुमम, ननु
तरस्मणिन्ये, पुंसमेवाऽस्वभावते तदा सिद्धे व्यतिरिक्तमलपिरिकल्यायोगात। अनितेये च, तत्कार्यकर्मादि एवोपलम्भातु तद्भवेये
चाँदुपलम्भातु, उज्ज्वलता व्यतिरिक्तलसिद्धिरिति नैयायिकादि। आदि
ग्रहणातिनिमित्तैतिच ग्रहणातिनिमित्तैतिच ग्रहणातिनिमित्तैतिच
अन्तः सिद्धान्त—

सत्त्वं नान्यावृक्तार्धग्रह्यस्मात्सदेशरी इत्यत्॥ १०॥

e 9ab. मलसरोधात्तेशामकृता [ conj. ]; मलसंस्गादेवलोकांग्रीवा मकुती L; मलसरोधात्तेशामकृता

10.2 युक्तिमती बकुमम [ conj. ]; युक्तिमती बकुमम [ conj. ]; तत्स्स्थित्वे L 10.3 तरस्मणिन्ये [ conj. ]; तत्स्स्थित्वे

9c. पत्युस्ति ततो रूथ्या [ L°E_F ]; पत्युस्ति ततो रूथ्या [ L°E_F ]; पत्युस्ति ततो रूथ्या [ L°E_F ]; पत्युस्ति ततो

9d. ज्ञानप्रशोध्या [ L ]; ज्ञानप्रशोध्या [ L ]; ज्ञानप्रशोध्या [ L ]; ज्ञानप्रशोध्या [ L ]; ज्ञानप्रशोध्या [ L ]; ज्ञानप्रशोध्या [ L ];

10.4 तत्कार्यकर्मादि [ conj. ]; तत्कार्यकर्मादि [ conj. ]; तत्कार्यकर्मादि [ conj. ]; तत्कार्यकर्मादि [ conj. ];

10.5 उज्ज्वलता [ conj. ]; उज्ज्वलता [ conj. ]; उज्ज्वलता [ conj. ]; उज्ज्वलता [ conj. ]; उज्ज्वलता [ conj. ]; उज्ज्वलता [ conj. ];
पूर्व कलाविद्योगाद्यमहाद्वीपः क्रिये न विचिते।

इति चोदकवल्स्—

व्याख्यारहिते तत्र हि नो गुह्रणे न बल्वसज्जावत्॥ इत्यादिन्तः॥ १०॥

अतः मलसंसरोध्यत्युत्स्ते वथ्या इत्युक्तम्। तत्र कार्यान्तरसमुच्यः—

मायाविकारयोगेः कर्मयुक्तः कारणं मलो भविनाम्।

मायाविवक्ष्योगोः पुंसां न केवल एव मलः कारणम्, अपि तु कर्मयुक्त एव।

विञ्ज्ञान्योगसप्न्यासेभोगाद्वा कर्मणं क्षयत्।

विञ्ज्ञानेववलास्तत्र प्रोक्तः सम्भविन्यस्तः॥ इति।

प्रागस्य मलस्य सर्वपुनर्ज्ञानवाक्षेत्रे प्रतिपादिते विशेषाभावस्यस्वपूर्वपुर्व-पाणिः युगपह्रुव्यो क्रोण वा प्रसकं इति। तदर्थमेवत्

मलशक्यो विभिन्नः:

प्रत्याल्पान्त्वट्ट तद्दृश्यावरिका॥ ६॥

अत एवेकवे उप्यम्य मलस्य शक्यों विभिन्नः प्रतिपुरुषं गम्यते यास्ते ज्ञानुपुरुषां गुणाविकारः। इति न भव्यते प्रसकः। च शब्दात्मामुको सार्वाविकारः प्रत्याल्पानं भिन्नं एव। कार्यकरणस्यामेदे हि सर्वस्य सर्वात्मस्य प्रसकः।

येवकं भोगमोक्षे प्राणिः

अन्यथा हि सुवासीदीना युज्यमाने प्रक्रिये भेदे न युज्यते।

योक्ष्यते प्रमणो भेदाराट्टाणे (f.111r)'यदि योक्ष्यते। इत्यादिः॥ ११॥

येवं प्रतिपुरुषं मलशक्योक्ष्यस्यविशेषाल्पानवत् वन्धस्य मोक्षस्य वा प्रसकः। तत्रोऽयते—

10.12 पूर्व कलाविद्योगाद्यमहाद्वीपः क्रिये न विचिते। व्याख्यारहिते तत्र हि नो गुह्रणे न बल्वसज्जावत्॥ Tattvasaṅgraha 20.

11.2–3 विश्वसन्यस्यात्तरे सम्भविन्यस्तेत्: Paramokṣanirāśārikā 596d and an unknown half-verse.

11.10–11 अन्यथा हि सुवासीदीनां 'यदि योक्ष्यते Bhogākārikā 106c–107b.

11.8 "कार: प्रत्याल्पानं" [conj.]; "कार्याकारणस्यामेदे" [conj.]; कार्यकरणास्यामेदे [conj.]; कार्यकरणास्यामेदे [em.]; तदेदे [L]
विनिवर्तते निरोधात्शुरिन्दा: परिषमन्मलः कालात।
परिणतिप्रियोण्योगासः
स कदाचित्कृपात्नेत्रायत्नेत्रधित्मनोह॥ १२॥

पुरुषाकार्याक्षेत्राकृत्वात्वात्साक्यद्वेषद्विभूतकलेन शक्तिमा सांवादरूपकर्ण परिषमन्मप्रियोण्योगासः प्राप्त निवर्तते। यदृक श्रीवायाम्यः—

श्रीनेत्र तत्समन्ध्यायत्मकः स्वात्त्वरं नै। श्रीयस्य प्रतिः। इति।

अतः तत्तपिताश्रेष्ठश्राक्षात् मलः कदाचित्विवर्तते, न सर्वदा। तत्तपिताभाबात्नायत्नेत्रधित्मनोहः। कथपूर्व तीनासदामिदेवदन्तुकं श्रीकिरे। तस्मात्श्रेष्ठ। स च कालात्पर्यं। तत्तपिताश्रेष्ठ। तत्त्पिताभाबात्नायत्नेत्रधित्मनोहः। कथ्यते, प्रसिद्धकालाय्ये। दूषि महाप्रलये प्रलयकेलवलादे। तस्मात्यान्मदिति॥ १२॥

अथाः प्रसिद्धश्रेष्ठ परिद्यायेश्वर एव नित्यिमातिः स्वात्त्वरकिरिभः
वादनः। तस्मिन मलस्य परिपरियस्वभावकल्पनया परिपाकमुणकल्पनया वेत। तत्त्वच्यरे—

अतं एव पुज्जनानां परिपुर्वः साधनादृढ़यः॥ १३॥

कालाधृणेन तथा घटतेः । दृष्टी सन्नाथाः जातु॥ १३॥

यो दृष्टे पुज्जनानां साधनाश्रेष्ठशास्त्रयुद्धमस्य भोक्तरात्मनो विषेषः कदाचित्कृपात्नेत्रधित्मनोहः। कथपूर्व तिरीक्षात् प्राप्तिदातो। । दृष्टी साधनादृढ़यः। वाक्यान्मदिति। कथ्यते, नान्यथे वसराधिः। तत्त्वापि

13a. पुज्जनाः | $E_D E_P$; पुज्जनाः $L$ 13b. पुरोहित: साधनादृढ़यः | $E_P$; पुरोहित: $L$ ।

13.3. क्षीरणे तत्समन्ध्यायत्मकः स्वात्त्वयेष्वरे नै। श्रीरामसं प्रति Svāyambhuvasūtraśaṅgaha : 1:17cd.

12.6. इत्युक्तं क्षीरणे See Kīrāṇa 5:30ab (and commentary): मन्ना मन्नतरा श्रिक: कर्मसामायववस्थाय।

12.1. शक्तिमानवार्तकरण | conj. | शक्तिमानवार्तकरण $L$ 12.3. नै। $L$; नै। $L$

Svāyambhuvasūtraśaṅgaha Ed. 12.8 परिणामार्थिति | em.; परिणामार्थिति $L$
स्वातन्त्र्येणाविशेषांग्लेश्वरसम्बन्धेन स एव तदवस्थः प्रसङ्गः। यदेवम्, मलपरिपाकादिविद्वेष्यात्तस्यात्तस्यात्तस्यार्थादिशः। न निर्मितार्थाक्षेत्रम्–
स्वातन्त्र्येण पत्त्वं कर्मेन्द्रियक्षेत्रं नारायणिर परिकायम्—
स्वातन्त्र्यार्थाण्वेश्वरसम्बन्धेन करणाविषय्योक्तता।
कर्ता: स्वातन्त्र्यमेतदति न कर्मार्यान्येलिता॥
इत्यदिः ॥ १३ ॥
तततथा न पूवीकः: प्रसङ्गः इत्यस्य—
इत्यं गणनाहीनं निमित्तमभविवेक्ष्य चेढ़रणेक्षम्।
साधुकिमिद्दमुकेनेतरथा साधनानन्त्यम्॥ १४ ॥
अनेन प्रकारासाधनतपशस्वास्थित्यानन्त्यं प्रतिपुरूः भिन्नमेव रुक्तिमिन्वितं
मलपरिपाकादिभिः साधुकः प्रकाराणानन्त्यानन्त्यानन्त्य विवेकते। यथं तथा
(११२) पूर्तं चाभविवेक्ष्य रहस्यता तत्ताधिनस्य दीक्षाच्यस्यानन्त्यं संहिता
भेदनोक्तम्, न प्रकारार्तेनेति नायकेश्वरकुटी सर्वमोक्षोपप्रसङ्ग इत्यथ:॥ १५ ॥
एवं च—
यथं यदा यथवित्तम्: सच्छेद्योपोयनकृतलः पार्थे।
तस्य तदा तावद्विवहिते विजहाति बन्धुत्वम्॥ १६ ॥
यथा मायविकारयोगों कर्मुक्ततः कारणं मल इत्युक्तम्, तथापि मायविक्यः
पार्थे: सह यथं पुसं यथेति तत्तल्लमस्तिकात् यथ च व्याख्ये मलः।


13.8–9 स्वातन्त्र्यार्थायविवेक्ष्यं न कर्ममेतदिस्यता The second line is Naresvara-parikṣa 2:30ab; the first line contains the same ideas as 2:29, but in different wording.
Our verse appears attributed to Siddhaguru ad Mrgendravidyāpāda 3:5.

13.4 तदवस्थः [conj.; तदवस्था L 13.8 स्वातन्त्र्यम् [conj.; स्वातन्त्र्यम् L 14.1 भिन्नमेव [conj.; भिन्नमेव L 15.1 मायविक्यः [conj.; मायविक्यः L
सच्चेद्योरोद्कृतदित्यनिर्धारितः, तस्य पुनःस्तिर्मिन्नकाले स्थाने भोगेन हैः। 3

क्षणिते: सो श्रिय वन्मत्तव विज्ञाहारत्। नामित्रं विरुढ्यम तस्य नायेन मलस्य परिपक्वे मायीया अपि पापा: सहकारिकारण प्रवर्तेनान विचारिताना वा। 6

सर्ववस्तु सुगोदय इव विद्यानुकेकवेदित्वम्।। 15॥

इत्येवत्—

इत्यादपार्थ यत: सम्मुक्ते: साधनानि दृष्यन्ते।

शार्ये शार्ये तानि च नेतरथा युक्तिमिति जायन्ते॥ 16॥

यत: पारमेवरे शार्ये शर्मिति प्राप्तस्यव प्रतिस्थानो भोगद्वारोज्ज्वरे मायीयाचतुर्कृतमुक्ते: साधनानि दृष्यन्ते। तद्व शे तैमोयण्यविहारस्तुत्र तत्र मलस्य (f.112°) तत्तद्देहायकेन दिखिते तत्र दृष्यते। अन्यथा तान्यपिसाधनान्युक्तमानि दृष्यज्ञान्ते, निष्कारणं बन्धनान्नकर्मिवादित॥ 16॥

तत्तद्यता शिक्षृणुअवदुक्तः पुरुसामित्यादिश्रिवपुःकृतोद्वृत्तस्वत्त्मा मलस्यहृद्यनेन निर्णये। अते तस्येव रूपणान्तररिण्यायायर्थार्थसाधने प्रद्य:— 6

परिमाणयति हि मलं कः

किल मलपरिणाममकर्पनार्थ प्रक्षेपेद्व मल: परिमाणेत् इति कस्तस्य परिणाममः, न कथितस्य मलस्यभावसिद्धं एव मोक्षः प्रस्करः, नेश्वरकर्त्तः इति। तत्स्ततः स्वतन्त्रकृष्याक्षपत्त मलस्य एवायन्याल्पनात्मक: इति प्रारम्भ:। 3

सिद्धान्तस्तु—

यः कृमावेश्य चित्रकरकमः।

बीजाध्वदति चिर्च निष्कृत्य निर्माणसाधने भोगम्॥ 17॥

यस्य स्तवारे बीजं कुर्वास्वस्ते प्रस्तूतये योगम्।

विश्रवं च तत्र निहितं प्रलये येनेव विश्रास्त्ये॥ 18॥

17 a. परिमाणयति हि ] conj. (supported in the commentary on 19); परिमाणयति हि L(unmetrical); परिमाणयति एरएफ 17b. यः कृमावेश्य ] LEF(following M); कृमावेश्य एड 17cd. चिर्च निष्कृत्य ] LEF(following M); चिर्च निष्कृत्य ए यः: एड 18c. विश्रवं ] एरएफ; विश्रवं L 18d. पुर्वये येनेव ] conj.; पुर्वये येनेव एड; प्रलये एड 15.3. रोपकदित्यस् ] em.; रोपकदित्यस् Lए; रोपकदित्यस् ए ए ए ए ए ए ए ए L 16.4 प्र- स्तवारे ] conj.; प्रस्तवारे L
कर्म च भुक्ते पुंसां जाग्रति ववेके करोति चेषान्।
स मलं मलहा बलदः कारणात्सवङ्गदेव विनिवृत्ते॥ १९॥

y ईशानो विचित्रकङ्कुशक्षया पुरुषवस्यो बीजामायात्मकाविपायामनुष्यं
विचित्रे भोगे सह तत्साधनेतत्थावभवानात्मक्षेत्रद्वंद्वः। (११३३') यशानं
वातन्त्रपुणरैौ क्रमार्धवर्षम्। दुःख भोगार्थे क्रमार्धवर्षम्। तत्क्रमम्
कुर्वलसार्थे। चेषान च तत्र तत्रस्त्रावर्तिके क्रमार्धवर्षम्। भवानादि तदा-
नी सत्त्वनेतराण्वस्य निहितम्। यद्र शून्यकाले दृष्टे कर्मं भोगस्याद्वयं
करोति पुनःवर्षाम्। स ईशानं। मलं हन्त्वति मलहा पुरुषवस्य बल-
लं शत्त्वानिकं दयालीति बलदं। सत्त्वह वस्त्रिकन्ते विनिवृत्त्ये करोति
परिवर्णयतीति। अयमसं: यथा परिवर्णयतस्वाभाविकम्। यथा भावायाम् के
लादे। कर्मार्धवर्षेऽद्वैतानिरङ्केऽद्वैतानिम्नोऽद्वैतानिरङ्केऽद्वैतानिम्नः
शून्यसंहिरेऽद्वैतानिरङ्केऽद्वैतानिम्नः। यथा तदन्त्वनेतार्थमिति। इति उऽ
कुः। स्वत्त्वनेत्रकियातसिद्धं॥ १९॥

अतः एवं—

तद्विवर्तये: प्राक्षक हि तत्साधनस्य सफलता कियते।

यावधिवस तसंकाराध्यायदरसरणलस्तान्यहस्तप्रशिष्ठ: प्रागीरस्य मन्त्रादि
मलसाधनमेव पुनःस्वरोधायामक सफलता कियते। न तदन्त्वपर्यः एव नविवेत

इत्यस्ति। तथा हि—

पुनःस्वरोधायामकुर्वलपश्यति हि स पाशाौधिकाशालपम्य॥ २०॥

19b. विचरे करोति चेषान्: L; विचरे दृष्टे किष्ठलोकन: E_dE_p 19c. स मलं मलहा
बलद: L; समलं स महाकर्ष: E_dE_p 19d. सत्त्व: E_dE_p; सत्त्व L(unmetrical)
20 ab. प्राक्षक हि तत्साधनस्य सफलता कियते: L; प्रागिर तत्साधनादेवलनादेव
ते E_p(unmetrical); प्रागिर तत्साधनस्य सबलताकृति: E_p(following ABM, all his
MSS); but E_p remarks that Aghorasvāsa's commentary suggests the reading: तस्य-
मलसाधनादेवलनादेव 20 d. प्राक्षक हि स पाशाौधिकाशालपम्य: L; इत्यस्ति: स च
पाशाौधिकाशालपम्य E_dE_p

19.2 भोगेः em.; भोगेः L 19.3 पुरुषोग्रहे तद्वस्य: conj.; पुरुषसः ****-के
से व L. 19.4 तत्साधनेन्द्रनान्निवि: conj.; तिः हि भुवानादि L 19.6 कर्म भोगायो
करोति पुनःवर्षाणाः conj.; कर्मभोगयो: conj.; भुवानादि: E_dE_p 19.7 बल: conj.; बले L 19.8 वर्ण-
तिस्ति: conj.; परिवर्णतिस्ति: L
वृद्धि च तत्त्ववृद्धि यो (f. 113°)गये युक्ते नूमुक्ते करणम्।
एवं स मलशिक्षयुक्ते भए चुक्ते रसायनत्वस्त्र पाश्चात्य यासी श्लोकत्वस्त्र यज्ञात्मक साधारणशास्त्र वाक्यविवेकस्त्र पश्चातिः। फलप्रदको मि सर्वसाधारको यतः। तद्व्रत दृढः तस्मात्साधारिः
वृत्ती नूर्सां मुक्तिलहनं करणं निीशाखयुक्ते।
ननु परिणमं: कार्यमुक्ते: मायाया इव कलादि। मलस्य त्वप्रकृति-
त्वात्कार्यसम्भवेन परिणामानुपपत्तितिः। अत्रोच्चये—

बीजस्येव स्वापे
परिणामितिः मलस्य चितिहानौ॥ २१॥
यथा बीजस्य जमते मायाया: स्वापे महाप्रकाशकाले परिणतिः: पुनःस-
गोत्तासदानुगुणः: श्लोकविशालस्त्रिस्तम्भः: स्वरूपपरिणामादेव भवति—न कार्यालयानो विज्ञातीयपरिणामात्, तदानी तस्मात्मकावस्त्र—तद्वरनस्त्र कार्यान्तराप्रकृतिः ५पि स्वरूपपरिणामितिः स्वाभाविकवादेव चितिहानिनिवधिः ५पि
परिणामितिः कार्यप्रतियोगिः ॥ २८॥
अन्तः स्वतन्त्रशक्तिप्रतियोगिः अण्डाकृतिः ॥ १२॥
यदि च विनिवृत्तियोगं कुरुते शम्भुमलेन ततः किमिति।
सर्वाल्पसु नो कुर्यायुपपरितिः च चोदयन्वायः॥ २२॥
कल्पित्वालया मलस्य परिणामितिः स्वाभाविकः भवद्विरुधः एव तस्य परिपाकः—
तुः। स च विशेषाभावशक्तिः स्वरूपपरिणामयोऽविदितं पूर्वः: प्रसङ्क:। तदवशं
तत्त्वस्त्रारथस्त्र च प्रकृतिः स्वाच्छन्दो श्रूपगतस्त्रारथस्त्र। तद्वरनस्त्र किमत्त-
गंगुन्यानु मलस्य परिणामितिकथापूर्नेभोखोदशेत्ते एवं वक्र्यः॥ २२॥
कथानित्यार्याभागेभोच्चये—
किमिति न सर्वं युपपकृते भोगम् स कर्म

21 b. सुमुक्ते [Σ; सुमुक्ते Eρ's M  21 d. चितिहानौ [L; चितिहाने: Eρ Eρ]
22 cd. कुर्यायुपपरितिः च [L; युपपकृति युपपकृति युपपकृति युपपकृति युपपकृति युपपकृति]
23 b. स कर्म [L; स्कर्म Eρ Eρ]
21.1 मलाभयं [em.; मलाभयं L  21.3 तव [conj; यथा L

- 332 -
भवत्स्कर्षो धर्मयो कर्मणीकामान्वितो दर्शये हेतुः। यतः कर्मयोऽर्धनिषेधीति धार्मिकोऽर्धनिषेधीति न सवर्गेव युगप्रदेवगतं कर्तव्यते। न
tु यथा त्यथा कर्मस्वतं बुद्धया तथा मले मम भविष्यति त्यस्येवम्।
एवं तिनस्मादविद्यो बायुक्तार्नकोशान्तुज्ञावनं निग्रह एव। यदाहुः—
असाधनाः नायनस्वकोशान्तुज्ञावनं द्वैयोः।
निग्रहयानमनवतु न यूक्तिनि नेष्यते॥
इत्यश्रुक्तम्, अतः कर्मणीकामान्वितकदीतिकाद्वकत्वोऽन्नक्तः।
अत्रकाणिकामिकपरिहारस्तुनितरस्तः—
तदव्यायाम्।

न समाधिरनेत्रक्तः
कालान्तरभोग्यता बलीयत्वम्॥ २३॥
न कर्मणि विशेषः (१.१४८)भवानित्वम् हेतुः: सिद्धः। यत्स्तत्र पुरुषभेदनानेत्रक्तम्, एकत्वविशेष पुरुषजन्मान्तरभोग्यता, तीव्रनित्येन बलीयत्वम्
 च कर्मान्तरार्पण काव्यो विषेषो विषेषो विषेषो विषेषो। इत्येवमने कानिकत्वमध्ये हेतुतः: ।
समाध्यात्, अस्य न समाधिरनेत्रक्तम्, कालान्तरभोग्यता, बलीयत्वम्
वा। कुत: ? तत्स्ततः समाधिरनेत्रक्तम्, कालान्तरभोग्यता, बलीयत्वम्
वा। ४४म्। ४४म् ४४म् ४४म् ४४म् ४४म् ४४म् ४४म्। ४४म् ४४म् ४४म् ४४म् ४४म् ४४म् ४४म् ४४म्।
मले ४४म् हेतुसिद्धविद्यावपमक इत्यथः: यत्स्तत्रनित्येन प्रतिपुरुष्य शक्तिभेदनानेत्रक्तं कालान्तरपरिशिल्वभावतं च तीव्रतरस्तक्मान्तरभोग्यतादिकारिः—

23.3 यदाहुः [ conj.; मले ल 23.6 निग्रहयानमनवतु] em. ; निग्रहयानस्वकोशान्तु L 23.7
अन्य यो यो [ conj.; गतिसम्पायनस्वकोशान्तु L 23.8 अन्य यो [ conj.; गतिसम्पायनस्वकोशान्तु L 23.12 समाध
यात्, अस्य [ em. ; समाधायस्य L 23.13 यो यो [ conj.; गतिसम्पायनस्वकोशान्तु L 23.12 समाध
यात्, अस्य [ em. ; समाधायस्य L 23.13 यो यो [ conj.; गतिसम्पायनस्वकोशान्तु L 23.12 समाध
यात्, अस्य [ em. ; समाधायस्य L 23.13 यो यो [ conj.; गतिसम्पायनस्वकोशान्तु L 23.12 समाध
यात्, अस्य [ em. ; समाधायस्य L 23.13
सार्वविश्वसिद्धार्थविवेच्स्वभावसं च कृतिपुकुर्वे शस्त्रि, न सर्वस्मिन्त्यकरायः ।

अथ च —

सर्वविकारोत्तपति शास्त्र शक्ति: सदैव सत्ताहि।
ईशे बीजे च यतो भविनि विभुत्वं च भोक्तुभावसं । ॥ २४ ॥

तेनानेकानीशः कृत्त्वा वृद्ध्दानि कार्यकरणादे:।
बीजादिपत्तुरुपं भोजयतु स सर्वकर्माणि। ॥ २५ ॥

ईश्वरशक्त्या मायाशक्त्या चानेकान्तिको दृश्ये हेतु:। भवित्ये हि तद्यः: सर्वेऽ श्रविकारोत्तिचेन सत्तानान्तविवेच्स्वभावसं, भोक्तु भावकयुगः सर्ववं स्वभावात्। युगः । युगः: कार्यकरणस्वभावसं चुरुषान्ता(१.११५) योज्य क्रियति स सर्वकर्माणि।

अथ पराभित्राय: —

नन्त्वुमिगुत: क्रमसो दृढ्या कर्माणि भुज्यमानानि।

विपचित्ति तथेषः श्रम्पुश्तानीति।

पापकर्मविवेच्से तस्य पापनर्व: कर्मे बालाध्ववस्तरामेण भुज्यमाने दृढः भगवानपि तथोपरापान्तोपथेषु वहे वार्तस्य कर्म्माणि। ततो नाननेकार्तनिको दृश्ये हेतु: सिद्धवृत्त्वात्। अन्तःतर्य: —

समान्सम्भव्यात् ॥ २६ ॥

येवोऽन्ते कर्म्माणि वन्ते १६७४श्चाद असिद्धवृत्त्व्य समानमित्रवान्ध्यायोऽस:।

कथमिद्युपद्यते—

24d. विभिन्नं | E₅E₆F; बहुविं | L  25d. भोजयतु स | em.; भोजयतु स L; भोजयतु E₅(unmetrical); भोजयतु स E₆; क्रमसो E₅E₆F  26a. क्रमसो | L; क्रमसो E₅E₆F  26c. विपचित्ति | E₅; विपचित्ति तथेषः L(unmetrical); पापकर्माणि तथेषः E₅.

23.16 “सिद्धिक्रियति” | conj.; “सिद्धिक्रियति” L  23.16 क्रियः [ conj.; भि L  25.2 सत्तानान्तविवेच्स्वभावसं | conj.; सत्तानान्तविवेच्स्वभावसं | L  25.3 कार्यकरणस्वभावसं | em.; कार्यकरणस्वभावसं | L  26.2 “सतीये” | L“; “मुदीये” L“?  26.4 “सिद्धिवृत्त्व्य” | conj.; “सिद्धिवृत्त्व्य” L
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यस्मात्कायो मोक्ष विनिवृत्तौ गम्यते मले न प्रयत्न।
शक्नोति हि योग्यतं तथेऽव कूर्तं महेश्वरो न पीत।।

यस्मात्वस्य कमिणि स्वयोग्यत्वस्य कमिण्य परिपक्वक्षेत्रायाय कार्यमुक्तम्, तथेऽव मले दुःपि करमेण —तथेऽव मुक्तवाच्यादिदशतान्त्रावनुपपत्तिसिद्धं कमेण्य परिपक्वक्षेत्रायं कार्यमेत्र शास्त्रे गम्यते एव। यदुकं श्रीमत्वायमुच्ये—
श्रीणे तर्कमिन्ययथा स्वायत्ते ने क्रेयश्च स्मारत। इति।

वेव च भोगाय दक्ष मोक्षो योग्यताकर्मणेष्व एव परिपक्वेतुमहेश्वर:; तथेऽव मलस्यापि स एव।» परिपक्वेतुरुतिः हितक्षेत्रायिन्यसिद्धतेष्व—

न केवलमैव यावत् (f.115°) —
स्वाये दस्येयं योनेयायत्वं कर्मणां पुर्वेन।
भवतोत्तरभिवेयं स्थितिसमयस्य साक्षात्कालीन्म् ॥ २८॥

प्रकृतीद्रवर्तनान्त्यतुस्मोऽभोगप्रत्येकनापपापितानार्धकल्व शक्तिक्ष्टम् तदार्नी—
मपचितानाधिकारीयूनिक्षितवेदानापपापितानार्धकल्वाद्भोगदानायोग्यत्व—

मिती तदानानादानाय महाप्रतत्तसद्विमाको भवद्विन्द्रपुराणत्वः।

यदुकं श्रीमन्दुगः गुनैः —
स्वाये दस्यास्ते बोधयायोग्यमोऽधिकारावत्नानाध्यायनकर्मिकम्।

मायाशकीयतिकायोऽथ: प्रकृतिन्ततव पश्येदद्वाध्य सत्तुजाताम्॥ इति।

27a. यस्मात्] L; मवऽ E_D_E_F  27b. विनिवृत्तौ गम्यते मले न प्रयत्न | L; विनिवृत्तिः गम्यते मलस्यावऽ E_D_E_F  28a. दस्येयं] L; वैयः E_D_E_F  28b. दस्येयं] L; दस्येयं E_D_E_F  28d. समयात्जालस्य] L; समयाकालिन स (unmetrical); समयकालिन E_D_E_F  28. स्थि स्थि स्थि स्थि काल्योऽथः E_D_E_F

27.4 श्रीणे तस्मिन्ययथा स्वायत्रेण न: सेयश्च प्रायस्य। Svāyambhuvasūtrasāstra 1:170d

28.5–6 स्वाये दस्यास्ते बोधयानं—यथाः सत्तुजातम् Mtgardravidyapāda 4:15.

27.4 ने: भेयसं L; नं: भेयसं Svāyambhuvasūtrasāstra Ed. 27.5 कमिणो | conj.; कमिणा L  27.6 योंगात्रक्षेत्रे परिपक्वेतु महेश्वरः; तथेऽव मलस्यापि स एव | conj.; योगात्रक्षेत्रे L  28.1 नवरत्सा | em.; नवरत्सा L  28.3 दानायायोग्यतानमिति | conj.; दानायोग्यतानमिति L  28.5 स्थनत् L Mtgendra (Ked); रोधम् L  28.8 सत्त वर्षेद्] L; पश्चात् सर्वा Mtgendra (Ked)
तत्त्वविशेषाभावत्त्वात् श्रावणमात्रेऽतमसुपरसंहि तत्त्वाभावमात्र विशेष भवान् कस्मात् सुमन: सर्व न विषयते? किमर्मस्य सर्वसमकालं तत्त्वाभेष्टते? इत्यादि भवता प्रकृतेतत्त्वाभावकाले वाचनार्थोऽरुण तदेव वाचनार्थोऽरुणात्मक अत्मकाले वा -

तथा -

श्रोत: सु च च सर्वान्नी निममविहिनो यथा च यदृस्यु।
यावत्काले भवित च तथौ तथा तावदीशे। २९॥
कल्य शक्तिमती सुमन: मुखे: दिपि तत्त्विस्मादेन।

सर्वारोपकाले पूर्वपूर्वकालास्वतत्त्वात्मकाले कस्मात्मकाले मात्यायनोत्तुकेश्यो (११६) निमित्तेय: कलाकृतिविशेषाभावकाले गुणादिपुस्तियमतमाति तत्त्वजानने नोपादयति? किमर्मस्यावान्त्रप्रकृतिसम्बन्ध्य तस्याभेष्टते? यदृस्यु।

श्रोत: -

कलात्त्वदार्गाधिकारे द्वे तत्त्वे सम्भूत:।

अव्यक्त: च तथा भूयो गुणाकारानुजः प्रस्यः।।

गुणाच्यो निश्चित: जशे अठवथा गुणाभिभवत।

बुद्धेशायथ संशोध्यं हस्त्रात:।

अहंप्रान्त: मूर्क्षाच्यो तत्त्वाभेष्टीन्द्रयापि च।

तत्त्वाभेष्टिर्मुद्रान् भूताति सर्व। च क्राचः स्मृतः॥ इति॥

तत्त्वाभेष्टिर्मुद्रान् भूताति तथा कार्यवस्तुः यदृस्यु यथा वा प्रकृतिनिपितमलक्षणप्रकारे च यावति काले भवान्नेत्र: तत्त्वाभेष्ट तथा तत्त्वाभेष्ट काले भवान्नेत्र: श्रावणी। १२॥

29 c. यावत्काले भवित च।: L; यावति काले भवित: E_D(unmetrical); यावति काले भवित: हि E_F. 29 d. तावदीशे।: L; E_D. 30 a. २१दे।: E_D E_F. 30 b. २१दे।: E_D E_F.

30.5-10 कलात्त्वविशेषार्थोऽद्र: - क्राचः स्मृतः Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha 2:15-17.
नान्यथेत्विशेषाः सिद्धलक्षणमत्रोतं वाच्यम्। तद्विं मोक्षनिमित्तेऽनल-परिपक्वात्मानं तुल्यमिति नकशोदेशप्रसंगः। इति कुतसत्तसंगे "निराकुटसम् राकृतसम् स्वतन्त्रशिक्षकात्मक्यम् सिद्धिरिति। तदेव—

अलमुहिद्यमशुद्दे: सदृशं निरवशेषेण॥ ३०॥
शास्त्रेवेकल्पायं शताधानन्त्र विना निवृत्तिष्ठम्।
शताधानन्त्रमुखं सत्यूऽके: कारणोत्थाया॥ ३१॥

श्रमपुरुषतल्लयोविद्बन्धेन्तुभूतमशुद्दमलयं यत्तारम् (f.116) धितकं रूपं तत-तपों कुऽति निरवशेषेन प्रोक्तम्। यथा यस्य मलस्य शास्त्रेवेकल्पायमिति—

यदुंकं श्रीवायामः—

अथानानांमिल: पुरां पशुवं परिक्रितितम्। इति।
तत्र हि मलस्येकल्पन तुसां भुविचनन विनिर्महास्वपुष्पाणामेक एव मल इति प्रतिपादितम्। आविष्क्रियात्तरिष्यमितम्। यदुंकं तज्जेव—

श्रीभेजे तस्मिन्ययासा स्पन्दिति।

—तत्त्वाधानन्त्र विना निवृत्तिष्ठमभावयेव मलस्य भवेत्। विना श-कान्तिष्ठम् अभवच्छान्तिन्त्र यस्यं मलस्य निवृत्तिष्ठ मलनिवृत्तयो भवतीत्त्वः।

चौरूकः: क्षेष्णीरामानुकृत इतिवद। नायाप्येवङ्काया राकृतमनेकोशक्षिक-कल्यनं विनोपमपर्यं यतः। अत एव शताधानन्त्रमभावयं तदायगोत्थाया:

सदृशूऽके: सर्वाशास्त्रित्तुमिति प्रवेशित प्राक् ‘मलशक्यो विभिन्न: प्रत्य—

31.4 अथानानांमिल: पुरां पशुवं परिक्रितितम् Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha 2:1ab, in which Sadyojayī's text has अथांनांमिलः:

31.7 श्रीने तस्मिन्ययासा स्पन्दित। Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha 1:17c.
त्मानम्' इति॥ ३१॥
अथ प्रकरणोपसंहारः —
उकः समासो शयं तत्त्वचरणिन्द्रयः स वृत्तिकृता।
स्वाभव्युक्तस्य जडतामपनेतुमनादादिकों पुनः॥ ३२॥
सो शयं तत्त्वचरणिन्द्रयः स्वाभव्युक्तस्य वृत्तिकृता केतपालेन पुरुषेऽयो जड-
तान्तिवत्थे सत्त्वेणाक इति॥ ३२॥
इति तत्त्वचरणिन्द्रयंविवृत्तिविविधाभिसारस्तः।
प्रतत्त्वाये रचिता काशीरिकभट्टरामकण्ठेन॥
इति भट्टश्रीरायणकण्ठात्मजभट्टश्रीरामकण्ठेन विरचिता तत्त्वचरणिन्द्रयां-
स्यं विवृत्तिसम्पूर्णं समासंति श्रीवम्।

32b. निन्यं: स कृतिकृता | L: निन्यंयं वृत्तिकृता E_D E_F  32c. जडताम् | E_D E_F;
जडम् L(unmetrical)

Rāmakaṇṭha’s tenth-century Tāttvatrayanirṇayavivṛti
Translation

O Śambhu, when those whose perception has been rendered free of
impurity after being empowered by the descent of power that is
your impurity see you, pure, your power uninhibited, then, surely,
the arguments that philosophers formulate over difference and
non-difference are devoid of purpose.\(^{12}\)

Although the settled view of the thirty-six principles (saṭṭrimśattattva-

\(^{12}\)For the inability of the bound soul to use its limited faculties to grasp Śiva, see
Mokṣakārīkā 106; but Rāmakaṇṭha is here referring to the ‘seeing’ of Śiva by a soul with
its unmediated power of knowledge after it has been empowered by initiation: see Mokṣa-
kārīkā 109–110 and Rāmakaṇṭha’s commentary thereon:

viśuddhenātmataṭṭhena caityākhyena sūtrakṛt
śivaśaktikaleddhena (śivaśaktikaledhena) conj.; śivaśaktikaledhyena GOML
R 14466; śivaśaktikale śuddhe E\(_{\text{V}}\) śivo dhyeya iti bruvan
pāśārayo mahēśāna iti khyāpayati sma nāh.
[Mokṣakārīkā 109–110b.]

[Mokṣakārīkāvṛtti] dīkṣitair jñānaśaktayeiva nirmalayaś śivaśaktya dīpyate śivo dhyeya iti
raurvasūtraśāro bruvan (bruvan) GOML R 14466; ‘brahīt E\(_{\text{V}}\) na buddher dhyātayo
(dhyātayo) E\(_{\text{V}}\); yaṁtayo GOML R 14466) bhāgavān ity aha
sarvañjanaśvetameva śivaśaktikalidhitam (śivaśaktikalidhitam) BHATT,
GOML R 14466; śivaśaktikalottithitaḥ E\(_{\text{V}}\)
ātmataṭṭham idam śuddham śūdhakānosti prakīrti
atstōh bhavatayavvam tām kalūṃ cintayad budhāḥ (budhāḥ) GOML
R 14466, E\(_{\text{V}}\); sadā BHATT.

Here ‘BHATT’ refers to BHATT’s edition of the Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha, in which the 3
quoted half-lines are 4:43ab, 4:43cd and 4:42cd. The siglum E\(_{\text{V}}\) marks the readings of
Vrajavallabhā Divīd’s edition of the texts of the Aṣṭapakaraṇa.

The author of the sūtras [of the Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha, on which I am com-
tenting], in telling [us] that Śiva is to be meditated upon by the purified
‘entity that is the soul’, [that may be] called ‘the power of consciousness’,
[once it has been] set afloat by a part of the power of Śiva, has informed us
that the Supreme Lord cannot be approached through [the limited faculties
of knowing that are] bonds. [Mokṣakārīkā 109–110b.]

[Mokṣakārīkāvṛtti] In saying that initiates should meditate upon Śiva by means of their
pure power of consciousness inflamed by the power of Śiva, the author of the Rauravasūtra
tells us that the Lord is not for the buddhi to meditate upon:

Freed of all impurities, strengthened by a part of the power of Śiva, this is
proclaimed to be the purified ‘soul’ of the aspirants. Located in that, with the
entity that is his self unmerged (or merged?), the wise man should meditate
upon that power(?).
nirṇaye) according to this system (iha) has certainly (hi) been enunciated (ukte) in such works as the Tattvasaṅgraha, [our author] now (tāvat) [pays] obeisance to the Supreme Lord in order to obviate obstacles (avighnāya) so as to be able to teach here (ātra) a further treatise (prakaraṇāntaram vaktum) that is intended to settle the nature (-arthasaḍbhāvaṇiṇīya)¹³ of three main entities (pradhānasya. . .tattvatrayasya),¹⁴ namely that which experiences, that which is experienced and that which enables experience¹⁵—a nature] that may be defined by what they do and do not have in common (sādharmyavādādharmyalakṣaṇa"), both with each other and with the other principles.

Obeisance to Him, who, independent (anāyattaḥ) and of beginningless splendour (anādyudayaḥ), bestows through his own greatness various rewards upon souls, after determining the nature of the varying [degrees of] bondage [that afflicts them]. (1)

Obeisance to Him who gives to souls the varied fruits, namely (-lakṣaṇam) experience, liberation and whatever is connected as the means of achieving those two (bhakti-mukti-tatsādhanaśambhanda)-¹⁶ after ascertaining the varying nature of their bondage, which can be the result of past action, derived from primal matter and of the type [of impurity] that belongs to [each] individual [bound soul] (kāramāyugāpāvasya). From among those [bonds] (tatra), he ascertains (jñātavā) the variety of the power to give experience (bhogadānākṣamavaiśvacitryam) of the bond that derives from past action, and then gives (dadāti) the various experience that is connected with (sambandhi) the means of bringing about experience (tatsādhanaīḥ),

¹³'nature' may seem a weak translation of arthasaḍbhāva, but something of this kind appears to be required. Rāmakaṇṭha seems to be echoing Sadyojayī's use of the word in verse 2. We do not find other parallels.

¹⁴Here Rāmakaṇṭha shifts to a non-technical sense of tattva, for, as we shall see below, the three tattvas that are the subject of the treatise cover more than three of the thirty-six tattvas of the Śaiva Siddhānta.

¹⁵Ez conj.

¹⁶As we shall see in what follows, the Lord bestows experience and liberation by means of a connection with a number of factors which produce or condition them. Why then should one enumerate the connection with factors that produce liberation and experience separately from bhakti and mukti? Perhaps the answer is that Śiva can in certain cases simply give mukti (or lower levels of mukti) directly, without needing to connect the soul with instruments. It is not inconceivable that the text is corrupt and that we should read instead bhuktimuktisādhanaśambhandha², 'connection with the means of achieving experience and liberation'.
which derive from primal matter (māyāṁ), and that consists in awareness of them (tatsaṁvittyaṭmakaṁ), [namely:] the tattvas from kalā to earth; the worlds that rest in them (tadadhikaranaṁ āśe), beginning with that of Kālagni and going up to that of Aṅgūṣṭhamātra, the infinite variety of bodies born in those various worlds; and the experienceable states of mind that are the bhāvas and pratyaṇyas. Then, upon ascertaining (jñātvā) the

17 Ex conj.

18 Why is Aṅgūṣṭhamātra mentioned here? The Saṁhita scriptures are not unanimous in placing the world of Aṅgūṣṭhamātra in at the top of the māyā-derived ‘impure’ part of the cosmos. Thus in the Sarvajñānottara (9:109), the Kirāṇa (8:23–4) and the Mataṅga (vidyāpāda 11:38), he is at the head of a group of eight Rudras who are placed in rāgaṇattva; in the Mṛgendra (vidyāpāda 13:151–2) we find him at the head of the same group, but described as being inside a tranche of three tattvas, namely kalā enveloping rāga and vidyā (rāgavidyāgarbhe kalāpade); and in the largest old Śaiva cosmographical account, that of the Svācchanda, Aṅgūṣṭhamātra heads the same group, but is found lower still, in buddhīsattva (10:1045–6).

But Rāmakaṇṭha appears here to be following the cosmographical tradition represented by the Mālaviya-jayottara (5:28–9) and of which the earliest surviving source is perhaps the Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha (4:25), according to which what is essentially the same group of eight Rudras headed by Aṅgūṣṭhamātra is at the top of the impure universe in mājātattva. The Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha, although it does not allocate worlds and Rudras to particular tattvas, also implies that, whereas Aṅgūṣṭhamātra lies (4:19–21). The Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha and the Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha are the only surviving tantras of the Śaiva Siddhānta that we can be certain Sadyojayotih knew, and so it is fitting here that Aṅgūṣṭhamātra should be placed here at the head of the uppermost level of the universe within which embodiment is regulated by karmāṇa. Rāmakaṇṭha is presumably echoing verse 55 of Sadyojayotih’s Paramoksanirāsakārikā:

aṅgūṣṭhamātraḥ bhūvane kaivalyaṁ sambhavet pāśoḥ
viṣṇunayagasaṁnyāsaṁ bhogād vā karmāṇaḥ kṣayāṁ

Isolation is possible of the bound soul in the world of Aṅgūṣṭhamātra by the destruction of karmāṇa through knowledge, yoga, renunciation (saṁnyāsa) or consumption.

One other relatively early source that places Aṅgūṣṭhamātra high up is worth mentioning in passing: Bheja’s Siddhāntaśārayapaddhati (SANDERSON’s unpublished e-text, NAK 5:743, NGMPP B 28/19, §46”): mahātejasvāmadevabhava-udbhava-ekapīṁgeśvara-
iśānakahvan-cag-āṅgaṣṭhamātra iti manḍaleṣvarāṣṭakaman māyāḥ.

19 The bhāvas are the eight basic propensities that are properties of the buddhi, namely dharma, jñāna, vairāgya, aśīvarya and the opposites of these four. They are the fruits of karmāṇa. When this karmāṇa becomes yet further ripened, they develop into more concrete experienceable states of mind called pratyaṇyas (thus Aghoraśīva in the Mṛgendra-vṛtti-
dipikā ad 10:25: te dharmāṅga eva prakārṣāvasthāṁ prāptāḥ sthālene rūpeṇa bhogada-
śaṁ pratipannaṁ pratyaṇyaḥ). According to the Sākhyas, from whom this nexus of ideas is inherited, there are 50 pratyaṇyas; according to Aghoraśīva ad Mṛgendra-vṛtti-
dipikā 10:25, interpreting the Mṛgedra and the Mataṅga, there are 300 for the Śaivas. For more on the subject, see Mṛgendra-vidyāpāda 11.
variety of this same [bond resulting from past action] that depends upon destruction, either by knowledge, by yoga, by renunciation or by consumption [of karman], [He bestows] the ‘fruit’ that consists in being a soul in the state of being deprived of experience on account of the universe's being resorbed or in another state [of deprivation of experience, namely that of the vijñānakevala] (pralayakevalatvādi phalam),\(^{20}\) which [in turn] depends upon (sambaddham) [such factors as phases of] creation and resorption. Upon ascertaining the variety of [the bond of innate impurity] that affects each individual, [a variety which] is produced by [the degree of] its ripening, [He bestows] various types of liberation by means of various types of initiation, starting with [the commonest type, namely] the salvific initiation whose effect is not immediate (asadyonigrohdhīvidhānaicaitreṇa). And this He bestows by means of His own splendour alone (eva), which means ‘by His Powers’ (svaśaktiśakṣaṇena), and not by means of any independent instrument, for even if He should make use of such a thing (tadupādāne ‘prī), it is His Power that remains the [primary] instrument (śaktā eva karaṇatveṇī). Furthermore (ca) He is one whose ‘splendour’ (udayā), which consists in omniscience and omnipotence, is beginningless. The meaning is that He is beginninglessly liberated.\(^{21}\)

Now, immediately after the offering of homage, the connection [with Śaiva scripture], the subject-matter and the motivation of this work [are given], necessarily together with (-pūram) [mention of] the qualification of certain particular persons [for studying it].

**Now, o you who merit honour,**\(^{22}\) for the benefit of those

---

\(^{20}\) Here again Rāmākṛṣṇa is plainly echoing Paramokṣanirāsakārikā 55, quoted above
in footnote 18 on p. 11. As we shall show below (see footnote 67 on p. 28), the second half of the verse is in other passages typically used when explaining how someone becomes a vijñānakevala, in other words, a soul whose karman has been completely used up and who can therefore no longer have a body made up of the evolutes of māyā. For such a soul, only mala remains. It is clear therefore that in this sentence Rāmākṛṣṇa intends to speak of the two conditions in which the soul is deprived of experience, namely that of the pralayakevala (or pralayākula) and that of the vijñānakevala (or vijñānakula).

\(^{21}\) Ez conj.

\(^{22}\) We could instead take natibhājāḥ as an ablative agreeing with gurutāḥ. The position of the two words seems to us to make Rāmākṛṣṇa’s interpretation more plausible. Another possibility, the one adopted by Aghoraśiva, is to take it as a genitive, referring to Śiva as the author of tantric scripture. Yet another would be to take the expression as a vocative addressing devotees: ‘o you who have respect’. The advantage of this last interpretation is that we could smoothly construe the phrase with tantro: ‘o you who have respect for this tantra’. One more conceivable interpretation worth mentioning requires taking natī in the sense in which it is used in verse 6, namely ‘transformation’: ‘o you who are subject to [a need for] maturation [of impurity].’
of slow intellect [who belong] inside this tantric system (tantre). I am about to teach briefly the special (kaṃcid) essence²³ that I learnt from the Guru. (2)

O you who merit veneration (natibhājoh = namaskārārhāḥ), [namely] elders! I shall teach the special (kaṃcit) nature (arthaśadbhāvam) that is on the agenda of this work (vakṣyamāṇam) and that consists in settling what three entities have and do not have in common [both with each other, and with other entities]. The meaning is that this is the subject-matter of this [work]. And this [subject-matter] has been 'learnt from the Guru', in other words has reached us from the Supreme Lord through a succession of teachers of the śāstra. This is the statement of the connection [of this work with Śaiva scripture]. Saying (iti) [that this is] for the benefit of those of slow intellect who are specifically (eva) initiated inside this tantric system (tantre 'śmin'),²⁴ [he conveys that] the work is targeted at particular persons qualified to study it and is thereby (vāśiṣṭādhiśāṅkārigatatvena) a statement of the motivation [for the studying] of this [work].

Here the nature [of these three] is taught:

Śiva, the soul and primal matter are eternal (nityam), pervasive (vibhu), and endowed with power of agency (kartṛśaktiyuktam). Even when all evolutes sleep, this triad, among [all] entities [alone] wakes.²⁵ (3)

Śambhu, that is to say the entity Śiva, [which is one of the three entities discussed in this treatise, means] the Supreme Lord together with liberated Śivas,²⁶ and together with the two reality-levels of Sādāśiva and Īśvara. This he will [by implication] teach [below in verse 6:]

The group of actions that require transformation [of the universe's cause] are therefore beginninglessly established [as being

²³Aghoraśiva's text requires understanding a compound kaṃcidarthasadbhāvam, which Filliozat (1991:137) renders with 'l'essence réelle de quelques objets'. We assume this to be a secondary reading. It is clear in any case from, for example, his preamble to verse 1 that Rāmakaṇṭha takes arthaśadbhāv as a unit of vocabulary the meaning of which we took to be 'nature'.
²⁴Ex conj.
²⁵This follows Rāmakaṇṭha's interpretation; but more natural would be 'this triad of entities wakes'.
²⁶Souls who attain liberation may be referred to as 'liberated Śivas'. They have achieved omniscience and omnipotence, in other words have become identical to Śiva, but they have to be freed from bondage to realise their innate Śiva-nature, whereas Śiva has always been free of bondage.
vested] in the Lord, and so is the division into Sakala, Sakalakala and Akala that is proclaimed [in scripture] and which relates [in fact] to [a difference in degree of involvement in] activity.

Now the soul is [so called because he is] one who requires to lie (śayanārhaḥ) inside a body (puruṣa puruṣa tatra);[27] he is bound, according to circumstance by one, two or three bonds—that is the entity of the bound soul.

As for matter (maṇḍā), she can be higher or lower. The higher one is the reality-level of [pure] vidyā, the locus of the [eight] Mantrās.[28] and the Mantras.

[...][20]

This has been taught in the venerable Svāyambhuva[sūtrasaṅgraha]:

From that [maṇḍātattva evolved] time and kalā,[30] passion, [im-pure] knowledge and [lower] matter (rāgavidyāvyaktaḥ), together with [the tattva of] guṇa. [Below these] from buddhi came ahaṅkāra [and from that in turn] the subtle elements and the faculties [of sense and action]. From the subtle elements [evolved] the gross elements. And He created all this in due order.

This triad alone among entities is eternal; all other entities are not eternal. And furthermore it is ‘pervasive’. This same triad is also pervasive, because even primal matter pervades [at least] its effects. And you cannot say that in this [statement] there is a problem of insufficient-inclusion on the grounds that Śadāśiva and Īśvara are also all-pervading, since those two are already included here [within the three entities]. This has [already] been taught (īty

---

[27] For this widespread nirvacana, see, e.g., Śatapathabrāhmaṇa 13.6.2: ... so' syām puri śete tasmāt puruṣaḥ,... Cf. also Mahābhārata 12.203:35.

[28] In Rāmānuja’s usage, the term Mantrās refers to the eight Vidyās, namely Ananta (the demiurge responsible for creation), Śūkṣma, Śivottama, Īśvara, Ekaṇa, Ekaḍha, Triṁuṭi, Śrīkaṇṭha and Śīkaṇḍin (cf., e.g., his introduction to Mokṣakaṅkṣa 93). Pure vidyā (which can be referred to as mahāmaṇḍā) and primal matter (maṇḍā) are contiguous tattvas, but the first is the matter for the ‘pure universe’ (śuddhāhārva) and the second is the matter for the ‘impure universe’ (asuddhāhārva), which we inhabit. For a brief outline of the ladder of tattvas in the classical Śiva Siddhānta, see GOODALL 1998:lii–lv.

[29] It seems more than likely that some text has dropped out here which identified the lower of the two maṇḍās as maṇḍātattva and stated that it was the source of all the evolutes of the impure universe, since that appears to be the claim for which the following quotation of the Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha is intended to furnish scriptural support. A statement to this effect might well have begun with aparā and ended with maṇḍātattvam. Such an ending might then easily have provoked eyeskip by being similar to that of the sentence before it.

[30] Or, if we follow the interpretation of Sadacarayatī at loc., ‘time, niyati and kalā’.
uktam). Furthermore it is ‘endowed with power of agency’. This same triad is also one whose nature is to do things (kāryakartṛsvabhāvam). Matter’s being a cause is taught [here] to be its agency, given that it is impossible for it to be an agent [in the primary sense of that word], since it is insistent, as will be explained below.

Whoever is the controlling agent of the factors that govern a verbal action (kārakānām), whether in setting in motion or in cessation, whether or not he happens to be engaged in action or not engaged, he is the factor governing a verbal action which we call the agent.31

And although Mantras and Mantrēsvaras are also agents, there is no under-extension in this [statement], since they are particular types of soul. Similarly, although kalā and the other [evolutes of māya] are causes [and therefore might in a limited sense be considered ‘agents’ in the way māya is], there is no under-extension here since it is really māya, existing as potentiality, who is the true cause through them, and so there is no fault [here], for the true nature of māya is to exist as potentiality.

Furthermore ‘even when all evolutes sleep, this triad wakes’. The meaning is that in a total resorption [of the lower universe] (mahāpralaye), even when all other entities have been resorbed, this same group of three entities remains. Surely this is [already] understood simply (eva) from the mention of their being eternal. True, but it is repeated here in order to remove a mistaken notion (vipratipattinivṛtyartham). For some people, such as the author of the Vārttika on the Raurava, hold that at the moment of total resorption, when [the world/rank of] Ananta is resorbed, there is no resorption of the [ranks/worlds] of the other Vidyēśvaras. But that is wrong, because scripture teaches [that they attain] simultaneous liberation. This has been shown by Sadyojyotih in the Rauravavṛtti.32 For this has been taught in the Rauravaj-[sūtrasāṅgha], in 2:13:

31 The point of citing this verse must be to justify the impossibility of māya being an agent in the primary sense. In the other places in which we have found it quoted (see the apparatus), we find pravṛttasu ca niḥṛttasu ca.

32 This is a reference to Sadyojyotih’s Mokṣakārikā 93:

ami rudrāś tu sūkṣmādyā mantraś ca śivatulyatām
sānandāḥ svādhikārante yānti muktiṃ hareraṇāt

This is evidently intended as commentary upon Rauravasūtrasāṅgha 2:13, which Rāma-kṛṣṇa is now just about to quote in our text. (The Bhogakārikā, Mokṣakārikā and Paramokṣanirūsakārikā, as well as some now lost works, made up Sadyojyotih’s Rauravavṛtti: see GOODALL 1998:xx–xxvi.) A fragment of Bṛhaspatipāda’s lost Rauravavārttika that is evidently commenting on exactly the same unit, Rauravasūtrasāṅgha 2:13, is quoted by
Rāmakaṇṭha in his Mokṣakārikāvṛtti ad 93:

anantoparama śhānām (sthānām) GOML R 14466; sthāne E\textsuperscript{v} 

padāt padām vicārato hy ekaikasya mahātmanāh

sthāne śikṣaṇāmas tv anyāṃ (tv anyāṃ) E\textsuperscript{v}; satyaṃ GOML R 14466

rudrāṇāṃ kurute śivāh.

When Ananta desists [from his duties] Śūkṣma assumes that position. As each of these great-souled [Vidyāśaras] moves [up] from one position to the [next] position, Śiva places another of the Rudras into the position of [the lowest of the Vidyāśaras,] Śikhaṇḍin.

We must understand vicārato hy ekaikasya as a genitive absolute, though without the connotation that that construction is held to express (viz. anādare). Note that the line is shared by the Matanga, where it is vidyāpāda 5:14ab. For the Mataṅga contains an account (vidyāpāda 5:10–15) similar to that of Bṛhaspatipāda, and we may surmise that one account must have served as the inspiration for the other:


nirvāti kṛtkṣayatvād ananto 'nantavāryāvān
tatāt tasmin samārūdhāḥ pañcamamantratinānāṃ śivāh 10
dadāty anujñāyāṃ sūkṣmasya vidyāśasya mahātmanāḥ
sa ca prāptavārah śrīmān bhūtar ajñānivartakāḥ 11
tattantraḥ padām ānantaṁ adhiśśhāya mahāyāsāh

nīrāvartyat adhaś cakraṃ yat tān māyātmakaṃ jagat 12
evān śivottamasyāpi sūkṣmasyoparaṇeva śivāh

pruddadāśīsāsoṣṭhasya kāraṇatvam anidintam 13

padāt padām vicārato hy ekaikasya mahātmanāḥ

yāvat sā pāramā kāṣṭhā tāvāc cakrasya kāraṇam 14

aśvagchedāya rudrāṇāṃ kṛtvā saktibalāvātām

niyamakti pade tasmān yavīyasi śikhaṇḍinām 15

\* 11a anujñāyāṃ sūkṣmasya \| Kashmirian MSS; ājnāṃ sūkṣmasya Ed.
\* 12b mahāyāsāḥ \| Kashmirian MSS; mahāyāsāḥ Ed. \* 15c. yavīyasi \| Kashmirian MSS; yavīyāmsāṃ Ed.

Ananta, whose power is infinite, because he has accomplished his duties, goes to the liberated state, and then, once he has ascended, Śiva, whose body is the five mantras, gives authorisation to Śūkṣma, the great-souled Vidyāśa. And he [in turn], having acquired [His] favour (prāptavārah), splendid, assumes the glorious position of Ananta, and carries out the commands of his master, remaining within his [master’s] control. He keeps the wheel moving below [—the wheel] that is this universe of māyā. In the same way when Śūkṣma stops [his work], Śiva [gives authorisation] to Śivottama. He gives to all the Vidyāśas (śesārāghasya) the blameless state of being the [instigating] cause [of the creation and maintenance of the universe]. Of each great-souled one as he moves up from level to level the [duty of] keeping the wheel moving (cakrasya kāraṇam) is maintained until he reaches the Supreme State. In order that there should be no interruption, He makes one among the Rudras who is endowed with powers [into] Śikhaṇḍin and employs him in the most junior position.
Once Ananta has finished [his cosmic duties], the supreme state, which brings about omnipotence, is realised for those great universal emperors.

And also in the Matañga, [invidyāpāda 25:62cd, 63cd]:

The gods who are lords in the pure universe, and mantras, who are of invincible power, upon ceasing at the end of their [phase of] duty, go to the supreme level.

And so there is no contradiction.

And so, with this group of properties, what is common among these three entities, and also what they do not hold in common with other entities, has been stated. Now he will further (apā) state both of these [viz. both what is held in common and what is not] within the group [of three] (parasparatāḥ).

Śiva and the soul are beyond number, do not produce anything (prasadāvahīnau) and are endowed with sentience (citā). (4ab)

In brief, it is clear that the two great ancient exegetes of the Śaiva Siddhānta, Sadyojyotīḥ and Brhaspatipāda, were perceived by the tenth-century Kashmirians as having taken sides over Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha 2:13. Sadyojyotīḥ, in verses 93–4 of the part of his Rauravavṛtti known as the Mokṣakārikā, favoured a straightforward interpretation, according to which all the Vidyēśvaras attained liberation simultaneously, and Brhaspatipāda, both in his *Rauravavārttika, which we have cited above, and in his *Śivatanusāstra, cited by Abhinavagupta in Tantrāloka 8:345–53, upholds the position that each of the Vidyēśvaras moves up to the position of his superior each time that the Vidyēśvāra who bears the uppermost rank of Ananta becomes liberated. In this Brhaspati may have been drawing on Mataṅgavidyāpāda 5:10–15, if that text existed when he wrote. Rāmakaṇṭha accepts, on the authority of the Mataṅga, that the Vidyēśvaras can move up step by step, but rejects, on the authority of the Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha and of Sadyojyotīḥ, the position of Brhaspatipāda that this takes place in mahāpralaya.

Why is all this relevant here? If Brhaspatipāda’s position were to be adopted, that would mean that the ranks (adhikāra) of Ananta and the other Vidyēśvaras would still be present at a time of mahāpralaya, but also, and perhaps more importantly, their bodies and worlds, made up of the subtle matter of vidyāttava would also remain, and that would mean that not only the entity māyā (which includes both māyā and pure vidyā) would remain, but also the evolutes of pure vidyā. Rāmakaṇṭha goes to some trouble over this detail, but he seems not to remark at all on the fact that there are two rather important entities other than sambhu, puruṣa and māyā as they are defined in this text that survive in mahāpralaya, namely mala and karman, neither of which find a place among the Śaiva tattvas. Because they are subject to change, they cannot be treated as properties of the soul (as Rāmakaṇṭha explains of karman in his commentary on Kīraṇa 3.8), since this would entail the mutability and therefore the impermanence of the soul. Rāmakaṇṭha’s explanation, in his commentary on Kīraṇa 1:13, of their vicarious inclusion in the tattvākrama, does not show how this problem might be solved.
First of all (tāvat), Śiva, taking into account [the fact that this category includes] liberated Śivas (muktaśivāpekṣayā), is uncountable (asaṃkhyātaḥ), [i.e.] infinite [in number] (anantaḥ). In this system (iha), liberation consists in being equal to Śiva (śivasamāvatvam eva), and not in being merged in Him (na tu tallayāḥ). The [category of the] soul too is infinite in number, since we here adopt the position that souls are plural, on the grounds that the soul (tasya) is proved to be so (evaṃ siddheḥ) [viz. proved to be plural] because of [the combination of] his self-awareness (svasaṃvedanena) and the fact that he knows other souls; [we do] not [accept] (na tu) the position that there is only one soul (ātmātikṣyasya). This we have taught elsewhere. One might object that (nānu) other entities such as kalā must also be infinite in number since they too are divided [so as to belong individually] to each [bound] soul. This is taught in the treatise on Experience and Liberation (bhogamokṣe). 

...the collection of means to experience ending with kalā is separate (niyatā) for each experiencer.

True, and that is why he will say exactly this [later in the text]. But here what is to be expressed is what is not held in common [by Śiva and the soul] specifically (eva) with māya, and not with other entities, and so there is no fault [with the argument].

33It would also be possible to split the words differently here to yield muktaśivāpekṣayā samākhyātaḥ 'anantaḥ. This would make the sentence more closely parallel with the parallel statement about the soul in the next line, but we think that Rāmākānta intended first to give, as is often his practice, an etymologically close gloss (asaṃkhyātaḥ) followed by a looser one (anantaḥ). When commenting on the expression the second time, as applied to souls, he chose to gloss differently for variety, just as in line 4 he writes asaṃkhyāta to express the same notion, again for the sake of variety. We find that he uses asaṃkhyāta to mean ‘uncountable’ in the Nārēśvararāparikṣāprakāśā ad 3:49.

34Many of Rāmākānta's works discuss his theory that the existence of the soul is proven by svasaṃvedana. We do not know when Rāmākānta composed the Tattvavātayānirnayavivṛtti, and so it is difficult to say which earlier works of his own this cross-reference might refer to (cf., however, fn. 46 on p. 22), if it is indeed a reference to one of Rāmākānta's own works. Among the earliest of his compositions (see Goodall 1998:xxviii and ff) is the Paramokṣaṃjīrāsaṃkārikāvṛtti, and this work deals at length with svasaṃvedana, particularly in the refutation of Buddhist views (commentary on verse 43), and also with the plurality of souls, particularly in the refutation of the Pāṇcarātriśa view of liberation (commentary on verse 48).

35Bhogakārikā 106c–106b. The Bhogakārikā and the Moṣkārikā are here referred to as forming just one work. As we have recalled above (see p. 5 and fn. 5), they form part of Sadyojayotih's Rauravravṛtti.

36Ex conj. The passage in question occurs in 11.7–8.
Furthermore (*kim ca*), the two of them [viz. Śiva and the soul] ‘do not produce anything’, in other words (*iti*) both of them are not subject to transformation (*aparītāmināvau*), for if they were [subject to transformation], they would be insentient like clay and such. This is taught in the *Kīrāṇa*, [in 2.26ab]:

Transformation [is a property] of what is insentient; it is not possible of what is sentient.

And the two of them are ‘endowed with sentience’. [In other words] they are taught to be of the nature of consciousness, and not [simply] sentient because of being connected with the mind, or for some other reason.\(^{37}\) This is taught in the *Mataṅga*, [in *vidyāpāda* 6.81a]:

Sentience is the innate property of the soul (*cetāḥ*).

Now a dissimilarity between these two and *māyā* is stated.

**The category *māyā* is single, is of a nature to produce effects and is devoid of sentience. (4cd)**

The category *māyā* is just one, since there is no proof that it should be plural,\(^{38}\) as there is in the case of the category of the soul, and since it is proved to be the sole cause [of the universe] because [all effects] share [with each other and with *māyā* as their material cause] the one common property of seductiveness (*mohanaikārvyāt*).\(^{39}\) It is ‘of a nature to produce effects’, [i.e.] it is subject to transformation (*parītāmayuktam*), because this is proved by the very fact of its being the material cause of *kāla* and the other evolutes. And for this same reason it is insentient, like clay and the

---

\(^{37}\) It is not clear to us what this other reason or factor might be. One possibility is that *manahsaṁyoga* is the first in a sequence of requirements, the next being a connection between an *indriya* and the *manah*. Another conceivable possibility is that *adṛśa* is referred to with -*adi* here: cf. *Naresvaraparīkṣāprakāśa* 1.1, p.3.

\(^{38}\) *Ey conj*. The conjecture is not strictly speaking necessary, since *pramāṇābhāvāt*, but it would be ambiguous and not typical of Rāmakṛṣṇa.

\(^{39}\) It is probably not the usual sense of *anuṣaya* that Rāmakṛṣṇa intends here, but another technical sense that he uses in his refutation of the Pañcarātra view of liberation towards the end of his commentary on *Paramokṣanirāsakārīka* 48: ‘yā tu arthasya kārte pratiyavajavam cānyatra visadṛśatare ‘py vastutena rūpṇa sarvatvaṁdviṁśurtīthā, so ‘nuṣaya ucyate; ‘That (yā) continuity (anuṣertiḥ) of a thing (e.g. clay) in an effect (e.g. sherds), in every part (e.g. the neck and bottom of a pot), and elsewhere even in extremely dissimilar objects (e.g. clay dishes) in every case in that very form—that is called *anuṣaya*.’ Thus *anuṣaya* of a property is something shared by a material cause and all its evolutes.
like. And the same must be understood to be the case also for the higher māyā.

By saying here that ‘Śiva and the soul are beyond number’, the Īśvaras who can be referred to with the expression ‘Śiva’ have been stated above (proktāḥ) to be plural: the similarities and dissimilarities between them too are now (atha) stated:

ĪŚVARAS have realised their power (pravṛttaviryaḥ); one among them is one whose full range of properties has been beginninglessly realised. Through Him (tataḥ) the purity of liberated Śivas [is realised], and also their powers of knowledge and action, which are all-encompassing. (5)

Among these [shared and not shared properties] (tatra), the state of having realised their power (pravṛttaviryaṭavam), which means a state in which they have realised powers of knowledge and action in every possible domain (sarvaviṣaya-pravṛttajñānakriyātmakatvam), is common to all the Īśvaras [since they are] in this [same liberated] condition (tasyām avasthāyām). But the difference [between them and the Supreme Lord] is the result of their previous condition: the plenitude with respect to His qualities (guṇesu vaibhavam), [in other words] the omnipotence (prabhutvam), of the Supreme Lord is beginninglessly established, whereas (tu) in the case of liberated Śivas (mukteśvarānām) the cessation of bondage (bandhanivṛttīḥ [=vaimalyam]) and the realisation of innate Śiva-hood (śiva-vābhimuktiḥ [=svarūthe vyākriyे]) [come about] through Him (tataḥ), in other words (iti) through the Supreme Śiva.

Because this is so,

The group of actions that require transformation [of the universe's cause] are therefore beginninglessly established [as being vested] in the Lord, and so is the division into Sakala, Sakalākala and Akala (sakalākala-prabhedaḥ) that is proclaimed [in scripture] and which

---

^By āṣṭāṃś we interpret this to mean more than simply ‘Sakala and Akala’. Aghora-Śiva’s interpretation here is entirely different, in part because he reads kṛtvāryaḥ (which is perhaps more likely to be original than kṛtvāryaḥ). Following his interpretation, we may translate: ‘The group of effects [of māyā] depends on transformation [of māyā]. That is why (tena), although the Lord is established to be without beginning, a division into ‘with parts’ and ‘without parts’ is taught, as well as one which relates to action.’ The expression sakalākala-prabhedaḥ here refers, as in Rāmakaṇṭha’s interpretation, to Śiva,
relates [in fact] to [a difference in degree of involvement in] activity. (6)

Therefore (tena kāraṇena)\(^{41}\) the group of actions consisting in creation, maintenance, resorption, occlusion and compassion (sthitisaṃpruṣadānabhaavānuṣṭhaṃmanāḥ),\(^{42}\) and at whose beginning (yasya pūrvam = ādau) there is [necessarily] a transformation (parinatīḥ = natiḥ) [of the material cause of the universe],\(^{43}\) is beginninglessly established to be [vested] in this Lord (tasmin svāmī), [in other words] in the Supreme Lord [as his prerogative], and not in the liberated Śivas (na tu muktaśiveṣu), since in them this is established at a certain initial moment (ādisiddhatvāt).\(^{44}\) And also the division into Sakala and so forth, which relates to [the Lord’s degree of involvement in] action, that too is beginninglessly established in the Supreme Lord, but in liberated Śivas it is established at a certain initial moment. This [division] is in this system (atra) ‘proclaimed’ (gītah) as being included within Him (taṇḍantarbhūśenai), in other words (iti) as being not distinct [from Him] (na bhedena). Among these [subdivisions] (atra), the state of [inactive] capacity (sākṣatavam) with respect to [the five types of] action is the undivided state (nīkṣaṇāvasthā), called Śiva. As for the state of readi-

\(^{41}\)Sadāśiva and Īśvara, but also to a division among souls, for they too may be either sakala or akala (i.e. pralayaśāla or vipñchānāśāla). The division that relates to action is then taken by Aghoraśiva separately to refer to the five cosmic acts (paçaśīṛṣṭya), each of which is assigned to one of the five faces of Sadāśiva.

\(^{42}\)Rāmakaṇṭha’s wording here deliberately echoes the formulation for the locus classicus, Rauravasūtraśaṅghraha 1:15ab: sthitisaṃpruṣadānabhaavānuṣṭhaṃmanāḥ. Cf. Kirāpa-vṛtti 1:9.47 and GOODALL 1998:173. It is possible that the author of the Rauravasūtraśaṅghraha del not in fact intend to refer to the list of five actions, but the subsequent tradition has interpreted the half-line in this way.

\(^{43}\)We have assumed that Rāmakaṇṭha means to understand natiḥpurvaḥ to mean ‘which is necessarily dependent upon a transformation [of mūsya]’, but it must be admitted that the analysis of the compound is not exactly what we would have expected as the most natural way of conveying this. It is possible, therefore, that natiḥ parinatīḥ pūrvam ādau yasya is intended rather to mean ‘at the beginning of whose [list] there must be transformation [i.e. creation]’.

\(^{44}\)This is perhaps a very clumsy rendering of this last expression and one is tempted to translate as though the text read ādisiddhatvāt. But emendation is probably unnecessary, for the very next sentence contains the expression ādiśiddhāḥ. It is presumably the capacity to perform the five cosmic acts that is realised in liberated souls and not the performance itself, since souls are content to leave off acting once liberated (cf. Parākhyāna 15:68–70). It is unlikely that Rāmakaṇṭha had in mind here the lower levels of liberation, seven levels of which are taught in Maṭaṅgaṃyagopāda 5:63–9.
ness (udyuktatvam) with respect to that [group of actions] (tatra), it is the state which is both divided and undivided (sakalaniśkalavasthā), [also called] Sadāśiva. And as for the state of being engaged in action (yat punaḥ pra-vṛttakriyatvam), that is the divided state (sakalavasthā), [also known as] Īśvara. Thus, even though there is only one [Lord], this division into three reality-levels (tattvatabheda) is [found] in Him (atra). As they say [in the following verse]:

An agent is held to be of three kinds: empowered, ready, and engaged in activity.45

And also in the venerable Kīrāṇa, [in 3:13cd:]

He is differentiated according to the division of His activities [into the following forms]: Śānta, Sadāśiva and Īśa.

But from the perspective of the soul who through initiation or some other means attains some particular world there [among these high reality-levels] (tatpadoprāptaḥ), there is indeed a real differentiation (vastubheda eva) of these three reality-levels, because of the degree of involvement (vyaktatvā) of the power of action (kriyāskāte) [in them], which may be gross, subtle or ultimately [ly fine] (sthūlasūṣkmaprabhedena). This [I have] taught elsewhere.46

Earlier, what is shared by Śiva and the soul was stated in [the half-verse] ‘Śiva and the soul are beyond number, do not produce anything and are endowed with sentience’ (4ab). Now what they do not share is taught.

The group of properties (guṇajātam) possessed by souls (purṣām) [viz. their capacity to know and act] is also (api) all-encompassing (sarvasaṃguṇatam), just as is the case of Śiva’s properties; but in their case that [group of properties] is beginninglessly obstructed (anādisanruddham) by one single (ekenaiva) impurity (malena).47 (7)

The group of properties of souls too, as is the case of Śiva’s properties,48 is capable of connecting with all things (sarvārthasambandhayogam), since it

46This issue is discussed in the Mātṛgīvṛtti ad vidyāpāda 3:20 and we may assume that it is to this work of his own that Rāmakṛṣṇa means here to refer.
47The hi is presumably emphatic rather than causal here, and has not been translated.
48Ex conj.
is the [very] nature [of souls] to know and to do (jñatvākartaṃtvavabhbhāvatvāt).
[Objection:] if they too possessed this [group of properties], just as Iśvara
does, then [there would be] the corollary that everybody would be omniscient
and omnipotent (sarvaṃjñātvādiprasaṅgah). True, but because that group
of qualities in souls is beginninglessly obstructed by impurity (malena),
that corollary does not apply. And here, by the very mention of the fact
that it is beginninglessly blocked by impurity, impurity too is proven to be
beginningless. As for the oneness of impurity, [it is proven] because it would
be impossible otherwise to account for its being beginninglessly binding
(anādirbandhakatvānyathānupapattyāvān). For if it were plural, since it is
insistent, it would therefore require some cause [to set it in motion] (kāraṇa-
pūrvakatvena), just as is the case of kalā and other [evolutes of māyā],
and since it would therefore have a beginning (ādīmatvāt), it would be
impossible for there to be beginningless bondage (anādirbandhānupapattīh).

For bondage would not occur (sambhayati) for one for whom, as is the
case for Śiva, impurity has ceased to operate (niṣṭhāmālaśya śivasyeva).

What follows from this that is relevant (tataḥ prakṛte kim)? He replies
(ucyate):

These [souls] are therefore powerless (anīśāh), [in other
words] nescient (ajñāh) [and] inactive (nirvīyāpārāh).

---

49 Ex conj.
50 Ex conj.
51 Ex conj.; cf. the passage of the Nareśvaraparakṣāprakāśa cited in the next footnote.
52 Rāmacanṭha attributes to Sadyojyoti the view that this type of argument is used by
the Śāṅkhyas in his commentary on Nareśvaraparākṣā 1:70:

yah prakteḥ kāpiśair nyūya jagadgavaṃtvadīsādhu
āyamānurūtītatvān nyāṅgaḥ sādhuh sa eva hi

yenaiva sāṃkhyaśār ccitaraty saty anekatvād buddhyādīnām ghaṭādīnām iva
kāraṇapūrvakatvānumānumārām gauḥ kāraṇam avasthāpītas teneiva guṇānām
apy acaitante saty anekatvād avyaktatvam kāraṇam. avyaktaḥ gaviṣṭādīnām
kālakalānām api pratiṣṭhītah bhinnānām māyāmābhībhī sādhvante.

Cf. also Tantrālokaviveka ad 9:153: atra pañcāvayaṃ parārtham anumānam nirūpam.
tadyathā—pradhānām kāryam, acaitante saty anekatvāt: yad acaitante saty anekam tat
sarvaṃ kāryam, yathā ghaṭāḥ; yan na kāryam tad acaitante satī anekam na bhavati,
yathātā; acaitante saty anekam ca pradhānām, tasmat kāryam iti bhavo
caitad bheda-vādīhīr (conj. YOKOCHI; vedavādīhīr Ed.) upapūdītam itiha granthasvitarūbhayaṇā
na vitāntiṃ.

53 Once again, as in the last verse, the particle hi need have no causal force, but it is
conceivable that it reinforces the causal force of the atāh. It is also possible that it is
placed here simple to obviate a hiatus. Yet another possibility is that it is irregularly
placed (bhinnakrama) and that we should interpret: "They are therefore powerless, and
[being] without any revelation of their powers (bala-vyaktim).\(^{54}\) (8ab)

Therefore (atah), [in other words] because of (kṛṣṇat) beginningless bondage by impurity (anādimalabandhāt), these souls are powerless (aniśvarāh), [in other words] with powers of knowledge and action unrevealed (anabhīvyakta jñātavakṣaḥtvabalāh), since it is only when impurity ceases to operate (malaniyuttāv eva) that those [powers] are revealed (tadabhīvyakteḥ). For this same reason (ata eva),

And they are not able by themselves each to make their own (svam svam) [innately unlimited] abilities (balam) devoid of impurity (amalam) [and thus] all-encompassing (sarvagam). (8cd)

Because it is a substance (dravyatvā), like an impurity in the eye, such as a cataract (patalādeḥ), it is not the case that the cessation (nivṛttiḥ) of this [impurity], which is the cause of nescience (ajñānahetoh), may come about through knowledge (jñānāt), as a result of which, if it were the case, (yena) men would have power, as they do [have increased power] when mental nescience, which is of the nature of wrong superimposition of notions, such as the notion that something is the soul when it is not the soul (an ātmādāv ātmādhivyavasāyātmanah), ceases. Therefore (iti) the cessation of this [impurity may be accomplished] only (eva) through an action of the Lord (iśvaravyāpāreṇaiva), namely initiation (dikṣālakṣaṇena), just as something like a cataract [can be removed only] by the intervention of an eye-doctor (cakṣurvidyāvyāpāreṇa).

This is taught in the venerable Pauṣkara.\(^{55}\)

The soul never attains liberation through his own power.

and also in the venerable Svāyambhuva[sūtrasaṅgraha, in verse 2:24cd]:

Initiation alone liberates and leads upwards to the glorious level of Śiva.

and so there is no fault [in our position].

Thus

so (hi) without knowledge and without action...

\(^{54}\) Or perhaps 'unless they have (vinā) their powers revealed (balāvyaktim)'.

\(^{55}\) See apparatus to the edition.
Because of their being blocked by impurity,\textsuperscript{56} accordingly they are subject to the uncreated \textit{(akṛtaḥ)} control of Śiva;\textsuperscript{57} therefore \textit{(atah)} they belong to the Lord \textit{(patyus te)} [as creatures] requiring to be blocked, to be bound, to be purified and to be awakened. (9)

Just as their impotence and so forth,\textsuperscript{58} being caused by impurity, are beginningless, in just the same way \textit{(tadvad eva)} their subjection to the control of Śiva, [in other words] their state of being governed, is beginningless \textit{(anādir eva = akṛtaḥ)}. And because of \textit{(hetoh)} this same fact of being conjoined with impurity \textit{(malasamsargaḥ = ata eva)} they are the Lord’s \textit{(bhagavataḥ)} to be blocked \textit{(rodhyāḥ)} by [His power known as] Vāmā,\textsuperscript{59} through her presiding over impurity \textit{(malādhīśṭhānena)},\textsuperscript{60} and [further] bound \textit{(bandhyās ca)} by the bonds that derive from prānta matter \textit{(māyāyair bandhanaḥ)}, and purified \textit{(śodhyās ca)} by initiation, and awakened \textit{(prabodhyās ca)} by knowledge and the others \textit{(jñānādībhīḥ)}\textsuperscript{61}.

On this point \textit{(atra)} [the author now presents] a rival view in the form of an attack on the existence of an impurity that is distinct [from other known entities] \textit{(vyatiriktamalapelūkṣepena)}.

Surely the postulation of impurity and the rest [of your theory] is desirable \textit{(jyāyaḥ)} if the powers of knowledge and such [viz. the powers of knowledge and action] are [indeed] eternal [in souls]. (10ab)

Surely it is [only] if the powers of knowledge and action are eternal, [in other

\textsuperscript{56}If we had retained \textit{malasamsargaḥ}, we could have translated ‘because of their being conjoined with impurity’, but we chose to adopt the reading \textit{malasannrodhaḥ} on the strength of the allusion back to this verse in the \textit{avatārśākā} to the first half of verse 11.

\textsuperscript{57}Once again the particle \textit{hi} is not translated here: it may be intended to express emphasis.

\textsuperscript{58}Since the \textit{anśeśarṣa}a corresponds to \textit{anādir} in 8ab, the \textit{ādi} refers perhaps to nescience (\textit{ajñatva}) and inactivity (\textit{nirvāyopara}) and \textit{asmita}, these being also mentioned in 8ab.

\textsuperscript{59}For the role of Vāmā in \textit{rodha}, cf. Māksakāra\textsuperscript{a} 32c-33b as quoted and translated in Goodall 1998:329. For the names of these \textit{sāktis} and more about their functions see also Goodall 2004:308ff.

\textsuperscript{60}It is odd that Vāmā presides over \textit{mala} rather than over some more obviously manipulable aspect of bondage, such as \textit{māyā}. Perhaps the manuscript’s reading is not correct here and some conjecture is required, such as \textit{vāmāyā māyāmalaśīḥśṭhānena}. Another possibility would be to retain the adopted text but to interpret \textit{mala-} to mean \textit{āṇavamāyīya-kārmarāla-}.

\textsuperscript{61}It is not clear what is intended by the \textit{ādi} here. One possibility, perhaps, is this is a reference to the four principal topics of a full \textit{tantra}, namely \textit{jñāna}, \textit{yoga}, \textit{kriyā}, and \textit{caryā}. 
words] proven to be the very nature (svabhāvatayā siddhe) of the soul, that the postulation of impurity can be reasonably claimed (yukti-mati va) as a way of accounting for the removal of the [otherwise expected] corollary of omniscience and omnipotence (sarvajñatvādiprasavagaparīhāreya) in the soul (tasga) while in this [worldly] state. But this would not be so (na tu) if these [powers] were not eternal, since it would then of itself (eva) be proven that the nature of souls must be one of nescience, and so it would be wrong to postulate the existence of an impurity separate [from other known entities]. If they are not eternal, say the Naiyāyikas and others, then, since they will be perceived only when the [cause, which in this case is the body made up of] this [soul’s] instruments and effects is present (tatkāryakaranabhāva eva), and since they will not be perceived when that [causal relation] is absent, the proof of an independently existing impurity [must be abandoned (ujjhita)]. The use of the word ādi [in the compound malādiparikalpanam] [refers to] the postulation of such previously stated [consequences of impurity as the] impotence [of souls] and their requiring to be bound and so forth, since these are caused by this [impurity] (tannimittatvena). The established view (siddhāntaḥ) on this point [is as follows]:

True. [In fact] this [group of powers] is not otherwise [i.e. is not non-eternal], since it is found at all times in the Lord in just this way (tādṛk) [i.e. eternal], (10cd)

That is true. [In fact] these powers (tad balam) are experienced as being (drṣyate) not like [anything of] the other [type] (anyad iva), [in other words,

---

62 Ex conj.

63 Ex conj.

64 Ex conj. Cf. Kriṣṇaṅgṛti ad 2:22c–23b: yad āhur naiyāyikavaisēspikāḥ—yad yatār kāraṇāntareṇa kriyate tat tatra nāstī evānāhakaśa ēva pradhānāṁ kriyamānāṁ prakāśah. kriyate ca kāryakaranādhibhir ātmanāḥ viśiṇāṇāṁ. tatas tad api tatra nāstīty ajñāsvabhāva evānā śiddhyati kuto vyātirikta malaśiddhiḥ. ‘This the Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas say: whatever is produced in something by some other cause does not [naturally] exist in that thing [prior to its being produced], just as light, which is produced by a lamp or the like, [does not naturally exist] in darkness. And knowledge is produced in the soul by the instruments and effects [that embody it], as well as by other factors (kāryakaranādhibhiḥ), and therefore that too does not [naturally] exist in it. Thus the soul is proved to be essentially ignorant. How then can one prove the existence of an independent impurity.’

For the use of the old collocation kāryakaraṇa to refer to embodiment, cf. Kriṣṇaṅgṛti ad 2:7–8: bhogas ca na vinā maṅgalyāḥ kalādhibhiḥ kāryakaraṇāḥ iti tava api athātavikṣama-śarivarākāraṇaṃ bandho yataḥ, tato na śarivarāhāvan nīrīrtir muktiḥ. ‘And experience does not take place without the instruments and effects of kāla and so on, which are evolutes of primal matter, and so (īti) there is bondage by these too in the form of subtle and gross bodies. Thus (... yataḥ, tatoḥ) liberation (muktiḥ = nīrīrtiḥ) does not come about from the absence of a body.’
not] like what is non-eternal. The meaning is that they are eternal. Why? Because they are experienced as being exactly as they always are in the Lord, [in other words] as eternal. This is the meaning: those (tat) powers in the soul (pumbalam) are also eternal, since they are powers of consciousness (cidbalatvāt), just as is the case for the Lord’s powers, and so, by the above-stated reasoning, the existence of an independent impurity is established. How is it then [that these powers are] not seen in the absence of effects and instruments? Because there is [then] an absence of factors that cause them to be revealed. This is stated in the Tattvasaṅgraha, [in verse 20,] after raising this objection (iti codayitvā)

Before being connected with kalā and the others [among the evolutes of māyā,] [the powers of] knowledge and action do not exist, since they are not perceived.

with the passage that begins as follows (ityādīna)

Because (hi) in that circumstance (tatra) they are not perceived because they are devoid of factors that reveal them, and not, as is well known (khalu), because they do not exist.

That is why it was stated ‘Because of being bound by impurity...these [souls] belong to the Lord...[as creatures] to be bound...’. For that [bondage] (tatra) [he now explains the need for] the addition of another cause:

The cause for those in saṃsāra being connected with the evolutes of primal matter is impurity together with karman. (11ab)

For souls, it is not impurity just by itself (kevala eva) that is the cause of being joined to bonds that evolve from primal matter (māyīyobandhayoge), but rather [impurity] only when (eva) linked with [the retributive force of] past actions (api tu karmayuktah).

---

65 The expressions cait and caitanya are not infrequently used in the sense of jñāna and kriyā: see Goodall 2004:233, fn. 319.
66 Eō conj. (Isaacson). Before adopting this text we had considered the smaller, but, as we now think, less convincing emendation kāryakāryābhaveṇa darsyate. We then translated this question and the reply that follows in this way: ‘How is it then (kathām tarhi) [that these powers] can be presented [as though they occurred] as a result of a causal relation? Because [at certain particular times] there is an absence of factors that cause them to be revealed.’
Through the destruction of karman through knowledge, yoga, renunciation (sannyāsa) or consumption, [souls] are taught to be liable then to become (sambhavinaḥ) Viṣṇuṇākevalaḥ.⁶⁷

Given that this impurity which envelops all souls has been stated above to be one,⁶⁸ since there is nothing that differentiates it, the simultaneous bondage or liberation of all souls should logically follow. In response to this [possible objection], the following [is stated]:

The powers of impurity are also (ca)⁶⁹ separate for each soul; they envelop the capacities of those [souls]. (11cd)

For this reason, although this impurity is one, its powers, which veil the capacities of these souls, are to be understood to be (gamyante) separate for each soul. And so this unwanted corollary does not apply. From the word ‘also’ (caśabdāt) [we are to understand that] the above-mentioned evolutes of primal matter [with which souls are embodied] are [also] separate for each soul.⁷⁰ For if the collection of effects and instruments [that make up the subtle transmigratory body]⁷¹ were not separate [for each different soul], then there would be the unwanted consequence that all souls would share all experience. This has been taught in the treatise on Experience and Liberation (bhogamokṣe) in the passage that begins as follows [Bhogakārikā 106c–107b]:

For otherwise the variety of happiness and such [other types of experience] that we directly perceive must be impossible (na

⁶⁷We have seen above (in footnote 18 on p.11) that the much-quoted first half-line of this verse is also the second half-line of Paramokṣanīrāsakārikā 55. It is possible, however, that the Paramokṣanīrāsakārikā is not its original context and that it comes rather from another lost work, perhaps a scriptural one. In other places we find the half-verse associated, as here, with becoming a Viṣṇuṇākevala. In commenting on Narēvara-parikṣā 3:91cd (kṣetra 'pt karmajīte ogān malaḥ naiva sāmkṣaṇāḥ; 'Even when [a soul’s] collection of [the retributive force of] past actions has been used up, impurity and so forth are not destroyed,'), Rāmakaṇṭha gives the following explanation: viṣṇuṇāyogasamāṃśair bhogād va karmaṇaḥ kṣaya tī kṣetra 'pt tasmin, malaśyādīgṛhaḥānād iśvarapravṛtyatvaṣya ca naiva kṣaya tī viṣṇuṇākevalitvam eva teṣaṁ, na mokṣaḥ. 'When that has been used up “through the destruction of karman through knowledge, yoga, renunciation (sannyāsa) or consumption”, impurity and the fact of being commanded by the Lord, which is expressed by the use of the word ādi, are not destroyed, and so these [souls attain] the state of being viṣṇuṇākevalaṁ, not liberation.'

⁶⁸See the second half of verse 7.

⁶⁹This follows Rāmakaṇṭha; in a natural interpretation the ca would link the two parts of this half-line.

⁷⁰Ex conj.

⁷¹Ex conj.
yeṣyate). It would be possible only on the basis of variety of karman; [but] only if variety of that [karman] will [indeed itself] be possible.

In that case (yady evam), since even a power of impurity which is particular to a particular soul, is just one, [and so] without distinction [over time], the unwanted consequence will follow of [that particular soul being] always [in a state of] bondage or liberation. In reply to that he says:

This [individualized power of] impurity, ripening, turns back, after ‘time’, from the powers of the soul, [which is to say turns back] from [the activity of] blocking [them], as a result of acquiring a certain particular [degree of] ripeness at a certain moment, for a certain soul and in a certain particular manner.72 (12)

As it ripens in its blocking (niruddhakatvena), [in other words, as it ripens] in its form as an individualized power (śaktyātmâ) that envelops (āvārakeṇa),73 it attains a particular [degree of] maturity and turns back from (avadheḥ) the powers of the soul, namely from the above-mentioned powers of knowledge and action. This is taught in the venerable Svāyambhūvaśūtrasaṅgraha, in 1:17cd:

Once that [impurity] has diminished, a desire to go to the Supreme Highest State arises.

And so, [in other words] because of the particular [degree of] its maturity, this impurity ceases at a certain point [in ‘time’], and not always. And because there is sometimes no maturation in it, [the author says that it ceases] only in the case of certain particular souls, not for everybody. And in a certain particular way, [in other words] in varying degrees of intensity or mildness (tiṇramandādibhedena). This has been taught in the venerable Kāraṇa.74

72It seems unlikely indeed that this verse was intended to mean what Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary requires it to mean. Aghoraśva's treatment is more natural and it probably reflects Sadvyojotī's intentions more closely. Following Aghoraśva we might translate: 'As it transforms over time, impurity stops (vinivartate) its blocking (niruddhā) [the manifestation] of the soul's powers. Because it may have different particular degrees of ripening, this [impurity stops] at a certain particular moment for a certain particular soul and in a certain particular way.'
73Es conj.
74It is possible that Rāmakaṇṭha has in mind his distortive interpretation of Kāraṇa
Therefore the unwanted consequence [mentioned in the introduction to verse 12] does not apply. And this [impurity ceases] ‘over time’, [that is to say] through ripening. The [so-called] ‘time’ for this [impurity] is nothing other than (eva) ‘having the nature of ripening’ (paripātisvabhāvavatvam). Because it transforms for pralayakevalas and others even in the absence of the familiar time [that is an evolute of mâyā], [in other words] in a phase of total resorption of the universe (mahāpralaye).

Those who maintain that the [grace-giving] descent of [the Lord’s] power must depend on nothing else [than the Lord’s will] (svatantrāsaktipātā-vādinah) will say (iti): ‘And what if (atha), in order to avoid this unwanted corollary, it is the Lord Himself who is the cause [of putting an end to the occlusion by impurity of a given soul’s powers]? In that case (tat), why postulate that impurity’s essential nature is to transform or that it has as a quality [a certain degree of] ripeness? In reply to this he teaches:

It is for this very reason that various degrees of ‘success’ (udayabhedah) that have been explained above

5:30ab, mandā mandatarā śaktāh karmasānyavivakṣayā, of which a natural interpretation might be ‘[Śiva’s] power is [said to be] slow or very slow with the intention of referring to the speed of attainment of mutual blockage of [two simultaneously ripe] actions.’ Instead, Rāmānuṇa interprets as follows: ‘[Śiva’s] power is [said to be] slow or very slow with the intention of referring to its balancing the activity [of the ripening of the soul’s innate impurity].’ His commentary reads: karmatā malaparapākālaṣeṇa yat sāmyam mandatvaṃ mandataraṇaṃ vā tasya vivakṣāhetutvād tavakṣā jñānam eva tasya hetubhūtaya mandā mandatarā vā śaktā pāramesvāri dīkṣā vā yassopatiṣṭhate tasya pratyāvāgyacchato bhavati eva. tasya tu malaparapākālaṣeṇa karmatā tīrthena tīrthena vā sāmyam tadvivakṣayā tīrta tīrthenā vā śaktā patātī tasya na pratyāvāgyat katham api sambhavacit vaktam bhavati. ‘The soul whom a weak or very weak divine power or initiation approaches—[said to be weak] because there is an awareness ([here referred to as] a desire to express, because it is the cause of a desire to express) that it equals (i.e. is [appropriately] weak or extremely weak) the activity of the ripening of impurity—such a soul (tasya) does (eva) become linked to transgressions. But for the soul on whom [what is referred to as] an intense or extremely intense power falls—[so called] because there is a desire to express the fact that it balances an intense or extremely intense activity of ripening of impurity—for such a soul (tasya) transgression is in no way possible. This is the purport [of the above half-verse].’

Or perhaps: ‘[so-called] time is nothing other than the transformation of impurity’. Cf. the unattributed Śaṅkhya verse about transformation and time quoted in the Maṭaṅga-vṛtti ad vidyāpāda 12.3 on p. 338:

paripātā prathaghāvo vyavasthākramatāh sadā bhūtāypsavartamānātmā kālarūpo vibhāvyate.

76 These ‘others’ are presumably vijnānakevala souls.
(paridṛṣṭah) come about for souls through the means [known as initiation], in the same way (tathā), [i.e.] because of ‘time’ and because of the quality [of each individual’s impurity] and not ever otherwise. (13)

The particular degree of success, in other words, liberation, that was alluded to (pratipāditaḥ = paridṛṣṭah) earlier with the expression ‘at a certain moment... and in a certain particular manner’ [and that is attained] by souls through the means called initiation comes about (ghaṭate) through so-called ‘time’, in other words the above-mentioned [‘time’] that is impurity’s self-transformatory nature (parinatisvabhāvātmakāt), and because of the quality, [i.e.] the particular [degree of] ripeness [of a given individual’s impurity]. It does not come about otherwise, [i.e.] through [the intervention of] the Lord alone. As for Him, since he is without any difference in being equally independent [in his actions towards all souls] and since he cannot have affection, hatred or other such [bias], the same unwanted corollary [stated in the introduction to verse 12] would remain unchanged (tadavasthaḥ) [if we were to adopt the position of the svaṁatraśaktipāṭāvādin]. In that case (yady evam), because He would then be dependent upon such factors as the ripening of impurity, it would follow that in this context (atra) the Lord (tasya) is afflicted by the fault of not being independent and by other such [entailed problems]. [We reply:] being dependent upon certain circumstances (nimittāpekṣitvam) is not [necessarily] a cause for lacking independence, as for example being dependent on the past actions [of bound souls is not a cause for the Lord’s lacking independence] in the context of [His enabling] experience. But [what would be a cause for saying that the Lord lacked independence would be] being dependent on another Lord, and that is not [a] possible [charge here], since He is Lord over all. This is stated in the Nārēśvararāparikśā.78

77 Sadyojyotih perhaps intended that this should mean simply ‘seen’, but our translation follows Rāmānanda’s interpretation.
78 The second half of this verse is Nārēśvararāparikśā 2:30ab; the first half contains the same ideas as 2:29, but with different wording. It is conceivable that Nārēśvararāparikśā 2:29 is a secondary expansion of our first half-verse, but in that case it is odd that Rāmānanda’s Nārēśvararāparikśāprakāśa should comment on the expanded form. Perhaps his commentary too was expanded in transmission. Or perhaps he used different sources for the Nārēśvararāparikśā when writing his commentary on it than the one he used when quoting from it in the Tattvāvatyanāraṇayavīrtti. Another possibility is that he has here consciously modified the Nārēśvararāparikśā’s formulation in order to make a pithier quotation. But this is not his usual practice, and furthermore, the same short quotation is found, with attribution to Siddhārū, in Nārāyaṇānanda’s Mrgendra-vīrtti ad 3:5c–6 (with the same readings that we have adopted in the Devakoṭtai edition, and with svatantrānya in the KSTS edition).
It is this which is that [well-known] independence of the agent: not being used by some other person according to their will (śvā-
tantrāṇyāṇyāprayojyaḥ) [and] being someone who makes use of instruments [and other factors]. It is not independence from [the retributive force of] past actions or other such [immutable things].

Thus there is no problem [in our position].

And so here the previously stated corollary [mentioned in the introduction to the second half of verse 11] does not apply, as he states [with the following verse]:

And discerning [a range of permutations of] the cause of liberation [that are] thus beyond counting and [that have been] defended by valid argument (sadyuktiṁ), the Lord has [thus and] not otherwise taught an infinitude of means.\(^\text{79}\) (14)

Having discerned the cause (nimittam) of liberation, which is the matura-
tion of impurity and which is in this way [as we have seen above] infinitely various in that it affects an infinite number of souls, [in other words] different (bhinnam eva) for each individual soul, [a cause] for which good reasoning exists to prove it, in the form of logical inferences that have been previously stated [in the preceding 3 verses and in the commentary thereon], the Lord has taught an infinitude of means, called initiation, for this [liberation], in the various scriptures (saṃhitābheda), and not in any other way.\(^\text{80}\) And so (iti) what is meant is that the problem of everbody being liberated when one person is liberated does not apply in this system (atra).

And so,

Along with all the bonds that have all been destroyed
[and in company] with which it blocked the liberation

---

It is conceivable, then, that Rāmakanṭha has a different text here because he is drawing on Nārāyaṇakāṇtha's passage in which the quotation occurs, rather than on the sources he used when commenting on the Nārēśvarāparikēś.

\(^\text{79}\) We think that this translation reflects Rāmakanṭha's commentary; a more natural interpretation of the verse would be as follows: 'And having thus discerned [the permutations of] the situation, [which are] beyond counting, the Lord has taught an infinitude of means for attaining liberation, which are defensible by reason. It could not be otherwise.' Unfortunately, Aghorāśīva does not make clear exactly how he understood this verse.

\(^\text{80}\) Rāmakanṭha appears to be understanding īttham... netarāthā almost as relative (yathā) and corelative (tathāvya).
of a soul (yasya), at that same moment (yadā... tadā), impurity gives up its binding function for that soul (tasya).81 (15)

Since it has been stated [above] that impurity together with past action is the cause for being connected with the evolutes of primal matter, accordingly, along with the bonds of matter that have been destroyed by experience and in company with which (māyīyair yathā pāśaṁ saha... bhogena taṁ kṣapitaṁ) it blocks liberation, in other words (iti) keeps bound down a particular soul (yasya pumsaṁ), at the same moment (yadā... tasmin kāle), namely (iti) when [that soul’s] various past actions have ripened, and in that same place (yatra ca sthāne... [tasmin] sthāne), impurity gives up its binding function for that soul (tasya pumsaṁ).83 According to the rule that ‘nothing unmixed transforms’,84 the bonds derived from primal matter, as they act or cease to act, are also contributory causes for the ripening of impurity, just as [the bonds of primal matter, when they cease to act, are a contributory cause] for the [partial] arising of the qualities of Śarva in [souls such that they become] viññānakevalaṁ.85

And the above (etat) is also (ca) because of the following:

[A reason why we must accept that impurity stops binding in these circumstances is] because means to true

---

81 This is an attempt to follow Rāmakṛṣṇa’s commentary as we now understand it; but it is possible that Sadyojātī rather intended: ‘Impurity blocks liberation of a certain soul at a certain time by means of as many fetters as it has (yāvadbhūtaṁ pāśaṁ), and when all those [fetters] are destroyed, at that time and for that particular soul, impurity gives up its function of binding.’
82 Ez conj.
83 The verse appears to mean, for Rāmakṛṣṇa, that when certain particular past actions ripen, then impurity, which bound the soul together with those particular bonds of karma, gives up, together with those bonds, which have been destroyed, its binding functions. We also considered another interpretation, in which bhogena taṁ kṣapitaṁ would have to be treated as an instrumental absolute: ‘... accordingly, impurity blocks liberation, in other words (iti) keeps bound down a particular soul, at a particular time, in other words (iti) while various particular past actions ripen, and in a particular place, together with the bonds that evolve from primal matter. With those bonds being destroyed by experience (bhogena), impurity too (so ‘pi) gives up its binding function for that particular soul and at that particular time and place.’
84 This tag is much quoted in Rāmakṛṣṇa’s other works, for example in the Kṛṣṇa-vṛtti ad 2:8 and ad 4:29ab, in the Mataṅga-vṛtti ad vidyāpāda 2:19 and in the Narāśvaraparīkṣā-prakāśa ad 3:2.
85 We find no parallel for this idea and are not sure that the text is correct here. Perhaps we could instead take gūnodaya as a nominative and interpret: ‘just as the qualities of Śarva [are the contributory cause for the ripening of impurity] in the case of viññānakevalaṁ’. For this idea we find no clear parallel.
liberation of such a particular kind (ittamrūpāṇi) are found in Śaiva scripture (sārve śāstre), and these would otherwise become unjustifiable by reason. (16)

In this scriptural tradition taught by the Lord (pūrṇaśeṣvare śāstre 'śmin) means to liberation are found of such a particular kind (ittamrūpāṇi), [in other words] ones that in every situation (pratisthānam) bring about the destruction of the bonds that derive from primal matter through experience alone (bhogadvāreṇāvai),86 and for this reason too (yataḥ...tato 'pi) we must understand that the binding by impurity of various souls (tattadbandhakatvam) ceases as the [bonds] derived from primal matter are destroyed (tair māyāyair vihataḥ) for those particular souls (tatra tatra). Otherwise the unwanted consequence would result that (prasajyante) those means, for their part (api), would be unjustified (ayuktāni), because of the destruction of the other bonds [which those means would effect] pointlessly (niskāraṇam).87

So (tat), with this much [of the text] (iyatā), starting from the section ‘the group of properties possessed by souls (pumsām)...just as Śiva’s properties’ [in verse 7], we have settled the nature of impurity (malasvarūpaṁ nirnītam), which is the cause of the difference between Śiva and the soul. Now [comes] a question in a quarter of a verse on this subject (atra) that aims to settle the question of its transformation (rūpāntaranirnīrayya).

Who is it that causes impurity to transform? (17a)

It seems that (kīla) according to the view [the Siddhāntin holds] in which we postulate that impurity transforms itself, it is because of impurity’s nature alone that impurity transforms. So (iti) who is it who causes it to transform? Nobody does. Therefore (iti) the unwanted corollary is that liberation is brought about by the nature of impurity and is not brought about by the Lord (nēśvarakartākāh). And so (iti) in order to prove that [the Lord brings about liberation], it is the view that the descent of [the Lord’s grace-giving]

---

86 These means here are presumably still varieties of initiation, so it might seem odd here that the text underlines that bonds must be destroyed ‘through experience alone’. But it must be borne in mind that initiation is not in fact a means of destroying karmāṇ rather a means of making all a soul’s karmāṇ be destroyed by being experienced in all the various worlds and embodiments in which it was due, but magically speeded up through mantras in the course of the initiation ritual.

87 Initiation magically induces the experience of all karmāṇ and thereby gets rid of the souls bondage by karmāṇ and by the evolutes of māyā, but there would be no point in doing this if this did not also in some way serve to bring about the destruction of impurity.
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power is autonomous that must be accepted. That is the purpose of the question.

But the settled view (siddhāntas tu) [is as follows]:

He who discerns the varying [retributive power of] past actions and, drawing upon the seed [that is primal matter], gives to souls various experience, together with the means of experiencing it; (17bcd)
And He who, in [the universe’s phases of] sleep keeps ensuring (kurvann āste) that the seed should be ready (yogam) for producing [evolutes]; and He by whom the universe is placed in that [seed] at a time of resorption, in order that there should be rest; (18)
And [who] makes (karoti) karmāṇ [ready] for being consumed by souls at a time when the universe is awake; That (sah) Lord, the destroyer of impurity, the giver of [souls’] power, out of compassion at all times [makes] impurity [ready] for ceasing to act (vinivr̥ttyai). ⁸⁸ (19)

The Lord who, with due respect to the varying [retributive power of] past actions, causes varied experience to arise from the seed, [in other words] from the material cause that is primal matter, and gives it to souls, along with the instruments to experience it (tatsādhanaṁ), namely tattvas, bhūvas and worlds;⁸⁹ and who recognising that that [seed] is incapable of ceaselessly providing experience to an infinite number of souls (anavarātāntapuruṣābhogapradāne),⁹⁰ keeps on (āste) working to make it (kurvan) ready for that (tatsāman) in phases of total resorption of the universe (mahāpralaye), by allowing it to rest (taddviśrāntyā);⁹¹ and He by whom at that [same] time

⁸⁸Note that Aghoraśiva’s readings here, and therefore also his interpretation, differ widely from ours. Following his apparently somewhat corrupt text, as constituted by FILLIOZAT, we might translate verses 18 and 19 as follows: ‘And He who, in [the universe’s phases of] sleep keeps ensuring (kurvann āste) that the seed should be ready (yogam) for producing [evolutes] and the karmāṇ of souls [ready] to be consumed, by Him (tenāvas) the universe is placed in that [seed] at a time of resorption, in order that there should be rest. When the universe is awake, this Lord, who bestows the great power [of Śiva-hood] (mahābhalaṇḍa), at all times [makes karmāṇ] along with impurity (samalām) somewhat (kincit) [ready] to be removed, because of his compassion.’

⁸⁹More common is the collocation tattvakaraṇaḥbhūvana, but tattvabhāvaḥbhūvana is not without parallel: see, for instance, Rāmakaṇṭha’s Nareśvaraparikṣāsūkṣa’s ad 2:2–3.
⁹⁰Ez conj.
⁹¹It is odd that Rāmakaṇṭha should mention viśrānti when glossing the first half of 18, in which it is rather prasūtaye that occurs, and that he should then mention upatti (which
the universe \( (vīśvatam) \), in other words all tattvas, bhūvas and worlds and so forth, without exception \( (sarvatva eva) \), is placed in that same seed \( (tasmin eva bije = tatra) \), in order that it may rise up again \( (punarupṭyartham) \); and He who, also at the time of creation makes the retributive force of the past actions of souls ready to give experience; that same Lord, who destroys impurity \( (malaṁ hantīti malahā) \), and who gives to souls their powers of omniscience and omnipotence \( (purusābhyaś ca balam jñātādikaratm dadātiī baladāḥ) \), at every moment \( (pratikṣaṇam = sarvadā) \) makes impurity \[ready\] for ceasing to act, in other words causes it to transform. This is the meaning: just as you claim that the Lord is the agent for creation and resorption even though the nature of primal matter, of the evolutes beginning with kalā and of the retributive force of past actions is to transform—and \( (tu) \) you do not hold that creation and resorption are produced entirely by the nature of primal matter or the others \( (māyādisvabhāvasiddhā eva) \)—so too \( (tadvat) \) it is reasonable to maintain \( (upapadyate) \) that it is really the Lord \( (iśvara eva) \) who is the agent of liberation \( (mokṣa-kartā) \) also in this view of ours that impurity transforms \( (malapariprati-pakṣe) \). So \( (iti) \) on what ground \( (kutāḥ) \) [should we go to the extreme of claiming that there is] proof of the view that the grace-giving descent of the Lord’s power must be independent [of all other factors]? And for this reason [viz. because He is agent of liberation]

And even \( (hi) \) before this impurity ceases to act, the success \( (saphalatā) \) of its capacity is produced [by the Lord].

\(^{92}\) Ez conj.

\(^{93}\) Ez conj.

\(^{94}\) FILLIOZAT (1991:151) constitutes and interprets verse 20 very differently, but not, it seems, in a way that follows Aghorāśīva, for, as he remarks in his fn. 203, the commentary of Aghorāśīva seems to support a text somewhat closer to the unmetrical reading of Eo. We assume that FILLIOZAT did not wish to put what no written source supported into his text of the mūla. FILLIOZAT prints:

\[ tadviniārtthā prāg api talsāmarthyasya sabalākṛtaye \]
\[ pumbalarodham kurvan dṛṣṭah sa ca pāśādakṣītāhygam \]

This he interprets

Même avant l’élimination du [karman et du mala], pour renforcer la capacité
While impurity, since it is the cause of transmigration, is still not ripened (aparinataḥ), before its transformation the Lord rather (pratyuta) helps to make (kriyate) the capacity of impurity (malasāmarthyam), which consists in its blocking of the powers of the soul, successful; but it does not desist from acting when it is unripe. That is the meaning. For, to explain:

As he effects the blocking of the soul’s powers, he sees the success of the power of the bond [of impurity]. And upon seeing [this ‘success’], He uses (yunikte) an instrument suitable (yogyam) for the rescuing [of souls] from that [bond] (tannivrūttyai) and for [producing the liberated state in souls (nṛmuktaye).\(^{95}\) (20c–21b)

While the Supreme Lord thus performs the blocking of the soul’s powers by favouring with his grace the power of impurity, he sees the completion of the duty (samāptādhikāratā = sāphalyam) of the power of the bond called impurity, [in other words] a certain [degree of] ripeness (paripākavisēṣah), for (hi...yataḥ) the duty (adhisthāraḥ) of every [person or thing] (sarvasya) culminates in the [attainment of the] goal (phalaparyantaḥ). And having seen this,\(^{96}\) He employs (upayunikte) an instrument known as initiation, which is suitable for causing souls to escape from that bond (tasmat pāśān nivrūtyartham [= tannivrūttyai yogam]) and whose fruit is the liberation of souls.

Surely a transformation is said to be an effect, as for example kalā and the other evolutes [are transformations] of primal matter. But one cannot have transformations of impurity, for it is impossible for it to have effects, since it is not a material cause (aprakṛtitvāt). In reply to this (atra) he says:

\(^{95}\) A more natural interpretation of this unit, assuming the reading tāṃ nivrūthyai (instead of tannivrūttyai) would be as follows: ‘As he effects the blocking of the soul’s powers, he sees the success of the power of the bond [of impurity]. And upon seeing this [impurity] to be ready to cease (nivrūthyai) he employs (yunikte) an instrument for the liberation of the soul.’

\(^{96}\) Ex conj.
Just as there is transformation of the seed [without production of effects] during [the universe's] sleep, so to we hold there to be [transformation] of impurity, with the result that there is no sentence (cīṭhānau) [in the soul].[^97] (21cd)

Just as, in a period of total resorption (mahāpralayakāle = svāpe), the seed of the universe that is primal matter transforms, [i.e.] attains an access of power (śaktiyatīśayapratilambhaḥ) that is conducive to bringing forth creation again (punahsargotpādānuṣṭaḥ), only by [matter producing] transformed results that are [still nothing other than] its own nature (svaṝpaparīṇāmād eva)—not by [a transformation producing] transformed results different from itself that would be effects (kāryātmako vijātiyaparīṇāmāt), since that would be impossible at that time—so in the same way also in the context of the destruction of [the soul's] sentience (cīṭhānivīṣaye 'pi), this same (asau) [sort of] transformation will take place in impurity, even though it is not a material cause of effects different from itself (kāryāntarā- prakṛtitve), but simply (eva) because its essential nature is to transform [in such a way as to produce transformed results that are nothing other than] its own nature (svaṝpaparīṇatvasvabhāvavatvāt). And so there is no problem (ity adosāh).

On this point (atra) [there follows] a rebuttal [by the Siddhāntin], preceded by the raising of a doubt by the proponent of the view that a descent of [the Lord's grace-giving] power must be independent:

> 'And if (yadi ca) Śambhu makes impurity ready for cessation, why does He not then make [it ready] simultaneously for all souls?' To one who makes this objection, one should reply as follows. (22)

[The opponent speaks:] You have postulated that impurity is something whose nature it is to transform and then you have proclaimed that it is the Lord who is the cause of its maturation. The above-stated unsatisfactory consequence of this (pūrvaḥ prasaṅgaḥ) is that He should cause [the impurity] for all [souls at once] to transform, because of the absence of any differentiating factor. So (tat) inevitably (avaśyam) you have to accept the Lord's independence in this context [of determining the when and how of liberation] (atra) in order to avoid this [problem]. So (tat) let there be only

[^97]: Aghoraśīva reads cīṭhānėḥ and interprets this to mean 'because of the absence of sentience [in impurity]'.
(eva) that [independence of the Lord!] What need of this redundant (antar-gaṇḍūnā) postulation of the ripening of impurity? [The Siddhāntin says:] one who raises this objection should be replied to as follows.

With a part of a verse (āryābhāṣyaṇa) [the author] explains how [to respond].

Why does He not make all [the retributory force of] past actions ready to be experienced simultaneously? (23ab)

Even in your position this logical ground (hetuḥ) is rendered inconclusive (anakāntikaḥ) by [the case of] past actions (karmanā). For why does He not, because of the absence of any differentiating factor, make all [the retributory force of past actions] simultaneously experienceable [for all souls], given that (iṭi) the Lord ripens [the retributory force of] past action and makes it experienceable by souls? And (tu) you cannot explain [our position] (vyākhyeye) by saying (iṭi) that just as you admit this [dependence of the Lord on external factors] in the case of past actions, we will also have it [viz. this same dependence of the Lord, but as a fault] in the case of impurity. For if in this way the opponent does not raise a fault [in that he raises as a fault what is in fact not a fault] in the proof stated by the [first] debater (vādyaktaśādhanadosūnuḥbhāvanam), he is defeated (migraha eva).

As they say,

Stating something as part of an argument when that something is not capable of proving [what one wishes to prove] (asādhanāṇīga-vacanam) [and] raising [as a fault] what is [in fact] not a fault (adoṣodbhāvanam)—these are the bases for defeat in argument (migrasthāna) for the two [speakers, namely the first

---

98The logical ground here of the opponent’s prasaṅgānumāna should be viññābhāsvāt: ‘because of the absence of any differentiating factor’. The Lord should be impartially the same without difference towards all souls and so impurity should be simultaneously ripened to the point of cessation for all souls. But the same type of argument could be constructed for karman, all of which should, by this logic, be rendered simultaneously ready for experience for all souls. This is clearly absurd and the logical ground is inconclusive.

99Ez conj. Or perhaps: ‘And (tu) you cannot explain [our position] (vyākhyeye) by saying (iṭi) that just as you admit this [dependence of the Lord on external factors] in the case of past actions, we may also have it [viz. this same dependence of the Lord as a fault] in the case of impurity.’ In such a case, we would have to take adoṣodbhāvanam to mean ‘not [being capable of] stating a fault [which in fact exists]’.

100This migrasthāna is also interpreted as ‘not [being capable of] stating a fault [which in fact exists]’ (see, e.g., Nyāyaśāstra, volume 2, pp. 679–80 and 714); but it appears that Rāmānuja does not here understand it in this way, even though his introduction to this quotation might seem to suggest such an interpretation.
debater and the opponent, respectively) (dvayoh). No other [basis for defeat] is logical (yuktam) and so we don’t accept [any other] (neṣyate).

Accepting this [viz. this notion of the Buddhists about what are bases for defeat in argument],101 this [passage above] was taught [by the author] in order to point out [that the opponent’s position suffers from] the fault of inconclusiveness [in the logical ground] because of [the case of] the retributive force of past actions (karmaṇā).

Here [the Siddhāntin presents] a refutation of the grounds [that the opponent might use] for rejecting the problem that his logical ground is inconclusive:

**Plurality** (anekatvaṁ), needing to be experienced at different times (kāḷantarabhogyatā), and relative strength (baliyastvam)—[these properties of karman are] not an answer [that resolves the difficulty of inconclusiveness], since they are not absent [in impurity]. (23)

[The opponent might say:] the logical ground ‘because of the absence of any differentiating factor [in the Lord’s treatment of different souls]’ does not apply in the case of [the retributive force of] past actions, since there are [indeed] differentiating factors (viśeṣah) [namely]: this [retributive force of past actions] (tatra) is plural [because the fruits of past actions are to be experienced] by different souls; it needs to be experienced in different rebirths even when it belongs to a single soul; and it can be stronger with respect to [the retributive force of] some other action by being of greater intensity (tīvraveyatvena). If [the opponent] (yah) wishes to resolve (samādadhāt) the problem of the inconclusiveness of the logical ground in this argument (atra) in such a way, [none of these factors,] neither plurality, nor needing be to experienced in different periods, nor relative strength is a factor that can resolve the fault (samādhīḥ) for him (asya). Why? Because [each supposedly] resolving factor (samādheḥ) is to be found (vidyamānatvāt = ahānāt)102 also in the pakṣa (sādhyadharmīny api) [i.e. in mala]. The meaning is that this [original] logical ground [of the absence of any differentiating factors in the Lord’s treatment of different souls (viśeṣābhāvād iti)], since it is not established even in impurity, does not serve to prove [what the opponent wishes, viz. that we must therefore assume the independence of

---

101 Ex conj.
102 Ex conj.
the descent of the Lord’s grace-giving power] (apagamakah). [This is so] because (yatah) even there [in the case of impurity] (tatrāpi) [these factors are found: it has] plurality, because it is divided into [individuated] powers [with each one] corresponding to a soul (pratipurusam); and [it has] the nature of transforming over different periods (kālantarapaśīvānāhādisahakārisānīdhyasiddhapariṇātā). Thus there is no fault [in the position of the siddhānta].

Furthermore

Since power (śaktih) is at all times (sadaiva) at hand (sannihitā) that is capable of causing all creation to arise (sarvanīkārotpatatā śaktā) [both] in the Lord and in the seed, and [since] souls (bhavini) are all-pervading and have the condition of being experiencers, (24) then (tenā) let the Lord create (kṛtvā) the great quantities (anekāni...vṛndāni) of effects and instruments and other factors [required for experience] (kāryakaraṇādeḥ) out of the seed and make souls experience (bhojayatu) all [the fruits of their] actions simultaneously. (25)

This logical ground [of the absence of any differentiating factor in the Lord’s treatment of different souls (vīśeṣābhāvād iti)] is rendered inconclusive (anakāntakā) also by the Lord’s power and by the power of primal matter, for (yatah...hi) in your view (bhavatpakṣe) why (kim iti) should the Lord not link [all] souls with all the groups of instruments and effects [that they require for experience], ripen all [the fruits of their] past actions and cause them to enjoy them all together at the very same time (yugapad eva), given that the powers [of the Lord and of primal matter] are omnipresent (sarvatra) and capable of producing all things (sarvārthakārtvāna) and that there is thus no difference in their being equally close to all souls (sannidhānāvīśeṣāyi), and given that the experiencing soul

103 [We find no parallel for this form. Perhaps we should emend here to agamaka?]
104 Ez conj.
105 Ez conj. As for the two instances of ādi in "satkarmādyanuṣṭhānādi", perhaps we should take them to refer respectively to asatkarmāṇ and to anuṣṭhāna.
106 Ez conj.
(bhoktuh), being all-pervading (vyapakatvena), is [also] present everywhere (sarvatra bhavati)?

In response to this (atra) the view of the opponent [is stated] (parabhipraya):

Surely it is upon seeing [the fruits of] past actions being experienced in a gradual sequence (kramatah) that we infer that (iti) it is Sambhu who [of necessity] ripens them in just that way. (26abc)

Even though there is no differentiating factor on the side of the ripener (pacaakasya), when we see [the fruits of] past actions that have to be ripened being experienced in a given sequence of childhood, [youth] and the other life-stages, we conclude (avasthaye) that the Lord too (api) ripens these [past actions] (tesam) in accordance with their fitness for that [viz. fitness for being experienced] (tadyogyatapekshaatva) in a given sequence (kramehna [=thathavam]). And so this [same] logical ground [of the absence of any differentiating factor in the Lord's treatment of different souls (vivesahavt ad iti)] is not inconclusive [as a proof of the simultaneous ripening of impurity

---

107 Ramaanatha is not closely reflecting this part of the verse, for Sadyojyotish's wording, translated more literally, would be 'since in the soul in saamsaara (bhavini) are the properties of] all-pervasiveness (vibhutvam) and the condition of being an experiencer (bhoktrabhavah). Perhaps Ramaanatha paraphrases this rather loosely because it seems to him pleonastic: the soul in saamsaara is necessarily endowed with bhoktrabhavah, since the latter is a beginningless state caused by souls' impurity. Cf. Kirana 3:2ab (bhoktrtvam namya yat proktam anadi malakaramam; 'The condition of being an experiencer, which we have taught, is beginningless, [because] it is caused by impurity.') and Ramaanatha's Kirapavritti thereon:

\[
\text{yad etad bhoktrtvam asmabhith prag uktram tad anadi. yato malakaramam uktam tato malayamadditva tad apy anadi. etad uktram bhavati—anyad evaam mahajanatit bhoktrtvad bhagyapoyatatvalaakaanam etad bhoktrtvam. pralayakale vidyate na tu vijitanaakevale karmabhaavat.}
\]

This condition of being an experiencer, which we have taught above, (prag uktram [= proktam]) is beginningless. Because it has been taught to be caused by impurity, and since impurity is beginningless, it too must be beginningless. This is the purport [of this half-verse]: this condition of being an experiencer can be defined as a fitness for experience, and it is different from that [other condition referred to as a] condition of being an experiencer which arises from delusion. It occurs in the pralayakala but not in the vijitanaakevalin because of the absence [there] of karmam.

108 Adding here 'of necessity' reflects what appears to be Ramaanatha's understanding of this verse, but it is not clear whether this was really what Sadyojyotishh intended.
unless we accept that the Lord’s grace is independent, since it is not established (asiddhatvāt) here [in the case of past actions] (atra). The reply [of the Siddhānta] to this [is as follows]:

This is the same in both cases. (26d)

In that case [if the Lord depends on the fitness of karman], this [situation, in other words this] unprovenness of that [logical ground] (asiddhatvam asya)\(^{109}\) is the same (samānām) in the case of impurity too, just as in the case of past actions, and so here too there is no problem [in our position]. [With the next verse] is explained how.

Because the effect [that is] taught [of past actions, namely the effect that is ripening,] is also understood here [in the Saiva Siddhānta to take place] in impurity [in such as a way as] to result in its cessation. And also (api) because (iti) the Lord really (hi) is capable of producing readiness in exactly the same way [in both cases].\(^{110}\) (27)

---

\(^{109}\) Ex conj.

\(^{110}\) This seems to us conceivable as a rendering of what might have been Rāmacāṇṭha’s interpretation of this verse, but it is full of doubtful points. The constitution of the text, which Aghorāśīva transmits quite differently, is uncertain, and it seems to us far from certain that Rāmacāṇṭha renders what Saḍyojayotīḥ intended to express. He might have wished to express, for instance, ‘Because the effect [that is] taught [in the case of karman for the sake of experience (cf. verse 19)] is also understood according to this [scriptural tradition to take place] in impurity [in the case of] its cessation. For scripture teaches] that (iti) the Lord is indeed (hi) also capable of producing readiness in the same way [in impurity]’. Or perhaps more plausible would be: ‘Since the effect [you have] referred to [in the case of karman] is known to us (gamyate) also, according to this system (atra), in impurity, such that it results in cessation, [we infer (anuminumod)] that Śambhu is capable of creating ripeness [in impurity] too in exactly the same way.’ But it seems to us most likely that Saḍyojayotīḥ wrote mātā instead of yasmāt and that he intended verses 26 and 27 as part of a single unit drawing parallels between what we can infer about karman and māta, the effects of which are known to us respectively from direct perception and from scripture: ‘Surely it is upon directly perceiving (dṛṣṭoḥ) that [the fruits of] past actions are experienced in a given sequence that we infer that (iti) Śambhu ripens them in exactly this way [i.e. sequentially]. It is the same in both cases. Knowing (mātā) that there is an effect which results in [impurity’s] cessation [because that effect is] taught [in scripture], we infer (gamyate) [the same] in the case of this impurity too: [namely] that (iti) the Lord is indeed (hi) able to bring about its ripeness too (api) in the same way [i.e. in due sequence].’

Since we assume that this is more likely to be a faithful interpretation, it seems likely to us that Rāmacāṇṭha was hampered by the corruption of mātā to yasmāt. If we had been reconstructing Saḍyojayotīḥ’s text as he might have composed it (rather than as
Because, just as in the case of [the retributive force of] past actions the effect that is a particular kind of maturation is said to come about gradually by reason of its own fitness [for being experienced], so too [does this come about] gradually in the case of impurity—[i.e.] so too [in the case of mala] is there understood in this sūtra to be an effect, [namely] a particular kind of maturation that comes about gradually, [an effect] that is proved by the impossibility of otherwise accounting for our observing people who have a desire for liberation and others [at various stages along the path to liberation].\(^\text{111}\) This has been taught in the venerable Svāyambhuva/sūtra-saṅgraha, in 1:17cd:

Once that [impurity] has diminished, a desire to go to the Supreme Highest State arises.\(^\text{112}\)

And just as the Lord is the [instigating] cause of the ripening of [the retributive force of] past actions for experience, in due order in accordance with their readiness [for being experienced], in exactly the same way [i.e. in due order in accordance with its readiness] it is He who is the [instigating] cause of the ripening of impurity too.\(^\text{113}\) And so the logical ground ‘because of the absence of any differentiating factor [in the Lord’s treatment of different souls]’ is not established even here [in the case of impurity, just as it is not there in the case of past actions]. Thus there is no problem [in our position].

It is not only on this point [that the opponent is forced to acknowledge our position that the logical ground he proposed is inconclusive] \((\text{atra})\),\(^\text{114}\) in so far as

---

\(^{111}\) It appears that \(\text{vinirītyāi}\) is effectively glossed here with \(\text{mumukṣvādidadāraṇā-}\ \text{nyathānupapattisiddham}\.\) The \(\text{ādi}\) in \(\text{mumukṣvādi}\) could refer perhaps to others further back on the ‘path’ who have not yet conceived a desire for liberation, but it could instead refer to those further advanced along the path who have already approached a guru, taken a first initiation (\(\text{samaṇapādikā}\)), etc.

\(^{112}\) In fact, according to Rāmakaṇṭha, further stages intervene: a salvific \(\text{sākṣipta}\) takes place once the soul’s \(\text{mala}\) is sufficiently ripened, whereupon the soul manifests equanimity with regard to all that befalls him in this world and so a desire to be released. See Kīrata 1:20c–22b and the Kīratavyūtī ad loc.

\(^{113}\) \(\text{Ez conj}\.\) We have assumed haplography triggered by an eyeskip here. Two phrases ending in \(\text{paripākahetūḥ}\) have, we guess, been involuntarily collapsed into one by a copyist. The diagnostic conjecture will almost certainly be ‘wrong’ in details of wording, but we think that it probably conveys what the now missing text once conveyed.

\(^{114}\) Or perhaps: ‘It is not only here [that the logical ground is not proven], since…’
In the same way also in [periods of the universe’s] sleep [the Lord brings about] the readiness of primal matter (yoneḥ) and of [the retributive force of] past actions over a period that equals the time in which creation was maintained: upon being asked, you are obliged to give [the same] answer [that consists in acknowledging that the logical ground is inconclusive].

Since [primal] matter (prakteḥ [= yoneḥ]) has increasingly depleted powers (apacitatarasāaktitvāt) from ceaselessly providing experience to countless souls (anavaratānantapuruṣabhogapradatvena), and since [the retributive force of] action too at the same time (tadānim) becomes increasingly depleted (apacitataraśaktitvāt), on account of being produced by embodied souls who themselves have increasingly depleted forces (apacitataraśaktiśarvayunanuṣṭhitavena), they [viz. matter and the retributive force of past actions] become unfit (ayogyatam) for providing experience (bhogadānāya).

And so (iti), in order to bring about their readiness (tadyogyatotpādanāya), you will have to admit that there is a period of total resorption of the universe that enables them to rest (tadvīśrāmakāḥ). This is taught in the venerable Mrgendra:

Even in [a period of the universe’s] sleep He keeps on awakening those deserving of awakening, blocking those to be blocked, ripening the [retributive force of] the past actions of those who have [still to experience the fruits of] past actions, making the powers of primal matter ready to become manifest, [and] He observes all things as they are.

Now (ca) [if we were to take the opponent’s position], because of this [logical ground of] ‘absence of any differentiating factor’, why should the Lord not resorb [the effects of] this [matter] (tām upasāṃḥṣtya) and cause [the retributive force of] past actions to rest (karmāni ca viśrāmya) just for an instant (ksaṇamātram eva) and then [at once] produce a new creation (punahsaryam)? Why does he wait (apekṣate) before doing that (tatra) for

---

115 In this rendering we attempt to follow Rāmakaṭha’s interpretation. It seems likely, however, that Sadyojātiḥ intended rather: ‘If you are asked about the [reaching of a state of] readiness by primal matter and by karman in a similar way even when the universe is resorbed, you have to give answer that it lasts the same time as a period in which creation is maintained.’

116 Ez conj.

the length of a period of [maintenance of] creation? Here too you have to give the very same answer, [the answer] that consists in [acknowledging] the failure to establish [the logical ground] ‘because of the absence of any differentiating factor’\textsuperscript{118} in this [viz. in mahaprulaya, which is here the pakṣa], because [He is forced to act] in accordance with the way the nature of matter happens to be (prakṛtes tathāsvabhāvatvāṇusārenā). And the same is also true without any difference (aviśīṣṭam) in the case of impurity in the manner stated above (prokṣtanayena). And so there is no contradiction [in our position].

In the same way (tathā)

Also (ca) at the beginning of a phase of creation (sargādau), which is [something that has happened] without restriction [of number],\textsuperscript{119} the Lord is able [on each occasion] to create [from] within the streams [that issue from primal matter] exactly the same things (yad vastu...tad dhi) in the same way (yathā...tathā) and for the same time (yāvatkāle...tāvat). In the case of liberation too, this\textsuperscript{120} is the same (tulyam) with the conditions that produce that [liberation] (tannimittena).\textsuperscript{121}

(29–30b)

At the beginning of a phase of creation, [a moment that is] infinite in number (anantasamkhya [= niyamavihāne]), because it is many in that it [is invariably something that has] happened on many previous occasions (pūrnapūrvatārādibhedena), why does the Lord not cause the body of tattvas (tattvajñatam) beginning with guna and ending with earth to arise [directly] out of the streams of primal matter that are the causes [of creation] (nimittebhyaḥ), just as kalā and the rest\textsuperscript{122} [arise directly out of māyā]? Why

\textsuperscript{118} Ez conj. For this conjecture, cf. the formulation in the first line of the commentary after 23cd. A similar repair to the text is required in the parallel phrase towards the end of the commentary on 29–30b (30.13).

\textsuperscript{119} This follows Rāmākṛṣṇa's interpretation of niyamavihāne, but it seems almost certain that Sadovyatī took it to mean ‘in which there is no restriction [as to the Lord’s apparent options]’. He might have intended it to be construed closely with srotahṣu: ‘in which there is no restriction as to the streams [that might form from primal matter]’.

\textsuperscript{120} We have not followed L’s itham, since this seems not to have been glossed by Rāmākṛṣṇa, whereas his tathā idam could be a reflection of idam in the verse.

\textsuperscript{121} Aghoraśīva’s commentary is transmitted with a simpler (and probably secondary) reading here: tulyam mokṣe ca tannimitte ca; ‘this is the same in liberation and in the conditions that produce that [liberation].’

\textsuperscript{122} Ez conj. According to Sadovyatī’s much quoted interpretation of Svaśambhuva-
does He depend upon (apeksate) connecting them (tasya) with a lower matter [namely the avyakta that is recognised also by the Sāṅkhya] (avāntara-prakṛtiṃsaṃbandham)? As is taught in the glorious Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha, 123

From the principle of limited power to act arose the two principles of passion and [impure] knowledge and [also] the unmanifest. The Lord further created the guṇas [from the unmanifest]. From the guṇas was born the buddhi, which is eightfold according as it has [eight] qualities (aṣṭarūpa guṇānvitā). 124 And then from the buddhi, because of its being shaken (saṃkṣobhāt), arose ahaṃkāra. Now from ahaṃkāra arose the imperceptible subtle elements and the faculties [of sense and action], and from the subtle elements the gross elements. And all [this] he created in due order.

There too you have to give an answer that consists in the failure to establish [the logical ground] ‘because of the absence of any differentiating factor’ (avivesāśūdhiṃsaṃjñāna) 125 in this [viz. in creation, which is here the paksā], [in that you have to answer] that (iti) when a particular thing (yad vastu) becomes fit to arise (bhavanayogyam [= bhavati]) 126 from among the various things that are effects (kāryavastūnām) in a particular way (yathā), [in other words] in a manner requiring the [involvement] of avyakta (prakṛtiṇiyama-lakṣaṇaprakāreṇa), and for a certain particular length of time (yāvatī kāle), [then] the Lord is able to create that thing (tat) in the same way (tathā) for the same length of time (tāvatī), and not in any other way (nānyathā). This is the same with the condition that produces liberation, namely the ripening of impurity (malaparipākātmānā). Thus (iti) the above-stated fault [of simultaneous liberation for all] 127 is not entailed (noktadoṣapraśāgah) and so (iti) how could one prove that the [grace-giving] descent of [the Lord’s] power must be independent [of all external factors, since it has been]

sūtrasaṅgraha 2:9 (e.g. Kṛiṇaṇavṛtti ad 4:22c–23) three tattvas evolve directly from māyā, namely kalā, kāla, and niyati. The remaining evolutes all evolve directly or indirectly from kalā, as the following quotation from the Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha shows.

123 Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha 2:15–17. Rāmakaṇṭha discusses the sequence of creation of these evolutes ad Kṛiṇaṇavṛtti 4:22c–23, in which passage he quotes part of Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha 2:15, the first verse of this quotation.

124 These are the eight properties of the buddhi, namely dharma, jñāna, vairāgya, aśīvarya and their opposites.

125 Et conj. For this conjecture, cf., once again, the first line of the commentary after 23cd.

126 Et conj.

127 This unwanted corollary was first mentioned in Rāmakaṇṭha’s introduction to 11cd.
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refuted by the rejection of that corollary.\textsuperscript{128}

Thus (\textit{evam}), then (\textit{tat}),

The true form of impurity (\textit{aśuddheḥ}) has been thoroughly (\textit{alam}) outlined (\textit{uddiṣṭam}), omitting nothing (\textit{niravaśeṣeṇa}). Its properties, such as oneness, [\textit{learnt} from scripture (\textit{śāstrāt})], would be for the destruction [of impurity] (\textit{nirṛtyartham}) if it were not for its infinitude of powers.\textsuperscript{129} [And therefore these properties] have as the most important property infinitude in powers (\textit{sāktyānantyapramukham}), [which is proven] through true arguments (\textit{sadyukteḥ}) that come from the [Lord who is] Cause [of All] (\textit{kāraṇotthāyāḥ}),\textsuperscript{130} (30c–31)

The true form (\textit{pāramārthikam rūpam}) of impurity (\textit{malasya = aśuddheḥ}), which is the cause of the dissimilarity between the two entities of Śambhu and the soul, has been thoroughly (\textit{paryāptaṃ kṛtva = alam}) taught, omitting nothing (\textit{niḥśeṣeṇa [= niravaśeṣeṇa]}). And as for (\textit{yac ca})\textsuperscript{131} impurity’s oneness and other [properties] (\textit{ekatvaṇyam}) [learned] from scripture—as in the glorious Śvāyambhūva\textit{sūtrasaṅgraha}, in 2:1ab:

\textit{Ex conj. The conjecture may not be necessary, but it gives the sense required.}

\textit{It would also be possible to take all the above (from 30c to 31b) as one sentence: ‘The true nature of impurity, beginning with the property of oneness, has been thoroughly outlined in accordance with scripture, leaving nothing out.’ We have discussed this passage at some length and have come to the conclusion that a smooth interpretation of the text as transmitted to Rāmakaṇṭha is probably impossible. Aghoraśīva’s text of the last syllables of the first line of verse 31 seems to us much more likely to be original. Here is the same unit as it appears in Filliozat’s edition:}

\begin{quote}
alam uddiṣṭam aśuddheḥ sadrūpam niravaśeṇa
śāstreṇa ekatvaṇyam sāktyānantyam vināniartyaṃ tat
sāktyānantyapramukhaṃ sadyukteḥ śāsanothāyāḥ
\end{quote}

Following Aghoraśīva’s commentary we may translate as follows:

The true form of impurity, [as well as its properties of] oneness, among other properties, have been thoroughly and completely taught in the scriptures. Without its having an infinitude of powers it would be unremovable. Beginning with its infinitude of powers [its properties have been taught here] on the basis of good reasoning that has been drawn from scripture.

\textsuperscript{128}It is possible that kāraṇotthāyāḥ, the interpretation of which is not at once obvious, is in fact not original and that we should therefore adopt the easier reading śāsanothāyāḥ. Cf., however, the expression kāraṇavaktrapadmād vinīgata/vinīḥṛta in Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha 10:103 and Mātāṅgakṛtyāpāda 6:67.

\textsuperscript{130}The corelative (\textit{tat}) to this relative pronoun occurs after the second of the quotations from the Śvāyambhūvasūtrasaṅgraha, in other words in line 31.8.
Now the impurity of men is beginningless; it is proclaimed to be that which makes them bound souls (paśutva).\textsuperscript{132}

for since impurity is there mentioned as singular and souls as plural, this conveys that there is just one impurity for all souls. The use of the element ‘and other [properties]’ (ādigrahaṇāt) [in the compound ekavādyam] refers to [impurity’s] being subject to transformation. This is taught in the same text, [in Svāyambhūvitasūtrasāṅgraha 1:17c:]

Once that [impurity] has diminished, a desire to go...arises.

—that [group of properties beginning oneness] would be for the [logical] destruction of impurity (abhāvaḥaśvaḥ malasya bhavati = nivṛtṭyartham), if it were not for (vinā) its infinitude of powers (śaktiṇaṇṭyam). The meaning is that [this group of properties beginning oneness] without the infinitude of powers, [in other words] if it did not include infinitude of powers (abhavacchaktyāṇstantyam), would result in impurity’s ceasing to exist (malanivṛttaye = malasya nivṛtṭyartham)—†it would be like saying that the havoc (kṣeṣaḥ) that [we see usually] caused by a thief had been produced by no thief\textsuperscript{133}—since (yataḥ) without postulating many powers it is not possible to account for one thing enveloping many (snekāśvāraṇakatvam). For this reason (ata eva) [the true form of impurity] has been proven (siddham) through (sakṣaśa) true reasoning (sadyukteḥ) that comes from the scripture He has taught (tadagamothāḥāḥ = kāraṇoḥthāḥ), in which the principal property is having an infinitude of powers (śaktiṇaṇṭyapradhānam).\textsuperscript{134}

This has been shown above in [verse 11cd with] ‘The powers of impurity are separate for each soul’.

And now the conclusion of the work.

This ‘settled view on the three entities’ has been taught concisely (samāsataḥ) by the author of the commentary

\textsuperscript{132}Alternatively, if we read athānādīdūnalab, we may render this with ‘Now the beginningless impurity of men is proclaimed to be that which makes them bound souls’. paśutva is in fact also simply used as a synonym of mala, for cf., e.g., Kṛṣṇa 2:19c–20, so we might also render this: ‘Now the beginningless impurity of men is called paśutva.’

\textsuperscript{133}We discussed several unsatisfactory interpretations of this puzzling sentence without reaching consensus. One earlier translation was: ‘just as we say “by removing theft (caurabhāvaḥ) one gets rid (kṣeṣaḥ) of the thief (caurakṛtaḥ)”’, but this would require taking caura in the sense of caura (a meaning that MONIER-WILLIAMS attributes to ‘L[exicographers]’. Applied to our context this might mean that impurity would be logically destroyed if its activities, which depend on its many powers, were not to exist. Another suggestion was the following: ‘just as the havoc (kṣeṣaḥ) that [we see usually] caused by a thief [is inexplicable if you say that it is] produced by no thief’.

\textsuperscript{134}Ex. conj.
of the Svāyambhuva, in order to remove from souls their beginningless dullness (jaḍatām).\textsuperscript{135} (32)

This ‘settled view on the three entities’ has been taught concisely (saṁ-kṣepena [= samāsāt]) by Kheṭapāla, the commentator on the Svāyambhuva-śūtrasaṅgraha, in order to remove insentience from souls.

Thus [ends] the commentary (vṛttiḥ) on the ‘settled view on the three entities’, composed by the Kashmirian Bhaṭṭa Rāma-kanṭha, residing in Dārvābhishāra (dārvābhisārasyasthena), [for others] to attain the supreme reality level (paratattvāptayai).\textsuperscript{136}

\textsuperscript{135}This presumably refers to souls’ impurity, which is indirectly removed by correct understanding of the Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha, since that understanding will then put them on the right path to lead a good life, which will then in turn help to induce ripening of impurity. Impurity may also be referred to by various synonyms for ‘nescience’, since it is the cause of nescience: cf. Kīraṇa 2:19e–20.

\textsuperscript{136}This is probably intended to mean at the same time also: ‘[for others] to attain the highest truth [about the subject of the text]’.
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