

A First Edition and Translation of
Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's *Tattvatrayanirṇayavivṛti*,
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 TATTVATRAYANIRŪṆAYAVIVṚTI,
A TREATISE ON ŚIVA, SOULS AND MĀYĀ,
WITH DETAILED TREATMENT OF MALA

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 Rāmakaṇṭha II, an older contemporary of the Kashmirian theologian Abhinavagupta, on the *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* of Sadyojyotiḥ. Sadyojyotiḥ was probably active between 675 and 725 AD¹ 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 (*māyā*), 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 Rāmakaṇṭha was a Kashmirian, a number of his works survive only in the South of India. Exceptions are the *Mataṅgavṛtti*, which is transmitted both in South Indian sources and in Kashmirian ones, and the *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa*, which is transmitted almost exclusively in Kashmirian sources. The *Tattvatrayanirṇayavivṛti*, transmitted in a single Śāradā manuscript, now joins Rāmakaṇṭha's oeuvre. Like the *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa*, it appears not to have been transmitted in South Indian sources.

Another, shorter commentary on the *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* survives, by the well-known twelfth-century follower of Rāmakaṇṭha'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 Vrajavallaba DWIVEDĪ (1988: E_V) and Pierre-Sylvain FILLIOZAT (1991: E_F). Aghoraśiva's commentary departs from that of Rāmakaṇṭha both in its interpretations and in its readings of Sadyojyotiḥ's work, and it seems a reasonable assumption that Aghoraśiva, who knew and echoed Rāmakaṇṭha's commentaries on the *Kiraṇa*, the *Mataṅga*, the *Sārdhatriśatikālottara*, the *Mokṣakārikā* and the *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā*, did not know Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary on the

¹See SANDERSON 2006, the conclusions of which regarding Sadyojyotiḥ's date are to be found on p. 76.

Tattvatrayanirṇaya.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 *Tattvatrayanirṇayavivṛti*.

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 Dārvābhisāra, 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,³ Dārvābhisāra was delimited by these two rivers according to STEIN.⁴ Since the *Kiraṇavṛtti* too was composed in Dārvābhisāra 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 *Tattvatrayanirṇayavivṛti* 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

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

³In an undated letter to Dominic GOODALL.

⁴STEIN (1979:32-33, annotation to *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 1:180) identifies the area as follows: 'From the evidence available it appears that *Dārvābhisāra* as a geographical term comprised the whole tract of the lower and middle hills lying between the Vitastā and Candrabhāgā. [The Candrabhāgā 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 *Rājapuri* (Rajauri) was included in Dārvābhisāra.'

sources. Editing Rāmakaṇṭha's *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* has seemed vastly easier (which is not to say that we feel confidence in having resolved all its problems).

The commentary of Aghoraśiva on the *Tattvatrayanirṇaya*, reedited and translated into French by FILLIOZAT (1991), is, by contrast, a very much simpler composition. In general Aghoraśiva follows, imitates and echoes Rāmakaṇṭha's interpretations quite closely, but, as we have mentioned above, it seems to us unlikely that Aghoraśiva had access to Rāmakaṇṭha's *Tattvatrayanirṇaya*. Unlike, Rāmakaṇṭha, whose style is more discursive and whose interpretations seem often distortive, Aghoraśiva seems to stick extremely closely to commenting on Sadyojyotiḥ'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 Aghoraśiva; but we found that for much of the work the readings of Aghoraśiva'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 Sadyojyotiḥ's œuvre. Given that Rāmakaṇṭha is nearly two centuries closer in time to Sadyojyotiḥ, 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 Aghoraśiva'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 *mūlapāṭha*, 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 Sadyojyotiḥ and to the *Rauravasūtra-saṅgraha*. 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 saṃbandhābhidheyaprayojanāni	2
1.3 tattvatrayam	3-4
2 īśaḥ	
2.1 sādharmaḥ	5a
2.2 parameśvaraḥ	5b
2.3 mukteśvaraḥ	5cd
2.4 sakalākālaprabhedāḥ	6
3 puruṣaḥ	
3.1 malanīrodhaḥ	7
3.2 anīśatvam	8
3.2 śivavaśīkāraḥ	9
4 malaḥ	
4.1 mokṣavaicitryam	
4.1.1 puṃbalanīyatvam	10
4.1.2 malaśaktayaḥ	11
4.1.3 malapariṇatīḥ	12
4.1.4 sādhanād udayabhedāḥ	13
4.1.5 sādhanānantyam	14-16
4.2 malapariṇāmaḥ	
4.2.1 sṛṣṭisthitikāle	
4.2.1.1 malapariṇāmakāḥ	17-19
4.2.1.2 muktiyogyaśādhanaṃ	20-21ab
4.2.2 svāpakāle	21cd
4.3 īśvarasya svātantryam	
4.3.1 sthitikāle	
4.3.1.1 svatantraśaktipātavādinam praty uttaram	22
4.3.1.2 karmabhogaḥ	23-25
4.3.1.3 pūrvapakṣiṇaḥ punaruttarābhidhānam	26abc
4.3.1.4 siddhāntinaḥ parihāraḥ: ubhayatra samānam	26d-27
4.3.2 svāpakāle	28
4.3.3 punaḥsṛṣṭikāle	29-30ab
4.4 malopasaṃhāraḥ	30cd-31
5 prakaraṇopasaṃhāraḥ	32

According to Aghoraśiva's commentary on verse 2, Sadyojyotiḥ's *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* elaborates the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*'s presentation of doctrine, in contrast to the *Tattvasaṅgraha* (among other texts), in which Sadyojyotiḥ expounds that of the *Raurava*: *śrīmadrauravasiddham arthasadbhāvaṃ tattvasaṅgrahaṇa saṃkṣepāt prakāśya, śrīmatstvāyambhuvasiddham anena prakāśayati*. It may be that Sadyojyotiḥ himself makes the same point in *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* 32, where he describes himself as the author of the commentary (*vṛtti*) on the *Svāyambhuva*, but we cannot be certain that he means to express thereby that the *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* is an exposition of the doctrines of the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*.

It does seem, however, that Sadyojyotiḥ's theology in general depends to a greater extent on the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 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 *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*, on which he wrote a partial commentary, and the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, on which his *Bhogakārikā*, *Mokṣakārikā* and *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā* are commentaries.⁵ Among the other Siddhāntatantras that survive, the *Niśvāsa* and the shorter non-eclectic recensions of the *Kālottara* (*Dviśatikālottara* and *Sārdhatriśatikālottara*) 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 *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*: not only is it the only one in whose cosmography the ladder of worlds (*bhuvanādhvan*) has been mapped on to the ladder of *tattvas* (*tattvādhvan*),⁷ but it is also the only one which makes mention of innate impurity (*mala*).

Now *mala* is absolutely central to Sadyojyotiḥ'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 *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* that Sadyojyotiḥ 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 *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 1:17 (quoted several times by Rāmakaṇṭha in the course of our text). It would therefore not be surprising if Sadyojyotiḥ meant to imply, in verse 32, that his *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* was an exposition of an important nexus of doctrines that is presented in

⁵See GOODALL 1998:xix-xxvi, SANDERSON 2006:47, fn. 11 and GOODALL [forthcoming].

⁶For some indication of why we believe the *Niśvāsa* may be the earliest Śaiva tantra to survive, see GOODALL and ISAACSON 2007.

⁷On this matter, see *Tāntrikābhīdhānaśāstra* III [forthcoming] s.v. *tattvādhvan*. The *Dviśatikālottara* and *Sārdhatriśatikālottara* cannot be compared on this point, since they present no cosmography.

the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*. FILLIOZAT (1991:134) expresses this in the following way:

Sadyojyoti 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, Sadyojyoti 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 *Tattvatrayanirṇayavivṛti* covers only a few pages (ff. 106r–118r) and follows upon the text of the *Śivasūtra-vimarśinī* of Kṣemarāja, the colophon of which occupies the bottom lines of f. 105v. Immediately after the colophon to the *Tattvatrayanirṇayavivṛti*, which ends on line 3 of f. 118r, there appears the following verse:

sandhyāvandana bhadram astu bhavato bho snāna tubhyaṃ namo

⁸Sadyojyotiḥ 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, Sadyojyotiḥ 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.'

⁹The manuscript is catalogued on pp. 18–19 and 362–3 of *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in The Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad, Second Series, vol. IV*. Lucknow: The Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad, 1995.

*bho devāḥ pitaraś ca tarpaṇavidhau nāhaṃ kṣamaḥ kṣamyatām
duḥsaṃsāravikārabhāskarakaraprāgbhārabhāroddhatam
cetaḥ samprati citsudhājalanidhau pūrṇe śive majjatu.*¹⁰

After that follows what appears to be a Vedāntic discussion of *suṣupti* that begins with the words *suṣuptāḥ ahaṅkārahāve pi tadvāsanāvāsītājñāna-bhāsakasya caitanyasya svataḥ*.... 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 madhusūdayām*. If this is a reference to a work of Madhusūdanasarasvatī, 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 Śāradā script. One relatively late feature of the script that we have seen in many other Śāradā documents is not to be found in this manuscript: our manuscript marks no distinction between *ṣṭa* and *ṣṭha*. 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 *i*; *ī* 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 *Mataṅgavidyāpāda* 25:62c at the end of the commentary on verse 3 and in the quotation of *Kiraṇa* 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 Vilvamaṅgala's *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta* 2:107:

*sandhyāvandana bhadrām astu bhavato bhoḥ snāna tubhyaṃ namo
bho devāḥ pitaraś ca tarpaṇavidhau nāhaṃ kṣamaḥ kṣamyatām
yatra kvāpi niṣīdya yādavakulottamsasya kamsadvīṣaḥ
smāraṃ smāraṃ aghaṃ harāmi tad alaṃ maṇye kim 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 *āśvāsas*, 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 KUNJUNNI RAJA's detailed discussion (1958:31–51) convincingly dates the *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta* to not later than 1300 AD (1958:44) and shows that suspicion about the authenticity of the second and third *āśvāsas* 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 Rāmakaṇṭha 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 FUJII, Dr. Kazuo KANO, Dr. Makoto KITADA, Dr. Werner KNOBL, Dr. Taisei SHIDA, and Miss Junko SHINODA in Kyoto).¹¹ 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.

¹¹Dominic GOODALL also read and discussed the first few pages of the work in Pondicherry in February 2008 with Alberta FERRARIO and Dr. Marzenna CZERNIAK-DROŹDŹOWICZ. 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.

तत्त्वत्रयनिर्णयविवृतिः ॥

शम्भो यदा भवदनुग्रहशक्तिपातप्रोत्तेजितामलधियो विमलं भवन्तम् ।

पश्यन्त्यखण्डविभवं ननु वादभाजां भेदाविभेदघटना विफला तदानीम् ॥

- 3 इह हि तत्त्वसंग्रहादावुक्ते ऽपि षट्त्रिंशत्तत्त्वनिर्णये प्रधानस्य भोक्तृभोग्यभोगदात्रात्मनस्तत्त्वत्रयस्यान्योन्यं तत्त्वान्तरैश्च साधर्म्यवैधर्म्यलक्षणार्थसद्भावनिर्णयायात्र प्रकरणान्तरं वक्तुमविधाय तावत्परमेश्वरप्रणामः ॥

पुंभ्यः फलं विचित्रं ददाति संवीक्ष्य बन्धवैचित्र्यम् ।

स्वमहिम्नानाद्युदयो यो ऽनायत्तो नमस्तस्मै ॥ १ ॥

- यो बन्धस्य कार्ममायीयाणवस्य वैचित्र्यं ज्ञात्वा भुक्तिमुक्तितत्साधनसम्बन्ध-
लक्षणं फलं विचित्रमेव पुरुषेभ्यो ददाति तस्मै नमः । तत्र कार्मस्य भोगदान-
3 क्षमत्ववैचित्र्यं ज्ञात्वा तत्साधनैर्मायीयैः कलादिक्षित्यन्तैस्तत्त्वैस्तदधिकरणै-
श्च कालाग्न्याद्यङ्गुष्ठमात्रान्तैस्तद्भुवनैस्तत्तद्भुवनजैश्चानन्तजातिभागिभिः शरी-
रैर्भावप्रत्ययात्मकैश्च भोग्यैः सम्बन्धि विचित्रं भोगं तत्संवित्यात्मकं ददाति ।
6 तदा तस्यैव विज्ञानयोगसन्न्यासैर्भोगाद्वा क्षयलक्षणं वैचित्र्यं ज्ञात्वा सर्गेण
प्रलयेन च सम्बद्धं प्रलयकेवलत्वादि फलमिति । (f.106^v) आणवस्य तु परि-
पाकात्मकं वैचित्र्यं ज्ञात्वासद्योनिर्वाणादिदीक्षावैचित्र्येण मुक्तिवैचित्र्यमिति ।
9 तच्च स्वमहिम्नैव स्वशक्तिलक्षणेन ददाति । न तु व्यतिरिक्तेन करणान्तरेण ,
तदुपादाने ऽपि शक्तेरेव करणत्वात् । स च , अनादिरुदयः सर्वज्ञत्वसर्वक-

1 b. संवीक्ष्य] $E_D E_F$; संवेक्ष्य L 1 d. यो ऽनायत्तो नमस्तस्मै] L; ऽनायत्तो न-
मो नमस्तस्मै E_D (unmetrical) ?; ऽनायत्तो यो नमो नमस्तस्मै E_F ; यो ऽनायत्तो नमो
नमस्तस्मै E_F 's M

1.6 Cf. *Paramokṣanirāṣakārikā* 55cd: विज्ञानयोगसन्न्यासैर्भोगाद्वा कर्मणः क्षयात् ।

0.1 शम्भो] *em.*; ॐ स्वस्ति ॥ ओं नमः शिवाय ॥ ओं शम्भो L 0.4 °भोगदात्रा°]
conj.; °भोगदाना° L 0.5 वक्तुमविधाय] *conj.*; वक्तुं सविधाय L 1.1 वैचित्र्यं]
em.; वैचित्र्ये L 1.3 °क्षमत्ववैचित्र्यं] *conj.*; °क्षमत्वं वैचित्र्यं L 1.5 भोगं] *conj.*;
भोगं च L 1.5 तत्संवित्यात्मकं] *conj.* *Isaacson*; तत्सवित्र्यात्मकं L 1.7 सम्बद्धं]
conj.; सम्बन्ध L 1.8 ज्ञात्वासद्योनिर्वाणादिदीक्षा°] *conj.*; ज्ञात्वासद्योनिर्वाणाद्यस-
द्योनिर्वाणदीक्षा° L 1.9 करणान्तरेण] *conj.*; कारणान्तरेण L

तृत्वात्मको यस्य, तथाभूतः। अनादिमुक्त इत्यर्थः॥ १॥

अधुना नमस्कारादनन्तरं विशिष्टपुरुषाधिकारपूर्वमस्य प्रकरणस्य सम्बन्धाभिधेयप्रयोजनानि। 12

अथ नतिभाजस्तन्त्रे संक्षेपात्कंचिदर्थसद्भावम्।

वक्ष्ये ज्ञातं गुरुतो हितकृतये मन्दबुद्धीनाम्॥ २॥

हे नतिभाजो नमस्कारार्हा गुरुवः, अर्थसद्भावं कंचिद्वक्ष्यमाणं तत्त्वत्रय-साधर्म्यवैधर्म्यनिर्णयात्मकं कथयिष्ये इत्येतदभिधेयमस्येत्यर्थः। तच्च 'ज्ञातं गुरुतः' इति परमेश्वराच्छास्त्रोपदेष्टृपारम्पर्येण प्राप्तमिति सम्बन्धकथनम्। 3
तन्त्रे ऽस्मिन्मन्दबुद्धीनां दीक्षितानामेव हितायेति विशिष्टाधिकारिगतत्वेनास्य प्रयोजनकथनम्॥ २॥

अयमसौ अर्थसद्भाव उच्यते — 6

शम्भुः पुरुषो माया नित्यं विभु कर्तृशक्तियुक्तं च।

सुप्ते ऽपि विकृतिजाते त्रितयं जागर्ति तत्त्वानाम्॥ ३॥

शम्भुः — पर(f. 107r)मशिवः सह मुक्तशिवैः सदाशिवेश्वरतत्त्वद्वयेन च — शिवतत्त्वम्। यद्वक्ष्यति —

नतिपूर्वः कृतिवर्गस्तेन स्वामिन्यनादिसंसिद्धः। 3

सकलाकलप्रभेदो गीतो यश्च क्रियाविषयः॥ इति।

पुरुषस्तु पूर् वपुस्तत्र शयनार्हः, यथासम्भवमेकद्वित्रिबन्धनबद्धः — पशुतत्त्वम्। 6

मायापि परापरा। परा मन्त्रमन्त्रेश्वरनिवासो विद्यातत्त्वम्। †...† यदुक्तं श्रीमत्स्वायम्भुवे —

तस्मात्कालकले रागविद्याव्यक्तं गुणान्वितम्। 9

2b. कंचिदर्थ°] L; किंचिदर्थ° E_DE_F 3d. त्रितयं] E_FE_D; त्रितये L

3.3-4 नतिपूर्वः...क्रियाविषयः Tattvatrayanirṇaya 6.

3.9-11 तस्मात्कालकले...सर्वं च क्रमशो ऽसृजत् Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha 2:9-10b.

1.11 अनादिमुक्त] conj.; अनादिरुक्त L 2.4 तन्त्रे ऽस्मिन्] conj.; तत्रास्मिन् L

3.5 पूर् वपुस्तत्र] conj.; पूर्वबुद्धिस्तत्र L

बुद्धितत्त्वादहङ्कारस्तन्मात्राणीन्द्रियाणि च॥

तन्मात्रेभ्यश्च भूतानि सर्वं च क्रमशो ऽसृजत्॥ इति ।

- 12 तदेतत्तत्त्वानां मध्यात्तितयमेव नित्यम्; अन्यत्तत्त्वमनित्यम् । किं च वि-
भ्विति । व्यापकमप्येतदेव त्रितयम् । मायाया अपि स्वकार्यव्यापकत्वात् ।
न च सदाशिवेश्वरतत्त्वयोरपि विभुत्वादव्याप्तिरत्रेति वाच्यम्, तयोरप्यत्रै-
15 वान्तर्भावादित्युक्तम् । किं च कर्तृशक्तियुक्तमिति । कार्यकर्तृस्वभावमप्येतदेव
त्रितयम् । मायाया अपि वक्ष्यमाणेनाचेतनत्वेन कर्तृत्वासम्भवात्कारणत्वमेव
कर्तृत्वमुक्तम् । यदाहुः —

- 18 प्रवृत्तौ वा निवृत्तौ वा कारकाणां य ईश्वरः ।

अप्रवृत्तः प्रवृत्तो वा स कर्ता नाम कारकः॥ इति ।

- मन्त्रमन्त्रेश्च(f.107^v)रादीनां कर्तृत्वे ऽपि तेषां पुरुषविशेषात्मकत्वान्नात्राव्या-
21 स्तिः । एवं कलादीनां कारणत्वे ऽपि तद्वारेण शक्तिरूपाया मायाया एव
कारणत्वान्नात्राव्याप्तिरित्यदोषः, शक्त्यात्मकत्वमेव मायायाः स्वरूपं यतः ।

- किं च सुप्ते ऽपि विकृतिजाते त्रितयं जागर्तीति । महाप्रलये सर्वान्य-
24 तत्त्वोपसंहारे ऽप्येतदेव तत्त्वत्रयमवशिष्यत इत्यर्थः । नन्वेतन्नित्यत्वाभिधा-
नादेव गतम् । सत्यम् । विप्रतिपत्तिनिवृत्यर्थं तु पुनरुक्तम् । यतः कैश्चिद्रौ-
रववार्त्तिककारादिभिर्महाप्रलये ऽनन्तोपसंहारे विद्येश्वरान्तराणामनुपसंहार
27 इष्यते । तत् त्वयुक्तम् । युगपन्मुक्तिश्रुतेरिति दर्शितं रौरववृत्तौ गुरुणा । प्रोक्तं
हि रौरवे —

अनन्तोपरमे तेषां महतां चक्रवर्तिनाम् ।

- 30 विहितं सर्वकर्तृत्वकारणं परमं पदम्॥ इति ।

श्रीमत्तङ्गे ऽपि

3.18–19 प्रवृत्तौ वा निवृत्तौ...स कर्ता नाम कारकः Source unknown. Also quoted ad Nareśvaraparīkṣā 1:56, ad Mataṅgavidyāpāda 6:31 and ad Bhogakārikā 72c–73b.

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

3.16 वक्ष्यमाणेनाचेतनत्वेन] conj.; वक्ष्यमाणाचेतनत्वेन L 3.18 कारकाणां] conj.;
कारणानां L 3.26 °प्रलये ऽनन्तोपसंहारे] conj.; °प्रलयो नन्तोऽपि संहारो L 3.27
°पसंहार] em.; °पसंहर L

शुद्धाध्वपतयो देवा मन्त्राश्चामोघशक्तयः ।

समाप्य स्वाधिकारान्ते प्रयान्ति परमं पदम् ॥

33

इत्यविरोधः ॥ ३ ॥

एवमनेन धर्मजातेनास्य तत्त्वत्रयस्य साधर्म्यं तत्त्वान्तरैश्च वैधर्म्यमुक्तम् ।
अधुना परस्परतो ऽपि तदुभयमुच्यते—

36

शिवपुरुषावतिसङ्घौ प्रसवविहीनौ चिता समेतौ च ।

शिवस्ताव(f. 108^r)न्मुक्तशिवापेक्षयासङ्घातो ऽनन्तः । शिवसमत्वमेवेह मो-
क्षो न तु तल्लयः । पुरुषो ऽपि सङ्घयानन्तः, पुरुषबहुत्वस्येहाभ्युपगमात्,
तस्यैवं स्वसंवेदनेन पुरुषान्तरवेदकतया च सिद्धेः, न त्वात्मैक्यस्येत्युक्तम-
न्यत्र । ननु कलादिरपि प्रतिपुरुषं भिन्नत्वादसङ्घा एव । यदुक्तं भोगमोक्षे—

3

...कलाप्रान्ता भोगसाधनसंहतिः ।

नियता प्रतिभोक्तारम् । इति ।

6

सत्यम्, अतः «एव तद»पि वक्ष्यति । इह तु मायात एव वैधर्म्यं प्रतिपा-
द्यम्, न तत्त्वान्तरेभ्य इत्यदोषः । «किं च प्रसवविहीना»विति द्वावप्येता-
वपरिणामिनौ, तथात्वे हि «मृदादिवदचेतनौ»,
यदुक्तं श्रीकिरणे—

9

परिणामो ऽचेतनस्य चेतनस्य न युज्यते । इति ।

चिता समेतौ च । चिद्रूपावेवोच्येते । न तु मनःसंयोगादिना चेतनौ, यदुक्तं

12

श्रीमतङ्गे—

3.32–33 शुद्धाध्वपतयो देवा...परमं पदम् *Mataṅgavidyāpāda* 25:62cd and 63cd, in
which the edition reads प्रयान्ति पदमुत्तमम्, for which it records no variant. The
intervening line reads: न सीदन्ति न लुप्यन्ति पीड्यन्ते न च केनचित्

4.5–6 वसुधादिकलाप्रान्ता भोगसाधनसंहतिः । नियता प्रतिभोक्तारं परिज्ञेया मनीषिभिः ॥
Bhogakārikā 105c–106ab.

4.11 परिणामो ऽचेतनस्य चेतनस्य न युज्यते । *Kiraṇa* 2:26ab.

3.32 °पतयो देवा] *em.*; °मतयो L(unmetrical) 4.3 °वेदकतया] *conj.*; °वेदकं
तया L 4.7 अत एव तदपि] अतः [4-3]पि L 4.8 किं च प्रसवविहीनाविति] *conj.*;
किं [4-4]पि विति L 4.9 मृदादिवदचेतनौ] *conj.*; मृत [4-4]पि L 4.11 परिणामो
ऽचेतनस्य चेतनस्य] *em.*; परिणामो चेतनस्य L(unmetrical) 4.12 चिता समेतौ च]
em.; चितौ समेता च L

चितेश्वित्सहजो धर्मः । इति ।

15 अथ मायाया एताभ्यां वैधर्म्यमुच्यते —

एकं प्रसवित्वयुतं मायातत्त्वं चिता विहीनं च ॥ ४ ॥

एकमेव मायातत्त्वम्, पुरुषतत्त्वस्येवानेकत्वे प्रमाणाभावात्, मोहनैकान्व-
याच्चैतदेकमेव कारणं सिद्धं यतः । प्रसवित्वयुक्तं परिणामयुक्तम्, कलाद्यु-
18 पादानकारणत्वेनैव सिद्धेः । अत एव चाचेतनं मृदादिवत् । एत(f. 108^v)च्च
परस्या अपि मायाया बोद्धव्यम् ॥ ४ ॥

अथेह शिवपुरुषावतिसङ्घावित्यनेन शिवशब्दवाच्या ईश्वरा बहवः प्रो-
21 क्तास्तेषामपि साधर्म्यवैधर्म्यमुच्यते —

ईशाः प्रवृत्तवीर्यास्तत्रैको ऽनादिसिद्धगुणविभवः ।

मुक्तेश्वरवैमल्यं सर्वार्थे दृक्क्रिये च ततः ॥ ५ ॥

तत्र प्रवृत्तवीर्यत्वं सर्वविषयप्रवृत्तज्ञानक्रियात्मकत्वं तस्यामवस्थायां सर्वे-
षामीश्वराणां समानम् । प्रागवस्थाकृतस्तु विशेषः । परमेश्वरस्यानादिसिद्धं
3 गुणेषु वैभवं प्रभुत्वम् । मुक्तेश्वराणां तु बन्धनिवृत्तिः शिवत्वाभिव्यक्तिश्च ततः
परमशिवादिति ॥ ५ ॥

यत एवं —

नतिपूर्वः कृतिवर्गस्तेन स्वामिन्यनादिसंसिद्धः ।

सकलाकलप्रभेदो गीतो यश्च क्रियाविषयः ॥ ६ ॥

तेन कारणेन नतिः परिणतिः पूर्वमादौ यस्य कार्यवर्गस्य स्थितिसंरक्षणा-
दानभवानुग्रहात्मनः स कार्यवर्गस्तस्मिन्स्वामिनि परमेश्वरे ऽनादिसिद्धः ।
3 न तु मुक्तशिवेषु, आदिसिद्धत्वात् । यश्च सकलादिभेदः कार्यविषयः सो

5 b. °विभवः] LE_D; °विभावः E_F(unmetrical) 6 a. कृति°] L; कृत° E_DE_F

6 b. °संसिद्धः] L; °संसिद्धे E_DE_F

4.14 चितेश्वित्सहजो धर्मः *Mataṅgavidyāpāda* 6:81a.

4.14 चितेश्वित्सहजो] *em.*; चितेस्तत्सहजो L 4.16 प्रमाणाभावात्] *conj.* Isaacson;
प्रमाणाभावात् L 6.1 कारणेन] *em.*; कारणे L 6.3 मुक्तशिवेषु, आदिसिद्धत्वात्] *conj.*;
मुक्तशिवेष्विवादिसिद्धत्वात् L

ऽप्यनादिसिद्धः परमेश्वरे । मुक्तशिवेषु त्वादिसिद्ध इति । अत्र तदन्तर्भावेनैव
गीतो न भेदेनेति । अत्र कार्यं प्रति यच्छक्तत्वं सा निष्कलावस्था (f. 109^r)
शिवः कथ्यते । यत्तु तत्रोद्युक्तत्वं सा सकलनिष्कलावस्था सदाशिवः । य- 6
त्पुनः प्रवृत्तक्रियत्वं सा सकलावस्थेश्वर इत्येकत्वे ऽप्ययमत्र तत्त्वत्रयभेदः ।
यदाहुः—

शक्तोद्युक्तः प्रवृत्तश्च कर्ता त्रिविध इष्यते । 9

श्रीकिरणे ऽपि—

ईशः सदाशिवः शान्तः कृत्यभेदाद्विभिद्यते । इति ।

दीक्षादिना तु यस्तत्पदप्राप्तो ऽणुस्तदपेक्षयास्य तत्त्वत्रयस्य वस्तुभेद एव, 12
क्रियाशक्तेः स्थूलसूक्ष्मपरभेदेन व्यक्तत्वादित्युक्तमन्यत्र ॥ ६ ॥

पूर्वं 'शिवपुरुषावतिसङ्घौ प्रसवविहीनौ चिता समेतौ च' इति शिव-
पुरुषयोः साधर्म्यमुक्तम् । अथ वैधर्म्यमुच्यते— 15

शिवगुणवद्गुणजातं पुंसामपि सर्वसंगतं किन्तु ।

एकेनैव हि तेषां मलेन तदनादिसंरुद्धम् ॥ ७ ॥

पुरुषाणामपि «शिवगुणवद्» गुणजातं सर्वार्थसम्बन्धयोग्यम्, ज्ञत्वकर्तृ-
त्वस्वभावत्वात् । ईश्वरस्येव यद्ये«षामप्येतत्, सर्व»स्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वादिप्रस-
ङ्गः । सत्यम्, किन्तु तद्गुणजातं पुंसां यस्मान्मलेना«नादिसंरुद्धं त»स्मान्नै- 3
ष प्रसङ्ग इति । अत्र च मलेनानादिसंरुद्धत्वाभिधानादेव मलस्याप्यनादित्वं

7b. पुंसामपि सर्वसंगतं किन्तु] E_F; पुंसां □ [-7-] □ किन्तु L; पुंसामपि सर्वसंगतं किञ्च
E_D 7c. एकेनैव हि तेषां] L; एकेन हि सर्वेषां E_DE_F

6.9 शक्तोद्युक्तः प्रवृत्तश्च कर्ता त्रिविध इष्यते Source unknown. Also quoted elsewhere,
e.g. ad Kiraṇa 3:13, ad Mataṅgavidyāpāda 3:20. And note that this half-line is plainly
alluded to in Ratnatrayaparīkṣā 265 and then expounded in Ratnatrayaparīkṣā 266–82.

6.11 ईशः सदाशिवः शान्तः कृत्यभेदाद्विभिद्यते Kiraṇa 3:13cd.

6.13 इत्युक्तमन्यत्र See Mataṅgavṛtti ad vidyāpāda 3:20.

6.14 शिवपुरुषावतिसङ्घौ प्रसवविहीनौ चिता समेतौ च Tattvatrayanirṇaya 4ab.

7.1 शिवगुणवद्] conj.; □ [-6?-] □ L 7.2 यद्येषामप्येतत्, सर्वस्यैव] conj.; □ [-6?-] □
स्यैव L 7.4 मलेनानादिसंरुद्धं तस्मा°] conj.; मलेना □ [-5?-] □ स्मा° L

- सिद्धम् । एकत्वं तु मलस्यानादिबन्धकत्वान्यथानुपपत्त्यैव, अनेकत्वे हि
 6 तस्या(f. 109^v)चैतन्यात्कारणपूर्वकत्वेन कलादेरिवादिमत्त्वादनादिबन्धानुपप-
 त्तिः । न हि निवृत्तमलस्य शिवस्येव बन्धः सम्भवतीति ॥ ७ ॥

ततः प्रकृते किम्? उच्यते—

ते ऽतो ऽनीशा ह्यज्ञा निर्व्यापारा विना बलव्यक्तिम् ।

अतो ऽनादिमलबन्धात्कारणात्ते पुमांसो ऽनीश्वराः, अनभिव्यक्तज्ञत्वकर्तृ-
 त्वबलाः, मलनिवृत्तावेव तदभिव्यक्तेः । अत एव—

न च शक्तास्ते स्वं स्वं

बलममलं सर्वगं स्वतः कर्तुम् ॥ ८ ॥

- 3 द्रव्यत्वात्तस्याज्ञानहेतोश्चक्षुर्मलस्येव पटलादेर्न ज्ञानान्निवृत्तिः सम्भवति, ये-
 नानात्मादावात्माद्यध्यवसायात्मनो बौद्धस्याज्ञानस्य निवृत्ताविव पुरुषाणां
 सामर्थ्यं स्यादिति चक्षुर्वैद्यव्यापारेणैव पटलादेरीश्वरव्यापारेणैव दीक्षालक्ष-
 6 णेन तस्य निवृत्तिरित्युक्तं श्रीमत्पौष्करे—

न मोक्षं याति पुरुषः स्वसामर्थ्यात्कदाचन । इति ।

श्रीस्वायम्भुवे ऽपि—

- 9 दीक्षैव मोचयत्यूर्ध्वं शैवं धाम नयत्यपि ।

इत्यदोषः ॥ ८ ॥

एवं च—

8a. ते ऽतो ऽनीशा] L; तेनानीशा E_DE_F 8cd. स्वं स्वं बलममलं सर्वगं] L; स्वबलं
 विमलं सर्वार्थगं E_DE_F

8.7 न मोक्षं याति पुरुषः स्वसामर्थ्यात्कदाचन Quoted and attributed to the *Paṣkara* in
 the *Mṛgendravṛtti* ad *vidyāpāda* 2:28 and in the *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa* ad 3:150cd.
 The line occurs in the South Indian *Paṣkara*: 1:90ab (Adyar ed.).

8.9 दीक्षैव मोचयत्यूर्ध्वं शैवं धाम नयत्यपि *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 2:24cd.

7.5 अनेकत्वे] conj.; अनेकत्वं L 7.6 °चैतन्यात्कारणपूर्वकत्वेन] conj.; °चैतन्यात्का-
 रणप्रेरकत्वेन L 7.7 कलादेरिवादि°] conj.; कलादेरिवानादि° L 8.1 पुमांसो] em.;
 पुंसांसो L 8.4 °त्माद्यध्यवसायात्मनो] em.; °त्माध्यवसायात्मनो L 8.5 °व्यापा-
 रेणैव] em.; °व्यापारेणैव L

मलसंरोधात्तद्वत्तेषामकृतो हि शिववशीकारः ।

पत्युस्ते ऽतो रोध्या बध्याः शोध्याः प्रबोध्याश्च ॥ ९ ॥

यथैव तेषामनादि मलकृतमनीश्वरत्वादि, तद्वदेवाकृतो ऽनादिरेव शिवस्य
सम्बन्धी वशीकारो ऽधिष्ठेयत्वम् । अतः (f. 110^r) एव मलसंसर्गाद्वेतोस्ते भ-
गवतो रोध्या वामाया मलाधिष्ठानेन, बध्याश्च मायीयैर्बन्धनैः, शोध्याश्च 3
दीक्षया, प्रबोध्याश्च ज्ञानादिभिः ॥ ९ ॥

अत्र व्यतिरिक्तमलप्रतिक्षेपेण पूर्वः पक्षः—

नित्ये ज्ञानादिबले मलादिपरिकल्पनं ननु ज्यायः ।

ननु ज्ञत्वकर्तृत्वात्मके बले नित्ये पुंसः स्वभावतया सिद्धे सति तस्य त-
दवस्थायां सर्वज्ञत्वादिप्रसङ्गपरिहाराय मलपरिकल्पना युक्तिमती वक्तुम्,
न तु तस्मिन्ननित्ये, पुंसामेवाज्ञस्वभावत्वे तदानीं सिद्धे व्यतिरिक्तमलप- 3
रिकल्पनायोगात् । अनित्ये च, तत्कार्यकरणभाव एवोपलम्भात् तदभावे
चानुपलम्भात्, उज्झिता व्यतिरिक्तमलसिद्धिरिति नैयायिकादयः । आदि-
ग्रहणात्तन्निमित्तत्वेन प्रागुक्तानीश्वरत्वरोध्यत्वादिपरिकल्पनम् । 6

अत्र सिद्धान्तः—

सत्यं नान्यादृक्तादृग्यस्मात्सदेश्वरे दृष्टम् ॥ १० ॥

सत्यमेतत् । नान्यदिवानित्यवदृश्यते तद्वलम् । नित्यमेवेत्यर्थः । कुतः । य-
स्मात्तादृङ्गित्यमेतदीश्वरे सदा दृष्टम् । अयमर्थः—पुंवलमपि तन्नित्यं चिद्व- 9
लत्वादीश्वरबलवदिति पूर्वोक्तयुक्त्या व्यतिरिक्तमलसिद्धिः । कथं तर्हि कार्य-
करणाभावे न दृश्यते । (f. 110^v) व्यञ्जकाभावादित्युक्तं तत्त्वसङ्गहे—

9 ab. मलसंरोधात्तद्वत्तेषामकृतो] conj.; मलसंसर्गात्तद्वत्तेषां मकृतो L; मलसंरोधाद्यदत-
स्तेषां E_DE_F 9 c. पत्युस्ते ऽतो रोध्या] L^pE_F; पत्युस्तेतो बोध्या L^{ac}; पत्युस्त्वेते
रोध्या E_D 9 d. शोध्याः प्र०] E_F; शोध्याः प्रो० L; शोध्याश्च E_D 10 d. सदेश्वरे]
LE_F's M; तदीश्वरे E_DE_F

10.2 युक्तिमती वक्तुम्] conj.; युक्तिमतीत्युक्तं L 10.3 तस्मिन्ननित्ये] conj.; तस्मि-
न्नित्ये L 10.4 तत्कार्यकरण०] conj.; तत्कार्यकारण० L 10.5 उज्झिता] conj.;
उत्थिता L 10.6 ०रोध्यत्वादि०] conj.; ०बोध्यत्वादि० L 10.11 कार्यकरणाभावे न
दृश्यते] conj. Isaacson; कार्यकारणभावेन दाश्यते L

12 पूर्व कलादियोगादग्रहणादृक्क्रिये न विद्येते ।

इति चोदयित्वा —

व्यञ्जकरहिते तत्र हि नो गृह्येते न खल्वसद्भावात् ॥ इत्यादिना ॥ १० ॥

15 अतो मलसंरोधात्पत्युस्ते बध्या इत्युक्तम् । तत्र कारणान्तरसमुच्चयः —

मायाविकारयोगे कर्मयुतः कारणं मलो भविनाम् ।

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

विज्ञानयोगसन्न्यासैर्भोगाद्वा कर्मणः क्षयात् ।

3 विज्ञानकेवलास्तत्र प्रोक्ताः सम्भविनस्ततः ॥ इति ।

प्रागस्य मलस्य सर्वपुरुषावारकस्यैकत्वे प्रतिपादिते विशेषाभावात्सर्वपुरुषाणां युगपद्वन्धो मोक्षो वा प्रसक्त इति । तदर्थमेतत्

मलशक्तयो विभिन्नाः

प्रत्यात्मानं च तद्गुणावरिकाः ॥ ११ ॥

6 अत एवैकत्वे ऽप्यस्य मलस्य शक्तयो विभिन्नाः प्रतिपुरुषं गम्यन्ते यास्तेषां पुरुषाणां गुणावरिकाः । इति न भवत्येष प्रसङ्गः । चशब्दात्प्रागुक्तो मायाविकारः प्रत्यात्मानं भिन्न एव । कार्यकरणस्याभेदे हि सर्वस्य सर्वभोगप्रसङ्गः ।

9 यदुक्तं भोगमोक्षे —

अन्यथा हि सुखादीनां दृष्टो भेदो न युज्यते ।

योक्ष्यते कर्मणो भेदात्तद्भेदो (f. 111^r) यदि योक्ष्यते । इत्यादि ॥ ११ ॥

12 यद्येवं प्रतिपुरुषं मलशक्तेरप्येकत्वेनाविशेषात्सर्वदा बन्धस्य मोक्षस्य वा प्रसङ्गः । तत्रोच्यते —

10.12 पूर्व कलादियोगादग्रहणादृक्क्रिये न विद्येते । व्यञ्जकरहिते तत्र हि नो गृह्येते न खल्वसद्भावात् ॥ *Tattvasaṅgraha* 20.

11.2–3 विज्ञानयोगसन्न्यासैर्...सम्भविनस्ततः *Paramokṣanirāśakārikā* 55cd and an unknown half-verse.

11.10–11 अन्यथा हि सुखादीनां...यदि योक्ष्यते *Bhogakārikā* 106c–107b.

11.8 °कारः प्रत्यात्मानं] *conj.*; °कारप्रत्ययात्मा L 11.8 कार्यकरणस्याभेदे] *conj.*; कार्यकारणस्याभेदे L 11.11 तद्भेदो] *em.*; तद्भेदे L

विनिवर्तते निरोधात्पुंलतः परिणमन्मलः कालात् ।

परिणतिविशेषयोगात्

स कदाचित्कस्यचित्कथञ्चिच्च ॥ १२ ॥

पुम्बलात्प्रागुक्ताज्ज्ञत्वकर्तृत्वात्मकादवधेर्निरोधकत्वेन शक्त्यात्मनावारकेण
परिणमन्परिपाकविशेषं प्राप्य निवर्तते । यदुक्तं श्रीस्वायम्भुवे—

क्षीणे तस्मिन्यियासा स्यात्परं नैःश्रेयसं प्रति । इति ।

अतश्च तत्परिपाकविशेषवशात्स मलः कदाचिन्निवर्तते, न सर्वदा । तत्प-
रिपाकाभावात्कस्यचित्च पुंसः, न सर्वस्य । कथञ्चिच्च तीव्रमन्दादिभेदेनेत्युक्तं
श्रीकिरणे । तस्मान्नैष प्रसङ्गः । स च कालात्परिणतेः । परिणतिस्वभावत्व-
मेवास्य कालः कथ्यते, प्रसिद्धकालाभावे ऽपि महाप्रलये प्रलयकेवलादेः
परिणामादिति ॥ १२ ॥

अथास्य प्रसङ्गस्य परिहारायेश्वर एव निमित्तमिति स्वतन्त्रशक्तिपा-
तवादिनः, तत्किं मलस्य परिणतिस्वभावकल्पनया परिपाकगुणकल्पनया
वेति । तत्रोच्यते—

अत एव पुद्गलानां परिदृष्टः साधनादुदयभेदः ।

कालान्गुणतश्च तथा घटते ऽसौ नान्यथा जातु ॥ १३ ॥

यो ऽयं पुरुषाणां साधनादीक्षाख्यादुदयस्य मोक्षात्मनो विशेषः कदाचित्क-
थञ्चिच्चेति प्राक्परिदृष्टः प्रतिपादितो ऽसौ कालादिति प्रागुक्तान्मलस्य परिण-
तिस्वभावात्मकान्गुणतश्च परिपाकविशेषाद् घटते, नान्यथेश्वरादेव । तस्यापि

13 a. पुद्गलानां] $E_D E_F$; मुद्गलानां L 13 b. °दृष्टः साधनादुदयभेदः] E_F ; °दृष्टः
साधनादुदयभेदः LE_F 's M; °दृष्टाः साधनादुदयभेदाः E_D 13 d. नान्यथा जातु] L;
नान्यथेशतो जातु $E_D E_F$

12.3 क्षीणे तस्मिन्यियासा स्यात्परं नैःश्रेयसं प्रति *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 1:17cd.

12.6 इत्युक्तं श्रीकिरणे See *Kiraṇa* 5:30ab (and commentary): मन्दा मन्दतरा शक्तिः
कर्मसाम्यविवक्षया ।

12.1 शक्त्यात्मनावारकेण] conj.; शक्त्यात्मनावारणेन L 12.3 नैःश्रेयसं] L; निःश्रेयसं
Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha Ed. 12.8 परिणामादिति] em.; परिणमादिति L

- स्वातन्त्र्येणाविशेषाद्रागद्वेषाद्यसम्भवाच्च स एव तदवस्थः प्रसङ्गः । यद्येवम्,
मलपरिपाकादिसापेक्षत्वात्तस्यात्रास्वातन्त्र्यादिदोषः । न निमित्तापेक्षित्वम-
6 स्वातन्त्र्यहेतुः, कर्मापेक्षित्वमिव भोगे, अपि त्वीश्वरायत्तता । सा च तस्य
सर्वेश्वरत्वात्त सम्भवतीत्युक्तं नरेश्वरपरीक्षायाम् —
स्वातन्त्र्यान्याप्रयोज्यत्वं करणादिप्रयोक्तृता ।
9 कर्तुः स्वातन्त्र्यमेतद्वि न कर्माद्यनपेक्षिता ॥
इत्यदोषः ॥ १३ ॥

ततश्चात्र न पूर्वोक्तः प्रसङ्ग इत्युच्यते —

इत्थं गणनाहीनं निमित्तमभिवीक्ष्य चेश्वरेणोक्तम् ।

सद्युक्तिमद्विमुक्तेर्नेतरथा साधनानन्त्यम् ॥ १४ ॥

- अनेन प्रकारेणानन्तपुरुषसम्बन्धितयानन्तं प्रतिपुरुषं भिन्नमेव मुक्तेर्निमित्तं
मलपरिपाकात्मकं सद्युक्तिः प्रोक्तानुमानलक्षणा साधनाय विद्यते यस्य त-
3 था(f. 112^r)भूतं चाभिवीक्ष्य भगवता तत्साधनस्य दीक्षाख्यस्यानन्त्यं संहिता-
भेदेनोक्तम्, न प्रकारान्तरेणेति नात्रैकमुक्तौ सर्वमोक्षदोषप्रसङ्ग इत्यर्थः ॥ १४ ॥
एवं च —

यस्य यदा यावद्भिः सच्छ्रेयोरोधकृन्मलः पाशैः ।

तस्य तदा तावद्भिर्विहतैर्विजहाति बन्धत्वम् ॥ १५ ॥

यथा मायाविकारयोगे कर्मयुतः कारणं मल इत्युक्तम्, तथापि मायीयैर्यैः
पाशैः सह यस्य पुंसो यदेति तत्तत्कर्मपरिपाककाले यत्र च स्थाने मलः

14 c. °मुक्तेर्] L; °मुक्तौ E_DE_F 15 ab. यदा यावद्भिः सच्छ्रेयोरोधकृन्मलः] em.;
यदा यावद्भिः सच्छ्रेयो बोधकृन्मलः L; यथा यावद्भिः स श्रेयोरोधकृन्मलः E_DE_F; यदा
यावद्भिः स श्रेयोरोधको E_F's M 15 cd. तदा तावद्भिर्विहतै°] L; तदा तावद्भिर्निहतै°
E_F's M; तथा तावद्भिर्निहतै° E_DE_F

13.8-9 स्वातन्त्र्यान्याप्रयोज्यत्वं...न कर्माद्यनपेक्षिता The second line is Nareśvara-
parīkṣā 2:30ab; the first line contains the same ideas as 2:29, but in different wording.
Our verse appears attributed to Siddhaguru ad Mṛgendravidyāpāda 3:5.

13.4 तदवस्थः] conj.; तदवस्था L 13.8 स्वातन्त्र्यान्या°] conj.; स्वातन्त्र्यास्या° L
14.1 भिन्नमेव] conj.; भिन्नमेवं L 15.1 मायीयैर्यैः] conj.; मायीयैः L

सच्छ्रेयोरोधकृदित्यधोनियामकः, तस्य पुंसस्तस्मिन्काले स्थाने भोगेन तैः 3
क्षपितैः सो ऽपि बन्धत्वं विजहाति । नामिश्रं परिणमत इति न्यायेन मलस्य
परिपाके मायीया अपि पाशाः सहकारिकारणं प्रवर्तमाना निवर्तमाना वा ।
†सर्वस्य गुणोदय इव विज्ञानकेवलेष्वित्यर्थः† ॥ १५ ॥ 6

इतश्चैतत् —

इत्थंरूपाणि यतः सन्मुक्तेः साधनानि दृश्यन्ते ।

शार्वे शास्त्रे तानि च नेतरथा युक्तिमन्ति जायन्ते ॥ १६ ॥

यतः पारमेश्वरे शास्त्रे ऽस्मिन्नित्थंरूपाण्येव प्रतिस्थानं भोगद्वारेणैव मायीय-
पाशविघातकर्तृणि मुक्तेः साधनानि दृश्यन्ते, ततो ऽपि तैर्मायीयैर्विहृतैस्तत्र
तत्र मलस्य (f. 112^v) तत्तद्वन्धकत्वं निवर्तते इति प्रतीयते । अन्यथा तान्यपि 3
साधनान्ययुक्तानि प्रसज्यन्ते, निष्कारणं बन्धान्तरक्षपणादिति ॥ १६ ॥

तदियता शिवगुणवद्गुणजातं पुंसामित्यादिना शिवपुरुषयोर्वैधर्म्यहेतुभूतं
मलस्वरूपं निर्णीतम् । अथ तस्यैव रूपान्तरनिर्णयायात्रार्धार्धभागेन प्रश्नः — 6

परिणमयति हि मलं कः

किल मलपरिणामकल्पनापक्षे मलस्वभावादेव मलः परिणमते इति कस्तस्य
परिणामकः, न कश्चिदिति मलस्वभावसिद्ध एव मोक्षः प्रसक्तः, नेश्वरकर्तृक
इति तत्सिद्ध्यर्थं स्वतन्त्रशक्तिपातपक्ष एवाभ्युपगन्तव्य इति प्रश्नार्थः । 3

सिद्धान्तस्तु —

यः कर्मावेक्ष्य चित्रकमणुभ्यः ।

बीजाद्दाति चित्रं निष्कृष्य ससाधनं भोगम् ॥ १७ ॥

यश्च स्वापे बीजं कुर्वन्नास्ते प्रसूतये योग्यम् ।

विश्वं च तत्र निहितं प्रलये येनैव विश्रान्त्यै ॥ १८ ॥

17 a. परिणमयति हि] conj. (supported in the commentary on 19); परिणमति हि
L(unmetrical); परिणामयति E_DE_F 17 b. यः कर्मावेक्ष्य] LE_F(following M); क-
र्मावेक्ष्यैव E_D 17 cd. चित्रं निष्कृष्य] LE_F(following M); चित्र्यं निष्कृष्य च यः E_D
18 c. विश्वं] E_DE_F; विश्वे L 18 d. प्रलये येनैव] conj.; प्रलयो येनैव L; प्रलये
तेनैव E_DE_F

15.3 °रोधकृदित्य°] em.; °बोधकृदित्य° L^{pc}; °बोधकृ ×द्यि× दित्य° L 16.4 प्र-
सज्यन्ते] conj.; प्रसृज्यन्ते L

कर्म च भुक्त्यै पुंसां जाग्रति विश्वे करोति चेशानः ।

स मलं मलहा बलदः कारुण्यात्सर्वदैव विनिवृत्त्यै ॥ १९ ॥

- य ईशानो विचित्रकर्मापेक्षया पुरुषेभ्यो बीजान्मायात्मकादुपादानादुत्पाद्य विचित्रं भोगं सह तत्साधनैस्तत्त्वभावभुवनात्मकैर्ददाति; (f. 113^r) यश्चान-
3 वरतानन्तपुरुषः «भोगप्रदाने तदक्षमं» बुद्ध्या महाप्रलये तद्विश्रान्त्या तत्क्षमं कुर्वन्नास्ते; येन च तत्र तस्मिन्नेव बीजे «विश्वं तत्त्वभाव» भुवनादि तदानीं सर्वमेव पुनरुत्पत्त्यर्थं निहितम्; यश्च सृष्टिकाले ऽपि कर्म भोगयोः «ग्यं
6 करोति पुरुषाणाम्», स ईशानः, मलं हन्तीति मलहा, पुरुषेभ्यश्च बलं ज्ञत्वादिकं ददातीति बलदः, सर्वदा प्रतिक्षणं मलं विनिवृत्त्यै करोति परिणमयतीति । अयमर्थः । यथा परिणतिस्वभावत्वे ऽपि मायायाः कलादेः कर्मणश्चेश्वरः सृष्टिसंहारयोः कर्ता—न तु मायादिस्वभावसिद्धावेव सृष्टिसंहारौ—भवद्भिरिष्यते, तद्वन्मलपरिणतिपक्षे ऽपि ईश्वर एव मोक्षकर्तोपपद्यत इति कुतः स्वतन्त्रशक्तिपातसिद्धिः ॥ १९ ॥

12 अत एव—

तद्विनिवृत्तेः प्राक्च हि तत्सामर्थ्यस्य सफलता क्रियते ।

- यावद्धि मलः संसारकारणत्वादपरिणतस्तावत्तत्परिणतेः प्रागीश्वरेण प्रत्युत मलसामर्थ्यमेव पुंबलरोधात्मकं सफलं क्रियते । न त्वपरिपक्व एव निवर्तत
3 इत्यर्थः । तथा हि—

पुंबलरोधं कुर्वन्पश्यति हि स पाशशक्तिसाफल्यम् ॥ २० ॥

19b. विश्वे करोति चेशानः] L; विश्वे ऽपि किञ्चिदीशानः E_DE_F 19c. स मलं मलहा बलदः] L; समलं स महाबलदः E_DE_F 19d. सर्वदैव] E_DE_F; सदैव L(unmetrical)
20 ab. प्राक्च हि तत्सामर्थ्यस्य सफलता क्रियते] L; प्रागपि तत्सामर्थ्योद्बलनदानकृते E_D(unmetrical); प्रागपि तत्सामर्थ्यस्य सबलताकृतये E_F(following ABM, all his MSS); but E_F remarks that Aghoraśiva's commentary suggests the reading: तत्सामर्थ्योद्बलनदानकृतये 20 d. पश्यति हि स पाशशक्तिसाफल्यम्] L; दृष्टः स च पाशशक्तिसाहाय्यम् E_DE_F

19.2 भोगं] em.; भोगे L 19.3 °पुरुषभोगप्रदाने तदक्षमं] conj.; पुरुषसा ----क्षसे च L 19.4 विश्वं तत्त्वभावभुवनादि] conj.; नि □ भुवनादि L 19.6 कर्म भोगयोग्यं करोति पुरुषाणां] conj.; कर्मभोगयो □ L 19.7 बलं] conj.; बले L 19.8 परिणतिस्व°] conj.; परिणमतिस्व° L

दृष्ट्वा च तन्निवृत्त्यै यो^(f. 113^v)ग्यं युङ्क्ते नृमुक्तये करणम् ।

एवं स मलशक्त्यनुग्रहद्वारेण पुंवलरोधं कुर्वन्परमेश्वरस्तस्य मलाख्यस्य पा-
शस्य यासौ शक्तिस्तस्या यत्साफल्यं समाप्ताधिकारता परिपाकविशेषस्तं
पश्यति । फलपर्यन्तो हि सर्वस्याधिकारो यतः । तच्च दृष्ट्वा तस्मात्पाशान्नि- 3
वृत्त्यर्थं पुंसां मुक्तिफलं करणं दीक्षाख्यमुपयुङ्क्ते ।

ननु परिणामः कार्यमुच्यते, मायाया इव कलादि । मलस्य त्वप्रकृति-
त्वात्कार्यासम्भवेन परिणामानुपपत्तिरिति । अत्रोच्यते — 6

बीजस्येव स्वापे

परिणतिरिष्टा मलस्य चित्तिहानौ ॥ २१ ॥

यथा बीजस्य जगतो मायायाः स्वापे महाप्रलयकाले परिणतिः पुनःस-
र्गोत्पादानुगुणः शक्त्यतिशयप्रतिलम्भः स्वरूपपरिणामादेव भवति — न का-
र्यात्मनो विजातीयपरिणामात्, तदानीं तस्यासम्भवात् — तद्वन्मलस्य का- 9
र्यान्तराप्रकृतित्वे ऽपि स्वरूपपरिणतिस्वभावत्वादेव चित्तिहानिविषये ऽपि
परिणतिरसौ भविष्यतीत्यदोषः ॥ २१ ॥

अत्र स्वतन्त्रशक्तिपातवादिन आशङ्कापूर्वं प्रतिक्षेपः — 12

यदि च विनिवृत्तियोग्यं कुरुते शम्भुर्मलं ततः किमिति ।

सर्वात्मसु नो कुर्याद्युगपदिति च चोदयन्वाच्यः ॥ २२ ॥

कल्पयित्वा मलस्य परिणतिस्वभावत्वं भवद्विरीश्वर एव तस्य परिपाकहे-
तुरुक्तः । स च विशेषाभावात्सर्वस्य परिणमयेदिति पूर्वः प्रसङ्गः । तदवश्यं
तत्परिहारार्थमत्र स्वातन्त्र्यं भगवतो ऽभ्युपगन्तव्यम् । तत्तदेवास्तु किमन्त- 3
र्गङ्गुना मलस्य परिणतिकल्पनेनेति यच्चोदयेत्स एवं वक्तव्यः ॥ २२ ॥

कथमित्यार्याभागेनोच्यते —

किमिति न सर्वं युगपत्कुरुते भोग्यं स कर्म

21 b. नृमुक्तये] Σ ; शुमुक्तये E_F 's M

21 d. चित्तिहानौ] L; चित्तिहाने: $E_D E_F$

22 cd. कुर्याद्युगपदिति च] L; युगपत्कुर्यादिति $E_D E_F$

$E_D E_F$

23 b. स कर्म] L; स्वकर्म

21.1 मलशक्त्य°] *em.*; मलशुक्त्य° L

21.3 तच्च] *conj.*; यच्च L

- भवत्पक्षे ऽपि कर्मणानैकान्तिको ऽयं हेतुः, यतः कर्मेश्वरः परिणमय्य भोग्यं पुंसः करोतीति विशेषाभावात्किमिति न सर्वमेव युगपद्भोग्यं करोतीति । न
- 3 तु यथा त्वया कर्मण्येतदभ्युपगतं तथा मले मम भविष्यतीति व्याख्येयम् । एवं हि प्रतिवादिनो वाद्युक्तसाधनदोषानुद्भावनं निग्रह एव । यदाहुः—
- असाधनाङ्गवचनमदोषोद्भावनं द्वयोः ।
- 6 निग्रहस्थानमन्यत्तु न युक्तमिति नेष्यते ॥
- इत्यभ्युपगम्य, एतत् कर्मणानैकान्तिकदोषोद्भावकत्वेनोक्तम् ।
- अत्रानैकान्तिकपरिहारहेतुनिरासः—

तदहानात् ।

न समाधिरनेकत्वं

कालान्तरभोग्यता बलीयस्त्वम् ॥ २३ ॥

- 9 न कर्मणि विशेषा(f.114^v)भावादित्ययं हेतुः सिद्धः, यतस्तत्र पुरुषभेदेना-
नेकत्वम्, एकस्मिन्नपि पुरुषे जन्मान्तरभोग्यता, तीव्रवेगत्वेन बलीयस्त्वं
च कर्मान्तरापेक्षया विशेषो विद्यते । इत्येवमत्रानैकान्तिकत्वमस्य हेतोर्यः
- 12 समादध्यात्, अस्य न समाधिरनेकत्वम्, कालान्तरभोग्यता, बलीयस्त्वं
वा । कुतः? तस्य समाधेः साध्यधर्मिण्यप्यहानाद्विद्यमानत्वादिति । मले
ऽप्ययं हेतुरसिद्धत्वादपगमक इत्यर्थः, यतस्तत्रापि प्रतिपुरुषं शक्तिभेदेना-
- 15 नेकत्वं कालान्तरपरिणतिस्वभावत्वं च तीव्रतरसत्कर्माद्यनुष्ठानादिसहकारि-

23 b. तदहानात्] L; तदहर्वा E_DE_F 23 c. °नेकत्वं] L; °नेकत्वात् E_DE_F

23.5-6 असाधनाङ्गवचनम्...न युक्तमिति नेष्यते Verse from the beginning of Dharma-
kīrti's Vādanyāya. The verse is quoted in the Nyāyamañjarī (vol. 2, p. 679), where the
following explanation is given (p. 680): वादिना सिषाधयिषितपक्षसिद्धये साधनमभिधे-
यम् । स चेदसाधनाङ्गं ब्रूयात्, निगृह्येत । प्रतिवादिनापि वाद्युक्ते साधने दूषणमुद्भावनीयम् ।
स चेददोषमेव दोषत्वेनोद्भावयेत्, निगृह्येत । ते एव द्वयोर्वादिप्रतिवादिनोर्निग्रहस्थाने ।
अतो ऽन्यथा निग्रहकरणमन्याय्यमेव ।

23.3 मले] conj.; मलं L 23.6 निग्रहस्थानमन्यत्तु] em.; निग्रहस्थानसत्यन्तु L 23.7
°गम्य, एतत्] conj.; °गतैतत् L 23.8 अत्रानै°] em.; अत्रनै° L 23.12 समाद-
ध्यात्, अस्य] em.; समादद्यादस्य L 23.13 °द्यमानत्वादिति] conj.; °द्यमानादिति
L

सान्निध्यसिद्धपरिणतिस्वभावत्वं च क्वचित्पुरुषे ऽस्ति, न सर्वस्मिन्नित्यदो-
षः ॥ २३ ॥

अपि च —

18

सर्वविकारोत्पत्तौ शक्ता शक्तिः सदैव सन्निहिता ।

ईशे बीजे च यतो भविनि विभुत्वं च भोक्तृभावश्च ॥ २४ ॥

तेनानेकानीशः कृत्वा वृन्दानि कार्यकरणादेः ।

बीजाद्युगपत्पुरुषं भोजयतु स सर्वकर्माणि ॥ २५ ॥

ईश्वरशक्त्या मायाशक्त्या चानैकान्तिको ऽयं हेतुः, भवत्पक्षे हि तस्याः सर्वत्र
सर्वार्थकारित्वेन सन्निधानाविशेषात्, भोक्तृश्च व्यापकत्वेन सर्वत्र भावात्,
युगपदेव सर्वैः कार्यकरणवृन्दैः पुरुषान्सं(f. 115r)योज्य किमिति न सर्वक- 3
र्माणि परिपाच्य भोजयति स भगवान्यतः ।

अत्र पराभिप्रायः —

नन्वनुमिनुमः क्रमतो दृष्ट्वा कर्माणि भुज्यमानानि ।

विपचति तथैव शम्भुस्तानीति

पाचकस्याविशेषे ऽपि पाचनीयं कर्म बालाद्यवस्थाक्रमेण भुज्यमानं दृष्ट्वा
भगवानपि तद्योग्यतापेक्षयैव पाचकस्तेषां क्रमेणावसीयते । ततो नात्रानैका-
न्तिको ऽयं हेतुरसिद्धत्वादिति । अत्रोत्तरम् —

3

समानमुभयत्र ॥ २६ ॥

यद्येवं, कर्मणामिव मले ऽप्येतद् असिद्धत्वमस्य समानमित्यत्राप्यदोषः ।
कथमित्युच्यते —

24d. विभुत्वं] $E_D E_F$; बहुत्वं L 25d. भोजयतु स] *em.*; भोजयन्तु स L; भोजयति
 E_D (unmetrical); भोजयति स E_F 26a. क्रमतो] L; क्रमशो $E_D E_F$ 26c. विपचति
तथैव] E_F ; विपचति तथैव L(unmetrical); पाचयति तथैव E_D

23.16 °सिद्धपरिणति°] *conj.*; °सिद्धं परिणति° L 23.16 क्वचित्] *conj.*; चित् L
25.2 सन्निधानाविशेषात्] *conj.*; साधनाविशेषाद् L 25.3 कार्यकरणवृन्दैः] *em.*; का-
र्यकरणवृन्दैः L 26.2 °वसीयते] L^{pc} ; °नुमीयते L^{ac} ? 26.4 °सिद्धत्वमस्य] *conj.*;
°सिद्धमस्य L

यस्मात्कार्यं प्रोक्तं विनिवृत्त्यै गम्यते मले ऽप्यत्र ।

शक्नोति हि योग्यत्वं तथैव कर्तुं महेश्वरो ऽपीति ॥ २७ ॥

यस्माद्यथैव कर्मणि स्वयोग्यतयैव क्रमेण परिपाकविशेषात्मकं कार्यमुक्तम्,
तथैव मले ऽपि क्रमेण—तथैव मुमुक्ष्वादिदर्शनान्यथानुपपत्तिसिद्धं क्रमेणैव

3 परिपाकविशेषं कार्यमत्र शास्त्रे गम्यत एव । यदुक्तं श्रीमत्स्वायम्भुवे—

क्षीणे तस्मिन्ययासा स्यात्परं नैःश्रेयसं प्रति । इति ।

यथैव च भोगाय कर्मणो योग्यताक्रमेणैव «परिपाकहेतुर्महेश्वरः, तथैव

6 मलस्यापि स एव» परिपाकहेतुरित्यविशेषादित्यस्य हेतोरत्राप्यसिद्धतेत्य-
दोषः ॥

न केवलमत्रैव यावत् (f. 115^v)—

स्वापे ऽप्येवं योनेर्योग्यत्वं कर्मणश्च पृष्टेन ।

भवतोत्तरमभिधेयं स्थितिसमयसमानकालीनम् ॥ २८ ॥

प्रकृतेर्ह्यनवरतानन्तपुरुषभोगप्रदत्वेनापचिततरशक्तित्वात् कर्मणश्च तदानी-
मपचिततरशक्तिशरीर्यनुष्ठितत्वेनापचिततरशक्तित्वाद् भोगदानायायोग्यत्व-

3 मिति तद्योग्यतोत्पादनाय महाप्रलयस्तद्विश्रामको भवद्विरभ्युपगन्तव्यः ।

यदुक्तं श्रीमन्मृगेन्द्रे—

स्वापे ऽप्यास्ते बोधयन्बोधयोग्यान्नोध्यानुन्धन्पाचयन्कर्मिकर्म ।

6 मायाशक्तीर्व्यक्तियोग्याः प्रकुर्वन्सर्वं पश्येद्यद्यथा वस्तुजातम् ॥ इति ।

27a. यस्मात्] L; मत्वा E_DE_F 27b. विनिवृत्त्यै गम्यते मले ऽप्यत्र] L; विनिवृत्तिर्-
गम्यते मलस्यात्र E_DE_F 28a. °प्येवं] L; चैवं E_DE_F 28b. °ग्यत्वं] L; °ग्यत्वे
E_DE_F 28d. °समयकालीनम्] L; °समये कालीने E_D(unmetrical); °समयकालीने
E_F

27.4 क्षीणे तस्मिन्ययासा स्यात्परं नैःश्रेयसं प्रति । Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha 1:17cd

28.5-6 स्वापे ऽप्यास्ते बोधयन्...यद्यथा वस्तुजातम् Mrgendravidyāpāda 4:15.

27.4 नैःश्रेयसं] L; निःश्रेयसं Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha Ed. 27.5 कर्मणो] conj.;
कर्मणे L 27.6 योग्यताक्रमेणैव परिपाकहेतुर्भगवान्, तथैव मलस्यापि स एव] conj.;
योग्यताक्रमेणैव L 28.1 °नवरता°] em.; °नवरता° L 28.3 °दानायायोग्यत्व-
मिति] conj.; °दानयोग्यत्वमिति L 28.5 रुन्धन्] Mrgendra (Ked); रोध्यन् L
28.6 सर्वं पश्येद्] L; पश्यन् सर्वं Mrgendra (Ked)

ततश्च विशेषाभावात्क्षणमात्रमेव तामुपसंहृत्य कर्माणि च विश्राम्य भगवान्
कस्मात्पुनःसर्गं न विधत्ते? किमर्थं सर्गसमकालं तत्रापेक्षते? इत्यत्रापि
भवता प्रकृतेस्तथास्वभावत्वानुसारेण तदेवात्राविशेषासिद्धिलक्षणमुत्तरं वा- 9
च्यम्। तच्च मले ऽपि प्रोक्तनयेनाविशिष्टमित्यविरोधः ॥ २८ ॥

तथा—

स्रोतःसु च सर्गादौ नियमविहीने यथा च यद्वस्तु।

यावत्काले भवति च तद्धि तथा तावदीशेन ॥ २९ ॥

कर्तुं शक्यमितीदं तुल्यं मोक्षे ऽपि तन्निमित्तेन।

सर्गप्रारम्भकाले पूर्वपूर्वतरादिभेदेनानन्तसंख्ये कस्माद्भगवान् मायास्रोतोल-
क्षणेभ्यो (f. 116^r) निमित्तेभ्यः कलादिवद्विशेषाभावाद् गुणादिपृथिव्यन्तमपि
तत्त्वजातं नोत्पादयति? किमर्थमवान्तरप्रकृतिसम्बन्धं तस्यापेक्षते? यदुक्तं 3
श्रीरौरवे—

कलातत्त्वाद्वागविद्ये द्वे तत्त्वे सम्बभूवतुः।

अव्यक्तं च तथा भूयो गुणांश्चासृजत प्रभुः ॥

गुणेभ्यो धिषणा जज्ञे अष्टरूपा गुणान्विता।

बुद्धेश्चाप्यथ संक्षोभादहंकारो ऽप्यजायत ॥

अहङ्कारात्तु सूक्ष्माणि तन्मात्राणीन्द्रियाणि च।

तन्मात्रेभ्यश्च भूतानि सर्वं च क्रमशो ऽसृजत् ॥ इति ॥

तत्रापि भवता तेषां कार्यवस्तूनां यद्वस्तु यथा वा प्रकृतिनियमलक्षणप्रका-
रेण यावति काले भवनयोग्यं तत्तथा तावति काले भगवान्कर्तुं शक्नोति, 12

29 c. यावत्काले भवति च] L; यावति काले भवति E_D(unmetrical); यावति काले
भवति हि E_F 29 d. तावदीशेन] LE_D; तावतीशेन E_F 30 a. °तीदं] E_DE_F;
°तीत्थं L 30 b. मोक्षे ऽपि तन्निमित्तेन] L; मोक्षे च तन्निमित्ते च E_DE_F

30.5–10 कलातत्त्वाद्वागविद्ये द्वे...क्रमशो ऽसृजत् Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha 2:15–17.

28.9 °त्वानुसारेण] conj.; °त्वेनुसारेण L 28.9 °विशेषासिद्धि°] conj.; °विशेष-
सिद्धि° L 28.10 °विशिष्ट°] conj.; °वशिष्ट° L 30.1 कस्माद्] em.; कर्माद् L
30.2 कलादि°] conj.; कलाः कलादि° L 30.12 भवनयोग्यं] conj.; भावनयोग्यं L

नान्यथेत्यविशेषासिद्धिलक्षणमत्रोत्तरं वाच्यम् । तदिदं मोक्षनिमित्तेन मल-
परिपाकात्मना तुल्यमिति नोक्तदोषप्रसङ्ग इति कुतस्तत्प्रसङ्गः «निरासः» नि-
15 राकृतस्य स्वतन्त्रशक्तिपातस्य सिद्धिरिति । तदेवं —

अलमुद्दिष्टमशुद्धेः सदूपं निरवशेषेण ॥ ३० ॥

शास्त्रादेकत्वाद्यं शक्त्यानन्त्यं विना निवृत्त्यर्थम् ।

शक्त्यानन्त्यप्रमुखं सदुक्तेः कारणोत्थायाः ॥ ३१ ॥

शम्भुपुरुषतत्त्वयोर्वैधर्म्यहेतुभूतमशुद्धेर्मलस्य यत्पारमा(f.116^v)र्थिकं रूपं त-
त्पर्याप्तं कृत्वा निःशेषेण प्रोक्तम् । यच्चास्य मलस्य शास्त्रादेकत्वाद्यमिति —
3 यदुक्तं श्रीस्वायम्भुवे —

अथानादिर्मलः पुंसां पशुत्वं परिकीर्तितम् । इति ।

तत्र हि मलस्यैकवचनेन पुंसां बहुवचनेन निर्देशात्सर्वपुरुषाणामेक एव मल
6 इति प्रतिपादितम् । आदिग्रहणात्परिणामित्वम् । यदुक्तं तत्रैव —

क्षीणे तस्मिन्ययासा स्यादिति ।

—तच्छक्त्यानन्त्यं विना निवृत्त्यर्थमभावायैव मलस्य भवेत् । विना श-
9 क्त्यानन्त्यम् अभवच्छक्त्यानन्त्यं मलस्य निवृत्त्यर्थं मलनिवृत्तये भवतीत्यर्थः ।
[चौरकृतः क्षेपश्चौराभावकृत इतिवत्] । नाप्येकस्यानेकावारकत्वमनेकशक्ति-
कल्पनं विनोपपद्यते यतः । अत एव शक्त्यानन्त्यप्रधानं तदागमोत्थायाः
12 सदुक्तेः सकाशात्सिद्धमिति प्रदर्शितं प्राक् ‘मलशक्तयो विभिन्नाः प्रत्या-

31 a. शास्त्रादेकत्वाद्यं] E_F 'sAM; शास्त्रादेकत्वाख्यं L; शास्त्रेष्वेकत्वाद्यं $E_D E_F$ 31
b. शक्त्यानन्त्यं विना निवृत्त्यर्थम्] *em.*; शक्त्यानन्तं विना निवृत्त्यर्थम् L; शक्त्यानन्त्यं
विनानिवर्त्यं तत् $E_F E_D$ 31 c. शक्त्यानन्त्यं] $E_D E_F$; शक्त्यानन्तं L 31 d. कार-
णोत्थायाः] L; शासनोत्थायाः $E_D E_F$

31.4 अथानादिर्मलः पुंसां पशुत्वं परिकीर्तितम् *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 2:1ab, in
which Sadyojyotiḥ's text has अथानादिर्मलः

31.7 क्षीणे तस्मिन्ययासा स्यात् *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 1:17c.

30.13 °त्यविशेषा°] *conj.*; °ति विशेषा° L 30.15 °निरासनिराकृतस्य] *conj.*;
°निराकृतस्य L 31.5 बहुवचनेन] *em.*; बहुवचन° L 31.8 तच्छक्त्यानन्त्यं] *em.*;
तच्छक्त्यानन्तं L 31.9 °वच्छक्त्यानन्त्यं] *em.*; °वच्छक्त्यानन्तं L 31.11 °प्रधानं]
conj.; °प्रधानस् L

त्मानम्' इति ॥ ३१ ॥

अथ प्रकरणोपसंहारः —

उक्तः समासतो ऽयं तत्त्वत्रयनिर्णयः स वृत्तिकृता ।

स्वायम्भुवस्य जडतामपनेतुमनादिकां पुंभ्यः ॥ ३२ ॥

सो ऽयं तत्त्वत्रयनिर्णयः स्वायम्भुवस्य वृत्तिकृता खेटपालेन पुरुषेभ्यो जड-
तानिवृत्तये सङ्क्षेपेणोक्त इति ॥ ३२ ॥

इति तत्त्वत्रयनिर्णयविवृतिर्दावोभिसारसंस्थेन ।

परतत्त्वास्थै रचिता काश्मीरिकभट्टरामकण्ठेन ॥

इति भट्टश्रीनारायणकण्ठात्मजभट्टश्रीरामकण्ठेन विरचिता तत्त्वत्रयनिर्णय-
स्य विवृतिस्सम्पूर्णा समाप्तेति शिवम् ।

32b. °निर्णयः स वृत्तिकृता] L; °निर्णयश्च वृत्तिकृता E_DE_F 32c. जडताम्] E_DE_F;
जडम् L(unmetrical)

31.13 मलशक्तय विभिन्नाः प्रत्यात्मानम् Tattvatrayanirṇaya 11cd.

RĀMAKAṆṬHA'S TENTH-CENTURY TATTVATRAYANIRṆAYAVIVṚTI
TRANSLATION

O Śambhu, when those whose perception has been rendered free of impurity after being empowered by the descent of power that is your grace 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 (*ṣaṭtriṃśattattva-*

¹²For the inability of the bound soul to use its limited faculties to grasp Śiva, see *Mokṣakārikā* 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 *Mokṣakārikā* 109–110 and Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary thereon:

*viśuddhenātmatattvena caitanyākhyena sūtrakṛt
śivaśaktikaleddhena (śivaśaktikaleddhena] conj.; śivaśaktikaledhyena GOML
R 14466; śivaśaktikale śuddhe E_v) śivo dhyeya iti bruvaṇ
pāśāgamyo maheśāna iti khyāpayati sma naḥ.
[Mokṣakārikā 109–110b.]*

[*Mokṣakārikāvṛtti*:] *dīkṣitair jñānaśaktyaiva nirmalayā śivaśaktiā dīpitayā śivo dhyeya iti
rauravasūtrakāro bruvaṇ (bruvaṇ] GOML R 14466; 'bravīt E_v) na buddher dhyātavyo
(dhyātavyo] E_v; yaṃtavyo GOML R 14466) bhagavān ity āha*

*sarvāñjanavinirmuktaṃ śivaśaktikalaidhitam (śivaśaktikalaidhitam] BHATT,
GOML R 14466; śivaśaktikalotthitaḥ E_v)
ātmatattvam idaṃ śuddhaṃ sādhanānāṃ prakīrtitam
tatstho 'līnasvatattvena tāṃ kalāṃ cintayed budhaḥ (budhaḥ] GOML
R 14466, E_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_v marks the readings of Vrajavallabha DVIVEDI's edition of the texts of the *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*.

The author of the sūtras [of the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, on which I am commenting], 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 alight 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. [*Mokṣakārikā* 109–110b.]

[*Mokṣakārikāvṛtti*:] 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 (*atra*) a further treatise (*prakaraṇāntaram vaktum*) that is intended to settle the nature (*-arthasadbhāvanirṇayāya*)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 (*sādharmyavaidharmyalakṣaṇa*°), 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 (*bhukti-mukti-tatsādhanasambandha*),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] (*kārmamāyīyāṇavasya*). From among those [bonds] (*tatra*), he ascertains (*jñātvā*) the variety of the power to give experience (*bhogadānakṣamatvavaicitryam*) 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 (*tatsādhanaiḥ*),

¹³‘nature’ may seem a weak translation of *arthasadbhāva*, but something of this kind appears to be required. Rāmakaṇṭha seems to be echoing Sadyojyotiḥ’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.

¹⁵*Ex 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 *bhukti* 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 *bhuktimuktisādhanasambandha*°, ‘connection with the means of achieving experience and liberation’.

which derive from primal matter (*māyāyāiḥ*), and that consists in awareness of them (*tatsaṃvittiyātmakam*),¹⁷ [namely:] the *tattvas* from *kalā* to earth; the worlds that rest in them (*tadadhikaraṇaiś ca*), beginning with that of Kālāgni and going up to that of Aṅguṣṭhamātra;¹⁸ the infinite variety of bodies born in those various worlds; and the experienceable [states of mind] that are the *bhāvas* and *pratyayas*.¹⁹ Then, upon ascertaining (*jñātvā*) the

¹⁷ *Ex conj.*

¹⁸ Why is Aṅguṣṭhamātra mentioned here? The Saiddhāntika scriptures are not unanimous in placing the world of Aṅguṣṭhamātra in at the top of the *māyā*-derived ‘impure’ part of the cosmos. Thus in the *Sarvajñānottara* (9:109), the *Kiraṇa* (8:123–4) and the *Mataṅga* (*vidyāpāda* 11:38), he is at the head of a group of eight Rudras who are placed in *rāgatattva*; in the *Mr̥gendra* (*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 *Svacchanda*, Aṅguṣṭhamātra heads the same group, but is found lower still, in *buddhitattva* (10:1045–6).

But Rāmakaṇṭha appears here to be following the cosmographical tradition represented by the *Mālinīvijayottara* (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 Aṅguṣṭhamātra is at the top of the impure universe in *māyātattva*. The *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, although it does not allocate worlds and Rudras to particular *tattvas*, also implies that this is where Aṅguṣṭhamātra lies (4:19–21). The *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* and the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* are the only surviving tantras of the Śaiva Siddhānta that we can be certain Sadyojyotiḥ knew, and so it is fitting here that Aṅguṣṭhamātra should be placed here at the head of the uppermost level of the universe within which embodiment is regulated by *karman*. Rāmakaṇṭha is presumably echoing verse 55 of Sadyojyotiḥ’s *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā*:

*aṅguṣṭhamātrabhuvane kaivalyaṃ sambhavet paśoḥ
vijñānayogasaṃnyāśair bhogād vā karmaṇaḥ kṣayāt*

Isolation is possible of the bound soul in the world of Aṅguṣṭhamātra by the destruction of *karman* through knowledge, *yoga*, renunciation (*saṃnyāsa*) or consumption.

One other relatively early source that places Aṅguṣṭhamātra high up is worth mentioning in passing: Bhoja’s *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* (SANDERSON’s unpublished e-text, NAK 5-743, NGMPP B 28/19, f. 46^v): *mahātejavāmādevabhava-udbhava-ekapīṅgeḥṣaṇa-īśānabhuvaneśa-aṅguṣṭhamātra iti maṇḍaleśvarāṣṭakaṃ māyāyāṃ*.

¹⁹ The *bhāvas* are the eight basic propensities that are properties of the *buddhi*, namely *dharma*, *jñāna*, *vairāgya*, *aśvarya* and the opposites of these four. They are the fruits of *karman*. When this *karman* becomes yet further ripened, they develop into more concrete experienceable states of mind called *pratyayas* (thus Aghoraśiva in the *Mr̥gendravṛttidīpikā* ad 10:25: *te dharmādaya eva prakarṣāvasthāṃ prāptāḥ sthūlena rūpeṇa bhogyadaśāṃ pratipannāḥ pratyayāḥ*). According to the Sāṅkhyas, from whom this nexus of ideas is inherited, there are 50 *pratyayas*; according to Aghoraśiva ad *Mr̥gendravṛttidīpikā* 10:25, interpreting the *Mr̥gendra* and the *Mataṅga*, there are 300 for the Śaivas. For more on the subject, see *Mr̥gendravidyāpāda* 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 *viññānakevala*] (*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 (*asadyonirvāṇādīkṣāvaicitryeṇa*). And this He bestows by means of His own splendour alone (*eva*), which means ‘by His Powers’ (*svaśaktīlakṣaṇeṇa*), and not by means of any independent instrument, for even if He should make use of such a thing (*tadupādāne ’pi*), it is His Power that remains the [primary] instrument (*śakter eva karaṇatvāt*). Furthermore (*ca*) He is one whose ‘splendour’ (*udayaḥ*), 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 (*-pūrvam*) [mention of] the qualification of certain particular persons [for studying it].

Now, o you who merit honour,²² for the benefit of those

²⁰Here again Rāmakaṇṭha is plainly echoing *Paramokṣanirāśakārikā* 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 *viññānakevala*, 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 Rāmakaṇṭha intends to speak of the two conditions in which the soul is deprived of experience, namely that of the *pralayakevalin* (or *pralayākala*) and that of the *viññānakevalin* (or *viññānākala*).

²¹*Ex conj.*

²²We could instead take *natibhājaḥ* as an ablative agreeing with *gurutaḥ*. The position of the two words seems to us to make Rāmakaṇṭha’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 *tantra*: ‘o you who have respect for this *tantra*’. One more conceivable interpretation worth mentioning requires taking *nati*² 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
(*tantré*), I am about to teach briefly the special (*kaṃcid*)
essence²³ that I learnt from the Guru. (2)

O you who merit veneration (*natibhājah* = *namaskārārḥāḥ*), [namely] elders!
I shall teach the special (*kaṃcit*) nature (*arthasadbhāvam*) 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
of intellect who are specifically (*eva*) initiated inside this tantric system
(*tantré 'smin*),²⁴ [he conveys that] the work is targetted at particular persons
qualified to study it and is thereby (*viśiṣṭādhikārigatatvena*) 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
(*kartr̥śaktiyuktam*). 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 Sadāśiva and Īśvara. This
he will [by implication] teach [below in verse 6:]

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

²³ Aghoraśiva'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 *arthasadbhāva* as a unit of vocabulary the meaning of which we
took to be 'nature'.

²⁴ *Ex conj.*

²⁵ This follows Rāmakaṇṭha's interpretation; but more natural would be 'this triad of
entities wakes'.

²⁶ Souls 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, Sakalākala 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 (*pūr vapus 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 (*māyā*), she can be higher or lower. The higher one is the reality-level of [pure] *vidyā*, the locus of the [eight] Mantreśvaras²⁸ and the Mantras.

†...†²⁹

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

From that [*māyātattva* evolved] time and *kalā*,³⁰ passion, [impure] knowledge and [lower] matter (*rāga vidyāvyaktam*), together with [the *tattva* of] *guṇa*. [Below these] from *buddhi* came *ahāṅkāra* [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 Sadāśiva and Īśvara are also all-pervading, since those two are already included here [within the three entities]. This has [already] been taught (*ity*

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

²⁸In Rāmakaṇṭha's usage, the term Mantreśvara refers to the eight Vidyeśvaras, namely Ananta (the demiurge responsible for creation), Sūkṣma, Śivottama, Ekanetra, Ekarudra, Trimūrti, Śrīkaṇṭha and Śikhaṇḍin (cf., e.g., his introduction to *Mokṣakārikā* 93). Pure *vidyā* (which can be referred to as *mahāmāyā*) and primal matter (*māyā*) are contiguous *tattvas*, but the first is the matter for the 'pure universe' (*śuddhādhvan*) and the second is the matter for the 'impure universe' (*aśuddhādhvan*), which we inhabit. For a brief outline of the ladder of *tattvas* in the classical Śaiva Siddhānta, see GOODALL 1998:lii–liv.

²⁹It seems more than likely that some text has dropped out here which identified the lower of the two *māyās* as *māyātattva* 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 *māyātattvam*. Such an ending might then easily have provoked eyeskip by being similar to that of the sentence before it.

³⁰Or, if we follow the interpretation of Sadyojyotiḥ ad loc., 'time, *nīyati* 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 insentient, as will be explained below.

Whoever is the controlling agent of the factors that govern a verbal action (*kāraṇāṇām*), 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 Mantreśvaras 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 *māyā*] are causes [and therefore might in a limited sense be considered ‘agents’ in the way *māyā* is], there is no under-extension here since it is really *māyā*, existing as potentiality, who is the true cause through them, and so there is no fault [here], for the true nature of *māyā* 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 (*vipratipattinivṛttyartham*). 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 Vidyeśvaras. But that is wrong, because scripture teaches [that they attain] simultaneous liberation. This has been shown by Sadyojyotiḥ in the *Rauravavṛtti*.³² For this has been taught in the *Raurava-sūtrasaṅgraha*, in 2:13]:

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

³²This is a reference to Sadyojyotiḥ’s *Mokṣakārikā* 93:

*amī rudrās tu sūkṣmādyā mantrāś ca śivatulyatām
sānantāḥ svādhikārānte yānti muktiṃ hareraṇāt*

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

Rāmakaṇṭha in his Mokṣakārikāvṛtti ad 93:

*anantoparame sthānaṃ (sthānaṃ] GOML R 14466; sthāne Ev) tat tu
sūkṣmo 'dhitisthate
padāt padaṃ vicarato hy ekaikasya mahātmanaḥ
sthāne śikhaṇḍīnaś tv anyam (tv anyam] Ev; satyam GOML R 14466)
rudrāṇāṃ kurute śivaḥ.*

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

We must understand *vicarato 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 *Mataṅga*, 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 kṛtakṛtyatvād ananto 'nantavīryavān
tatas tasmin samārūḍhe pañcamantratanuḥ śivaḥ 10
dadāty anujñāṃ sūkṣmasya vidyēśasya mahātmanaḥ
sa ca prāptavaraḥ śrīmān bhartur ājñānuvartakaḥ 11
tattanttraḥ padam ānantam adhiṣṭhāya mahāyāśaḥ
nīvartayaty adhaś cakram yat tan māyātmakam jagat 12
evam śivottamasyāpi sūkṣmasyoparame śivaḥ
pradadātīśasamghasya kāraṇatvam aninditam 13
padāt padaṃ vicarato hy ekaikasya mahātmanaḥ
yāvat sā paramā kāṣṭhā tāvac cakrasya kāraṇam 14
avyucchedāya rudrāṇāṃ kṛtvā śaktibalānvitam
nīyunakti pade tasmin yaviyāsi śikhaṇḍīnam 15*

- 11a anujñāṃ sūkṣmasya] Kashmirian MSS; ājñāṃ sūkṣmasya Ed.
- 12b mahāyāśaḥ] Kashmirian MSS; mahāyāśaḥ Ed. • 15c. yaviyāsi] Kashmirian MSS; yaviyāṃsaṃ 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 Sūkṣma, the great-souled Vidyēśa. And he [in turn], having acquired [His] favour (*prāptavaraḥ*), 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 Sūkṣma stops [his work], Śiva [gives authorisation] to Śivottama. He gives to all the Vidyēśas (*īśasaṅghasya*) 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 *Mataṅga*, [in *vidyāpāda* 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 (*api*) state both of these [viz. both what is held in common and what is not] within the group [of three] (*parasparataḥ*).

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

In brief, it is clear that the two great ancient exegetes of the Śaiva Siddhānta, Sadyojyotiḥ and Bṛhaspatipāda, were perceived by the tenth-century Kashmirians as having taken sides over *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* 2:13. Sadyojyotiḥ, 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 Bṛhaspatipāda, both in his **Rauravavārttika*, which we have cited above, and in his **Śivatanuśāstra*, 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 Vidyēśvara who bears the uppermost rank of Ananta becomes liberated. In this Bṛhaspati 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 Sadyojyotiḥ, the position of Bṛhaspatipāda that this takes place in *mahāpralaya*.

Why is all this relevant here? If Bṛhaspatipāda'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 *vidyātattva* 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 *śambhu*, *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 *Kiraṇa* 3.8), since this would entail the mutability and therefore the impermanence of the soul. Rāmakaṇṭha's explanation, in his commentary on *Kiraṇa* 1:13, of their vicarious inclusion in the *tattvakrama*, 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 (*asaṃkhyātāḥ*), [i.e.] infinite [in number] (*anantāḥ*).³³ In this system (*iha*), liberation consists in being equal to Śiva (*śivasamatvam eva*), and not in being merged in Him (*na tu tallayaḥ*). 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 (*evam siddheḥ*) [viz. proved to be plural] because of [the combination of] his self-awareness (*svaśaṃvedanena*) and the fact that he knows other souls; [we do] not [accept] (*na tu*) the position that there is only one soul (*ātmaikyasya*). This we have taught elsewhere.³⁴ One might object that (*nanu*) 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*).³⁵

... 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].³⁶ But here what is to be expressed is what is not held in common [by Śiva and the soul] specifically (*eva*) with *māyā*, 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 saṃkhyāto 'nantaḥ*. This would make the sentence more closely parallel with the parallel statement about the soul in the next line, but we think that Rāmakaṇṭha intended first to give, as is often his practice, an etymologically close gloss (*asaṃkhyātāḥ*) followed by a looser one (*anantāḥ*). 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 *asaṃkhyā* to express the same notion, again for the sake of variety. We find that he uses *asaṃkhyāta* to mean 'uncountable' in the *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa* ad 3:49.

³⁴Many of Rāmakaṇṭha's works discuss his theory that the existence of the soul is proven by *svaśaṃvedana*. We do not know when Rāmakaṇṭha composed the *Tattvatraya-nirṇayavivṛti*, 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 Rāmakaṇṭha's own works. Among the earliest of his compositions (see GOODALL 1998:xviii and ff) is the *Paramokṣanirāsakārikāvṛtti*, and this work deals at length with *svaśaṃvedana*, particularly in the refutation of Buddhist views (commentary on verse 43), and also with the plurality of souls, particularly in the refutation of the Pāñcarātriśa view of liberation (commentary on verse 48).

³⁵*Bhogakārikā* 105c–106b. The *Bhogakārikā* and the *Mokṣakārikā* are here referred to as forming just one work. As we have recalled above (see p. 5 and fn. 5), they form part of Sadyojyotiḥ's *Rauravavṛtti*.

³⁶*Ex conj.* The passage in question occurs in 11.7–8.

Furthermore (*kiṃ 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 (*aparīṇāminau*), for if they were [subject to transformation], they would be insentient like clay and such. This is taught in the *Kiraṇa*, [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 (*citeḥ*).

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 (*mohanaikānvayāt*).³⁹ It is ‘of a nature to produce effects’, [i.e.] it is subject to transformation (*parīṇāmayuktam*), because this is proved by the very fact of its being the material cause of *kalā* and the other evolutes. And for this same reason it is insentient, like clay and the

³⁷It is not clear to us what this other reason or factor might be. One possibility is that *manaḥsaṃyoga* is the first in a sequence of requirements, the next being a connection between an *indriya* and the *manaḥ*. Another conceivable possibility is that *adrṣṭa* is referred to with *-ādi* here: cf. *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa* 1:1, p. 3.

³⁸*Ex conj.* The conjecture is not strictly speaking necessary, since *pramābhāvāt* could mean *pramāṇābhāvāt*, but it would be ambiguous and not typical of Rāmakaṇṭha.

³⁹It is probably not the usual sense of *anvaya* that Rāmakaṇṭha intends here, but another technical sense that he uses in his refutation of the Pāñcarātrika view of liberation towards the end of his commentary on *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā* 48: *yā tv arthasya kārye pratyavayavam cānyatra viśadṛśatare 'pi vastuni tenaiva rūpeṇa sarvatraivānuvṛttiḥ, so 'nvaya ucyaṭe*; ‘That (*yā*) continuity (*anuvṛttiḥ*) 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 *anvayaḥ*.’ Thus *anvaya* 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 (*pravṛttavīryāḥ*); 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 (*pravṛttavīryatvam*), which means a state in which they have realised powers of knowledge and action in every possible domain (*sarvaviṣayapravṛttajñānakriyātmakatvam*), 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 (*guṇeṣu vaibhavam*), [in other words] the omnipotence (*prabhutvam*), of the Supreme Lord is beginninglessly established, whereas (*tu*) in the case of liberated Śivas (*mukteśvarāṇām*) the cessation of bondage (*bandhanivṛttiḥ* [= *vaimalyam*]) and the realisation of innate Śiva-hood (*śivatvābhivyaktiḥ* [= *sarvārthe dṛkkriye*]) [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-prabhedah*)⁴⁰ that is proclaimed [in scripture] and which

⁴⁰By *āvṛtti* we interpret this to mean more than simply ‘Sakala and Akala’. Aghoraśiva’s interpretation here is entirely different, in part because he reads *kṛtavargah* (which is perhaps more likely to be original than *kṛtivarṇah*). 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-prabhedah* 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 (*sthitisaṃrakṣaṇādāna-bhavānugrahātmanah*),⁴² and at whose beginning (*yasya pūrvam = ādau*) there is [necessarily] a transformation (*pariṇatīḥ = natīḥ*) [of the material cause of the universe],⁴³ is beginninglessly established to be [vested] in this Lord (*tasmin svāmini*), [in other words] in the Supreme Lord [as his prerogative], and not in the liberated Śivas (*na tu muktaśīveṣu*), 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' (*gītaḥ*) as being included within Him (*tadantarbhāvenaiva*), in other words (*iti*) as being not distinct [from Him] (*na bhedenā*). Among these [subdivisions] (*atra*), the state of [inactive] capacity (*śaktatvam*) with respect to [the five types of] action is the undivided state (*niṣkalāvasthā*), called Śiva. As for the state of readi-

Sadāśiva and Īśvara, but also to a division among souls, for they too may be either *sakala* or *akala* (i.e. *pralayākala* or *viññānākala*). The division that relates to action is then taken by Aghoraśiva separately to refer to the five cosmic acts (*pañcakṛtya*), each of which is assigned to one of the five faces of Sadāśiva.

⁴¹In other words, because, as is implicit in the previous verse, no other soul was liberated and so no other soul than Śiva could initially have performed the cosmic functions of creation, maintenance and so forth.

⁴²Rāmakaṇṭha's wording here deliberately echoes the formulation for the *locus classicus*, *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* 1:15ab: *sthitisaṃrakṣaṇādānabhavānugrahakāriṇaḥ*. Cf. Kiraṇavṛtti 1:9.47 and GOODALL 1998:173. It is possible that the author of the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* did not in fact intend to refer to the list of five actions, but the subsequent tradition has interpreted the half-line in this way.

⁴³We have assumed that Rāmakaṇṭha means to understand *natipūrvah* to mean 'which is necessarily dependent upon a transformation [of *māyā*]', 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 *natīḥ pariṇatīḥ pūrvam ādau yasya* is intended rather to mean 'at the beginning of whose [list] there must be transformation [i.e. creation]'.
⁴⁴This is perhaps a very clumsy rendering of this last expression and one is tempted to translate as though the text read *sādisiddhatvāt*. But emendation is probably unnecessary, for the very next sentence contains the expression *ādisiddhaḥ*. 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. *Parākhya* 15:68–70). It is unlikely that Rāmakaṇṭha had in mind here the lower levels of liberation, seven levels of which are taught in *Mataṅgayogapāda* 5:63–9.

ness (*udyuktatvam*) with respect to that [group of actions] (*tatra*), it is the state which is both divided and undivided (*sakalanīṣkalāvasthā*), [also called] Sadāśiva. And as for the state of being engaged in action (*yat punaḥ pravṛttakriyatvam*), that is the divided state (*sakalāvasthā*), [also known as] Īśvara. Thus, even though there is only one [Lord], this division into three reality-levels (*tattvatrayabhedah*) 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 *Kiraṇa*, [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] (*tatpadaprāptah*), there is indeed a real differentiation (*vastubheda eva*) of these three reality-levels, because of the degree of involvement (*vyaktatvāt*) of the power of action (*kriyāśakteḥ*) [in them], which may be gross, subtle or ultimate[ly fine] (*sthūlasūkṣmaparabhedenā*). 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 (*puruṣām*) [viz. their capacity to know and act] is also (*api*) all-encompassing (*sarvasaṃgatam*), just as is the case of Śiva’s properties; but in their case that [group of properties] is beginninglessly obstructed (*anādisaṃruddham*) 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 (*sarvārthasambandhayogyam*), since it

⁴⁵ Quoted also in *Kiraṇavṛtti* 3:13.5: cf. GOODALL 1998:279, fn. 361.

⁴⁶ This issue is discussed in the *Mataṅgavṛtti* ad *vidyāpāda* 3:20 and we may assume that it is to this work of his own that Rāmakaṇṭha means here to refer.

⁴⁷ The *hi* is presumably emphatic rather than causal here, and has not been translated. It is possible that it reinforces the emphatic force *eva*.

⁴⁸ *Ex conj.*

is the [very] nature [of souls] to know and to do (*jñatvakartṛtvasvabhāvatvāt*). [Objection:] if they too possessed this [group of properties], just as Īśvara does, then [there would be] the corollary that everybody would be omniscient and omnipotent (*sarvajñatvādiprasaṅgaḥ*).⁴⁹ True, but because that group of qualities in souls is beginninglessly obstructed⁵⁰ 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 (*anādibandhakatvānyathānupapattyaiva*). For if it were plural, since it is insentient, it would therefore require some cause [to set it in motion] (*kāraṇa-pūrvakatvena*),⁵¹ just as is the case of *kalā* and other [evolutes of *māyā*], and since it would therefore have a beginning (*ādimattvāt*), it would be impossible for there to be beginningless bondage (*anādibandhānupapattiḥ*).⁵²

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

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

These [souls] are therefore powerless (*anīśāḥ*), [in other words] nescient (*ajñāḥ*)⁵³ [and] inactive (*nirvyāpārāḥ*),

⁴⁹ *Ex conj.*

⁵⁰ *Ex conj.*

⁵¹ *Ex conj.*; cf. the passage of the *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa* cited in the next footnote.

⁵² Rāmakaṇṭha attributes to Sadyojyotiḥ the view that this type of argument is used by the Sāṅkhyas in his commentary on *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* 1:70:

*yah proktaḥ kāpilair nyāyo jagadgaunatvasiddhaye
āgamānugṛhītātvaṁ nyāyah sādhuḥ sa eva hi*

*yenaiva sāmkyair ācāitanye saty anekatvād buddhyādīnām ghaṭādīnām iva
kāraṇapūrvakatvānumānena guṇāḥ kāraṇam avasthāpitās tenaiva guṇānām
apy ācāitanye saty anekatvād avyaktatvaṁ kāraṇam. avyaktarāgavidyānām
kālakālānām api pratipurūṣaṁ bhinnānām māyāsmābhiḥ sādhyate.*

Cf. also *Tantrāloka* viveka ad 9:153: *atra pañcāvayavaṁ parārtham anumānam nirdiṣṭam. tadyathā—pradhānam kāryam, ācāitanye sati anekatvāt: yad ācāitanye saty anekam tat sarvaṁ kāryam, yathā ghaṭaḥ; yan na kāryam tad ācāitanye sati anekam na bhavati, yathātmā; ācāitanye saty anekam ca pradhānam, tasmāt kāryam iti. bahuśaś ca itad bheda-vādibhir (conj. YOKOCHI; vedavādibhir Ed.) upapāditam itiha granthavistarabhayān na vitānitam.*

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 *ataḥ*. 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 (*balavyaktim*).⁵⁴ (8ab)

Therefore (*ataḥ*), [in other words] because of (*kāraṇāt*) beginningless bondage by impurity (*anādimalabandhāt*), these souls are powerless (*anīśvarāḥ*), [in other words] with powers of knowledge and action unrevealed (*anabhivyaktaññatvakartṛtvabalāḥ*), since it is only when impurity ceases to operate (*malanivṛttāu eva*) that those [powers] are revealed (*tadabhivyakteḥ*). For this same reason (*ata eva*),

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

Because it is a substance (*dravyatvāt*), like an impurity in the eye, such as a cataract (*paṭalādeḥ*), it is not the case that the cessation (*nivṛttiḥ*) of this [impurity], which is the cause of nescience (*ajñānahetoḥ*), 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 ātmādhyavasāyātmanaḥ*), ceases. Therefore (*iti*) the cessation of this [impurity may be accomplished] only (*eva*) through an action of the Lord (*īśvaravyāpāreṇaiva*), namely initiation (*dīkṣālakṣaṇena*), just as something like a cataract [can be removed only] by the intervention of an eye-doctor (*caḥsurvaidyavyāpāreṇa*).

This is taught in the venerable *Paṇḍita*.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...'

⁵⁴Or perhaps 'unless they have (*vinā*) their powers revealed (*balavyaktim*)'.

⁵⁵See apparatus to the edition.

Because of their being blocked by impurity,⁵⁶ accordingly they are subject to the uncreated (*akṛtaḥ*) control of Śiva:⁵⁷ therefore (*ataḥ*) they belong to the Lord (*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,⁵⁸ being caused by impurity, are beginningless, in just the same way (*tadvad eva*) their subjection to the control of Śiva, [in other words] their state of being governed, is beginningless (*anādir eva = akṛtaḥ*). And because of (*hetoḥ*) this same fact of being conjoined with impurity (*malasaṃsargāt = ata eva*) they are the Lord's (*bhagavataḥ*) to be blocked (*rodhyāḥ*) by [His power known as] Vāmā,⁵⁹ through her presiding over impurity (*malādhiṣṭhānena*),⁶⁰ and [further] bound (*bandhyās ca*) by the bonds that derive from primal matter (*māyīyair bandhanaiḥ*), and purified (*śodhyās ca*) by initiation, and awakened (*prabodhyās ca*) by knowledge and the others (*jñānādibhiḥ*).⁶¹

On this point (*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] (*vyatiriktamalapratikṣepeṇa*).

Surely the postulation of impurity and the rest [of your theory] is desirable (*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

⁵⁶If we had retained *malasaṃsargāt*, we could have translated 'because of their being conjoined with impurity', but we chose to adopt the reading *malasaṃrodhāt* on the strength of the allusion back to this verse in the *avatārikā* to the first half of verse 11.

⁵⁷Once again the particle *hi* is not translated here: it may be intended to express emphasis.

⁵⁸Since the *anīśvaratva* corresponds to *anīśaḥ* in 8ab, the *ādi* refers perhaps to nescience (*ajñatva*) and inactivity (*nirvyāpāratva*), these being also mentioned in 8ab.

⁵⁹For the rôle of Vāmā in *rodha*, cf. *Mokṣakārikā* 32c–33b as quoted and translated in GOODALL 1998:329. For the names of these *śaktis* and more about their functions see also GOODALL 2004:308ff.

⁶⁰It is odd that Vāmā presides over *mala* rather than over some more obviously manipulable aspect of bondage, such as *māyā*. Perhaps the manuscript's reading is not correct here and some conjecture is required, such as *vāmayā māyīyamalādhiṣṭhānena*. Another possibility would be to retain the adopted text but to interpret *mala-* to mean *āṇavamāyīyā-kārmamala-*.

⁶¹It is not clear what is intended by the *ādi* here. One possibility, perhaps, is this is a reference to the four principal topics of a full *tantra*, namely *jñāna*, *yoga*, *kriyā*, and *caryā*.

words] proven to be the very nature (*svabhāvatayā siddhe*) of the soul, that the postulation of impurity can be reasonably claimed (*yuktimatī vaktum*)⁶² as a way of accounting for the removal of the [otherwise expected] corollary of omniscience and omnipotence (*sarvajñatvādīprasaṅgaparihārāya*) in the soul (*tasya*) while in this [worldly] state. But this would not be so (*na tu*) if these [powers] were not eternal,⁶³ 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 (*tatkāryakaraṇa-bhāva eva*), and since they will not be perceived when that [causal relation] is absent, the proof of an independently existing impurity [must be] abandoned (*ujjhitā*).⁶⁴ The use of the word *ādi* [in the compound *malādīparikalpanam*] [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 (*drśyate*) not like [anything of] the other [type] (*anyad iva*), [in other words,

⁶² *Ex conj.*

⁶³ *Ex conj.*

⁶⁴ *Ex conj.* Cf. Kiraṇavṛtti ad 2:22c-23b: *yad āhur naiyāyikavaiśeṣikāḥ—yad yatra kāraṇāntareṇa kriyate tat tatra nāsty evāndhakāra iva pradīpādīnā kriyamāṇaḥ prakāśaḥ. kriyate ca kāryakaraṇādibhir ātmani vijñānaṃ. tatas tad api tatra nāstīty ajñasvabhāva evātmā siddhyati kuto vyatiriktamalasiddhiḥ.* '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 (*kāryakaraṇādibhiḥ*), 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. Kiraṇavṛtti ad 2:7-8: *bhogaś ca na vinā māyīyaiḥ kalādibhiḥ kāryakaraṇair iti tair api sthūlasūkṣma-śarīrākāreṇa bandho yataḥ, tato na śarīrābhāvān nirvṛtir muktiḥ.* 'And experience does not take place without the instruments and effects of *kalā* and so on, which are evolutes of primal matter, and so (*iti*) there is bondage by these too in the form of subtle and gross bodies. Thus (... *yataḥ, tataḥ*) liberation (*muktiḥ* = *nirvṛtiḥ*) 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*),⁶⁵ 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?⁶⁶ 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 (*ityādinā*)

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 (*khaku*), 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 (*māyīyabandhayoge*), but rather [impurity] only when (*eva*) linked with [the retributive force of] past actions (*api tu karmayuktah*).

⁶⁵The expressions *cit* and *caitanya* are not infrequently used in the sense of *jñāna* and *kriyā*: see GOODALL 2004:233, fn.319.

⁶⁶*Ex conj.* (ISAACSON). Before adopting this text we had considered the smaller, but, as we now think, less convincing emendation *kāryakāraṇabhāvena darśyate*. We then translated this question and the reply that follows in this way: 'How is it then (*katham 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 (*sambhaviṇaḥ*) *Vijñānakevalas*.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 (*gamyaṇte*) 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 *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā* 55. It is possible, however, that the *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā* 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 *Vijñānakevala*. In commenting on *Nareśvara-parīkṣā* 3:91cd (*kṣiṇe 'pi karmajāte syān malāder naiva saṃkṣayaḥ*; ‘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: *vijñānayogasaṃnyāsair bhogād vā karmanāḥ kṣaya iti kṣiṇe 'pi tasmin, malasyādigrahaṇād īśvarapreryatvasya ca naiva kṣaya iti vijñānakevalitvam eva teṣām, 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 *vijñānakevalins*, 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.

⁷⁰*Ex conj.*

⁷¹*Ex conj.*

yujyate). 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 [individuated 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 (*nirodhakatvena*), [in other words, as it ripens] in its form as an individuated power (*śaktyātmanā*) that envelops (*āvāraṇa*),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 Svāyambhuva[sūtrasaṅgraha, 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 (*tīvramandādibhedena*). This has been taught in the venerable Kiraṇa.⁷⁴

⁷²It seems unlikely indeed that this verse was intended to mean what Rāmakaṇṭha’s commentary requires it to mean. Aghoraśiva’s treatment is more natural and it probably reflects Sadyojyotiḥ’s intentions more closely. Following Aghoraśiva we might translate: ‘As it transforms over time, impurity stops (*vinivartate*) its blocking (*nirodhāt*) [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.’

⁷³*Ex conj.*

⁷⁴It is possible that Rāmakaṇṭha has in mind his distortive interpretation of Kiraṇa

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’ (*parīṇatisvabhāvatvam*).⁷⁵ Because it transforms for *pralayakevalas* and others⁷⁶ even in the absence of the familiar time [that is an evolute of *māyā*], [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] (*svatantraśaktipāta-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 śaktiḥ karmasāmyavivakṣayā*, 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 a] mutual blockage of [two simultaneously ripe] actions.’ Instead, Rāmakaṇṭha 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: *karmanā malaparipākalakṣaṇena yat sāmyaṃ mandatvaṃ mandataratvaṃ vā tasya vivakṣāhetutvād vivakṣā jñānam eva tayā hetubhūtayā mandā mandatarā vā śaktiḥ pārameśvarī dikṣā vā yasyopatiṣṭhate tasya pratyavāyayogo bhavaty eva. yasya tu malaparipākalakṣaṇena karmanā tivrēṇa tivratareṇa vā sāmyaṃ tadvivakṣayā tivrā tivratarā vā śaktiḥ patati tasya na pratyavāyah katham api sambhavatīty uktam 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].’

⁷⁵Or perhaps: ‘[so-called] time is nothing other than the transformation of impurity’. Cf. the unattributed Sāṅkhya verse about transformation and time quoted in the *Mataṅga-vṛtti* ad *vidyāpāda* 12:3 on p. 338:

*parīṇāmaḥ prthagbhāvo vyavasthākramataḥ sadā
bhūtaiṣyadvartamānātmā kālarūpo vibhāvīyate.*

⁷⁶These ‘others’ are presumably *viññānakevala* souls.

(*paridr̥ṣṭaḥ*)⁷⁷ 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 (*pratipāditāḥ* = *paridr̥ṣṭaḥ*) 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 (*pariṇatisvabhāvātmaḥ*), 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 *svatantraśaktipātavādin*]. 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 *Nareśvaraparīkṣā*:⁷⁸

⁷⁷Sadyojyotiḥ perhaps intended that this should mean simply ‘seen’, but our translation follows Rāmakaṇṭha’s interpretation.

⁷⁸The second half of this verse is *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* 2:30ab; the first half contains the same ideas as 2:29, but with different wording. It is conceivable that *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* 2:29 is a secondary expansion of our first half-verse, but in that case it is odd that Rāmakaṇṭha’s *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa* should comment on the expanded form. Perhaps his commentary too was expanded in transmission. Or perhaps he used different sources for the *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* when writing his commentary on it than the one he used when quoting from it in the *Tattvatrayanirṇayavivṛti*. Another possibility is that he has here consciously modified the *Nareśvaraparīkṣā*’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 Siddhaguru, in Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha’s *Mrgendravṛtti* ad 3:5c–6 (with the same readings that we have adopted in the Devakoṭṭai edition, and with *svatantrānyā*^o 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 (*svātantryānyāprayojyatvam*) [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 (*sadyuktimat*), the Lord has [thus and] not otherwise taught an infinitude of means.⁷⁹ (14)

Having discerned the cause (*nimittam*) of liberation, which is the maturation 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 (*saṃhitābhedenā*), and not in any other way.⁸⁰ And so (*iti*) what is meant is that the problem of everybody 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 Rāmakaṇṭha has a different text here because he is drawing on Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha's passage in which the quotation occurs, rather than on the sources he used when commenting on the *Nareśvaraparīkṣā*.

⁷⁹We think that this translation reflects Rāmakaṇṭha'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, Aghoraśiva does not make clear exactly how he understood this verse.

⁸⁰Rāmakaṇṭha appears to be understanding *ittham...netarathā* almost as relative (*yathā*) and correlative (*tathaiva*).

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 yaiḥ*)⁸² *pāśaiḥ saha... bhogena taiḥ kṣapitaiḥ* it blocks liberation, in other words (*iti*) keeps bound down a particular soul (*yasya pumsaḥ*), at the same moment (*yadā... tasmīn kāle*), namely (*iti*) when [that soul's] various past actions have ripened, and in that same place (*yatra ca sthāne... [tasmīn] sthāne*), impurity gives up its binding function for that soul (*tasya pumsaḥ*).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] *viññānakevalas*.⁸⁵

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

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

⁸¹This is an attempt to follow Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary as we now understand it; but it is possible that Sadyojyotiḥ rather intended: 'Impurity blocks liberation of a certain soul at a certain time by means of as many fetters as it has (*yāvadbhiḥ pāśaiḥ*), and when all those [fetters] are destroyed, at that time and for that particular soul, impurity gives up its function of binding.'

⁸²*Ex conj.*

⁸³The verse appears to mean, for Rāmakaṇṭha, that when certain particular past actions ripen, then impurity, which bound the soul together with those particular bonds of *karman*, gives up, together with those bonds, which have been destroyed, its binding functions. We also considered another interpretation, in which *bhogena taiḥ kṣapitaiḥ* 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.'

⁸⁴This tag is much quoted in Rāmakaṇṭha's other works, for example in the *Kiraṇavṛtti* ad 2:8 and ad 4:29ab, in the *Mataṅgavṛtti* ad *vidyāpāda* 2:19 and in the *Nareśvaraparīkṣā-prakāśa* ad 3:2.

⁸⁵We find no parallel for this idea and are not sure that the text is correct here. Perhaps we could instead take *guṇodaya* as a nominative and interpret: 'just as the qualities of Śarva [are the contributory cause for the ripening of impurity] in the case of *viññānakevalins*'. For this idea too we find no clear parallel.

liberation of such a particular kind (*itthamrūpāṇi*) are found in Śaiva scripture (*śārve śāstre*), and these would otherwise become unjustifiable by reason. (16)

In this scriptural tradition taught by the Lord (*pārameśvare śāstre 'smin*) means to liberation are found of such a particular kind (*itthamrūpāṇi*), [in other words] ones that in every situation (*pratisthānam*) bring about the destruction of the bonds that derive from primal matter through experience alone (*bhogadvāreṇaiva*),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 māyiyair vihataiḥ*) 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 (*niṣkāraṇam*).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 (*malasvarūpaṃ nirṇītam*), 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 (*rūpāntaranirṇayāya*).

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 (*neśvarakarṭṛkaḥ*). 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]

⁸⁶These 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 *karman* without the fruits of that *karman* being experienced: initiation is rather a means of making all a soul's *karman* 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.

⁸⁷Initiation magically induces the experience of all *karman* and thereby gets rid of the souls bondage by *karman* 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.

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 (*yogyam*) 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*) *karman* [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 (*vinivṛtṭyai*).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 (*tatsādhanaḥ*), namely *tattvas*, *bhāvas* and worlds;⁸⁹ and who recognising that that [seed] is incapable of ceaselessly providing experience to an infinite number of souls (*anāvaratānantapurusa-bhogapradāne*),⁹⁰ keeps on (*āste*) working to make it (*kurvan*) ready for that (*tatkṣamam*) in phases of total resorption of the universe (*mahāpralaye*), by allowing it to rest (*tadviśrāntyā*);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 (*yogyam*) for producing [evolutes] and the *karman* of souls [ready] to be consumed, by Him (*tenaiva*) 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] (*mahābaladaḥ*), at all times [makes *karman*] along with impurity (*samalam*) somewhat (*kimcit*) [ready] to be removed, because of his compassion.'

⁸⁹More common is the collocation *tattvakaraṇabhuvana*, but *tattvabhāvabhuvana* is not without parallel: see, for instance, Rāmakaṇṭha's *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa* ad 2:2-3.

⁹⁰*Ex conj.*

⁹¹It is odd that Rāmakaṇṭha should mention *viśrānti* when glossing the first half of 18, in which it is rather *prasūta* that occurs, and that he should then mention *utpatti* (which

(*tadānīm*) the universe (*viśvam*), [in other words] all *tattvas*, *bhāvas* and worlds and so forth⁹² without exception (*sarvam eva*), is placed in that same seed (*tasminn eva bīje = tatra*), in order that it may rise up again (*punarutpattiyartham*); and He who, also at the time of creation makes the [retributive force of the] past actions of souls ready to give experience;⁹³ that [same] Lord, who destroys impurity (*malam hantīti malahā*), and who gives to souls their powers of omniscience and omnipotence (*puruṣebhyaś ca balam jñatvādikam dadātīti baladah*), 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 (*māyādisva-bhāvasiddhāv eva*)—so too (*tadvat*) it is reasonable to maintain (*upapadyate*) that it is really the Lord (*īśvara eva*) who is the agent of liberation (*mokṣa-kartā*) also in [this] view [of ours] that impurity transforms (*malapariṇatipakṣe*). So (*iti*) on what ground (*kutaḥ*) [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].⁹⁴ (20ab)

corresponds to *prasūti*) when glossing the second half of 18, in which *viśrāntyai* occurs. But in fact the two notions are so closely related in this context as to be virtually the same: *pralaya* takes place to allow the universe to rest in order that it should be able to produce its effects. We assume therefore that Rāmakaṇṭha felt free to rearrange these two words (and to use an instrumental rather than a dative) in order to give a free paraphrase of the verse.

⁹² *Ex conj.*

⁹³ *Ex conj.*

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

*tadviniṣṛtteḥ prāg api tatsāmarthyasya sabalatākṛtaye
pum̐balarodham kurvan dṛṣṭaḥ sa ca pāśaśaktisāhāyyam*

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 (*yunkte*) an instrument suitable (*yogyam*) for the rescuing [of souls] from that [bond] (*tannivṛttiyai*) 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 (*paripākaviśeṣaḥ*), for (*hi...yataḥ*) the duty (*adhikāraḥ*) of every [person or thing] (*sarvasya*) culminates in the [attainment of the] goal (*phalaparyantaḥ*). And having seen this,⁹⁶ He employs (*upayunkte*) an instrument known as initiation, which is suitable for causing souls to escape from that bond (*tasmāt pāśān nivṛttyartham* [= *tannivṛttiyai yogyam*]) 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 (*aprakṛitvāt*). In reply to this (*atra*) he says:

à cela, le [Seigneur] apparaît accomplissant l'arrêt de la manifestation de la puissance de l'âme et l'aide de la puissance du lien.

But FILLIOZAT is probably correct in suggesting (1991:151, fn. 203) that Aghoraśiva commented instead on the reading *tatsāmarthyopodbalanadānakṛtaye*. This changes little in a translation of Aghoraśiva's understanding of the verse:

Even before the removal of that [impurity], in order to bring about an invigoration of its power, He is seen to perform a blocking of the powers of the soul and to help the power of the bond.

⁹⁵ A more natural interpretation of this unit, assuming the reading *taṁ nivṛttiyai* (instead of *tannivṛttiyai*) 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 (*nivṛttiyai*) he employs (*yunkte*) 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 sentience (*citihānau*) [in the soul].⁹⁷ (21cd)

Just as, in a period of total resorption (*mahāpralaya* *kāle* = *svāpe*), the seed of the universe that is primal matter transforms, [i.e.] attains an access of power (*śaktyatiśayapratilambhaḥ*) that is conducive to bringing forth creation again (*punaḥsargotpādānugunaḥ*), only by [matter producing] transformed results that are [still nothing other than] its own nature (*svarūpa-pariṇāmād eva*)—not by [a transformation producing] transformed results different from itself that would be effects (*kāryātmano vijātīyapariṇāmāt*), 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 (*citihāniviśaye '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-prakṛitve*), 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 (*svarūpapariṇātisvabhāvatvāt*). And so there is no problem (*ity adoṣaḥ*).

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 (*pūrvah prasāṅgaḥ*) 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 Aghoraśiva reads *citihāneḥ* 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-gaḍunā*) 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 (*āryābhāgena*) [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 (*hetuh*) is rendered inconclusive (*anaikāntikaḥ*) by [the case of] past actions (*karmanā*).⁹⁸ For why does He not, because of the absence of any differentiating factor, make all [the retributive force of past actions] simultaneously experienceable [for all souls], given that (*iti*) the Lord ripens [the retributive force of] past action and makes it experienceable by souls? And (*tu*) you cannot explain [our position] (*vyākhyeyam*) by saying (*iti*) 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.⁹⁹ 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 (*vādyuktasādhanaadoṣānuddbhāvanam*), he is defeated (*nigraha eva*).

As they say,

Stating something as part of an argument when that something is not capable of proving [what one wishes to prove] (*asāadhanāṅga-vacanam*) [and] raising [as a fault] what is [in fact] not a fault (*adoṣodbhāvanam*)¹⁰⁰—these are the bases for defeat in argument (*nigrahassthānam*) for the two [speakers, namely the first

⁹⁸The logical ground here of the opponent's *prasaṅgānumāna* should be *viśeṣābhāvāt*: '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.

⁹⁹*Ex conj.* Or perhaps: 'And (*tu*) you cannot explain [our position] (*vyākhyeyam*) by saying (*iti*) 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 *nigrahassthāna* is also interpreted as 'not [being capable of] stating a fault [which in fact exists]' (see, e.g., *Nyāyamañjarī*, volume 2, pp. 679–80 and 714); but it appears that Rāmakaṇṭha 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] (*dvayoḥ*). 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 (*karmanā*).

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 (*anekatvaṃ*), needing to be experienced at different times (*kālāntarabhogyatā*), and relative strength (*balīyastvam*)—[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 (*viśeṣaḥ*) [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 (*tīvravegatvena*). If [the opponent] (*yaḥ*) wishes to resolve (*samādadhyāt*) 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 to be experienced in different periods, nor relative strength is a factor that can resolve the fault (*samādhiḥ*) for him (*asya*). Why? Because [each supposedly] resolving factor (*samādheḥ*) is to be found (*vidyamānatvāt = ahānāt*)¹⁰² also in the *pakṣa* (*sādhyaḍharmīṇy 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] (*apagamakaḥ*).¹⁰³ [This is so] because (*yataḥ*) 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 (*pratipurūṣam*); and [it has] the nature of transforming over different periods (*kālāntaraparīṇatisvabhāvatvam*); and it is such ([°]*svabhāvatvam*) that in the case of certain particular (*kvacit*) souls,¹⁰⁴ not all, its transformation may be brought about by the proximity of auxiliary causes such as the performance of meritorious actions and such and [so it may be] relatively intense (*tīvratarasatkarmādyanuṣṭhānādisahakārisānnidhyasiddhaparīṇati*).¹⁰⁵ Thus there is no fault [in the position of the *siddhānta*].

Furthermore

Since power (*śaktiḥ*) is at all times (*sadaiva*) at hand (*sannihitā*) that is capable of causing all creation to arise (*sarvavikārotpattaḥ 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 (*tena*) 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 (*viśeṣābhāvād iti*)] is rendered inconclusive (*anaikāntikaḥ*) also by the Lord's power and by the power of primal matter, for (*yataḥ... 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 (*sarvārthakāritvena*) and that there is thus no difference in their being equally close [to all souls] (*sannidhānāviśeṣāt*),¹⁰⁶ and given that the experiencing soul

¹⁰³We find no parallel for this form. Perhaps we should emend here to *agamaka*?

¹⁰⁴*Ex conj.*

¹⁰⁵*Ex conj.* As for the two instances of *ādi* in [°]*satkarmādyanuṣṭhānādi*, perhaps we should take them to refer respectively to *asatkarmaṇ* and to *anānuṣṭhāna*.

¹⁰⁶*Ex conj.*

(*bhoktuḥ*), being all-pervading (*vyāpakatvena*), is [also] present everywhere (*sarvatra bhāvāt*)?¹⁰⁷

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

Surely it is upon seeing [the fruits of] past actions being experienced in a gradual sequence (*kramataḥ*) that we infer that (*iti*) it is Śambhu who [of necessity]¹⁰⁸ ripens them in just that way. (26abc)

Even though there is no differentiating factor on the side of the ripener (*pācakasya*), 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 (*avasīyate*) that the Lord too (*api*) ripens these [past actions] (*teṣāṃ*) in accordance with their fitness for that [viz. fitness for being experienced] (*tadyogyatāpekṣayaiva*) in a given sequence (*kramena* [= *tathaiva*]). And so this [same] logical ground [of the absence of any differentiating factor in the Lord's treatment of different souls (*viśeṣābhāvād iti*)] is not inconclusive [as a proof of the simultaneous ripening of impurity

¹⁰⁷Rāmakaṇṭha is not closely reflecting this part of the verse, for Sadyojyotiḥ's wording, translated more literally, would be '[since] in the soul in *saṃsāra* (*bhavini*) [are the properties of] all-pervasiveness (*vibhūtvam*) and the condition of being an experiencer (*bhokṛtḥbhāvaḥ*).'] Perhaps Rāmakaṇṭha paraphrases this rather loosely because it seems to him pleonastic: the soul in *saṃsāra* is necessarily endowed with *bhokṛtḥbhāvaḥ*, since the latter is a beginningless state caused by souls' impurity. Cf. *Kiraṇa* 3:2ab (*bhokṛtḥtvam nāma yat proktam anādi malakāraṇam*; 'The condition of being an experiencer, which we have taught, is beginningless, [because] it is caused by impurity.') and Rāmakaṇṭha's *Kiraṇavṛtti* thereon:

yad etad bhokṛtḥtvam asmābhiḥ prāg uktam tad anādi. yato malakāraṇam uktam tato malasyānāditvāt tad apy anādi. etad uktam bhavati—anyad evāsmān mohajanitād bhokṛtḥtvād bhogayogyatvalakṣaṇam etad bhokṛtḥtvam. pralayākale vidyate na tu vijñānakevale karmābhāvāt.

This condition of being an experiencer, which we have taught above, (*prāg uktam* [= *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 *pralayākala* but not in the *vijñānakevalin* because of the absence [there] of *karman*.

¹⁰⁸Adding here '[of necessity]' reflects what appears to be Rāmakaṇṭha's understanding of this verse, but it is not clear whether this was really what Sadyojyotiḥ 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 (*samānam*) 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 Śaiva 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 Rāmakaṇṭha's interpretation of this verse, but it is full of doubtful points. The constitution of the text, which Aghoraśiva transmits quite differently, is uncertain, and it seems to us far from certain that Rāmakaṇṭha renders what Sadyojyotiḥ 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 for the sake 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 (*anuminumah*)] that Śambhu is capable of creating ripeness [in impurity] too in exactly the same way.' But it seems to us most likely that Sadyojyotiḥ wrote *matvā* 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 *mala*, the effects of which are known to us respectively from direct perception and from scripture: 'Surely it is upon directly perceiving (*dṛṣtvā*) 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 (*matvā*) 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 Rāmakaṇṭha was hampered by the corruption of *matvā* to *yasmāt*. If we had been reconstructing Sadyojyotiḥ'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 *śāstra* 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].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.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.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] (*atra*),¹¹⁴ in so far as

commented upon by Rāmakaṇṭha), we would have adopted *matvā*. Once again, Rāmakaṇṭha’s distortive interpretation is aimed at bringing to the forefront the logical ground *aviśeṣābhāvāt* in the opponent’s syllogism.

¹¹¹It appears that *vinivṛtṭyai* is effectively glossed here with *mumukṣvādidarśanā-nyathānupapattisiddhaṃ*. The *ādi* in *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 (*samayadīkṣā*), etc.

¹¹²In fact, according to Rāmakaṇṭha, further stages intervene: a salvific *śaktipāta* takes place once the soul’s *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 *Kiraṇa* 1:20c–22b and the *Kiraṇavṛtti* ad loc.

¹¹³*Ex conj.* We have assumed haplography triggered by an eyeskip here. Two phrases ending in *paripākahetuḥ* 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.

¹¹⁴Or 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].¹¹⁵ (28)

Since [primal] matter (*prakṛteḥ* [= *yoneḥ*]) has increasingly depleted powers (*apacitataraśaktitvāt*) from ceaselessly providing experience to countless souls (*anavaratānantapurusaḥbhogapradatvena*), and since [the retributive force of] action too at the same time (*tadānīm*) becomes increasingly depleted (*apacitataraśaktitvāt*), on account of being produced by embodied souls who themselves have increasingly depleted forces (*apacitataraśaktiśarīryanuṣṭhitatvena*), they [viz. matter and the retributive force of past actions] become unfit (*ayogyatvam*) for providing experience (*bhogadānāya*).¹¹⁶ 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 (*tadviśrāmakaḥ*). This is taught in the venerable *Mṛgendra*.¹¹⁷

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 upasaṃhṛtya*) and cause [the retributive force of] past actions to rest (*karmāṇi ca viśrāmya*) just for an instant (*kṣaṇamātram eva*) and then [at once] produce a new creation (*punaḥsargam*)? Why does he wait (*apekṣate*) before doing that (*tatra*) for

¹¹⁵In this rendering we attempt to follow Rāmakaṇṭha's interpretation. It seems likely, however, that Sadyojyotiḥ 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*Ex conj.*

¹¹⁷*Mṛgendravidyāpāda* 4:15. Frequently quoted elsewhere, for instance in the *Nareśvara-parīkṣāprakāśa* ad 2:31, p. 153, and in the *Kiraṇavṛtti* ad 4:17.

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'¹¹⁸ in this [viz. in *mahāpralaya*, which is here the *pakṣa*], because [He is forced to act] in accordance with the way the nature of matter happens to be (*prakṛtes tathāsvabhāvatvānusāreṇa*). And the same is also true without any difference (*aviśiṣṭam*) in the case of impurity in the manner stated above (*proktanayena*). 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],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, this¹²⁰ is the same (*tulyam*) with the conditions that produce that [liberation] (*tannimittena*).¹²¹ (29–30b)

At the beginning of a phase of creation, [a moment that is] infinite in number (*anantasamṅkhye* [= *niyamavihīne*]), because it is many in that it [is invariably something that has] happened on many previous occasions (*pūrvapūrvatarādibhedena*), why does the Lord not cause the body of *tattvas* (*tattvajātam*) beginning with *guṇa* 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 rest¹²² [arise directly out of *māyā*]? Why

¹¹⁸ *Ex 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).

¹¹⁹ This follows Rāmakaṇṭha's interpretation of *niyamavihīne*, but it seems almost certain that Sadyojyotiḥ 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 *śrotaḥsu*: 'in which there is no restriction as to the streams [that might form from primal matter]'.

¹²⁰ We have not followed L's *ittham*, since this seems not to have been glossed by Rāmakaṇṭha, whereas his *tad idaṃ* could be a reflection of *idaṃ* in the verse.

¹²¹ Aghoraśiva's commentary is transmitted with a simpler (and probably secondary) reading here: *tulyaṃ mokṣe ca tannimitte ca*; 'this is the same in liberation and in the conditions that produce that [liberation]'.

¹²² *Ex conj.* According to Sadyojyotiḥ's much quoted interpretation of *Svāyambhuva-*

does He depend upon (*apekṣate*) connecting them (*tasya*) with a lower matter [namely the *avyakta* that is recognised also by the Sāṅkhyas] (*avāntara-prakṛtisambandham*)? 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 (*aṣṭarūpā 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’ (*aviśeṣāsiddhilakṣaṇam*)¹²⁵ in this [viz. in creation, which is here the *pakṣa*], [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* (*prakṛtiniyamalakṣaṇaprakāreṇa*), and for a certain particular length of time (*yāvati kālē*), [then] the Lord is able to create that thing (*tat*) in the same way (*tathā*) for the same length of time (*tāvati*), and not in any other way (*nānyathā*). This is the same with the condition that produces liberation, namely the ripening of impurity (*malaparipākātmanā*). Thus (*iti*) the above-stated fault [of simultaneous liberation for all]¹²⁷ is not entailed (*noktadoṣaprasaṅgaḥ*) 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. *Kiraṇavṛtti* 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 *Kiraṇavṛtti* 4:22c–23, in which passage he quotes part of *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* 2:15, the first verse of this quotation.

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

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

¹²⁶*Ex conj.*

¹²⁷This unwanted corollary was first mentioned in Rāmakaṇṭha’s introduction to 11cd.

refuted by the rejection of that corollary.¹²⁸

Thus (*evam*), then (*tat*),

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

The true form (*pāramārthikam rūpam*) of impurity (*malasya = aśuddheḥ*), which is the cause of the dissimilarity between the two entities of Śambhu and the soul, has been thoroughly (*paryāptam kṛtvā = alam*) taught, omitting nothing (*niḥśeṣeṇa [= niravaśeṣeṇa]*). And as for (*yac ca*)¹³¹ impurity's oneness and other [properties] (*ekatvādyam*) [learned] from scripture—as in the glorious Svāyambhuva[sūtrasaṅgraha, in 2:1ab:]

¹²⁸ *Ex conj.* The conjecture may not be necessary, but it gives the sense required.

¹²⁹ 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. Aghoraśiva'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:

*alam uddiṣṭam aśuddheḥ sadrūpam niravaśeṣeṇa
śāstreṣu ekatvādyam śaktyānantyam vinānivartyam tat
śaktyānantyapramukham sadyukteḥ śāsanotthāyāḥ*

Following Aghoraśiva'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.

¹³⁰ 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 *śāsanotthāyāḥ*. Cf., however, the expression *kāraṇavaktrapadmād vinīrgata/viniḥṣṭa* in *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* 10:103 and *Mataṅgakriyāpāda* 6:67.

¹³¹ The correlative (*tat*) to this relative pronoun occurs after the second of the quotations from the Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha, 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 (*paśutvam*).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]' (*ādīgrahaṇāt*) [in the compound *ekatvādyam*] refers to [impurity's] being subject to transformation. This is taught in the same text, [in *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 1:17c:]

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

—that [group of properties beginning with oneness] would be for the [logical] destruction of impurity (*abhāvāyaiva malasya bhavati = nivṛttyartham*), if it were not for (*vinā*) its infinitude of powers (*śaktyānantyam*). The meaning is that [this group of properties beginning with oneness,] without the infinitude of powers, [in other words] if it did not include infinitude of powers (*abhavacchaktyānantyam*), would result in impurity's ceasing to exist (*malanivṛttaye = malasya nivṛttyartham*)—[it would be like saying that the havoc (*kṣepaḥ*) that [we see usually] caused by a thief had been produced by no thief]¹³³—since (*yataḥ*) without postulating many powers it is not possible to account for one thing enveloping many (*anekāvāraikatvam*). For this reason (*ata eva*) [the true form of impurity] has been proven (*siddham*) through (*sakāśāt*) true reasoning (*sadyukteḥ*) that comes from the scripture He has taught (*tadāgamotthāyāḥ [= kāraṇotthāyāḥ]*), in which the principal property is having an infinitude of powers (*śaktyānantyapradhānam*).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

¹³² Alternatively, if we read *athānādimalaḥ*, 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., *Kiraṇa* 2:19c–20, so we might also render this: 'Now the beginningless impurity of men is called *paśutva*.'

¹³³ We discussed several unsatisfactory interpretations of this puzzling sentence without reaching consensus. One earlier translation was: 'just as we say "by removing theft (*caurābhāvakṛtaḥ*) one gets rid (*kṣepaḥ*) of the thief (*caurakṛtaḥ*)"', but this would require taking *caura* in the sense of *caurya* (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 (*kṣepaḥ*) that [we see usually] caused by a thief [is inexplicable if you say that it is] produced by no thief'.

¹³⁴ *Ex conj.*

of the *Svāyambhuva*, in order to remove from souls their beginningless dullness (*jaḍatām*).¹³⁵ (32)

This 'settled view on the three entities' has been taught concisely (*sarīkṣepeṇa* [= *samāsāt*]) by Kheṭapāla, the commentator on the *Svāyambhuva-sūtrasaṅgraha*, in order to remove insentience from souls.

Thus [ends] the commentary (*vivṛtiḥ*) on the 'settled view on the three entities', composed by the Kashmirian Bhaṭṭa Rāma-kaṇṭha, residing in Dārvābhisāra (*dārvābhisārasaṁsthena*), [for others] to attain the supreme reality level (*paratattvāptyai*).¹³⁶

¹³⁵This 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. *Kiraṇa* 2:19c–20.

¹³⁶This is probably intended to mean at the same time also: '[for others] to attain the highest truth [about the subject of the text]'.

WORKS CONSULTED

Editions

- AṢṬAPRAKARAṆA. Ed. Kṛṣṇaśāstrī. Devakōṭṭai: Śivāgamasiddhāntaparipālanasaṅgha, 1923 (TATTVAPRAKĀŚA, TATTVASAṆGRAHA, TATTVATRAYANIRṆAYA, with the commentaries of Aghoraśivācārya) and 1925 (RATNATRAYAPARĪKṢĀ, BHOGAKĀRIKĀ, NĀDAKĀRIKĀ with the commentaries of Aghoraśivācārya, and MOKṢAKĀRIKĀ and PARAMOKṢANIRĀSAKĀRIKĀ with the commentaries of Rāmakaṇṭha II).
- . Ed. Vrajavallabha Dvivedī. Yogatantragranthamālā Vol.12. Varanasi: Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, 1988.
- KIRANATANTRA. *śrīmat kiraṇāgamamahātantram*, ed. Ti. Rā. Pañcāpageśaśivācārya and K. M. Subrahmanyaśāstrī. Śivāgamasiddhāntaparipālanasaṅgha Vol. No. 16. Devakōṭṭai, 1932.
- . See also GOODALL 1998.
- KṚṢṆAKARṆĀMṚTA of Vilvamaṅgala (identified with Kṛṣṇalīlāsuka). *Sri Krishna Karṇamritam of Lila Suka with the commentary Suvarṇa Chashaka of Papayallaya Suri and an English Introduction by K. Sundararama Aiyar, M. A.*, [no editor accredited]. Sri Vani Vilas Sanskrit Series No. 19. Srirangam: Sri Vani Vilas Press, [no date].
- TATTVATRAYANIRṆAYA of Sadyojyotiḥ with the commentary of Aghoraśiva. See AṢṬAPRAKARAṆA and FILLIOZAT 1991.
- TATTVASAṆGRAHA of Sadyojyotiḥ with the commentary of Aghoraśiva. See AṢṬAPRAKARAṆA.
- TANTRĀLOKA of Abhinavagupta with commentary (-VIVEKA) of Rājānaka Jayaratha. *The Tantraloka of Abhinava=Gupta. With Commentary by Rājānaka Jayaratha*, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 23, 28, 30, 35, 29, 41, 47, 59, 52, 57 and 58. Bombay and Srinagar, 1918-38.
- NAREŚVARAPARĪKṢĀ of Sadyojyotiḥ with commentary (-PRAKĀŚA) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. *The Nareshvarapariksha of Sadyojyotiḥ with commentary by Ramakantha*, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 45. Srinagar, 1926.
- NYĀYAMAṆJARĪ of Jayantabhaṭṭa. *śrī jayantabhaṭṭakṛtā nyāyamaṇjarī sampādaka-grathitanyāyasaurabhākhyatippaṇṣamanvitā*, ed. K. S. Varadacharya. 2 Vols. Oriental Research Institute Nos. 116 and 139. Mysore: Oriental Research Institute, 1969 and 1983.
- PARAMOKṢANIRĀSAKĀRIKĀ of Sadyojyotiḥ with the commentary of Rāmakaṇṭha. See AṢṬAPRAKARAṆA.
- PARĀKHYATANTRA. *The Parākhyatantra, a scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta. A critical edition and annotated translation*, ed. and trans. Dominic GOODALL. Collection Indologie 98. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient, 2004.
- BHOGAKĀRIKĀ of Sadyojyotiḥ with the commentary of Aghoraśiva. See AṢṬAPRAKARAṆA.
- MATAṆGA, VIDYĀPĀDA, with the commentary (-VṚTTI) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. *Mataṅga-pārameśvarāgama (Vidyāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakanṭha*, ed. N. R. Bhatt. Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No. 56. Pondicherry: Institut Français d'Indologie, 1977.

- MATAṆGA, KRIYĀPĀDA, CARYĀPĀDA and YOGAPĀDA, with the commentary (-VṚTTI) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha up to KRIYĀPĀDA 11:12b. *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama (Kriyāpāda, Yogapāda et Caryāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha*, ed. N. R. Bhatt. Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No. 65. Pondicherry: Institut Français d'Indologie, 1982.
- MAHĀBHĀRATA. *The Mahābhārata. for the first time critically edited*, ed. V. S. Sukthankar (1927-43) and S. K. BELVALKAR (from 1943) with the co-operation of Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, R. N. Dandekar, S. K. De, F. Edgerton, A. B. Gajendragadkar, P. V. Kane, R. D. Karmakar, V. G. Paranjpe, Raghu Vira, V. K. Rajavade, N. B. Utgikar, P. L. Vaidya, V. P. Vaidya, H. D. Velankar, M. Winternitz, R. Zimmerman and other scholars 19 Vols. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1927-1959.
- MĀLINĪVIJAYOTTARATANTRA. *Sri Mālinivijayottara Tantram*, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 37. Srinagar, 1922.
See also VASUDEVA 2004.
- MRĠENDRATANTRA. *The S'rī Mr̥gendra Tantram (Vidyāpāda & Yogapāda) with the commentary of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha*, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 50. Bombay, 1930.
- MRĠENDRATANTRA. *śrī mr̥gendram. kāmikopāgamam. vidyāyogapādadvayamilitam śrībhaṭṭanārāyaṇakaṇṭhaviracitayā vṛtṭyā tadvyākhyayā 'ghoraśivācāryaviracitayā dīpikayā cālāṅkṛtam*, ed. Nā. Kṛṣṇaśāstrin and K. S. Subrahmaṇyaśāstrin. Śivāgamasiddhāntaparipālanasamghaparakāśyasamkhyā 12. Devakottai, 1928.
- MOKṢAKĀRIKĀ of Sadyojyotiḥ with the commentary of Rāmakaṇṭha. See AṢṬAPRAKARAṆA.
- . Paper manuscript R 14466 of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras.
- RATNATRAYAPARĪKṢĀ of Śrīkaṇṭha with the commentary of Aghoraśiva. See AṢṬAPRAKARAṆA.
- RAURAVĀGAMA, ed. N. R. Bhatt. 3 Vols. Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No. 18. Pondicherry: Institut Français d'Indologie, 1961, 1972 and 1988.
- RAURAVASŪTRASANĠRAHA. Printed at the beginning and end of volume 1 of the RAURAVĀGAMA.
- VĀDANYĀYA of Dharmakīrti. *Dharmakīrtis Vādanāyāḥ Teil 1 Sanskrit-Text*, ed. Michael Torsten Much. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 581. Band. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991.
- ŚATAPATHABRĀHMAṆA. *The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa in the Mādhyandina-Çākhā with extracts from the commentaries of Śāyana, Harisvāmin and Dvivedaganga*, ed. Albrecht Weber. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series No. 96. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1964. (reprint of first edition of Leipzig 1924).
- SARVAJÑĀNOTTARATANTRA NAK MS 1-1692. NGMPP Reel No. A 43/12. Palm-leaf, early Nepalese 'Licchavi' script. Described by Śāstrī (1905:lxiv-lxxv and 85-6). Also GOML MS D 5550 and IFP T. Nos. 334, 760, paper transcripts in Devanāgarī. The verse and chapter numeration used in our annotation is that of GOODALL's edition in progress.

- SĀRDHATRISĀTIKĀLOTTARA. *Sārdhatrisātikālottarāgama avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha*, ed. N.R. Bhatt. Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No. 61. Pondicherry: Institut Français d'Indologie, 1979.
- SIDDHĀNTASĀRAPADDHATI of Bhoja. See SANDERSON 2005*.
- SVĀYAMBHUVASŪTRASANĠRAHA, ed. Venkaṭasubrahmaṇyaśāstrī, Mysore, 1937.
- SVĀYAMBHUVASŪTRASANĠRAHA with the VṚTTI of Sadyojyotiḥ, see FILLIOZAT 1994.
- SVACCHANDATANTRA with the commentary (-UDDYOTA) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja. *The Svacchanda-Tantra with commentary by Kṣhema Rāja* ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Shāstrī. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 31, 38, 44, 48, 51, 53, and 56. Bombay 1921–35.

Translations and Studies

- FILLIOZAT, Pierre-Sylvain, ed. and trans. 1988. 'Le Tattvasaṃgraha « Compendium des Essences » de Sadyojyoti' in *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 77, pp. 101–163.
- FILLIOZAT, Pierre-Sylvain, ed. and trans. 1991. 'Le Tattvatrayanirṇaya « La Détermination des Trois Essences » de Sadyojyoti avec le Commentaire d'Aghoraśivācārya' in *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 78, pp. 133–58.
- FILLIOZAT, Pierre-Sylvain, ed. and trans. 1994. *The Tantra of Svayambhū vidyāpāda With the commentary of Sadyojyoti*. Kalāmūlāsāstra Series 13. Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts and Motilal Banarsidass.
- GOODALL, Dominic, ed. and trans. 1998. *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the Kirāṇatantra. Volume I: chapters 1–6. Critical edition and annotated translation*, Publications du département d'indologie 86.1. Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry/ École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- GOODALL, Dominic, 2004. See PARĀKHYATANTRA.
- GOODALL, Dominic, and ISAACSON, Harunaga, 2007. 'Workshop on the *Nisvāsātattva-saṃhitā*: The Earliest Surviving Śaiva Tantra?' in *Newsletter of the Nepal-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project*, No. 3 (January-February 2007), pp. 4–6.
- GOODALL, Dominic, [forthcoming.] (In press in a volume in honour of Professor Pierre-Sylvain FILLIOZAT since 2005.) 'The *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* Revisited (some indications of its relative antiquity with an appendix of improvements to the edited text)'.
- KUNJUNNI RAJA, K., 1958. *The Contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit Literature*, Madras: University of Madras.
- MONIER-WILLIAMS, Monier, 1899. *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- SANDERSON, Alexis, 2005*. Unpublished e-text of Bhoja's *Siddhāntasārapaddhati*, based upon two Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts: NAK 1-1363, NGMPP B 28/29, completed in Śaṃvat 197 (1077/8 AD) and NAK 5-743, NGMPP B 28/19, completed Śaṃvat 231 [ā la 1] (1111/2 AD).
- SANDERSON, Alexis, 2006. 'The Date of Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati' in *Cracow Indological Studies* VIII (2006), pp. 39–91.

- STEIN, M. A., 1979 [reprint of first edition of 1900]. *Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī. A Chronicle of the Kings of Kaśmīr Translated with an introduction, commentary & appendices.* 2 vols. Delhi, Varanasi, Patna: Motilal Banarsidass.
- TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA III. [forthcoming]. *Tāntrikābhidhānaśa III. Dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique. A Dictionary of Technical Terms from Hindu Tantric Literature. Wörterbuch zur Terminologie hinduistischer Tantren*, ed. Marion Rastelli and Dominic Goodall. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- VASUDEVA, Somdev, 2004. *The Yoga of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra. Chapters 1–4, 7, 11–17. Critical Edition, Translation & Notes*, Collection Indologie 97. Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry/ École française d'Extrême-Orient.