

*Dominic Goodall*  
(*École française d'Extrême-Orient*)

**Saiddhāntika paddhatis I.**  
**On Rāmanātha, the Earliest Southern Author of the Śaivasiddhānta**  
**of Whom Works Survive, and on Eleventh-century Revisions of**  
**the *Somaśambhupaddhati***

SUMMARY: The study of ritual in India is indissociable from the study of prescriptive texts. Now the Śaiva scriptures of the Śaivasiddhānta purport to lay down every aspect of the Śaiva religion, from doctrine to comportment, but they are for various reasons typically not straightforward guides to the performance of rituals and, in spite of their presenting themselves as revealed literature, they do not teach one body of ritual activity that is coherent and free from internal contradictions, as Śaiva exegetes have long freely acknowledged.<sup>1</sup> One way of helping practitioners to perform rites ‘according to the rules’ was to write commentaries on particular scriptures.

---

<sup>1</sup> Only on doctrine were the scriptures held to be univocal; in matters of ritual, each taught different practices, as is acknowledged in a much quoted verse (cited, e.g., by Rāmakaṇṭha ad *Sārdhatrisatikālottara* 4.2ab) attributed to Sadyojyotiḥ, who seems to have been active between 675 and 725 AC (see Sanderson 2006) :

kriyādibhedabhedena tantrabhedo yataḥ smṛtaḥ  
tasmāt tatra yathavoktaṃ kartavyaṃ nānyatantrataḥ.

Since it is held that tantras are divided up according as they differ in details of ritual and such [other non-doctrinal matters], therefore one should perform what is enjoined in one particular tantra exactly in the way that it is enjoined there and not following some other tantra.

The tenth-century Kashmirian theologian Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, a back-to-the-texts fundamentalist at least in the matter of ritual correctness, clearly advocated this strategy and has left us commentaries on the ritual portions of the *Mataṅgapārameśvaratantra* and the *Sārdhatriśatikālottara*. Another strategy was to craft ritual handbooks, *paddhatis*, that clearly set out ritual practice step-by-step. Almost all surviving *paddhatis*, as Sanderson has observed (Sanderson 2004:358), are notionally based upon a single scripture, the *Dviśatikālottara*; but in practice this strategy gave ample room for innovation, typically by eclectic blending of ritual elements from different sources. A large number of Śaiva ritual manuals composed from the tenth century onwards survive (the best known are listed by Sanderson in his fn. 24 on p.358 of Sanderson 2004), only a few of which have been published to date. Because these manuals acknowledge themselves to be the works of human authors rooted in time and place, they can be of particular interest to the religious historian partly because they allow us to map the spread of different currents of Śaivism in time and place. Like the scriptures, they borrow generously from each other, thus demonstrating how they are mutually related. This article, to be followed by a few others on the same general theme, is intended as a small contribution to the history of Saiddhāntika *paddhati* literature.

KEYWORDS: Indian religious history, ritual manuals/paddhati, Śaivasiddhānta, Rāmanātha, Tiruvārūr, Sanskrit text-transmission

It is difficult to exaggerate the importance for medieval Śaivism of the *Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī*, the verse manual of ritual composed by an eleventh-century scholar and pontiff of the monastery commonly known as Golakīmaṭha in Northern India.<sup>2</sup> Héléne Brunner's remarkable four-volume study of the work (1963–1998) has now made the work

---

For further exploration of how this verse was understood and used, see Goodall forthcoming.

<sup>2</sup> I am grateful to the following colleagues who joined me to produce together an electronic transcription of an important part of the evidence on which this article is based, namely the text of Rāmanātha's *Naṭarājapaddhati*: Michael Gollner, Nirajan Kaffle, Dr. S.A.S. Sarma and Dr. R. Sathyanarayanan. I am also grateful to Michael Gollner, Alexis Sanderson and S.A.S. Sarma for their comments on an earlier draft of this article, to Marzenna Czerniak-Drożdżowicz for having invited me to contribute it to this journal, and to Emmanuel Francis for bibliographical suggestions.

famous again to students of classical India in our own time, but there is evidence that the work was widely diffused, imitated and quoted from as soon as it had been produced. Naturally enough, Śaiva authors indebted to Somaśambhu are numerous indeed, the most celebrated being the twelfth-century South Indian exegete Aghoraśiva, whom we shall have occasion to mention below, but one recently noticed reworking of Somaśambhu's words is even Buddhist: Harunaga Isaacson has spotted that a fragmentary Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript microfilmed by the Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project ('*prakīrṇa patra*', NAK 5-7495, NGMPP A 933/1) transmits a portion of Somaśambhu's treatment of reparation rites, but one in which distinctive and important Śaiva details, such as the names of mantra-deities, have been supplanted with Buddhist ones (Isaacson 2011:1–2)! It has been noted, moreover, that Somaśambhu's *paddhati*, like the *Yājñavalkyaśmṛti* and other works of wide authority, has been incorporated almost whole into the extant *Agnipurāna*,<sup>3</sup> and more than one region of India has claimed the author as its own: Brunner, for example, found it natural to believe, when she began her *magnum opus*, that Somaśambhu was a Southerner (1963:xli) and Sanderson has recently discussed the claim (by which he is not convinced) that Somaśambhu was a Kashmirian (Sanderson 2007:245–247):<sup>4</sup>

It may be thought that Somaśambhu's famous Paddhati should be included in this account of Kashmirian Saiddhāntika literature. For the Rājānakas of Padmapura (Pampur, 34°02'35"N 74°53'53"E) have claimed Somaśambhu as one of their remote ancestors, at least from the fifteenth century onwards. But the claim is dubious. In the Kashmirian version of the final verses of his Paddhati he is said to have been a brahmin of the Gārgya Gotra, while the Rājānakas of Padmapura tell us that their Gotra is the Gautama. In any case, even if Somaśambhu was from Kashmir, the Saiddhāntika Śaiva ritual system that he teaches is in no sense characteristic of that region. Somaśambhu wrote for a pan-Indian audience while holding office as the abbot of the prestigious Golakīmaṭha near Tripurī in Central India.

<sup>3</sup> Brunner 1998:lix–lxi. For Pāñcarātra sources that have been similarly incorporated, see Rastelli 2007.

<sup>4</sup> For the details of the claim, see Sanderson 2007:245–246, footnotes 49–50.

It is generally agreed now that Somaśambhu, whatever his origin, was the pontiff of this monastery, a foundation of Yuvarājadeva I of the Kalacuri dynasty, in the Rewa District of Madhya Pradesh, but, as Sanderson has demonstrated, the name of the place in Somaśambhu's time seems rather to have been Golagī (2009:264).

As for the date of his composition, we often see this given as 1095/6 AD (e.g. Sanderson 2004:358, fn. 24), but in a recent article Sanderson has tended to favour instead an earlier date, namely 1073 AD. His footnote on the subject is worth quoting in full (2007:420–421, fn. 640):

In the colophonic verses in the edition of the text published in the KSTS from Kashmirian manuscripts it is said to have been completed in year 1130 of the Vikrama era (*vikramārkaṅṅpakālasamudbhaveṣu śūnyāgnibhiḥ samadhikeṣu ca tacchateṣu | ekādaśasv amalaśāstram idaṃ samastam* [v.1813]), that is to say, in A.D. 1073/4, if we assume that the years are counted as expired rather than current, as is usual with dates given in this era. But in the Devakoṭṭai edition, prepared from Grantha manuscripts, and reproduced in the edition of Brunner (1963–1998, pt. 4, p.419) the same verse gives the year as Vikrama 1153 (*vikramārkaṅṅpakālasamudbhaveṣu pañcāśatā trisahiteṣu śaracchateṣu | ekādaśasv amalaśāstram idaṃ samāptam*), which is A.D. 1096/7. An East Indian palm-leaf manuscript of the text prepared in the seventh year of the reign of the Pāla king Madanapāla [MS A, f.120v2–4: \**parameśvaraparama*(em.: *pareśvarapara* Cod.)*bhaṭṭāra-kamahārājādhirājaśrīmanmadanapāladevasya pravardhamāne vijayarāje saptame samvatsare [...]* *bhagavatpādapaṇḍitaśaivācāryakumāra-gaṇeṇa likhāpīto 'yaṃ śaivāgamaḥ śomaśambhukṛtaḥ*], that is to say, in A.D. 1149 in the chronology of D.C. Sircar (1976), doubtless conceals the same reading beneath its errors: *vikramārkaṅṅpakālasamudbhaveṣu pañcāhata triśūśateṣu śaracchateṣu | ekādaśaśca mama śāstram idaṃ samāptam* (f.121r3). An early undated Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript of the text (MS B) lacks this verse, ending after the preceding verse with the prose *śrīmatkarṇaparakāśavyavaharaṇāya sasamasamvatsare kriyākāṅḍakramāvalīpustakaṃ paṇḍitācāryaśrīśomaśivena vira<ci> tam samāptam iti* (f.74r4–5). The reading *sasama* is meaningless. If this is an error for *daśama*, the meaning will be 'Here ends the text of the *Kriyākāṅḍakramāvalī* composed by Somaśiva for the use of the excellent Karṇaparakāśa in the tenth year'. The work was composed while Somaśambhu was abbot of the Golakīsthāna in the domain of the Ka-

lacuri kings of Tripurī in Central India, whom we know to have appointed Saiddhāntikas of this richly endowed monastic institution as their Rājagurus. The year is surely regnal and I propose that the name Karnaparakāśa is a periphrasis for Yaśaḥkarṇa, the Kalacuri king who ruled from Tripurī from A.D. 1073 to 1123, radiance/whiteness (*prakāśaḥ*) being the defining characteristic of fame/success (*yaśaḥ*) in Indian poetic convention (see, e.g. *Haravijaya* 13.3: *yaśaḥprakāśam*; 16.54: *śaśiśubhrayaśaḥprakāśa-*; Cambodian inscription K. 286, v.16bc (Coedès 1952, p.90): *kṣitīndrāḥ jātā jagattraya vikīrnayaśaḥprakāśāḥ*). If this is correct we have a third date of composition, 1082. But *daśama* is not the only possibility. If *sasama* is a corruption of *prathama* the year will be A.D. 1073 and so agree with the version of the Kashmirian manuscripts. The fact that two different dates are given in an otherwise identical verse indicates not corruption but conscious revision. Perhaps the text circulated in two editions, an earlier and a later.

This footnote of Sanderson's presents a rather fascinating muddle of dates and ends with an intriguing conclusion. But before we consider the concluding remark, I should like to muddy the waters further by introducing evidence of a different kind that, while it furnishes no specific date, points to a time of composition a little earlier still than the dates hitherto proposed.

### Somaśambhu and Rāmanātha

In the Śaiva monastery at Tiruvāvaṭuturai, near Kumbhakonam (Tamil Nadu), a single paper manuscript survives of a South Indian *Naṭarāja-paddhati* by a certain Rāmanātha.<sup>5</sup> The text is full of close verbal echoes

<sup>5</sup> The manuscript appears to have been written with a fountain pen with black ink in modern Devanāgarī script on a feint-lined exercise book and its cover appears to proclaim in Tamil that it bears Copy Number 9 (*kā. pi. eṇ: 9*). The title-page states that it was copied from a manuscript in the same library: *iyam kila śrīmanṇaṭarājapaddhatiḥ śrīmad-Gomuktīśv arapurastha[Tiruvāvaṭuturai]śrīmacchaivamaṭhālayād āgataprāktanamāṭṛk āpustakānusāreṇa vilikhitā yathāmāṭṛkaṃ saṃśodhitā ca satī vijayatetarām*. I am grateful to the *maṭha* for having permitted the Pondicherry Centre of the École française d'Extrême-Orient to take digital photographs of this manuscript in 2004.

of the *Somaśambhupaddhati*, and on first reading parts of it I suspected that it might have been a source for Somaśambhu for two reasons. The first was that many of the formulations that were extremely close seemed slightly clumsier in Rāmanātha's version. Admittedly with only one manuscript surviving of his text, some apparent "clumsiness" might simply be attributed to poor transmission, but such an explanation does not account for the kinds of clumsiness I mean, involving, for instance, slightly less satisfactory metrical breaks and sentences that yield their sense less readily. Compare for example these two closely parallel accounts of mendicancy, the first being that of Rāmanātha (MS, p.39).<sup>6</sup>

viśuddhabhasmanā snātaḥ kaupīnaṃ mekhalādi ca 2:31  
 parivartya samācamya maunī dhyātvā guruṃ śivam  
 tayor ājñāṃ samāsādyā tāmṛādyam tumbakādi vā 2:32  
 ādāya pātram astreṇa kṣālitaṃ ghoramantritam  
 tanutrajaptakāśāyaśucivastrāvakuṅṭhitam 2:33  
 astreṇa japtadaṇḍaṅ ca chatropānatparigrahaḥ  
 kopam vivādam niṣṭhīvam sparśanam mārgasarpaṇam 2:34  
 kutsāṅ ca hitvā<sup>7</sup> varṇānām caturṇām etya mandiram<sup>8</sup>  
 bhikṣāṃ dehīti sañjalpya tāvat tiṣṭhed adhomukhaḥ 2:35  
 yāvat prasnauti<sup>9</sup> gaur vatsayogāt gacchet tato 'nyataḥ

Bathed with pure ash, after putting on his loin-cloth and girdle, etc., and after sipping and silently venerating (*dhyātvā*) the guru and Śiva, he should obtain their permission [to go begging, then], taking up a vessel of copper or other [metal], or [one fashioned out of] a gourd or the like, which has been washed with water and has had the *AGHORA*-mantra recited over it, and which has been covered over with a clean reddish-brown-dyed cloth over which the *KAVACA* has been recited, and a stick over which the *ASTRA* has been recited, and equipped with a parasol and [ascetic's] sandals, avoiding anger, discussion, spitting, touching, wandering [from] the way, and censure [of others], he should go the home of [one of any of] the four classes,

<sup>6</sup> The provisional numeration of chapters and verses is mine.

<sup>7</sup> hitvā] *conj.*; bhivā MS

<sup>8</sup> mandiram] *conj.*; mandiraḥ MS

<sup>9</sup> prasnauti] *conj.*; prastauti MS

uttering “Give alms”. He should stand face down for as long as it takes for a cow to lactate after being united with her calf. Then he should go elsewhere.

Now there is nothing actually wrong with any of this, but as soon as we put it beside Somaśambhu’s account we shall see two things very plainly. First of all we see that the two accounts are unquestionably so closely related to one another that we are likely to assume one to have been derived from the other,<sup>10</sup> and secondly we shall notice several small awkwardnesses in Rāmanātha’s account that are absent from Somaśambhu’s:

- In 2:34a, e.g., there is an unpleasing *sāpekṣa-samāsa*.
- There are three instances where a unit of sense runs across the *pāda*-break in such a way as to create a slightly awkward widow- or orphan-effect: 2:33ab, 2:35ab and 2:36ab.<sup>11</sup> Somaśambhu’s passage has not one such awkwardness.
- A concatenation of absolutives ties the whole unit together, whereas Somaśambhu’s unit is more clearly articulated because of the occasional use of main verbs.
- The appearance of words that are key to the understanding of units of sense is sometimes delayed: in 2:32d, for instance, qualifiers of *pātram* are introduced before *pātram* itself, and in 2:34cd we have to read through an oddly disparate list, beginning abruptly with *kopam*, before we reach the verb *hitvā*, which clarifies why this collection of items have been clumped together.

<sup>10</sup> As always in such cases of textual relationship, many other more complex scenarios could be imagined too.

<sup>11</sup> Such “enjambement” is not remotely problematic in philosophical *kārikās* or in versified instructions of this kind, but it can be jarring when it occurs frequently in a short sample of text, as here.

Here is Somaśambhu's treatment of the same ideas:<sup>12</sup>

bhikṣārthaṃ tāmrajaṃ lohaṃ brahmavṛkṣādipatrajaṃ<sup>13</sup>  
 bubhukṣor vihitam pātraṃ mumukṣos tumbikādijam<sup>14</sup> 1.9.32/345  
 pavitraṃ śikyakālambi<sup>15</sup> bahurūpābhimantritam  
 tanutrajaptakāśāya<sup>16</sup> śucivastrāvaguṇṭhitam<sup>17</sup> 1.9.33/346  
 viśuddhabhasmanā snātaḥ<sup>18</sup> kaupīnaṃ cottarīyakam<sup>19</sup>  
 parivṛtya<sup>20</sup> samācama maunī dhyātvā śivaṃ gurum 1.9.34/347  
 tayor ājñāṃ samādāya daṇḍaṃ cāstrābhimantritam  
 ātapatrakaro yāyād bhikṣārthaṃ śuddhaveśmasu 1.9.35/348  
 tadā praṇāmaṃ niṣṭhīvaṃ<sup>21</sup> sparśam unmārgasarpaṇam  
 kutsanaṃ<sup>22</sup> ca na kurvīta tyajec ca śvādisaṃkulam<sup>23</sup> 1.9.36/349  
 caturṇāṃ śuddhavarṇānāṃ samāsādyā gṛhāṅgaṇam  
 bhikṣāṃ dehīti saṃjalpya<sup>24</sup> pādāṅguṣṭhāgralocanaḥ 1.9.37/350  
 tāvatkālam pratīkṣeta yāvad gaur<sup>25</sup> vatsayogataḥ  
 prasnavam<sup>26</sup> samavāpnoti tato 'nyatra vrajen munih 1.9.38/351

For gathering alms, the vessel made for a Sādhaka (*bubhukṣoḥi*) is of

---

<sup>12</sup> C = a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript in Cambridge University Library, MS Add. 1406; K = Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies edition; D = Dēvakkōṭṭai edition; P = Pondicherry edition of Brunner.

<sup>13</sup> °patrajaṃ] CK; °sambhavam DP

<sup>14</sup> tumbikādijam] KP; tumbakādikaṃ C; kambukādijam D

<sup>15</sup> pavitraṃ śikyakālambi] KP; pavitraśikkikālambi C; pavitraśukti-kālambi D

<sup>16</sup> tanutrajaptakāśāya°] KD; tanutrajaptakaśāya° C; tanuprajapta-kāśāya° P

<sup>17</sup> °guṇṭhitam] CK; °kuṇṭhitam DP

<sup>18</sup> snātaḥ] CDP; snātam K

<sup>19</sup> cottarīyakam] DP; uttarīyatam C; sottarīyakam K

<sup>20</sup> parivṛtya] *conj.*; parivartya CK; parivṛtṭya DP

<sup>21</sup> tadā praṇāmaṃ niṣṭhīvaṃ] DP; tadā praṇāmaniṣṭhīva C; tato gṛhāṅgamalaṣṭhīva° K

<sup>22</sup> kutsanaṃ] KDP; kucchanaṃ C

<sup>23</sup> tyajec ca śvādi°] DP; tyajeyuḥ śvādi° C; tyajedaśvādi° K

<sup>24</sup> saṃjalpya] KDP; saṃjanya C

<sup>25</sup> gaur] CDP; gau K

<sup>26</sup> prasnavam] P; pratyāvam C; prasravam K; prasnuvam D

copper, of iron, or of leaves from such plants as the Brahmaṅkaṣa; for the seeker of liberation it should be made of a gourd or the like. [It should be] purified, suspended from a sling, having had the AGHORA recited over it, and covered over with a clean reddish-brown-dyed cloth over which the KAVACA has been recited. Bathed with pure ash, after putting on his loin-cloth and upper cloth, and after sipping and silently venerating (*dhyātvā*) the guru and Śiva, he should obtain their permission [to go begging], he should take his stick, over which the ASTRA has been recited, and he should go out in search of alms in pure households with a parasol in his hand. At that time he should not greet, not spit, not touch [others], not go off on detours and not revile [others]; and he should avoid groups of dogs and such. Reaching the yard of a house of [people belonging to any of] the four pure social groups, he should say “Give alms” and wait, with his eyes fixed on his big toes, for as much time as it takes for a cow to produce milk on being united with her calf. Then the muni should go elsewhere.

The comparative clarity and elegance of Somaśambhu’s treatment of this subject is striking and would not, as I have indicated above, seem inconsistent, to my mind with his treatment having been a careful reworking of Rāmanātha’s. Moreover, many other examples could be found to illustrate both that the two texts are very closely related to each other and that Somaśambhu’s is more polished and more readily comprehensible.

We come now to the second reason that initially made me leap to the conclusion that Rāmanātha was a source for Somaśambhu. Flipping to the back of the manuscript, a feint-lined exercise book with pagination on both sides of each page, we find that Rāmanātha gives an account of his lineage, date and location. A full edition of that account is given below as an appendix, but for now I give only the last two verses exactly as they appear in the MS (p.192).

śrīmat-Puṣpavanādihīśadhāmāprāṇmaṭhadeśikah  
 † śākā † śākābdadaśaśate viṃśativarjite  
 Goḷakīmaṭhaniṣṭhāna - - - vidhāyinīm  
 paddhatin naṭarājākhyām akarot sukhābodhitām

Sadly, this is damaged in two rather important places,<sup>27</sup> but here is what it seems to say:

The pontiff of the monastery to the east of the temple of the venerable Puṣpavanādhīśvara [when] ten hundred less twenty years of the Śaka era † [had passed?] †, [i.e. in 980, viz. 1058 AD,] produced [this] manual, called the *Naṭarāja*, which is easily taught,<sup>28</sup> and which performs † ... † of Goḷakī monastery.

Now a damaged verse offering an otherwise unsubstantiated date, corresponding to 1058 AD, is of course rather flimsy evidence on which to build anything. But we do find a corroborating echo of this date in another work of Rāmanātha, namely a doctrinal *prakaraṇa* teaching the tenets of the Śaivasiddhānta called the *Siddhāntadīpikā* (not to be confused with the prose works of that title, namely the published *Siddhāntadīpikā* or *Siddhāntaparakāśikā* of a certain Sarvātmaśambhu and the unpublished *Siddhāntadīpikā* of Madhyārjunaśiva). Rāmanātha's *Siddhāntadīpikā* is a work in 420 *anuṣṭubh* verses transmitted in a few South Indian manuscripts and here is its conclusion, transcribed from IFP T. 914, T. 284 and T. 112:

śakābdake daśaśate<sup>29</sup> samāpte nyūnasaptake<sup>30</sup>  
 śrīmat-Puṣpavanādhīśadhāmāprānmaṭhavartinā<sup>31</sup>  
 kālenālpēna sarveṣāṃ siddhāntārthaparakāśikā<sup>32</sup>  
 subodhā Rāmanāthēna<sup>33</sup> kṛtā siddhāntadīpikā

<sup>27</sup> One could perhaps repair the second half-line to read: *samāpte śakābdadaśaśate viṃśativarjite*, which would yield a tolerable *bha-vipulā*, but not a locative phrase, which we seem to require.

<sup>28</sup> Perhaps one could consider correcting here to *sukhabodhinīm*, “which teaches easily”.

<sup>29</sup> śakābdake daśaśate] 914; śakābdayugasāhasre 284; śakābde ... 112

<sup>30</sup> samāpte nyūnasaptake] 914, 284; ... 112

<sup>31</sup> °dhāmāprānmaṭha°] 914, 284; ... 112

<sup>32</sup> °prakāśikā] 914, 112; °prakāśakāḥ 284

<sup>33</sup> rāmanāthēna] 914, 112; nāmanāthēna 284

abhidhārthābhidhā<sup>34</sup> padyaiḥ savimśatiścatuśśataiḥ<sup>35</sup>  
śrotre niveśya<sup>36</sup> sasnehaṃ satataṃ prajvalatv iyam<sup>37</sup>

The wording is not elegant, and corruption and attempts to emend it may have disfigured it further. Here is a tentative translation of this very tentatively restored conclusion.

When ten hundred minus seven Śaka years had passed, [i.e. in 993 (=1071 AD),] Rāmanātha, residing in the monastery to the east of the temple of the venerable Puṣpavanādhīśa, composed the *Siddhānta-dīpikā*, which is easy to understand, which reveals the doctrines of the Siddhānta quickly (*kālenālpēna*) to everyone, whose name has the sense of its literal meaning (*abhidhārthābhidhā*), with four hundred and twenty stanzas. Once one has allowed it to enter one's ears with devotion, may it always shine brightly.

The formulation of this conclusion echoes that of the *paddhati*, and once again it gives a date in the second half of the eleventh century that is earlier than any of the dates hitherto proposed for the composition of Somaśambhu's manual.

### Excursus on Rāmanātha being the first dated South Indian Saiddhāntika writer of whom works are extant

We may remark in passing that the dates of composition of Rāmanātha's two works place him about a century earlier than the celebrated commentator Aghoraśiva, whose *Kriyākramadyotikā* is dated to 1157 AD,<sup>38</sup> and thus makes Rāmanātha the earliest known South

<sup>34</sup> abdhidhārthābhidhā] *conj.*; abhidhārthābhidhāḥ 914; abhidarthābhiḥ 284; ... dima° 112

<sup>35</sup> savimśati°] 914, 112; savimśatiś° 284

<sup>36</sup> niveśya] 914, 284; nibasya 112

<sup>37</sup> satataṃ prajvalatv iyam] *conj.*; santataṃ prājvantvimāḥ 914 (unmetrical); santataṃ prājvalanti mām 284; satataṃ projvalanti mām 112

<sup>38</sup> For a detailed discussion of this date, see Goodall 1998:xiii–xvii, fn. 24.

Indian theologian of the Śaivasiddhānta of whom works survive.<sup>39</sup> Of course that he is South Indian is an assumption, for I am not certain of the place of his monastery,<sup>40</sup> but it seems a reasonable assumption to make given even just the rather typically Southern name he has chosen to give his *padhati*.<sup>41</sup> Of course that name is a reflection of his guru's name, but that his guru should be called Naṭarāja (or variants

---

<sup>39</sup> No pre-twelfth-century works in Tamil appear to have been considered to be in any sense Saiddhāntika until after the twelfth century: see the Preface entitled 'Explanatory remarks about the Śaiva Siddhānta and its treatment in modern secondary literature' in Goodall 2004. This is of course not to say that the Śaivasiddhānta had not long reached the Tamil-speaking South, for we know of its presence there as early as the seventh century from Pallava inscriptions (see Goodall 2004:xix, fn. 17, and Goodall et al. 2005:112–113); but no surviving Sanskrit or Tamil literature belonging to this current of thought is known to us that proclaims a Southern origin.

<sup>40</sup> On the basis of the name-element Puṣpavana, numerous conceivable identifications could be advanced, such as Pūvaṇūr on the southern bank of the Kaveri, or Pūvaṇam in Sivaganga District, where there appears to have been a Puṣpavaneśvara temple from perhaps as early as the eighth century (ARIE 1894, B. 17 and ARIE 1985–86, B. 377, an inscription in "characters of the 8<sup>th</sup> century" that refers to the construction of the temple for Tiruppūvaṇattudēvar); but an equivalent of Puṣpavana might not form part of the toponym, and there may once have been several places with quite different names in which there was a Śiva-temple named Puṣpavaneśvara or Puṣpavanādhiśvara or the like, e.g. Tiruppūndurutti (ARIE 1894, B. 166).

<sup>41</sup> This is not to claim, of course, that Naṭarāja or Naṭeśa or other Sanskrit equivalents, or indeed any Tamil equivalents such as Āṭavallāṇ (used, for instance, as the name for a measure of weight in many of the eleventh-century inscriptions at the great temple in Tanjore: Hultzsch in *South Indian Inscriptions* II, No. 1, p.2) was by this stage exclusively or even particularly associated with Chidambaram, or even necessarily with the distinctive iconography of Śiva dancing in a posture known as *bhujāṅgatrāsita* that is found, among other places, at Chidambaram. Recent scholarship (e.g. Kaimal 1999 and Wessels-Mevissen 2012) has underlined how difficult it is to determine which Sanskrit term, if any, was at first privileged as the label for this iconographic type.

thereof) is still itself perhaps an indication that he was a Southerner. Sometimes Rāmanātha uses the name in such a way that it must refer only to his guru, e.g. in the following concluding verse (p.41):

akarot pāšavicedaṃ yasya sāksān naṭeśvaraḥ<sup>42</sup>  
tena rāmeśvareṣena prokto nityavidhikramaḥ 2:47<sup>43</sup>

The procedure for obligatory daily enjoined rites (*nityavidhikramaḥ*) has been taught by Rāmeśvareṣa, whose bonds Nateśvara in person (*sākṣāt*) cut away.

But in other places, for instance the concluding verse to the first section of Rāmanātha's *paddhati*, he appears to make the name Naṭarāja allude both to Śiva and to his own guru (p.147):

naṭarājapadāmbhojasmaraṇadhvastakalmaṣaḥ<sup>44</sup>  
rāmeśvaraḥ śivaśrāddham<sup>45</sup> antyeṣṭyā saha so 'bravīt

Rāmeśvara, from whom all impurity has been shaken off my meditating on the lotus-feet of Naṭarāja, has taught Śaiva post-mortuary rites, together with the death-rite.

We may note also that Rāmanātha's *Naṭarājapaddhati* is much cited by later Southern authors, in particular Nirmalamāṇi in his *Prabhāvyākhyā* on the *Kriyākramadyotikā*, albeit using the title *Rāmanāthapaddhati*,<sup>46</sup> and the wording of some passages in Aghoraśiva's works suggest that Aghoraśiva too was influenced by Rāmanātha.<sup>47</sup> One further indication

<sup>42</sup> naṭeśvaraḥ] *conj.*; naṭaśvaram MS

<sup>43</sup> nityavidhikramaḥ] *conj.*; nityavidhiḥ kramaḥ MS

<sup>44</sup> °smaraṇadhvastakalmaṣaḥ] *conj.*; °smaraṇāvāstrakalmaṣaḥ MS

<sup>45</sup> rāmeśvaraḥ śivaśrāddham] *conj.*; rāmīśvareṇa - srāddham MS

<sup>46</sup> The citations may nonetheless be located in the *Naṭarājapaddhati*.

<sup>47</sup> Compare, for instance, the visualisation of the planets in the retinue of the sun as given by Rāmanātha (MS, p.13):

somaṃ sitaṃ budhaṃ gauram rocanābhaṃ bḥaspatim  
sitaṃ bhārgavam aindrādidikṣv āgneyyādidikṣv atha 1:100

of Southern origin may be mentioned: all the historical figures in Rāmanātha's spiritual lineage (see appendix) are associated with Kamalālaya, as is Nirmalamāṇi himself (see the verses on pp.389, 517 and 523 of his commentary), which is presumably to be identified with Tiruvārūr.<sup>48</sup>

---

raktam aṅgāraḥkaṃ dhyātvā śyāmaravaṇṇaṃ śanaīśvaram  
vāmorunyastahastāṃś ca dakṣiṇaiś cābhayaḥpradān 1:101  
kṛṣṇaṃ kṛtāñjalim rāhuṃ ketuṃ dhūmrādisannibham

100d āgneyyādidikṣv atha] *conj.*; agnyādidakṣvathaḥ MS (unmetrical)  
101a aṅgāraḥkaṃ] *em.*; aṅgāraḥka MS  
101c °nyasta°] *conj.*; °nyasya MS  
102a kṛtāñjalim] *conj.*; kṛṣṇāñjalim MS

with the same visualisation in Aghoraśiva's Pañcāvaraṇastava:

somaṃ sitaṃ budhaṃ gauraṃ guruṃ gorocanādyutim  
śukraṃ śuklaṃ ca pūrvādidikṣv athāgnyādikōṇagān 3  
raktaṃ bhaumaṃ śyāmadehaṃ ca saurim kṛṣṇaṃ rāhuṃ  
dhūmravaṇṇaṃ ca ketuṃ  
vāmair hastair naumi tān ṣaṭ sametān  
vāmorusthair dakṣiṇaiḥ sābhayaiś ca 4

For further striking evidence, see the discussion of verses 1–5 of the appendix.

<sup>48</sup> It is uncertain how old the use of Kamalālaya to refer to Tiruvārūr is. Today, it seems commonly to be used as a label for the tank (e.g. in The Hindu of 18<sup>th</sup> March 2004), perhaps because the name, “abode of lotuses”, can be a kenning for a tank. But an undated 3-verse Sanskrit inscription “on a stone near a well in the first prakara” of what is today known as the Tyāgarājaswāmi temple reveals that the name Kamalālaya used to refer rather to the place. The first verse (SII, IV, No. 398, ARIE 74 of 1890) reads:

Śaṅkhatīrtham iti khyātaṃ Kamalālayamadhyagam|  
vanmīkasambhavasyaṅgre sarvarogakṣayāpaham|

[This is] called Śaṅkhatīrtha, situated in the middle of Kamalālaya, in front of [the liṅga] that arose from the ant-hill; it removes all maladies and afflictions.

Given that Pūnkōyil, “Flower-temple” is also used as a name for the principal Śiva-temple in Tiruvārūr,<sup>49</sup> it seems not inconceivable that this should have been sanskritised as Puṣpavanādhīśadhāma and that Rāmanātha’s *maṭha* should have been to the east of the temple.<sup>50</sup> Whether or not this is correct, it is clear that Kamalālaya is in the South, since Rāmanātha’s antecedent from Gauḍadeśa is said to have come to Kamalālaya in order to raise up Southerners (see verse 6 of the Appendix).

### Rāmanātha’s awareness of Somaśambhu

Given such a date, and given the many instances of shared verses, it seemed reasonable to assume that Rāmanātha’s *paddhati* was

---

A long Tamil inscription dated to the 7<sup>th</sup> regnal year of Kulottuṅga II, in other words c. 1140 ad, concludes with 3 not entirely clear Sanskrit verses that appear to give our toponym twice, once in the form *Lakṣmīyālaya* and once in the form *Kamalāpura*. The inscription is found in SII, VII, No. 485 (ARIE 269 of 1901) and the verses in question read:

śrīmatbrahmapurīśavāgadhīpatis svasvāmimitraś ca ye  
tebhyo (31) hemasabhādhīnāthacaraṇanyāsollasanmastakah[]  
prādāt bhūmihiraṇyakam sarajatān anyān dhanān sottamān  
śrīyĀrūrādhīpasya mūlavasatau devo [ ]napāyo nṛpaḥ||  
Lakṣmīyālaye racitadharmmaparānupāla-(32)śīlān nṛpām[ghri]  
kamalām cirasā namāmi[]  
Vyāghrāgrahārahemasabhānaṭeśapādāravindamadhu[p]o [hy  
anapāya]nāmā||  
āluṭaiya nampi mātākka| icaiñāniyār  
jananī bhavato nānaśivācāryakule bhavet  
śaive gau[tama]gotre smin nānākhyā Ka[malā]pure||

<sup>49</sup> Thus *Tēvāram* 4.19:5, according to V. M. Subrahmanya Aiyar’s interpretation in the *Digital Tēvāram*.

<sup>50</sup> Of course the compound *puṣpavanādhīśadhāmaprānmaṭha* could be interpreted differently: one could understand the Eastern Monastery at the temple of Puṣpavanādhīśa. A number of mentions of an “Eastern Monastery” are found in Southern inscriptions in different Southern towns with the label *kīlai-maṭha*. Rajeshwari Ghose has written that *kīlai-maṭha* ‘seems to be the Tamil for *Dakṣiṇa Golakī maṭha*’ (Ghose 1996:165), but this seems improbable, since *kīlai* does not mean ‘southern’.

an unacknowledged source for Somaśambhu. But this assumption must now be rejected, because it turns out that Rāmanātha actually alludes to Somaśambhu when quoting his prescription for the manufacture of the *sruk* (MS, p.76):

rāmavedāṅgulaḥ kumbho gaṇḍī yugayamāṅgulā<sup>51</sup>  
 viṣṭṛtā gartagāmbhīryaṃ tryaṅgulaṃ dviyavottaram<sup>52</sup>  
 vedāṅgulaṃ ca<sup>53</sup> vistāraṃ ity uktam Somaśambhubhiḥ  
 śrīparṇī śimśapā<sup>54</sup> dāru bījakāmrvikaṅkatāḥ<sup>55</sup>  
 srucci vṛkṣāḥ praśasyante<sup>56</sup> kiṃśukādyaś ca yājñikāḥ

The “pot” [of the ladle] should be three or four finger-breadths across; the “cheek” should be of four or two finger-breadths. The depth of its bowl should be two-barley grains more than three finger-breadths. And its breadth should be four finger-breadths—thus Somaśambhu has taught. The woods recommended for the ladle are *śrīparṇī*, *śimśupā*, cedar, *bījaka*, mango, *vikaṅkata*, and sacrificial woods such as that of the *kiṃśuka*.

The corresponding passage in Brunner’s edition is easy to identify (SP4 2:83 and 87):

rāmavedāṅgulaḥ kumbho gaṇḍī yugayamāṅgulā  
 khātaṃ vedāṅgulair vṛttaṃ dviyavaṃ tryaṅgulaṃ khanet 83  
 ...  
 śrīparṇī śimśapā dāru bījakāmrvikaṅkatāḥ  
 srucci vṛkṣāḥ praśasyante kiṃśukādyaś ca yājñikāḥ 87

Rāmanātha’s other surviving work too, the *Siddhāntadīpikā*, although it apparently contains no explicit mention of Somaśambhu, appears to echo Somaśambhu’s classifications of initiation types (cf. SP3, 1:1–13

<sup>51</sup> °yamāṅgulā] *conj.*; MS

<sup>52</sup> viṣṭṛtā gartagāmbhīryaṃ tryaṅgulaṃ dvi] *conj.*; tiṣṇām gartagāmbhīrya tryaṅguladviṃ° MS

<sup>53</sup> vedāṅgulaṃ ca] *conj.*; vedāṅgulastha° MS

<sup>54</sup> śrīparṇī śimśapā] *conj.*; śīparṇī śimśupā MS

<sup>55</sup> °mrvikaṅkatāḥ] *conj.*; dravikaṅkatā MS

<sup>56</sup> srucci vṛkṣāḥ praśasyante] *conj.*; sāci vṛkṣāḥ praśalyante MS

and IFP T. 914, pp.5–6) and of five varieties of *pratiṣṭhā* (cf. SP4, 1:1–7 and IFP T. 914, pp.9–10).

We could choose to assume then either that all our dates for the composition of Somaśambhu’s work are wrong, or that the dates for Rāmanātha’s works are. But there is a third possibility. If Rāmanātha was indeed writing in the 1050s and yet had access to Somaśambhu’s text, perhaps he had access to an earlier edition of the work. We may recall that Sanderson, without being aware of Rāmanātha’s manual, concluded his above-quoted footnote with the remark: ‘[p]erhaps the text circulated in two editions, an earlier and a later’. Furthermore, Sanderson has since found further evidence that points to another, still earlier date for the completion of the *Somaśambhupaddhati* than those advanced above, and he has told me that he intends to present this evidence in a future publication.

In his stimulating introduction to a recent volume of the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* (Band LII–LIII) devoted to textual criticism, Hanneder makes the following observation (2010:9–10):

In view of the wide-spread occurrence of author variants in modern, that is, better documented times, it is not unrealistic to assume that some ancient authors worked like Goethe and kept record of how they developed their work. Furthermore, according to Pasquali, a plausible scenario for the “publication” of works is the following: an author composed and wrote down or dictated his work and permitted reproduction of his own copy. Not all authors died afterwards or lost interest in their work, leaving us with a single autograph without variants. Some authors may have added corrections in the margins, or copied a revised version. If we assume that the text was copied by the author in different stages of its development, every text could be slightly different and all variants at that stage would be authorial variants; the final copy of the author would contain the last version, which – as we have seen – is not necessarily the definite one. In other words, we could have the same problem as the new philologist, but we are unlikely to notice it.

In the case of Somaśambhu, at the head of a well-endowed and important Saiddhāntika monastery,<sup>57</sup> one can imagine him being visited

---

<sup>57</sup> For the wealth of the Golagīmaṭha, see Sanderson 2009:263–265.

by Saiddhāntika initiates from many parts of the country, many of whom may have wished to take away copies with them of his extremely carefully written and for them clearly useful ritual manual. This might account for there being more than one date given as the date of completion in the sources that survive, and it might also account for a Southern abbot using a copy of the work before the issue of the dated “editions” now known to us. There may have been little difference between the various editions, but it is also not inconceivable that the work grew and improved over time and that Rāmanātha had a shorter and less polished work before him. We have observed above that Rāmanātha’s formulations make the impression of being less polished drafts of passages that we find in Somaśambhu’s *paddhati*. This may simply be because Rāmanātha does not write particularly well, but it may also be because he had before him an earlier version of Somaśambhu’s work. Similarly, Rāmanātha’s omissions may be attributable to Rāmanātha choosing not to treat certain topics, but it is also conceivable that such topics were not all from the first included by Somaśambhu. To give one example, Rāmanātha provides no account of the *damanotsava*. Could this have been added later by Somaśambhu, who prefaces his account with a sort of apology for introducing it into a Saiddhāntika manual in spite of the absence of any Saiddhāntika source?

With this short article I hope to have filled out a little our knowledge of South Indian Saiddhāntika literary history, for which, hitherto, no testimony earlier than the mid-twelfth century was known.<sup>58</sup> Those interested in the precise details of the apparently partly non-brahmin spiritual lineage leading to Rāmanātha in eleventh-century Tiruvārūr may consult the appendix that follows. I have also embroidered on a possible partial explanation of the conflicting evidence for the date of composition of the *Somaśambhupaddhati*. The hypothesis that it circulated in several eleventh-century “editions” may not have

---

<sup>58</sup> For more on the twelfth-century writers of the school, see Goodall 2000.

much impact on editorial choices in the editing of the work,<sup>59</sup> but it is a speculation that it is interesting to entertain and it might provoke useful speculation about the circulation and use of other texts in pre-modern India.

## APPENDIX: Rāmanātha's lineage

Here follows the concluding section of Rāmanātha's *paddhati* (MS, pp.189–192):

granthakartṭpraśamsā<sup>60</sup>  
 ādau śivaśikhājyotisāvityākhyān<sup>61</sup> gurūttamān<sup>62</sup>  
 anugrahārthaṃ lokānāṃ anujagrāha śaṅkaraḥ 1  
 tebhyaḥ siddhāntasamsiddhaṃ gocarāṇāṃ catuṣṭayam  
 mantreśarudradeveśakramād bhūmim upāgatam 2  
 † jyotiṣāṃ lāttīti † yasmād utpannā gurusantatiḥ  
 addhyāsta bhārate varṣe Goḷakīsaṃjñakaṃ maṭham 3<sup>63</sup>

<sup>59</sup> A new edition of the text covered by Brunner 1963, together with the hitherto unpublished commentary of the *Somaśambhupaddhatiṭīkā*, is being prepared in the Pondicherry Centre of the EFEO by Dr. S.A.S. Sarma.

<sup>60</sup> Note that verses 1 and 2 are identical with the verses that introduce the brief account of Aghoraśiva's genealogy at the end of his *Dviśatikālottaravṛtti*, which have been edited in Goodall 1998:xiv, fn. 24. The following verse there, however, although clearly related to our verse 3, places emphasis on Āmardaka, rather than on Goḷakī, as the most important of the Śaiva monasteries: see below.

<sup>61</sup> śivaśikhā°] *conj.*; śivaḥ śiva° MS

<sup>62</sup> gurūttamān] *conj.*; gurusattamān MS (*unmetrical*)

<sup>63</sup> In place of verses 3–5 of our text, the corresponding section of the conclusion to the *Dviśatikālottaravṛtti* (Goodall 1998:xiv, fn. 24) has been reconstructed to read as follows:

tebhyaḥ śivakulād ādyād utpannā gurusantatiḥ  
 śrīmadāmardakaṃ nāma sthānaṃ mokṣasya bhārate  
 guravaḥ tatsamudbhūtā nānāścaryavidhāyinaḥ

gotraṃ manonmanīsaṃjñāṃ<sup>64</sup> yasya vṛkṣo vaṭaḥ<sup>65</sup> smṛtaḥ  
 yatsantateḥ sa kūṭastho Dūrvāsā bhagavān muniḥ<sup>66</sup> 4  
 śrīmān asmin maṭhe Bhāvaśaṃbhuh śambhusamaḥ sthitaḥ<sup>67</sup>  
 guravo 'smāt samutpannā<sup>68</sup> nānāścāryavidhāyinaḥ 5  
 teṣv eko gauḍadeśīyaḥ<sup>69</sup> prāptavān Kamalālayam  
 Īdṛṣīm mūrtim ādāya dākṣiṇātyottitūṣayā 6  
 āgataḥ<sup>70</sup> śiva evāyam iti lokānumoditaḥ  
 padavākyapramāṇajñāḥ śrīmān Brahmaśivaḥ<sup>71</sup> svayam 7  
 tatra Puṣkariṇīṭire Dakṣiṇe<sup>72</sup> Golakīmaṭhe  
 vidvadbhir avasat sārddham agnikalpais tapodhanaiḥ 8  
 yathādhīpuram āsādya<sup>73</sup> śivaḥ pāṇinaye purā  
 sūtraṃ vyākaraṇasyāha karaṇānām agocaraḥ 9  
 Puṣkarādhipatitvena yaḥ<sup>74</sup> pṛthivyāṃ prathāṃ gataḥ  
 brahmacaryatapovidyādayāśāntisamanvitaḥ 10  
 sadehikaś ca devaś ca mahāṃs tacchiṣyatāṃ gataḥ  
 sa mahātmā Mahādevaḥ sadā pratyaṃmukhendriyaḥ 11  
 yathāvajjñātaśaivārthas tathānyeṣv<sup>75</sup> abhiyogavān  
 vītarāgaḥ praśāntaś ca tatraiva Kamalālaye 12  
 śīṣyaiḥ tapodhanaiḥ prājñaiḥ sārddham Prācīmaṭhe 'vasat

But *sthānaṃ mokṣasya bhārate* is a restitution based on a parallel in Aghoraśiva's *Gotrasantati*, and the Trivandrum MS there reads *sthānaṃ adhyasta bhārate*. It seems therefore more probable that we should correct *adhyasta* to *adhyāsta* and supply a missing half-line similar or identical to our 4cd (which supplies Dūrvāsas as the subject for *adhyāsta*).

<sup>64</sup> gotraṃ manonmanīsaṃjñāṃ] *conj.* Sanderson; gotraṇā nmanīsaṃjñāṃ MS

<sup>65</sup> vaṭaḥ] *em.*; vaṭa MS

<sup>66</sup> muniḥ] *em.*; maniḥ MS

<sup>67</sup> Bhāvaśaṃbhuh śambhusamaḥ sthitaḥ] *conj.* Sanderson; śaṃbhuh śaṃbhuh samāsthitaḥ MS (unmetrical)

<sup>68</sup> °tpannā] *em.*; °tpanno MS

<sup>69</sup> gauḍadeśīyaḥ] *conj.*; gauḍadeśe yaḥ MS

<sup>70</sup> āgataḥ] *em.*; agataḥ MS

<sup>71</sup> brahmaśivaḥ] *conj.*; brahmaśivaṃ MS

<sup>72</sup> dakṣiṇe] *conj.*; dakṣiṇo MS

<sup>73</sup> āsādya] *conj.*; ānyāya MS

<sup>74</sup> yaḥ] *conj.*; yāṃ MS

<sup>75</sup> yathāvajjñātaśaivārthas tathā°] *conj.*; yathāvat jñānaśaivārthāḥ tada° MS

kaniṣṭho 'syāvasad Vāmaśivaḥ Puṣkariṇīmathe 13  
yah siddhānte śivaḥ sāksāt śilpe 'pi ca vidhiḥ śrutah<sup>76</sup>  
jñātvāntaṃ svecchayā dehaṃ tyaktvā<sup>77</sup> yah śivam āviśat 14  
devasya ca mahān śiṣyo Devadevāhvayo<sup>78</sup> vaśī  
Śrīśaile duścaram cakre tapaḥ kandaphalāśanaḥ<sup>79</sup> 15  
tasya śiṣyottamaḥ śrīmān Naṭarājasya deśikah  
yasyāpi ca kramāyātaḥ<sup>80</sup> sa eva Kamalālayah 16  
ayatnapūrvam yasyāsta brahmacaryātapovratam<sup>81</sup>  
† śrīmatpārsvapuvamrāyah † Nṛttarājaś ca<sup>82</sup> viśrutah 17  
yah prāpa sarvavidyānām pāram tatra kṛtaśramah<sup>83</sup>  
Gayāyām yo dadau piṇḍam kṛpayātmabhāvataḥ<sup>84</sup> 18  
ceṣṭāḥ śivārcanam yasya yasya svairakathā japaḥ<sup>85</sup>  
śivatvāpādanam yasya<sup>86</sup> cakṣuḥpāto<sup>87</sup> yadṛcchayā 19  
devo 'nantaḥ prasannātmā yasya śiṣyo bahuśrutah  
śrutaśīlopannaś ca śrīmāms Tatpuruṣaḥ<sup>88</sup> śivaḥ 20  
tapovidyādhiś ca śrīkaṇṭhaśivasamjñakaḥ<sup>89</sup>  
jñānābdhir bhūtale khyātaḥ<sup>90</sup> prānmathādhīpasamjñayā 21  
śivāgamānām vyākhyātā padādiṣu ca paṇḍitaḥ  
so 'pi Viśveśvaro devo yacchiṣyo deśikottamaḥ 22

<sup>76</sup> vidhiḥ śrutah] *conj.*; vidhiśrutau MS

<sup>77</sup> tyaktvā] *em.*; tyaktā MS

<sup>78</sup> mahān śiṣyo Devadevāhvayo] *conj.*; mahat śiṣyo devadevāmhvyayo MS

<sup>79</sup> duścaram cakre tapaḥ kandaphalāśanaḥ] *conj.*; — ram cakre tapaḥ —  
palāśanaḥ MS

<sup>80</sup> ca kramāyātaḥ] *conj.*; kākramāyātā MS

<sup>81</sup> yasyāsta brahmacaryātapovratam] *conj.* Sanderson; yasyāstat  
brahmacādhātaye vratā MS

<sup>82</sup> Nṛttarājaś ca] *conj.*; tatra jā — ś ca MS

<sup>83</sup> pāram tatra kṛtaśramah] *conj.* Sanderson; vāmam pāraṣṭambakṛtta-  
mah MS

<sup>84</sup> °prabhāvataḥ] *conj.* Sanderson; °prabhā — MS

<sup>85</sup> svairakathā japaḥ] *conj.* Sanderson; sverakathāśanaḥ MS

<sup>86</sup> °pādanam yasya] *conj.*; °pādanam svasya MS

<sup>87</sup> cakṣuḥpāto] *conj.* Sanderson; cakṣuḥpādo MS

<sup>88</sup> Tatpuruṣaḥ] *em.* Sanderson; tatpuruṣa° MS (unmetrical)

<sup>89</sup> Śrīkaṇṭha°] *conj.*; śrīkaṇṭhaḥ MS

<sup>90</sup> jñānābdhir bhūtale khyātaḥ] *conj.*; jñānābdhi bhūtale khyāntaḥ MS

prājñāḥ Pañcākṣaro devaḥ<sup>91</sup> pañcākṣaraparāyaṇaḥ  
 Triyaṃbakaśivaḥ śāntyā tapasā munisannibhaḥ 23  
 tasmād anantaraṃ dhīmān \_\_\_\_\_ sabhāpatiḥ<sup>92</sup>  
 kṛtāgamārthavinyāsaḥ<sup>93</sup> śānto Jñānaśivaḥ<sup>94</sup> sudhīḥ 24  
 tataś śāntaḥ śrutinidhiḥ Nilakaṇṭhaśivābhidhaḥ  
 Oṃkāropapado devaḥ sarvasaṃgavivarjitaḥ 25  
 devo Maheśvaraḥ śāntaḥ tapovidyādayānviṭaḥ  
 bahuśrutaḥ sudhīr devaḥ Somanāthaḥ taponidhiḥ 26  
 yasyaite deśikāḥ sarve śiṣyāḥ prājñās ca naiṣṭhikāḥ  
 tasya śrī-Nṛttarājasya śiṣyaḥ śrīkaṇṭhatejasah 27  
 śrī-Rāmeśvaranāthākhyāḥ savarṇakulasambhavaḥ  
 tanmukhāj jñātasiddhāntarahasyārthaḥ samāhitaḥ<sup>95</sup> 28  
 śrīmat-Puṣpavanādhīśadhāmāprānmaṭhadeśikāḥ  
 † śākā † śakābdadaśasate viṃśativarjite 29  
 Goḷakīmaṭhaniṣṭhānām<sup>96</sup> \_\_\_\_\_ vidhāyinīm  
 paddhatin naṭarājākyāṃ akarot sukhabodhitām 30

### Panegyric of the author of the book:

In the beginning, Śaṅkara, in order to bestow compassion on [all] men, bestowed compassion on the greatest gurus, who were called Śiva, Śikhā, Jyoti and Sāvitrī (1). From them the four lineages that are established with-in the Śaivasiddhānta came to earth, via Mantreśas, Rudras and gods (2). There came to reside (*adhyāsta*) in the continent of Bharata at the monastery called Goḷakī, † [so-called] because it takes (*lāti*) from among light (*jyotiṣām*) †,<sup>97</sup> from which there arose a lineage of gurus (3). † ... † whose [emblematic] tree is the banyan, and from which lineage [sprang]

<sup>91</sup> devaḥ] *conj.*; devaṃ MS

<sup>92</sup> sabhāpatiḥ] *conj.*; saḥāpatiḥ MS

<sup>93</sup> kṛtāgamārthavinyāsaḥ] *conj.*; kṛtāgamārttho vinyāsaḥ MS

<sup>94</sup> Jñānaśivaḥ] *conj.*; jñānaḥ śivaḥ MS

<sup>95</sup> tanmukhāj jñātasiddhāntarahasyārthaḥ samāhitaḥ] *conj.*; tanmukhā jñānasiddhāntarahasyārtthasamāhataḥ MS

<sup>96</sup> °niṣṭhānām] *conj.* Sanderson; °niṣṭhāna MS

<sup>97</sup> This attempt at a translation assumes that this is a *nirvacana* of Golakī in which the element *go* is interpreted as a “ray of light” and the element *la* is interpreted as representing the verb *lā*, a favourite root for *nirvacanas*.

that supreme (*kūṭasthaḥ*) sage the lord Dūrvāsas (4).<sup>98</sup> In this monastery was the venerable Bhāvaśambhu, the equal of Śambhu [himself].<sup>99</sup> From him descended gurus who accomplished many extraordinary feats (5). Among them, one who was from Gauḍadeśa came to Kamalālaya, approved with joy by men with the thought that this was Śiva himself who, assuming such a [human] form, had come in order to bestow salvation on Southerners: knowledgeable in grammar, exegesis and logic [this was] the venerable Brahmaśiva himself (6–7). There, on the bank of the [temple] tank [of Tiruvārūr (?)], in the Southern monastery of Golakī, he lived together with learned, fire-like ascetics, just as, once upon a time, Śiva, who is [usually] inaccessible to the senses, having reached Ādhapura taught the *sūtras* of grammar to Pāṇini (8–9).<sup>100</sup> He who has become well-known on earth as the Lord of Puṣkara, equipped with chastity, [the stored up power of] penance, knowledge, compassion, and peace, a god incarnate (*sadehikaḥ* ?), great (*mahān*), became his pupil. That was the great-souled Mahādeva, whose senses were always turned inwards [away from

<sup>98</sup> Dūrvāsas is elsewhere usually associated not with Golakī, but with Āmardaka, e.g. in Anantaśambhu's commentary on *Siddhāntasārāvalī* 116 (penultimate verse of the *kriyāpāda*), and the banyan tree is the emblematic tree of Raṇabhadra. But such an association may not be very old. The earliest account of the *gocaras* in which it appears is probably that of Aghoraśiva in his *Gotrasantati* (pp.428–9), which appears at the end of the *Mahotsavavidhi* that is attributed to him. And, as we have seen above (in footnotes 60 and 63), Aghoraśiva appears to have adopted and adapted Rāmanātha's account of the *gocaras*, changing Dūrvāsas' association with Golakī to an association with Āmardaka.

<sup>99</sup> *Ex conj.* This follows a conjecture of Alexis Sanderson (letter of 23.xi.2010): "In my view *samāsthitaḥ* yields no acceptable sense. As for what precedes, we need, I think, a name ending in śambhuḥ, with a two-syllable *pūrvapada* to make up the number of syllables required. I propose *bhāvaśambhuḥ*, understanding this as synonymous with Prabhāvaśiva/Sadbhāvaśambhu, the first abbot of the *maṭha* at Golagī."

<sup>100</sup> As Alexis Sanderson has pointed out to me (letter of 22.xi.2010), Ādhapura is to be identified with Tiruvorriyūr in North Madras. For the myth that Śiva appeared here to Pāṇini to bestow the grammar on him—hence his worship in a Maṇḍapa there as Vyākaraṇādānaperumā!—see ARIE 1913, p.110 (and ARIE 201 and 202 of 1913).

the senses] (10–11).<sup>101</sup> Just as he had learned Śaiva doctrine, so too he exerted himself in other areas. Devoid of passion, at peace, he lived there itself in Kamalālaya with his followers, who were wise ascetics, in the Monastery of the East (*prācīmaṭhe*) (12–13b). His youngest [disciple] Vāmaśiva lived in the Puṣkariṇīmaṭha (13cd).<sup>102</sup> He was a veritable (*sākṣāt*) Śiva in [his learning about] the Śaivasiddhānta, and he was famed as [a veritable] Brahmā also in craftsmanship (*śilpe*).<sup>103</sup> Knowing [the time of his] death, he deliberately left his body and entered *śiva* (13c–14). The great self-controlled disciple of [Mahā-]deva was called Devadeva,<sup>104</sup> [who]

---

<sup>101</sup> Several points are uncertain here, but it seems clear that this person was called Mahādeva from the play on words in 11a. As for where or what Puṣkara is here, I do not know. Could it be the town of Tiruvārūr? For the turning inwards of the senses, cf. the first verse of the fourth *vallī* of the *Kāthopaniṣad*.

<sup>102</sup> Is the Puṣkariṇīmaṭha not the same as the Prācīmaṭha?

<sup>103</sup> *Ex conj.* This conjecture rests on the assumption that Brahmā, as creator, is supremely skilled as a craftsman (cf., for instance, *Raghuvamśa* 7:14). Alexis Sanderson has proposed another conjecture (letter of 23.xi.2010): “I am reluctant to accept that *śrutau* is a corruption of *śrutah*, not least because Brahmā has no obvious association with Śilpa. I propose an alternative: *yah siddhānte śivas tvaṣṭā śilpe 'pi ca vidhiḥ śrutau*.” He offers this translation: ‘Śiva [himself] in [his mastery of] the Siddhānta, Tvaṣṭṛ in the practical arts, and Brahmā in [his mastery of] Śruti’.

<sup>104</sup> Several of the names in this lineage are initiatory names with the familiar ending -śiva, but the names ending in -deva (Mahādeva, Devadeva, Anantadeva, Viśveśvara-deva, Pañcākṣara-deva, Oṃkāradeva, Maheśvara-deva, Somanātha-deva) might also be initiatory names, for the endings -śiva and -deva are prescribed respectively for Brahmin and Kṣatriya initiates in Somaśambhu’s *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* (SP3, *samayadīkṣāvidhi* 107–9; Brunner 1977:96,102), as well as in several later Southern works and in one other Northern source that may be of comparable antiquity, namely Vimalācārya’s *Tattvaratnāvalī* (unnumbered folio of fragmentary codex unicus NGMPP B 26/16):

taddhaste puṣpam āropya śive prakṣepayet tataḥ  
udghāṭya netre deveśaṃ darśayen muktibhuktidam  
puṣpapātavaśān nāma śivadevagaṇāntikam

viprādīnām kramāt kuryād athavā svecchayā guruḥ  
(śivadevaṅgaṅāntikam) *conj.*; śivadeveṅgaṅāntikam MS)

Placing a flower in his [*scil.* the disciple's] hand, he should then cause him to cast it upon Śiva [in the *maṅḍala*]. Unbinding his eyes, he should cause him to see the Lord of gods [in the *maṅḍala*], who grants liberation and supernatural power. He should form his [initiatory] name according to [the mantra] where the flower falls, ending with -śiva, -deva and -gaṇa for brahmins, Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas respectively. Alternatively, the guru [may form the first part of an initiate's name] as he wishes.

Evidence for the use of the suffix -deva as the suffix of an initiatory name is confusing because the suffix is so common in non-initiatory names. A certain Bhaṭṭāraka Jñānasiu of (the temple of) Aṅṇapamveśvara is mentioned, along with several other temple priests on a 12<sup>th</sup>-century pillar inscription: bhaṭṭāraka Varuṇasiu of Aṅṇahileśvara, bhaṭṭāraka Maheśvarasiu of Jendrarājeśvara, bhaṭṭāraka Īśānū of Pṛthivīpāleśvara, bhaṭṭāraka Mukti-deu of Jojaleśvara, Vināyaka and Sāmtisiu of Tripuruṣu, bhaṭṭāraka Mūladeu of Āsāleśvara, bhaṭṭāraka Tatpuruṣa of Padmaleśvara, bhaṭṭāraka Kedārū of Tripālakeśvara, bhaṭṭāraka Brahmarāsi of Āsapāleśvara [after which are mentioned some persons styled aboṭī, whose names appear not to be initiatory ones]. All are witnesses to a deed of the townspeople of Nāḍōl on a pillar in the temple of Someśvara (Jodhpur State), dated [Vikrama-]Samvat 1198 (=1142 AD). *Epigraphia Indica* XI, No. 4.9, pp.26ff. Bhandarkar comments (p.39):

*Abōṭīs* are an inferior class of Brāhmaṇas, who are generally temple servants, and are still chiefly found in Dvārka. Of the names of the *bhaṭṭārakas* of temples, many end in *siū* (Śiva), two in *deū* (*dēva*), and only one in *rāśi*. I have elsewhere said that of the four well-known sects of the followers of Śiva, those whose names ended in Śiva were Śaivas, and those whose names ended in *rāśi* were Lakulīṣa-Pāśupatas. But to what sect the ascetics who bore the honorific suffix *deū* (*dēva*) belonged, is not clear.

It is possible that in that inscription too the names in -deva are initiatory names of initiates to the Śaivasiddhānta. Returning to our own context, some of the instances of -deva are clearly intended as suffixes (see, e.g., 25c: *omkāropapado devaḥ*), but in some cases the element deva precedes or is separated from the name (e.g. 22c, 26a, 26c), which suggests rather that

deva might be used as a title. But we should not lose sight of the possibility that some of the initiates of this lineage, including perhaps Rāmanātha, were non-brahmin.

Alexis Sanderson has kindly sent me (letter of 22.xi.2010) the following list of Saiddhāntika names in -deva extracted from his prosopography file:

Aghoradeva. An inscription of the reign of an unidentified Jaṭāvarman Tribhuvanacakravartin Vīrapāṇḍyadeva (362 of 1916) records a grant to an Aghoradeva of the Jñānāmṛtācāryasam̐tāna of the Golakīmaṭha (at Kallaḍakurucci in the Tinnevely district). He is called Śoḷan Śīyan alias Aghoradeva in a record of the fourth year of the reign of Māravarman Tribhuvanacakravartin Sundarapāṇḍya. See Saletore, Ancient Karnataka, p. 398. 358 of 1916, an inscription of Māravarman Sundarapāṇḍya, tells us that Aghoradeva alias Śoḷan Śīyan belonged to the Jīyar santāna of the Golakī school (Swamy 1975, p. 175).

Aghoradeva. Of the Āmuṇḍamaṭha. See Nandikeśvarasantāna. 422 of 1907. Aghoradevarāvaḷar. alias Śivadavanapperumāl. 145 of 1932/3, AD 1216. See -rāvaḷar and cf. Rāvaḷan.

Astradeva. Guru of Vandandeva (q.v.); Guru of the Kīḷaimaṭha lineage. Tiruvārūr, Tañjāvūr district. 131 and 132 of 1894.

Īśānadeva. Alias Sadavacananallur. Resided with his pupils in the Nailapperumal maṭha at Karungalam. They came from the Kṛṣṇagolakimaṭha at Tiruvārūr in the Tanjore District. 504 of 1909, time of Sundarapāṇḍya I (c. AD 1250–).

Īśānadeva. Maṭhādhipati. 311 of 1927/8. Swamy 1975, p. 187. = Īśānaśiva.

Jñānamūrtideva. Of the Āmuṇḍamaṭha. 560 of 1911. Swamy 1975, p. 181. But on p. 176 he refers to the same as Jñānāmṛtadeva; see Nandikeśvarasantāna.

Tatpuruṣadeva. of the Jñānāmṛtācāryasam̐tāna (q.v.). 364 of 1916.

Namaśśivāyadeva. Abbot of the Nārpetteṇṇāyiravan maṭha of the Tirucchattimurram lineage at Tirunaikkaval (ARE Part II, § 53). Swamy 1975, p. 176.

Namaśśivāyadeva. Of the Āṇḍār-marudapperumāl lineage at Tirucchengat-tankuḍi; abbot of the Śiṛutondar maṭha. 76 of 1922, AD 1232, from Siyatunagai, Nannilam taluk, in the Tañjāvūr district. Swamy 1975, p. 184.

Namaśśivāyadeva. Attached to the Terkil maṭha. 95 of 1942/3. Swamy 1975, p. 186.

Vandandeva. Disciple of Astradeva; a guru of the Kīḷaimaṭha lineage. Tiruvārūr, Tañjāvūr district. 131 and 132 of 1894.

practised difficult asceticism at Śrīśaila, eating [only] roots and fruits (15).<sup>105</sup> His greatest disciple was the venerable teacher of Naṭarāja,<sup>106</sup> by whom also this same [monastery at] Kamalālaya was inherited (16). Effortlessly... famed as Nṛttarāja<sup>107</sup> ... (17). Who attained the farther shore of all disciplines of knowledge...; who, out of compassion, performed a *śrāddha*-rite (*piṇḍam dadau*) at Gayā (18); Whose actions were [all] worship of Śiva; whose spontaneous conversation (*svairakathā*) was the muttering of mantras (*japaḥ*);<sup>108</sup> the chance fall of whose glance (*caḥṣuḥpātaḥ*)<sup>109</sup> brought about Śiva-hood (19). His erudite disciple was the serene-minded Ananta-Deva (?), and the venerable Tatpuruṣaśiva, full of learning and virtue, and also Śrīkaṇṭhaśiva, superior in asceticism and wisdom, an ocean of knowledge, known on earth by the title “Head of the Monastery of the East” (20–21). And there was also Viśveśvara-deva, a commentator on the Śaiva scriptures and a Paṇḍit in grammar and the others [of

---

Vāgīśvaradeva. A Guru of the Kīlaimaṭha lineage. Cidambaram. 483 of 1920.  
Viśveśvaradeva. Mudaliyār connected with the Tyagavinodan maṭha in Tirukacchiyur in the Chinglepet district. 58 of 1932/2, time of Vijatagaṇḍagopāla (13<sup>th</sup> c.).

Viśveśvaradeva. Of the Periyamaṭha at Tiruvannamalai. 305 of 1919, AD 1359, of Kampana Odeyar (Vijayanagara dynasty). Swamy 1975, p. 186.

Śivadeva. Alias Kayilāyadevan; 1of the Kīlaimaṭha lineage; Vikkiramangalam, Madurai district. 617 of 1926.

<sup>105</sup> *Ex conj.* One might equally have conjectured *mūlaphalāśanaḥ* (perhaps the commonest cliché), or *pattraphalāśanaḥ*, or *ṭṭṇaphalāśanaḥ*, or *parṇaphalāśanaḥ*. Alexis Sanderson has pointed out, however, that these last three seem somewhat extreme, and suggests therefore *śākaphalāśanaḥ* (letter of 23.xi.2010).

<sup>106</sup> If the text is correct here, then this should be Rāmanātha’s guru’s guru, in which case the several students who follow from verse 18 onwards must have been colleagues. This seems to be confirmed by verse 27 below.

<sup>107</sup> *Ex conj.* Cf. verses 16 and 27.

<sup>108</sup> *Ex conj.* This is the proposal of Alexis Sanderson (letters of 22.xi.2010 and 23.xi.2010) who referred to a number of other parallels for the use of the expression *svairakathā*, e.g. *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā* 50.9c–10b and Kṣemendra’s *Avadānakalpalatā* 8.5cd, and who also pointed to *Śivasūtra* 3.27: *kathā japaḥ*.

<sup>109</sup> *Ex conj.* This is again the suggestion of Sanderson (letter of 22.xi.2010). If one were to retain *caḥṣuḥ pādo yadṛcchayā*, then one could interpret “whose [mere] glance or [the touch of whose] foot, [met with] by chance, brought about Śiva-hood”.

the basic disciplines, namely exegesis and logic], and whose disciple was the excellent teacher Pañcākṣara-deva, wise and focussed upon the five-syllabled mantra, [and] Triyambakaśiva, like a muni by his peace and his asceticism (22–23). After him [came] the wise ... (...*sabhāpatiḥ*),<sup>110</sup> calm, intelligent Jñānaśiva, by whom a compendium of scriptural doctrine was produced (*kṛtāgamārthavinyāsaḥ*) (24).<sup>111</sup> Then the calm repository of scripture called Nīlakaṇṭhaśiva, [and] Omkāradeva, devoid of all attachments [to this world], [and] Maheśvaradeva, calm, possessed of [the stored up power of] asceticism, wisdom and compassion, [and] the learned, intelligent Somanātha-deva, an ascetic (25–26). Of this glorious Nṛttarāja, whose fiery power was that of Śrīkaṇṭha [himself], and of whom all these [above-named] teachers and wise followers of religious observance until death (*prājñās ca naiṣṭhikāḥ*) were disciples, the glorious bearer of the name Rāmeśvaranātha, born of a family of the same *varṇa* (*savarṇakulasambhavaḥ*), was the disciple (27–28b). Concentratedly he learned the secret doctrines of the Siddhānta from his [viz. Nṛttarāja's] mouth (28cd). Pontiff of the monastery to the east of the temple of the venerable Puṣpavanādhīśvara [when] two hundred less twenty years of the Śaka era † [had passed?] † , [i.e. in 980, viz. 1058 AD,] he produced [this] manual, called the *Naṭtarāja*, which is easily taught,<sup>112</sup> and which performs † ... † for those belonging to the Goḷakī monastery (29–30).<sup>113</sup>

<sup>110</sup> A small emendation of *sahāpatiḥ* to *sabhāpatiḥ* has been made, but I have hesitated to fill out the gap. This could be done, for example by reading *śrīmān Dabhrasabhāpatiḥ*, in which case this would be an anthroponym based on the name of the deity in Chidambaram. But Alexis Sanderson has suggested to me (letter of 23.xi.2010) that it is more likely to be an adjective qualifying Jñānaśiva, and has proposed ‘something like *arcitacitsabhāpatiḥ*’.

<sup>111</sup> *Ex conj.* This appears to refer to the composition of at least one non-exegetical doctrinal work by a South Indian contemporary of Rāmanātha.

<sup>112</sup> Perhaps one could consider correcting here to *sukhabodhinīm*, “which teaches easily”.

<sup>113</sup> Alexis Sanderson (2<sup>nd</sup> letter of 23.xi.2010) made the following helpful observation on this half-line: “I am not sure what the idea is here. But it is probably what could be expressed by, e.g., *golakīmaṭhaniṣṭhānām samyagvidhividhāyinīm* or *kriyākāṇḍavidhāyinīm* or similar, i.e. something like ‘that ordains the ritual procedures to be followed by those who are initiates of the Golakīmaṭha’.”

There follows below a schematic representation of what the above account tells us about Rāmanātha's lineage.



## Bibilography:

### Primary sources:

ARIE *Annual Reports on Indian Epigraphy*

EI *Epigraphia Indica*

NAK *National Archives, Kathmandu*

NGMPP *Nepal-German Manuscripts Preservation Project*

SII *South Indian Inscriptions*

*Avadānakalpalatā* of Kṣemendra. *Avadāna=kalpalatā of Kṣemendra. Volume I*, ed. P.L. Vaidya. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 22. Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1959.

*Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā. The Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā of the Pāñcarātrāgama*, ed. M.D. Ramanujacharya, under the supervision of F. Otto Schrader, revised by V. Krishnamacharya. The Adyar Library Series 4. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1966.

*Kāthopaniṣad*. See Olivelle 1998.

*Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu. *Karmakanda Kramavali* by Sri Somashambhu, ed. Jagaddhar Zadoo. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 73. Srinagar, 1947. See Brunner 1963–1998.

*Kriyākramadyotikā* of Aghoraśivācārya with the commentary (*Prabhāvyaākhyā*) of Nirmalamaṇi, ed. Rāmaśāstrin and Ambalavānājñānasambandha-parāśaktivāmin. Chidambaram, 1927.

*Tattvaratnāvalī* of Vimalaśiva. NAK 1-1697 7/6, NGMPP B 26/16. Fragmentary palm-leaf manuscript in a non-Nepalese Nāgarī script that uses *ṣṛṣṭhamātra* vowel-notation. There are twenty-six disordered leaves, on some of which foliation is still visible.

*Tēvāram. Hymnes sivaïtes du pays tamoul, édition établie par T.V. Gopal Iyer sous la direction de François Gros, volume II Appar et Cuntarar*. Publications de l'Institut français d'Indologie 68.2. Pondicherry: IFI, 1985.

*Digital Tēvāram*, ed. V.M. Subrahmanya Aiyar, Jean-Luc Chevillard and S.A.S. Sarma. Collection Indologie 103. Pondicherry: IFP, EFEO, 2007.

*Naṭarājapaddhati* of Rāmanātha. Preliminary electronic text typed in by Nirajan Kifle, Michael Gollner, Dominic Goodall, S.A.S. Sarma, and R. Sathyanarayanan from the Paper Devanāgarī MS at the Math in Tiruvāṭaturai.

*Pañcāvaraṇastava* of Aghoraśiva. The Pañcāvaraṇastava of Aghoraśivācārya: A twelfth-century South Indian prescription for

the visualisation of Sadāśiva and his retinue. An annotated critical edition by: Dominic Goodall, Nibedita Rout, R. Sathyanarayanan, S.A.S. Sarma, T. Ganesan, S. Sambandhaśivācārya. Collection Indologie 102. Pondicherry: IFP/EFEO, 2004 (appeared 2005).

*Śivasūtra. The Shiva Sūtra Vimarshinī being the Sūtras of Vasu Gupta with The Commentary called Vimarshinī by Kṣhemarāja*, ed. J.C. Chatterji. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 1. Srinagar, 1911.

*Sārdhatrīśatikālottara. Sārdhatrīśatikālottarāgama avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakāṅṭha*, ed. N.R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI No.61. Pondicherry: IFP, 1979.

*Siddhāntadīpikā* of Rāmanātha. IFP MSS T.284, pp.48–89, and T.914. Paper transcripts in Devanāgarī.

*Siddhāntasārāvālī* of Trilocanaśiva. with the commentary (*vyākhyā*) of Anantaśivācārya, published in five parts in the Bulletin of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library Madras Vol.17.1, pp.29–68 (ed. A.A. Ramanathan and T.H. Viswanathan); Vols.17.2, pp.1–48; 18.1, pp.1–64 and 19.1, pp.53–84 (ed. R.K. Parthasarathi and T.H. Viswanathan); Vol.19.2 pp.1–48 and Vol.20.2, pp.49–71 (ed. T.H. Viswanathan, P.G. Seetharaman and R. Ganesan). Madras, 1965–1968.

### Secondary sources:

Bhandarkar, D.R. The Chahamanas of Marwar. In: *Epigraphia Indica* XI (1911–12): 26–79.

Brunner, H. (ed. and trans.). 1963, 1968, 1977, 1998. *Somaśambhupaddhati. 4 vols: Première Partie. Le rituel quotidien dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu; Deuxième Partie. Rituel Occasionnels dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu I : Pavitrārohaṇa, Damanapūjā et Prāyaścitta; and Troisième Partie. Rituels occasionnels dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu II : dīkṣā, abhiṣeka, vratoddhāra, antyeṣṭi, śrāddha; and Rituels dans la tradition śivaïte selon Somaśambhu. Quatrième partie : rituels optionnels : pratiṣṭhā*. Publications de l'IFI No.25. Pondicherry: IFI.

Ghose, R. 1996. *The Lord of Ārūr. The Tyāgarāja cult in Tamilnāḍu. A Study in Conflict and Accomodation*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

- Goodall, D. (Ed. and trans.) 1998. *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra. Volume I: chapters 1–6. Critical edition and annotated translation*. Publications du département d'indologie 86.1. Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry/ École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Goodall, D. 2000. Problems of Name and Lineage: relationships between South Indian authors of the Śaiva Siddhānta. [a review article of Brunner 1998]. In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Series 3, Vol. 10, Part 2: 205–16.
- Goodall, D. (Ed. and trans.) 2004. *The Parākhyatantra, a scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta. A critical edition and annotated translation*. Collection Indologie 98. Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry/ École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Goodall, D. et al. 2005. See *Pañcāvaraṇastava*.
- Hanneder, J. 2010. Introduction. In: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, LII–LIII (2009–2010): 5–16.
- Hultzsch, Eugen, 1890. South-Indian Inscriptions, II, No. 1, p.2 Madras.
- Isaacson, H. 2011. *Yoginīyoga/Yogin as Yoginī. On the sādhana of female deities in Indian mantranaya Buddhism*. Handout for a presentation given at the Śākta Traditions Conference organised by the Oxford Centre for Hindu Studies given on 11.ix.2011. (Downloaded from <https://uni-hamburg.academia.edu/HarunagaIsaacson> on 26.v.2014.)
- Kaimal, P. 1999. Shiva Nataraja: Shifting Meanings of an Icon. In: *The Art Bulletin* 81 (1999): 390–419.
- Olivelle, P. 1998. *The Early Upaniṣads. Annotated Text and Translation*. New York–Oxford: OUP.
- Rastelli, M. 2007. The “Pāñcarātra Passages” in Agnipurāṇa 21–70. In: D. Goodall and A. Padoux (Eds). *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner. Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*. Collection Indologie 106. Pondichéry : IFP/EFEO: 187–229.
- Sanderson, A. 2004. The Śaiva Religion among the Khmers (Part I). In: *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 90–91 (2003–2004): 349–462.
- Sanderson, A. 2006. The Date of Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati. In: *Cracow Indological Studies* 8 (2006): 39–91.

- 
- Sanderson, A. 2007. The Śaiva Exegesis of Kashmir. In: D. Goodall and A. Padoux (Eds). *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner. Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*. Collection Indologie 106. Pondichéry : IFP/EFEO: 231–442.
- Sanderson, A. 2009. The Śaiva Age—The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism in the Early Medieval Period. In: S. Eino (Ed.). *The Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo: 41–349.
- Wessels-Mevissen, C. 2012. The Early Image of Śiva Natarāja: Aspects of Time and Space. In: D. Boschung and C. Wessels-Mevissen (Eds). *Figurations of Time in Asia*. Morphomata volume 4. Munich: Wilhelm Fink: 298–348.

