

ŚĀKTA TRADITIONS AMONG THE ŚAIVAS OF KASHMIR

Handout for a Lecture recorded online in two parts on 12 and 27 October, 2020
for the Oxford Centre for Hindu Studies

Alexis Sanderson

Not to be quoted without the author's permission

A. The earliest evidence of Śaivism

1. Four theories rejected:

- a) The claim that the figure with a horned head-dress seated in a 'yogic' posture and allegedly three-faced and ithyphallic depicted on a steatite seal (no. 420) unearthed at Mohenjo-daro from the Indus Valley Civilization of approximately 2600–1900 BC "is recognizable at once as the prototype of the historic Śiva" (MARSHALL 1931, vol. 1, p. 52). A sober analysis of this figure (SRINIVASAN 1976) in the light of two other seals (no. 222 and no. 235) has shown that the supposed erect penis is in fact the end of the waistband, and that the supposed two lateral faces are rather the ears of a bull-headed figure. The affinities of this and other bull-man, horn-crowned Indus valley icons are to be found not in post-Vedic India but in the trans-Elamite culture of southeast Iran and western Balochistan that developed from the Mesopotamian Early Dynastic period (2900–2334 B.C.) to Ur-III times (ca. 2000–1900 B.C.) (WINKELMANN 2000).
- b) The view that when the *Rgveda* deprecates the *śiśnādevāḥ* 'those whose god is the penis' it refers to worshippers of the Liṅga, the phallic substrate of Śiva's worship, and therefore provides evidence that Śaivism was already current in the subcontinent more than fifteen hundred years before the Common Era. In 7.21.5 the poet prays that the *śiśnādevāḥ* will not attack "our truth" (*mā śiśnādevā āpi gur ṛtām naḥ*) and in 10.99.3 we are told that Indra slew them. The meaning intended is more probably 'those whose highest object of veneration is [their own] sex organs', alleging godless carnality rather than Śaiva religious practice. Cf. classical Skt. *śiśnodaraparāyaṇaḥ* 'intent above all on [satisfying] penis and belly' in, for example, *Mahābhārata* 12.287.25b. But even if the expression refers to real rather than figurative worship and even if there were a historical link between this penis-worship deprecated in the *Rgveda* and the much later Śaiva worship of the Liṅga, it would not follow that this ancient antecedent was in any sense Śaiva.
- c) The view that Śiva is the identity of the Indian 'Dionysos' of the Greek author Megasthenes (c. 350–c. 290 BC), who, according to his own testimony visited India in an embassy sent to Candragupta Maurya (r. c. 321–c. 297 BC) and wrote about the country and its people, drawing on the interpretations of other Greeks, in a lost work known to us in part through the testimony of later historians from the first century B.C. to the second century A.D. According to the 'fragments' of this work reported by these authors Megasthenes associated his Indian 'Dionysus' with wine and Bacchanalian rites; and this has prompted the conclusion

that he must have had Śiva in mind, since Śiva was believed to have a similarly orgiastic nature. But that belief was derived from much later and inapposite Śākta Śaiva sources. If any Indian god was associated at this time with wine-drinking and drunken revels it was Baladeva (Balarāma, Saṃkarṣaṇa), the older brother of the god Vāsudeva (Kṛṣṇa) who has been thought to be the Indian ‘Heracles’, the only other Indian cult figure mentioned by Megasthenes. The choice of Heracles and Dionysus for this *interpretatio graeca* of Indian religion is at first sight surprising. The explanation lies in the fact that Megasthenes was drawing on the reports of those who had accompanied Alexander in his invasion of India in 327 BC and were seeking to magnify their heroic leader. For Alexander (r. 336–323 BC) believed that Heracles and Dionysus were his forefathers, that they had penetrated Asia as far as India before him, and that he was following their example, even surpassing it. If my hypothesis is correct that the true identities of Megasthenes’ Indian manifestations of Dionysus and Heracles are Saṃkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva, then this is strong evidence that the cult of the two Bhāgavats goes back at least to the late fourth century B.C. A reference to the pair in the *Mahāniddeśa* may be almost as old, but the dating of such Pali materials is uncertain. Otherwise the earliest evidence is from the second century B.C.: a coin issued by the Seleucid governor Agathocles (r. c. 190–c. 180 BC [BOPEARACHCHI 1991, p. 56]) found in the region of Ai Khanum, which shows Baladeva on the obverse and Vāsudeva on the reverse (AUDOUIN and BERNARD 1974).

- d) The fourth claim is that there is knowledge of Śaivism, indeed of the Śākta Śaiva cult of the goddess Kālī, in the Pāli Buddhist canon (GOMBRICH 1996, pp. 135–164: Who was Aṅgulimāla?). If this claim is sound then worship of Śiva was already current in some form as early as the fourth century B.C. But as MAITHRIMURTHI and ROSPATT have shown (1998, pp. 169–173) and as I shall demonstrate with further arguments in a future publication (*Rules and Records*), none of the evidence adduced survives scrutiny.

Now, although there may be no evidence of knowledge of Śaivism in the Pali canon, absence of evidence is not evidence of absence; and there is no evidence of which I am aware that excludes the possibility that the worship of Śiva was present somewhere in the Indian subcontinent during this early period. However, we may be confident that if such worship was present it was not important enough to merit attention in the earliest Buddhist literature. Particularly significant is the silence of the Pali *Mahāniddeśa*. For that text, possibly composed as early as 300 B.C. (NORMAN 1983, pp. 84–87; cf. HINÜBER 1996, pp. 58–59), catalogues the observances (Skt. *vrātam*) adopted by non-Buddhist votaries to propitiate gods (*devatā*). The gods listed are Vāsudeva (/Kṛṣṇa), Baladeva (/Saṃkarṣaṇa), the two Yakṣa generals Pūrṇabhadra and Maṇibhadra, Agni, the Nāgas, the Suparṇas, the Yakṣas, the Asuras, the Gandharvas, the [four] Mahārājas (Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Virūḍhaka, Virūpākṣa, and Vaiśravaṇa, who guard the world in the four directions), the Moon, the Sun, Indra, Brahmā, the Devas, and the Directions. This evidence is particularly striking because it reports the propitiation of the Bhāgavata deities Vāsudeva and Baladeva; indeed it places their cults at the head of its list of deity-observances (*vāsudevavatikā vā honti baladevavatikā vā honti* [*vāsudevavratikā vā bhavanti baladevavatikā vā bhavanti*]). If Śiva had been known

at this early period as a deity with a significant following, then we would expect that they would have been mentioned here at least. Their absence strongly suggests that this other tradition, which would rival and overshadow Vaiṣṇavism in later centuries, had not yet emerged with any strength, if at all.

2. Earliest literary evidence: the grammarian Patañjali, probably around the middle of the 2nd century B.C., commenting in his *Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.3.99: images of Śiva; on 5.2.76: pike-carrying Śivabhāgavatas; and on 6.3.26: Śiva-and-Vaiśravaṇa (*śivavaiśravaṇau*). This archaic pairing of Śiva and Vaiśravaṇa is seen also in the Jaina *Aṃgavijjā*, the *Arthaśāstra*, and the *Mahābhārata*.
3. Earliest epigraphic evidence:
 - a) *CII* 2 i:26 (= *SI* 2:32), an inscription in a northwestern Prakrit written in the Kharoṣṭhī script found at Panjtār between the Swat and Indus rivers in what is now the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province of Pakistan, formerly known as the North-West Frontier Province. It records that one Moika, son of Urumuja—the names are Iranian rather than Indian—had a *śivasthalam* made there, ‘a precinct for [the worship of] Śiva’. The inscription is dated in year 122 of an unspecified era during the reign of an unnamed Kushan ruler. The era is almost certainly that of the Indo-Scythian king Azes I, giving a probable date of c. A.D. 75 for this foundation. This date depends on the date of the era of Azes argued by FALK and BENNETT (2009).
 - b) A fragmentary record (*IAR* 1981–82, p. 79, no. 16; *EI* 41:16) in central-western Prakrit in the Brāhmī script at Vāsana in the Dharwad District of Karnataka reports a donation to a temple of Caṇḍaśivamahādeva during the time of the Sātavāhana king Vāsiṭhīputa Siri (Vāsiṭhīputraśrī-) Puḷumāvi II, whose reign spanned the turn of the first and second centuries A.D.
 - c) That the worship of Śiva was a relatively late phenomenon in the Deccan, or at least late in its recognition by the Sātavāhanas, is suggested by the formula of obeisance that opens the Prakrit inscription (*SI* II:76–81) of Nāyanikā, consort of the early Sātavāhana king Sātakaṇi I at the top of Nāṇeghāt pass in the Western Ghats. For in the proemium of this record, which was written in the second half of the first century A.D., obeisance is offered only to Prajāpati, Dharma, Indra, Saṃkarṣaṇa-and-Vāsudeva, Candra-and-Sūrya, the four Lokapālas Yama, Varuṇa, Kubera, and Indra, and Kumāra (Skanda). This list is strikingly similar to the list of deities whose votaries’ practices are attacked in the Buddhist *Mahāniddeśa*. There is no mention of Śiva/Maheśvara.
 - d) After the Vāsana record I know of no epigraphic evidence of any other Śaiva foundation of which we can be sure that it predates the fourth century. From that time onwards epigraphic and literary evidence is abundant.
 - e) Numismatic evidence. Further evidence has been adduced from legends on coins and the figures that they identify, which if it were genuine, would greatly raise the profile of Śaivism from the second century B.C. to the fourth century A.D., between the Mauryas (–185 B.C.)

and the Guptas (335 A.D.–). For it has been maintained that we have abundant proof of recognition of the importance of Śaivism from as early as the late second century B.C. on coin issues of the foreigners who ruled parts of northern India during this period, namely the Indo-Greeks, Indo-Scythians, Indo-Parthians, and Kushans.

- i. The Indian humped bull, the zebu (*Bos primigenius*), that appears on the reverse of some coins of the Greek mint of Gandhāra has been interpreted as the bull that is Śiva's mount and therefore as establishing beyond doubt that the Indo-Greek rulers of this region had co-opted this deity. But there is no proof here, since there are good reasons to doubt that the bull had this meaning in the Hellenistic context. For it had already been used by the Seleucids, appearing on the reverse of coins of Seleucus I Nicator (r. c. 355–c. 281 B.C.) (GARDINER 1878). Moreover, while the zebu does appear on the reverse of some coin issues of seven of the thirty-two known Indo-Greek rulers of the region to the south of the Hindukush, from the second century B.C. to the first A.D. (BOPEARACHCHI 1991), there is in this fact nothing that implies any association with Śiva and much that tells against it, namely that it appears on coins that are Greek in all other respects.
- ii. The same claim has been made for the bull that appears on coins of the Indo-Scythian (Śaka) Maues (BANERJEA 1956), who ruled in the same region during the first century B.C. But it fails for the same reason: though the bull is certainly Indian, it is depicted standing behind a figure of the Greek goddess Artemis, and the only other deities found on Maues' coins are also Greek: Zeus, Nike, Apollo, Heracles, Poseidon, and Athene.
- iii. Nor am I persuaded by the claim (BANERJEA 1956) that Śiva is represented in the figure that holds a trident and a club on the obverse of some of the coins of Maues and a trident and palm-branch on the obverse of some of those of Gondophares (Pkt. Guduvhara), the Indo-Parthian who ruled Arachosia, Seistan, Sindh, Panjab, and the Kabul valley from c. 20 to c. 46 A.D. The deity portrayed on these coins is more probably Poseidon, in keeping with the other deities on the coins of these rulers, all of whom are Greek.
- iv. It has also been widely asserted that from the beginning of the second century AD to the early fourth Śiva appears on the reverse of several of the coin issues of the Kushans, beginning from the reign of Vima II Kadphises (r. c. AD 95–c. 127) and ending with that of Bazodēo/Vāsudeva II (r. c. AD 275–c. 310), and of one group of those of Ohrmazd, Pērōz, and Wāhrām among the Kushano-Sasanian governors of eastern Iran during the second half of the third century after the conquests of the Sasanian Ardašīr I (r. AD 224–241 AD) had deprived the Kushans of their western territories. The deity is two-, four-, or six-armed, sometimes three-faced, sometimes accompanied by a bull, sometimes with an erect penis, and holds a trident. It has been assumed from the similarity with the iconography of Śiva in later times that this shows that the Kushans had adopted Śiva as one of their tutelary deities, adding him

to their non-Indian and predominantly Iranian pantheon. But against this striking iconic similarity must be set the fact that the deity is identified in the modified Greek majuscule script used for the Bactrian legends on these coins as OHPO (*Wēš).

But this is the East-Iranian wind-god (TANABE 1992 and 1997) who surfaces later in Sogdian Buddhist sources of the seventh to ninth century as the three-faced deity Wēšparkar (*wyšprkr*) seen in pictorial representations found in mural paintings of the early eighth century excavated at Panjikent in the Sugdh province of Tajikistan, in another mural of approximately the same period excavated in the palace of Qal'a-i Qahqaha in Ustrushana, a principality bordering Sugdh, and in a painted wooden panel found at Dandān Uiliq in the Khotan oasis in southwestern Chinese Turkestan. One of those at Panjikent bears an inscription that gives the deity's name.

That this is a wind-god follows from recognition that the name Wēš-parkar is a Middle Iranian descendant of Avestan *vāyuš uparōkairyo*, the name of the wind-god in the nominative singular followed by an epithet *uparōkairya-*, a combination that occurs several times in the scriptural corpus of the Zoroastrians, both in that of the priestly liturgy and in that of the prayers to be recited by the faithful on everyday occasions. *uparōkairya-* is rendered *aparkār* in the Pahlavi translation (BARTHOLOMAE 1904, s.v.).

The iconographic similarity between Wēš and Śiva remains to be explained; but the assumption that this must be understood as the result of the absorption by Wēš of features proper to an already canonized iconography of Śiva is unjustified. I favour the alternative hypothesis that Wēš contributed to the evolution of that iconography, as occurred with three other major deities of the Kushans' pantheon: Ardoxšo in the cases of Hārītī and Lakṣmī, Nana in that of Durgā, and Srošard in that of Skanda.

- f) It is apparent, then, that firm evidence of Śaivism during the centuries between Patañjali and the Guptas is so sparse that one might be tempted to conclude that at this time devotion to Śiva was a marginal phenomenon in comparison with Buddhism, Jainism, and Vaiṣṇavism. We certainly have far less epigraphic evidence of its patronage during this period.
- g) However, the epigraphic record also reveals that although the cult of Śiva/Maheśvara was not yet a major beneficiary of support by India's rulers and although in all likelihood it had not yet developed competitive soteriological aspirations, it was nonetheless common and widespread in the population, and that this was the case throughout the subcontinent. We may infer this from the fact that theophoric names beginning with Śiva- and meaning, for example, 'Given by Śiva', 'Servant of Śiva', or 'Protected by Śiva', are well represented from the second century B.C. to the third century A.D. among the many lay donors named in the Buddhist and Jaina donative inscriptions of that period found at such widely separated sites as Bīmarān in Afghanistan, Chilās in the Upper Indus region, Shahdaur in Hazara, Ahicchatra and Mathurā in northern India, Kaṇheri and Nāsik in Maharashtra, and Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, Bhaṭṭiprolu, and Amarāvati in Andhra. This is also the period during which the anthropomorphic iconography of Śiva begins to take shape and the Liṅga, Śiva's phallic emblem and principal substrate of worship, emerges in the archaeological record and passes

through the greater part of the changes of design that lead to its classical, less naturalistic form (MITTERWALLNER 1984; SRINIVASAN 1984; KREISEL 1986).

From this evidence I conclude that when Śaivism did rise to prominence in the epigraphic record, as it did in later centuries, it did so on the back of an already well-established and widespread tradition of popular devotion that goes back at least to the second century B.C.

- h) Growing Buddhist attention to the worship of Śiva from the first century A.D. onwards.
- i. Though awareness of the existence of votaries of Śiva is lacking in the Pāli canon it does appear in later works, as the cult of Śiva became more prominent. In the *Vinaya* of the Dharmaguptakas, composed in Gandhāra around the beginning of the Christian era we encounter Maheśvara in a series of deities whom a certain king is said to have worshipped successfully in order to obtain offspring (IYANAGA cites and paraphrases this passage in 1983, p. 723a10–19): Pūrṇabhadra, Mañibhadra, the Sun, the Moon, Indra, Brahmā, Pṛthivī, Agni, Vāyu, **Maheśvara**, gods of gardens, woods, the wilderness, and markets, Hārītī, and gods of walled towns.
 - ii. He also appears in the same context, but now under the name Śiva, and at the head of the list, in the *Cīvaravastu* of the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, not produced before the reign of the Kushan Kaniṣka I (AD 127–147) and probably during it, in a passage concerning a householder of Śrāvastī: “Being without a son and desiring a son he prays to Śiva, Varuṇa, Kubera, Indra, Brahmā and other deities, who are specific [to particular places], namely deities of gardens, woods, squares, crossroads, also deities that receive Bali offerings, deities that are of his lineage, of his religion, and permanently attached to him” (*GM*, vol. 3, pt. 2, p. 139).
 - iii. Maheśvara appears in the literature of Mahāyāna Buddhism as an interlocutor. He appears in this role in the early version of the *Lalitavistara* translated into Chinese in A.D. 308 and in that of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* translated in A.D. 286.
 - iv. However, at this early stage there is as yet no sign of Buddhist defensive hostility to Śaivism, nothing that would suggest that Śaivism had already achieved the status of a significant rival.
 - v. The earliest evidence of such hostility appears to my knowledge in the Mahāyānist *Ratnaketuparivarta* of the *Mahāsannipāta* Sūtra collection, also called the *Ratnaketudhāraṇīsūtra*, first translated into Chinese during the first quarter of the fifth century. There the wicked Māra appears before the Buddha in the form of Śiva (Īśvara, Maheśvara) and tries in vain to lure him and his followers from the Buddhist path by offering to teach him his own path to true liberation. The episode is present not only in the Gilgit manuscript of the Sanskrit text, probably of the seventh century, but also in the two Chinese translations, the first completed by Dharmakṣema between 416 and 426. Here we see the beginning of the response to the rise of Śaivism that would culminate in the eighth century and after in the mythology and iconography of the violent Buddhist

subjection and conversion of the Śaiva deities seen in the Buddhist Yogatantras and Yoginītantras.

- i) Evidence of Śaivism's rise to dominance after the Gupta period:
 - i. The great preponderance in quantity and quality of Śaiva temples.
 - ii. The great preponderance of Śaiva foundations in the epigraphic record.
 - iii. The powerful influence exerted on surrounding traditions, leading to Vajrayāna Buddhism, neo-Pañcarātra (*Jayākhyasamhitā*, *Sātvatasamhitā*, *Pauṣkarasamhitā* etc.), and the Jaina liturgical system of the *Nirvāṇakalikā* (redacted on the basis of the 11th-century Saiddhāntika Śaiva *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* of Bhojadeva), such Jaina Mantraśāstra texts as the *Bhairavapadmāvatīkalpa* and the *Jvālāmālinīkalpa*, and the Yogaśāstra of Hemacandra.

B. The forms of Śaivism:

Lay Śaivism: *Śivadharma*, *Śivadharmottara* etc., *Ur-Skandapurāṇa*, *Vāyupurāṇa* etc. Traditions largely independent of those of initiatory Śaivism.

Initiatory Śaivism: Atimārga, Mantramārga, and Kulamārga.

1. Atimārga:

- a) Atimārga I: Pāñcārthika Pāśupatas: *Pañcārtha* (*Pāśupatasūtra*) and its commentary (*Pañcārthabhāṣya*) by Kauṇḍinya; *Gaṇakārikā* and commentary; some minor tracts. Earliest epigraphic evidence, early 4th century, but pointing to the existence of this tradition perhaps as early as the 2nd century. Invested brahman men only.
- b) Atimārga II: Lākulas / Kālamukhas / Mahāvratas. No surviving scriptures, only a list of their names, a single citation of one of these, and a brief but informative account of their beliefs and world-rejecting, antinomian practices in the *Niśvāsamukha* of the *Niśvāsa* corpus, the earliest texts of the Mantramārga, probably 5th to 7th centuries A.D., backed up by later Śrīvaiṣṇava attacks in the works of Yāmunācārya and Rāmānuja.

The *Niśvāsa* corpus inherits and extends the cosmos of the Lākulas and gives us the distinction between the Atimārga (in which it recognizes only Atimārga I and II) and the Mantramārga, which it announces as its own system.

Earliest evidence: predates the *Niśvāsa* corpus and so probably earlier than the 5th century. Abundant epigraphic evidence in later centuries, mostly from Maharashtra and Karnataka.

- c) **ATIMĀRGA III:** Kāpālikas, followers of the Somasiddhānta, also called Mahāvratins. No surviving scriptures. However, it is very likely that Kāpālika scriptural material has been carried forward into some of the scriptures of the Vidyāpīṭha of the non-Siddhāntika Mantramārga.

The irruption of Śāktism into the Atimārga: the incorporation in Atimārga III of antinomian cults of Bhairava and Cāmuṇḍā/Carcikā (the emaciated goddess); possession; collective orgiastic worship (→ the Vidyāpīṭha of the Mantramārga, and the Kulamārga).

No reference to this tradition before the fifth century. The earliest reference to Kāpālikas that I have encountered may be in Agastyasimha's Prakrit commentary (*cūrṇī*) on the Jain *Dasaveyāliyasutta*, *Gāthā* 237, p. 232 on *kupāsamḍiṇo* 'followers of bad religious practices': *abambhacāriṇo kāvāliyādayo rattavadādayo ya samcaiyā | evamādayo davvabhikkhavo bhavaṃti* 'Insincere mendicants are, for example, non-celibate ascetics such as the Kāpālikas and monks with abundant provisions such as the red-robed [Buddhists]'. This commentary "can realistically be dated to around the fifth century CE" (DUNDAS 2002, p. 6). However, that date is based on the fact that Agastyasimha predates the council convened by Devarddhigaṇin at Valabhī. That event has been placed in 453 or 466, both dates being recorded by Jaina tradition. But the accuracy of those dates has been shown to be uncertain (WILES 2006). Leaving this evidence aside, we have evidence from the sixth century onwards, beginning with the *Bṛhatsamhitā* of Varāhamihira (c. 500–550), which says (9.25) that when hair and fragments of bone lie scattered over the ground it looks as if the latter has adopted the observance of the skull (*kāpālaṃ vratam*), and the *Vāsavadattā* of the poet Subandhu (ca. 550–600), which speaks of the setting sun as "the wine-filled skull-bowl of the Skull-bearer Time" (*kālakapālinah*) (p. 167).

It has been claimed (LORENZEN 1991, pp. 13–14) that we have a much earlier reference, from the early centuries of the Christian era, in the Buddhist *Lalitavistara*, since that mentions deluded ascetics who believe that they are purifying themselves by such practices as carrying a skull and skull-staff. It is indeed the case that this is a text that goes back to that period, since the first of the two Chinese translations, that by Dharmarakṣa, was completed in A.D. 308 according to the *Kaiyuan lu* catalogue of A.D. 730, which later Chinese editors of the Tripiṭaka considered the most reliable. But a passage in the Chinese corresponding to the passage cited by LORENZEN, seen in the Sanskrit text edited on the basis of much later Nepalese manuscripts, is found only in the second translation, completed by Divākara in A.D. 683 or 685. The section of the much earlier translation roughly corresponding to that within which this reference occurs includes no mention of such practices. Indeed, like the Pāli canon, it seems entirely unaware of Śaivism. For when in this section it lists the various gods in which those with false views place their trust they do not include Maheśvara. It is only in Divākara's version that the repertoire of deities has expanded to accommodate him.

LORENZEN (1991, p 13) has also cited a verse in the anthology *Sattasāi* (v. 408 of the Vulgate [G] in WEBER 1881) in which a woman is compared to a female Kāpālika (*kāvāliṇī*). He asserts that this collection of verses in Māhārāṣṭrī Prakrit "traditionally ascribed to the first century A.D. . . . was probably compiled sometime in the third to fifth centuries" and concludes that this verse therefore "may well be the earliest reference to the Kāpālika sect". I cannot follow him in this conclusion since I know of no evidence that proves conclusively that this collection is so much earlier than the seventh century, the date of the earliest testimony (Bāṇa, *Harṣacarita*, introd. v. 14), and in any case this verse is not one of the 430 that are common to all the recensions of the collection (WEBER 1881, pp. XLVII–XLVIII). Indeed this mention of the Kāpālika observance in the *Sattasāi* joins that of the elephant-headed Gaṇeśa and knowledge of the seven-day week to indicate a post-Gupta

date. A reference to Kāpālikas in the *Yavanajātaka* (62.25) would give a much earlier date if PINGREE (1979) were correct in his claim that the colophonic verses of this work reveal that it was composed in [Śaka] 191, = A.D. 269/270. But this dating is spurious (MAK 2013). At present we can say only that it is earlier than the earliest reference to it, which is in Bhāskara's commentary on the *Āryabhaṭīya*, composed in A.D. 629. It might also be claimed that we have an earlier reference in the Jaina canonical work *Aṅuogaddārāim*, the term *kāvāliyaē* (Skt. *kāpālikah*) occurring there in a list of words denoting ascetics following false faiths (*pāsamḍa-*). For this text is included in the lists of Jaina canonical works issued in final redaction at Valabhī in the fifth century. But lists in prose are exceptionally vulnerable to later insertions and the suspicion that the term has been added at a later date is aggravated by the fact that Haribhadra does not refer to the term in his commentary on this place.

There are epigraphic records of Kāpālikas from the seventh century to the twelfth in inscriptions from Chattisgarh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, and Tamilnadu. There are also literary accounts, beginning with that in Acts 5 and 6 of the eighth-century *Mālatīmādhava* of Bhavabhūti.

Not recognized as a variety of the Atimārga in the *Niśvāsa* corpus but recognized as such in the *Bhairavamaṅgalā*, a scripture related to the *Picumata*, that has reached us in a ninth-century manuscript, and in later South Indian Śaiva doxographical works. There is strong evidence of its Atimārgic character in doctrinal material found in the seventh-century Malhar copperplate inscription of Śivagupta Bālārjuna from Sirpur in Dakṣiṇa Kosala (ed. BAKKER 2000a and 2000b, SHASTRI 2001, and MAJUMDAR 2007). This records that this Śaiva king had appointed Bhīmasoma, disciple of Tejasoma, and grand-disciple of Sthānaguru Rudrasoma, to preside over the monastery attached to the temple of the Śiva Bāleśvarabhaṭṭāraka that he had established with his own name.

2. Mantramārga: initiation as the means of liberation and the accomplishing of supernatural effects (*siddhiḥ*), open to both ascetics and the married.

- a) Saiddhāntika Śaivism. Principal surviving scriptures: the *Niśvāsa* corpus, related redactions of the *Kālottara*, the *Sarvajñānottara*, the *Pārameśvara* (*Pauṣkarapārameśvara*), the *Svāyambhuvāsūtrasaṅgraha*, the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, the *Matāṅga*, the *Kiraṇa*, the *Mṛgendra*, the *Parākhya*, and the eclectic 6000-verse *Bṛhatkālottara*; and an ancillary canon of texts concerned only with the consecration of images, shrines, and related matters: the *Devyamata*, the *Mohacūḍottara*, the *Mayasaṅgraha*, and the *Piṅgalāmata* or *Jayadrathādhikāra* (the last also covering non-Saiddhāntika procedures).

Followers of this division of the Mantramārga propagated a vision of a Śaiva-Vedic social order under the authority of Śaiva kings, and cultivated a marked public dimension. Its leading ascetic Ācāryas served as the Gurus of kings, offered them Śaiva initiation and consecration, consecrated royal temples, royal palaces, and public utilities such as irrigation works, and developed a monastic network, aspiring to pan-Indian liturgical standardization through Paddhatis based on the simplest of the various ritual systems found in the early Siddhāntas, namely that of *Kālottara* in either its 350-verse or 200-verse redaction. In its

observances it avoided antinomian elements and maintained conformity with brahmanical caste divisions. It was strongly ritualistic in its orientation, a tendency consolidated and defended by its earliest known exegete Sadyojyotis (fl. in the period c. A.D. 675–750) and by his Kashmirian followers, Bhaṭṭa Nāyāraṇakaṇṭha and Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha during the tenth and eleventh centuries and their South Indian epigones from the twelfth onwards.

In the ninth century it spread in an early form to the Khmer empire in mainland Southeast Asia, where it appears to have remained uninfluenced by later Indian developments.

There is an extensive body of scripture under Saiddhāntika titles in South Indian manuscript collections. There is no trace of any of these works outside this region and their contents reflect a distinctive South Indian Śaiva tradition centred on the great temples of the Coḷa period: *Aṃsumat*, *Ajita*, *Kāmika*, *Kāraṇa*, *Candrajñāna*, *Cintyaviśvasādākhyā*, *Dīpta*, *Makuta*, *Yogaja*, *Raurava*, *Vijaya/Vijayottara*, *Vīra*, *Śarvottara*, *Samtāna*, *Sāhasra*, *Siddha*, *Suprabheda*, and *Sūkṣma*. The earliest, probably the *Kāmika*, goes back to the twelfth century, and may represent a tradition introduced into the Tamil-speaking South from Eastern India.

Earliest literary evidence: parts of the proto-Saiddhāntika *Niśvāsa* corpus composed as early as the fifth century.

Earliest epigraphic evidence: sixth century. An inscription from Senakapāt in Chhattisgarh, close to Sirpur (Śrīpura, 21°20' N, 82°11' E), the ancient capital of Dakṣiṇa Kosala, undated but issued under the Pāṇḍuvaṃśin king Śivagupta Bālārjuna, who ruled this kingdom between the approximate limits of A.D. 590 and 650. Reporting a grant to a living ascetic called Sadāśivācārya, it tells us that he is the disciple of a disciple of the 'brother' of an ascetic Sadyaśivācārya who was originally from the Āmardaka hermitage, the institution to which all subsequent Saiddhāntika ascetic lineages traced their authority. Variousy designated a hermitage (*tapovanam*), a monastery (*maṭhaḥ*), or a see (*sthānam*), it was located in the Deccan at modern Auṃḍhā/Aundah (19°32' N, 77°2' E) in the Hiṃgōlī Taluk of the Marāṭhavāḍā region of Maharashtra, about 180 km southwest of Sirpur. It is the site of Śiva Nāgeśvara (Nāganātha), one of the twelve Jyotirlingas of the current pan-Indian Śaiva topography.

Epigraphic evidence of royal initiations from the second half of the seventh century onwards: the Cālukya Vikramāditya I of Badami in A.D. 660, the Eastern Gaṅga Devedravarman (probably in 682/3), and the Pallava Narasiṃhavarman of Kāñcī (at some time between c. 680 and c. 731).

- b) The non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga: the Bhairava scriptures, variously classified. Antinomian practice centring on the propitiation of the fierce deities Bhairava and the Goddess (Aghorī, Aghoreśvarī, Parā, Kālī/Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī), with a heavy Siddhi-orientation that recommended it to royal patrons, but also developing strongly mystical soteriologies based on the anti-dualistic transcendence of brahmanical notions of purity and caste. Generally not engaged in the public domain; private practice for self or for royal and other clients seeking supernatural protection and other such benefits through the commissioning of

Tantric rituals.

The following classification of the divisions of the non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga, which is that seen in the first *Ṣaṭka* of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, corresponds most closely to the way in which this literature was perceived by the Śākta Śaiva authors of Kashmir. I have specified the principal surviving scriptures:

- i. Mantrapīṭha (Bhairava-oriented): *Svacchandatantra*: the propitiation of Svacchanda-bhairava and his consort Aghoreśvarī. Draws strongly on the Saiddhāntika *Niśvāsa* corpus.
 - ii. Vidyāpīṭha (Goddess-oriented):
 - A. Vāma texts: *Vīṇāśikhatantra*. Propitiation of the four sisters (Jayā, Vijayā, Jayantī, and Aparājitā) and their brother the Bhairava Tumburu.
 - B. the Yāmala texts (← **Atimārga III**): *Brahmayāmala* (*Picumata*). Propitiation of the goddess Aghorī (consort of Kapālīśabhairava) and the four Guhyakās (Raktā, Karālī, Caṇḍākṣī, and Mahocchuṣmā).
 - C. the Śaktitantras (← **Atimārga III**)
 - a. **Trika**: *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, *Mālinīvijayottara*, **Trīśirobhairava*, *Tantrasadbhāva*, **Devyāyāmala*. The propitiation of the three goddesses Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā, singly or as a set, or these with a fourth goddess (Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī) as their ground (**Devyāyāmala*), also the two alphabet deities (Śabdarāśibhairava and Mālinī). In the *Tantrasadbhāva*: also propitiation with the Umāmaheśvaracakravidyā of an Ardhanārīśvara form (male in the right half of his body as the alphabet deity Śabdarāśibhairava, accommodating the alphabet goddess Mālinī as the left half of his body) (= the Sun, Mārtaṇḍabhairava), surrounded by the circuits consisting of eight other Bhairavas (= the other eight Grahas or ‘planets’), twelve Rudras (= the twelve solar months), and twenty-four Yoginīs.
 - b. *Ṣaṭka* 1 of the *Jayadrathayāmala* *Tantrarājabhṭāraka*. The propitiation of the goddess Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī.
3. Kulamārga (← **Atimārga III**):
 - a) *Kulapañcāśikā*, *Kulasāra*, *Kulānanda*, *Kaulajñānanirṇaya*, and *Timirodghāṭana*.
 - b) Kulamārga materials within texts of Śākta orientation that are assigned to the Mantramārga, so that in such traditions we are offered two distinct cults of their deities, one following the Mantramārga (*tantraprakriyā*) and the other, seen as more elevated, following the Kulamārga (*kulaparakriyā*) or texts teaching forms of the Kulamārga for the Kaula propitiation of the deities of the Trika or forms of Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī.
 - i. (parts of) the *Mālinīvijayottara*; the **Kularatnamālā*, **Bhairavakula*, **Vīrāvalī* etc.
 - ii. the rest of the *Jayadrathayāmala* (Kālīkula), namely its second, third, and fourth *Ṣaṭkas*, which teach the Kaula propitiation of numerous forms of Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī culminating in variants of the Krama in the third and fourth *Ṣaṭkas*.

- c) Scriptures of the Krama (Kālikula): *Kālikulapañcaśataka*, *Kālikulakramasadbhāva*, *Devī-dvyardhaśatikā*, *Yonigahvara*.
- d) Scriptures of the worship of the goddess Kubjikā, heavily dependent on the scriptures of the Trika: *Kubjikāmata*, *Ṣaṣṣāhasra*, *Kularatnodyota*, *Manthānabhairava* etc.
- e) Scriptures of the cult of Tripurā/Tripurasundarī: *Nityākaula*, *Vāmakeśvarimata*, *Yoginīhr̥daya*.
- f) Kaula initiation through possession (*āveśah*) (← Atimārga III).

Kaula Āmnāya classification:

- a) Eastern (*pūrvāmnāyah*): Trika
- b) Northern (*uttarāmnāyah*): Krama/Kālikula
- c) Western (*paścimāmnāyah*): worship of Kubjikā
- d) Southern (*dakṣiṇāmnāyah*): worship of Nityā goddesses (*Nityākaula*), → Śrīvidyā (cult of Tripurasundarī), which claims to transcend this classification.

Earliest evidence of Kaula Śāktism:

The Kaula Trika was already well-known in Kashmir in the early ninth-century. This is evident from references to it in the *Caṇḍīstotra* of the *Haravijaya* of the poet Ratnākara, composed c. 830. But the Kula system is within the purview of the *Netratantra*, which was composed in Kashmir at some time between c. 700 and c. 850. It is possible, therefore, that the earliest surviving reference is from the eight century.

C. Śaivism in Kashmir:

1. “Kashmir Śaivism”: a misleading label

It is a product of the contraction of the Śaiva traditions during recent centuries that left two isolated islands: one in Kashmir and the other in the Tamil South, the first defined by its intuitionist, mystical approach and non-dualistic metaphysics and the second by its ritualism and dualistic metaphysics.

In fact in earlier centuries Śaivism in both Kashmir and the Far South Śaivism was a complex of traditions that comprised both of these poles. To continue to use the term Kashmir Śaivism to refer to the traditions embraced by the non-dualistic exegesis of Somānanda, Utpaladeva, Abhinavagupta, Kṣemarāja, Jayaratha and other authors in their tradition is to overlook the fact that these predominantly Śākta traditions coexisted in Kashmir with the dualistic, Saiddhāntika tradition, that this Kashmirian Saiddhāntika tradition, far from being a fringe phenomenon, was the dominant Śaiva tradition in Kashmir in the time of these authors, and that the non-Saiddhāntika traditions draw much of their force from their co-existence with the Saiddhāntika tradition.

Furthermore the traditions embraced by these non-dualist Kashmirian exegetes were by no means limited to these two regions in earlier times. My exploration during recent decades of epigraphical

evidence, art historical evidence, and of Śaiva and Śākta-Śaiva manuscripts preserved in libraries around the world, especially in the extensive collections of early Nepalese and East Indian Śaiva and Śākta-Śaiva manuscripts preserved in the Kathmandu Valley, has shown that the infrastructure of these traditions was much more widely distributed throughout the subcontinent, as was that of the Saiddhāntika Śaivas.

2. Kashmirian Saiddhāntika Śaivism:

- a) Surviving literature. 10th and 11th centuries: the commentaries of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha on the *Mṛgendra*, of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha on the *Mataṅga*, the *Vidyā* chapters of the *Kiraṇa*, the 350-verse redaction of the *Kālottara*, and the *Nareśvaraparikṣā* of Sadyojyotis, and of Bhaṭṭa Vidyākaṇṭha on the *Mayasamgraha*. Among Saiddhāntika scriptures the eclectic *Bṛhatkālottara*, also known as the *Ṣaṭśahasra*, is probably a product of Kashmir. No Kashmirian Saiddhāntika works known after the 11th century.
- b) Character: Strictly ritualistic and Veda-congruent and therefore vulnerable to assimilation as one of the forms of religion considered valid by mainstream brahmanical authorities. Vidyākaṇṭha's commentary on the *Mayasamgraha* and Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha's lost commentary on the *Piṅgalāmata/Jayadrathādhikāra* shows that the Kashmirian Saiddhāntikas shared the general Saiddhāntika range of engagement from initiation and private worship to the public institutions of the temple and the monastery (Maṭha). The ascetic tradition is not conspicuous in the literature that reached us, but this may be because the institutional basis of Śaiva asceticism, the temple and the monastery, was largely eliminated during the centuries of Islamic rule (1339–1586 [Shāhmīrī kings], 1586–1751 [Mughal governors], and 1753–1819 [Pathan governors]). Jayantabhaṭṭa's *Āgamadambara* ('Much Ado about Scripture') attests the existence of Saiddhāntika asceticism in Kashmir around the turn of the ninth and tenth centuries, as does the eleventh-century Kashmirian poet and satirist Kṣemendra, who mocks the licentiousness of three fictional ascetics of this tradition in his *Deśopadeśa*, 8.46–47: "Three] Śaiva ascetics, bald Nayanaśiva, + + + bucktoothed Rūpaśiva, and Dhyānaśiva devoid of [knowledge] of both the rituals and their Mantras [now] enter [before] the Maṇḍala. The massed tresses of Śaiva ascetics, cleansed by washing with nutmeg, areca nut, and cloves, richly fumigated with incense, their lice killed with fist-fulls of ash, are fortunate indeed, for they are prostitutes' pillows."
- c) Date:
 - i. Known to the *Netratantra*, which was produced between c. 700 and c. 850, very probably in Kashmir.
 - ii. The Kashmirian poet Rājānaka Ratnākara and, we may presume, his audience, are conversant with its scriptures and with the Saiddhāntika exegesis of Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati (c. 675–750). This is clear from the *Śivastotra* of his Mahākāvya *Haravijaya* (6.13–187), composed during the reign of Cippaṭa-Jayāpīḍa, c. 830.
 - iii. Evidence of its acceptance by the mainstream brahmanical tradition in the *Nyāyamañjarī* of the Kashmirian Naiyāyika philosopher Jayantabhaṭṭa, a contemporary of King

Śaṅkaravarman, who ruled Kashmir from 883 to 902.

- iv. Kṣemarāja reports that it was the most influential Śaiva tradition in his time (fl. c. 1000–1050) and that he wrote his commentaries on the non-Saiddhāntika *Svacchandatantra* and *Netratantra* in order to free them from the Saiddhāntika readings to which they had been subjected. Example of *surā* ‘beer’ to be offered as the guest-water when Svacchandabhairava, the principal deity of the first, has been summoned for worship (commentary on *Svacchanda* 2.136ab).

3. Non-Saiddhāntika Śaivism:

a) Worship of Svacchandabhairava and Amṛteśvarabhairava:

i. Principal surviving works:

- A. *Svacchandoddyota* and *Netroddyota*, commentaries composed by Kṣemarāja (fl. c. 1000–1050) on the *Svacchandatantra* and *Netratantra* respectively
- B. the *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* of Manodadatta completed in A.D. 1335/6 and extended by Rājānaka Śivasvāmin in A.D. 1598, based primarily on the *Svacchanda* and secondarily on the *Netra*, but incorporating ancillary material from the Siddhāntas, the *Picumata*, the *Jayadrathayāmala*, and, marginally, the *Trika*.
- C. the *Gurupustikā* of Rājānaka Śitikaṇṭha (active c. A.D. 1375–1425), based on the *Netra*.
- D. the *Nityādisaṃgrahapaddhati* of Rājānaka Takṣakavarta (compiled after the eleventh century), covering primarily worship following the *Svacchanda*, the *Netra*, and the Siddhāntas.
- E. the anonymous ritual manuals used by the Tantric Śaiva family priests of the Kashmirian brahmins for cremation and Śrāddha and the other posthumous rituals: *Śivanirvāṇapaddhati*, *Śivakriyā*, *Śivaśrāddha*, etc. These, like the *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* are primarily based on the *Svacchanda* and *Netra* but also incorporate diverse ancillary materials ranging from the Siddhāntas to the *Krama*. The analogy of an archaeological site.
- F. the anonymous *Agnikāryapaddhati*. This too is *Svacchanda-Netra*-based, but it has drawn in both early Śākta materials from the *Trika*, the *Brahmayāmala*, the *Jayadrathayāmala*, the *Kubjikāmata*, the *Vāmakeśvarīmata*, and also later Śākta materials from Eastern India, apparently adapting to the preferences of immigrants from that region.

ii. Date:

- A. The absence of any reference to Svacchandabhairava in the *Śivastotra* and *Caṇḍīstotra* of the *Haravijaya*, c. 830, raises the possibility that this cult was not yet present in Kashmir.
- B. However, the *Netratantra* was composed in Kashmir in the period c. 700–850 and this scripture presupposes the *Svacchandatantra*.

b) Kālikula:

- i. *Jayadrathayāmala*, also called *Tantrarājabhṭāraka*
 - A. Kāpālika character
 - B. Vaiṣṇava elements
 - C. Atimārga III in *Yoginīsaṃcāraprakaraṇa* redacted in Ṣaṭka 3 (→ Buddhist Yoginī-tantra *Laghuśaṃvara*)
 - D. Date: not completed before c. 850
 - E. Provenance: Kashmirian redaction of Ṣaṭkas 2–4
 - F. Impact on the ritual practice of the Kashmirians: in the *Agnikāryapaddhati*, the *Bhuvanamālinīkalpa* for abbreviated initiation, the four Pratyāṅgirās, and the Vyomeśvarīvidyā in the *Śivanirvāṇapaddhati*.
- ii. Krama (also called Mahārtha, Mahānaya, Devīnaya)

Major works:

- A. The *Kālikāstotra* of Jñānanetraṇātha, c. 850.
- B. The *Kramakeli*, a commentary by Abhinavagupta on this seminal text, now accessible only in citations.
- C. The *Kramastotra* of Erakanātha, c. 900, now accessible only in citations.
- D. The *Mahānayaprakāśa* of Arṇasiṃha, fl. c. 1050–1110.
- E. The *Mahānayaprakāśa* of unknown authorship published in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series from a single Malayalam manuscript.
- F. The Old Kashmiri *Mahānayaprakāśa* with a Sanskrit commentary published in the Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies. The edition's attribution to one Śitikaṇṭha is not supported by the manuscripts, none of which mentions an author.
- G. A Sanskrit *Mahārthaprakāśa* based on the Old Kashmiri *Mahānayaprakāśa*.
- H. The *Vātulanāthasūtra* and its commentary by Anantaśakti.
- I. The *Chummāsaṃketaprakāśa* attributed to Niṣkriyānandanātha: Old Kashmiri aphorisms with a Sanskrit commentary incorporating thirty Old Kashmiri verses.

Date:

- A. Striking absence of any reference to the Krama in the *Caṇḍīstotra* (Ratnākara, *Haravijaya*, canto 47), c. 830. RASTOGI claimed that it is indicated in verse 55 of that hymn by the mention of the goddess Saṃkarṣaṇī, a common abbreviation for Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī: *saṃkarṣaṇī nigaditā kila śāsane tvam*. But the reading of the edition is corrupt. The verse should be emended to *sāṃkarṣaṇe nigaditā kila śāsane tvam* and is referring not to the Krama but to the Sāṃkarṣaṇa school of the Vaiṣṇava Pañcarātra. This is the reading of the Bodleian Library's ms Stein

Or. d. 52, f.45r24–25 and it is supported by the variant *sāṃkarṣaṇī* reported by the edition. *i* and *e* are prone to confusion by Kashmirian copyists, since the two sounds are virtually indistinguishable in their vernacular.

B. Jñānanetranātha c. 850.

Provenance: the Uḍḍiyāna connection, the Kashmirian context of *Jayadrathayāmala*, Ṣaṭkas 2–4.

Character: Kāpālika. Gurus both male and female. The *Śrīkaṅṭhīyasamhitā*'s detailed account of the five branches of the Mantramārga's scriptures shows Krama elements in its listing of the titles of texts belonging to the exorcistic Paścimasrotas, whose practitioners Abhinavagupta reports to have been Kāpālikas.

iii. Abhinavagupta's training in the Śākta traditions began in the Krama and later extended to the Trika. This is apparent from his *Bhagavadgītārthasamgraha* ('A Summary of the Teaching of the *Bhagavadgītā*') and the *Kramakeli*, his lost commentary on the *Kramas-totra* of Erakanātha, as reported in the *Mahārthamañjarīparimala* of Maheśvarānanda.

c) The Trika.

i. The lost commentary on the *Trīśikā* (*Parātrīśikā*) by Somānanda, fl. c. 900–950 (Guru of Utpaladeva, the Paramaguru of Abhinavagupta).

ii. The commentary of Abhinavagupta (fl. c. 975–1025) on the same text: *Trīśikāvivarāṇa*.

iii. Abhinavagupta's exegesis of the *Mālinīvijayottara: Mālinīślokaṅkārikā, Tantrāloka, Tantrasāra*

iv. The Trika before the Gurus from Somānanda to Abhinavagupta:

A. The Kashmirian Ratnākara's *Caṇḍīstotra, Haravijaya*, 47.1–153, composed c. 830, shows an intimate technical knowledge of the Trika and, we may reasonably assume, presupposes the same in his intended audience.

B. The Trika in the Deccan: its scriptures utilized by the *Kubjikāmata* composed there.

C. References to the Trika in South Indian literature in A.D. 959, considerably before evidence of Kashmirian influence on the Śākta Śaivism of the region. These are in the *Yaśastilaka*, the monumental poetic work of the Campū genre completed in that year by the Jaina Somadevasūri at Gaṅgadhārā in Telangana. The form of the Trika known to him corresponds with that of the *Tantrasadbhāva*, a work much of which was incorporated in the *Kubjikāmata*.

v. Works that underpin the theory that sustains that exegesis:

A. The *Śivasūtra* and *Spandakārikā*, second half of the ninth century. Kalhaṇa on the appearance of Siddhas during the reign of Avantivarman (855/6–883) (*Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 5.66: *anugrahāya lokānām bhāṭṭasrīkallaṭādayaḥ | avantivarmaṇaḥ kāle siddhā bhuvam avātaran*).

- B. Somānanda, *Śivadr̥ṣṭi*
 - C. Utpaladeva, *Śivadr̥ṣṭi* commentary
 - D. Utpaladeva, *Īśvarapratyabhijñāḱārikā*
 - E. Utpaladeva, *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvṛtti*
 - F. Utpaladeva, *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛti* (fragments only, mostly preserved in marginal annotations)
 - G. Utpaladeva, *Sambandhasiddhi*, *Īśvarasiddhi*, and *Ajadapramāṭṛsiddhi*
 - H. Abhinavagupta, *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarsinī*
 - I. Abhinavagupta, *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivismarsinī*, a commentary on Utpaladeva's *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛti*.
- d) Abhinavagupta's project in his exegesis of the Trika:
- i. A Trika-Krama synthesis.
 - ii. Gnostic, anti-ritualism; liberation through knowledge; ritual action reconfigured as the inculcation of liberating knowledge. The three Upāyas of the *Mālinīvijayottara*.
 - iii. The figure and concerns of the ascetic are largely absent.
 - iv. Visionary Yoga marginalized.
 - v. Aestheticization of antinomian behaviour
 - vi. Rationalization leading beyond ritual (Krama → Pratyabhijñā).
 - vii. A higher non-dualism (*paramādvayavādaḥ*) that subsumes and validates all forms of Śaivism under the aegis of the Trika.
 - viii. Hierarchy of successive initiations from Siddhānta up to the Trika and within the Trika (*Mālinīvijayottara* → *Bhairavakula* → *Virāvalikula*).
- e) Śākta outreach: the works of Kṣemarāja, pupil of Abhinavagupta
- i. Commentaries on the *Svacchanda*, *Netra*, and *Vijñānabhairava*.
 - A. Eighteen-armed Svacchanda presented as a manifestation of the eighteen-armed goddess Durgā.
 - B. Insistence on non-dualistic practice (*advaitācārah*) and the irrelevance of an initiate's birth caste.
 - C. Krama-based exegesis of Niṣkala-Svacchandabhairava's Mantra HŪṢ.
 - ii. The *Bhairavānukaraṇastotra*.
 - iii. Commentaries on the *Śivasūtra* (*-vimarsinī*) and *Spandakārikā* (*Spandasamḁdoha* and *Spandanirṇaya*).
 - iv. Commentaries on popular hymn collections: on the *Stavacintāmaṇi* of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa and the *Śivastotrāvalī* of Utpaladeva.

v. The *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya*.