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A Special Note.

The writer will be immensely gratified if the following pages justify and bear out the worth and excellence of the Lingayat religion and the high estimate made of it and expressed in the extracts given below.

(1) The sanest and the most powerful and influential branch of Shaivism in South India in the 12th century A. D. It was, as generally agreed upon, a very popular religion in its day...simple living and high thinking were the ringing watchwords of its worthy Founder Basava, whose views were, however, far in advance of the times. He believed that the religious life of people was closely allied to their social welfare. In the words of Rice he carried on social revolution side by side with religious reformation.

Miss V. T. Laxmi, M. A. in Triveni (Vol. IX, no. 2.)

(2) The devoutest worshippers of Linga (worn on the body—editor.) are the Lingayats, the most Puritanical sect of India—Will Durant in the Story of Civilization, page 519.

(3) The subject (Veerashaivism, a phase of Agamānta) is exceedingly weighty...To my knowledge no competent endeavour has yet been made to present the superb teachings of Sahamārga...the stage that is contemplated par excellence by Veerashaivism is pure subjective worship of the Lord...Their practical bearing on the daily conduct of the searcher after the Lord is nowhere to be seen more clearly than in the life of a sincere Veerashaiva....Veerashaivism has so well perfected these truths of spiritual communion in its teachings of Shatsthala and Lingāngasāmarasya...The subjective culture and conduct of the soul proceeds pari passu with the objective training of the attitude of the vyāvahāric man towards the Lord's Prapanch, includidg animals and the rest....The Mulāchāryās are usually credited with founding the faith; but we must understand such opinions only in a figurative sense....The Ashtāvaranas or the eight spiritual shields are spiritual weapons to withstand any
possible onslaughts of Prakritic blandishments....I may safely say that there are few faiths that have flourished on the Indian soil, which have so openly preached the equality of man, of the prince and the peasant, of sages and sinners, in the social scale. The Veerashaivas did away with the lip-religion of polished common-places and of mere moral and spiritual shibboleths, and actually lived the principles that they taught—Dr. Ramananshastri in Siddhanta Dipika, vol. XI.

(4.) The Lingayats have been not inaptly described as a peaceable race of Hindu Puritans, though it may be questionable how far their rejection of many of the chief dogmas of Brahmanic Hinduism leaves them the right to be styled Hindus at all....One of the many reformist movements aimed against the supremacy of Brahmins, whose selfish exploitation of the lower classes led to the rise of new sects, essentially anti-Brahmanic in origin. The traditional Lingayat Teacher, Basava, proclaimed—

✓ (1) All men are born equal. ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 

(2) Combined with the assertion of the essential equality of all men constituted the vital departure from the doctrines of orthodox Hinduism, the removal of all chief Hindu rites and of the ceremonial impurity—Enthoven in Encyclopaedia of Religion, and Ethics.
PREFACE.

In the preparation of this Text of Linga-Dhārana-Chandrikā, the printed edition of the same, printed and published by the Swami of Jangamawadi, Benares, and two manuscripts of the Oriental Library, Madras, have been consulted. The book is very unsystematically printed. No sections on different topics are marked off under different headings; but the whole Text runs continuously in different pieces with commentary thereon. The Text is also printed like prose without verses therein being put into their proper form. Moreover it is incomplete in that it begins with "सारान्तके ते इति". It is strange that it should be without the previous portion at the beginning. It seems to have been based on a single mutilated copy. I have prepared the text after comparing and collating the printed book and the two manuscripts. The various readings are noted at the bottom of pages, T denoting the printed text and A & B denoting the two manuscripts.

The text is divided into sections with proper titles.

The publication of the book has taken a long time; and the delay was unavoidable owing to various distractions and pressure of work in other connections. However I feel glad that I have at long last succeeded in completing the work designed and undertaken. I am conscious that the portion about the origin and history of Shaivism, the Agamas, etc. has been disproportionate. I beg pardon of readers.

The only person that has studied and understood Lingayat religion very well is Dr. Ramanan Shastri, Madras Presidency. I can say without the fear of contradiction that he knows much more about the religion than any body else, Lingayat or Non-Lingayat. He is a thoroughgoing student of the Agamas and Shaivism (comparatively with Vaishnavism) and was the well known editor of the monthly magazine "Siddhanta Dipika", now no more. His lectures on "Veerashaivism, a phase of Agamanta" (appearing in S. D. Vol. XI) will unmistakably show his thorough grasp of and insight into the religion. I am very much indebted to him for the profoundly scholarly lecture. Opinions
expressed by him on Lingayatism are bound to be weighty and authoritative. Readers are referred to the extracts from his lecture on pages 500, 507 to 509, 672.

I am so sorry for the many misprints appearing all through the book, in spite of the best care and attention bestowed on proof-reading. The care and attention may be maximum on my part but are obviously insufficient for the misprints. I really feel sorry that they are sure to mar the worth of the book as a book and will be troublesome to readers. I have only to request readers to bear with them and excuse me.

I shall be failing in my duty if I do not express my sense of thankfulness for the very diligent help rendered to me by Mr. B. G. Naik, B. A., (Hons) B. T., teacher, G. A. High School, Belgaum, in proof-reading and many suggestions in printing. I am also thankful to some of the members of the Lingaraj College staff for the help they gave me in preparing the topical analysis of contents, which was arranged subsequently in an alphabetical index by some G. A. High School teachers. To the latter also my thanks are due. I have also to thank the manager, Mahavir Press, Belgaum, for diligence shown in printing the book.

The author, Nandikeshwar, has also written a dialectical discourse, in which he has established the burial of the dead on the authority of Vedic and Smriti texts. This forms the 2nd part of the book. But it is not included herein, being considered a minor topic, though an antithesis of the Brahmanic custom of burning the dead.

The book is divided into two main parts, first part comprising the introduction and the second part comprising the Sanskrit text, its translation and notes on it. As the text and translation began to be printed at two presses simultaneously, the pagination has been separate for the four. Pictures in illustration of Shivalingam as the human body in meditative posture, and the petals of the Chakras are given in their proper places.
ARGUMENT.

I long cherished a desire to place before the reading world the philosophy and principles of the Lingayat religion for the main reason that it is not much known outside Karnataka, of which Lingayats form a majority community. Even in Karnataka it is known as a kind of Shaivism with another alternative name of Veerashaivism, and the Lingayats are said to be a Shaiva sect, wearing Linga on their bodies and being outside the sphere of Brahmanic influence. Linga worn on the bodies is the most prominent characteristic of Lingayatism and Lingayats, no doubt. But the wearing of Linga means next to nothing unless the meaning underlying it and the principle on which it is based and enjoined are understood and are what matter most, like the sweet and invigorating kernel enclosed by the hard crust of a coconut, or like the luscious juice of a fruit, rather than its shape and charming exterior. Moreover wrong ideas have long been prevailing about the status of the community and not much is known about the religion historically. One instance will suffice to show what kind of deep ignorance prevails even among scholars. For instance Mr. K. A. Nilkanthashastri, Professor of History and Archaeology, University of Madras, makes an astoundingly wrong statement and a sweeping assertion that the religion was founded by Bijjala (vide Cultural Heritage of India, Vol. II, p. 34). Even a child will be shocked by such an unhistorical statement. One would be puzzled to understand how he failed to see that it was impossible for a Jain king to found a different religion.
Lingayats themselves do not know what their religion is and what its history is, much less others. The community is considered to be a kind of caste of the Hindu fold and the religion merely a sect. To dissipate wrong ideas entertained about the religion and to place before the reading and thoughtful public facts of the religion was the chief cause of my long cherished desire, which remained a desire awaiting its fulfilment. And after my return from England I began to seriously think of undertaking the heavy responsibility and the enormous and onerous task of setting forth and explaining the principles of the religion so far as I could.

If ignorance about the religion is so deep, want of knowledge about its origin and founder is much worse. Even the Lingayats do not know who founded the religion and when. Certain things handed down by tradition are taken for granted. In their enthusiasm attempts have been made by some unknowns to push back the origin of the religion to very ancient times with the idea that high antiquity is not only a mark of its soundness but also of the greatness of its principles. It was probably thought soundness and greatness of the religion lay in its antiquity like the survival of the fittest and not in the soundness and greatness of its principles, doctrines and philosophy. I thought it proper, therefore, to discuss its foundation and founder, and a whole chapter (XI) is devoted to the topic. It is likely that Lingayats themselves will be taken aback and surprised by my conclusion. But I leave it to readers to see how far my reasoning and conclusion are right. I shall have succeeded if they begin to think of the subject and discuss it historically.
It also seems that the idea, like that of Hindus, of अपौर्वेयत्व (the impersonal divine origin), is the sure and unimpeachable sign of greatness of a religion. Hence the origin seems to have been imputed to mythical founders rising out of Lingas. It is generally thought that Basava only revived the Shaiva religion without pausing to think and consider the great and stupendous work he did and the revolution he effected in the Shaivism of his time. People mixed up Shaivism with Veerashaivism and thought that the latter was merely a revival of the then existing religion without any clear conception about Religion in general and Veerashaivism in particular. All such wrong ideas have contributed to worst confusion about the religion, its status and that of the community in the Hindu fold. I have tried my best to dispel all wrong ideas in these respects and place before readers what the real state is, and should be, of the religion and the Lingayat community. I, therefore, hold that the terms “Lingayat” and “Lingayatism” are preferable and real to avoid confusion and to give distinctness to the religion and the community, as an independent fold.

To give a good historical perspective to the evolution of the Lingayat religion out of Shaivism, that forms the background of Lingayatism, I thought it fit to trace historically the origin of Shaivism as a Dravidian religion and the result of Dravidian civilization. I wanted to be brief, but as I undertook the task the treatment became unavoidably elaborate regarding its origin and its adoption and absorption by the Aryans and its subsequent history up to 12th century, when the Lingayat religion had its rise. It is thought by many that Shaivism has grown out of Vedic worship of Rudra. We may see for instance “Origin and
early History of Shaivism in South India" by Mr. C. V Narayana Iyer. Others think that Shaivism is probably a pre-Aryan religion of the pre-Aryan inhabitants of India. The latest finds of Mohenjo Daro and Harappa, now unearthed, have been very useful for my thesis about the origin of Shaivism. I have, therefore, given profuse extracts from the descriptions of these finds and conclusions arrived at by scholars of Archaeology.*

Not much is known of the Agamas, their origin and date. I have, therefore, tried to explain all about these points to the best of my ability and to place my views before readers for their consideration and further research in connection with the Agamas.

Shivalingam is generally considered to be phallus and its worship phallic worship. I found it desirable to refute such a horribly wrong idea and explain the real meaning of Shivalingam. Mr. C. V. Narayana Iyer is my predecessor in this respect. But his explanation is not quite sufficient. I have tried my utmost to explain Shivalingam as the amorphous representation or symbol of Shiva, the ultimate Reality. It is for scholars to see how far they agree with and accept my interpretation. So also Ishtalinga is mistaken for an image. And I have tried to prove that it is not so.

Different schools of Shaivism and their principles and philosophy are also described in order to show how far the principles and philosophy of Lingayatism agree with those

*I may also mention here that the works of late Mr. P. T. Srinivas Iyengar have been very helpful to me in my description and exposition of Dravidian civilization, which he maintains to be Tamilian, as he holds Dravidians to be identical with Tamil people.
of others and how far and where they differ from them. The practice of Lingayat religion based upon its philosophy is the most essential thing, as of any other religion. This, therefore, required a detailed treatment; naturally it has been the bulk of chap. XII.

Shaivism, Shaktism and Lingayatism are all allied religions. The basic philosophy is the same, except that Shakti is considered not only prominent but all-in-all as the main phase of Universal Consciousness in Shaktism. In Shaivism and in Lingayatism on the contrary, Shiva is considered primary as the possessor and wielder of Shakti. But Lingayatism is more allied to Shaktism. On better examination and study of the two religions it will be found that there is point to point correspondence in philosophy and principles. But they violently differ in the practice of religion, the spiritual life and discipline. This makes the main or whole difference between the two. It has not been possible for me, however, to give a comparative description of the points of correspondence and the points of difference, as I thought it would be too much for the thesis. It may, however, be done in a separate volume.

Lingayatism differs both from Shaivism and Shaktism in respect of adoption by both Shaivas and Shaktas of Varnashramadharma in some form or other. The Shaiva Brahmins in particular, like Vaishnavas, have adopted all Sanskaras of the Varnashramadharma. The rest of the Shaivas are considered Vaishyas or Shudras; the Kshatriyas, forming the second Varna, are hardly to be found and recognized as such in India now. The same state of affairs obtains more or less among the Shaktas of Bengal. Hence Shaivas and Shaktas have been indistinguishable from the
caste Hindus and are Hindus in religion, if Hinduism is Varnashramadharma, mixed with images and image-worship and the details of the worship according to the teachings of the Agamas. But Lingayats having done away with both Varnashramadharma and image worship, fundamentally differ from all these communities. I have tried to explain this in the thesis and established that the Lingayat Community is an independent religious entity.

Linga worn on the body is not only the most prominent characteristic of the religion but its basis and central point. Lingadhâranachandrikâ, therefore, has been made the basis of my thesis and the result has been the present work.

To facilitate the understanding of the dissertation of Lingadhâranachandrikâ by an ordinary reader I thought it best to append the translation of the text and explanatory notes. The latter have become unavoidably copious. They may or may not be exhaustive but are, I think, quite sufficient to facilitate easy understanding of the dialectical discussion of the topics by the author.

Though I am positively of opinion that Vachana Shastra is the basic literature of the religion as its scriptures, I have based all my thesis with profuse quotations on Sanskrit books for the simple reason that my thesis centres round a Sanskrit work. So also I wanted to show how the Sanskrit treatises of the religion have caused confusion and misunderstanding about the religion and its status, though they agree in the fundamentals and maintain its own independence and that of the community.
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APPRECIATION.

By

(V. Subrahmanya Iyer, Esq. Retired Registrar, Mysore University)

The Lingadhāранchandrikā by Professor M. R. Sakhare, m. a., t. d. (Cantab.) is a work of exceptional merit. It has traced with much care the history of the leading doctrines and the doctrinal differences of this religious school farther than any other work that I have read on the subject. The author's scholarly investigations have thrown a flood of light on many disputed points. They furnish valuable evidence to indicate that not only Shaivism and Lingāyatism are recognized in the Vedas but also that other forms of worship had their origin in them. He has, further, given proofs for the former also having had a Dravidian origin. What is of still greater interest is that the doctrine of 'Transmigration of Souls' is as much Dravidian. This shows that the Dravidian Civilization was not inferior to the Aryan. The contention that 'Linga' is not a phallic symbol, is really praiseworthy.

The chapters on the 'Philosophy and Practice of Lingayat Religion' are very illuminating, in that they point out in very clear terms the differences between Lingayatism and several schools of Vedanta in their philosophical aspects. The author's exposition of what is known as 'Lingarupa' and 'Yoga' practices is most striking.

It is needless to say that his criticism of the schools of thought, bold and original, may not be acceptable to all alike. Those that are criticised may retort in similar terms. But this is bound to go on in this world.

The account given of the rise of the Lingayat Religion and of its founders breathes a true spirit of scholarly and historical research. This excellent work bids fair to be a highly authoritative one on this special subject.
INTRODUCTION.

(1) Veerashaiva and Lingayata.

Lingadharanachandrinkinga is a treatise written to establish the principle and creed of wearing Linga on the body by the Veerashaivas or Lingayatas. The latter term is comparatively a later one to have come into vogue; but it prominently expresses the followers of Veerashaivism and signifies unmistakably those that wear on their bodies the holy Linga, that forms the most distinctive and distinguishable religious mark of the followers. The former is coeval with the origin of the religion, whenever it may have been; but it fails to express the distinctive mark worn on the body by the followers of Veerashaivism, though it expresses them strikingly in contradistinction from all other Shaivas and Shiva sects of India. The word "Veerashaiva" does not bring out the idea of Linga worn on the body as strikingly as the word "Lingayata" does. The former has been etymologically defined and elaborately explained in treatises and literature of the religion. But the origin of the word "Lingayata" is not only obscure but conspicuous by the absence of its explanation in religious literature, and is neither defined nor explained therein. Still it has the very enviable merit of marking out the followers of the religion severally and collectively as a religious community. It is no wonder, therefore, that the term "Lingayata" should have been more common since some time past and long enough past, to the obscuration of the other to a
certain extent in ordinary parlance, and should express not only a member of the community but also the distinctive mark of the faith that makes the community a distinct religious entity. It connotes the most distinctive and characteristic feature of the religion, nay, the very heart and soul of the religion, namely, the creed of wearing of Linga on the body, and denotes that such are the followers of the faith and such is the community, in sharp and unmistakable distinction from other religious communities or sects of India. The term “Veerashaiva” is significant and looms large in religious tracts and literature to the total exclusion of “Lingayata” but is less common in ordinary language. “Lingayata” is ordinarily more common and more known. This is why the term “Lingayata” is used in the title of the book.

† The word “Lingayata” has been spoken of derisively by a person, who makes no secret of his intentions, and has been slightly compared by him to words like “Bagayata” (garden land) and the similar. This is but mere mockery and impious and irreverent language that it does not deserve. Whatever and whenever may be the origin of the word, it is seen that it has attained the full religious and communal signification and significance. One may feel sorry that the word should be so mocked at and tossed about in the spirit of contempt and satire. It is palpably renegade-like to do so. One may not like it but one cannot help the lolling tongue of scandal. But the word had not

† See Mr. Pavate’s Basavabhaṇu pp. 16-19.
the misfortune of being left alone to be treated so slightly. It had its stalwart defenders and exponents. A learned gentleman has explained the word, in sharp retort, grammatically and justified its significance and popularity. The word “Lingayata”, he says, is a Sanskrit word and can be a Sanskrit word in formation. It is derived, he explains, from the constituents, ling and aya or ling-aya-yut. The formation of the word has been explained grammatically by him as follows:—

1. लिङ्ग आयत: (ब्रजप्रमाण सामर्थ्याकविस्तारता गत:) लिङ्गायत:।
2. लिङ्ग आ (सम्भार) सामर्थ्यां यतेत (यति प्रयतने) + अच्छु (सामांते कतेरीर अच्छु) लिङ्गायत:।
3. लिङ्ग आ (समंतात्) शास्त्रयति (यति उपस्थो) + अच्छु (सामांते कतेरीर अच्छु) लिङ्गायत:।
4. लिङ्ग आ (समंतात्, अभिव्यक्तव्यय सन्यात्वसंबंधायेः) यति: (यमु-त्, यत्त परिवेषणे परिवेष्टने) लिङ्गायत:।

The above explanation is convincing and speaks well of the scholarship of the gentleman and it cannot be taken exception to, except by pettyfogging spirits. All the same an explanation of this kind has not been found in treatises of the past times. The explanation has been original and given for the first time. And it may be accepted in authority hereafter, as it will attain confirmation and sanctity of age in due course. But so far as our knowledge of existing Sanskrit works of Veerashaiva Religion goes, it is not found used, except only in one book, namely, वैराज्ञाचार्याप्रतीविक्रम (page 62), in the verse—

मंशिक परिप्रूत्तस्य लिङ्गे दर्शयेते युधः।
तस्मादशिवाय मँशिके देव लिङ्गाविन्द: दृष्टि: स्तुनः।

But it is noteworthy that the word used here is लिङ्गाविन्द and not लिङ्गायत. It cannot be said whether it is misspelt or misprinted. But it is very probable that it
may be so. The verse quoted above seems like an explanation of the word तथ्यायत. Except for this there is no book in which the word is used. It looks, therefore, like a solitary island peak, prominent and striking, and attracting the attention of readers.

The learned gentleman is conscious himself and admits that the explanation given above has been his own attempt to prove that the word is a Sanskrit word grammatically formed. He, therefore, remarks § "After the word has been established in the foregoing to be a Sanskrit word grammatically formed, there remains no ground for any body to ask for its occurrence in books of past times, for the simple reason that its use at present is proof enough of its use in the past. Grammar and the explanation of the grammatical formation of a word is sufficient to prove, whether the word is a तत्त्वम (loan-word), तत्त्वाश्च (modified word), देश (original Kanarese or indigenous word), अन्यदेश्य (foreign word), or श्राय (slang). Now that we have established the word to be a Sanskrit word, the disputant cannot say that the word is not a Sanskrit word unless and until he successfully disproves it”.

§ Translated from original Kanarese which reads as follows:—केवलक दोहे में सिद्ध हैं साहित्य जिसमें न तत्त्वमें धारण नहीं किया गया है। वह अभी तक साहित्य में गुणवत्ता दर्शक नहीं है। तत्त्वमें धारण करने के लिए उपयुक्त नहीं है। तत्त्वाश्च में सिद्ध हैं साहित्य जिसमें न तत्त्वमें धारण नहीं किया गया है। वह अभी तक साहित्य में गुणवत्ता दर्शक नहीं है। तत्त्वाश्च में सिद्ध हैं साहित्य जिसमें न तत्त्वमें धारण नहीं किया गया है। वह अभी तक साहित्य में गुणवत्ता दर्शक नहीं है। अन्यदेश्य में सिद्ध हैं साहित्य जिसमें न तत्त्वमें धारण नहीं किया गया है। वह अभी तक साहित्य में गुणवत्ता दर्शक नहीं है। अन्यदेश्य में सिद्ध हैं साहित्य जिसमें न तत्त्वमें धारण नहीं किया गया है। वह अभी तक साहित्य में गुणवत्ता दर्शक नहीं है। (See Basavabhânu, p. 19).
After stating the polemic about the word, we like to give our own opinion and explanation of the origin and growth of the word into wide popular use. We think that the word is one of conventional growth. It is based on the psychology of the people to have a word expressive of an object, short, simple, and connotative of the inner meaning of the object for which it stands. The people desire that the inner meaning or pith of the object should flash forth and the object should throb before their minds' eye or imagination, as soon as the word expressive of the object is uttered. The word "Veerashaiva" failed to satisfy such a desire of the people. It denoted, as it does now, simply some kind of Shaiva. But it did not connote in any way the prominent and the only characteristic, namely, the holy Linga worn on the body. Linga worn on the body is the visible sign and a distinctive mark of being a Veerashaiva. But the word "Veerashaiva" by itself does not and did not bring out the idea of the mark. Men had and have to pause and think before they comprehended the characteristic mark. But having had no patience to do so, they were busy in finding out a new word, as a short cut, to understand the characteristic, Linga, to the exclusion of others, which are not only less prominent but are also common to other Shaivas, namely, विमुलि and श्राव. But Linga is the only special mark of a Veerashaiva. Linga is so, but what about the wearer of the Linga? How is he to be expressed and understood easily? The method of solving the problem was simple. The possessive Sanskrit affix वर was there. And the word भिमवल्, like
and a host of others, must have come to be used and attained popularity in a very short time, as it expressed both the distinctive mark and the possessor of the mark. धनवाद expresses the possessor of धन and conveys to the hearer easily and prominently both the characteristic, namely, धन and its possessor. In the same way लिंगायत also does the same. As soon as it is uttered it conveys to the hearer without any trouble on his part to understand, the distinctive mark and its wearer. लिंगायत is the nominative singular of लिंगवत्, the uninflected form (प्राप्तिपदक), and expresses a single individual wearing Linga; and लिंगवत्: is the nominative plural of लिंगवत् and expresses many individuals wearing Linga or the whole host of Linga-wearers or the members of the Lingāyata community. It is very common and customary to use plural as a mark of honour, when a single individual is addressed or spoken of or to. The use of plural with reference to a single individual is courteous refined manners. Hence लिंगवत्: must have been more common than the singular लिंगायत्, as it was civil and respectful when used with reference to a single individual but was necessary, when used with reference to many or the whole host of the members of the community. The Sanskrit words लिंगायत् and लिंगवत्: must have been first used by the educated few, educated in Sanskrit; but in course of a very short time it must have come to be used by the ordinary folk and attained currency in the general public, on account of its connotative merit. The language of the ordinary folk being Kanarese, लिंगायत् and लिंगवत्:, and more probably the latter, must have

"It may be noted that even now in some places people use the word "लिंगवत्रह (Ommammeh)" for Lingāyatas."
assumed the form of लिंगायत, a तढ़व word, a class of words of the Kanarese language. The word "लिंगायत" thus seems to be a word of conventional growth. Such is our explanation, though we cannot quote in authority any explanation given of it in books of past times. We are alone responsible for it, whatever may the truth in it and whatever may the merits or demerits in it, though such seems to be the truth. And we may repeat the words of the learned gentleman, mutatis mutandis "After the word is established in the foregoing to be a word of conventional growth as a तढ़व word, there is no ground for any body to ask for its occurrence in books of past times, for the simple season that its use at present is proof enough of its use in the past. Explanation of a word, as being a word of conventional growth, is sufficient to prove that it is a तढ़व word conventionally grown out of a Sanskrit word. The disputant cannot now say that it is not so, unless and unlit he successfully disproves it."

There is another reason why the word "लिंगायता" is to be used in preference to the word "Veerashaiva". The words Lingāyata and Veerashaiva are neither coextensive nor convertible, though they look so. In a way "Veerashaiva" is more extensive and a genus. The word "Lingāyata" is less extensive and a species. The former is more extensive and a genus, because it includes within its fold the आराध्यस, who form a class or a community, though a small community mostly found in Telgu districts. "Lingāyata" is a species and less extensive, because it does not include within its fold the आराध्यस, who call themselves Veerashaivas and not Lingाव-
yatas. They are a small sect or a subsect of Veerashaivas; and they profess and practise पद्मा and अद्वैत, the creed of Veerashaivism or Lingayatism, and profess and practise in addition § वर्णधार्मिक of Hindus and Hinduism. They wear on their bodies Linga and also the sacred thread. They retain some of the Brahmanic rites and repeat गायत्री and follow all Brahmanical sixteen संकारां like पूजन, सिंहतोलन and others, which are tabooed from the Veerashaiva creed.

In short if the real religion, the real Veerashaiva religion, is to be understood it comes to be understood as वैष्णव विशिष्ट, पद्मा, and अद्वैत and neither more nor less. And this aspect of the religion and the whole aspect including the संतुत्तराए (fivefold code of life) and शिवस्तिनिकास, (sixty three rules of daily conduct) is better expressed and unfolded by 'Lingayatism' and the follower is better expressed by 'Lingayata.' It is to be understood that whenever the words Veerashaiva and Veerashaivism, and Lingayata and Lingayatism, are used in these pages, they are used as coextensive and convertible terms and as exclusive of the आराध्यायम.

(b) Shaivism and Veerashaivism.

Veerashaiva is a particular Shaiva, distinguished from other Shaivas; and Veerashivism is a division or subdivision of Shaivism. Veerashaivas form a section of the Shaiva world and Veerashaivism forms a species of Shaivism, though an integral and distinct part of it.

§ See "Castes and Tribes of Mysore", vol. II; page 32.
distinction and is intended for making the whole distinction, and is elaborately explained in various ways. That makes Veerashaivism a distinct religious entity. That Veerashaivism is a distinct religious entity and that the Lingayata community is a distinct religious community, will be vindicated and proved later, so that Veerashaivism deserves to be counted and mentioned along with other major religions of the world. It will suffice here to state the relation between Shaivism and Veerashaivism to show that Veerashaivism has grown out of Shaivism and made itself so distinct a part as to be on par with other religions of the world, though unfortunately, Veerashaivism or the religion of the Lingayatas is the least known religion, for reasons that will be noted further on in a relevant section.

Shaivas and Veerashaivas have something in common but differ so widely in other vital matters that they stand on a different level altogether and the something common comes to be obscured largely. Thus Shaivism is the background of Veerashaivism that forms the foreground. The thing, common to both Shaivas and Veerashaivas or Lingayata, is the Godhead or उपासनेत्वम्. Moreover the idea of the deity at the bottom of the Universe, created, protected and reabsorbed by the deity, the idea of the deity as the cosmic principle and spirit, evolving the Universe, involving the Universe into itself and transcending over the Universe, is the common ground on which both Shaivism and Veerashaivism stand. Here ends the common ground, though there are some other things
common to both like विभूति, स्मार्क, and मंत्र. But these also differ so widely in their relation to other things in the system of their religious practices. In short the deity and the broad philosophical interpretation of the working of the deity in cosmogony and the reabsorption of the Universe into the deity by the deity is what forms the common principle and common ground of the meeting of the two. In other respects, in respect of the methods of attaining final beatitude (the whole called the religious practice), in respect of spiritual practices for spiritual culture of individuals, in respect of sociology and the broad basis of society or the basic principles of society, they differ so widely that they bifurcate and stand on a different level altogether never to meet. However there can be no gainsaying the fact that Veerashaivism has grown out of Shaivism. And to understand how Veerashaivism has evolved or grown out of Shaivism, study historically its growth and development in the proper perspective, and to understand the scripture and religious literature common to both and peculiar to both, it is indispensable to study and trace the growth of Shaivism historically. To this, therefore, we now turn; because this is as much necessary as it is to understand the background well to be enabled to understand the foreground equally well.

II

Pre-Aryan Dravidian Civilization.

All scholars unanimously hold that there was no high form of civilization in ancient India before the coming of Aryans to India. The people that inhabited India before the immigration of Aryans were almost
barbarians leading a life of nomads. It has been the fashion of scholars to give credit to Aryans for all that was best in India and for the splendour and glory that was once Ind. Religion, philosophy, and literature in all forms were all due to the activities of Aryans after they entered India, settled there, and made it their home. It has been, moreover, asserted that the Aryans, whenever and from wherever they entered India through north-western passes were already a civilized people and were in possession of a form of civilization, which they brought to India and which became the basis of the civilization, that later flourished in all branches in that dazzling form, that has been the cultural heritage of India. *Hitherto it has commonly been supposed that the pre-Aryan peoples of India were on an altogether lower plane of civilization than their Aryan conquerors; that to the latter, they were much what the helots were to the Spartans, or Slavs to their Byzantine overlords—a race so servile and degraded, that they were commonly known as Dasas or slaves. The picture of them gleaned from the hymns of Rigveda was that of black-skinned, flat-nosed barbarians, as different from the fair Aryans in physical aspect as they were in speech and religion, though at the same time it was evident that they must have been rich in cattle, good fighters, and possessed of many forts in which they defended themselves against the invaders. These "forts", however, were explained away by Vedic scholars as being no more than occasional places of refuge—simple earth-works, that is to say, surrounded, may be, by palisades or rough stone walls; for, seeing that the Aryans them-

*Marshall's preface to Mohenjo-Daro and Indus civilization.
selves were still in the village state and that their society was in other respects correspondingly primitive, it was deemed impossible that the older races of India—the contemptible, outcast Dasas—could already have been living in well-built cities or fortresses, or in other respects have attained a higher state of culture. Mentally, physically, socially, and religiously, their inferiority to their conquerors was taken for granted, and little or no credit was given them for the achievements of Indian civilization. Never for a moment it was supposed that five thousand years ago, before ever the Aryans were heard of, the Punjab and Sind, if not other parts of India as well, were enjoying an advanced and singularly uniform civilization of their own, closely akin but in some respects even superior to that of contemporary Mesopotamia and Egypt.

That India was peopled by Dravidians before the immigration of Aryans into India has been admitted by all, with the exception of the great Sanskrit scholar, Muir, whose explanation of Indo-Aayan origin of Dravidians will be given presently. But who were the Dravidians and how they thrived there is a knotty problem that defies attempts at a satisfactory solution. And it is also commonly held by scholars of ethnology and antiquity that even Dravidians were immigrants that entered India and settled there side by side with the aborigines, who were later driven to take shelter in mountain fastnesses, where they are still seen as hill tribes. Various are the theories propounded by different scholars about the origin of Dravidians as follows:—

(a) *Muir holds that “Among the Dasyn tribes, which, according to the Aitareya Brahmana, were descended from Rishi Viswamitra, are mentioned the

*Muir's Sanskrit texts Vol. II, Sec. 5, P. 422.
Andhras. Manu specifies the Dravidas as among the tribes, which had once been Kshatriyas, but had sunk into the condition of Vrishalas (Shudras) from the extinction of sacred rites and the absence of the Brahmins. In like manner the Cholas and Keralas are stated in the Harivansha to have once been deprived of their social and religious position by king Sagara. In the same way, it appears that several Puranas, the Vayu, Matsya, Agni, and Brahma, claim an Aryan descent for the southern races by making their progenitors or eponyms Pandya, Karnata, Chola, and Kerala to be descendants of Dushyanta, the adopted son of Turvasu; a prince of the lunar line of Kshatriyas. Turvasu, the Puranas say, was appointed by his father to rule over the south-east. Thus the Harivansha relates, Yayati, the son of Nahusha, having conquered the earth with its seven continents and oceans, divided it into five portions for his sons. This wise king placed Turvasu over the south-east region. According to the legend, Turvasu, in common with most others of Yayati's sons, had declined to accede to his father's request that he should exchange his condition of youthful vigour for his father's decrepitude, and was in consequence cursed by the old man. The Mahabharata I, 3478 gives the following particulars of the curse:—since thou, though born from within me, dost not give me up thy youth, therefore thy offspring shall be cut off. Thou fool shalt be King over those degraded men who live like the mixed castes, who marry in the inverse order of the classes, and who eat flesh. Thou shalt rule over those wicked Mlenchchas who commit adultery with their preceptor's wives, perpetrate nameless offences, and follow the practices
of brutes. The Andhras, Dravidas, Cholas, and Keralas, who have been mentioned in the foregoing pages as degraded Kshatriyas, or as descendents of the adopted son of Turvasu, were the inhabitants of Telengana, of the central and the southern parts of the Coromandel coast or the Tamil country, and of Malabar respectively. Thus in the opinion of this great Sanskrit Scholar Dravidians were an offspring of Aryans after they entered India and propagated their race there. But little credit can be given to this explanation of Dravidian origin. For, a people, that descended from the Aryans, could not have developed a language of their own, the Dravidian language, altogether distinct from Sanskrit, the language of the Aryan people, from whom they have been said to have descended. It would be quite reasonable and proper to hold that they inherited the Sanskrit language from their fore-fathers, if they were really the descendents of the Aryan people.

As opposed to Muir's theory of the Indo-Aryan origin of Dravidians, the following theories propounded by different scholars about Dravidians and their entrance into India, may be noted.

(a) The Indo-African-Austral origin of Dravidians and their immigration into India via Lemuria. According to this theory of Huxley and others and supported by Keene and Morris, it is said that once the Indian Ocean was a continent and was called Lemuria. It extended from Madagascar to Malaya Archipelago, connecting south India with Africa and Australia. Later the continent submerged under water long long ago. † Mr. Oldham also concludes

† Thurston's Castes and Tribes of Southern India, Vol. I, p. xxiv.
from close affinities between plants and animals in Africa and India at a very remote period that there was once a continuous stretch of dry land connecting India and Africa. It is held that before the submergence of this continent Dravidians entered India from the south. Moreover the aborigines of Australia have been associated with Dravidians by many ethnologists; and the affinity between them has been based upon some common words employed by both and upon the boomerang used by them. But Sir W. Turner turns down this theory and says that there is no affinity between the Dravidians and the Australians from comparison of their crania.

(b) *Sir William Hunter holds that Tibeto-Burmans and Kolarians entered India by the North-eastern passes and "the Dravidians, or the third stock, seem, generally speaking, on the other hand, to have found their way into the Punjab by the North-western passes. They now inhabit the southern part of the three-sided table land, as far down as Cape Camorin, the southernmost point of India. It appears as if the two streams, namely the Kolarians from the North-east and Dravidians from the North-west, had converged and crossed each other in Central India. The Dravidians proved the stronger and broke up the Kolarians and thrust aside their fragments to east and west. The Dravidians then rushed forward in a mighty body to the south."

§ The aboriginal tribes in Southern and Western Australia use almost the same words for I, thou, he, we, you, etc. as the Dravidian fishermen on the Madras coast, and resemble in other ways the Madras hill tribes, as in the use of their national weapon, the boomerang. (\*\*The Indian Empire, p. 105. ) *Ibid p. 103.
(c) The theory of Elamite origin of Dravidians says that India was first in occupation of two hordes of Elamite invaders, one coming by the sea-route of the Persian gulf, and the other following the land-route through Bolan pass. The first settled on the west coast of India and the other occupied North India. Thus * Ragozin says in his Vedic India "The connection between the Dravidians of the Northern and Western India and the first Babylonian Empire,—the Babylonia of Shumiro-Accads, before the advent of Semites—becomes less surprising when we realize that there is between them something more than chance relations, that they were in fact of the same race and stock—that which is broadly designated as Turanian. Philology points that way, for Dravidian languages are agglutinative; craniology will not disprove the affinity, for a glance at the Gondh types and the turbaned head of Tell-Loh will show the likeness in features and shape. But even more convincing is the common sacred symbol—the Serpent, the emblem of the worship of the earth, with its mystery, its wealth and its forces. The Accadian supreme god Ea was worshipped as the holiest shrine at Eridhu under the form of a serpent, and as Eridhu was the centre from which the Chaldean civilization started and spread, so the serpent symbol was accepted as that of the race and its religion." This theory seems to have been based on the Pauranik myths of deluge and the Ark common to India and Elam.

(d) The theory of diffusion, that is, the theory of the diffusion of culture from Egypt to Sumer, Elam, and thence to other countries. † Prof. W. J. Perry says that Egypt

* Vedic India, pp. 308, 309. † Growth of civilization p. 53.
was the first home of civilization, that the Egyptians were the first to develop a civilization that was the source of civilization in other surrounding countries for many centuries. The culture of Sumer and Elam was Egyptian in origin. According to this school the Dravidians were a branch of Mediterranean race. The exponents of diffusion school base their conclusions on the resemblance between the Mediterranean people and the Dravidians in shape of skull, colour, texture of hair, colour of eyes, and features and the build.

+ Prof. Fleure thinks that immigrants akin to the Mediterraneans, Hamitic and the Semitic, may well have brought to India many improvements lifting men above merely hunting stage and even giving the beginnings of agriculture...not less than a thousand years before the coming of the Aryans and that Dravidian culture was the result. $Dr. Hall of the British Museum also says “With our present evidences, the Dravidians look like being a Mediterranean people, coming out of Crete and passing through Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, where they were in close touch with Sumerians and Elamites; and possibly these latter were related to them and the Cretans. Then they came by the southern part of the Iranian plateau into Sindh, whence they came into the interior of India. This must have happened long before 3000 B.C....India is thus linked more closely than ever to the Western world through both the Aryans and the Dravidians”. Some words, common to Brâhui dialect spoken in Baluchistan and Tamil, are also taken in evidence of Dravidians entering India through north-western passes. Dr. Hall makes a counter suggestion also as will be noted later.

+ Noted by Slater in his “Dravidian Element in Indian culture” p. 40.

$ Quoted by R. Narasinhachar in his “History of Kanarese Literature” p. 12.
The long and short of all these theories of Dravidian element in the Indian population is that Dravidians like their successors, the Aryans, were immigrants bringing with them a sort of civilization; that the West, according to the majority of different schools, was the cradle of civilization; and that no credit could be given to India for being the home of civilization, which was twice imported into India by Dravidian and Aryan immigrants at different times. These theories, based as they are on strong and almost incontrovertible evidence, seem to have sprung, it seems, from one basic misconception—that India could give no scope climatically or economically for autochthones to spring into existence and develop their own civilization by degrees from the lowest to the highest form. Hence the aborigines, whoever they might be, were a low class of human beings and who were, therefore, twice superseded later by intruders from outside.

It is altogether a great puzzle to see that India, with her fertile lands, with her wonderful wealth of minarets underground, with a very rich variety of fauna and flora overground, with her climate local in some respects but continental in others, and thus eminently fitted to be a nursing ground for a people to make their first appearance, thrive in all stages of life, and to evolve a culture of their own in situ, should yet depend upon outsiders to come and evolve a culture there. It is strange, indeed, that it did not strike scholars that India could well afford a stimulus to the slow growth of social and religious life of her autochthones under the beneficent influence of physical environment and
reaction of geographical causes. Says J. Eagozin "the immense variety of her vegetation will be inferred from the fact that, besides the distinctly tropical and indigenous plants which have been just briefly touched upon and a great many more, there is scarcely a variety of fruit tree, timber tree, food plant, or ornamental plant that Europe and the temperate regions of Asia can boast, but makes its home in India and thrives there. The cause of such extraordinary exuberance is not far to seek; it lies in the great variety of climates, which in India range through the entire scale from the hottest tropical to moderately warm and even cold.....The same variety, and for the same reasons, marks the animal creation of fauna of the Indian continent, both wild and domestic.....Even so brief and cursory a review of India’s physical traits and resources would be incomplete without some mention of the mineral wealth which, for ages, has been pre-eminently associated with the name.” It, therefore, requires no stretch of imagination to understand that India could well be and was the home of a people to spring into existence and develop a culture of their own in the midst of her congenial climate or climates and encouraging geographical conditions. It is, thus, no wonder that in the light of recent researches some scholars come forward and assert that Dravidians were the autochones of India and evolved a civilization of their own gradually in all evolutionary stages and ages of early man’s life. In direct contradiction of all foregoing theories it is said by § Govinda-charya Swami “Hence we shall not be far wrong if we

Vedic India, chap. I. § Indian Antiquary 1911, p. 118.
infer that south India gave a refuge to the survivors of the deluge, that the culture developed in Lemuria was carried to south India after its submergence, and that south India after its submergence, was probably the cradle of the post-diluvian human race. As the centre of gravity of the Dravidian people, as determined by the density of population, lies somewhere about Mysore, south of India must be considered as the home of these people, whence they might have spread to the North”.

* Dr. Chatterji says “It would be established, provided Hall’s theory of Sumerian origin be true, that civilization first arose in India and was probably associated with the primitive Dravidians. Then it was taken to Mesopotamia to become the source of Babylonian and other ancient cultures, which form the basis of modern civilization”.

† Mr. P. T. Shrinivas Iyanger asserts “The pageant of Indian history is the grandest that the history of any country can offer. The history of India began when man first appeared on the globe. Since then, the Indian people alone of the peoples of the various countries of the earth have been progressing without interruption in handicraft, physical sciences applied to manual industries, art work on wood, stone and ivory, social amelioration and religious experience. The civilization of India alone has progressed for countless millenniums without being prematurely choked out of existence by the desiccation of soil or the drying up of

* Modern Review, Dec. 1924. † The stone Age in India—Introduction.
the nobler springs of human action, by the spread of malaria or the moral decadence of the people". Proofs are not wanting to show that man made his first appearance in India, as elsewhere, and gradually progressed so as to reach the height of civilization that has been the cultural heritage of Indian people of the present day, the civilization, which with the activities of the of Aryans after their immigration has been the composite civilization. From the biological approach to the evolution of human beings India, † It is said by Rev. E. O. James "It is quite within the bounds of probability that further research in the neighbourhood of the Siwalik (Sapâdalaksha) hills in Northern India will reveal one more of the tertiary forerunners of the apes and man. Palaeopithicus (i.e. ancient ape) may be cited as an example from the pleiocene of the Siwalik hills of a generalized type of extinct ape related to the Chimpanzee, the Gorilla, and the Gibbon, with upper premolars resembling those of man". After the appearance of the book scholars making scientific investigation visited Siwalik hills and arrived at the conclusion that Northern India was probably the first home of man. But information about the condition of man in the dim ages of the past, i.e. the pre-historic times, can be gathered only by the material relics of man's workmanship, called artefacts, such as tools, weapons, pottery, and tombs, which have survived from those remote past times and have been collected and carefully preserved by scholars, interested in pre-historic antiquities with a view to piece together man's history and his gradual progress.

† Introduction to Anthropology, 1919, pp. 61-62.
Man's origin and appearance on the globe has been a mystery that baffles attempts at a satisfactory scientific solution. But when he made his first appearance he was little better than other animals, with the difference that he was, and has been, blessed with superior intelligence, which makes the whole difference between him and other animals. His first concern was, like that of other animals, to find food to satisfy hunger a primary animal demand. It is this demand of hunger and man's attempts at satisfying the demand as easily as possible has been the prime cause of man's progress and advancement. He had first to invent tools for easy procuration of food, and then to invent weapons to protect himself from animal and human foes. Gradually as he advanced he invented the art of making pottery for the convenience of life for storage and cooking food. Later he must have conceived the idea of disposing of the dead. First he must have left exposed the dead bodies on the earth and then he must have begun the burying of the dead, from which arose the idea of tombs. Thus says Rev. E. O. James, † "Homo primogenius was probably at first mainly a vegetarian,...........It can be pretty safely assumed judging from the teeth of the earliest skulls and from the lack of implements, that prior to the Chellean age (the lowest palaeolithic Age) primordial man was chiefly a vegetarian, except for flesh as was furnished by small animals". † Later he says "By assuming the erect attitude man became differentiated from all other animals by being free to pick up and

† Introduction to Anthropology pp. 65-67.
hold or throw stones, etc., an accomplishment of the greatest value in the daily quest of food. With a piece of flint he could pound up his roots, berries etc., scrape with a similar weapon the skins of the animals he had killed, dig holes in the ground for store-houses, or increase the warmth of his hut, and in later times could hollow out trees to make canoes. In short, flint or perhaps, a bone implement, was used for every thing for which a tool was used. At first a stone haphazardly picked up no doubt served for many purposes." So also says R. B. Foote "At first a stone haphazardly picked up no doubt served for many purposes. Monkeys have been observed to use stones for cracking nuts, etc., and therefore there is no definitely human mental activity in the performance of such an act. But as soon as he appeared, it was not long before he discovered that a shaped implement was more practical than an unshaped one, and he began flaking his tools to the desired proportions. The earliest tools must have been made by flaking or hammering a piece of gravel with another stone to improve its shape and adapt it for use." So man; when he began his career on the globe, began to manufacture tools and artefacts for himself which form the best evidence of man's presence in a particular place on the earth and his progress. Tools and other things tell an eloquent tale of man's history of pre-historic times:

Archaeologists are agreed that nascent civilization of man arose and developed by successive stages and divide pre-historic times broadly into four periods or Ages (1) Palaeolithic Age or that of the old rough stone tools (2) Neolithic Age or that of the new smooth stone tools (3) Bronze Age or that of bronze tools (4) and Iron Age or that of iron tools. If enough materials of these different stages and Ages are found in India there will be no scope for doubting that civilization arose in India and developed there by stages, and she had no cause to look to the face of other countries for importing civilization or culture. That this is so is amply borne out by the pre-historic finds collected so far and kept in museums.

Before tools and artefacts of pre-historic antiquities are noted, it will be proper here to note the places where these tools and artefacts, particularly of palaeolithic Age, are found. Scholars engaged in collecting early human artefacts in India arrive at the conclusion that man first appeared in and has since then occupied the edge of Deccan plateau. This will be evident if the places, where these tools and artefacts have been discovered, are noted on the map of India. A study of the map of palaeolithic sites, says R. B. Foote, * "shows that the several peoples concerned were widely distributed over the country, except in the mountain and

* R. B. Foote, Indian pre-historic and proto-historic antiquities. p. 36.
great forest regions of the west peninsula, in which so far as my experience goes, no traces have been found of palaeolithic race or races. The localization of all the races has also been influenced in some measure by the distribution of the rocks yielding materials suited for their respective implements. Thus there are far more numerous traces of the palaeolithic race the great quartzite-yielding groups forming the Cuddapah series of the Indian geologists and the great quartzite shingle conglomerates of the Upper Gondwana system in the Chingleput (Madras), North Arcot and Nellore districts, than in other regions. In diminishing quantities traces of palaeolithic man are found to the northward of Kistna valley, where quartzite becomes a much less common rock. So also to the southward of Palar valley where quartzite becomes a rare material; to the westward on the Deccan plateau, where the stone chippers finding no quartzites in the Bellary district had recourse to the banded jasper haematite rocks of the Dharwar system; and further north in the valley of Kistna where recourse was had in one instance to hard siliceous limestone. " So also Mr. P. T. Shrinivas Iyanger says § "Palaeoliths have been chiefly found in south India. The Kurnool district has yielded abundant palaeolithic remains. Considerable areas of the coastal regions of the Guntur and Nellore districts contain relics of man's hand-work. So too, the hills, maidans, and scrub jungles of the Cuddapah district. The Chingleput and North Arcot districts have yielded innumerable palaeolithic tools. In the Dharwar and Bijapur districts—the southern Mahratta country—all sorts of implements

§ The Stone Age in India, p. 8.
of the old stone Age have been picked up. A single specimen of the Narmada valley (Central provinces) furnishes decisive contemporaneity with extinct vertebrate fauna. In the Godavari valley (Warangal division of the Hyderabad state) has been found an old factory of palaeolithic tools. A few implements have been found scattered in central India and Rajputana and almost none in Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa. This proves that from earliest times man flourished in the edge of the Deccan plateau.\footnote{Quartzite was the most suitable material for making tools; and by far the greater number of palaeoliths that have been discovered so far in southern India have been made of quartzites, which are \textquotedblleft metamorphosed sandstones, the metamorphism consisting of the introduction and deposition of secondary silica, in crystalline continuity with the rolled quartz-grains of the original sandstone.\textquotedblright} But R. B. Foote remarks \footnote{R. B. Foote, Geology of India, p. 72.} \footnote{Op. cit. p. 9.} \textquotedblright North of the valley of the Palar river, it was far and away the most plentiful material; the great shingle-beds of different ages of the Jurassic rocks (The Rajmahal series), the Sripermbur and Sattiyavedu series, afford inexhaustible and widespread supplies of splendid shingle, which the palaeolithic folk seem to have preferred greatly to masses of quartzites broken off from the vast beds of that rock, which gives to enormous scarps which figure so strikingly in the Cuddapah and Kurnool systems, as seen in the Nagari mountains and the Vellikonda and Nallamalai ranges of the Eastern Ghats\textquotedblright. But West of longitude 77.30 W. true quartzite, he remarks further on \footnote{Op. cit. p. 77.} \textquotedblright is not found in any quantity and the old stone chippers had to
content themselves, unless prepared to take a long perilous journey, with the best substitute they could find, which in Bellary district was the more siliceous varieties of the haematite quartzite, which forms such huge beds in the Dharwar system to which belong the hill ranges in the centre and the western part of the district. It lent itself by no means so well to being worked into implements as the true quartzite, but still the old workers managed to turn out useful axes and other tools."

Mr. P. T. Shrinivas Iyangar discusses how the Deccan or Peninsular India was quite suitable for man's early habitation and his activities towards progress. *He says "On the one hand we may discuss which part of the earth was best fitted to support primitive man in fairly large numbers when he first arose in ancient times. He could surely not have inhabited the bleak mountain tops of the Himalayas where man even now cannot live; nor could he have inhabited the dense forests that clothe the lower levels of the Himalayan mountains or the equally thick jungle regions called Dandakaranyam, which in those days stretched from where the Indo-Gangetic plain ended to within a few miles of Cape Camorin. The inner recesses of the tropical jungle, even today, many milleniums after man learnt to conquer nature and to utilize or transcend the conditions of his environment, continue to be unhealthy for human habitation and too thickly infested with animal and vegetable monsters for feeble man to flourish there. Nor could early man have inhabited the great river*
valleys of ancient India. In early days the beds of rivers were much broader and higher than they are now and the regions adjoining then far too marshy. The great Indo-Gangetic plain, however fitted to maintain a teeming population now that the rivers have hollowed a deep bed for themselves and man has drained the soil for thousand of years and learnt to raise several kinds of crops, must have been in the far off past too much without cavert to afford primitive man shelter against the animal foes both huge and small and too much water-logged to be fit for men to live and grow there. Man, therefore, most probably rose and grew in the comparatively narrow strip of coast between the jungle and the Indian ocean. Here the land is of moderate height above sea-level; the jungle was too thin to enable early man's animal foes to infest it in large numbers; he could find shelter in bushes and on tops of trees. The climate then was equable as it is now; the atmospheric conditions did not require that his skin comparatively denuded of hair needed any protection in the form of dress which he had to provide for himself with, when later he spread to less favourable climates. The soil, not far from river valleys, retained enough water to meet the wants of early man who for want of pots could not live very far from sources of water supply .... The fruits and nuts which formed the main portion of his diet were available in plenty in the fringes of Dandakaranyam. The fact that primitive representatives of the four existing types of anthropoid apes—the Gorilla and the chimpanzee, the Gibbon and the Orang-outang—have been discovered in southern India proves that here man ought to have risen and flourished
in ancient times. The environment that suited these apes must have suited also early man." Therefore it is seen from the material for tools and implements and from the sites of tools and implements south or Peninsular India was the home of man when he first rose there."

* J. C. Brown divides tools and implements of Palaeolithic Age in India "into three types, namely, bouchers, which correspond to the English "Celt"...palaeoliths, in which I included the axe and the cleaver-like forms...and discoid forms." But † Foote holds that ten distinct forms of tools can be recognized. He says "The palaeolithic forms are at least ten in number, clearly designed for different purposes. The leading shapes are pointed ovals. ...These show considerable differences in the proportion of their width to length and have all sharp edges all round which would prevent their being used in the unprotected hand. They were in all probability fitted into cloven handles and securely lashed with guts or stripes of wet hide or strong vegetable fibre; but no type of hafting was preserved in the deposits in which the implements came to be buried ". The ten forms of tools are (1) axes, of which four forms have been found—(a) pointed oval (b) oval (c) square edged, called the Madras type (d) oblique-edged, called the guillotine type; (2) spears—(a) narrow type (b) broad based type; (3) digging tools, pointed with thick pebble butts; (4) circular instruments, hurling stones with sharp edges all round, the prototype of Vishnu's disk; (5) choppers, pointed oval with sharp edge on one side only; (6) knives, long narrow flakes with parallel sharp edges; (7) scrapers; (8) cores; (9) hammer-stones; (10) strike-a-lights.

§ Traces of Magdalenian settlements, belonging to the close of the Palaeolithic Age have been discovered in the great Billa Surgam cave in the Kurnool district. Besides bones of extinct and existing animals, a number of pre-historic objects including pendants made of teeth, and a few carved bones were found there. Other caves in the great limestone areas of the Kurnool, Cuddapah, and Dharwar systems still await the search of the investigator."

Drawings and pointings of men and animals of men, carvings in horn and engravings on stone made by palaeolithic artists have been found in French and Swiss caves; but none such are found in India except the pendants made of teeth found in the Billa Surgan cave of the Kurnool district. In this connection † Foote remarks it would be unsafe to conclude that none had been produced by the old people who were possessed of burins, or engraving tools, similar to those used by the palaeolithic artists who draw the wonderful pictures of man and his contemporary animals referred to above. Similar drawings may have been made by the Indians, and have been destroyed by those ubiquitous destroyers of many human artefacts, the termites, which are known to have attacked and damaged human crania in ancient Egyption graves. It is by no means unlikely that the Indian insect ravagers may have done the same, and have annihilated the carvings and drawings made by the old people of this country on bone and ivory.....It I think, far from improbable that other caves than in, Bills Surgan and Oyerrazari Gabbì groups may exist in

§ P. T. S. Iyangar, Stone Age in India, p. 16.
the great limestone of the Cuddapah and Kurnool systems and their more westerly equivalents of Bhima and Kaladgi series. Search should be made all our those lime stone areas for caves that were unknown to the geological surveyors for they had to get over such large tracts of country at great speed, that they easily might have missed caves in thickly jungled valleys, and many important caves may be unknown to the local natives. Caves may be hidden to a strange extent, by the falling in of the rocks over their entrance or mouths. That the old people might have possessed pigments, wherewith to produce coloured paintings if they desired to do so, is a well-known fact and in several places many varieties of coloured clays and ochers are in large quantities. A very interesting example of such a site occurs along the west boundary of the Dharwar rock, which are exposed in the scarp of Raman Drug (ought to be Raman Durg) hills in Bellary distrct; the series of clay schists here met with contains examples of red of several shades green dark, and light blackish and other intermediate tints.

From the foregoing it will be seen that the life of the people in the Deccan during the Placolithic Age was similar to that of the Palaeolithic people in other parts of the world.

Now about the Neolithic Age, which succeeded the palaeolithic Age. The tools and implements of the Neolithic Age in India, found and displayed in museums, are more various and numerous. This is as it ought to be in the advanced stage of man's life on the earth.

*Twelve types of celts with sides of different shapes,*

*The Stone Age in India pp. 30-31.*
six types of chisels, square, triangular etc., Three of hammers, two of adzes, anvils, corn-crushers, cylinders, discs, hammers Stones, horns, mace-heads, mealing places on rocks in situ, two types of mealing stones, two of mealing troughs, mortars, mullers (for grinding powders on slab), net sinkers, pestles, pivot-stones, powders, polishing grooves, slabs for grinding, slick-stones (used to put a gloss upon the surface of cloth while still on the loom), stone vessels, of steatite, tally-stones, thumb-stones (made to fit the hand and used for flaking), whet-stones, palettes for rouge, pén cil s of Steatite, phalli, besides beads of many types, buttons, human and animal figurines, marbles (toys'), pendants, and fire-drills—all of polished Stones, have been so far discovered. Of polished artefacts we have tough anvils, three types of arrowheads, bone-splitters, two types of burins, six types of cores, flakers, knives, lance-heads, lancets, mallets, potting stone for potters, saws, scalpels, three types of scrapers, sling-stones, spokeshaves, and wedges, and also selected Stones of many kinds for various purposes. This long list excludes the wooden tools, of which they must have had a large variety and which have not survived. "Men of this age made their polished tools of trap-rocks, a material tougher and more tenacious than quartzite and amenable to better polish. "Neolithic men," § says Foote "did not, except possibly in very rare cases, make their implements out of large pieces of freshly broken rock, but sought about on the trap dykes whence they procured their work material, for fragments of rock of

suitable size and shape formed by convenient disposition of the joint planes, or shrinkage cracks set up in all igneous rocks when cooling from a highly heated condition. Such suitably shaped fragments of rocks were of very great assistance to the stone-clippers as they enabled them to form their several implements with very much less labour than if they had to reduce large pieces of broken rock to the comparatively small size of the axes, adzes, and hammers in general demand by their non-toolmaking neighbours.” R. B. Foote has recorded an interesting description of several neolithic settlements and implement factories in southern India. One such is found on the Kapagallu (Peacock’s) hill near Bellary, about which he says “The castellated summit of the Kupgal offered to its inhabitants several fine rock shelters of which they availed themselves gladly. One reason and probably the principal one for the special attraction of celt makers to the Kupgal was the existence of a great dyke of dioritic traps which traverses the hill axially in a N. W. by W. direction. This dyke furnished the stone workers with an inexhaustible supply of excellent material of two sorts, the coarse black diorite and the fine-grained pale green-grey to drab-trap which occurs in lenticular masses, of ten of large size, included in the great diorite dyke........the celts and other polished implements are met with in different stages of manufacture........(First the implement) was chipped into form roughly........(It was) advanced a stage by “pecking”, that is, breaking down the angles of the

different chippings with a sharp-pointed instrument with the object of decreasing very greatly the quantity of material which would have to be removed by grinding....(then the implement was) ground and all excessive roughness removed....(Then) the ground surface was polished”. So also another interesting account has been given by Mr. Longhurst in the § Annual Report of the Archaeological Department, of the manufacture of stone implements of neolithic times as follows—“To the South and East of Dennakotiapalle, a small village situated eleven miles to the east of Hindupur railway station in the Anantapur district of the Madras Presidency are a number of small rocky hills, more or less connected together and which rise abruptly from the plains. Running along the crest (of one of the hills) is an outcrop of black trap, which, when viewed from a distance resembles the ruins of a fort-wall...Most of the boulders are not complete, as almost all of them show signs of having been struck with stone hammers in order to produce the flakes required for working up into finished celts. Hundreds of flakes and partly made stone implements, together with a quantity of stone hammers, may be found lying round the bases of these boulders, the latter showing unmistakable signs of being the original blocks from which the flakes were struck. In some cases I was able to replace the flakes on the very blocks from which they were struck and thus the first process of the manufacture of a stone celt became apparent, so much so, that I was able to produce a number of stone flakes...by simply picking up a stone hammer and bringing it down

§ Southern Circle, Madras, for 1914-15, p. 39.
with a good smart blow on the crown of one of the dome-shaped boulders. This part of the making of a stone implement is simple enough and does not require any practice; a stone hammer and a stone arm is all what is required. But the trimming of the edges of flakes and the working of it into an implement or weapon is a very different matter and a very difficult one. Judging from the number of partly finished celts lying on the ground, all of which were broken and useless as implements and weapons, it would appear that for every finished celt made, dozens of failures must have occurred. The finishing of the edges of the flakes must have been done by pressure and not with the hammer. I tried this myself and found that the use of the hammer for this work invariably broke the flake, but I was successful in trimming the edges by pressure applied by the aid of another stone.

Other implements like mealing stones, hammer stones, flakers etc. have been found made of various different materials such as granite, gneiss, haematite, quartzite, and granite of the Dharwar and Gondawana system. Moreover many pigmy flints have been found about which J. C. Brown says "Pygmy flints are found in great profusion among the offshoots of the Vindhyans in the United Provinces; Rewah and Baghelkhand...together with the cores from which they are derived, and are of chert, agate, jasper and carnelian often of beautiful tints. They have been obtained from the open surface of the ground, from under the earthly deposits on the floors of rocky shelters and caves, and from tumuli which also contained bones and

pottery." Besides stone tools there have been also found in neolithic tools numerous selected stones. x "By the term selected stones are meant stones foreign to the locality, in which they were found and which were brought there intentionally by human agency to be utilized in the preparation of some special implements. In many cases these selected stones were produced in some way or other from far distant places, and getting them must have involved considerable labour and travel on the part of neolithic people." The principle selected stones were chert, agate, jasper, and chalcedony. x "Under the head of selected stones might be included the material frequently brought from distant places for the manufacture of corn-crushers, mealing stones and hammer stones of various types." From the above extracts it seems that there was transfer or interchange of materials and implements from one place to another.

Pottery—Many relics of pottery have been found in neolithic settlements in the districts of Anantpur, Cuddapah, Kurnool, Tinnevelly, Salem, Pudukottah, Trichinopoly, and Bellary, and in Mysore, Hyderabad, Baroda, Kathiawar, Baluchistan, and other regions. It is probable that at first kilns were not constructed for burning the earthenware but they were burnt in open-fires, * "A strong argument in favour of this idea is provided by the appearance of many good vessels which are black at the top, but pass down into red. The black part is imperfectly burnt and the red, if bright red, is thoroughly well burnt." The types, of pottery may be classified § "as plain and decorated according to the

general surfaces irrespective of shape and colour. In the plain group we see four subgroups, (a) rough (b) smooth (c) polished (d) painted. The sub-groups of the decorated variety are three in number and may be described as (a) impressed (b) moulded (c) incised, of which the third is much the least common, though the two former were not so simple and easy to produce." One prominent feature that distinguishes the pottery is the fast colour of its surface. From neolithic graves many burial urns many thousand years old have been unearthed, yet the enamel looks as fresh as if it had been given just yesterday. Urns, vases, bowls, figurines, lotahs, chatties, saucers, spouted vessels, lamps, and libation vessels, have been recovered from various neolithic settlements. As regards the moulding and casting of pottery R. B. Foote remarks—§ "The preparations of earthenware structures, such as hut-urns and other angular forms, demands the pressing of the moistened clay into moulds. This process of moulding was one which had been discovered prior to the invention of potter's wheel, and so had seemingly been the process of cast vessels, which consists in the pouring of thick "slip" (i.e. semi-fluid clay) into a hollow mould, and allowing it to acquire a sufficient consistency to admit of its being removed from the mould without deforming it, before placing it in the kiln."

Art—So far as art is concerned natural objects like leaves, fruits etc. are seen represented on pottery. ‡ "Very noteworthy as good moulded imitation of a fruit is on the side of a large melon-bowl (found at Maski)"

...decorated with a fillet of rasp-berries outside below the lip ... the bowl when entire have been a distinctively handsome wheel.” J. C. Brown remarks * “The extent to which neolithic people were interested in and affected by perception of colour is not easy to gauge, as few indications of their love of varying tints remain; still there are four facts from which inferences can be drawn. Firstly, the several tints they allowed their pottery to receive was by varying the degree of firing they exposed the pots to. Secondly, the pigments they used to paint the different vessels the potters turned out, were shades of red, yellow, brown, and rarely orange or purplish grey. The third fact is the great fondness the old folk had for pistacite granite with its mixture of green and pink colours and for chrome gneiss with its delicate greenish white and green tints. In many cases, the specimens of these two rocks must have been fetched from great distances, though they would have served no better than the common country rock for the making of mealing-stones and corn-crushers for which they were generally used. The fourth fact or seeming fact lies in the very pretty and often quite gay colours of many of the selected stones gathered by the old people from quite distant places, e.g., the pleasing colours of the cherts and agates they collected to convert into drill-head flakes, scrapers and strike-a-lights.” Moreover, “The walls and roofs of caves which yield pigmy flints, are sometimes covered with rough drawings in ruddle or haematites. Similar ones, illustrating hunting scenes, occur in the Kaimur range, and it is believed from the primitive outlines of the depicted

weapons that they are some of the drawings of the Neolithic age. Beautiful examples of this art have recently been found in caves near Raigarh in the extreme east of the Central Provinces. Specimens of earthly red haematite, which have been rubbed down to produce a red colour wash, have been discovered in no less than thirteen sites in the Deccan, while the collection of the Indian Museum contains many specimens from the Hazaribagh district in Bohar. Two small palettes for grinding down this material to produce rouge have been described from Bellary and from Maski in the Raichur doab.” Decorated bangles have been recovered in various places. Shell bangles show decorative carvings of various devices on their backs.

Dress and Decoration—†“ As the cotton plant is a native of the Deccan, the neolithic people early learnt to weave cotton cloth; the hide dress and the bark dress of the earlier age were reserved for occasions of sanctity. The supply of cotton being plentiful, they wove pieces of cloth several yards long and wrapped them round their waists, and more especially round their heads, to protect them from the sun. Such is still the prevailing fashion of dress among the natives of cotton districts. They discovered vegetable dyes; the neolithic people had a delicate colour perception. The dyes used at first were yellow, indigo, and red....Woollen cloth was woven by the pastoral tribes Kurumbas, even perhaps before cotton cloth was woven. Neolithic people decorated themselves, besides, with beads and buttons,

† Foote op. cit. p. 125. † The Stone Age in India, p. 38.
and bangles of shell and bone. These have been picked up in various neolithic settlements and are still worn profusely by the class of people who have not shared in the cultural advancement of later times. Ornaments of shell and bone and beads are still used for decorating the much-beloved cow."

Neolithic ladies made themselves attractive by peculiar styles of hair-dressing. In the Salem district have been found some red earthen-ware figurines of women. § "The special interest attaching to those figures is due to the unique style of head-dress they show, namely, having their hair dressed in short riglets all round the head and wearing high conches on the top. The finding of these little female figures with such an elaborate style of hair-dressing throws light upon the use of a neck-rest unearthed in an old iron-age site on the north (left) bank of the Cauvery river opposite to the town of Tiruna Kodlu Narsipur in Mysore and just below the Sangam, or junction, with the Kabbani or Kapila river. The use of a neck-rest was essential if the women desired to preserve their curls intact when sleeping." Near the Guntakal Junction in Anantpur district was discovered a wooden comb, such as was used by neolithic ladies referred to above. * "This comb escaped the greed of white ants because imbedded in a layer of white ash, a substance they hate immensely as contact with it greatly disagrees with their soft

moist bodies." It is interesting to note that this comb has been discovered at a place from which a good number of neolithic earthenware has been obtained.

Occupations—§ "The large variety of polished stone tools that have been discovered in neolithic sites indicates that the men pursued numerous avocations. In fact the work of men-folk was quite as varied as that which obtains now, in Indian villages, especially, those that have not been affected by commercial intercourse with the world outside India. The wood-worker and the stone-worker were more in demand than at present; for they used more wooden tools than in the later Iron Age; and as all other tools were made of stone and well polished the stone-worker plied his trade very much more extensively than now....Nature has fitted the greater portion of the Deccan plateau for the production of cotton, and the neolithic Indians early developed the art of weaving cotton cloth. For a very long time since the Indians supplied cotton goods to the rest of the ancient world. The various tools needed for this manufacture, except those made of wood have been discovered in neolithic sites; and the presence of slick stones among others proves that the neolithic Indian liked his cloth to be made smooth by the use of this tool....Many other occupations were pursued in neolithic times, corresponding to the various kinds of tools that have been discovered. Of these prominent mention may be made of their leather industry which served the needs of the house and the farm and in which were used the finely made scrapers and cutting and hammer-

§ The Stone Age in India, pp. 36, 37.
ing tools made of trap-rock. The chief occupations of women, were as now, cooking and assisting men in their various occupations. Besides wooden ones of various kinds, women had plenty of earthenware culinary implements. The chief things they cooked were, as now, rice and curry, and cakes of rice meal and preparations of millets.

Trade by barter was developed. Otherwise we cannot account for the presence of chert in the environment of Madura, though chert does not occur in situ in the district.”

Houses and buildings—No relics of houses and buildings have been as yet found. It seems that houses were built of wattle and mud and wood, which must have been all destroyed by termites or white ants. In this connection Foote remarks * "Even mud-built houses leave no trace of themselves when in exposed positions, but are absolutely destroyed and washed away by the violent rains of the two monsoons and the yet furious downpours, which accompany some of the thunderstorms." In the hilly country, where tribal wars were frequent, the people lived in fortified hills. Foote says * "The Deccan hill forts all rise abruptly out of the plain and command the cultivable tract around their foot, which in most cases a black soil flat. On the larger hills the inhabitants had room for their habitations on the less steep part of the slopes, where there were frequently spaces free from rock on which they could conveniently build their houses. These

spaces or terraces which are real linchets are often held up at their lower extremities by revetments of rough stones. They vary much in size, but mostly small and frequently near the summit. Many of the hills are naturally castellated. The granite rocks being convently jointed by great vertical and by approximately horizontal joint planes which have caused the hills to be weathered into their characteristic shapes. The natural castellation of the hills was taken advantage of by the stone-folk in many cases and improved upon here and there by the building of rough walls to stop passages which were inconvenient to the dwellers on the hills. These systems of vertical and very highly inclined joint fissures have in many cases led to the formation of large and small rock shelters which must have afforded to the hill dwellers great protection against both sun and rain....In no cases did I observe the castellated hills to be surrounded with circuit walls near their base but they may likely have been enclosed by a thick edge of thorny character, a true Zareba....In some cases the disposition of the summit blocks gave rise to the formation of small but valuable cisterns, which would hold rain water in some quantity in very sheltered positions. An excellent example of this is yet to be seen on the summit of the fort hill at Bellary. These, which did not dry up by mere evaporation between the rains of the two monsoons, were beyond the reach of the enemies’ arrows....On many of the hills small tanks had been constructed in convenient corners.
Disposal of the dead—So far as this question is concerned the following extracts will make the matter clear briefly but very well. *“In pre-historic, as in modern India, various methods for the disposal of the dead were adopted. The men of palaeolithic times probably abandoned their dead in the forests, as the Oritae of Gedrosia (Makrân) continued to do in the days of Alexander the Great. In the Neolithic Age burial was perhaps the rule; and it seems certain that the practice of burial is older than that of cremation.

Examples of sepulchres which can be referred to with confidence to the neolithic period are rare in India, where most of the megalithic tombs belong to the Iron Age. The Stone implements of Kon ravines in south Mirzapur, already mentioned, are associated with neolithic interments.

Captain Cole found two fragments of stone implements associated with piles of pottery evidently wheel-made, in a cemetery comprising fifty four tombs at Mashalli in the Kolar district of Mysore. No metal object was disinterred in this cemetery, which must be referred to a late period of the Neolithic Age (I.A. ii, 86). At Daosa in the Jaipur state of Rajputana Mr. Carlleyle observed rude stone implements in the cairn tombs.

The tombs at Pallavaram near Madras city are earthen mounds covering terra-cotta coffins, which are of two kinds, oblong and pyriform. The former about

* Imperial Gazetteer of India vol. II pp. 95-97.
six feet in length, were used for females, who were buried in the extended position. The latter, about 2½ ft. in height were used for males, who were buried in the contracted position. Large quantities of pottery, apparently wheel-made, were found in those tombs, but no objects of either stone or metal.

Oblong terra-cotta sarcophagi, standing on short legs, similar to those used for the interment of females at Pallavaram, have been discovered at various places in the Madras District of Chingleput, Nellore, North and South Arcot, sometimes associated with iron implements. The Pallavarm examples may be of neolithic age. The Indian oblong sarcophagi are practically identical in form with similar objects found at Gehrareh near Baghdad (I. A. V, 255). This fact is one of the many indications connecting archaic Indian civilization with that of Babylonia and Assyria, which suggest tempting ethnological speculations.

Megalithic tombs in great variety of form abound throughout Madras, Bombay, Mysore, and the Nizam's Dominions. They generally contain iron implements, which are evidently of very various ages, some being truly prehistoric and of remote antiquity, while others may be described as modern. The example in the Nilgiri Hills, explored by Mr. Breeks, extend over many centuries down to 1596, which is the date (Saka 1518) of a Tamil inscription on one.

Examples of urn burial, not of cremated ashes, but of the whole body, occur at places as wide apart as Brahmāhabād in Sind and Tinnevelly District at the extremity of the Peninsula. Large jars, narrow at the
neck and pointed at the bottom, were used; and the body must have been reduced in bulk either by dissection or by pounding before it could be passed through the narrow neck. Similar jars occur in Babylonia, where they were coated with bitumen on the inside. The Indian examples substitute for the bitumen a black smear, or false glaze, prepared from the juice of abutilon indicum.

The great cemetery at Adichannalur, in Tinnevelly District, partially explored by Mr. Rea, covers an area of 114 acres, and it is estimated that about 1000 urns are buried in each acre. The presence of few stone implements indicate that parts of this necropolis may be very ancient, but most of the tombs contain iron implements and bronze ornaments of comparatively recent date.

In connection with these tools and implements V. A. Smith remarks† "The various forms of the Indian implements on the whole are identical with those familiar in European antiquaries; but a shouldered celt with an edge like that of carpenter's plane, which is common in the Irrawady Valley of Burma, and occasionally occurs in the hilly regions of Western Bengal, seems to be unknown in Europe."

India has been conspicuous by the absence of Bronze Age, unlike other parts of the world. Stone Age thus seems to have passed into the Iron Age without the intervening Bronze Age. In other parts of the world, the Copper Age, followed the Stone Age and was followed soon by the Bronze Age; in which the people

† Imperial Gazetteer, Vol. II p. 92.
learnt to make an alloy of copper and tin, which was much harder than copper. § "In India generally the Bronze Age is missing, and the transition from polished stone to iron was directly effected, but in some parts of the country tools and weapons were made of pure copper before iron came into ordinary use." But in South India, as in China, no brief Copper Age or long Bronze Age intervened between the Neolithic Age and that of Iron. § "Prof. Growland, F. R. S., the great metallurgist and the successful explorer, archaeologically, of the Japanese Islands, has expressed the idea that something of iron may have been hit upon by accident while experiments were being made. This lucky accident may well have happened in India, where the iron industry is one of great antiquity (far greater indeed than in Europe, e. g., at Hallstat or Le Tene) and iron ores occur so largely." Stone tools seem to have continued in use even after iron tools, specially on ceremonial occasions, for Stone tools being older must have been considered through spirit of conservatism sacrosanct.

* But according to Sir John Marshall there was Bronze Age in India. In his book "Mohenjo Daro and Indus Civilization" he says "Bronze was used in preference to copper for the manufacture of weapons and implements requiring an extra sharp cutting edge and for ornaments, figurines, and other such articles in which a specially fine finish was desired etc." In a footnote he further remarks "Needless to say, the discoveries at Mohenjo Daro and
Harappa have completely disposed of the hitherto accepted theory that bronze was not manufactured in India during the pre-historic age."

But there is evidence that there was a copper age in some parts of Northern India, which preceded the iron age. Tools and implements of practically pure copper have been found at some places in Northern India, mainly in the Upper Ganges Valley. So also at Gungariah in the Balghat District of the Central Provinces has been a hoard, which, according to Sir John Evans "...is the most important discovery of instruments of copper yet recorded in the old world. In 1170 no less than 421 hammered copper implements, made of practically pure metal, weighing collectively, 829 pounds, and 102 thin silver plates were discovered there. Copper implements are extremely varied in form, principally consisting of flat celts of many different shapes. There are also long crowbar-like instruments with an expanded lunette-shaped chisel edge at the lower end, which may be designated as bar-celts. The silver objects are all laminae about the thickness of ordinary paper, comprising two classes, viz., circular disks and ball's heads. The Gungariah deposits although found south of Narbada River are clearly to be associated by reason of its contents with Northern India."

Iron Age Antiquities—Tools of different Shapes have been collected from the graves of this period. At a site on the Shevoroyes in the Salem District Foote gets "...a large axe, a very fine hill-hook of large size with its handle in one place, a sharp sword and two javelin heads made with

tangs in stead of sockets." From some other place have been obtained.† "axe-heads...spear-heads and fragments of blades of small knives or small swords. The iron axe-heads had a broad butt end expanding into a rather leaf-shaped blade. The method of fastening the iron axe-heads to their helve would seem to have been that adapted now-a-days or certainly not very long ago, namely, of inserting the butt-end of the axe-head into a cleft in a piece of hand wood with a couple of rings and a wedge to tighten the hold of the helve. The rings are placed on either of the butt-end, and the wedge is driven tightly through the ring spaces and prevents the axe-head from slipping; but the lower end also prevents the cleft in the helve from extending downwards." The shapes of bill-hooks and some other tools of the early Iron Age are exactly like those of the implements now in the hands of the village Gods. "It seems that the shapes of tools used for secular purposes have changed with times in accordance with fashion and utility, but the weapons of gods have remained of the oldest fashions of tools," is the opinion of P. T. S. Iyanger (see his Pre-Aryan Tamil culture, p. 8.)

In the graves at Adichchamallur in the Tennevelly district articles of gold, bronze, and iron and pottery have been found. Rea's catalogue of Prehistoric Antequities mentions implements of iron 3940 in number always placed point downwards, as if they had been thrust into the surrounding earth by the attendant mourners.

Indian Iron Age pottery is so good that Foote remarks that "The people who could make such high class pottery......must have attained a considerable degree of civilization."

Coming down to the historic or the proto-historic period we find Dravidians far advanced in civilization and culture. They were carrying on trade with other parts of the world before the coming of the Aryans. They had developed maritime activities and supplied goods to the then different nations, Babylonia, Egypt and others, goods like muslin and teak. Says Ragozin † "Thirty-five years ago no one would have thought of connecting India (pre-Aryan India) with archaic Babylonia, and if a solitary fact pointing that way was once in a while picked out by an exceptionally inquisitive and observant mind, it was suffered to remain unexplained, as a sort of natural curiosity, for the inferences it suggested were too startling to be more than hinted at. Eminently such a mind was the late Francois Lenormant, and he laid great stress on the use of the word manā as early as Rigveda, to note a definite quantity of gold, a word which can be traced to ancient Chaldea, or Semetic Babylonia, with the same meaning, and which afterwards passed into Greek monetary system (mna, still later latinized into mina). Well, this little fact simply points to a well established commercial intercourse between Dravidian India (for Kolarians never came as far west as the land by the Indian ocean) and Babylonia or Chaldea. and now years after, chance brings two more discoveries individually...

as trifling, yet linked together the three form a chain of evidence as complete as it is strong. In the ruins of Mongheir, ancient Ur of the Chaldees, built by Ur-Ea, (or Ur-Bagash) the King of United Babylonia, who ruled not less than 3000 B. C., was found a piece of Indian Teak. This evidence is exceptionally conclusive because as it happens, this particular tree is to be located with more than ordinary accuracy: it grows in Southern India (Dekhan) where it advances close to the Malabar Coast, and nowhere else; there is none north of Vindhyâ. Then again, the precious vocabularies and tests of all things and names, which those precise Babylonians were so fond of making out and which give us so many startling surprises, come to the fore with a bit of very choice information, namely, that the old Babylonian name for muslin was Sindhu, i. e. that the stuff was simply called by the name of the country which exported it." He further in a footnote says "It is well known that the name for the fine and dainty fabric called muslin (moussoline) is derived from that of the city on the Tigris, Mosul, which, throughout the Middle Ages and to the present day, has been famous for its fabrication. How long before—who can tell? An imaginative and inquisitive mind might wonder whether, if all the links could be recovered and joined together, this particular industry might not be traceable to those almost pre-historic commercial relations between Dravidian India and Chaldean Babylonia. Did the latter learn the art from India and import the cotton from there—and did the Assyrians carry it north along with other arts? A stupendous issue to hang on so frail a thing!" † "Prof. Vedic India, p. 307.
Max Muller has long ago shown that the names of certain articles are Sandal-wood (indigenous on the Malabar coast and nowhere else), ivory, apes and peacocks, and their native names, which could be easily traced through Hebrew corruptions, have all along been set down as Sanskrit, being common words of that language. But now, quite lately, an eminent Dravidian scholar and specialist brings proof that they are really Dravidian words, introduced into Sanskrit. This is a dazzling ray of light, and proof so conclusive, when added to the already strong and compact case, that further corroborative evidence would be welcome, but scarcely necessary." So also W. H. Schott says, † " Thousands of years before the emergence of the Greeks from savagery... Egypt and the nations of ancient India came into being, and a commercial system was developed for the interchange of products within these limits, having its centre of exchange near the head of the Persian gulf. The people of that region, the various Arab tribes and more especially those ancestors of the Phoenicians, the mysterious red men, were the active carriers or intermediaries. The growth of civilization in India created an active merchant marine, trading to the Euphrates and Africa, and eastwards we know not whither. The Arab merchants, apparently tolerated the presence of Indian traders in Africa, but reserved for themselves the commerce within the Red sea, that lucrative commerce which supplied precious stones and spices and incense to the ever increasing service of the Gods of Egypt. This was their prerogative, jealously guarded, and upon this they lived and prospered according to the prosperity of

† Periplus, p. 3.
Pharaohs. The muslins and spices of India they fetched themselves or received from the Indian traders in their ports on either side of the Gulf of Aden; carrying them in turn over the highlands to the upper Nile, or through the Red sea and across the desert to Thebes and Memphis. The articles taken to Egypt by the Arabs were South Indian products, which the South Indian people took in their boats to Aden and the East African Coast. That the people, who had developed mercantile marine, who so early traded with other parts of the world and supplied them such fine stuff as muslin, must have been not only a civilized people but more advanced than the then other nations in that particular respect, viz. the art. of producing cloth and muslin, goes without saying and is incapable of being contradicted.

From all the foregoing it may be safely concluded that culture and civilization in India was evolved gradually by the autochthones of Peninsular India by stages. That the evolution of culture was continuous without any break, though gradual. The culture, after the neolithic age, spread gradually to other parts of India during chalcolithic and later ages. And as the people that occupied Peninsular India were Dravidians, it is undoubted that Dravidians first evolved a culture in India.

The Dravidians had their own language, which ultimately developed into four main languages, the Tamil, Kannad or Kanarese, Telgu, and Malayalam, and various other languages and dialects allied to one or the other of the four main languages.
According to Bishop Caldwell, a great and authoritative scholar of Dravidian languages, the Dravidians went on merrily till Aryans spread into the Deccan and mixed with Dravidians, as represented by Ramayana and Mahabharata, the two great epics of India. The following may be stated as marks of Dravidian civilization:—*

1. They had their own kings who lived in strongly built houses and villages and towns and ruled over small territories.

2. The Kings had minstrels that sang to glorify them on festive occasions.

3. They had their own characters (pictographic according to Dr. Hall) and wrote with a stylus on palmyra-leaves. (All species of palm are a characteristic of south India).

4. They had religion and acknowledged the existence of God (Shiva or Linga) representing the male energy.

5. Some sort of marriage system existed among them.

6. They knew and used ordinary metals, except tin, lead and zinc. They also knew all planets, ordinarily known to ancients, excluding mercury and saturn.

7. They knew numbers up to a hundred and even up to a thousand.

8. They knew herbal medicines and their use.

9. They manufactured all necessary articles of life by means of the arts weaving, dyeing, pottery etc.

*Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of Dravidian languages.
(10) They were well acquainted with agriculture.

(11) They made and used canoes and boats and even ships (small-decked coasting vessels).

(12) They loved wars and were adept in the use of bows, arrows, spears and swords (iron swords).

(13) They had their own ‡ revenue system, which still persists in some form in southern India.

(14) † They carried on trade with ancient Egyptians.

These conclusions have been further corroborated and strengthened by recent finds of Mohenjo Daro and Harappa, which have proved the excellence of an advanced state of civilization of a people that flourished in the sites of the finds. § "Mohenjo Daro and for the matter of that also Harappa in the Panjub, and several other sites in the Indus valley are cities of a pre-Aryan nation whose civilization was in a highly flourishing state, which may be fully styled the proto-civilization of India. Accordingly, Mohenjo Daro and other similar sites in Sind and the Panjub are the most important archaelogical sites in India."

A good idea of the advanced condition of the Indus civilization will be formed from the following * extract;—

‡ This is disputed by Dr. Altekar of Hindu University, Benaras. See his "Village communities of Western India", p. 135. † Ibid, page 134 may be noted in addition. § Rev. Fr. H. Heras, Mohenjo Daro—The most important Archaelogical site in India. * Mohenjo Daro and Indus civilization by Sir John Marshall; the preface pp., V-VIII.
They exhibit the Indus peoples of the fourth and third millenia B.C., in possession of a highly developed culture in which no vestige of Indo-Iryan influence is to be found. Like the rest of western Asia, the Indus country is still in the Chalcolithic age—that age in which arms and utensils of stone continue to be used side by side with those of copper or bronze. Their society is organised in cities; their wealth derived mainly from agriculture and trade, which appears to have extended far and wide in all directions. They cultivate wheat and barley as well as the date palm. They have domesticated the humped Zebu, buffalo, and short-horned bull, besides the sheep, pig, dog, elephant and camel; but the cat and probably the horse are unknown to them. For transport they have wheeled vehicles, to which oxen doubtless were yoked. They are skilful metal workers; with a plentiful supply of gold, silver and copper. Lead, too, and tin are in use, but the latter only as an alloy in the making of Bronze with spinning and weaving they are thoroughly conversant. Their weapons of war and of the chase are the bow and the arrow, spear, axe, dagger, and mace. The sword they have not yet evolved; nor is there any evidence of defensive body armour. Among their other implements, hatchets, sickles, saws, chisels, and razors are made of both copper and bronze; knives and celts sometimes of these metals, sometimes of chert or other hard stones. For the crushing of grain they have the muller and saddle-quern but not the circular grindstone. Their domestic vessels are commonly of earthenware turned on the wheel and not infrequently painted with encaustic designs; more rarely they are of copper, bronze or silver. The ornaments of the rich are made of the precious metals or of copper, sometimes overlaid with gold, of faience ivory, carnelian and other stones, for the poor, they are usually of shell or terra-cotta. Figurines and toys for which there is a wide vogue, are of terra-cotta; and shell and faience are freely used, as they are in Sumer and the West generally, not only for personal ornaments but for inlay work and other purposes. With the invention of writing

* Mohenjo Daro and Indus Civilization, preface, pp. V-VII.
the Indus peoples are also familiar and employ for this purpose a form of script which, though peculiar to India, is evidently analogous to other contemporary scripts of Western Asia and the nearer East.

To the extent thus briefly summarized the Indus culture corresponded in its general features with the Chalcolithic cultures of the Western Asia and Egypt. In other respects, however, it was peculiar to Sind and the Punjab and as distinctive of those regions as the Sumerian culture was of Mesopotamia or the Egyptian of the valley of the Nile. Thus to mention only a few salient points, the use of cotton for textiles was exclusively restricted at this period to India and was not extended to the western world until two or three thousand years later. Again there is nothing that we know of in pre-historic Egypt or Mesopotamia or anywhere else in Western Asia to compare with the well-built baths and commodious houses of the citizens of Mohenjo-daro. In those countries, much money and thought were lavished on the building of magnificent temples for the gods and on the palaces and tombs of kings, but the rest of the people seemingly had to content themselves with insignificant dwellings of mud.

In the Indus valley, the picture is reversed and the finest structures are those erected for the convenience of the citizens. Temples, palaces, and tombs there may of course have been, but if so, they are either still undiscovered or so like other edifices as not to be readily distinguishable from them. At Ur, it is true, Mr. Woolly has unearthed a group of moderate-sized houses of burnt brick which constitute a notable exception to the general rule; but these disclose such a striking similarity to the small and rather loosely built structures of the latest levels at Mohenjo-daro, that there can be little doubt as to the influence under which they were erected. Be this, however, as it may, we are justified in seeing in the Great Bath of Mohenjo-daro and in its roomy and serviceable houses, with their ubiquitous wells and bathrooms and
Elaborate systems of drainage, evidence that the ordinary townspeople enjoyed here a degree of comfort and luxury unexampled in other parts of the then civilized world.

Equally peculiar to the Indus valley and stamped with an individual character of their own are its art and its religion. Nothing that we knew of in other countries at this period bears any resemblance, in point of style, to the miniature faience models of rams, dogs, and other animals or to the intaglio engravings on the seals, the best of which—notably the humped and short-horn bulls—are distinguished by a breadth of treatment and a feeling for lime and plastic form that has rarely been surpassed in glyptic art; nor would it be possible, until the classic age of Greece, to match the exquisitely supple modelling of the two human statuettes from Harappa figured in Plates X and XI. In the religion of the Indus peoples there is much, of course, that might be paralleled in other countries. This is true of every pre-historic and of most historic religions as well. But, taken as a whole their religion is so characteristically Indian as hardly to be distinguishable from still living Hinduism or at least from that aspect of it which is bound up with animism and the cults of Shiva and the Mother Goddess—still the two most potent forces in popular worship. Among the many revelations that Mohenjo-daro and Harappa have had in store for us, none perhaps is more remarkable than the discovery that Shaivism has a history going back to the Chalcolithic Age or perhaps even further still, and that it thus takes its place as the most ancient living faith in the world.

But it is in regard to the early civilization, not of India alone but of the whole ancient Orient that these new discoveries seem likely to revolutionize existing ideas. The importance of the role played by palaeolithic man in India has long been recognised and from a typological comparison of palaeolithic and neolithic artefacts the inference has been drawn that it was actually on Indian Soil that the latter was first evolved from the former. Be this view.
correct or not, there can be no question that the north-west of India with its vast, well-watered plains, with its abundance of game, its warm but variable climate—more propitious perhaps than now—and with its network of rivers affording ready means of communication and intercourse, must have offered a specially favourable field for the advancement of early society, alike when man was in the hunting stage and later when he had turned himself to agriculture and the domestication of animals or was opening up commerce with distant lands. At present our researches carry us back no further than the fourth millennium B.C. and have lifted but one corner of the veil that hides this remarkable civilization, but even at Mohenjo-Daro there are still several earlier cities lying, one below the other, deeper than the spade has yet penetrated, though the permanent rise of the subsoil water precludes the hope of ever being able to explore the earliest settlements on this site. It can hardly be doubted that the story already unfolded will be carried still further back on other sites, of which there are a multitude waiting to be excavated in Sind and Baluchistan. One thing that stands out clear and unmistakable both at Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa, is that the civilization hitherto revealed at these two places is not an incipient civilization, but one already age-old and stereotyped on Indian soil, with many millennia of human endeavour behind it. Thus India must henceforth be recognized, along with Persia, Mesopotamia and Egypt, as one of the most important areas where the civilizing processes of society were initiated and developed. I do not mean to imply by this that India can claim to be regarded as the cradle of civilization; nor do I think on the evidence at present available that that claim can be made on behalf of any one country in particular. In my view the civilization, of the Chalcolithic and succeeding ages resulted from the combined efforts of many countries, each contributing, a certain quota towards the common stock of knowledge. From the Neolithic if not from the Palaeolithic Age onwards the most populated regions were undoubtedly the great river valleys of South and South-West Asia and Northern Africa, where the
cold was never intense, where food and water were ready to the
hand of man, where pasturage was good, irrigation feasible, and
communication easy along the courses of the natural water ways.
In each of these river-valleys, on the banks of the Nile and the
Euphrates as on those of the Karum, the Helmund on the Indus,
mankind may be assumed to have equal chances of development
and it is natural to suppose that progress in one direction or
another was being made in all these regions simultaneously and
doubtless in many others besides. If this view which is surely
the most rational one, be accepted, if we regard this wide-flung
civilization of the Afrasian belt as focussed in various centres and
developed by the mutual efforts of different peoples, we shall
better understand how, despite its general homogeneity, it
nevertheless comprised many widely different branches, each of
which, in its own sphere, was able to maintain its local individual
character.

This long extract, that justifies itself, may be sum-
marized into the following:

(1) The vast plains of Northern India afforded a
favourable field in point of climate and natural resources
for the people there to evolve a culture of their own
from the hunting stage to a better mode of settled life
of agriculture and commerce.

(2) Man played an important role in India during
the Palaeolithic, Neolithic, and Chalcolithic Ages.

(3) The Indus civilization, had its own distinctive
features, though it resembled the Chalcolithic cultures
of Western Asia and Egypt.

(4) Art and Religion were peculiar to Indus Valley
civilization and stamped it with individual character of
their own.
The civilization was of a highly developed type, as may be known from the articles of food and dress, ornaments of various kinds and metals, agricultural and commercial activities, the village and civic life of the people, and the script used by them.

The civilization flourished in the fourth millennium B.C., before the immigration of Aryans into India. The civilization, therefore, was pre-Aryan with no signs of Aryan influence on it. Evidently it was due wholly to the activities of the people that lived there.

That these Indus people were in communication with other parts of India, particularly South India, and with other parts of the world and carried on trade with the people there for the supply of materials required, will be evident from the following:

† "Besides gold and silver, the Indus people were familiar with copper, tin and lead. The respective sources from which these metals were obtained are uncertain. The metals may have been mined within the confines of India itself, where all of them, including even tin, are obtainable; or they may have been imported from neighbouring countries to the north and west; namely, Persia, which yields each and every one of them; or from Afghanistan, which yields gold, silver, copper, and lead; or from Arabia, which yields gold, silver and copper; or from Tibet which yields gold. Gold, according to Sir Edwin Pascoe, is likely to have come from the South India rather than from other quarters, since from

early historic times it has always been the 'South of the Peninsula (Hyderabad, Mysore, and the Madras Presidency) that has supplied the bulk of India's gold, and in some of the mines there workings of ancient date are still to be seen. A fact that lends support to this conjecture is that much of the gold of Mohenjo Daro and Harappa is alloyed with a substantial percentage of silver, and this alloy (electron, as it is commonly known) is found in Kolar gold fields of Mysore and at Anantpur in Madras, but not in other districts from which the Indus people would have been likely to procure it. And another fact which also strengthens this conjecture is that the green amazon stone, of which more will be said anon, almost certainly came from Niljari hills, thus showing that there must have been commercial intercourse at this time between Sind and the south of the Peninsula. Copper, was imported in large quantities, was obtainable either from Rajputana or Baluchistan, or further afield from Kashmere, Afghanistan, Persia, or Madras; but the presence of an appreciable amount of lead indicates, in the opinion of archaeological chemists, that it came either from Rajputana or Baluchistan or Persia, in all of which area lead is found in association with copper ore. " (All Italics ours )

Further on it is said there, § " Semi-precious stones were used with fine colour effects for beads and other ornaments. Of these the majority, including the rock crystal, Haematite, agate, chalcedony, onyx, carnelian, jasper, and jasper, bloodstone, plasma, tachylite, and

the exquisite azure-blue napheline-Sodalite, were obtainable from Rajputana, the Punjab, Kathiawar, or Central India. Some like haematite, which is found up the Persian Gulf as well as in Rajputana, the Punjab, the Central Provinces and Bihar, or plasma which is found in the beds of the Krishna and Godavari rivers as well as in Rajputana, may have come from further afield, but it is safer to assume that they came from the nearer regions, with which trade in other commodities is known to have been going on. On the other hand, the nearest spot from which the beautiful green amazon stone (a variety of microline felspar) could be got, was Dodabetta in the Nilgiris, far away in South India, and it is probable that amethyst was procured from the Deccan trap.” “Besides the metals and minerals detailed above, several other materials, natural or artificial, were in use for ornamental purposes as well as for making various small articles. Excluding pottery these materials were: bone, ivory, shell, faience, and vitrified paste. Bone must have been easily obtainable in the locality, and ivory is a commodity of which there has always been an abundant supply in India. Shells of many kinds and in large quantities were imported from the coasts of India as well as from the Persian gulf and the Red Sea, and the shell industry played a hardly less important part in the Indus Valley than it did in Sumer, though shell in-lay-work does not seem to have been elaborated to quite the same degree as in the latter country etc. etc.”

But who the authors of this civilization were is the most prominent and important question that arises and requires to be determined. And if it is settled that the
people of the Indus valley were Dravidians, our conclusions (1) that in pre-Aryan times there was a highly developed civilization in India and (2) it was the Dravidian civilization, will have another incontrovertible proof.

Scholars interested in the early history of man have been busy finding the authors of this ancient civilization. Though Sir John Marshall and his collaborators have definitely proved with a profusion of arguments that inhabitants of Mohenjo Daro were certainly pre-Aryan, they are not definite about their race. They merely give their opinion that the Mohenjo Daro people were probably Dravidians and the civilization was probably theirs, as may be seen from the following:

* It may be, nay it is more than likely, that this civilization was the offspring, not of any one race in particular, but of several-born, perhaps, rather of the soil itself and of the rivers than of the varied breeds of men which they sustained. For, as far back as its history can be traced, the population of Sind and the Punjab has been a blend of many diverse elements, and there is no reason for assuming that it was other than heterogeneous in the earlier age with which we are now concerned.

To return to the supposed connection between the Indus people and the Sumerians—it may be recalled that, before any thing whatever had been discovered of the Indus Civilization Dr. H. R. Hall proposed to locate the home land of the Sumorians somewhere to the east Mesopotamia, and suggested that they might belong to the same ethnic type as the Dravidians of India, who, though now restricted to the south of India, are believed on linguistic and ethnological grounds to have once populated virtually the whole of the peninsula, including the Punjab, Sind, and Baluchistan, where as is well known, the Dravidian speech is still

*Mohenjo Daro and Indus Civilization pp. 108-110.*
preserved in the language of the Brāhūis. Following on the discoveries at Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa which revealed various points of resemblance between the material cultures of these places and of the Sumer, it was natural that a fresh impetus should be given to this theory and that the resemblances referred to should be interpreted as additional proof of its correctness. Pending, however, the discovery of further evidence, it is well that we should realize on what a very insecure basis this theory really rests. What in effect is the supposed similarity of type between these two races—the Sumerians and the Dravidians—which is coming to be accepted as an established fact. Sir Arthur Keith says that the people who spoke Sumerian were dolichocephalic, with large brain capacity, like a certain section of the Predynastic Egyptians and like the present day Mesopotamians. "They had," he writes, "big, long, and narrow heads; their affinities were with the peoples of the Caucasian or European type; and we may regard South-Western Asia as their cradle land until evidence leading to a different conclusion comes to light." Mr. Wooley also states that, judging by their physical type, the Sumerians "were of the Indo-European stock, in appearance not unlike the modern Arabs." On the other hand, Professor Langdon holds the view that the dolichocephalic skulls found at Kish were Semitic and the brachycephalic ones Sumerian. If, however, we are uncertain about the physical type of the Sumerians, we are just as uncertain about that of the ancient Dravidians, for the very good reason that we possess no remains whatever that can be identified with them. The Modern Dravidian stock is officially described as being "of short stature, complexion very dark, approaching black; hair plentiful with an occasional tendency to curl; eyes dark, head long, nose very broad, sometimes depressed at the root but not so as to make the face appear flat." It would be absurd to assume that this represents the Dravidian type of 5000 years ago. In the case of the Brahui speaking people of Baluchistan we know that, though they have preserved the Dravidic speech of their ancestors, they have entirely failed to
preserve their racial character, which thanks to continuous recruit-
ment from without has now become mainly Iranian; and we know
also that the Dravidian type in the south of the Peninsula has been
largely transformed by the free admixture of aboriginal, i.e.
Proto-Australoid blood as well perhaps as of other elements. So
shadowy, indeed, is the distinction between the Dravidians and
many of the aboriginals, that in the case of the Munda speaking
people most authorities are inclined to doubt if any distinction
at all can be drawn. Any attempt, therefore to equate the Sumeri-
ans with the ancient Dravinitans is complicated at the outset by
the difficulty of defining either the Sumerian or the Dravidian
type. If, as most authorities on the subject maintain, the Dravid-
ians came out of the west and entered India as invaders, we might
suppose that they were originally related to the Mediterraneans who
are represented at Kish, Anan, Nal, and Mohenjo-Daro ( where
the largest proportion of skulls belong to this type ), and that the
type was subsequently transformed in India itself by intermarriage
with proto-Australoids and others. If, however, they were indige-
nous, as others hold, in India, we must suppose that they were
proto-Australoids in origin and developed their Dravidian character
by intermingling with foreign elements and by processes of natural
evolution. But in whatever direction they may have moved,
whether from East to West or West to East, it would obviously be
very rash in the present uncertain state of our knowledge to
endeavour to identify as “Dravidian” either the skulls classed by
Colonel Sewell as proto-Australoids ( Nos. 2, 11, and M.) or those
classed as Mediterranean. ( Nos. 6, 7, 9, 10, 19, 26 ); rashly
still to identify any of these skulls as “Sumerian.”

So also as far as the script of Mohenjo Daro is
concerned Sir John is equally undecided, as may be
noted from the excerpt reproduced here as follows:—
Of the language of these texts little more can be said at present than that there is no reason for connecting it in any way with Sanskrit. The Indus Civilization was pre-Aryan, and the Indus language or languages must have been pre-Aryan also. Possibly one or other of them (if, as seems likely, there was more than one) was Dravidic. This, for three reasons seems a most likely conjecture—first because \textit{Dravidic speaking people were the precursors of the Aryan} over most of Northern India and \textit{were the only people likely to have been in possession of a culture as advanced as the Indus culture}; secondly, \textit{because on the other side of the Kirthar Range and at no great distance from the Indus valley the Brahuis of Baluchistan have preserved among themselves an island of Dravidic speech} which may well be a relic from Pre-Aryan times, when Dravidic was perhaps the common language of those parts; thirdly, because \textit{the Dravidic languages being agglutinative, it is not unreasonable to look for a possible connection between them and the agglutinative language of Sumer in the Indus Valley, which, as we know, had many other close ties with Sumer}. This is a conjecture, however, which there is no tangible evidence to support. The skeletal remains, as we shall presently see, point to the presence here of elements from four different races, viz. Proto-Austroloids, Mediterraneans, Alpines, and Mongolo-Alpines, but it is quite impossible to affirm whether any of these spoke Dravidic. The Eastern Alpines are hardly likely to have done so, since there is no trace of their stock among the modern Dravidic-speaking races of India. And we should naturally expect the language of the Proto-Austroloids to have belonged to the Munda rather than Dravidic group. Western Alpines are said to be strongly represented among \textit{the Kanarese-speaking peoples of the Western Deccan and Mysore}, but if racial characteristics can be taken into account in this problem of language, it is clearly the long-headed Mediterraneans

\footnote{Mohenjo Daro and Indus Civilization, page 42.}
who have the strongest claim to a connection by blood with the
Dravidians and are most likely to have used a Dravidic speech.
May it be that these same Mediterraneans—who are traceable
across the whole south of the Afrasian belt—spoke agglutinative
languages and that they, perhaps, more than any others, were the
race at the back of this far-flung civilization of the Chalcolithic
Age? (Italics ours).

But other scholars of Archaeology, well versed in
reading the ancient script of Mohenjo Daro and others,
have maintained exactly what we have maintained in
the foregoing. The credit so far goes wholly and solely
to Father Heras of Saint Xavier's College, Bombay,
who has worked indefatigably at deciphering the scripts
of Indus Valley and proved that it was the Dravidians
that lived not only in the Indus Valley and the Deccan
but were spread all over India. It is the Dravidians,
he says, that flourished in India before the Aryans,
still a backward tribe, poured into India from the banks
of Volga, conquered the Dravidians by their superior
physical force, and borrowed and assimilated the civi-
lization flourishing there. It follows that the Aryans
later evolved a culture called Aryan civilization, which
is hence a composite civilization, composite of Aryan
and Dravidian elements.

Father Heras has written several articles that
have appeared in different magazines such as, "The
Journal of Indian History," "The New Review", "The
Karnatak Historical Review", and others. In all these
he has placed before the readers his interpretations of
several Mohenjo Daro scripts and inscriptions. These interpretations are highly technical and will not ordinarily interest readers. It is, therefore, thought best to reproduce extracts from his writings as follows. He is decisively of opinion that Mohenjo Daro script and language were proto-Dravidian, the parent of the present Dravidian script and languages. That it is so he proves in the following:—

* The Mohenjo-Daro script is pictophonographic and has affinities with other ancient scripts, which extend from Easter Island in the east to Spain in the west.

The writing of Mohenjo-Daro is a script between pictorial and phonetic, closely connected with the ancient scripts used by people near India: the Chinese, the Sumerians, and the Egyptians.

The study of the inscriptions of Mohenjo-Daro shows that these signs can be divided into simple signs and phonetic combinations. Again, every sign can be simple and compound. Those that are simple and which are the basis of the whole script, are pictorical and phonetic. Among the pictorial signs some are quite obviously, natural signs. For instance it is not difficult to represent a man with five strokes, after the manner of pre-historic, Stone Age designs: Similarly (1) a fish, (2) a bird, (3) a tree, (4) a chair, (5) even certain local expressions as "up", (6) "under", (7) "Sideways", can be easily represented by signs.

There is another kind of signs which can be said to be conventional. It is not easy to represent a cloud by means of a drawing. But once a sign is found (8) with such a meaning, one can easily conclude that it is a pictorial sign. Similarly the diagram of a rhombus (9) does not suggest any natural and direct

meaning. In reality it is believed that that diagram represents "losanghe" according to the anthropological principle. But in our script the sign in question represents the word 'house' and it certainly is the representation of the plan of a house according to the convention.

In the compound signs, the composition may be the joining of simple signs, or of simple signs and determinative signs. The simple signs are, in practice, joined by combining them or collegating them. For one who knows the simple signs, it is not difficult to find out the value of these compound signs.

Another kind of compound signs in the script of Mohenjo-Daro has one or more determinative signs. These have no determinate value in themselves, but they give a determinate value to the signs which they affect.

Finally the phonetic combinations which we find in this script are also numerous and very interesting. Two signs put one near the other can so combine as to assume a quite different meaning. For instance the sign (33) ir = dwelling and (34) alar = flower, give (35) iralar, a well known ancient Indian tribe, still existing in Arcot districts in the Madras Presidency. Similarly the 2 signs (36) adu = this, and (37) ir = to be, make (38) adir to tremble. In this script 62 different combinations have been discovered.

Being Dravidians, the inhabitants of Mohenjo-Daro and northern India naturally spoke a Dravidian language; yet this language was not one of the Dravidian languages now spoken in India, but probably their parent, which may be called proto-Dravidian.

The largest proportion of the words used in proto-Dravidian are also found in Tamil. This confirms the common belief that Tamil is the oldest of the present Dravidian languages. But some
proto-Dravidian words are found not in Tamil, but in some other Dravidian language. For instance, ‘pagir’ (to be afflicted, to be in distress), is found only in Kannada; ‘kadetla-koditla’, (at the end and at the beginning), is now used only in Tulu, though the words ‘kade’ and ‘kodi’ also exist in other Dravidian languages.

One might perhaps expect to find many proto-Dravidian words in Brahui; but this language has lost many of its original words through the influence of Baluchi, Sindhi and Persian, which are spoken in its present habitat. Even purely Dravidian words like ‘Kan’ (eye) and ‘Kal’ (stone) have been converted into ‘Khan’ and ‘Khal’, which contain the un-Dravidian aspirate Kh.

Proto-Dravidian naturally resembles Hale-Kannada more closely than modern Kannada. Similarly, it is nearer to Sangam Tamil than to modern Tamil. But this obviously refers to the words and not to the grammatical forms which are totally absent in the proto-Dravidian language.

In this proto-Dravidian language the construction of the phrase is generally the same as in the modern Dravidian languages. The inscription on the Mohenjo-Daro seal No. 321 may serve as an example:—

‘Kālar minavar Kan Kada ēr valvidadu
Kalakūrav val Kurangar nāl’

The inscription may be thus translated:

‘The four strong Kurangas from among the people of the united countries of (who possessed) the fort (which was) seen, crossed and taken over by the strong-legged Minas.’

It is also interesting to find in these inscriptions proto-Dravidian phrases and expressions which are used in modern Dravidian languages.
For instance, H. No. 44: "tal-tavtil", 'tal' means 'to glitter', in order to emphasize the glittering, the word is often repeated at present. So it was in ancient times.

M. D. No. 199:—Mānudayadu. The whole inscription informs us that in winter the weather is of "three garments". Now the Gandas, a kannada-speaking tribe found in the Western Ghats, express the intensity of cold by the number of blankets they put on. They say for instance, 'mīru Kambali chali', (three blankets cold) the very expression used in the inscription.

Very often 'mugil' is used in the sense of 'rainless cloud', and 'Karmugil' as 'rain-cloud', while there is another sign for 'male', 'rain', as, in modern Tamil. Similarly the expressions, 'mūnak' “three-eyed” and ‘mūnmūnak’ ‘three fish-eyed’, referring to Shiva are very frequently found in the inscriptions.

This is not the place to refer to the number of Dravidian tribes mentioned in the Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa epigraphs. What we have said above will suffice to show the nature of the language used in the so called Indus valley inscriptions throw some light on the Mohenjo-Daro riddle, which when finally solved will enable us to admit that great ancient culture which had hitherto been called by different names, but which may in future be denominated "proto-Dravidian", or rather 'proto-Indian' culture.

He elaborates the same point and proves by reading the scripts that civilization first arose in India and spread Westward. He remarks in the journal of the University of Bombay, July, 1936, "The present writer is of opinion that these proto-Indian people, migrating westwards in a later period, settled in Southern Mesopotamia and became the Sumorians, a contention which will be proved at length in the work
mentioned above. (The work referred to is "Proto-Indian script and civilization.") He establishes the conclusion in the following way:

§ The consequence deduced by Sir John Marshall after the Study of the Mohenjo Daro remains that this civilization probably is Dravidian is now fully confirmed by the decipherment by the present writer of about one thousand eight hundred inscriptions found in all these sites.

First of all there are three signs the values of which can only be explained in Dravidian languages. Only in Dravidian languages these three signs, which evidently represent a fish, may have the same phonetic values corresponding to three different meanings, according to the three differences shown in the signs themselves. If we suppose, for instance, that the languages of Mohenjo Daro were Sanskrit and we read the three above signs Matsya or even MINA—a word borrowed from Dravidian languages—these two words in Sanskrit have no other meaning than fish and therefore we shall not be able to give a proper meaning to the two other signs.

Moreover, in these inscriptions a number of phonetic combinations of signs have been found which also prove that the language of Mohenjo-Daro cannot but be Dravidian. Each sign separately has its independent value and meaning. But when the signs are united, their values combine and this third reading has a totally different meaning.

A much more powerful argument to determine the language family is the construction of the phrase which is purely and exclusively Dravidian. It is a construction which may be called qualitative: the main word is always relegated to the end, but it is preceded by a number of qualificatives which have likewise
other qualificatives of their own. Moreover, according to Dravidian construction the verb must always be at the end of the sentence and the adjectives in front of the nouns.

Dravidian languages do not know the relative pronoun. Accordingly no relative pronoun has ever been found in the inscriptions, though possessive and demonstrative pronouns are often come across. Instead of the relative pronoun they use a participle, for instance:

*IREKERA* in Tamil. Thus for instance, instead of saying “Who is”, they say “being”.

The decipherment of the inscriptions of the Indus valley has supplied us with yet another proof of the Dravidian family of the language spoken there. Almost mechanically I had placed the respective values under each sign in every inscription. Last October,...I could go to Nallur, Jaffna (Ceylon) to revise all my interpretations with Rev. Fr. S. Gna Prakasar, O. M. I, who is rightly held as the foremost Dravidian philologist. What was not my surprise when while reading my interpretations of the inscriptions, Fr. Gna Prakasar discovered about twenty-five fragments of poetry. These verses are written in different metres, five of them being written in the famous *KURAL* metre, the most beautiful metre of Tamil literature. Our readers will like to read one of these fragments of poetry properly scanned. The inscription found in one of the Mohenjo Daro objects reads as follows:—

Naṇ rururu tūku adu karumugil ārveli ōrūr
Eḍu etu ru uyarel ir ar ire pēr kaḍavul.

Which means: “The green -God who has the two paths of the noisy high sun reaching the year of Orūr (is) outside, the country of the rain clouds of the approaching thunder-sounding scale”.

Now this inscription contains two verses that are scanned in the following way:
The remains of the cities discovered in the Indus Valley, being therefore nearly Dravidian, offer unique materials for the study of the pre-Aryan civilization of India which hitherto was only known through stray and indirect references in the Vedas and epics and other works of ancient Sanskrit literature.

Contrary to what was clearly hinted at in those works, it was always supposed twelve or fifteen years ago that the Dravidian peoples at the time of Aryan invasion were in a totally uncivilized state, almost next to savagery. Thus Mr. Romesh C. Dutt described first encounters of the two races, in the beginning of our century. “There was continuous war between the Indo Aryan and the dark-skinned aborigines during this age. The aborigines retreated before the more civilized organization of the Aryan, but hung around in fastness and forest, plundered the peaceful villages of the Aryans and stable their cattle. With that tenacity which is peculiar to barbarians, they fought for centuries as they retreated; they interrupted the religious sacrifices of the conquerors, despised their “bright gods”, and plundered their wealth. But the Aryans conquered in the end: the area of civilization widened, waste and jungle lands were re-claimed and dotted with villages and towns, and the barbarians either submitted to the conquerors or retreated to the mountains where their descendants still live.”

Such statements could on no account be substantiated by any historical source. They were only the last expression of the baseless feelings of many Dravidian kings and groups of people who being unreasonably ashamed of their Dravidian origin, claimed Aryan descent. But after the discovery of Mohenjo Daro, Mr. R. D. Banerji could daringly challenge all Aryan feelings by

* The verse can be transcribed in Tamil; but for want of Tamil type here it could not be so done.
Dravidians were certainly far more civilized than the Indo-Aryan invaders. Further more, he states: “At this time (when they settled in the Punjab) the Indo-Aryans were carrying on a ceaseless war with the earlier and more civilized inhabitants of the country”. Thus the discovery of the Mohenjo Daro civilization marks the opening of a new era of Proto-historical research in India by finally settling the true and unmistakable point of view.

The relics of Indus valley disclose extraordinary similarity with the relics of ancient Sumer. These similarities were already pointed out by several scholars in the Illustrated London News and elsewhere, even before the publication of the work of Sir John Marshall. These similarities suggest intimate connections between the Mohenjo Doro people and Sumerians. The study of these connections will undoubtedly discover the foreign relations of our proto-Indian people and perhaps will solve the so called Sumerian problem. Besides other arguments derived from the study of the script and of the inscriptions, it is interesting to note that the ancient tradition of Sumer points to the East as the country of origin of the Sumerians. Berosus, the Babylonian priest of the first century B.C., has kept two names of the several chiefs who brought civilization and the art of writing to Sumer. One was called Oannes, an evident hellenized form of the name Uvānī, “elder brother of the flower”, a name very common even at present among the Tulus. The other name Odakon, is in this very form a Tamilian name which means “the master of the boat,” from Oda, “boat”, and Kon, “lord”, “master”, “king”. This tradition so faithfully recorded by the Babylonian historian has its parallel account in Genesis. After narrating the different generations of the sons of Noah, the Biblical account continues thus:

“And when they removed from the East, they found a plain in the land of Sennaar (Sumer), and dwelt in it”.

“And each one said to his neighbour: come let us make brick and bake them with fire. And they had brick instead of stones, and slime instead of mortar.”
The beautifully built houses with bricks and cement which have been found at Mohenjo Daro seem to be the best comment on this passage of the Bible. Evidently the reed-and-mud huts of Mesopotamia in pre-Sumerian days did not please those who had inhabited brick-built dwellings.

But the connections with ancient Sumer are not the only foreign connections of Mohenjo Daro. A small carving on a Steatite seal shows a bullfight scene, altogether similar to those that take place in Spain at present. Similar bull-fights have been found represented on the walls of the palace of Minos in Crete. The authors of the Minoan Civilizations as well as the Iberians of Spain are supposed to belong to the so-called Mediterranean race, to which according to modern anthropologists the Dravidians belong also. This view is now confirmed by the archaeological discoveries at Mohenjo Daro. A good historical illustration of such taurine customs might be found in the so-called "Bull marriage" described in the Tamil works of the Sangam period. When several young men were courting a girl, the father of the latter used to set loose a bull within a ring. The lad who succeeded in catching the bull by the horns proved to be worthy of his beloved.

Among the relics found at Mohenjo Daro, Harappa and other sites, the collection of steatite seals is of extraordinary importance. These seals, as a general rule, bear the figure of an animal in the lower portion, animal which seems to represent the Totem of the tribe, viz. a unicorn, an elephant, a bull, a buffalo, a tiger etc. The upper portion of the seals is occupied by an inscription in characters which were totally unknown. The study of these characters reveal undreamt of contacts with other nations of the ancient world—China, Sumer, Egypt, Crete, the Hittites, etc., contacts which may prove some ethnological affinities and may finally detect the parent of all the scripts used by them. I shall only mention one case which is very significant: the sign meaning "death" in the Mohenjo-Daro script. The upper portion of this
sign is the funeral monument called Stūpa, at a later period. The small narrow line-sign below is full of interest and meaning. The sign in our script mean “One”. Therefore it reads or. Now if you want to speak of a person we shall write the determinative of personification of this sign, thus †. This sign consequently reads Orvan, “One person” This is precisely the sign placed under the funeral mound. The whole sign therefore is a pictograph representing a person buried under the funeral mound. Now this sign passes through three stages of simplification within the Mohenjo Daro period. Now in early Sumerian script, in the tablets of Jemdet Nasar, death is expressed by the arrow-like sign only, turned 90 degrees to the left as usual, thus: +

This seems to be the last stage of simplification of this sign, impossible to explain in Sumerian writing without reference to Mohenjo Daro script. (The above signs of Mohenjo Daro read, Sā, which etymologically means “To fall on one side”. The majority of the corpses buried in Harappa and also the corpses of the royal cemetery of Ur were found on one side, practically always on the right side).

The script of Mohenjo Daro is a pictophonographic script of such a logical nature that it may be at times read without knowing its meaning. It is a script which tends to depict the sound, when in its phonetic signs it cannot depict the objects meant by the sounds. Such a script discloses a clear tendency to become alphabetic. When the Aryans entered India, they had no script of their own and they adopted this script which was the script of their enemies, the Dasyus. Thus the script developed through two different channels. In Northern India under the Aryas and their Aryanised friends, the Dravidians. In Southern India and Ceylon it developed under its own inventors, the Dravidians, more or less influenced by the Aryas of the North and by their Sanskrit language. Such is the origin of the two kinds of Brahui characters of North and South India, from which all the modern Indian alphabets proceed. The value of many of these Brahui characters is still a consonant sound of the primitive word represented by the Mohenjo Daro sign.
After the study of above one thousand eight hundred inscriptions which upto now have been deciphered by the present writer, it is easy to realize that the wave of migration of the mediterranean race which was supposed to have been from West to East, must now be finally settled as having taken place in the opposite direction, i.e., from East to West. The development of the script of Mohenjo Daro in relation with the Sumerian script, the religion of these two countries and that of Egypt, the titles of kings, the number of Zodiacal constellations among the proto-Indian people and the relative position of these constellations, the changing of the proto-Indian constellation of the Harp (Yāl) for Tārus (the bull) which must have taken place in Sumer, the tradition of ancient people of Mesopotamia recorded by Berosus, the parallel by Biblical account in Gen. II, 1-5,—all point to the same conclusion that the migration of the mediterranean race commenced from India and extended through Southern Mesopotamia and Northern Africa; spread through Crete, Cyprus, Greece, Italy and Spain, and crossing the Pyrenees reached Central Europe and the British Isles. This route starting from Ceylon up to Ireland is marked by an interrupted chain of dolmens and other megaliths, that seem to be the relics of this enterprising and highly civilized race which is termed the mediterranean by the anthropologists and which in India has been quite unreasonably despised under the name "Dravidian".

It has been an error to call the civilization discovered at Mohenjo Daro, Harappa, and other sites, "The Indus Valley Civilization," for this phrase seems to suggest that such civilization flourished in the Indus Valley only. Relics of the same civilization have also been found in the Gangetic valley and in Kathiawar. Signs like those of the Indus valley have also been discovered in pieces of pottery found in the Tinnevelly district, the southernmost district of India, on some rocks in the Nilgiris, and pottery found in the pre-historic tombs of the Hyderabad State. The back-ground of the Teks, so common in the Deccan, bearing images of Khandoba or another Shaiva deity, is covered with
similar sign too. The Lingayats of Karnataka mark their houses with another Mohenjo Daro sign, the meaning of which is now totally unknown to them. The present writer has lately discovered some signs of that script in a pre-historic cave of the Kegalle District of Ceylon and also in the earliest Struck Coins of Ceylon which bear quite intelligible inscription.

From the reading of the script the sign of Swastika is disclosed and it proves the pre-Aryan Dravidian culture as follows:—

"The name 'Svastika' is a Sanskrit name which means 'Sv-asti-ka', "that which is well being". But is the 'Svastika' a purely Sanskrit of Aryan lançhana? Thousands of years before the Aryans invaded India, the inhabitants of Mohenjo Daro, belonging to the Dravidian race, used some small square amulets with an inscribed 'Svastika'. Besides the svastika is also found in their inscriptions. No doubt remains at present about the origin to the Svastika. It is a Dravidian symbol which was adopted by the Aryas, as so many other institutions, when they entered India. Yet, what was its meaning or symbolism?

The Rigveda speaks of the 'purah', the forts, of the Dasyus, the people of the Mohenjo Daro nation. These forts were really walled cities, perfectly laid out with wide streets, and side lanes, as the remains of the city of Mohenjo Daro clearly show. Ancient works on town planning by Dravidian authors of South India very nicely agree with the planning revealed in the Indus Valley by the excavations. One of the different kinds of town-planning explained in those treatises is the planning called of the 'Svastika'.

What is the purpose of this apparently strange planning? It was due to war strategy. The city being well walled, the only

* India, the Empire of Swastika, Coronation Souvenir, Bombay, 1937.
way to enter the town was through gates. After succeeding in opening any of the gates, the army had to remain in the walled passage along the city wall before capturing the second gate. This gave ample time and opportunity to the defenders of the city to destroy the army cajoled into the passage from the top of the city walls. This system of planning the cities rendered them practically impregnable, and consequently the citizens were safe and their properties not liable to suffer from the predatory instincts of the neighbours. Many ancient forts in India, for instance, those of the Marathas, have their gates constructed in this fashion. This sort of city-planning was the cause of the prosperity of the city. That is the reason why the design Svastika soon became synonymous with prosperity, and its representation was used as an amulet and as a benediction. That was the reason why when the Aryas entered India, they applied the Vedic benediction 'swasti' with the nominal suffix 'ka' to this representation, under which name it is still known in the countries of the West.

This sign was not only used as an amulet but also as a sign of their ancient proto-Indian writing, reading 'nalam', 'prosperity'. An inscription of Harappa has five Svastikas.

Similarly this sign is found in some of the early coins of Ceylon with a nominal meaning as in the above inscription.

For when the Svastika, following the path of migration from East to West accompanied the Dramilas (Termiloi, according to Herodotus) of proto-Indian to Crete, Greece, Etruria, Iberia, and other countries, it kept the meaning of prosperity of the Mohenjo Daro and Ceylon inscriptions. Thus the Svastika designed on drinking vessels means, "may this drink be the cause of prosperity and happiness". Similarly this sign engraved both on Etruscan funeral urns and on the memorial stones of the Christian catacombs at Rome is a practical confession of the belief in a prosperous future life, which is wished to the souls of the persons whose remains are kept under it.
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Thus the Svasti̊ka spreading to East and West became universal. Yet India, the country where it was first designed and read, may still rightly be called "the Empire of the Svasti̊ka".

That the Mohenjo Daro people were in intercourse with the people of Karnāṭaka is proved in the following:

**Karnāṭaka and Mohenjo Daro.**

The fact that the ancient people of Mohenjo Daro were proto-Dravidians—a fact hinted at by Sir John Marshall and confirmed by the interpretation of all the inscriptions by the present writer—is already a link between all the Dravidian countries, including therefore Karnāṭaka, and Mohenjo Daro.

But the connection between Karnāṭaka and Mohenjo Daro is still more explicit than this general interrelation. The people of Karnāṭaka are apparently referred to in one of the seal inscriptions of Mohenjo Daro as one of the ancient tribes of the land.

The complete sign will read *Kaṇanir*, "people who have "eyes". This evidently refers to a tribe, to a number of people called so. The ancient word Kannaḍigas by which the people of modern Karnāṭaka are mentioned, seems to be but a Sanskrit modification of *Kaṇanir*.

An inscription reads: Kaṇan er ir ten vēlūr arup. It means: "the harvest of Vēlūr that has two cocoanut plantations in which the Kaṇanir rose". After comparing this inscription with other similar inscriptions of Mohenjo Daro, Harappa, and Chāñhū Daro, it is evident that the Kaṇanirs rose against Vēlūr, and that a battle was fought in the cocoanut plantations. Vēlūr was a kingdom of the tribe of the Minas in South India. The mountains in the vicinity of Vēlur were apparently fortified, for they are said to be the strength of the dynasty ruling in Vēlūr. The fortifications

---

* The Karnatak Historical Review, July 1937.
must have been very helpful to the Vēlūr king when he was attacked by the Kaṇanirs. In point of fact, though the inscription does not say who won the day in this war, it seems evident that the defenders of Vēlūr were not defeated, otherwise they would not have recorded the rise of their enemies in this inscription. Moreover, there is another inscription that shows the king of Vēlūr successfully fighting against a tribe who seem to have been allied to the Kaṇanirs, otherwise the Vēlūr king would not have marched across the Kaṇanir country on their mountain fastness. The second inscription is a fragment of proto-Dravidian poetry, of extraordinary literary beauty.

The inscription reads as follows, first line from right to left, second line from left to right:

Kālor mī | nan mīn | kān kada ēr | valīl adu |  
Kalakūri val | kei kudaga | nāl  

which means: "Many strong Kuṭāgas of (from) the people of the united countries of (who had) the strong house (fortress) which was seen with the perfection of the fish, crossed and taken over by the Mīna of the Kālors." The Kālors are the robber tribe inhabiting the neighbourhood of Trichinopoly. They are now called Kalers. Mīna of the Kālors cannot but be Mīna, the king of Vēlūr, who seems to have taken the fortress of the Kuṭāgas (called Vānaras after) by assault. The Kuṭāgas are the people of Coorg, whose language is still called Kuṭagu.

It seems therefore, that the Kaṇanirs or the Kannāḍigas already formed a separate tribe amongst the Dravidians in those early days. Did they speak a different language? We have not sufficient data for replying to this question, but it does not seem probable. Yet, the extraordinary distances existing between North and South India, specially if the lack of good means of communication is taken into account, naturally brought about dialectal forms of speech. At least two of these dialectal forms of speech—the forerunners of the modern Kannāḍa forms—already appear in the language of Moheṇjo Daro.
But besides the above two forms, there is still the form in 
-ru, which is purely Kannada. This plural is obtained by adding 
the sign U, ru, onomatopoeic sound for noise, to the sign representing the plural object.

Before ending we must refer to another link still existing from those ancient days between Mohenjo Daro and Karnaṭaka. The modern Lingāyats of the Kannada country depict a sign on the walls of their houses, the meaning of which does not seem to be known to them. The sign is this: $>$

This sign is often found in the inscriptions of Mohenjo Daro and Harappa. It reads kūḍu and means "union". The sign very likely refers to the union of male and female principles which is so prominent in the religious tenets of the Vīraśaiva sect.

Finally, that the Aryans came to India from the banks of Volga and arrived at Kathiawar is established in the following:

* Once settled that the clever traders of the Bāberu Jataka were Dravidians, we may safely affirm that they and others of the same race beyond doubt were the owners of those round seals (and three square seals) with proto-Dravidian inscriptions found in lower Mesopotamia. Some of them may have lost their seals or died in Sumer and their seals were found in modern times by the diligent excavator. Yet, one final question still remains to be answered: from what part of India were they hailing? In order to give a satisfactory reply to this query, we must turn a number of pages in the annals of history to the time when the Aryas were already settled in India their new and permanent home.

§ (This is not quite correct. The sign is $X$, called Lingamudra, the symbolic representation of Shivalinga:—The present Editor).

One of the most important provinces in Western India, in fact the nearest one to Mesopotamia, if the shores of the Indus Valley are excepted, is Kathiawar. This name is a very recent one. Before, this land was known as Saurastra, “good country”. Yet, this does not seem to be its original name. The numerous temples of Surya found there seem to point to a special connection of the sun. Temples dedicated to Surya are not very numerous in India, as happened practically with all the purely Vedic gods. Yet in the small peninsula of Kathiawar one comes across temples dedicated to Surya in many villages and even small hamlets, Prabhaspatan otherwise called Somnath Patan may claim three: one that has disappeared on the site of Jumma Masjid, the other still stands overlooking Triveni, south east of the town and the third along the river Hiran towards the north. Besides, Mudhera, Sūtrapāda, Kinderkheda, Than (in the Kandola fort), Pasthar, Kotai, Kanthkot and Arasavali and several other places possess temples of Surya; without mentioning villages like Visavada, portadī, and Bagavadar, in which the ancient images of Surya found there give a clear evidence of Surya temples in ancient times. There exist also a number of Surya Kundas as in Mul Dwarka and Surya wells as in Pasthar. What is the explanation of this extraordinary devotion of Surya?

If Kathiawar were situated on the eastern coast of India, the reply to the above query would not be difficult. Kathiawar would have been towards sun-rise, from where the sun was hailing, and this devotion to the sun would be easily understandable. But it is just the opposite. Kathiawar is on the western coast of India. The real explanation will be found in the ancient name of Kathiawar. Till the time when the name Kathiawar was adopted after the Maratha wars of the 18th century, this peninsula was called Saurastra, that is interpreted as “good country.” But this does not seem to be the most ancient name of Kathiawar. In the inscriptions of Rudradaman and Skanda Gupta at the foot of Girnar, Junagadh state, the country is called Surastra, and this little difference may be of great importance. Su may be the stem
of the derivative noun Savitre, which from the Vedic period down to the present is one of the names of the Sun. Su means "to go", "to move", "to impel" and \( Su^+itr-Sav^+itr-Savitr \) would mean the cause or agent of impelling and therefore the generator, the vivifier, the stimulator, as the sun is. Consequently Surastra would mean the country of the impeller or generator by excellence, the country of that one who goes across the skies is the country of the Sun. This seems to be original name given by the Aryas to Kathiawar.

Yet is it not strange after all that a country situated to the West should be denominated "the country of the sun"? For it is but natural that the country of the Sun should be towards the East whence the Sun comes from. Thus for instance the Chinese call Japan, "the Empire of the Rising Sun" Man always turns towards the East when the Sun is spoken of. And yet on this occasion "the country of the Sun" is placed on the western coast of India.

This clearly shows that this name was given to this land when the Aryas were not in India, but to the West India, when Surastra was towards the east of them. This early acquaintance of the Aryas—the future invaders of India and Iran—with Surastra was effected through the Panis going to the Kingdom of Baber trading with that land. The existence of the Mittani in Babylon and similarity of their gods \( Mi-it-ra-as, U-ru-W-na, In-dar-and Na-sa-at-ti-ia-an-na \) with the Indo Aryan gods Mitra, Varuna, Indra and the Nasatyas make it now quite certain that in course of their migration eastwards the Aryan nation stopped for long time in Mesopotamia. When the rude and uncivilized Aryas contemplated the wonderful natural goods or manufactured products brought by the Panis, they would naturally ask each other: "From where do they come?" The daring amongst them would finally ask the Sumerian and Semitic people of the country. "From where the Sun comes" the latter would reply, "from the country of the Sun". "Ah," finally the Aryas would say "they say they come from the country of the Sun, from Suryarastra or Surastra" and thus for those simple people.
the country from where the Panis were coming was christened Surastra.

And such was the impression that the goods of that country and its brilliant name produced in those poor emigrants, that when on account of their sufferings and hardship under the slavery of their Semitic overlords, they decided to escape to new lands, the idea of going to Surastra naturally arose in their heads. It was a colossal adventure. The Aryas coming from the banks of the Volga had never seen the sea, few amongst them perhaps had reached the shores of Sumer in lower Mesopotamia, they could not have seafaring inclinations. The migration of a whole nation to this new land, though so promising and rich in itself, could not but have innumerable perils. Besides the unknown is always frightening to simple folk. The leader of the Aryas, the Asura Indar-called afterwards in the Vedic hymns Indra, did not dare to take the whole nation to the new land first. First he wanted to make a trial. He took two families with him the families of the Yadus and Turvasas and embarking in one of the ships of the Panis they set sail from lower Mesopotamia and after a number of days landed on the shores of Kathiawar. This first expedition of the Aryas into India across the ocean is mentioned several times in the Rigveda. "What time, O Hero, o'er the sea thou broughtest, in safety broughtest them, O hero thou keepest Turvasa and Yadu safely." A third passage even testifies to the fear they felt in their hearts before sailing "So sapient Indra. Lord of might brought Turvasa and Yadu those who feared the flood (sea) in safety o'er."

That the place where they landed was the modern Kathiawar, the ancient Surastra, is the most common opinion among scholars: and if they landed on the Surastra shores they did so because they followed the route of their leaders the Panis. What harbour of Kathiawar was their objective we do not know for certain. Yet it seems probable that the landing place of the first Aryan expedition into India was the modern Veraval or its neighbourhood.
There was in ancient times on the western coast of Surastra a famous city called Minnagar. This is a hybrid name, for the first part of it Min is originally Dravidian while the second part is purely Sanskrit; Minnagar means "the shining city". This strange combination shows that Minnagar was pre-Aryan city and its name in pre-Aryan times evidently was Minur, "the shining city" a name which has been found in the inscriptions of Mohenjo Daro by the present writer. One of them which reads—

Talir urveli per Minur Kal adu, i.e. "that (is) a quarter of the great Minur which is outside the prosperous country."

From the discussion heretofore it is clear that man arose in India (simultaneously, if he arose in other parts of the world as well) in prehistoric times and gradually developed a culture in all its Stages and Ages, palaeolithic and others (2) That the Dravidians lived in India and had developed a high form of culture before the Aryans immigrated into India and made her their home (3) and that the culture and civilization of the Dravidians spread westwards. Now it is to be seen if these pre-Aryan Dravidians of India had any religion and what it was if they had one.

Scholars generally trace the origin and growth of Religion, Philosophy and Literature in India to Vedas. According to them then was nothing in India previous to the coming of Aryans to India, which was then a land occupied by people uncivilized and barbarous. It was the Aryans, they say, that brought with them some civilization which they spread among the people of India after conquering them. But even the references made in the Vedas to the people already
there show that they, with whom the Aryans had to
fight, were a people rich in wealth and cattle, owned
chariots and had weapons used in fights with the
Aryans. The rise of Aryans did not alter the stage of
culture reached by the people. According to the hymns
the Dasyus lived in "cities", (R. V. I-53-8, I-103-3)
and under kings the names of many of whom are
mentioned. The terms "Dasyu", "Dâsa", "Pani"
and others are used contemptuously with reference to
pre-Aryan people by the Aryans. The Dasyus had
"accumulated wealth", (R. V. VIII-40-6) in the form
of cows, horses and chariots (R. V. II-15-4), which
they kept in "hundred-gated cities" (R. V. X-99-3).
Indra seized and gave these away to his worshippers,
the Aryas (R. V. I-176-4). The Dasyus were wealthy
and owned property in "the plains and on the hills"
(R. V. X-69-6). They were "adorned with their array
of gold and jewels" (R. V. I-33-38). They owned
many castles (R. V. I-33-13). The Dasyu demons
and Aryan Gods lived alike in gold, silver and iron
castles. Indra overthrew for his worshipper, Divodâsa,
frequently mentioned in the hymns, a hundred stone
castles of the Dasyus (R. V. IV-30-20). Agni, worshiped
by the Arya, gleaming in front of him, tore and
burnt the cities of the fireless Dasyus (R. V. VII-5-3).
Brihaspati broke the stone prisons in which they kept
the cattle raided from the Aryans (R. V. IV-28-5 and
X-67-3). The wrong idea of Scholars of Indology
about the pre-Aryan Dravidians, which is now to be
revised in the light of Mohenjo Daro finds, was mainly
due to their being dazzled by the brilliant Sanskrit
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literature, particularly the Vedic literature, so honestly and carefully preserved and handed down from generation to generation. Being thus dazzled the eyes of scholars could not penetrate the vale^ mystery that yawned behind the Vedas and their teachings. The materials also in the form of various instruments and tools of different Ages were still unearthed and could not shed any light on the pre-historic life of India’s people, their activities, and the progressive growth of culture effected by them. This wrong idea of scholars firmly rooted in their minds made them blind to the references (already noted above) made to the people and their enviable condition of living and they tried to interpret the references suitably to their wrong idea of pre-Aryan people of India, as remarked by Sir John Marshall (see the extract given above on page 10). But now scholars are coming round to the view that the Dravidians, the pre-Aryan people of India, had developed a civilization that spread westward.

* Dr. Hall suggests the possibility of Sumerians being an Indian race which passed to the valley of two rivers. Says he, “The ethnic type of Sumerians, so strongly marked in their statues and reliefs, was as different from those of the races which surrounded them as was their language from those of the Semites, Aryans and others; they were decidedly Indian in type. The face-type of average Indian of today is no doubt much the same as that of his Dravidian ancestors of thousands of years ago. Among the Modern Indians, as among the Modern Greeks or Italians, the ancient pre-Aryan

type of the head has survived (as the primitive type of the head has always done), while that of the Aryan conqueror died out long ago. And it is to this Dravidian ethnic type of India that the ancient Sumerian bears most resemblance, so far as we can judge from his monuments. He was very much like a southern Hindu of the Deccan (who still speaks Dravidian languages). And it is by no means improbable that the Sumerians were an Indian type which passed, certainly by land, perhaps also by sea, through Persia to the valley of two rivers”. The account given by Berosus in the 3rd or 4th century B.C. appears to suggest that the early settlers of Sumer arrived by sea bringing with them a fully developed civilization. This civilization may possibly have arisen in the submerged Tamil lands that extended to the south of Kumari."

§ Sir John Evans in his presidential address to the British Association says “Southern India was probably the cradle of human race. Investigations in relation to race show it to be possible that southern India was once the passage ground by which the ancient progenitors of Northern and Mediterranean races proceeded to the parts of the globe which they inhabit.”

III

Shaivism, the Dravidian Religion.

That man is a tool-making animal is the definition of man based on a sound anthropological concept. Food, the primary concern of man, was the stern

necessity and became the mother of his subsequent inventions in all the progressive Stages and Ages of his life. But man has also been defined as a religious animal, which again is a sound psychological concept. Religion like science begins and grows in wonder, wonder about the endlessly expansive and mysterious universe, working so regularly and duly, full of countless varieties of objects and things useful for all creatures of all gradations. Man, an inquisitorial creature, endowed with the faculty of thinking and intellect requisite for that thinking, must have begun to inquire how it was that the Universe worked so regularly and well and how and if it possessed that power of working, or if there was any inscrutable power or spirit behind the Universe or at the bottom of the Universe that it should work so well. This was the beginning of man's idea about God and Religion. That the Dravidians had a religion and the religion was Shaivism, and for that matter Shaktism as well, with some of the characteristics that have still been found in their present form will be evident from the following discussion.

One full chapter has been devoted to religion of Sind people by Sir John Marshall in his "Mohenjo Daro and Indus Civilization." Therein he concludes that those people worshipped the mother Goddess, (the Shakti), and a male deity (Shiva). They also worshipped, he says, animals, trees, water etc. and identifies the male deity with Shiva from the prominent characteristics of the deity having three eyes and being
a Mahayogin, as represented on seals, images, carvings and other signs discovered in different sites. But his conclusions, having been based on data mentioned, are not considered very authoritative.

Nilkantha Shastri of Madras, therefore, says † "While Marshall's explanations appear conclusive in regard to the cult of the mother goddess, the phallic cult and the tree and animal cults, his speculations on the male god, who, he thinks, was prototype of the historical Shiva, are rather forced, and certainly not so convincing as the rest of the chapter. It is difficult to believe on the strength of a single "roughly carved seal" that all the specific attributes of Shiva as Mahesha, Mahayogin, Pashupati, and Dakhninamurti were anticipated in the remote age to which the seal belongs." It is thus necessary that his conclusions should be further supported by the inscriptions satisfactorily explained, as also remarked by the Shastri ‡ "The interpretation of these data can hardly become final until the inscriptions on the seals are satisfactorily explained". And this is exactly what has been done by Father Heras, whose reading of the inscriptions, as recorded in the following, proves beyond the shadow of doubt that Shiva and Shakti were the chief deities of Mohenjo Daro people, who have been already proved to be Dravidians.

† Cultural Heritage of India Vol. II, p. 21. ‡ Ibid.
*(1) The supreme Being.

In the inscriptions there are two, one of which apparently gives the essential description of God, while the other shows his position in relation with the other beings of the Universe. The former reads as follows:—

'Iruvan-adu kom mīnanir', i.e. 'the horn playing Mīnas of one who exists.' Now since the horn players in religious festivals are, even to-day, servants of the temples, 'one who exists' must be an idea that is only referable to God. Iruvan must have been a name of God and indeed God is the only being who really exists, for, as the metaphysicians explain he exists by himself, while all the other beings exist by another who is God, viz., they have not in themselves the reason of their existence. (cf. Thus when Moses asked God, after the latter had sent him to Egypt to save his brethren: "If they should say to me: what is his name? what shall I say to them,?" God replied to him: "You will tell them: I am who am". Even the phrase 'tat-tvam-asi' of the 'Chāndogya Upanishad, which is now interpreted in a pantheistic sense, had apparently no other meaning in the beginning than the meaning of the inscription, that reveals the high idea of God that the people of Mohenjo Daro had.)

The other inscription reads thus:—

'Kōil ella kadvul-adu'... 'the supreme God of all the Gods of the temple.' This epigraph shows that in reality this sign refers to a being which is superior to all other gods and consequently above the whole Universe.

The name, therefore, of this supreme God must be one revealing these two ideas: superiority and self-existence. In all the Dravidian dictionaries there is only one word that would embody them, and this word is ān, which might be properly translated 'Supreme Being'.

* The Journal of the University of Bombay, July, 1936.
Now the Supreme Being above everything is the Lord of the whole Universe, and, therefore, everything may be referred to him with a relation of possession. Thus the inscriptions tell us:

1. The Supreme Being of all the Gods of the field that make peace.
2. The Supreme Being of the successful dark growing moon.
3. The Supreme Being of the rain clouds of the Fish.
4. The Supreme Being of the clouds of man.
5. The Supreme Being of the Mīnas.
6. The supreme Being of the Mīnas who have the sun on high.

(2) The Attributes of the Supreme Being.

The attributes of the Supreme Being, which will communicate to us a clearer understanding of its essence, may be divided into two groups: A. Quiescent Attributes. B. Operative attributes.

A.

1. Life:—God being the only self-subsistent is the source of life and activity. Thus in an inscription he is called "the Supreme Being of Life." The word 'Vāl' may mean life and happiness, perhaps because originally life and happiness were synonymous, which is still true in the case of God.

2. Oneness:—He does not communicate his superiority, to any one. He is the only one. 'Orvan tīrpu tīrpu ērkra mīn naṇḍil ulavan'; i.e. Mīna, the farmer of the Crab, about whom 'the one' has decreed.' As we shall see later the farmer of the Crab' is a royal-title. Therefore no other but the Supreme Being, the one, could decree any thing about him.
3. **Greatness:**—This attribute means that in God there is no limit. Thus we read in an inscription of the very great-one:"

B.

4. **Omniscience:**—Two inscriptions speak of the God of the city of Nātur under the name of Viḍukan. Now this name properly means ‘open eye’ and refers to a person who has always the eyes-open, who sees and knows everything. This very ancient idea agrees with the modern common belief of Hinduism that the gods have no eyelids. Thus unable to close their eyes, they see everything.

5. **Benevolence:**—According to this attribute, the Supreme Being helps men in their needs. A very important inscription reveals to us the belief the Mohenjo Daro people had regarding this point. The inscription reads; ‘Udavu ir Min-adu Aṇ’, i.e. "the Supreme Being of Mina being help." The figure carved on the seal that bears the inscription enhances the value of this epigraph. It represents the skin of a unicorn spread in four directions. Now the unicorn is totem of one of the ancient tribes; it is the most common totem among the totems shown on the Mohenjo-Daro inscriptions. Yet skinning this animal supposes its being killed and the representation of its skin as a trophy discloses the fact that the tribe whose totem it was, was defeated by Mina, but the latter in the inscription attributes the victory to Aṇ.
6. Power of destruction and generation: Another seal that has been very often reproduced, represents a nude, three-faced god, seated in a sort of a Yogi pose, wearing a trident-like headgear. Round this figure several animals are placed. It has been said that this is a figure of Paśupati. The carver of this seal had not the intention of carving the representation of Shiva as Paśupati. He wanted to represent the Supreme Being surrounded by the totems of the different tribes that inhabited Mohenjo-Daro. The inscription which appears on the upper portion of the seal refers to two very characteristic functions of the same Supreme Being. The epigraph reads as follows: \textit{Av navē vilkei kūda minadu}, i.e. the Supreme Being enfeebling and strengthening is of the (the months of) jar and the fish. These were the two months of autumn, during which the whole of nature seems to weaken and lie; leaves fall from the trees, mountains and fields disappear under a coat of snow, cold stiffens the limbs of the body. But how useful is this for restoring strength and health to both vegetables and animals! From that sort of lethargic sleep nature rises again more vigorous than ever. This enfeebling and strengthening was directly attributed to the Supreme Being by the Proto-Indians. He is elsewhere often called “the god of the chariot and of the cultivated fields,” two symbols of destruction and fertility, which finally reveal \textit{Av} as the fore-runner of the modern Shiva. (Italics ours)

(3) His forms.

Enuai is till now a modern Shiva meaning “eight-bodied or formed.” Then there cannot be any doubt that in those early days this name was only attributed to the Supreme Being.

Another inscription tells that he is eight. “The two fishes (constellation) of that which is eight and who has the sun-on high.”

Images of this Supreme Being under these forms were worshipped in different parts of the country. Thus an inscription says “Of the god of one side (form) who is in the country.”
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Occasionally, two forms of the Supreme Being were combined into the same image... This combination is represented in the seal itself..... Yet the seal itself seems to show this is only a form of God, a symbol, a representation—for on the other side of the seal the figure of the God is represented standing in the middle of a tree with the trident on his head after the fashion of the other seal. Before him a devotee half-squatting on the ground offers his prayers to the deity.

(4) The Supreme Being is three-eyed.

This is the idea about Shiva in modern Hinduism, which we find clearly expressed with reference to God in the inscriptions of Proto-Indians; and the idea was so well known that the only mention of “his three eyes” as we find in two inscriptions, revealed to those people the idea of the Supreme Being. These three eyes were being worshipped. “The worshipped three eyes on which the four stars rise.” Accordingly God is called the three-eyed one. Thus the inscription which reads: “Parava nila īr minaniravana mūn kaṇ, i.e. the three-eyed, be of the Mīnas who are moon Paravas.” In another inscription it is said that “the twelve stars of the Spring Fish that have the sun on high (are) the three-eyed one.”

In this inscription some connection between the “three-eyed one” and the constellation of the Fish is being disclosed; but in the other inscriptions it is clearly stated that the Fish is also the “three-eyed one.” Thus:—

1. “The three-eyes of the Great Fish.”
2. “The three eyes of he of the Spring.”

Yet another inscription avers that “in the house of the Great Fish meditates on the three-eyed one.”

The subject is even expressed in two verses carved on two planes of a prism. These verses read:
"Mūn mūn pēr kaḍavul adu mūn
Mūn ār kaḍavul ār kārumugil mūn."

This means:

"The three stars are the three eyes of the great God"
"The three streams of the stream God are the three rain-clouds."

Two inscriptions refer to one eye only: i.e., 'orkan' "one eye."
Such inscriptions evidently refer to the third eye which grew at a later period, according to late Shaivite tradition when the God realised that two eyes were not enough to see everything. Accordingly one inscription speaks "of the growth of the eye," and, consistent with the idea that the fish is three-eyed, another inscription refers to the "eye in the Fish," viz., the third eye.

(5) The names of the Supreme Being.

We have accidentally noted above that Iruvan 'the one who is," seems to be one of the names given to God in those early days.

Another name which has been mentioned before is Eumai, a name which is still given to Shiva among the Dravidian nations of South India. Similarly, Viḍukau, also referred to above is used nowadays in the South.

A new name of God is contained in an inscription which reads: 'Pērāṇor nālvid,' i.e., "four houses of those belonging to Pēran." They seem to be the temple servants, where Pērāṇ was worshipped. Pērāṇ or Perumāl is a very common name of Shiva in Southern India. Accordingly another inscription calls god "Pērāṇ of the chariot and of the cultivated fields."
A fifth name is contained in an epigraph which reads: Tāṇḍavan ir nāl maram, i. e., the Tāṇḍavan is among the four trees, "i. e. in the forest Tāṇḍavan is the name of the dancing Shiva. This shows that the idea of God dancing as the source of all the movement of the universe is a very old one.

(6) The Linga.

That the phallus was worshipped in Mohenjo Daro is proved clearly by a number of such stones discovered there and at Harappa. Yet while going through the inscriptions one realises that its cult was not spread regularly amongst all classes of people. It is true that the 'Linga' is also identified with the high sun as in this inscription: "the lustrous linga is the high sun." But it is not less true that the—Minas afterwards called the Matsyas—who seem to form the main bulk of the Mohenjo Daro inhabitants, disliked the Linga worship. One of the inscriptions reads: "ūr nalam ḍug cuṇṇi irkra mīn mīnanir, i.e the prosperity of the land is of the Minas of the Fish who have despised the Linga." Another inscription informs us who were especially those who despised the Linga; "the canal (which is) in front of the houses of the land of the Linga (which is) despised by the thinkers of the land." According to the information supplied by this inscription, the high classes of the country, the intelligentia of the land, despised this cult. Only poor and ignorant people adhered to it.

What was therefore the origin of this cult? While studying these inscriptions we find the linga cult established as at home among the two tribes, the Bilavas and the Kavals. About the Bilavas the inscriptions say:

1. "In the dark growing half of the moon, when the sun was on high, the Bilavas pulled down the four houses of the linga."

(According to this inscription the linga among the Bilavas had house the rent of which was used for fostering this cult,)
2. "The linga of the eight villages of the Velvel Bilavas (is) the high Sun of the harvest."

About the Kavals we find "the old linga of the Kavals."

From these premises we may perhaps deduce the consequence that these two tribes were Kolerian and that they brought this cult from the far-off Eastern Islands.

(7) The Divine Triad

Among the Mohenjo-Daro inscriptions there is one of extraordinary importance, on account of its unexpected revelations in the field of the history of comparative religions and even in the general field of ancient civilization. The inscription reads: uṣa mūn pēr Kaḍavula—adu Kalak air; i.e. "the joined life of the three great gods."

First of all we must determine who were these three great gods. Were they the Aṅ, the Sun and the Linga? They could not be so; first because the Linga was not generally accepted by the Mīnas and even perhaps we may add by all the so-called Dravidi- ans. Besides Aṅ and the Sun are not two gods, but one, for they are identified not in a passing way but essentially. These three gods may therefore be Aṅ and two more.

A similar triad of gods is also found in Sumerian inscriptions and the three gods of Sumer in pre-historic times were Aṅ, Ama and Enlil. Aṅ was the father, Ama was the mother and Enlil was the son, who afterwards in historic Sumerian times became the father. The Proto-Dravidian triad is supposed to be similar to this. In fact Aṅ, the father of Sumer is the same Aṅ, the Supreme Being of India. The mother is called Ama in Sumerian. Now Amma is the common word for mother in Dravidian languages and a good number of clay statuettes of the mother goddess have been found in Mohenjo Daro and Harappa,
Such an idea of the mother goddess must be the first foundation of the Shakta sect of India. This mother received a name which is the female denomination corresponding to the denomination minkau attributed to Anu. In the inscription she is called Minkanani. This in fact had to be the original name of the goddess of Madura, Minakshi, whose name now is partly Dravidian-Mina-and partly Sanskrit akshi.

The son in the Proto-Indian Triad is named Anil. The corresponding sign occurs in several inscriptions.

What has been found is the combination of Anu and Amma. The inscription reads: uyarel ter or Amman: i.e. one Amman of the chariot of the sun. This deity half man (proper left) and half-woman (proper right), which is also found in Sumer with the name of Amma-a seems to be the original idea of the Hindu image of Ardhanareshwara, which is only found in Shaivism and which has the two parts put in the same relative position.

(8) Other Gods.

While studying these inscriptions we come across numerous references to a number of minor gods who in the course of time were supposed to preside over different places, elements or functions. Thus for instance, while speaking of Anu a reference has been found to "all the gods of the fields," from which phrase it may be rightly concluded that the gods presiding over the fields were more than one or two. One of these gods was very likely that mentioned in the inscription which reads:—uyarel ir nilavan kaḍavul-adu, i.e. "of the god of the living Nilavan who has the sun on high" This god of Nilavan very likely presided over the lands.

Another god of the fields was undoubtedly the god of rain which is so beneficial to agriculture. This god is often spoken of in the inscription which reads: uril irkramun kalkur kārmugil
kaṭavul-adu, i.e. "The three united countries which are in the country are of the god of the rain clouds."

Also the god of thunder is being referred to, but in a descriptive way. "The very great god shaking the height of the clouds who is in the house."

The god of death is referred to in connection with one of the human sacrifices. The inscription reads: Min ēl sāra kaṭavul kan ir maram; i.e. "The two trees under which the seven Minas saw the god of death." The phrase is equivalent to dying; yet the mention of the god of death is not without interest.

Yet it is evident that when referring to all these gods on many occasions the Supreme Being Āṇu is finally in their minds. Thus besides the gods of the main clouds, Āṇu itself is also connected with them.

Sometimes the trees were specially dedicated to one god or another or to any form of god. Thus the inscription reads: Vīḍ velvāge Min opad maram, i.e. "the nine trees of (dedicated to) the Fish (are) the velvāges of the houses." The inscription only informs us of what kind those trees were viz., velvāges, otherwise white siris, which were also used for building houses.

It was a common custom for each city or village to have one of these holy trees which were called 'the village tree'. Thus:—

1. "Of the village tree in the Spring when the sun is high." Very likely it refers to a festival.

2. "Of the tree of the village of the Minas."

On one occasion the sun and a tree are identified:—"One(are) the sun and the tree".

(8) Minor Deities.

The ayānārs or protective deities of the cities or villages are very common in Southern India. They have their shrines by the road-side at the entrance of the villages. It is interesting that
the only inscription that mentions these ayanārs calls them “road-ayanārs.” Thus:—“the road-ayanārs of the two cities in..the Spring with the Scale.” This epigraph refers to a festival in honour of the ayanārs, of those cities. The festival was celebrated at the special time when the Spring ends with the scale. For this constellation was the first constellation of summer.

Similarly spirits or devils, belief in whom is also much spread through the south, are mentioned in our epigraphs. For instance, an inscription refers to the “three houses of the devil of the villagers.”

(10) The Emblems of God.

The most commonly mentioned emblem of God is the trident. And that this is a symbol of God is definitely settled in an inscription which mentions “the trident in which there is one”; a phrase that evidently refers to त्र्य on whose head a trident is always seen.

Many villages seem to have had a trident, perhaps instead of an image, in the local temple. Unless the image itself, having a trident on its head was perhaps denominated trident. Thus:

1. “Three houses of the village trident.”

2. “The trident of the village of Mīna in the year velorvel (trident of tridents).”

3. “Of the trident of two villages attaining lustre.”

Moreover tridents existed in the fields and in boundaries of properties, very likely in small shrines, as is still customary now-a-days. A few specimens:—

1. “The trident of the cultivated fields that are in the country.”

2. The trident of the field of the Kuvals.”
3. Two tribes of the Mīnas who have boundary tridents."

Tridents in fact were a very common object in the house and every where. Some inscriptions only mention a number of tridents without informing us where they were, or what use was being made of them.

Thus:—1. "Three tridents."
2. "These tridents which are in the house."
3. "Four tridents which are in the country."
4. "Six tridents."

Another emblem of God only once referred to is the snake. The snake is one of the most common symbols of Shiva in modern Hinduism. Thus an inscription informs us that "Mīna meditates on the snake of the three-eyed one."

Similarly, another inscription mentions the axe which is also often seen in the hands of Shiva; "Whatever is of the axe of the 'fish' is of the village trident."

(10). Modes of worship.

Just as now-a-days, to see an object worthy of veneration was for those ancient people to worship that object. "Men see the holy tree", runs an inscription. In the same way thinking or meditating on a sacred being was equivalent to an act of worship.

A few specimens of such worship are given below:

1. "Of the great god who is meditated on in the village."
2. "One meditates on the three eyes."
3. "The imprisoned Mīnas meditate on three eyes."
4. "When the Fish reaches the Crab meditates on the three eyes. (Worship by a constellation)
5. "When the sun reaches the top, the Mīnas think on the three eyes."
6. "The Mīn of (devoted to) the Fish, who is in the country, worships the three-eyed one."
In the same way sprinkling a sacred object with water, milk or any other object was also considered an act of worship. Thus an epigraph says: "This year the sprinkled great Fish (is) one side of the eight (formed) god.

Another inscription refers to three vows or solemn promises taken by a man: "Mina who took three vows to God is a friend of the united countries of the Mīnas."

The Government of Mohenjo Daro was theocratical. God was supposed to be the king of the country. The king was only an administrator on behalf of God and he received the title of "the farmer", and since Mohenjo-Daro was called "Nāndūr", the city of the "Crab", the complete title of the king was "Nānduluvan or Nāndīlulavan," i.e. "the farmer of the Crab".

1. "Mīna, the farmer of the Crab, who is in the house".
2. "The shining farmer of the Crab who is in the country".
3. "The Mīna outside the country (is) the farmer of the Crab, the Mīna of the two united countries".

Another inscription removes all doubts as regards the Crab, which is the constellation: "The farmer of the Crab in which the sun is." Finally another one clearly establishes who is the Lord of the farmer while adding: "The farmer of the Crab of Āu"

The king having this sacred authority as a minister of God is also naturally entrusted with the office of a priest, a dual dignity which is stated in the inscription which reads: "Mīnanir māru adwrayyan sera taltalālva", i.e. "(the object of) the hostility of Mīnas is the imprisoned illustrious ruler who is a priest."

(11). Religious Festivals.

There are a number of feasts which apparently have no religious significance, for instance, the Naṉḍal at present called Pongal, which seems to be at least originally of a purely social character.
Other feasts are only briefly enunciated in a way which would be quite clear to all of them, but which is somewhat puzzling to the epigraphist who tries to unravel the mysteries of the inscriptions seventy centuries after their system is similar to ours if we would speak of the feast of Ganga celebrated after the monsoon saying, "On full moon day, Ganga of the abundant waters." Thus run some of the inscriptions:

1. "When the growing half of the moon reached the (new) year, the three Fish eyes."

2. "The Supreme Being of the Fish and death on full moon day."

Other inscriptions are a little more explicit.

1. "The rain-clouds of the approaching thunder sounding scale are the great god, who is (celebrated) during the twelve suns in the high days every eighth year outside the country of Orur".

2. "That trident of the country this year is the trident of the village."

According to this inscription it appears that a trident, or perhaps an image having a trident on its head, was transferred from village to village in the country and remained in each village for a year. The stay of the image or trident in the village was undoubtedly marked with special festivals.

The Temples.

The temple of the sun carved next to the inscription referred to above (A. S. I. Report, 1929-30, Pl. XXVIII, No. 11466 (8) seems to be small and square, only containing the shrine of the sun. The roofing in flat but is the four corners four spikelike finials break the flat line' of the edifice. In front of the temple
there was an open porch in front of which a double awning protected the worshippers from the sun and from the rain. At the very end of porch roof just over the awning, there is another finial of the same type. The carver of this design has placed the object of worship in the temple in the porch, so that it could be fully seen. It is the disc of the sun here placed over a throne as if meaning that the sun was the Supreme Ruler of the Universe.

Other temples were perhaps larger. They were generally built in the centre of the town towards which all the main streets converged.

The temples had servants, amongst whom there were the temple guards.

The temples enjoyed properties for the maintenance of the cult. These properties generally were houses or land, and are spoken of as belonging to the gods themselves. For instance,

1. "Four houses of the fish eyed one."

2. "In the dark growing half of the moon when the sun is on high, the Bilavas pulled down the four houses of the linga."

3. "Of the palm grove of the Linga"

4. "The Supreme Being of the Ram and the Fish of Nandur that has lands is happy"

5. "Of the one palm grove of the Great Fish, outside the country of the prisoner."

Taxes, and tributes were also fixed for the benefit of the temples. For instance,

1. "The mîna of the tax on fish of the high Sun-linga,"
2. "One share of Supreme Being (who is) the high sun is flax."

Some private houses were apparently having small shrines attached to them. An inscription runs thus: "In eight houses (there are) six trident temples."

**Death and Judgment.**

For the Mohenjo Daro people to die was the beginning of a new existence. All the phrases used in the inscriptions clearly show that the soul continued living after the body was committed to the earth or cremated for these were the two ways of disposing of the dead.

Some specimens are given herewith:—

1. "Five houses of two persons reaching the Sun."

2. "The great king four years (ago)...has reached the sun"

3. "Of the seven houses of the head man who is gone to the sky."

4. "Mina is in the very great god."

   (The sign that stands for Mina in this inscription is never used meaning the constellation of the Fish. It is the proper name of a man.)

5. "The farmer of the Crab reaching the Crab."

The belief of judgment after death seems to have existed among the people of Mohenjo Daro as the following two inscriptions show:—

1. "The very great Fish is the justice of all men."

2. "The Supreme Being of the chariot and the cultivated fields is the judge."
A third inscription that refers to the same subject suggests that according to those people the judgment of God lasted for a long time, very likely during the whole life time of very man, and the judgment was completed in the day of death, which is called the “day of God.” In some way their idea is quite correct: for God to see is to judge and this judgment is finished with death. This inscription, shown alongside, reads: “Mīnan kañ Ḡn-adu tīrpu kadavul pagal tīrtu.” i. e. “the judgment of the Supreme Being seen by Mīna is completed in the day of God.”

Virtuous life, heaven and punishment.

If there was a judgment of God there must have been a moral law by which the deeds of man were judged. The inscriptions themselves reveal the fact that only those that reach a definite perfection may obtain heavenly happiness. Thus an inscription which reads: “Vān tēr or mīn kañ vāl”, i. e. “Reaching the sky one who is fish-eyed is happy.” There is still another similar inscription which runs as follows: “The fish-eyed one reaching the sky is happy.”

Now these inscriptions do not speak of Ḡn who is the Supreme fish-eyed, for Ḡn cannot reach the sky or heaven, as he is always there. Therefore the inscriptions refer to persons who reach the sky. The limit of perfection in order to enter heaven is therefore to be fish-eyed, and since this is a perfection of Ḡn, to be fish-eyed was a possibility for men, a number of inscriptions speaking of persons who were fish-eyed clearly show, for instance

1. “Four houses of the six fish-eyed ones.

2. “Five houses of the fish-eyed prisoner.

3. “The fish-eyed, one who is in the country.”

4. “One fish-eyed, of whom the horn-man is afraid (trembling)”
The reward of virtuous life was heaven. The phrase "reaching the sky" seems to be synonymous of "reaching heaven." From this expression it is seen how old is the idea, that heaven is somewhere above. The phrase, "Reaching the sun" identified with Āṅu, or "reaching the Crab" which is one of the forms of Āṅu show that heaven is first of all the dwelling of God, and consequently to reach the sky would mean to dwell in company with Āṅu.

Where did all those who do not reach the sky go is not clear in the inscriptions. It is true that one of them speaks of "the rustling of the garment of the Supreme Being when he rises to punish," but it is not clear whether this punishment is after or before death. This inscription may well refer to an earthquake or to any other earthly calamity.

It is known from all the foregoing description that the Dravidians had their religion which was as follows:

(1) There was the Supreme Being, whose quiescent attributes were life, oneness and greatness, and whose operative attributes were omniscience, benevolence, power of generation and destruction; and he had eight-fold forms.

(2) That the Supreme Being had three eyes and his names were Iruvan, Enmai (a name of Shiva among Dravidians of South India of the present day), Vidukan, and Tandavan.

(3) There was Linga worship.

(4) There was divine triad, Āṅ (the Supreme God), Ama (the Goddess), and Ā-nil (the son of the God and the Goddess). These are the later day Shiva, Shakti, and the son (Shanmukha?).
(5) There were other Gods, the God of the field, the God of rains, the God of thunder, the God of death, and others.

(6) The Supreme God had emblems, namely, the trident, the snake, the axe, which are still the characteristic emblems of Shiva.

(7) The modes of worship were seeing (darshana), thinking (manana) and meditation (dhyâna), sprinkling Him with water, milk etc.

(8) There were temples and religious festivals were celebrated.

(9) The people had an idea of death and judgment after death of men by God.

(10) They also thought that a life of virtue had a reward in heaven and that of sin awaited punishment.

Centuries of years ago the Aryans were a wandering race and moved from place to place with their cattle in search of a permanent place of residence. But their nomadic tendency came to an end when they arrived in India, which they found expansive and convenient and which afforded all facilities geographically and economically for the propagation of their race. They at once made up their mind of settling there. India they found suitable in every way and saw that it was too charming to be left in preference to another. But they did not find it quite easy to do so. The Dravidians were already there, who being the original inhabitants and masters of the land, could not
naturally brook the idea of the Aryan intruders settling there and did not like to allow the alien immigrants to settle. This is but natural as it is seen in recent past, when the European people migrated to the two Americas and Africa, they met with stout resistance from the original inhabitants of these lands. This is mere repetition of history. The Aryans, therefore, had no easy task of settling in India. The Dravidians tried their utmost to drive back the intruding Aryans out of India; and racial pride raised, naturally of course, a barrier between the immigrants and the original inhabitants. But the Aryans, strong-willed and tenacious, did not and could not afford to yield to the resistance and attempts of the Dravidians to drive them out. The Aryans had to struggle and struggle hard for their existence in India. But they had the will to live, or rather, they had the will to power. In any case there arose struggle and fight between the Dravidians and the Aryans for supremacy. The struggle and fight, the Darwinian law of the survival of the fittest being inapplicable here, led not to the elimination or annihilation of the Dravidians but to the absorption of them and their culture by the Aryans and their culture, which came about in the following way.

Of all the sections of Aryans that moved about and spread in different directions and settled in different parts of the world, to wit, Europe and India, those Aryan hordes that immigrated into India, seem to have preserved most the recollections of their having been foreign settlers in the country of their adoption. They have preserved the history of their settlement in 2-15
India in the form of the Vedas, which are thus the most important and valuable record of their activities after they arrived in India. The period of Indian history, as reflected in the Vedas, is the period of struggle and fight of the Aryans with Dravidians and represents in point of time the invasion of the Aryans and the beginning of their long and unwearied march through the Indian continent, until at last the tribes settled down in various districts. The Vedas, particularly the Rigveda, furnishes scholars with the means and materials of piecing together the history and development of the Indian society of the times after the Aryans settled in India and gradually succeeded in predominating over and absorbing the Dravidians and their culture. Rigveda, therefore, is the most important historical document of the Aryan people and their movements in India. The first thing that confronted the Aryan people was religion. Religion like a code of morals, which almost comes to mean the same thing, is invented and intended by a people in order that they may propagate and preserve their race. What tends to the preservation of their society and what helps them to attain power over their competitors is considered by them good and what hinders them from attaining their objective is considered bad. The religion of the Aryans was altogether different from that of the Dravidians and hence great was the clash and conflict between the two races in India, as recorded and told by the Vedas. The Vedas indicate that for a long time the religion of the Aryans was a kind of naturalistic religion, which was confined to nature and the forces of nature. Amongst the numerous deities referred to
in the Vedas may be mentioned Agni, the God of fire and lightening; Indra, the god of firmament; Varuna, the god of waters, corresponding in general to the Greek god, Uranus; Soma, the exhilarating drink, prototype of Bacchus; others also like Maruts or winds, Ushas or the dawn, and many others, are mentioned. Aryans also offered animal sacrifices. Though the Aryan Gods were anthropomorphosed and considered to have had human frame and human limbs, their frame and limbs were shadowy and were meant to describe their activities figuratively. The Aryan gods, representing the forces of nature, were bestowers of long life, prosperity, and protection from enemies of the Aryans, the Dravidians. Sacrifices were offered to win their favour; and the idea of the hymns, of Rigveda specially, is "I give to thee that thou mayst give to me." The Aryan method of worshipping their deities was altogether, different. Being worshippers of nature and the forces of nature, they had neither temples nor idols. They performed all sacrifices under a tree on the bank of a river. The Aryans were a fire cult. They offered sacrifices to their Gods through fire, that was considered to be the intermediary between Gods and the human devotees, the Aryans. Fire carried to gods the oblations offered to gods. Fire was also one of the Gods. The Aryans offered sacrifices to their gods and entreated them to help them that they might succeed against their enemies, the Dravidians. The Aryan Gods also readily ran to the help of their worshippers and devotees so as to enable them to emerge successful in their fights with the
enemies. So the Aryan religion and their religious practices were altogether different from those of the Dravidians, whose religion stood on a higher plane.

The rivalry and fight between the Dravidians and Aryans was, in fact, owing mainly to their religious differences. The Aryan worship of natural phenomena and their meaningless sacrifices appeared to the philosophical Dravidian mind to be sacrileges. The deities of the Aryans were treated with contempt and the sacrificial performances were furiously attacked, wherever and wherever the sacrifices were performed, by the powerful Dravidians. This is why, it seems, that the honorific name “Āsura, Lord”, with which the Dravidians were at first addressed, changed its meaning as the enemy of the Gods in the last Mandala of the Rigveda and in the Bramhanas. The word Asura seems, in all probability, a metathesis of the Tamil word “Ārasu” or the Kanarese word “Ārasa, a king”. A careful reader is struck at once by the high development the Dravinian speculation of God had attained when compared with that of the Aryans. The latter called their object of worship by the term ‘Deva’ ‘a shining one,’ while the Dravidians called ‘Kadavul’ meaning ‘beyond the earth,’ ‘beyond the sky,’ i.e. eternal or endless. The Dravidian God was otherwise named “Shiva,” nothing but ‘goodness,’ ‘righteousness,’ and ‘graciousness,’ from Tamil root Sem ‘good’, ‘right,’ ‘gracious.’

The Aryans were a proud race and were proud of their intellectual and physical superiority, as they thought. They spoke of themselves as “Arya,” which
always connoted nobleness and pre-eminence. They applied to themselves various good terms as "the pure, the white race, the sons of light, the noble ones, (which) are a few terms by which they designated themselves." While they spoke of the Dravidians contemptuously as "Dasyus, " "Dasas," "Panis" etc. Still the Aryans were a shrewd and tactful people. Sagaciously enough they saw that if they should succeed against their powerful enemies, the Dravidians, they had to borrow and assimilate the culture of their enemies. And this they did gradually though reluctantly. That is why the Aryan gods, representing the phenomena and forces of nature gradually lose their prominence and predominance in the Aryan pantheon only to sink into total obscurity and the Dravidian God, Shiva, in the form of Rudra of the four Vedic Samhitas, gradually comes into prominence. The Dravidian modes of worship also of an idol of a god or gods in temples were slowly adopted, the modes of worship being sprinkling (abhisheka), seeing (darshana), thinking (manana), and meditation (dhyâna). While being compelled to borrow and adopt the god and modes of Dravidian worship, they gave all contemptuous names, choice epithets of abuse, to Dravidians. In fact, the hymns of Rigweda contain numerous references to persons, apparently of different descriptions, who were either hostile or indifferent to the system of religious worship, which the Rishis, the seers of Vedic Mantras, professed and inculcated. There is a long list of condemnatory

§ Religions and Philosophies of the East, page, 28.
epithets applied to persons, such as § adeva, adevayu, avrata, anindra, devanid, brahmadwish, ayajyu, ayajvan, anyavrata, apavrata, etc. etc. that is, godless, without rites, without Indra, revilers of gods, without devotion, unsacrificing, followers of other rites, etc. All these names, specially ‘followers of other rites’ ‘godless’ ‘without rites’ ‘without Indra’ are significant. In some passages we are told that there were some men that doubted the very existence of Indra; for instance it is said † “Have faith in that terrible being of whom men ask ‘where is he?’ and declare he is not”; * “seeking food, present a hymn to Indra, if he truly exists. ‘Indra does not exist’ says some one; who has seen him? whom shall we praise? ‘this is I, O worshipper (Indra exclaims), behold me here, I surpass all beings in greatness.’” Thus the word ‘Arya’ meant a worshipper of Indra that offered oblations to Indra through fire and to fire (Agni) himself. While Dasyus or Dasas were those that were opposed to Indra-Ágni cult and are explicitly described in the passages referred to above. Thus Aryans and Dravidians having had different religions and following different modes of worship did not have a common ground to meet for religious performances and ceremonies. And a careful analysis of the references between the Aryans and the Dravidians shows that the difference between the races was that of religious cult and culture.

§ Rigweda, I-51-8,9; I-32-4; IV-41-2; VI-14-3; V-42-9; VIII-59-11; X-22-8; V-189-3; I-33-4; IV-16-9; X-105-8; V-42-9; VII-18-6; etc. etc. † Rigweda, II-12-5; * R. VIII-89-3;
In the passages referred to above the epithets in question are connected with the words ‘Dasa’ or ‘Dasyu” and they are applied to Dravidian people. There are also texts containing denunciations of religious hostility or indifference without express mention of Dasyu or Dasa, for instance, R. 1-84-7, II-23-4, IV-51-3, V-34-3, and so on. But when read with reference to other texts it seems clear that the denunciations are levelled against the Dravidian people. Yâska defines a Dasyu as the destroyer of rites, that is, Aryan sacrificial rites (Nir. VII-23). Sayana also explains the word (Dasyu) as “अनुदानवर्त्तमानः उपायः वितारः भगवः”. All this clearly shows that Dravidians were the enemies of the Aryans in point of religion, as their viewpoint of religion was so different from that of the Aryans.

It is evident from the texts referred to above that the Aryans of the Vedic age found it impossible to enforce the Dravidians to follow the Aryan rites. The Dravidians, therefore, had to encounter considerable amount of contempt and abuse from the Aryans, who called them “brahmadvish” “the haters of devotion”. On the contrary the Aryans had to follow a policy of conciliation by adopting the deities of the Dravidians. From some passages, as will be noted presently, the recognized Aryan worship of gods, Agni, Indra, Varuna, and others was not free from the admixture of demonolatry, which was in all probability the worship of non-Aryan or Dravidian gods, whom the Aryans must have called demons or Rakshasas and given them other contemptuous names. It is also likely that some of the Aryans mixed freely with the Dravidians on
account of marriage connections and borrowed Dravidian religious ideas and customs. And it is indeed easy to conceive, or even a thing to be assumed as natural and necessary, that the religion as well as the language, manners, and customs of the Aryans should, in process of time, have undergone some modification from the close contact into which they must have been brought with their neighbours. From the texts (to be quoted presently) ascribed by tradition to the Rishi Vashistha, it seems that that distinguished personage himself had been accused, whether truly or falsely, of worshipping false gods, of familiarity with evil spirits, and the practice of devilish arts. A charge of this kind could scarcely have been made with any chance of being credited, unless such demonolatry was commonly known to have been practised either by him, or by other members of the same community. The passages referred to (R. VII-104-12ff) are as follows:—"the intelligent man can easily discern (when) true and false words contend together, which of them is true, which of them is correct. Soma protects the former and destroys the untruth. 13. Soma does not prosper the sinner; nor the man who weilds royal power deceitfully. He slays the Rakshas, he slays the liar; they both sleep in the fetters of Indra. 14. If I am one whose gods are false, or if I have conceived of the gods untruly; why art thou angry with us, O Jatavedas; let slanderers fall into thy destruction. 15. May I die today if I am a Yatūdhāna, or if I have injured any man's life. Then let him be separated from his ten sons, who falsely addresses to me (the words),
O Yâtudhâna. 16. He who addresses to me who am no Yâtû (the words) o, 'Yâtudhâna', or who being himself a Rakshas says, 'I am pure' let Indra slay him with his mighty bolt; let him sink down, the lowest of creatures" Sayanacharya, the commentator of the Vedas, in his note on V-12 refers to a legend according to which a Rakshasa had assumed the form of Vasishtha, and killed a hundred sons of the Rishi, and that these verses were uttered by Vasishtha to repel of his having been possessed by the demon. This legend, however, which was undoubtedy manufactured to explain the verses, does not really answer the purpose. And it would seem, as it has been assumed above, that Vasishta, or the speaker of the verses, whoever he might have been, had been charged with worshipping false gods, and with being under the influence of demons; and that while repelling the accusation he here retorts upon his accusers by calling him a Rakshasa.

The Rishi says again in VII-31-8 "I who am no Yatu invoke the gods; fulfilling (the ceremony) in due form, I offer a hymn". In another (VII-21-5) it is said: "neither, O Indra, have Yatus inspired us... Let the Lord (Indra) triumph over the hostile race; let no priapic (long-tailed) demons (shisnadevah) approach our ceremony."

In VI-62-8, a person characterized "rakshoyuj" is devoted to the vengeance of the gods. The commentator explains the term as either "the Lord or the instigator of demons, or a priest possessed of or by demons." In VII-85-1, the word "arakshas" is used in a sense, it seems, to that of 'ayatu: "I consecrate (पुजनि) for you twain an
undenominical (अराङ्कस्म) hymn, offering a libation of Soma to Indra and Varuna." The same word is also employed in VII-90-8, where the Ashwins are thus addressed: "Since we offer to you an undemoniacal (रानि अर्कस्म)" etc. This may be compared with II-10-5 and V-87-9. And if the sense of "the sacrifice offered to a Rakshasa" be assigned to the words "राक्षसे देवकीतौ" the preceding conclusions will be further confirmed.

If such demonolatry really existed to any extent among the Aryans, it is quite conceivable, I venture to suggest, that the intense hatred of the evil spirits whom, under different appellations of चाड्वान, राक्षस, अगुर, etc., Agni, Indra, and other deities, are so frequently represented (see Rigweda III-15-1, VII-13-1, VII-15-10, VII-10-4, VIII-23-13, VIII-43-26, X-87, X-187-3 and others) as destroying or chasing away from the sacrifices which they disturbed or polluted (see VII-104-18, X-87-9), may not have been inspired by the dread which the superstitious worshippers entertained of those goblins, so much as by the fact that they were rival objects of adoration for whom their rival votaries claimed a share in the oblations, whilst the adherents of the gods described their patrons as triumphing by their superior power over the hostile intruders and their rites.

It is possible to look upon Rudra, who subsequently came to be identified with Shiva, as having been originally the god of thunder worshipped by Dravidians and subsequently introduced by the Aryans into their worship as a demonlike deity. And he was then supplicated by the Aryans to abstain from inflicting the evils, of which he was
regarded as the author and flattered as the great healer of those sufferings, which had their origin in the malevolent nature attributed to him as to the demons. His malignant, homicidal, and cattle-destroying character (Rigweda, IV-3-6, I-114-10, Muir's Sanskrit Texts IV-339), assimilates him to the Rakshasas and Yatudhanas, though it is true they are not, as he is, described as inflictors of disease and death; he is described in the Shatarudriya (Vaj. S. XVI-8-20), as having attendants (सत्वान्), while in A. V. XIII-4-27, all the Yatus are said to obey his commands, and in 5-25 of the same hymn he is declared to be death, immortality, vastness, and a rakshas (स एव मृतः शेषोऽवतम् शेषस्वर्गस्य रक्षः); and in X-2-30 f, reverence is offered to his wide-mouthed howling dogs, and to his shouting, long-haired, devouring armies. It is true that he is asked to drive away dogs and shrieking female (demons) with dishevelled hair; that in A. V. IV-28-5, Bhava (a deity identical with Rudra) and Sharva are solicited to destroy the Yatudhana, who use incantations and make men mad; that in Vaj. 17-5, Rudra is besought to drive away Yatudhanis; that in A. V. XI-2-28, Bhava is asked to be gracious to the sacrificer who has faith in the existence of the gods, and in 5-23 is said to destroy the contemners of the deities who offer them no sacrifice; but all of these latter traits are common to him and the other Vedic gods. If, however, Rudra really represents, as is assumed, a god or demon borrowed by the Aryans from the Dravidians, it was to be reasonably expected that when adopted by the former he would be invested with the general characteristics which they assigned to their other deities, and that his connection with the evil spirits, of whom he was originally the chief,
should as far as possible be kept out of sight and ultimately forgotten.

It is true that this theory leaves unexplained the connection of Rudra with Maruts, in conformity with which he ought to be the god of tempests (Weber’s Ind. Stud. in Sanskrit Texts, IV, 334 ff.) But Rudra may be a composite character, and modified by the addition of heterogeneous elements in the course of ages.

There is no proof in the Rigveda that the introduction of the worship of Rudra, even though it was more recent than that of the other Vedic gods, was met with any opposition, and even though he was borrowed from the Dravidians and adopted reluctantly. But it is found that there are hints that the adoration of the Rudras or Maruts was regarded as an innovation. These deities are described in many places as the sons of Rudra and Prisni, and might, therefore, he supposed to have had some connection with Rudra (Muir’s contributions to a knowledge of Vedic Theogony etc. p. 110 ). In one place also (R. VI 1-56-17, a cattle-destroying and homicidal character (गोड़ा चट्टा कवी व:) akin to his, is ascribed to them. On the other hand, they are frequently represented as in close relation with Indra; and in fact it is almost inevitable that these deities of the tempest should be associated with the thunderer, who could scarcely fulfil his function as dispenser of rain without their cc-peration. But there are some hymns, (R. I-165, 171, 177) in which Indra is introduced as regarding them with jealousy, and as resenting the worship which was paid to them. Thus in (I-160-5 ff.) he boasts that he is quite independant of their aid, while
they reply that their assistance had been of importance to his success in battle. Again in I-170 Indra, who complains (V-3) that the Rishi Agastya was despising him and neglecting his worship, is besought to come to terms with the Maruts, and to associate with them at the sacrifice (V-5). And in I-171-4 the Rishi asks forgiveness of the Maruts, because, through dread of Indra, he had discontinued the sacrifice which he had begun in their honour. From all this it would seem as if the worshippers of Indra had entertained some objection to the adoration of the Maruts, and ascribed to the gods the aversion to it, which they themselves entertained. If there is any truth in the hypothesis that Rudra may have originally been a deity or demon who was introduced from the worship of the Dravidians into that of their Aryan conquerors, the same may have been the case with the Rudras or Maruts, the sons of Rudra. Only if this be a fact, these gods have been transformed in character in the course of their reception into the Aryan pantheon, and rehabilitated by ascribing to them different functions and milder attributes than those which belonged to them as deities or demons.

The supposition which I have here made of the gradual transformation of Râkshasas into deities, is illustrated by the story told in the Mahâbârata of the Rakshas, Jarâ, who is called a household goddess, and is represented as seeking to requite by the benefits, the worship which was paid to her. (see Muir's Sanskrit Texts, IV-247).

Long before the Mohenjo Daro and Harrappâ finds were unearthed and their inscriptions deciphered and interpreted, scholars even then held that the Dravidians
had their own religion and philosophy. Thus prof. Maxmuller says in his "Six Systems of Indian Philosophy" (preface, p. XIX) "In the south India there exists a philosophical literature, which, though it may show clear traces of Sanskrit influence, contains also original indigenous elements of great beauty and of great importance for historical purposes. Unfortunately few scholars only have taken up, as yet, the study of Dravidian language and literature; but young students who complain that there is nothing left in Sanskrit literature, would, I believe, find their labours amply rewarded in that field." Sir Charles Eliot maintains * "Indian religion is commonly regarded as the offspring of an Aryan religion brought into India by invaders from the North, and modified by the contact with Dravidian Civilization. The materials at our disposal hardly permit us to take any other point of view; for the literature of the Vedic Aryans is relatively ancient and full, and we have no information about the old Dravidians comparable with it. But, were our knowledge less one-sided, we might see that it would be more correct to describe the Indian religion as Dravidian religion stimulated and modified by the ideas of foreign invaders. For the greatest deities of Hinduism, such as Shiva, Krishna, Rama, Durga, and some of its most essential doctrines such as metempsychosis and divine incarnations are either totally unknown in the Vedas or obscurely adumbrated in it. The chief characteristics of the native Indian religion are not the characteristics of religion in Persia, Greece, or other Aryan lands". So also Fergusson in his "Tree and Serpent

* Hinduism and Buddhism—An Historical Sketch, Book I, p. XV.
worship" remarks that Shaivism is certainly local, and not an Aryan form of faith, and belongs rather to the south than to the north of India. † Dr. Stevenson holds that Shiva was the Tamilian God, and was worshipped in two forms, one as a spiritual object of meditation, and the other as a material symbol or Linga to represent the invisible to the visible. Adoring God with flower and incense was an ancient practice prevalent among the Tamils. " i.e. Dravidians. Dravidians, it is said, were worshippers of trees, animals, and serpents, as amply borne out by history and Mohenjo Daro excavations. Their religion is said to have consisted largely of magical rights and demonolatry. § "It is to be noted here that Tamilians were very skilful in ancient days in magic power, which may be said to have been brought by them from their native land, Elam and Chaldea, and imparted to the Aryans within the land. The ancient Chaldeans were indeed famous for their knowledge of the magic Arts. Even today the Malabar is noted for its sorcery and has been perpetuating it from of old. In the great war (i.e. Mahabharat-War), if Arjuna, the Bharatan, became victorious, it was owing to his unsurpassed skill in sorcery, which he opportunely and dexterously, though unfairly, used along with his archery. Every warrior was more or less acquainted with this magic art in olden days. What are believed to be Dēvāstrās "divine arrows," used in campaigns, were nothing but the arrows sent with the aid of this sorcery. The Atharvan replete with such mystic mantras malicions

† T. R. Shesha Iyangar’s "Dravidian India", p. 103.
§ Siddhanta Deepika, Vol. IV, p. 150.
in nature and intended specially to destroy one's enemy, is thus kept ever mysterious, known only to a few. ” It is to be noted in connection with the above quotation that Dravidians are said to have come to India from Elam and Chaldea, their original home. But according to father Heras, as noted above, just reverse is the case, namely, the Dravidians first flourished in India, whence they migrated to Elam and Chaldea. There is nothing wrong and inconsistent if Dravidians, side by side with a belief in the existence of one Supreme Deity, as proved by Father Heras already noted, and his great power (Shakti), worshipped trees, serpents, and demons, when it is seen that at present grosset fetishism and superstition exists in India side by side with the most abstruse systems of Philosophy.

Long before the higher form of religion arose and high speculations and ideas of one Supreme Deity and his power, Shakti, developed, other gods and the local demons or spirits inhabiting trees, rivers and hills were evolved in the country. These gods were evolved in all the five geographical regions of the Dravidians separately and in accordance with the geographical characteristics of each region. Dravidians had deities corresponding to the five geographical regions, which are (1) kurunji, the hilly country or hilly tracts. (2) Palai, the dry waterless region or the sandy desert (3) Mullai, the wooded land between the high lands and the low lands or the pastoral region. (4) Mrudau, the lower course of rivers, or the river valley region. (5) Neydal, the littoral tract skirting the sea or the coastal region.
§ “The God of the hilly region—Kurunji—was the Red God (séyón), also called Murugan, who was the patron of pre-nuptial love. He was offered by his worshippers balls of rice mixed with the red blood of goats killed in his behalf. He was a hunter and carried the Vēl or spear and was hence called Vēlan, spearman. His priest was also called Vēlan. This god created the love-frenzy in girls; and when girls were obsessed by him, the priest performed magic rites for curing the love-sick girls. When the priest was in communion with the god, he was also seized with divine frenzy and sang and danced a devil dance (veriyāttam).

Women, too, took part in priestly functions. Men or women priests, when under the influence of the god, not only sang and danced, but also read the dim past, predicted the future, diagnosed diseases (and the particular demons that caused each disease), and cured all the ills that the flesh and the brain were heir to. The means of cure was not wholly supernatural, for, as the hilly region abounded in simples, the magic of the priests and the priestesses was fortified by the use of drugs. Hence the early priest was the medicine-man and even today, not withstanding the milleniums of philosophical evolution, the devil-priest-cum-medicine-man of the Kurwar tribe (the inhabitants of Kurunji were socalled—editor) drives a flourishing trade among the elite of society, on the sly.” It is interesting to note that Murgeppa is a very common name among the Shaivas of Madras Presidency as well as among the Lingayatas. The pontifical Math of Chitaldroog is called

§ History of the Tamils, pp. 76-77.
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Maragi Math. The names seem to be reminiscent of this ancient God of Dravidians.

The deity of Pālai, the desert region, was Korravai, the goddess of victory. § "Like the adjacent hilly tracts it was the region where the matriarchate persisted for a long period; and hence the divinity of the region was the goddess of victory (Korravāi) and her devotees, the Maravar (the inhabitants of the region were so called—editor), men of cruel deeds, offered her bloody sacrifices, human and animal. Pālai was the black land, appropriately associated with the tragedy of love, that is, the long parting of lovers, when the hero goes out in search of fortune to lay at the feet of the beloved and has to travel along sandy paths covered with the bleaching bones of the dead. Korravai was worshipped with wild drunken revelry as well may be imagined."

Mullai, the third region had its own god. † "The god of the Pastoral region—Mullai—was the Black God (Māyon) who was a herdsman, beloved of both milk-maids and of cattle. He was always uttering sweet music with the flute (Kulal) and its music moved all nature. He delighted in dancing. Surrounded by a crowd of milk-maids, he or his priest danced most complicated dances, as herds folk do today. Milk and milk-products, sometimes mixed with boiled rice were his offering. Pastroal life affords more opportunities than a hunter's life for indulging in the delights of love, as it also provides occasions for the temporary parting of lovers, which latter only

§ History of the Tamils, p. 82. † Ibid. p. 77.
hoightens the pleasure of re-union. The life of the herdsman is the jolliest of all, because, unlike the hunter or the man who sails far out into the sea, whose lives are fraught with risks, he does the easy work of leisurely tending cattle in the forest. Hence the Black God of the tenders of cattle is the jolliest of Indian Gods.” The description of this god sounds almost like that of Krishna in the midst of Gopies. Is it likely that the worship of Krishna, an incarnation of Vishnu, had its root in this? It is an intriguing speculation, indeed!

The God of river valley region or Māruṇān was the king (of gods). § The God of this region is the cloud-compeller, he who breaks with his thunder bolt (a tool of stone like the ancient spear-head of Murugan) the rain-bearing clouds when the lands pant with thirst in summer. He is a lascivious god, surrounded by divine harlots, just as his devotees were by mortal ones. The favourite offering to this god was rice cooked with pulses (called in tamil pongal). This feast is still the most popular feast in the agricultural tracts during the harvest festival.”

Lastly † “The god of the coastal region was, of course, the dread lord of the sea. The horn of the terrible shark symbolized him in the rituals of the fishermen worshippers, who crowded on the sea-coast, black men and women with children on their hips, offered him flesh or salted fish or meat. The joys of love were not denied to the fisher folk; for we read in

§ History of the Tamils, p. 81. † Ibid. p. 81.
the literature of a later period that noblemen of surrounding regions were, notwithstanding the fishy smell of the well-grown limbs of these swarthy dames, who embellished their persons with lilies of the marshes, smitten with love for them, and while their men-folk were away out on the sea, drove in their carts or chariots to the sea-side to visit their paramours.”

Early man invented the methods of invoking or compelling the help of supernatural beings to get rid of the real or imaginary evils that threatened him and to secure things that he wanted for his happiness and pleasure. These methods at first consisted of religio-magical rituals, because, it was only at a later stage of civilization that difference was made between religion as a method of addressing prayers and offerings to a deity or deities and magic was primitive science as the method of compelling superhuman power to obey man’s invocations. The religio-magical ritual comprised ritual feasting, ritual singing and dancing. In later times feasting, singing, dancing and the drama were sequestrated from religion and became activities pursued for immediate pleasure. Such were exactly the methods of Dravidians in their primitive stage of religion, unlike those of the Aryans, who being a fire cult invoked the aid of their gods by means of sacrifices and offerings thrown into fire that carried the offerings to the gods addressed. When the Aryans, wholly a fire cult, were confronted with the Dravidian religion and philosophy they adopted the deities, practices and philosophy of the Dravidian religion either in the spirit of compromise or toleration or out of necessity and fusion took
place between the two religions. At first the adoption of Dravidian gods and the religious practices then current must have been made reluctantly. That is why the Aryans spoke so derisively of the Dravidians in point of religion and gave them the choice epithets of abuse, as noted above; but in course of a long time they assimilated the religious culture of Dravidians. The Aryans must have seen that they themselves as a progressive community could not but absorb and assimilate foreign thoughts and foreign ideas and that infusion of fresh blood added to their vigour and energy. Rudra, a Dravidian god, was essentially a mountain deity and could be evolved by wild mountaineers and not by the dwellers on the plains. The Aryans adopted this Dravidian god as a storm god, shrieking, howling and weeping on the wild hilltops and running about on the mountains. It seems that because the Aryans adopted this foreign deity reluctantly they gave him rather an unhappy name of "loud-shrieking howling weeping god," as known from the derivation recorded by Yāska in his Nirukta, Devatā-kanda, as—रावतीति नतः । रस्तःमाणे द्रवतीति वा रेदचते भे । यद्रहेन ततुद्भवः 

This derivative explanation of छ्र्व is altogether different from the one given by Shaivas in later times, as discussed in notes on section V of the text—as छ्र्व सं भरुःः द्रव्यतिति छ्र्बः etc. etc. Shiva, the Lord or the Supreme Being of the Dravidians was also Malai Arasan (Mountain chief). In later times he came to be known as Daxināmūry, i.e. the God of south India, where the Dravidians arose and flourished only to spread throughout India. Shiva is said to have delivered the Agamas at Mahendra, one of the peaks
of Western Ghats, south of Pothiya hills between Tinnevelly and Travancore. Manickavachakar addresses God Shiva as the Lord of the Mahendra Hill. Hence Shiva gradually came to be identified with Rudra, the storm god dwelling on mountains.

Some scholars on the contrary hold that Rudra was the Aryan God of storms and he gradually came to be identified with the Dravidian Shiva. Thus says R. W. Fraser * "This was due to the necessity, under which the Aryan colonists of India lay, of compromising with the people among whom they settled. The Dravidian religious conceptions reacted on the Aryan modes of thought. The attributes of Dravidian deity, Shiva, were found to be most in conformity with those of the Vedic God, Rudra, the weilder of the thunderbolt and the father of the Storm Gods. The conception thus grew of a half-Dravidian, half-Aryan deity, Rudra, who became the supreme deity Shiva, of the great mass of Dravidians".

Korravai, the victorious matron, was the object of worship among the Dravidians and is still the great demoness, whose worship is performed under many names in all villages of South India. The Aryans adopted her and she became later their Durga, Kali, or Shakti. Murugan, the hill of the Dravidians, the son of Korravai became Subramanya of the Aryans. So went on the process of assimilating the Dravidian deities by the Aryans.

* Southern Dravidians—Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.
In support of our contention that Dravidian Rudra was adopted by Aryans, we may note what is said † "In contrast to them stands out the figure of the terrific Rudra, euphemistically called Shiva (beneficent), who is generally regarded as being an Aryanized form of some local godling worshipped by the (non-Aryan) predecessors of the Aryans in India, this worship having probably once extended beyond the limits of India proper. The younger Vedas and the Brahmanas in particular already raise him to very nearly, though not quite, the position that he enjoys at a later period. Some of the later Brahmanas even draw him into the all-embracing net of their sacrifice; but originally the cult must have been a menace to the Brahmanā ritualism......But the presence in these texts of an infusion of Rudra or Shiva worship is significant as indicating the anxiety of the Brahmanas to admit into, and assimilate with, their own system such of the newer gods and cults as were important and capable of assimilation."

The Aryans borrowed not only the Dravidian gods but also their religious philosophy, particularly the idea or doctrine of metempsychosis, which is conspicuous by absence in the Vedas as remarked by Prof. A. B. Keith † "there is nothing in the Rigwedic literature to suggest that the idea of metempsychosis had presented itself to the Aryan mind." So also Prof. MacDonell says § "the Rigweda contains no traces

of it beyond a couple of passages in the last book which speak of the soul of a dead man as going to the waters or plants. It seems hardly likely that so far-reaching a theory should have been developed from the stray fancies of one or two later Vedic poets. It seems more probable that the Aryan settlers received the first impulse in this direction from the original inhabitants of India. As is well known, there is among half-savage tribes a wide-spread belief that the soul after death passes into the trunks of trees and bodies of animals. Thus the Santhals of India are said even at the present day to hold that the souls of the good enter into fruit bearing trees. But in such races the notion of transmigration does not go beyond a belief in the continuance of human existence in animals and trees. If, therefore, the Aryan Indians borrowed the idea from the aborigines, they certainly deserve the credit of having elaborated out of it the theory of an unbroken chain of existences, intimately connected with the moral principle of requital."

In the ways aforesaid the Aryans borrowed and assimilated the culture of Dravidians in due course. It may, therefore, be safely concluded that:—

(1) The Aryans borrowed and adopted Dravidian Shiva and other gods.

(2) They adopted the Dravidian religio-magical practices and rituals, as reflected in the Atharva Veda particularly.

(3) They borrowed and assimilated the Dravidian methods of the worship of idols in temples by sprinkling them with water, meditation of a god or gods, and
offering flowers and addressing food to gods, as well as the celebration of the images of gods (अवथरण) on particular occasions. The methods of worship (अर्घन and ध्यान) are treated later in आपातुतस्रास of Baudhāyana, Gautama and others. 

(4) They adopted the Dravidian doctrine of the transmigration of souls and the Dravidian belief in the judgment after death, which both form the basis of the Aryan grand theory of कर्म.

(5) They adopted the idea of one Supreme Being and his divine Power स्वर्ण, on account of which the Aryan polytheism and henotheism gave way to the Universal and Pantheistic Brahma.

Henceforth, the Aryan began to shake off his belief in polytheism and to acknowledge the Tamilian monotheism. Everywhere were held discussions as to what Brahman is and what Atman. The Tamilian philosophy, ever since recognizes God as the Universal Being. "All things have emanated from Brahman, are a part of him, and will mingle in him and have no separate existence", from which has risen the later Pantheism, the proper Hinduism, a corrupt form of Tamilianism". (Siddhânta Dipikâ, Vol. IV, p. 160).

§ We have in the Rigweda also the germ of later Hindu cosmology, in the famous Nâsadiya Suktam; and this is also the central text of Shiva-shakti worship. In the beginning there was neither Sat nor Asat; Then there was neither sky nor atmosphere above. What then enshrouded all this teeming Universe? In the receptacle of what was it contained? Was it contained in the gulf profound of water? Then there was neither death nor immortality; Then, there was neither day, nor night, nor light, Nor darkness, only the Existent one breathed without breath self-contained.

Nought else but he there was, nought else above, beyond. Then first came darkness hid in darkness, gloom in gloom; Next there was water, all a chaos indiscrerate. In which the one lay void, shrouded in nothingness. Then turning inwards, he by self-developed force Of inner fervour and intense abstraction grew. First in his mind was formed Desire, the primal germ. Productive, which the Wise, profoundly searching, say Is the first subtle bond, connecting Sat with Asat.

(Siddhânta Dipikâ Vol. X p. 4.)
IV Shaivism during Vedic times.

After having established in the manner aforesaid that Shaivism was a pre-Vedic and a Dravidian religion we should now proceed to see how Shaivism fared during Vedic times, when Aryan firecult and culture prevailed and predominated to the absorption and obscurity of Dravidian religion and culture. The thing that most strikes the reader of Vedic literature is that the only two greatest deities of modern Hinduism, Shiva and Vishnu of equal importance should be far below the leading Aryan deities three or four thousand years ago. Shiva and Vishnu are the objects of worship and form the deities, round which various religious sects of the present day Hindus have grown and all other prominent deities of Vedic times faded into total oblivion as objects of worship. It is interesting to note how the fortunes of Gods fluctuated and varied in later times and Shiva and Vishnu have not only survived their comparatively very minor position but risen to the exalted status of being पश्चाद्भव in the Hindu pantheon. The result is that Shiva is the पश्चाद्भव of the Shaivas and Vishnu of the Vaishnavas.

The name Shiva is hardly seen in the Rigveda as the proper name of a deity. The very origin of the word is obscure and is derived variously. In the Dravidian religion as described above the name Shiva does not occur but आन was the name of the Supreme Being. It is said to have come from the Dravidian word "cem" redness as maintained in the following—

* Another attempt to derive शिव from the Tamil root "Sem" "to be good" is already noted above.  † Dravilic Studies III, by Anavaratavinayakam Pillai, published by Madras University.
epithet, is well known to be derived from श्रेय, "blessing, welfare, prosperity", plus the radical मृ "be or become", and to mean "being a blessing, beneficent." As a name in later times, of Shiva, I feel that it is likely to have been chosen because it suggested in the minds of the speakers some Dravidian word akin to the Tamil "cēm", redness; the colour red being always associated with this deity. That is to say, application of this epithet to Shiva—a euphemistic application—seems to me to become more intelligible under the above assumption of the existence in Northern India at an early period of a race or of races related to the Dravidians of South India. जंभु as a name of शिव, becomes in Tamil cāmpu, which, if an early importation, would, as I argue, have been originally pronounced with an initial sound like that of the English church. I venture the suggestion that this word has reverted to Sanskrit from some Dravidian dialect in the form "Jambu," as a name of Shiva bearing the connotation of "redness, reddishness." Both Jambuka and Shiva are used to denote a jackal, possibly because of the twany colour of this animal (?). And, when it is considered that the area characterized pre-eminently by the worship of Shiva must have lain originally south of the zone into which Aryan civilization had advanced, it will not, I think, be felt to be impossible that it was to this unknown region that the expression "jambu-dvipa" "the Shiva country" first had reference. While it is derived in Sanskrit variously as—* शिवानि सिवः | बशकोऽि इति वागः: पच्यथि पुष्येदत्तां वर्षोवये अकारस्यभादेश च शिव इति रूपम् | हिन्दियात्त: सिद्धश्च्छू शशकोऽि शिवस्मृत।
वर्षोवयते: सिद्धः पद्यकः काव्यो यथा || इन्द्रिमयाद्वः: ||

* शिवतालस्यम्, pp. 30-33,
The upshot of all the derivative explanation in Sanskrit is that the word शिव means "auspiciousness, being blessing". It is not strange, therefore, that there should be a difference of opinion about the identity of Shiva with Rudra, the Vedic God. Thus Prof. Wilson says that there is little of the Rudra of the Puranas in the Rudra of the Vedas except his fierceness. As to the identification of Shiva with Rudra, he holds, that except कपालिन् no other epithet applicable occurs in the Rigveda (see his Rigveda, Introduction). On the other hand Mocdonell holds that Rudra of the Rigveda is † "the earlier form of Shiva." The word शिव is applied many times in Rigveda to many Gods in the sense of "propitious" and once to Rudra (X-92-9) § "the Rigvedic Rudra exhibits more of the traits of the Rudra-Shiva of later times than have generally been allowed. In one hymn (II-33), for instance, the term व्रिशभ is applied to him five times, and he is called the doctor of doctors, आशा, Yuvan, Ugra, etc. He carries the bow and arrows and wears necklaces of all sorts and is followed by his hosts, and curiously enough, in one of the stanzas in this hymn also occurs the term कुमार. Thus most

of the stuff from which Shaiva legends take their rise is apparently as old as the oldest part of Rigveda. Though Shiva as a deity is unknown to the Rigveda, there can be no manner of doubt that the Vedic Rudra has furnished the foundation for Shaivism as we know it. That Rudra does not occupy in the hymns the high position which Shiva does later, cannot make different deities of them; for the fortunes of Gods have varied in times no less than those of their followers."

The Vedic Rudra was a god of terror, indeed! Muir therefore, says that Rudra must be regarded as "a malevolent deity whose destructive shafts, the source of disease and death to man and beast, the worshipper strives by his entreaties to avert. The remedies of which Rudra is the dispenser may be considered as signifying little more than cessation of his destroying agency and the consequent restoration to health and vigour of those victims of his ill-will who had been in danger of perishing". Weber also holds the same opinion and says * "It was thus in the natural course of things that they should connect everything horrible and terrible with the idea of the god of storms and regard him as the lord and the cause of every evil." But when the hymns of the Rigveda are read between lines and proper meaning is understood such an idea of Rudra will have to be dismissed. It can be easily seen when the hymns addressed to Rudra are carefully analysed that twofold functions are attributed to him, that of bestowing prosperity and that of destroying suffering.

† Original Sanskrit Texts, IV; p. 401. * Quoted by Muir in his O. S. T. IV, p. 396.
He is conceived to be a benevolent deity when he confers wealth and welfare and to be a wrathful deity when he punishes evil-doers. In many hymns of Rigweda the fear of Rudra is expressed. But a different aspect of him as a benevolent deity can be seen easily there. MacDonell aptly remarks, therefore, *"The position occupied by the god Rudra in the Rigweda is very different from that of his historical successor in a later age...He is usually said to be armed with bow and arrows, but a lightning shaft and a thunderbolt are also occasionally assigned him. He is described as fierce and destructive like a wild beast, and is called "the ruddy boar of heaven". The hymns addressed to him chiefly express fear of his terrible shafts and depreciation of his wrath. His malevolence is still more prominent in the Vedic literature. The euphemistic epithet Shiva "auspicious" already applied to him in the Rigweda, and more frequently, though not exclusively, in the younger Vedas, became his regular name in the post-Vedic period. Rudra is, of course, not purely malevolent like a demon. He is besought not only to preserve from calamity but to bestow blessings and produce welfare for man and beast; His healing powers are mentioned with especial frequency, and he is lauded as the greatest of physicians ".

Rudra's twofold nature, as a wrathful and malevolent deity and as a benevolent deity when appeased is vividly depicted and fully developed in Rigweda. In VII.46-3 he is said to discharge brilliant shafts that run about the heaven and the earth. He is said to possess weapons which slay cows and men (1.114.10) and is prayed by

* A history of Sanskrit Literature, p. 89.
chanters of hymns to keep these away from them and to protect the two-footed and four-footed beings belonging to them (1-114-1). And when so prayed the cattle go unharmed and he is represented as a protector of cattle (पशुपति इव) (1-114-9). He is prayed not to afflict children with disease (VII-46-2) and to keep all in the village free from illness (I-114-1). Thus Rudra is believed to be the cause of diseases and when men recovered from them or became free from them, that also was owing to the agency of Rudra. And he is in consequence described as possessing healing remedies (1-43-4) and as the physician of physicians (II-33-4) and having in possession a thousand medicaments (VII-46-3). The worshippers also pray for obtaining pure and salutary remedies belonging to Maruts and Rudra, which father Manu desired (II-33-13). He is invoked "oh Rudra, do not, out of anger, injure our children and descendants, our people, our cattle, our houses, and do not kill our men. We invoke thee always with offerings" (1-114-8). He is sought to protect from the anger of gods. "We invoke to our succour the impetuous Rudra, the fulfilber of sacrifice, the swift, the wise. May he drive away from us the anger of Gods (1-114-4). He is constantly appealed to for prosperity. We present these prayers to Rudra...that there may be prosperity to our two-footed and four-footed creatures, that all things in this village may be well fed and free from disease (I-114-1). He is considered a great doctor taking with him medicines for effecting cures. "I hear that thou art the great doctor of doctors (33-4). He is appealed to for long life and offspring. "Through the auspicious remedies conferred by thee, Rudra, may I attain
a hundred winters. Drive away from us enmity and distress and diseases to a distance" (II-33-2). "May we, Rudra, increase in offspring" (II-33-1). Without being conceived as being a malevolent god whose evils were to be dreaded, he is considered the god that averted all calamities. "Thou, Rudra, art in glory most eminent of beings, the strongest of the strong, the weilder of thunderbolt. Carry us happily across our calamity. Repel all the assaults of evil" (II-33-3). At the same time he is praised as a mighty god capable of being fierce whenever required for destroying evil-doers. "Celebrate the renowned and the youthful god, mounted on his chariot, terrible as a wild beast, destructive and fierce. Be gracious to thy worshippers (us), who praise thee. May thy hosts prostrate some one else than us (our enemies) (II-33-11)." From all these and similar passages the popular idea of Rudra of the Rigveda is plainly seen to be that of a benevolent deity; even though he is considered a wrathful god and a chastiser of sinners and evil-doers. He is petitioned to alleviate and remove suffering and grant prosperity and comforts. There is nothing to show that Rudra was merely a deity always disposed to evil, to avoid which he was to be praised and humoured into a good temper. This explanation of Rudra's nature as a benevolent deity well accords with Sayana's (one of the two) etymological explanations of Rudra, as रुद दुःखं दु;खदेतुष्म पपादः तस्य द्वारायिता | एतंचामन्त्रो देवोऽसि। ↑ Muir translates this as "rud means sufferings or sin etc. which causes suffering. Then the God so called, because thou drivest this away." This idea of Rudra fits in admirably with the idea of शिव as being

† O. S. T. IV-307.
"benign, auspicious, bestowing blessings". बिन्द also is thought, as is well known, as being a deity that is easily moved to wrath but also capable of being equally easily moved to compassion and forgiveness so as to bestow favours upon his devotees. It is aptly said, therefore, by Dr. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar “But human beings do not believe in a purely malignant power reigning in the universe. The dreadful phenomena are attributed to the wrath of a god, which, however, can be appeased by prayer, praise and offering. Then the god becomes Shiva, or the benignant. This appears to be the natural process by which a belief in such a god as Rudra-Shiva became established in India in ancient times”.

There are many indications in the Rigweda that go to prove that Rudra of the Rigweda is the Shiva of later times. (1) He is represented to be पञ्चपति (पञ्चपति—1-114-9). The same is said of him elsewhere “तस्मान 
खर पञ्चपति मधिपेत्”. In I-43-4 he is spoken of as “गायपति 
मेघपति खर जगवेष्य:। तण्डलोऽवरुणमेवैः।” (we pray Rudra, the Lord of Songs, the Lord of sacrifices, who possesses healing remedies, for his auspicious favour). In VI-49-10 he is called the father of the worlds, which agrees with the idea of बिन्द being the पञ्चपति—the Lord of all creatures in the Universe. As the पति of sacrifices he is the fulfiller of sacrifices: Thus he is called वल्लभाधम in I-114-4. As the God of gods, he is said to “derive renown from himself” (पञ्चपति स्ववशे). In short he is the Lord of all, that is, पञ्चपति. And no god but बिन्द is called पञ्चपति. (2) § “His form as described in the Rig-

† Shaivism and Vaishnavism, p. 145. § Siddhanta Dipika Vol. X, p. 3.

2-19
weda is almost the same as his image later times. He is called कपालिण with spirally braided hair. (And the name कपालिण belongs wholly and solely to द्वित.) It is never applied to any other deity. He is of द्वित (gold-formed) and brilliant “like the sun” and “shining like gold” (य=श्रुक्षय सूर्यो विद्यमान | रात्राः) (I-43-5). In X-136-1 to 7 he is described as the long-haired being who sustains the fire, water, and the worlds; who is to the view the entire sky; who is called the “Light”; He is wind-clad (naked), and drinks विष (water or poison) and a मुनि is identified with Rudra in this aspect.” (3) Another derivation of द्वित given by मायण in his द्विताथ्य is दिवदिनि सबे अंतिम्राह इति-he who causes all to weep at the end of time. मायण thus identifies द्वित with the destroying principle or विष. According to Hindus, as is well known, ब्राह्म is the creator of the Universe, विष the preserver and विष the destroyer.

(4) In Rigweda (X-92-9) the term, विष, appears used in apposition to Rudra. And the term is derivatively proved to mean gracious or graciousness. From all this, therefore, Rudra of Rigweda is the Shiva-Rudra of later times.

In the Yajurveda a new epoch of religious and social life is seen. It is compiled, like the Sāmaveda, for application to sacrificial rites only, with the difference that while Sāmaveda deals only with one part of the ritual, the Soma sacrifice, the Yajurveda supplies the formulas for the whole sacrificial ceremonial due to the extraordinary development of ritual detail. § “That, however, which impresses on the Yajurveda

§ MacDonell, Sanskrit Literature, pp. 182, 183.
the stamp of a new epoch is the character of the worship which it represents. The relative importance of gods and of the sacrifice in the order of religion has now become inverted. In the Rigveda the object of devotion was the gods, for the power of bestowing benefits on mankind was believed to lie in their hands alone, while the sacrifice was only a means of influencing their will in favour of the offerer. In the Yajurveda the sacrifice itself has become the centre of thought and desire, its correct performance in every detail being all important. Its power is now so great that it not merely influences, but compels the gods to do the will of the officiating priest. the religion of the Yajurveda may be described as a kind of mechanical sacerdotalism. In the Yajurveda the position of Rudra becomes more established on account of the inverted position of the Rigvedic gods. He is here more firmly established as the one without a second (एक एवं क्षणं न द्वितीयं तस्थं). The Rigvedic Rudra appears on the scene as Shiva. He is expressly called शिव by name (शिवनामासि). Here he is mentioned several times by names which later were peculiar to Shiva, such as Mahadeva and Shankar. In the 16th chapter of the बायवेद्य शिव शिव, Rudra is described by a large number of epithets which are subsequently peculiar to Shiva. And the most noteworthy among these are ईशान and महादेव, which though not found in this chapter, appear in the 39th chapter.

The character of Rudra as Shiva is fully developed in शिव, which forms the fifth अध्याय of the Yajurveda. Here Rudra is spoken as not only Shiva but gets all
the epithets peculiar to शिव such as संकर, शांत, ईश्वर, ईंशा, म्व, बर्म, वर्ग, सम, नोम ( उमा सहित ), पशुपति ( पशुपति पतेय ), नीलकंठ, नीलामोक, नीलीकांस, नीलीकान्त, नीलीकंठ, नीलिपिंद्र, and नीलिमोहित. Rudra is invoked to grant happiness by the verb छुड़, which becomes a name of Shiva ( छुड़:) later. He is spoken of as विनाहुलुक विनाकितक and he ultimately becomes विनाकितक. In the times of Yajurveda the population had increased.

There was more competition among the people owing to the complexity of society and social problems. Kings as protectors of the people had become more powerful. There was naturally more scope for crimes and sins and adequate measures were necessary for punishing criminals and sinners. Rudra, as already noted, was the chastiser of evil-doers and his office now as chastiser of criminals and sinners came to be more dreaded. He is therefore, addressed in शतरक्षक ( 10th एक्या ) as the Lord of stealers, those that carry swords, those that prowl by night, the Lord of plunderers and murderers etc. etc. He becomes, thus a more fearful deity; and the comparatively mild and beneficent Rudra of Rigweda becomes more powerful and terrible to deal out punishment un faltering and unflinchingly. Still the real nature of Rudra as a deity to give prosperity and destroy sin is only obscured but not lost sight of; for example, he is prayed in that very अध्याय that cattle may be healthy and cheerful. He is spoken as being more bountiful, bringer of prosperity, source of prosperity, and happiness. Here in शतरक्षक the famous पञ्चाश्रीमंत्र ( नमःशिवाय ) occurs which is said to be placed in the very heart of the three Vedas.
In this Veda, in the 6th अध्याय, the story of चिब्बुरसंहार is fully set forth, in which all gods admit वर as their पति, they themselves being पार्श्व. The story runs as—

In the 6th अध्याय, the story of चिब्बुरसंहार is fully set forth, in which all gods admit वर as their पति, they themselves being पार्श्व. The story runs as—

तेर आरा अथाना नाशकुर ते उपसंह चिब्बुरसंहार तस्मात: यथैदं वद यथा नोपसंहा ते महापुर्ण जयस्ति इत्यैं संस्कृत असुपरिमोक्ष: शर्य विधुं ते तज्जनं तं भागतं क हिमालिबन्ध्यति।

Rudra's position as the Lord of Gods was established and Shaiva religion came to be named as पार्श्व religion in later times.

In the Atharvaveda Rudra is raised to a higher position. Many names are given him, the prominent among which are भवन, भूवर, भूभव, महादेव, उग्र and इलाशन. A study of these names will show that the double character of Rudra the destructive and the beneficent, is still maintained. But the bearer of these different names is addressed individually and as a separate God. When Atharvaveda came to be composed people had begun to move further and spread into Upper India. There they came into conflict with the inhabitants already there, who would certainly have resented this encroachment upon their domains; and it must have been the trouble caused in the conflict that the men of Atharvaveda sought to avert by appealing to भव and शर्य. They are prayed, "Let भव and शर्य launch the lightning, the bolt of gods, against the doers of wickedness, against him who employs sorcery, against the evil-doers". (A.V. X-1-23).

This Veda is the youngest of the Vedas—and † "taken

† MacDonell, Sanskrit Literature, p. 185.
as a whole, it is a heterogeneous collection of spells. Its most salient teaching is sorcery, for it is mainly directed against hostile agencies, such as diseases, noxious animals, demons, wizard, foes, oppressors of Brahmans. But it also contains many spells of an auspicious character, such as charms to secure harmony in family and village life, reconciliation of enemies, long life, health, and prosperity, besides prayers for protection on journeys, and for luck in gambling. Thus it has a double aspect, being meant to appease and bless as well as to curse.” Wicked people practised sorcery and witch-craft; and the victims of such practices make petition to Rudra in his names of भव and चर्म. “Fierce gods, launch your thunder-bolt against Yâtudhâna, who practises sorcery and prepare root (for that purpose).” (A.V. IV-28-6). The people seem to have been molested and oppressed and Rudra is invoked to run to their aid “O Rudra, destroy the good of him who seeks to take ours” (A.V. II-27-6). “Distressed, I again and again invoke you; deliver us from calamity.” The methods of warfare also had advanced and poisons were used in the wars. Bhava and Sharva were naturally believed to use poisons, as may be seen in their prayer to carry their “deadly poison to others than us” (ibid. VI-93-1). One thing is remarkable, namely, Bhava is addressed as राजा. This unmistakably suggests that kings as protectors of the people had become so important. And Rudra as the saviour of the people from wicked sorcerers was the king. In this Veda Rudra is given the domain of the sky and the mid-regions; e.g. “We offer
reverence to thee...from thy domain in the sky; reverence to thy firmament". (AV. XI-2-3). He is spoken of as having thousand eyes. This attribute is also applied in the शतरंगीय. But it looks more appropriate to the dweller of the sky, to enable him to see everything on all sides as it were. It may be noted, however, that in शतरंगीय, the sky is assigned to the Rudras, the attendants of Rudra, and they are said to be living in the atmosphere.

But the most remarkable thing in the Atharvaveda is that a new class of beings make their appearance. They are Kesins, the long-haired 'munis' or ascetics, and the Vratyas. The Kesins are Rudra's special attendants and are employed by him to cause destruction to evil-doers, "Reverence to thy shouting, long-haired, reverenced, devouring hosts" (XI-2-31); "We worship the god, who has brown horses, is dark, black, destroying, terrible, who casts down the car of Kesin (the long-haired being)" (XI-2-18). The Munis are mentioned in the Rigveda (X-136-1) and had the honour of drinking water or poison (विष) with Rudra. They were human beings but seemed to have acquired supernatural powers by yogic practices, as may be gathered from "transported by our impulses as Munis we have pursued the winds." There will be some discussion later about the Munis and how they were Yogins. But here it is sufficient to state that the Munis wore long-hair in the Atharvaveda and were the attendants of Rudra-Shiva.

But the Vratyas are a more significant and a remarkable class. Who were these व्रत्याः? they meant originally those that were naturally pure and that,
therefore, needed no संस्कार or Brahmanic ceremony. They are hence so highly glorified in the Atharvaveda.

*प्राण is spoken in ५श्रेणि as being अद्व्य and has been explained by शंकराचार्य in his साध्य as—नथमज्ञातू साध्य संस्कृतर्भवात् ध्यस्य: क्यायः। तें स्वभावत: एव शुद्ध: इत्यभिप्रायः।

The ब्राह्मण, thus, were a sect that did not observe Vedic religious practices of वर्णांश्रवणम्, in whatever form it was then, and did not conform to the Brahmanic conventions. They like Kesins, seem to have attached greater importance to a life of austerity and meditation upon god than to the performance of sacrificial rites and the like. But what was the god that they meditated on? It must have been Shiva-Rudra on whom they meditated and whose devotees they must have been; for they were special favourites of Rudra-Shiva, who was always said to have attended on them. The whole chapter (XV-11) of Atharvaveda is a glorification of the Supreme Being (Shiva) under the name of ब्राह्मण. § "For him (the Vratya), from the intermediate direction of the eastern quarter, they (gods) made their archer Bhava attendant. The archer Bhava attends on him (as) attendant from the intermediate direction of the eastern quarter; not Sharva, not Bhava, not Ishana injures him nor his cattle nor his fellows, who knoweth thus. 2. For him they made the archer Sharva the attendant...3. For him they made the archer Pashupati the attendant...4. They made the archer, the formidable god (Ugra) attendant...5. Rudra the attendant...6. Mahadeva attendant...7. Ishana attendant". It is stated in

Atharvaveda (XV-11) that any one who "entertains a Vratya will gain the road that the gods travel," "will gain possession of waters," "will obtain what is dear," etc. etc. The Veda similarly mentions further other benefits bestowed upon those that honoured the Vratyas. The word, ब्रत्या, may or may not be understood as a form of Brahman like the स्केर्न and the ब्रह्मचारिन्न, but it is evident that at this and subsequent times they must have developed in the public a reverence for religious mendicants, who wandered about the land mostly as Shaiva ascetics, without conforming themselves to the Brahmanic conventions.

Even during the Vedic times their failure to conform to Vedic rites seems to have been disapproved and the ब्रत्याः were regarded as falling outside the pale of orthodox society. And an attempt seems to have been made by the orthodox section to take the Vratyas back into their fold by subjecting them to some purificatory ceremonies, called चरत्यस्तोमास, a noteworthy content of the तांत्रिकमृद्धाण of the Samaveda. "They are sacrifices meant to enable these Aryan but non-Brahmanical Indians to enter the Brahmanical order". But it seems that the चरत्यस्तोमास had not much effect and the ब्रत्यां section continued to develop and increase. Otherwise there was no necessity for the later orthodox literature contained in सूत्राः and स्मृतिः to treat of ब्रत्याः and the चरत्यस्तोमास, e.g. § कात्यायन श्रीतमृद्धाः say "ब्रत्याःस्म: | स च चरत्यस्तोमः | चरत्यस्तोमसंस्कारः: चत्तारः: क्तवः: भविति | ब्रत्या प्रसिद्धा एव... पञ्चितसंस्बन्धिनेऽकः: |"

As the ब्रत्याः cared not for the Vedic rites and ritual it could not be expected that they had any trust in and respect for सूत्राः and the स्मृतिः of later days. On the contra-
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ry, it could be well expected that they willingly admitted into their fold all persons, irrespective of caste and creed, only if the persons to be so admitted, were qualified for a life of devotion to and meditation on their deity. They thus came to be a heterodox and degraded people, as may be ascertained from the derivative explanation of the word 'भाष्य' as:* भाष्य समूद्रात्र चतवै वदु। अध्ववहारेन्म संस्कारः जातिमालोपजीविनि अर्थ द्वेषः ज्योतिष्यं गत्याभालोपजीविनि: | साविधिपतिता भाष्या भवन्तायंविगाहिता: || मुनि: ||

That was why the word 'भाष्य' acquired later the significance as despiser of Vedic rites and religious institutions, and why they were held in contempt in the epic age. The word still retains the same offensive sense. They were classed with the outcasts of society, such as incendiaries, poisoners, pimps, adulterers, abortionists, drunkards and so forth. This freedom from caste system was the special characteristic of the devotees (of Shiva) in later days. It, thus, seems that the Vratyas as the special devotees of Shiva, opposed to the orthodox section of the public, i.e., the followers of the Vedic rites and ritual, made their appearance for the first time in the Atharvaveda after the Aryan invasion of India and after the Dravidian religion, came to be obscured. But the religion, though remaining in obscurity for a long time, asserted itself and made its appearance in the manner stated above.

In the Brahmanas, that succeed the Vedas, the terrific side of Rudra's nature comes to be stressed and his beneficent nature is a little obscured. The people were so much obsessed with the idea that Rudra was a god to deal out punishment to wrong-doers that they considered him

* वाचस्पत्ये, p. 5071.
capable of punishing even the gods when they violated any established moral code. Thus Rudra is spoken of in a story in the Aitareya Brahmana as being created by all the gods together to punish Prajapati, the creator of the Universe, when he fell in love with his own daughter and approached her in the form of a stag, after she ran away to avoid him in the form of a hind. This was a deed unknown and unspeakable. And the gods visited meet punishment upon Prajapati through the agency of punishing Rudra, who thus becomes pre-eminent. In the same story an account has been given of how Rudra became Pashupati.

In Kaushitaki Brahmana Rudra is mentioned to be the son of Ushas; and after he was born Prajapati is said to have given eight names as he grew up. Of the eight names, the eighth is Ashani or the thunderbolt and the remaining seven were those already given to Rudra in the Atharva-veda. But in the Atharvaveda the seven names were given to seven different but allied gods as it were. But in the Brahmanas the names belong to one god. Of these eight names, Gar, Var, Varah, and Ashani are indicative of the god's fierce aspect; while the remaining Sav, Pashupati, Shadew, and Esman indicate the benignant counterpart. In the Gopathas Brahmana Shiva takes the place of Rudra. This is really significant of the predominance of the name Shiva as a deity over Gar for the first time.

In Shatapatrabhasana Gar comes to be considered an object of terror and his good beneficent nature gradually comes to be forgotten. This is known from the description given of the way in which the shiva, offerings are to be made. By-the-by it is significant to note that the name shiva
comes to be used, as विनयन, विनेत, व्यंबक are names patent to God, Shiva. It is said in the ब्राह्मण "And, accordingly, when he performs these offerings, he either does so hoping that thus no arrow (misfortune) will hit any of his, or because the gods did so. And thereby he delivers from Rudra's power both the descendants that are born unto him and those that are unborn". (II-6-2-9). "They are (offered) to Rudra; Rudra's indeed is the dart; and hence these offerings belong to Rudra". (II-6-2-3). Rudra is thought of in this Brahmana as a kind of evil spirit roaming about from place to place, and the sacrificer is, therefore, requested to place for him cakes on the ways and cross ways. etc. "Having removed all (the cakes from the potsherds) into one dish and taken a fire-brand from the Daksina fire, he walks aside towards the north—for that is the region of that god—and offers. He offers on a road—for on a road that god roves; he offers on a cross-road,—for the cross-road, indeed, is known to be his (Rudra's) favourite haunt" (II-6-2-7.) Later down it is said "the sacrificer now takes those (remains of the cakes) into his joined palms and throws them upwards higher than a cow can reach. Thereby they cut out his (Rudra's) darts from their bodies" (II-6-2-16). The sacrificer is pressed to send away Rudra after furnishing him with provisions; "Having then packed them with two net-work baskets and tied them to the two ends of either a bamboo staff, or the beam of a balance, he steps aside towards the north; and if he meets with a tree or a stake or a bamboo or an anthill, he fastens them thereon, with the text—"These, 0 Rudra, are thy provisions; therewith depart beyond the Mujavats...with thy bow unstrung and muffled
up,'" Whereby he means to say—Depart propitious, not injuring us; clad in skin—whereby he lulls him to sleep; for while sleeping he injures no one' (II-6-2-17). But the more remarkable thing about Rudra is that in the Brahmana a special function that purifying the impure is assigned. This is known from the story related that runs as "Now, once upon a time, स्वभौतं, the Asura, struck the sun with darkness; and stricken with darkness, he did not shine. Soma and Rudra removed that darkness of his; and freed from evil he (the sun) burns yonder. And in like manner does that (king) thereby enter darkness or darkness enters him, when he puts those unworthy of sacrifice in contact with the sacrifice—either Shudras or whomsoever—in contact with the sacrifice. It is Soma and Rudra that remove that darkness of his; and freed from evil he becomes consecrated" (V-3-2). But in direct contradiction of Rudra as a purifying agency, he is considered an impure deity himself, as may be gathered from the story in the Brahmana in II-6-2-18. It is said "They then turn to the right about without looking back. Having returned thither, they touch water; for they have been performing a ceremony relating to Rudra, and water is a means of purification—with water that (means of) purification they accordingly purify themselves. Thereupon he shaves his hair and beard, and takes up the fire (of the uttervedi)—for only after changing his place to the ordinary sacrificial ground he performs the (full moon) sacrifice) on that fire etc. etc." Here Rudra's worshipper becomes impure, which could not have been unless the god himself was an impure deity. How are these contradictory statements to be reconciled? The only way to explain away
the contradiction is that during the times of शास्त्रपथायान two views must have prevailed in society, one a liberal view, and the other a strictly orthodox one. According to the former, the Shudras were not entitled to take part in a sacrifice or any Vedic ritual. And they made the sacrificer impure by coming into contact with a sacrifice—in what way it is not possible to say—and Rudra was invoked to purify the sacrificer thus made impure. According to the latter, Rudra, an evil deity, was himself impure and made the sacrificer impure, though he sacrificer sacrificed to Rudra only out of necessity to escape his wrath.

The two stories quoted above betray the social condition of the times that, even according to the liberal view as assumed, the Shudras had no right whatsoever to any ritual, which they only contaminated by their association with it. The position of the Vratyas on the other hand was much better than that of the Shudras. They were certainly non-Shudras but were privileged Aryans and had degraded themselves by discarding the Brahmanical conventions. Otherwise the शाब्दस्तोमास or the purificatory ceremonies cannot be significant except that they were designed by the orthodox section to take back the Vratyas, the non-conformists, within their fold.

The Upanishads come at the end of the Vedas and are called Vedanta. The term Vedanta suggests that they teach the essence or the ultimate aim and scope of the Vedas. They contain the earliest records of the speculative Aryan mind and contain the foundations of all later philosophies and religions of India, either orthodox or heterodox. The polity of the Vedas was the performance
of sacrifices; but the Upanishads doubt and challenge the very efficacy of the sacrifices. The floating mass of vague notions about cosmology and theology that prevailed among the people did not satisfy great thinkers and they busied themselves with finding real solutions of matters spiritual and temporal. The worship of many gods is given up by them in favour of the Almighty and a more spiritual form of worship is substituted. Various problems about God, man, and the Universe arrested and engaged the attention of thinkers, the authors of Upanishads, and religious speculations of a more natural order came to be established in them. They are plentiful outpourings of the restless minds of philosophic cast attempting to grasp the true nature of reality. Not being the production of a single author they do not set forth any systematic philosophy. But a unity of purpose and vivid sense of spiritual reality runs through them all. Hence the truths of Shaivism will be of utmost importance and authority if they are found taught in the Upanishads.

Among the number of Upanishads founded and published heretofore some are purely sectarian and many are of a very late date. ब्रह्माण्यवर्ग, छांडोश्य, ईश, केन, कठ, प्रश्न, मुख्य, माइक्र, देवस्य, एलरे, ब्रह्मा, ब्रह्म, and कौंतिक are very ancient and precede all others in point of time. It
is to be seen, therefore, what they say regarding Shiva and Shaivism. श्रीदारण्यक, the oldest of the Upanishads, mentions all Vedic Gods and generally attaches the original characteristics of these old deities (I-4-11, 17). It recognizes Indra, Varuna, and Rudra as powerful gods but seeks to find an explanation of how they were so powerful by saying that these rulers among the gods derived their might from Brahma's superior form of "Kshatrahood." खण्डोपनिषत, that comes next in point of time and importance, does not give, on the other hand, such prominence to the Vedic deities. Rudra is not mentioned at all therein. In it Indra, a powerful and prominent deity of the Vedic times, learns with great pains the meaning of ब्रह्म from प्रजापति (VIII-7-1 to VIII-12-6). There is almost a total neglect of Vedic Gods in the वैदिकोपनिषत, except the bare mention of their names in the शांतिपाठ, the opening hymn of invocation. In other Upanishads also no attention is paid to Vedic gods. On the contrary there seems a feeling developed that the gods were unworthy of the honour paid them previously. For example in Kenopanishad Vedic gods अग्नि, बालु and इंद्र are belittled as being quite powerless before ब्रह्म, the Universal Spirit, which they were unable to understand. There in the story once Brahman won a victory for the gods and in that victory of the Brahman the gods attained glory. But the gods thought that the victory was owing to their might. The Brahman appeared before them in such a wonderful form that they could not know what it was and were puzzled. Agni and Vāyu were deputed one after another to see and explain what the wonderful Being was. One after another in their attempts to know what
it was, their power was put to a test and went back discomfitted and crest-fallen. Lastly when Indra was sent the Being disappeared and just then and there Uma, उमा, हृदःवती, stood before him in all her splendour. Indra asked what the Being, that erstwhile appeared and disappeared, was. She told him that it was Brahman that won the victory for them and that they should attain glory through Brahman's victory. The opening words of the story (ब्रह्म से द्वेष्यो विषमशेष) seem to be purposeful and indicate that without the help of Brahman gods were helpless. But the most noteworthy thing is that उमा, the daughter of the mountain द्वेष्यो, is mentioned for the first time in the Vedic literature. And though she has not been mentioned here as the consort of Shiva it is impossible to mistake that she was not so. Indirectly the story proves that the wonderful Being was Shiva, as परब्रह्म. Shankaracharya in his commentary says—महैस हेशोपात्सुयुता उष्णोणिता दृष्टेन आदुभूतिः तत्कां पुजयति । ।।।।।तस्मिनेष (आकाशे)। हिमसिन्धिरिणीं विद्यामाधवाः। श्रीभिष्मो-यौगेशुहँस्तायुश्यन्ती उमा हृदःवतीव सा बुद्धोभसमानः। हिमसिन्धिः। Here the great आकाशे means that उमा, * the consort of Shiva, was His great and inscrutable power capable of bestowing right knowledge (विद्या) on the devotees. In प्रवृत्तिनिपत्र some Vedic gods, भर्त, सूर्य, कालु, and हृद are mentioned. But they are metaphorically represented as servants of the soul.

† cf. अशुताध्य अपश्चातः या दुविधाप्रदायिनीः। बहिनिश्चायं वखे तामीशालमनोस्थाप्यः। सिद्धांतविधामणि, I-12.

* The following remarks of Weber about "उमा हृदःवती" are noteworthy (Indische Studien, Vol. II, pp. 186-90):—

But how to explain the relation of Uma Haimavati, who appears here as the mediator between Brahma and the deities? Ace-2-21
ccording to Shankara she is Vidya (knowledge) which Umarupini (in the form of Uma) manifests to Indra. The same view is taken by Sayana who (Taitt. A. X. 1,) quotes this passage at the explanation of the word Soma. He says there:—

And in the same way (ibid. anuv. 38)—‘Soma Brahmavidya tatha sah varmanantavatstom:’

This latter is the only passage in Vedic writings, besides the Kena Upanishad, where I have met directly with the name of Umā; for the “Umāsahāya” of the Kaivalya U. does not belong any more to Vedic writings, and although the commentaries also elsewhere, as Sayana, in the passages referred to, explain the word Soma by Umasahita, (for instance, Mahidhara in explanation of Vāj. pp. 16, 39, and Bhatta Bh. M., commenting on the corresponding passage of Taitt. S.) yet such a view is undoubtedly no more founded than in the passage, quoted from Sāyana, where the term means simply the juice of the Soma. If, then, from what has been said, viz., partly from the agreement among the commentaries, partly from the position which Umā holds here in the Kena U., the meaning of it as Brahmavidya seems to be pretty well certain, and directly to be identified itself with Saraswati, the divine word, if we even might be tempted etymologically to connect her with the sacred word “Om”; yet there are other points which seem to suggest quite a different view of the original meaning of Umā. First, why is she called Haimavati? (Shankara gives two explanations: hemakritabharanavatā athavā himavato duhitā.) What connection had she with the Himavat? Is it, that the brahmavidya came from the Himavat to the Aryans who inhabited
Madhyadesa? That the north of India was distinguished by a greater purity of language, and that people went there to learn the languages (Vacham sikshitum) and on their return enjoyed more respect and authority, we have seen from the Kaushitki Brahmana (I, 153); it would now be quite in order, if this had not been limited to language, but extended to philosophy, and if the knowledge of the one eternal Brahma had been sooner attained in the peaceful valley of the Himavat than this was possible in the Madhyadesa, where practical life had yet too much hold on the mind. However, such a view of the Uma Himavati seems to me very hazardous; for, independent, that in the explanation of the old Indian deities, it appears to better refer more closely to their relation to nature than to speculation, we do not know precisely, whether Uma really denotes the brahmavidya, and moreover, her later relation as the wife of Rudra (in the Taitt. A.) and resp. of Shiva would be entirely unintelligible. There is now among the names of this latter (the wife of Rudra) a similar one, viz., Pârvati. to judge from which we ought not to place the accent upon Himavat, but upon mountain, and to this I would add the names of Rudra which we learnt before from the Shatarudriya, viz., girisa, girisanta, girisaya, giritra, in which we traced the origin of the belief, that Shiva was dwelling on the Kailasa. It is the tempest which rages within the mountains, and his wife is therefore called properly "Parvati," "Haimavati". It is true, it is hence not evident, what is meant by his wife; originally she is perhaps not even his wife, but his sister; for Uma and Ambika are at a later time evidently the same, and Ambika is the sister of Rudra (vide. I, 183). This identity with Ambika suggests to us a new etymology of Uma; for as Ambika, "mother," seems merely an euphemous flattery to propitiate the cruel goddess (vid. Mahidh. commenting on Vaj. S. p. 3, 57. (in the same manner Rudra received the name of Shiva) so it appears also necessary to derive the name of Umâ from the root "a." "av." to protect. No doubt, a final vowel before ma gets commonly guna, or is prolonged, but sima and hima show that this is not
residing the body. Indra is identified with \textit{prāna} (soul) but Ṛṣabhā has been explained by commentators as \textit{pramēṣṭh} or \textit{prameśhākāṭīn}. Rudra, as a form of \textit{prāna} (soul), is stated here as the protector. Thus Rudra attains a high position here and is a manifestation of the \textit{prarabdha}, which by implication means \textit{vīrac}, because Rudra later is Shiva's \textit{vivekaśuddha}. In the \textit{śvetāmbara-pāṇini-pāṇiṣṭ} Rudra-Shiva attains the highest position as \textit{prarabdha}, which He ever retains afterwards in Shaivism. The doctrines of a more natural form of spiritualism and religious worship, taught by all other older Upanishads, find their finest expression in it. But theism or worship of a personal god, which was absent in all other old Upanishadas, is established round God, Shiva, who becomes the object of devotion to the devotees. In all other old \textit{Upanishads} the thinkers had discovered the immortality of soul residing in the heart of man and preached it with all force. This was of prime importance in the evolution of religious thought. Human beings were thought that they had a force within themselves, by means of which they could attain the highest and eternal bliss, and before which the impermanent heavenly happiness, however long it might be, was established to be quite insignificant. Vedic gods were no longer the object of dread. They were merely the agents of \textit{brahmā} and were

necessary, and the name of Ruma (unless it is to be derived from \textit{Ram}) is perhaps of a corresponding formation. It remains indeed involved in doubt, in what manner the cruel wife of Rudra appears here in the Kena U. as the meditator between the Supreme Brahma and Indra, unless this Upanishad belongs to a time in which Shiva, her husband, was considered the supreme deity, \textit{Īshwara}, and resp. \textit{Brahma}, that is, to the time of a sect of Shiva.
considered to discharge their duties in obedience to the orders of Brahman. e.g. "Through fear of Him the wind doth blow. Through fear of Him the sun doth rise. Through fear of him both Agni and Indra and death as fifth do speed along". (Kathopanishad, II-8). And one who attains Brahman need not be afraid of gods at all. On the other hand such a one enjoys the highest bliss, which is several times greater than the bliss of Indra, the greatest of gods (Taitt II-8). Thus religion became the concern of every individual and each person could attain never-ending happiness by a life of meditation and penance. ज्ञान or knowledge of ब्रह्म was the summum bonum of religious life. But a new path, which did not consist in the performance of sacrifices and rituals but of devotion to a personal god is established in the भ्रमचरीयपिणिष्ठ. The grace of god *(भ्रमचरीयपिणिष्ठ) as the means of final beatitude, which is mentioned in कठोपनिषद् (II-20), culminates in this उपनिषद्; because भ्रमचरीयपिणिष्ठ, himself the author of the उपनिषद्, came to know ब्रह्म through the force of penance and the divine grace of God (तपःप्रभावः देवप्रभावः ब्रह्म हुः भ्रमचरीयपिणिष्ठ बिद्वान्).

The other older and important Upanishads wax eloquent on impersonal Brahman, pervading, and projecting, maintaining, and reabsorbing the Universe into itself. They treat of the truths about the nature of Brahman, the individual soul and the inanimate world, and the relations between them. Meditation on the Supreme Soul as the way to redemption is the theme

* भ्रमचरीयपिणिष्ठ (through the tranquillity of senses) is another reading adopted by शंकराचार्य.
of them all; and certain Yogic practices and ethical principles to make meditation effective have been laid down, so as to ensure the final result, the redemption. "Soul is said to be certainly impotent over the cause of pleasure and pain (I-2). The impotent individual soul is in bondage on account of his being an enjoyer (of the objects of senses). He becomes free from all bonds, when he comes to know the god." The individual soul is, therefore, directed "that he ought to see tho Supreme Soul by the power he possesses and by the Yogic practices, just as he sees some gross object by means of lamplight. When he comes to see the Soul (god) unborn, eternal, pure in all respects, he becomes free from all bonds (of worldly life) (II-15)." The worshipper thus gets an idea of the god he has to worship and the methods, which consist of attaining the perception (ज्ञान) of the Supreme Soul. The ब्रह्माध्येयगणित, like other old and important Upanishads treats about the attributes of the Supreme Soul in very general terms and He is referred to by the general name देव. It is a little more specific about Yogic practices as may be seen in II-8, 9, 10. The object of meditation is the Supreme Soul or the Cosmic Purpose, which ought to be worshipped. This all-pervading Supreme Spirit or the Cosmic Purpose is described in II-16, 17, as "The God faces all quarters of heaven. Afore time he was born, and he it is within the womb. He has been born forth and will be born. He stands opposite creatures, having his face in all directions. It is he, who entered fire, water, and all the Universe, all plants and herbs; my bow to Him." But it is very difficult to worship the formless Cosmic Purpose. It is possible only for such men
as are of superior order of intellect. It is far above the power of ordinary beings. Hence the author of श्चत्तश्चत्तरोपनिषद् hits upon a happy device of identifying the unknown and unknowable god with a personal god. Thus the idea of a theistic Being is elaborated all through the Upanishad. He here effects a fine synthesis and syncretism of Bhakti and Dnyana, which latter was the burthen of song of all other older Upanishads, though not to the total neglect of divine grace as noted above. But the importance attached to and the stress laid on the divine grace (धर्म) is the special feature of this Upanishad. So also भक्ति is the special feature and is mentioned in it. Thus this Upanishad stands at the door of the Bhakti School and is the main source and cause of the subsequent development of that school.

Further the author of the Upanishad being conscious of the great difficulty of an ordinary person to practise worship of the impersonal Brahman, he identifies him with the personality of god, Shiva-Rudra. But here Shiva-Rudra is altogether different from the Rudra of the Brahmanas where his terrible nature was stressed. Here he is the one great Lord of the Universe. "Who, the only one, with the (outspread) net (of rulership) in his hand rules all the worlds. He alone is at the time of projection and reabsorption of the Universe. Those that know this attain immortality. Rudra alone exists and there is no other (god; i.e. He is the परम्पर)) He rules all the worlds with his powers of rulership. He stands opposite all creatures; and after creating them he protects them and frowns at the end of time. Having an eye on every side and a face on every side,
having an arm on every side and a fort on every side, the one god blows (the bellows) with hands and wings, creating the heaven and the earth. He who is the source and origin of the gods, the ruler of all, Rudra, the great seer, who of old created the golden germ, may he endow us with clear intellect” (III-1 to 4). In order that the personal god, Rudra-Shiva, may be mistaken as not being the Rudra of the Vedas, the author quotes hymns about Rudra from श्वस्त्रस्वरूपि (e.g. या ते रुद्र शिवातः तनुम्भं पापकृतिनिश्चितानि etc.). So also he quotes from the Rigweda the hymn “मा नस्तोकं तर्नेव मा न आभुवि..........रूरराहन्यानो रुद्र भामिते। वधी: etc.” (R. I-114-8). The word ‘देव’ is identified with बिब, रुद्र, मन्दिंद्र, as often as it is done with the Supreme Soul. In short Rudra-Shiva is raised to the status of the Supreme God-head and is invested with a personality perceived and acknowledged by all. § “Rudra-Shiva was alone, in the field as the Supremo god, and the germs of Bhakti or love, which manifested themselves at the time were directed towards him.” But what were the motives of the author that he chose Rudra-Shiva from amongst the Vedic gods to make him the theistic (Brahman)? Various must have been the reasons that weighed with him to do so. (1) Rudra-Shiva was the most ancient god, being the god of pre-Aryan Dravidians, who were gradually being absorbed into society and who formed a stratum of society; he was thus the common object of worship of both Aryans and Dravidians. (2) All other Vedic gods were not only treated in the Upanishadic times with scant regard but belittled (as in केन्द्रोपनिषत); and Rudra was exalted covertly to the

§ Bhandarkar’s Vaishnavism and Shavism, p. 157.
position of पत्रधारा through वमा, हैमवति. ।(3) Of all Vedic gods Rudra-Shiva combined in himself the two-fold function of protection and destruction both of which were badly required by all human beings. Ordinary folk want protection of themselves, their children and cattle and destruction of their enemies. Persons of advanced religious views worshipped him that he might protect their soul from sin and destroy the root-cause of sin for final redemption. Hence Rudra-Shiva was best fitted for the double function of protection and destruction, as required by all. (4) In the Yajurveda Rudra was established to be the Lord (पति) of all; while other gods were beasts (पशुं), as seen in the story of तिबुरसंहार already noted sketchily. (5) Rudra was the god that was worshipped by all sections of society, twice-born as well as the Shudras as noted above in a story from the यजुर्वेदः. (6) He was the god that looked after the welfare of the people in all the stages of life (आर्यवर्थस). e.g. as fire, with whom he has been identified many times, he gave wisdom to the आदिवासिः (e.g. जानवर AND कपलाच्छन were taught that way); as a bountiful god he gave prosperity to the householders (दक्षिणान्त). So also as a mountain deity he ministered to the comforts of men in the 3rd and 4th stages of life. (7) Rudra was the special protector of आदिवासिः, the non-conformists, that discarded the Brahmanic religious conventions and ritualism. Rudra was accordingly the only deity that looked after all sections of society. Thus he was the cosmopolitan deity popular with all classes of people in all regions of the earth. (8) Lastly as the terrific god he was bound to inspire fear and awe in all, as अब्बूँ was filled with fear when he saw क्रोध in his terror-inspiring universal form (विश्रुत). 2-22
To sum up the ब्रह्मण वाचक रूप ब्रह्मण establishes the Theistic Brahman instead of the non-theistic or absolute Brahman of the other old Upanishads, and Rudra-Shiva has the honour of having that position. The doctrine of Bhakti or the whole-hearted devotion to the deity, Rudra-Shiva, with a view to secure its grace for final beatitude is taught with force and vigour without divorcing it (Bhakti) from ज्ञान taught by the remaining Upanishadas. Thus it combines ज्ञान and ज्ञान that the devotee might attain at-one-ment with the Brahman, Rudra-Shiva.

† It is well said, therefore, “This entirely personal setting for the Supreme Godhead is to be found in the ब्रह्मण वाचक रूप ब्रह्मण ......we may see how the Upanishad tries to philosophically account for the creation of the world by the Godhead by the method of construction through criticism of the various extant opinions on the subject of the origin of the world.......In this manner does the ब्रह्मण वाचक रूप ब्रह्मण advance a truly philosophic theory of creation, in which all power is ultimately due to a personal Godhead who causes the whole universe to move round his finger.” Further on it is said “As for the roots of Shaivism in the Upanishads, we must turn again to ब्रह्मण वाचक रूप ब्रह्मण. Even though Umā as a heavenly damsel is mentioned so far back as the केनोपानिषत्, still, for a detailed and systematic philosophy of Shaivism, we must necessarily turn to ब्रह्मण वाचक रूप ब्रह्मण. It is true that the conception of Rudra-Shiva was being developed since the days of Rigweda and the Atharvaveda; but it is

† Ranade’s Constructive Survey of Upanishadic philosophy, pp. 100, 101, 193, 194.
only when we come to the time of ेवरुपनस्यर that we find the doctrine of Shiva placed on a more or less philosophical foundation. We are told in this Upanishad that "it is the God Íśa that supports both the mutable and the immutable, the manifest and the unmanifest. As contrasted with Him powerless is the Atman, who is bound on account of his being the enjoyer of the fruits of action; but that when this Atman knows the Íśa, he is relieved of his bonds, the परांश. " The philosophy of Paśu, Pati, and Pāśa is thus already to be seen in an embryonic stage in the ेवरुपनस्यर. "Rudra is the only Lord. They do not maintain another god. He who rules these worlds by means of his powers, standing before every man's face, and destroying the created world in anger at the time of the Great End. He is the Lord Shiva, who hidden in all beings, is the sole enveloper of the universe, who is like the subtle film at the top of ghee, by the knowledge of whom alone comes freedom from the meshes of ignorance. Verily does the God spread manifold the meshes in his hands, and move on the surface of this globe. He creates and recreates and maintains his sovereignty over all the worlds." In this fashion is the God, Rudra, who is identified with Shiva or Íśa, magnified in the ेवरुपनस्यर as the only Lord God who is the Supreme Soul of Souls and who is the Governor of the universe, by the knowledge of whom alone the individual Soul, who is bound down in the meshes of ignorance can attain absolution. This was the manner in which the ेवरुपनस्यर paved the way to later Shaivism etc. etc."
मैत्री or मैत्राश्वासनोपनिषत् is a very late Upanishad and seems to have been composed after the सूत्र period or at most during the period when सूत्र literature was being written as there is a distinct reference to the सूत्रs in the Upanishad, to wit “तत्समाद् एतस्मादेन्द्रब्रजन: सवे ख्राण: सवे न्योः: सवे देवा: सवे देवा: सर्वोऽणि च भूतानि उद्यति तत्स्योपनिषतवहां अवभिन्ति।

अथ रथा आद्यांस्माहितस्य धुरघुणा विनिबर्षेऽन्त व एतस्य महतो भुस्य निर्भवितस्तेतस्यावेदः यजुर्वेदः साभेदः अवर्तमार्गम् इतिहासः पुराणं विचारोपनिषदः। नोऽका: सूत्राणपुरुषाश्वासनानि व्याख्यानानि एव एतानि विश्वा भूतानि (VI-32)।”

* Prof. Ranade, therefore, says “the Maitri whose vocabulary is quite peculiar to itself and which has evidently two or more different strata in it, must, on account of its astronomical and mythological references, be regarded as coming quite near to the time when the Pauranika tradition began; while the Mandukya, which may be said to develop the thought of the Maitri itself in certain respects, namely, in postulating three and a half morae, while the Maitri postulates only three, of the symbol Om, as well as on account of its aphoristic method of thought-presentation, may be regarded as being the last of the older batch of the Upanishads.” Though ब्रह्म, विष्णु, and सत are considered, in this Upanishad, the manifestations of the परमात्मा, there is a distinct leaning towards Vishnu or Vaishnavism; and Vishnu seems to be considered the परमात्मा, as may be seen in “तत्सत्कं नववदयमस्माहितस्यकानां द्वस्मध्वस्मवर्षेऽन्त्र द्वैव विष्णुपूजितं अवभिन्तं धाम। (VII-3)।” सत is mentioned as a manifestation of प्रजापति from his नामस्त्रयं, as ब्रह्म is a manifestation of प्रजापति’s राजस्त्रयं and विष्णु of शाक्तिकांश.

“अलिंग: प्रजापति: तत्सत्स्त्रयां धर्माहततद्वैतम् ब्रह्म चत्रै विष्णुपरिवेश यथा ह किं नावास्त्र।

* Constructive Survey of Upanishadic Philosophy, p. 17.
But one thing of importance to be noted is that a derivative explanation of मेरा, a name of Shiva, is given as “अर्थ मेरा इति”। यो हुआ व्यक्तिविश्वसनीयो निहितस्तारकोशिको वैष मेरीक्रियः। मार्गमिति मेरा इति मेरांक्रियः। भौज्यतीति वैष मेरा इति इति इति वन्यंशिकंविश्ववासंशास्त्रिदिम। प्रजास्त-स्मात मरगतवात मेरा्ः।” (VI-7). As the same time Shaivas of broad views openly admitting within their fold all persons, non-Shudras and Shudras, are condemned as quite unfit to be associated with in words “अधिकारी ज्ञानेषु मेरांक्रियः राजा। मोहामलस्य वै वोनि: यदस्तवैः। दण्ड स्वर्णस्य:। वावेण पुरस्तुक्तेप्यसत्यमेवाशिक्षितः। अथ ये चान्ये ह निश्चितदिका निलयविशिष्टा निधायाचनकाः स्वधिश्चाः। अस्त्राक्रियः। अथ ये चान्ये ह चाजटयनमयाविकरितान्त्रिगतातरिकाः राजक्रियां नस्तिद्यः। अथ ये चान्ये ह वक्त्राक्षमृत्वानिश्चर्यममाहार्दीनाः। अथ ये पुरस्तुक्तेप्यमयायमीयः। अथ ये चान्ये ह बुध्या कवायकुड़हितः। कात्यतः। अथ ये चान्ये ह बुध्या: तर्केदार्यंत्रक्तेप्यम्मत्तेरिकाः परिश्चितिः। वैः सदा न संबंधेत प्रकाशमूलः। वै तेन तस्कः अस्त्रयो इति।” (Now, O King about the obstacles to the path of knowledge. Delusion (मोह) is the association of those worthy of heaven with those that are not worthy of heaven. (That people associate with them) is like their resorting to low-lying bushes even when a grove of trees is shown to be in front of them. Now, there are those that are always in a jolly mood and move about, always beg, and live continually upon handicraft. Again there are others who are town-beggars, who perform the sacrifices for the unworthy, who are disciples of Shudras, and who, though Shudras, know scriptures. And moreover there are others, who are rogues, who wear knotted hair, who are actors, who are quarrelsome, who are turned recluses, who assume various disguises, who are in the service of kings, and
who are fallen. And moreover there are others who profess to conjure down the evil caused by ghosts, goblins, ghouls, thieves, snakes and planets. Again there are others who falsely wear red garments and earrings, and who wear necklaces of skulls. There are others who are adept in deceptive logic and in (carrying conviction by giving false) instances and who still call themselves to be followers of the Vedas. They are verily thieves moving freely and are unworthy of heaven. With these none should associate). Here there is a clear mention of different types or sects of Shaivvas spoken of in strong condemnatory language. This is unmistakable evidence of the prevalence of Shaivism. Their practices have been disapproved and said to be due to illusion (भोड़ि). By the time this Upanishad came to be composed Shaivism had greatly developed and there were Shaiva sects that included within their fold people, high and low and of all vocations.

Ardharavashtra Upanishad is another Upanishad of a later date appertaining to Rudra-Shiva. It is an Upanishad of a later date but not so late, in our humble opinion, as Maitrayaniyopanishad. It seems to have been composed earlier than Maitri for various reasons. (1) Firstly only eight planets (हस्तः) are mentioned in the अष्टक्षेत्रे; while nine planets are indirectly mentioned in Maitri, as श्यु and केतु, that are the eighth and the ninth planets, are mentioned. (2) secondly, Shaivism does not seem to be full-fledged in अष्टक्षेत्रे, because अस्मातस्वरूप is the only thing mentioned additionally and no other characteristics, like ग्रहः and मन्त्र, are stated; while in मैत्रायणियोपनिषद् various types of
Shaivas (क्षायकुंडलिनः कापालिका:) are mentioned, who are certainly a later development. (3) Thirdly principal technical terms of सांस्कृतिक philosophy, like दुर्बल, भावन, मद्य, वुद्धि are mentioned. So also all terms of Yogic practices except यम, नियम, and अहान, have been stated (VI-18). Similarly, technical terms of न्याय philosophy, प्रभाण and प्रेम, are mentioned. Hence we hold that the Upanishad as a whole comes later than अथाशिषयः. In the अथाशिषय उपनिषत् Rudra's position as the Supreme Being or personal Brahman is fully vindicated by means of a story that once Gods went to Rudra and asked him who he was. He told them that he alone was, is and will be and none other. He said he was everything, eternal and non-eternal, manifest and unmanifest, the east and west; etc., he was man and woman, he was Savitri, Gayatri, and so forth. After enumerating so many things that he was and impressing on their minds that he was the universal all-pervading Brahman he disappeared. The gods thereafter raised their hands praised him in sentences in which Rudra was said to be identical with such a variety of things that showed his being the Universal Supreme Being. He is identified with Omkār to which epithets expressive of divine attributes have been given. The epithets are said to be the attributes of Rudra and are explained etymologically why they are so attributed to Rudra and identical with him. But one thing that strikes is that there is no mention of Shiva, though other names of Shiva like महेश्वर and ईश्वर are mentioned. Gauri comes to be mentioned in it. It is worth-noticing at the same time that the derivation of Rudra is given as "अथ क्रस्मादुपच्यते रुद्रः"
This derivation seems to have been given in contradiction of the one "रैसतिति सत: | रास्यमणे दृष्टातिति। रोक्यलोक।" as already noted. The words "नान्यैंमैः" seem to be significant and certainly point to non-Shaivas; and in all probability they point to the devotees of Vishnu that must have been gradually developing so as to bid fair to be rivals of Shaivas.

So far as the characteristics and technical terms of Shaivism are concerned नस्सम्बांनणा is alone mentioned, as noted just above, as the thing to be practised to attain mukti पश्चात्वभि भेष्यण, which is peculiar to Shaiva or Pashupata sect. Except for these two no more information about the practices and tenets of religion are available. Hence it seems that Shaivism was still in making during the times of this Upanishad and had not fully developed in all its technicalities.

It is thus that the idea of the pre-Vedic deity Rudra-Shiva gradually developed from the Vedic times into the theistic पश्चात् in the Upanishads and finds its fullest vindication in the अष्टवेदवृत at last.

(V) Development of Shaivism in later times upto the 12th Century A. D.

The Vedic period was followed by the Sūtra period when the शैव और गृह धर्म Sutras were composed. This period of Sutras was succeeded by the Smriti and the Epic period, because the Sutra literature was written in prose while the Smritis and the Epics were written metrically; and the metrical writings are certainly a later development. The Sutras contain the treatment
of sacrifices and the sacrificial ritual, the Smrities treat of customs of every day life, and the Epics relate old tales of heroism and legendary stories. The Upanishads contain the speculative side of the Bramhanas but the Sutras continue their ritual side. Still, like the Upanishads, they are not considered a part of revelation and no sacred character is attached to them. They are merely systematic manuals of Brahmanic worship.

The उपासना s are indispensable for the right understanding of the sacrificial rites and ritual, which are fourteen in number. They are not congregational but are performed on behalf of a single individual, यज्ञिक or sacrificer, by Brahmin priests who officiate for the sacrificer. The Sutras, Therefore, merely continue the Vedic religion of sacrifices of offering oblations (द्रव: ) to gods through fire. They treat in brief outlines the sacrificial ceremonies they deal with. Here the Brahmin priests attain a predominant position in society, which they ever retain afterwards as intermediaries between gods and laymen.

The दार्शनिक s treat systematically of the rules of domestic ritual and observances of daily life. These rules of ritual and observances are not at all treated in the Brahmanas and, therefore, seem to have been based on the authority of popular tradition. They moreover give the rules for the numerous ceremonies applicable to domestic life of a man and his family from birth to the grave. They describe forty consecrations or sacraments (संस्कार: ), which are performed at various important epochs in the life of an individual. These forty sacraments are later reduced to sixteen, which become 2-23
the foundation of वर्णाश्रमवत्ते of the Aryans. All these sacraments are meant exclusively for males, the only one in which the females have a share being the marriage. Among the most important duties of a householder is the daily regular offering of the five great sacrifices (पञ्चमहायज्ञः). They are—(1) the महायज्ञः or the daily recitation of the Vedas. (2) देवयज्ञः or the offering to gods. (3) पितृयज्ञः or the libation to the manes (तर्णं). (4) मूर्तियज्ञः or offerings (बलि) placed outside the house for all beings. (5) and मनुयज्ञः consisting of hospitality to unknown guests, specially the mendicants. The recitation of साविकीमंत्र or गायत्रीमंत्र in the morning and the evening (संध्यावंदन) is considered as meritorious as the ब्रह्मयज्ञः.

वर्मेसुत्रास form the third set of Sutras. They are based on tradition alone and are the earliest works on law and treat more fully of the religious aspect of life and briefly of the secular aspect. Then come the स्म्रितिः and are so called, because they are based on tradition only, like the चर्मेसुत्रास. They are the versified form of चर्मेसुत्रास and treat of secular subjects more fully. The subjects dwelt with therein are multifarious such as the duties of four religious orders (वर्णः), the mixed castes, various kinds of sacrifices, purification, penance, auspicious ceremonies, duties of kings, criminal justice, examination of witnesses, laws of inheritance and marriage, the position of women and so on. Thus the Smritis, being an improvement on the वर्मेसुत्रास, deal with all aspects of social life. It may be seen from the synoptical sketch of the contents of the Sutras and Smritis that they continue the Vedic fire-cult religion
and वर्णाश्रमम् in addition, which attains perfection in them and which has still retained its irremovable hold on the people with results, so much decried all over India at present. They present a complete picture of the ordinary life of the Vedic Indian and illustrate the daily domestic and social life in ancient India. The day in and the day out, the year in and the year out, the domestic and social life was honey-combed with sacrifices and no worship of a personal deity, i.e. अवेण was there, which being Dravidian found its way in the religious life of society very slowly. It is interesting, however, to note that महाभारताः contain a ceremony unknown to other युद्धसूत्राः, namely, the worship of four Vinayakas. This worship re-appears in the बायूतक्रामाः law book, where the four Vinayakas are combined into one Vinayaka, the god Ganesha. This seems to be the origin of the later custom of beginning every auspicious rite with the worship of Ganesha. But the influence of the fast growing theistic cult slowly finds its way in the युद्धसूत्राः, where the worship of deities Shiva and Vishnu prominently, is laid down. e.g. the गौतमब्रमचन्द्र (क्रियाकों) —“पाविन्नी अपेक्षा। ख्रेत्र जयमेकुण्डलं। अनातं विषय-विषयाः। सर्गात्रां संख्या न विचयते। ततो देवगृहं गता पूजार्थमानवार उपाविन्य आद्यने। श्रुते देवमन्त्रेत्। आवानाधनपालाध्यात्मसनातनतत्त्वकोपिवेदगंधपुरुषूद्विनेवैविचाचन्ति। तत्र तद्वृत्तस्वस्थितिः सूचिकृतां:। बोडङ्गमिः। इच्छदयं सम्मचयते। रावणसुक्रे विष्णुस्व। सांपाये मणी वंशे। स्वादिके भ्रष्टान्यां हृदे। पूजा कार्य। From this it will be quite clear that image worship in the full-fledged form was practised. But it is also to be noted such worship is laid down in the later and a few स्मृतिः only. But it is the Epics and पुराणाः that furnish us with fuller information about Shaiivism and Vaishnavism. To them, therefore, we now turn.
It has been noticed before that the worship of Shiva-Rudra was adopted by a section of the public and was looked upon by the Aryan fire-cult with deep disfavour and contempt. The section was called the ब्राह्माण्ड or the non-conformists and it included Shudras. An attempt also seems to have been made by the orthodox section to admit back within their fold the ब्राह्माण्ड by means of purificatory ceremonies, called the ब्राह्मणोमान्त. But the heterodox section increased, in spite of the disfavour and opposition of the orthodox section, by their adoption of Shiva-Rudra as the personal god with the natural consequence of making some people regard Shiva-Rudra as the highest god, the परमेश्वर. Later the rival cult of Vishnu worship rose; and the two sets of the worshippers of Shiva and Vishnu were responsible for the theistic attitude of mind, which in turn was responsible for the growth of many legends and stories about Shiva as well as Vishnu. These legends and stories have been elaborated in the Epics and the Puranas. But one can never be too careful to sift history out of them, in as much as they are all mixed up with fact and fiction; still a careful analytical investigation of them will throw a flood of light on the growth of Shaivism. As these legends and stories contain and expatiate those recorded in the Brahmanas as well as those that come down in the form of tradition, they explain the growth and development of popular beliefs in religion. Hence they are so valuable in tracing the history of a religion, if care is taken to sift history from fiction.

The two great epics, the Rāmāyana and the Mahābhārata, in their present literary form, are of the age
of the Sūtras, though their subject matter is much older. The geographical scene of Ramayana shows it to be older than Mahābhārata, because its scene does not extend far beyond the Vindhyas and names the Deccan as Dandakāranya. While Mahābhārata shows its acquaintance with all parts of India and its division into numerous Aryan states that were in a flourishing condition. The essential theme of Rāmāyana is the conflict between Rama and Ravana, the contending heroes of the poem. They may be taken as the representatives of the Aryan and the non-Aryan (i.e. Dravidian) civilization. The victory of Rama over Ravana after a long and arduous struggle was the triumph of Aryans over the non-Aryans, who were so difficult to defeat on account of their mighty developed material civilization with its centre in distant Ceylon. Rama, who astutely adopted the policy of divide and rule, was mightily aided by the monkey chiefs and their following who stand for the totemistic non-Aryans. This only betrays the great hold of Aryan rule over the non-Aryans, who seem to have been dissatisfied through jealousy with the rule of Ravana. Ramayana thus tells how the Aryan rule and civilization was gradually extended to the southernmost end of India. The war of Mahābhārata, the pivotal theme of the great work, was the conflict between two opposing sections of Aryans themselves; and the Aryan kings of the whole of the Indian continent were ranged on either of the two sides of Pandavas or Kauravas, that fought for supremacy, Ramayana is therefore, older than Mahabharata.

Ramayana is the first great poetic composition of high importance, because the story of Rama brings the
whole of south India into view for the first time. During the days of Ramayana the spread of Aryan rule throughout the Northern India had pushed down the non-Aryan Dravidians, called "Rakshasas" by the Aryans. The rule of Dravidians then extended to the South of Godavari on the banks of which were the hermitages of Vishvamitra and other sages. The sacrifices of the sage Vishvamitra were attacked and disturbed by the anti-fire-cult Dravidians; and he, therefore, had to seek the help of Rama to repulse the attacks. The king Ravana's realm and rule had extended to the borders of Vindhya mountain. There his powerful brother Khara persecuted the Aryans that lived in Janasthana and the Rishis complained to Rama about the atrocities committed by the Rakshasas.

Rama it is said had to break the bow of Shiva, as a wager laid down by Janaka to marry his daughter Sita, to the breaker of the bow. This shows that Shiva was the deity worshipped even by some Aryans. After Sita was carried away by Ravana out of revenge for the outrage perpetrated by Rama upon Shurpanakha, Ravana's sister, Rama had to go to Lanka to gain back his beloved Sita. On the shores of the sea Rama worshipped the Linga of Shiva, known even to this day as the Setubandha Rameshwar, one of the twelve celebrated Jyotirlingas of India. There is nothing improbable in this; because all Dravidians were the worshippers of Shiva, and Rama had to please the Dravidians to win them against Ravana; and he succeeded in this object by worshipping their God, Shiva, who being pleased with the devotion of Rama gave him
boons that enabled him to win the titanic war against Lanka. On his way back to Ayodhya after the conquest of Lanka Rama showed the Rameshwar Shivalinga to Sita and says:—

एवंतु हृदयं तीर्थं सागरस्य महाशानमः।
बेलुरं इति रंगाण्तैः देवोदक्षेणामिनयेजितम्॥
एतत्प्रियंमल्लं महापातकनावात्मम॥
अन्न पुर्वं महादेवः प्रसादमकात्मकम्॥
अन्न राक्षसराजोऽनुमाजायगम विभूषणम्॥

Ravana himself was a great devotee of Shiva and always carried with him a golden Linga for his worship. He placed the Linga in the midst of a pedestal of sand and worshipped it. It is said in the उत्तराखंडः—

यत्र यद्य च याति रम रमणो राक्ष्योत्तमः।
जाप्नूनसमयं संगतं तत्र तत्र च नीति॥

*"It is said that, before he aimed his dart or used his missile, he worshipped Isā in his usual manner and performed Puja......By his austerities and penances for years he obtained boons from Shiva, as longevity and a broad bright sword, which gave him victory. An instance of the severity of his penance may be cited here. When Ravana promised his mother to equal his brother Kuber in splendour he went to the hermitage of Gokarna or the Cow-ear in the Kerala country with his brothers and performed austerity."

Moreover the creed of Shiva-worship had spread among the Shudras in the times of Ramayan and

* M. S. P. Pillai's "Ravana the Great; the king of Lanka," page 20.
they practised penance. This the Aryans could not tolerate and they contrived the decapitation of Shanbhūka at the hands of Rāma, when the former was found practising penance. The scene of शन्हुकिघ is pathetic to a degree, as Rāma himself, thus forced by the orthodox section of the public to decapitate शन्हुकिघ, makes touching remarks.

Next comes the most illustrious Epic, Mahābhārata, an encyclopaedic work, indeed, known all the world over. This epic furnishes us with the largest amount of information about Shaivism and its spread in India, which will, therefore, be of utmost importance for our purposes here.

During the times of Mahābhārata the cult of Bhakti or devotion to either Shiva or Vishnu as deities had taken firm root in the land. The followers of Shiva or Vishnu held their respective deity to be above the other, not to speak of other Vedic deities, which by now ceased to be objects of worship, though there were still those that believed in the Vedic path of sacrifices. There were also those that held that Shiva and Vishnu were but the phases of the same Supreme deity (परमेश्वर). Evidently the latter attempted the unification of the two Schools of religious thought, the Shaivas and the Vaishnavas, and held that it was foolish to glorify the one at the cost of the other. These three sections tried their utmost to gain followers to their respective cult; but the devotees of Shiva or Vishnu remained intolerant of one another.

So for as Shaivism is concerned Shiva becomes the supreme deity of Shaivis not only, independent but the
controller of all other gods who were only the ministers of his orders. As the controller of the Universe he is इशान and is commonly styled Mahâdeva or the great god, Devadeva, the god of gods. With his consort Umâ and his vehicle भूषण he is said to be residing in the Himalayas in joy. His weapon पाण्डवत is fearful with which he killed the demons. As bearer of त्रिसूर (trident) he is named शृंगीर, which शृंग is the most powerful of weapons borne by gods. He is the unborn creator of the universe and is spoken of as इर, the destroyer of the universe projected by him. The nature of Shiva as shown by the accounts given in the Mahâbhârata is that He was a powerful God. Though an impetuous and wrathful deity he was generous and bountiful when propitiated and would stint in no boons to be given to his sincere devotees. If anybody desired to have something he was sure to have his desires fulfilled when Shiva was appealed to. He has all the attributes of the Supreme Godhead and is represented as betaking himself to Yogic practices or contemplation at times, even though he delighted in the company of his wife, Pârvati.

In the Vanaparvan Arjuna is said to have gone to the Himalayas and practised austere penance there for obtaining पाण्डुपालांग from Shiva. Shiva appears there with his wife Parvati, disguised as a Kirâta, in order to test the sincerity of Arjuna's devotion. A great fight takes place between them; and Arjuna is overpowered in the end and he lies down on the ground. Arjuna then prays Shiva and worships him on the altar. When flowers were put on the head of Shiva, they appeared to have been put on the head of the Kirâta. Arjuna makes out that the object of his adoration and fight was Shiva Himself, who being quite pleased
with the devotion of Arjuna offers him all he desired, whereupon Arjuna asks for the weapon presided over by Pashupati (पाण्डुपत) that possessed the power of destroying all formidable enemies. (Chaps. 38-40). In the same Parvan Rudra is identified with Agni while the birth of Skanda is narrated. It is Stated that Agni fell in love with the wives of six Rishis, but having failed in securing for himself the company of the Rishis’ wives he is said to have abandoned his wife Swâhâ and retired to the forest. Thereafter Swâhâ assumed on six consecutive days the forms of the six Rishis’ wives and enjoyed the company of her husband. Agni’s seed gathered by Swâhâ on the six days was deposited in a pit and covered with Kusha grass. On the sixth day the seed developed into the form of Kumâra i. e. Skanda. Later on it is said that Rudra, who was dallying with his consort Umâ for a long time, was prayed to by the gods to assume his other functions, and he dropped his seed on the earth. Agni was requested to take it in and develop it. But it was so hot that Agni could not bear it and he deposited it in the river Ganges. Skanda was born of it. These two stories identify Rudra with Agni.

In Chapters 80-81 of the Dronaparvan Krishna and Arjuna are said to have gone to the Himalaya and seen Shankara at his dwelling. They fall at his feet and praise him as being the unborn, the creator of the universe and the unchangeable. They thus propitiated him and asked for the Pâshupata weapon. They were directed to go to a lake, where the Astra was placed. When They went there they saw two venomous serpents, which, however, assumed the forms of a bow and an arrow on seeing them and were taken away by Arjuna.
In chapter 7 of Sauptikaparvan Ashwatthamā is said to have propitiated Shiva and obtained a sword from him. Shiva himself is said to have entered into the body of Ashwatthamā and committed havoc with the sword in the camp of the Pandavas. When Yudhishthira asked Krishna how Ashwatthamā was able to do all this havoc Krishna tells him that it was owing to the power of Shiva and related to him another story of Shiva. It is said that Brahmā once asked Shankara not to procreate, after which Shankara hid himself under water for a long time and there was no creation for a long time and Brahmadeva created Prajapati to bring into existence various beings. After some time Shankara rose out of water and saw that the new beings created by Parajapati were in a flourishing condition. He then cut off his generative organ as no longer necessary and went away to perform austerities at the foot of Munjavata mountain. A similar story has been given in the Vayupurāṇa with some variations. In the same Parwan Krishna relates a story of Mahadeva to Yudhishthira how the gods created the rite of sacrifice but assigned no oblation to Rudra; how Rudra was full of wrath and destroyed the sacrifice. The gods then assigned him a portion and the god was pleased. If the account, given by Krishna of Shiva, is examined an idea of the notions of Shaivism, prevalent in the epic age, may be formed.

According to the account in the Mahābhārata, Bhīṣma tells Yudhiṣṭhira:—“It is this Kṛṣṇa that is capable of narrating in its entirety the qualities and the true nature of Shiva.” Then at the request of Yudhiṣṭhira, Kṛṣṇa narrates as follows:—“It is impossible to comprehend
correctly the ways of Īśvara. How is it possible to know by names alone Him who is the support of Mahārṣis, and whose beginning and end were not known to the penetrating vision of Indra and other gods? I shall tell you some of the features of him who slew the Asuras and who is honoured by austerities...In ancient days I saw the real form of Siva through my yogic power...Garuḍa conveyed me to the proximity of the Himālayas where I gave him leave to depart. I saw wonderful things in that mountain. I saw the beautiful āśrama of Muni Upamanyu (son of Vyāghrapada), the spot best fitted for penance, worshipped by Devas and Gandharvas, and pervaded by the lustre of Brahmā. (Here follows a description of the different trees, fruits, birds and beasts found in that place). The air was filled with the fragrance of sweetly scented flowers, and I heard the music of murmuring mountain rills, the warblings of singing birds, the celestial songs of Kinnaras, and the sweet tones of Munis who chanted the Śāma hymns. That place is incapable of being even imagined by others. It shines with the river Gaṅgā which purifies both the inside and outside of every one. It is honoured with the presence of Mahātmas famed for their Dharma and lustrous like fire. Everywhere in that sacred region, there are Yogīs whose food is milk, vapour, smoke, water, and air and who are ever devoted to their bath, Japa and dhyāna. I saw several Rṣis who held fast to diverse forms of penance; some ate grass like the deer and cows; some used pebbles to remove the chaff from the grain, some had no other implements than their teeth to do this, some drank the moon-light and foam, some lived upon the banyan seeds, some slept upon water and some had only barks and skins for their clothing....Because of
their yogic powers, they were playing with snakes and mongooses, tigers and stags. As I was entering into that lovely āśrama, I beheld the young Brāhman clad in bark, his hair twisted like a braid and his form luminous like Agni because of his penance. He was surrounded by many attendant śiṣyās. He welcomed me...and I made enquiries about the welfare of birds...He said “...Mahādeva, with Umā, is playing here. In other times, Devas and hosts of Ṛṣis obtained their high desires here by worshipping Śaṅkara through penance, vow of chastity, truth and self-restraint. That Shiva whom you seek and who is unthinkable, and is the abode of glory and austerity, is here with the Devi, increasing good and decreasing evil. Hiraṇyaśakaśiṇu, who was strong enough to shake the mountain Meru, obtained from Shiva here the power of ruling over all the Devas for ten crores of years. His famous son Damana obtained a boon from Mahādeva and fought with Indra for ten crores of years. The chakra (discus) given you by Shiva after slaying the proud Asura who could pass through waters, was made by him in the old days, and though shining like fire, is invisible. It was in ancient times given the name Sudarśana by Shiva and is still known by that name. That discus was shattered when hurled against the Asura Gṛha by you. Nor had Indra’s thunderbolt any effect upon him...After the Devas obtained boons from Shiva, they massacred Asuras in large numbers. Shiva conferred upon the Asura Vidyutprabha the boon which enabled him to be the lord of the three worlds for a hundred thousand years. He also ordered him to be Shiva’s servant always. He gave him a crore of children, and Kuśadvīpa as his kingdom.......The celebrated Ṛṣi, Yājñāvalkya, won renown by worshipping
Mahādeva. So too Vedavyāsa, son of Parāśara. The Vālakhilyas, who were enraged by the insult offered to them by Indra, worshipped Mahādeva, and obtained the power of creating Garuḍa who could bring Amṛta. Once owing to the wrath of Siva all the water had to be created by obtaining the mercy of Siva through the performance of the Sapta Kāpāla sacrifice. Sage Atri’s wife got through the grace of Siva the three sons, Dattātrīya, Durvāsas and the moon……Sākalya of the sharp intellect performed the sacrifice of the mind for nine hundred years and Siva blessed him saying, “Child you will become a great author. Your undying fame will be heard in the three worlds, Your family will be adorned by Mahārṣis and will not perish. You will have a son who will be renowned among Brahmans and will make Sūtras.” Savarṇī was a celebrated Rṣi of the Kṛta age. He performed austerities before him and told him that he would become a great author and would remain without age or death. By worshipping, in Kāshi, the wind-clad Shiva who wore ashes on his forehead, Indra obtained the lordship of heaven.” Upamanyu goes on thus to mention others who gained several other things by the worship of Shiva, e.g. Nārada, Bānāsura, Lavaṇāsura, Rāvaṇa ‘Manmatha’s pride was humbled and Yama was consumed.” He then states how he himself was taught about Mahādeva by his mother.

Later on, the Mahābhārata relates how Upamanyu accepted Kṛṣṇa as his pupil by giving him the Dikṣā (or initiation). Kṛṣṇa says:—“On the 8th day, I was initiated by that Brāhman according to the Sūtras. Having shaved my entire head, anointing myself with ghee, and taking the staff and Kuṣa grass in my arms, I dressed
myself in bark fastened with the mekhala (the waist string).” Krṣṇa then performs penance and gets a sight of Mahādeva.

In chapter 14 of the Anushasanaparvan Krishna is introduced as recounting the greatness and glories of Shiva Mahadeva. He tells that Jambawati, one of his eight chief wives, desired to have a son as great as that of Rukmini, Krishna’s chief consort. In order to fulfil such a desire he was to have recourse to Shiva’s favour, to secure which he entered on a long course of austerities, at the end of which Shiva and Umā appeared before him. The god conferred eight boons upon him and eight more, including the son desired, on his wife Jambavati.

Apart from whether the foregoing briefly stated stories and accounts are trustworthy or not, the fact is evident that Shaivism had become a predominant religion in the epic age. Numerous was the Shaiva sect and it was not looked upon with contempt by the orthodox section. On the contrary it had become extraordinarily popular and a large number of people including great Rishis were its staunch adherents. Shiva had come to be looked upon as the bestower of all kinds of boons and gifts, for which he was sought after with devotion by the aspirants of the boons and gifts. He was the greatest Yogi and excelled all gods in power and penance.

So far as the nature of Shaivism is concerned it may be noted that (1) Yoga forms the first and foremost characteristic of the religion. (2) Bhakti and prayer form the second characteristic, which is the devotional worship. (3) Ahinsa or total avoidance of animal slaughter seem to have become a creed of the followers. For Shiva extolls
Abmisa in chap. 213 of the Anushasana parva. He says "non-slaughter is the first great Dharma; it is first bliss; and it alone is in all the Dharmashastras etc. etc." As a matter of fact the avoidance of sacrifices by the followers of Shiva in order to avoid dry ritualism and slaughter of animals in sacrifices was the cause of the Shaivas falling foul of the followers of the Vedic rites and ritualism.

(4) Diksha seems to have become a prominent initiation ceremony, which, therefore, seems to have been very ancient but which is now an essential part of the Shaiva religious system. (5) The goal to be reached by the Shaivas, as gathered from chapters (79 et seq.) of the Vanaparva, was the final liberation by the removal of sin great and small and by the destruction of fetters, bodily or mental. Hence Shiva was the god never to be destroyed but the destroyer of everything else. This is the reason why Shiva-Rudra is always considered as the destroyer of the universe at the end of kalpa or aeon. The final stage of spiritual development was union with Shiva, sayujya or Shivasayujya as it is called.

The extensive area over which Shaivism had spread can also be definitely known from Mahabharata by means of the Tirthas or holy places of pilgrimage, described in that encyclopaedic work. The Tirthas came to be established in the following way.

It has been already noted that during the times of Atharva Veda the worshippers of Shiva-Rudra attached more importance to a life of meditation than to that of performance of sacrificial rites as meaningless and irrational. Having kept the door open to all people high and low irrespective of caste, they attracted a large following, which
grew in the times of Bhamhanas that propounded far-fetched and fantastic theories and explanations of Vedic rites and ritualism. After Swetashwatara came to be written Shaivism became very popular as a theistic religion. Thereafter the worshippers of different castes practised praying and meditating on Rudra-Shiva with the result that Shaiva sects became numerous, as may be gathered from the strong condemnation contained in the Maitri Upanishad as noted before but it may be reproduced here. “Verily, the source of the net of delusion (Moha) is the fact of the association of one who is worthy of heaven with those who are not... Now there are those who are continually living upon handicraft. And moreover there are others who are town-baggars, who perform the sacrifices for the unworthy, who are disciples of the Shudras and who, though Shudras, know the scriptures. And moreover, there are others, who are rogues, who wear their hair in a twisted knot.... And moreover there are others who falsely wear the red robe, earrings and skulls.... with these one should not associate.” This makes it evident that the distinction between the Vedic rites and Shaivaitic rites came to be stressed. The clear mention of different types of Shiva’s worshippers is an unmistakable evidence of the wide-spread prevalence of Shaivism. But when we come to Mahabhârata we get enough material to prove the extensive area in which Shaivism was prevalent in all parts of India.

Those that practised meditation and performed penance with a view to gain knowledge of the ultimate truth became by example and probably by precept 2-25
teachers of yogic practices and philosophy. Numbers of such Yogis must have lived in different and secluded parts of hills and valleys, where they practised meditation and performed penance. They thereby imparted sanctity to the spots which became Tirthas or holy places fit to be visited and worshipped by the common people. The visit to the holy places open to all alike (सङ्कल्पः क्षत्रियाः वैशा युज्य राजस्वतं) is said to be productive of merit in varying degrees in proportion to importance attached to particular Tirthas. Thus it is said in बनपे chap. 82:—

अतिथिग्रामादिस्वरूपोऽसिद्धोऽनुपदकृष्णः।
न तत् ग्रामस्यायते सत्याभिष्मानान् यत्॥
काव्यानां वर्षोऽपि शतस्य फलकमङ्गुः।
अन्यं विवेचनायं फलमहुभूतेऽन्नातिषयः।
तत्र स्नात्वा नध्यर राजन् पुंजरोप्यमुखः।

etc. etc.

This shows that by this time the performance of sacrifices had definitely been pushed into background and the worship of deities in devotion had taken root in the land. In chapters 82 et seq of the बनपे it is seen that the sage like Pulastya and Dhaumya mention numerous holy places, scattered all over India, which were held in veneration on account of the holy life that ascetics led there. The description of the Tirthas includes numerous Shaiva Tirthas which prove the India-wide extent of the spread of Shaivism.

The description of holy places by गुज्जर is rather discursive. But that of द्वान्नय in chapters 86-90 is in order of the directions, east, west, north and south. ज्योतिष्ठ, the brother of उपमन्त्र, was a great Shaiva and hence
mentions Shaiva Tirthas; while Vishnu Tirthas inter alia, though the number of Shaiva Tirthas are more numerous and said to be more popular as productive of merit and conducive to the fulfilment of desired objects. When the chapter of the \[\text{वन्यन्} \] and also the chapters of \[\text{समार्थ} \], in which latter the \[\text{दिक्वीय} \] (Vishnu Ththas) of Sahadeva and his tour in South India are described, are carefully read they will impress readers with the popularity of Shaiva Tirthas all over India and the prevalence of a life of devotion (bhakti) to the Godhead.

Next come the Puranas, chiefly thirty six in number, eighteen principal and eighteen secondary. The word “Purana” means ancient; and the title “Purana” signifies ancient lore i.e. that which comes from of old. They are collections of old-world legends and set forth narrative as well as didactic matter. In the Brahmanas it is already found used designating cosmogonic inquiries in general. The Chhandogya Upanishad refers to Itihasa and Purana; but probably these terms relate to the stories and parables contained in the Vedas themselves. The references to the Puranas in the Dharmasutras, Mahabharata, and Kautilya’s Arthashastra are, however, to the Puranas proper. For instance Apastamba Dharma Sutra makes mention of Bhavishyat Purana. It is, therefore, clear that the Puranas are an old literature. The Matsya and Vayu Puranas go to the extent of saying that

\[\text{अष्टर्ते सर्वशास्त्राणां पुराणं जड़प्रा स्थुतम्} \]
\[\text{अर्नैर्ते च वक्रेऽश्रो वेदास्ति विनि:हर्ता:} \]

The same has been reiterated by Brahmanda. Making an allowance for this exaggerated claim that
these Puranas make for themselves and others, it may well be assumed that they contain much that is very old coming down traditionally from generation to generation.

Purana is said to be of five-fold Characteristics by अमरकोश (पुराण पंचवक्षण), which five-fold characteristics have been detailed by *विष्णुपुराण as—

कर्मणुक्षेत्र वाचा मन्त्रंतःणि च।
वैशाक्षारित्वैऽैव पुराणं पंचवक्षणम्॥

This shows that पुराण are written in old times on definite lines for definite purposes. But later they departed from the definitive line of treatment and became didactic in character and sectarian in purpose. They are the earliest interpreters of the Vedas and the Upanishads. Whole passages from the Vedas and the Upanishads are quoted, explained and elaborated. The principles of the Vedas and Upanishads are explained and illustrated by the Puranas by means of parables. Vedic stories themselves are elaborated, an example of which is the Kenapanishad story of Umā Haimavati elaborated in विष्णुपुराण-नन्दविल्हिता (and others), as noted in the notes (on page 80). The Puranas explain the difference between the old and the new system of worship and thought and bring out fully the difference and distinction between deities as objects of worship and devotion and establish the supremacy of a particular deity, Shiva or Vishnu. They deal with cosmogony, the doctrine of cosmic ages, the exploits of ancient gods,

* These five Lakshanas are amplified in भागवतपुराण into ten namely, समग्र, विषयग्र, स्थान, वाह्यग्र, मन्त्रंतर, उत्ति, ईशानुक्रया, सुङ्क्ष्यित आश्रय.
saints, heroes, accounts of the incarnations (अवतारः) of Vishnu, the genealogies of solar and lunar races of kings, enumeration of the thousand names of Shiva and Vishnu. They also contain rules about the worship of the gods by means of prayers, fastings, votive offerings, festivals, and pilgrimages. The striking features of the popular teaching of the Puranas are catholicity and provident care to make religious practice and the acquisition of blessings easy for all. The popular teaching declares that pilgrimages to sacred places, religious excursions, gifts, prayers, and other miscellaneous observances are the special provision available for women and lowest classes. Thus mere caste and personal limitations being disregarded, the Puranas have become the fifth Veda, the Veda of the laity. * Sāyanāchārya in his commentary on the Black Yajurveda says that the Mahābhārata and the Puranas are designed to the law of duty of women and Shūdras who were not allowed to read the Vedas.

In their primary form when they were first written, they must have been very small but have grown bulky by additions and interpolations from time to time. The direct evidence, apart from the indirect, of the growth by additions is obtained from Puranas themselves. Thus for instance Linga Purana says that it contains 108 chapters in the first book and 46 in the second. But the second book actually contains 55 chapters. So also Bhagavata Purana says that it contained 12000 verses; but was augmented by various stories to 50000, just as the Skanda was amplified. This process of

augmenting the Puranas has been carried on to the very recent times. e. g. Devanga Purana seems to have been added to the ब्रह्मङ्गुराण during the 12th century A. D., if not later, in as much as it contains the story of Devaradāsimaya, a great devotee of Shiva and a contemporary of Basava, the prime minister of Bijjala of the 12th century. It is said "ब्रह्मङ्गुराण उत्तरबंधे देवांग-चरिते देवदासावतात्तरकथानिहृतकः अथाविशेषोध्यायः." Devangas are a small community in South India and are worshippers of the goddess पार्वती or बांकि under different appellations. It seems that they contrived to add Devanga Purans as a part of the second book of ब्रह्मङ्गुराण with a view to give sacred character to their dogmas. So also mention is made of व्रजः in रक्तादुराण and अनुविष्टिग वीन्ह. A Purana of भरतमुद्र, the great शिवराजी and a contemporary of व्रजः, is considered to be a part of भविष्यत्तुराण. Basavapurana itself has been said to have been written by व्यास, the reputed author of all Puranas and Mahābhārata and the arranger of the Vedas in a systematic form. All religious sects, therefore, sought refuge of व्यास as the author of their particular Puranas only with a view to impart importance, sacredness, and antiquity to their Puranas. It is no wonder, Therefore, that they should be sectarian in purpose and character for establishing the tenets and dogmas of a particular sect or religion.

Puranas may be mainly divided into two classes, one class belonging to and glorifying Vishnu and setting forth the principles, dogmas and practices of Vaishnavism, i. e. Vaishnava Puranas like Vishnu and Bhagavata and the other belonging to and glorifying Shiva and setting forth the principals, dogmas, and practices
of Shiva religion, i.e. Shaiva Puranas like Linga and Shiva. But Vishnu Puranas praise and glorify Shiva as a deity subordinate to Vishnu and Shiva Puranas praise and glorify Vishnu as deity subordinate to Shiva. Some Puranas, though mainly concerned with the glorification of Vishnu and preaching Vaishnavite tenets say that both gods, Shiva and Vishnu are equal or are one and the same and that it is foolish to make any distinction between them. Brahma Purana § says that Vishnu is identical with Shiva. Padma Purana, which gives prominence to Brahma and also extols the supremacy of Vishnu says "Brahma, Vishnu and Maheshwar, though three in form, are one entity. There is no difference between the three except that of attributes." This Purana also contains the शिवभूति, in which the penance of Rama and his devotion to Shiva with a view to be enabled to get back Sītā is stated at great length. Rama is also taught therein the principles and philosophy of Shaivism. In ब्रह्मैवते देवोऽक्षरि नारद are stated to have obtained spiritual knowledge and learnt the means of final beatitude from शिव. Kalki Purana one of the eighteen secondary Puranas (कल्कीपुराण), states how Kalki worshipped ब्रह्मोदक्षिण्याश्रि and offered him prayers, how Shiva, pleased with devotion, appeared before him (कल्की) and gave him a destructive sword and a fleet steed. Vishnu Purana (in part I, ch. 2) says "Lord Janardana, though one, assumes the three formes of Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva for creation, preservation, and destruction of the universe respecti-
vely.” It also later affirms (in ch. 8) the identity of Vishnu and Laksnmi with Shiva and Gauri.

All Puranas expound the four subjects which comprise all human endeavours, called गुर्ग्वांस or the four objectives of human life, namely, धर्म (duty or righteousness), अर्थ (wealth), काम (desire or love), and मोक्ष (final emancipation from the worldly existence). The first three, when well observed, form a step to the last, which according to the philosophy of religion, is the highest aim and end of life. But भक्ति (loving faith in the supreme deity, Shiva or Vishnu) and द्वेष (meditation on and devotion to the supreme deity) are the two ways explained and taught in all their details by the Puranas for the attainment of the last गुर्ग्वांस.

Markandeya Purana elaborates the story of Rudra’s birth (given in the Shatapathbrâmhanâ) as follows:—At the beginning of the Kalpa (aeon) Brahmâ was meditating on begetting a son similar to himself. At once a boy of blue and red colour was seen sitting on his lap and weeping loudly. Brahmâ asked him why he was weeping. The boy answered ‘give me a name.’ Brahma conferred upon him the name Rudra. But the boy wept again and again for seven times and got seven more names, Bhava, Sharva, Ishâna, Pashupati, Bhîma, Ugra, and Mahadeo. Vishnu Purâna gives the following account of Shiva-Rudra’s birth. When Madhu and Kaitabha, the two demons, attempted to kill Brahmâ when he was created by Vishnu in the lotus that rose in his navel, Brahmâ prayed Vishnu that he might be saved from the demons. Pleased with his prayers Vishnu grew fiercely angry with the Râkshasas; from
the frowned brows of Vishnu sprang forth a being named Shambhu, weilding a trident and possessing three eyes. Thus there are various accounts of Rudra-Shiva's birth, as in the case of many other deities. These accounts show that Shiva was a minor deity in olden times subordinate to Brahmā or Vishnu.

Shiva Puranas, on the contrary, maintain that Shiva is the परशुराम and the highest of gods, whom it was impossible even for Vishnu and Brahmā to understand well. Thus in chap. 27 of वायुविवीक it is stated that Brahmā and Vishnu once began to quarrel that either of them was superior to the other. But in the course of their wrangling Shiva appeared in the form of Linga and both Brahmā and Vishnu were puzzled at the appearance of the strange Being and could not understand what it was. Vishnu went downwards digging in the form of a boar but could not find the bottom of the infinite Linga. Brahmā too soared up but was unable to see the top of the Linga. Thus foiled in their attempts they stood dismayed only to obtain the explanation of the form from Shiva who appeared before them and told all about himself as being the परशुराम. He told them that he, as परशुराम, created Brahmā, Vishnu, and Rudra, for creating, preserving and destroying the universe in the following verses:

एकाक्षरायदकाराक्ष्यादारम् अश्वाभिभीयते ||
एकाक्षरादकारायद्विहित्वा विष्णुसंपर्यते ||
एकाक्षरान्त्यकारायागनिष्ठो सदा उदाहरतः ||
दक्षिणागममहेश्वरस्य जातो जग्नातसंवर्षकः ||
वायुप्रायदवत्तिष्यंते विशेषति शंब्दितः ||
हृद्याचीलक्रोः स्मृतिच्छविभीषितः ||
सेषः प्रत्येको जगता स्थितेष्विष्णुविवेषः ||
संहारस्य तथा सदस्योर्नित्यं निमातः ॥

2-26
Thus in the sectarian spirit Vishnu and Shiva have been alternately raised up and lowered down in the Puranas by their respective followers.

In the Purans Shiva, the parshvan, in his theistic form is said to reside in the Kailas mountain practising penance there, probably to set an example for the beings to follow. He is said to reside there with his consort parvati, who is his ashir or inscrutable power. He leads a conjugal life at his pleasure in the company of parvati, the daughter of the Himalayas. Various stories of his exploits of destroying the niyur and the demons, अंचक, ढूंग, निन्दक, जालभार, and महिष are elaborated. The import of the various names of Shiva, such as लिंगुरार, शुद्धती, नात्रंकेश, श्रीकेश, शिविकेश, and so forth, is given by means of stories. For instance शिव is called त्रिवण or त्रेवक for having three eyes; and the third eye is said to have come into existence under the following circumstances. Shiva was sporting with पार्वती on the slopes of the Himalayas, when she playfully closed with her hands the two eyes of Shiva. The whole universe was at once immersed in cosmic darkness and all life and activities were suspended; sacrifices stopped and the gods became quiescent. Mahadeva, then, at the prayers of gods, dispelled the darkness by the fire that burst out of his forehead in which a third eye, as luminous as the sun, was formed.

Shiva has no genuine incarnations like those of Vishnu. Yet his worshippers have propounded in their sectarian zeal that Shiva has 28 incarnations contemporary with the 28
Vyasas, and their names, वेद, दमन, षुतार, etc. are mentioned in the Vayu, Shiva, and Linga Puranas. But it is to be noted that the 28 are merely Rishis that expounded the principles and practices of Yoga. It is clear that the Shaivas did not like that their god was in any way inferior to Vishnu. That is why they make attempts at propounding the 28 incarnations of Shiva, which seem to be merely in imitation of Vishnu having ten incarnations. The 28 Rishis, the incarnations of Shiva, look to be teachers of Shaivism at various times.

Shiva is worshipped as पशुपति, the Lord of cattle, beneath whom all the gods and creatures ranked as mere cattle. This cult of पशुपति is called the Pashupata cult, which is highly commended in the Shaiva Puranas and reprobated in others. The Puranas record the Pashupata religion, the general name of all Shaiva sects, and its principles and practices in the form of Linga worship. In them Shaivism finds its fullest and widest expression in all its aspects and details.

The history of Shaivism as collected from Mahâbhârata brings us somewhere near the beginning of the Christian era. For according to scholars the work in the present form existed before the beginning of the era. Thus says Macdonald * "We are accordingly justified in considering it likely that the great epic had become a didactic compendium before the beginning of the Christian era." We now proceed to trace the history of Shaivism during the first millenium of the Christian era.

* Macdonald's History of the Sanskrit Literature, page 287.
§ "The earliest mention of Shiva worship that can be dated definitely is that of Megasthenes. The prevalence of Shaivas is attested by Patanjali in the second century B.C. He mentions the Shiva-bhagavatas, ascetics moving about, iron trident in hand. He also mentions image of Shiva, Skanda, Vishakha made of precious metals and apparently used in domestic worship."

According to Dr. Vincent Smith the first four centuries of the Christian era are a dark period in the history of India. He declares in his "Early History of India"—So much, however, is clear that Vasudeva was the last Kushan king who continued to hold extensive territories in India. After his death there is no indication of the existence of a paramount power in Northern India. (page 290): Probably numerous Rajas asserted their independence and formed a number of short-lived states...but historical materials for the third century is so completely lacking that it is impossible to say what and how many those states were. (page 290): The period between the extinction of the Kushan and Andhra dynasties, about A.D. 220 or 230, and the rise of the imperial Gupta dynasty, nearly a century later, is one of the darkest in the whole range of Indian history. (page 292). In other words the period is a blank in the history of India. But thanks to the labours of Prof. K. P. Jayaswal, it is not so. He says * that "none of these three statements cited above can be accepted and need he repeated in future. The materials are copious, as we shall see below, and for two sections of the period, scientifically arranged for us by Hindu histori-

§ Cultural Heritage of India, vol. II, page 26

ans.” He maintains that during this period there was the empire of the Bhara Shivas succeeded by that of the Vakatakas. These two preceded the imperialistic domination of the Gupta dynasty beginning with Samudragupta of the fourth century A.D.

The end of the Kushan rule synchronizes with the rise of the Bhara Shivas. When they rise the power they had to face and break was that of the imperial Kushans. Roughly their rise is to be dated about 150 A.D. Their empire also roughly included Bihar, the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, Bundelkhand, the Central Provinces, Malwa, Rajputana and the Madra Republics in Punjab. In the early centuries of the Christian era Shaivism prevailed during the period of Kushans. The earliest coins bearing Shiva emblems, an image of Shiva with trident in hand on obverse and his bull on the reverse are those of Kushan. † Wema Kadphises, a powerful prince of the Kushan race, styles himself on the reverse of his coins a devotee of Maheshwar or a member of the Maheshwar sect. But the Bhara Shivas adopted Lord Shiva as the presiding deity of their empire. Shiva was their ishta devata. We find Shiva everywhere in the Bhara Shiva period. The air is surcharged with the belief that the destroyer Himself has founded the Bhara Shiva state and that he is the guarantor of the king and the people of the Bhara Shiva kingdom. That He has stood up to see His people free—free to follow their Dharma. * “The history of the Bhara Shivas is set in lapidary by the Vakataka historiographer. Never so shortly, yet so pregnantly, was history in miniature set

† Shaivism and Vaisnnavism, page 167. * History of India, 150 A.D.—350 A.D,
in, as in these three lines of the copper-plate:—अंकभारस्वचत्र-हिंसकशिलामोदानिथिविचःपरत्रेणषुत्थितराज्यवर्तमानं पराक्षामयितमागागध्वमन्तः—धीरेश्वरविदानां द्वाराधेवशास्त्रनानां भारविलानम्।”  
† “The Bhara Shiva rule was marked by Shiva asceticism. They have no grandeur, except the grandeur of their severe and austere undertaking. They ignore the imperial coinage of Kushans and revert to the old Hindu coinage. They assume no grandeur like the Guptas. Like Shiva they have a self-imposed non-richness. Like Shiva they give and not partake. They give freedom to Hindu republics; they give them freedom to mint their own money and to live their own full life. Like Shiva’s domestic polity they have a gana of Hindu states around them. They are the true Shiva-made Nandi, the Lord of the Ganas. They merely preside over a confederacy of states and foster freedom every where. They perform ashwamedhas, but do not become ekarat Emperors. They remain political Shaivas and international ascetics amongst their countrymen.

“A worshipper of Shiva is a worshipper of a symbol, a bindu. The Shaiva worshipper would have looked down upon the Buddhist idol-worshippers as followers of a low cult. Whether Bhara Shiva did so or did not, we can be certain of one fact that Buddhism could not but have declined in the Naga country, if for nothing else, at least for its political alliance with the enemy of the national civilization. It had become the foster-child of a tyrant and with the uprooting of the tyranny it must fall. This is the explanation of the decay of Buddhism which was so marked by the time of the early Guptas. The decay was in an advanced stage by the end of the Bhara Shiva’s

† History of India 150 A. D.-350 A. D. pages 51 ff.
period. Buddhism had become a denationalized system and assumed a non-Hindu character by its contact with the Kushans, in whose hands it had lost its spiritual independence and become a political instrument. The Buddhist Bhikshus in the Kushan in Kashmir were felt, on the evidence of Raja-tarangini, as a social nuisance and a load of oppression. They must have been so felt also in Aryavarta. Shaiva asceticism became a necessary antidote for a re-adjustment of society. The śakas had weakened the character of Hindu population; and Shaiva asceticism was a necessary factor of correction. The greedy imperialism of the Kushans was destroyed; the Hindu people were purged of deteriorated morals. And when the task was done, the Bhara Shivas retired. Shiva's mission was complete, and in Lord Shiva the Bhara Shivas re-entered in spiritual triumph. Unconquered till the last, untainted by any material selfishness, the true servants of their Lord and His people exit from the stage of history a rare, honourable and noble finis which the Bharashivas fully deserved....They restored the sanctity of Mother Ganges, the river of Lord Shiva etc. etc."

The Vakatakas succeeded the Bharashivas, and their dynasty came into existence about a century before Samudragupta's conquest. Their kingdom (248 A.D.-284 A.D.) developed into an empire (284 A.D.-348 A.D.). Though most of achievements in Hindu revival are to be credited to the Bharashivas, the maintenance of that free inheritance for fifty years with further progress is to be attributed to Vakatakas who carried on the policy of the Bharashivas.

* "The faith of the Vakatakas was strict Shaivism.

It changed only for one generation in the time of Rudrasena II, under the influence of his wife Prabhâvatî and his father-in-law, Chandra Gupta II, who were both ardent Vaishnavas. But when Chandra Gupta's influence was over, the family at once reverted to their Shaivism. Temples of the Vakataka period are prominently of the martial Shiva.' From the Bharashivas upto the Vakatakas there was the rule of that God of social asceticism, that aspect of the Almighty which undertakes destruction, the God, who though a giver, keeps no wealth, possesses no material splendour, the God who is austere and sombre. But under the Guptas, who ruled in Northern India from 320 A. D. to 480 A. D. Shaivism began to give way to Vaishnavism. The Gupta kings, notably Samudra Gupta, were ardent worshippers of Vishnu.

Later in the seventh century in the reign of Shri Harshavardhan Shaivism was in a flourishing condition, as may be known from the elaborate description of Bhairavacharya in Bana's Harshacharita. It furnishes another land mark in the history of Shaiva asceticism. * The history of Mattamayûr sect in the Haihaya kingdom of Tripuri marks another stage in the same line. † ‘The Chinese traveller Hiuen Tsiang in the middle of the seventh century mentions the Pâshupatas twelve times in his book. In some places he says that there were temples of Maheshwar at which the Pâshupatas worshipped; in one or two temples, he says, they resided. And at Benares he found about ten thousand sectaries who honoured Maheshwara,

* Cultural Heritage of India, page 27. † Shaivism and Vishnavism, pp. 167-169.
besmeared their bodies with ashes, went naked and tied their hair in knots. These and those who lived in temples must have been like the Bairagis, or ascetics, of modern times, who had given up the world; but probably the others mentioned by him were the followers of the Pashupata faith who lived the ordinary life of householders."

"Bana in his Kadambari represents Pashupatas with red clothing to have been among those who waited to see Tarapida's minister Shukanasa at the door of his house for some private purposes of their own; but in another place he represents Vilasavati, the queen of Tarapida, to have gone to the temple of Mahakala on the fourteenth day (of the dark half of the month) to worship the God. Bhavabhuti in the Malatimadhava represents Malati to have gone with her mother to the temple of Shankar on the fourteenth day of the dark half of the month. This fourteenth day still continues to be sacred to Shiva when special worship is performed. Now Vilasavati and her mother can hardly have been meant to be members of that sect, some followers of which with a red clothing were waiting at Shukanasa's door. It, therefore, appears to be clear that all worshippers of Shiva were not members of any of those sects, the names of which have come down to us."

"There were thus three classes of Shiva's worshippers:—(1) clericals or ascetics, (2) their lay followers, (3) and ordinary people who had no particular connection with any sect. The poets Kalidas, Subandhu, Bana, Shri Harsha, Bhatta Narayana, Bhavabhuti and several others adore Shiva at the beginning of their..."
works. They may have been the lay followers of any of the sects, but, in all likelihood, they belong to the third class....The many temples of Shiva constructed by early Chalukyas and the Râstrakûtas, and the Kailas and other cave temples at Ellora excavated by the latter, contain no indication of their being intended for any specific Shaiva sect, and therefore, they may by regarded as pointing to the diffusion of the general worship of Shiva in Maharashtra from the seventh to the tenth century."

During the first eleven centuries of the Christian era Shaivism prospered in South India and made tremendous progress to the complete routing of Jainism and Buddhism. The latter was uprooted and driven out of the land, as it was done in Northern India in the times of Bharashivas and Vakatakas. During this period Jainism had come down to South India and had such thorough hold on some people that Shaivism and Vaishnavism were in the background. Besides, some kings had not only espoused the cause of Jainism but were Jains themselves. However, Shaivism re-asserted itself gradually and spread like wild fire under the advocacy of Shaiva teachers and under the intense Bhakti cult of 63 Nayanârs or Shaiva saints.

In South India the Pallavas, like the Bharashivas and the Vakatakas in Northern India, had made Shaivism their state religion. According to K. P. Jayaswal, the Pallavas ruled from 295 A. D. to 360 A. D. * "They established Shaivism as the state religion in the South as the Vakatakas did the same in the North. Just as

the Guptas gave a permanent stamp of Vaishnavism on the Northern India which has come down to our own time, so the Pallavas imprinted Shaivism on Southern India which has come down to us....Like the imperial Vakataks they are Shaiva by religion....It is stated in the documents of the Pallava dynasty that the founder of the Pallava dynasty was made king by the Naga emperor on the former's marriage with a Naga Princess."

During this period literature about Shaivism came to be written in the Tamil language. The earliest and the most authoritative book on Shaivism was Tirumandirum of Tirumullar, who was himself one of the 63 Nāyanârs. But Shaivism has a few references made to it in the earlier Tamil literature, called the Sângam literature. This literature is mostly of love and war and is divided into two broad groups as Puram and Aham. It is, therefore, not possible to make an estimate based on the literature of the progress in religion and religious thought. However, from occasional references and incidental allusions, some information can be collected about Shaivism from the literature. Thus in a Puram stanza there is a reference to the destruction of the three castles, the blue neck, the moon on the head and an eye on the forehead, which is clearly about Shiva. So also in a poem, called PuraNānûru, it is said. "The one Veda classified as four Vedas and understood by means of the six Vedangas is ever on the tongue of Shiva of fully cutivated understanding and

† Origin and early history of Shaivism in South India, page 115.
high matted locks. The point worthy of notice here is that the Veda (which according to tradition came out of its own accord, and not from the mouth of any body) is described as abiding for ever on the tongue of Shiva. He alone therefore is fit to reveal the Veda, or make it known to the world. Again, any one uttering the Veda, necessarily utters the word of Shiva. Such a conception can originate only from one who regards Shiva as the highest god. Thus it is evident that the poet (Âvûr Mûlam Kilâr) was a believer in Shaivism."

In Manimekalai, an excellent Tamil work by Sattanâr, the superiority of Buddhistic philosophy to the philosophies of other religions is established. Manimekalai is only a story of a girl who becomes a nun and enters into an enquiry of "which philosophy is superior to which else." In the course of her inquiry she goes to a Shaiva-Vadin. The current views on Shaivism are found in a nut shell. * "He stated that the two lights (the sun and the moon), the doer and the five elements constitute the basis from out of which human beings are made by combination of life and body. He who does this is constituted of Kailas; his nature it is to create beings as an act of play, and He destroys them and thus gets rid of their sufferings; and He, besides whom there is no one else, such a one is my god."

But it is during the period of 63 Nâyanârs that Shaivism flourished and became firmly rooted in the land so as to get better of Buddhism and Jainism which came into conflict with Shaivism, with the result
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that both these religions were completely routed. Buddhism disappeared from the land, Jainism remained the religion only of a small minority as is seen now. Of the sixty three Nāyanārs four Nāyanārs, namely, Tirumular, Sambandar, Appar or Vagisha, and Sundarar or Sundarmurti are great writers and have written very authoritative books on Shaivism. Tirumular is the earliest and greatest of all and his work “Tirumandirum” is the most authoritative and exhaustive in the treatment of Shaivism. Next come Sambandar and Appar who were contemporaries and both of them were contemporaries of ten other Nāyanārs. Sundarmurti comes last; and eight other Nāyanārs were his contemporaries. Some Nāyanārs seem to be contemporaries of Tirumular also, as Tirumular severely condemns those that speak ill of Adiyars or devotees of Shiva, who were thought by Nāyanārs as much worthy of worship as Shiva himself. Some became Nāyanārs merely because they revered and adored Shaiva devotees and gave them food or anything that the devotees required.

The dates of Tirumular (circa 400-600 A.D.), Sambandar and Appar (circa 650 A. D.), and Sundarar (circa 800-825 A. D.), based on some reliable data, have been determined. But it is not possible to do so in the case of other Nāyanārs. However it can be said that they lived during the period of six centuries from 4th to 9th century A. D. We shall note briefly in what way the Nāyanārs were instrumental in popularising and spreading Shaivism in the land. It may be noted that Sambandar, Appar, Sundarar and Manikkavāsagar, the
author of Tisuvasagam, are called the four Samayacharyas or teachers of Shaivism because they were instrumental in popularizing and spreading Shaivism in the land by their writings and saintly life. It may also be noted that the great saint, Tirumular, and the four Samayacharyas wrote authoritative books on Shaivism and its principles and practices in the Tamil language, which was one of the languages of the people of South India. Shaivism as a cosmopolitan religion appealed to the people and prospered by leaps and bounds with the result, as already noted, that Jainism and Buddhism gave way completely to it. Of all the religious works of Shaiva authors, Tirumandiram, the work of Tirumular is the most authoritative, as it became the foundation on which the superstructure of Shaiva Siddhânta philosophy was raised later by Tirumular’s successors. But it is mainly the Nâyanârs that were greatly instrumental in the spread of Shaivism by their life of intense, sincere, and exemplary devotion.

The lives of 63 Nâyanârs have been outlined by saint Sundarar in his Tiruttundattogai, in which the author sings of the Nâyanârs. The lives were later elaborated in Periya Puranam by Sekkilâr, who lived about the end of the eleventh century A.D. the Puranam gives detailed information about the Nâyanârs and devotional activities and is, therefore, the main source of knowledge of the Nâyanârs. The main features of the Nâyanârs’ period are:—

(1) It was the age of Bhakti or sincere devotion to the Godhead Shiva, who was alone the saviour of the Bhaktas.
(2) It was mainly the age of Charya or Dâsamârga.
(3) It was the age of cosmopolitan spirit that pervaded the religion.
(4) It was the age of miracles.
(5) It was the age of Shivabhaktas and Shivayogis wandering about the country and receiving reverence and adoration from Shaivas.
(6) It was the age when no distinction was made of sex. Females were not excluded but considered equally entitled to religious practices.
(7) It was the age of hostility and conflict with Jains and Buddhas.
(8) It was the age of Agamic culture when the Agamic rites had been practised; and when the Agamas and their teachings were reconciled with the Vedas and their teachings and both were considered equal and one.
(I) The Shaiva Nâyanârs were persons of intense and sincere devotion, which was extolled as a virtue, though this devotion or bhaââti bordered on bigotry and fanaticism. Bhakti was considered more important than homas, tended with Vedic mantras, and knowledge or observance of Shâstrâs. Therefore a bhakta attached more importance to the worship of Shiva in all sincerity however much it was opposed to ordinary canons of right and wrong in the acts of bhakti. Shiva, according to Shaivism, is Parama Guru (the Highest Teacher) and extends grace to the bhaktas. This act of extending grace (prasad) is one of five acts of Shiva (pach kûshâni), the other four being चृति (creation), विधि (preservation), संहâ (destruction), and विरोधान (obscuration). It was the
conviction of Nāyanārs that bhakti was a means of purifying souls and getting rid of पाशा: or bonds, that bound the जीवा: in बंसार. In their deep devotion they lost their temper, when something happened to obstruct their devotional activity; and they committed acts of cruelty to the agent of the obstruction. Thus, Eripatta Nāyanār was in the habit of throwing his axc on any body that came in the way of anybody’s doing some work in the worship of God Shiva. Once Shivakami Andār was as usual gathering flowers for the worship of Pashupati in the temple at Karūr. King Pugal Chola’s elephant destroyed the flowers that Shivakami had gathered. Eripatta Nāyanār was enraged and killed not only the elephant but the five men that were in charge of the elephant. Another Nāyanār, of name Chandeshwar, was a Brahmin youth who learnt the Vedas in his fifth year and received the sacrament of Upanayana in his seventh year. One day he saw a cowherd belabour the cows tended by him. But Chandeshwar not liking this began to tend the cows himself. The cows so carefully tended by the Nāyanār began to give more milk and Chandeshwar began to use the overflowing milk for the Abhisheka of Shiva. The news reached his father who did not like this conduct, as he failed to realize the intense devotion of his son. He, therefore, when once his son was all occupied with the performance of his daily Abhisheka under a tree, struck blows on his son; but the latter was not at all conscious of the blows, till the father snatched away the milk-pot held by him. Only then the son became conscious of the obstruction caused by his father and taking a stick struck his father’s leg with it. The stick mysteriously became
an axe and cut off the leg. These two stories, though more can be given, are enough to prove the length of fanaticism to which the Nâyanârs went. But their bigotry and fanaticism were due to and proof of their intense devotion. These staunch Shaivas persuaded themselves that they were above all ordinary rules of ethics and morality, which they thought were inapplicable to them in their religious practices. In fairness to the Nâyanârs it was their merit of devotion and not their inability to control themselves that enabled them to attain Shiva’s grace. Their indignation was righteous indignation on account of something coming in the way of their devotional work. Fanaticism is certainly a defect but it does not mean in the case of Nâyanârs total absence of self-control. Otherwise, Yama (control), Niyama (discipline) and such other things, applicable to the practices of Shivayoga would be meaningless. The intense and sincere bhakti of the Nâyanârs had salutary effect upon the general public because it chalked out to them a path to attain Moksha, that has continued even to this day.

The Nâyanârs went to any length to serve Shiva in devotion. Thus Kannappa Nâyanâr plucked out his eyes to remedy the bleeding eye of Shiva; Kalaiya Nâyanâr sold the “Tali or Mangalsûtra” of his wife to buy incense for Shiva. Kalianâyanâr lighted lamps in the temple with oil supplied by himself. He exhausted all his wealth and possessions to buy oil and then decided to sell his wife to obtain money for buying oil. When nobody would purchase her he got desperate and decided to offer his own blood in place of oil. While doing this Shiva’s grace descended upon him.
The age of Nâyanârs was the age of Charyâ, also called "Dâsamârga." Charyâ is one of the Shaivaite four Sâdhanas of liberation as taught in the Agamas, the other three being, Kriyâ, Yoga, and Dnyâna. The mûrgas or paths, corresponding, to Kriyâ, Yoga, Dnyâna, are called Satputramarga, Sahamarga or Sakhamarga, and Sanmarga. The charyâ or Dâsamârga consists in cleaning the temple premises, making garlands of flowers, praising and feeding Shiva's devotees, lighting temple lamps, planting flower gardens, serving Shivayogis, collecting flowers for Shiva's worship and all other acts for the worship of the God and service of Shaivayogis. This path is within the reach of all, male and female, high and low, without the distinction of caste and creed, as a mode of attaining mukti. Most of the Nâyanârs were examples of Dâsamarga. Thus one collected flowers, another burnt incense, some one lighted lamps in the temple and so on and so forth. One Nâyanâr's devotion to god was a very strange one. It was Sakkiya Nâyanâr that developed a love towards a Shivalinga. Once in his admiration of the Linga he threw a stone on it out of self-forget-fulness and did not know what he was doing, being so much absorbed in his thought about Shiva. The next day he thought of his throwing the stone the previous day and decided that it was the God's will and determined to continue that peculiar form of expressing his love for the Linga. One day he forgot to do it but was reminded of his omission of his usual worship, just when he was sitting for his meal. He forthwith went away to do it, when God appeared before him and took him to His world. This does not mean that other modes or Sâdhanas were not practised. The three other modes were also practised by men of superior intellectual
calibre and capacity. For instance, Adipatta Nâyanâr, a fisherman by caste gave away to Shiva one of the fishes he caught. Shiva, with a view to test his devotion, caused it to so happen that the Nâyanâr could catch only one fish several days; still the Nâyanâr offered the single fish caught every day and went home. He got leaner and leaner day by day for want of food. One day he got a golden fish so valuable that he could buy a kingdom with the price of the fish. But the Nâyanâr liberated the fish as usual. Shiva was so pleased that he took him to His world. This is an instance of Kriyâ or Satputramârga.

Pusalâr Nâyanâr desired very much to build a temple for Shiva; but he could not do so for want of money. He then began to construct mentally a temple which he did day by day gradually strictly in accordance with the Agamic, rules of constructing a temple. In due course the structure was complete in his mind and he fixed up a day for installing the deity in it in proper ceremony. It happened that the same day was fixed up by Narasimhavarman II of Pallava line for installing Shiva's image in a temple that he had newly built. The previous night God Shiva appeared in the king's dream that He would be in the Pusalâr Nâyanâr's temple for the same ceremony, and therefore, the king should postpone his ceremony. The king then went to see the Nâyanâr's temple but was surprised to find that it was only a mental temple. This is an instance of Mânasa Pûja or Sahamârga. The saint Triumular and the Samayacharyas are themselves instances of Sakhâmârga and Sanmârga.

(III) The age of Nâyanârs was the age of cosmopolitan spirit. There is nothing special in this; for
cosmopolitanism was the creed of Shaivism from the very beginning and formed a special feature or differentia of the religion. Still by the impact of Vedic Varnashramdharma orthodoxy dogged the course of Shaivism ever and anon and had to be purged away. Of the 63 Näyanârs some were Brahmins and some belonged to the aboriginal and and other low castes. But ordinary ideas of castes did not weigh and matter with the devotees of Shiva. Whenever they met they met as equals. The Shivabhaktas of higher castes had no scruples in taking food with those of lower castes. Thus Sundarar, an Adi Shaiva Brahmin, ate with Serimân Perumal Näyanâr who was a low caste man. Moreover he married a low caste dancing girl, Perumai Nakkiyâr. The hunter Kannappa, a Berad, and Nanda, a Pulaiya occupied a position among Näyanârs, though they were low caste men. Amara Niti Näyanâr was a Vaishya; Enadi Näyanâr was a toddy-drawer; Tiru Nilkantha Näyanâr was a potter; Tirukkuriputtondar was a washerman; and Adipatti Näyanâr was a fisherman. All these low caste people rose to the high position of being saints. This shows that all people that were Shaivas were free from the barriers of caste. The story of Nanda Näyanâr is specially interesting in that it illustrates a miracle and how orthodoxy yielded to the cosmopolitan spirit of Shaivism. The writings of Samayacharyas inculcated the broad spirit of cosmopolitanism and had the desired effect on the people. Thus says Appar:—Brahmana’s jewel is the Veda. Ours is Panchâkshara; though one does not have good birth, that which gives much good according to birth is Panchâkshara. It must be noticed here that there is absolutely no mention of the superiority or inferiority of one caste over another; nor is there any condemnation of one sect in preference to another.
IV The age of Nâyanârs was the age of miracles, which were displayed by the Periya Puranam saints. The miracles served their purpose most effectively. Otherwise Kannappa and Nanda could never have been regarded as worthy of greatest respect as saints. The man in the street is not likely to be won over by dry theoretical argumentation and philosophical disputation, but would need some practical proof, which miracles could alone afford to give. The miracles were not peculiar to the Nâyanârs. The Buddhist scriptures abound with numerous instances of Buddha’s miracles. The Kuran states various miracles about the Prophet Mohamud. The Bible gives so many miracles performed by Christ. Thus miracles were not the exclusive property of Shaiva Nâyanârs. It is impossible to give an explanation of the possibility or otherwise of miracles, which on the very face look impossible. But according to Yogashastra, which is originally a science of Shaiva and Shakta religion, everything is possible. But Yoga is primarily a spiritual science, far above the head and intellect of dry materialists, who may carp at the possibility that can be attained by the infinite spiritual power, when cultivated and developed by the practice of Yoga. After all what is a miracle? The speaking chip was a miracle to the wild man but quite an ordinary thing to the civilized carpenter that wrote on the chip. Even to-day electricity is a miracle to an Indian villager, who, it may be said from personal experience, asks the question if oil is stored somewhere to feed the light when it is switched. A few years back no body could have believed in wireless telegraphy and television; but now it is quite an ordinary thing. The matters spiritual cannot be tested by matters physical or physical science. Christ, Mohamud, Buddha and Basava
were great Yogis and could perform miracles and work wonders. Such were the things that the Nāyanārs could do by force of bhakti, which was a spiritual force. Two instances of miracles will be enough to illustrate the force of bhakti. Nami Nandi Adigal was a Brahmin and worshipped Shiva in the temple of Tiruvārūr. Once he wished to light all the lamps in the temple and went to the neighbouring houses to beg for ghee for feeding the temple lamps. One of the houses belonged to a Jain, who being intolerant of Shaivism replied that Nandi Adigal might as well take water and use it in place of ghee. Nami Nandi was vexed and began to cry through sorrow. But he heard a voice that he might go to a tank and bring water for lighting lamps. He obeyed the voice and the lamps burnt brightly. (2) Dandi Adigal was a native of Tiruvārūr. He was born blind but a staunch Shivabhakta and always repeated the Panchakshara Mantra. He began to dig a tank for the benefit of Shiva’s devotees. Jains began to laugh and ridicule the attempts of the blind man. Annoyed at this he challenged that he would gain vision by Shiva’s favour. He prayed god and his prayers were granted in the presence of the then Chola king who was there to witness the miracle.

(V) During the age of Nāyanārs Shivayogis moved about in the land and were-revered as equal to Shiva, whom they represented as it were. They wandered over the land as agents of Shaivism to show the right path to ordinary Shaivas to attain mukti by precept as well as by example. The Nāyanārs worshipped Shivayogis with equal reverence. Thus Murkha Nāyanār always offered food to Shivabhaktas; and when he was short of money he earned money by gambling and fed Shiva’s devotees. Sirappuli Nāyanār
always ministered to the needs and comforts of Shiva-bhaktas and in the end gained the grace of God. This was the principle which the great Kanarese poet Shadakhsari of 6th century followed rigidly and took a vow that he would not write anything except in praise of Shiva or a Shiva-bhakta. His vow is contained in the following stanza:—

(VI) During this age women also attained sainthood on account of their Shivabhakti. They were as much entitled to religious rites and practices as men could be. This is but right, as sex belongs to the body and not to the soul, which, whether it is encaged in a male or a female body, was considered equally entitled to rights in religious principles and practices. Exclusion of women from matters of religion is a grave defect in the Vedic religion of Varna-shramadharma. Women also have souls to save from bondage (婆娑). It baffles understanding how women can save their souls merely by serving their husbands faithfully without religion and religious practices. Shaivism is free from this defect and has given equal rights to men and women. Thus Mangayakkarsiyar, a Pandya queen, and Kârakkâl Ammaiyyar and many others have a place amidst the Nâyanârs. The story of Tirunilanakka Nâyanâr’s wife is interesting. Once the Nâyanâr was worshipping Shiva’s image when a spider fell on it. The Nâyanâr’s wife, who was standing nearby, blew it away and her spittle fell on the image. The Nâyanâr thought that the image was polluted by his wife’s spittle and asked
her to be separated from him. But during his sleep at
night God Shiva appeared before him and showed the
saint how his whole body was blistered on account of the
spider’s fall except where his wife’s spittle had fallen on
his body. The saint repented and realized that bhakti
was more important than the knowledge of the shastras.

(VII) During this period Jainism and Buddhism
fell foul of Shaivism and were worsted by it. In earlier
times Jains, Buddhhas, Shaivas, and Vaishnavas were seen
to have lived in amity and peace side by side though they
held different religious views. In canto II of Silappadi
kāram the story is told that Kovalan and saint Kavundi
Adigal were travelling together to Madura. They met a
Brahmin on their way & asked him the route. The Brahmin
gave them a description of two routes with an account of
Hindu Gods and the Siddhis that could be got of by wor-
shipping the Gods in the manner prescribed by the
Shastras. After listening to the Brahmin patiently
Kavundi Adigal said—“O, Brahmin, learned in the Vedas,
I do not desire to go through the cave (lying on the route
described by the Brahmin) for attaining the ends or
Siddhis. You may go ahead to worship the God you
like; we shall go our own way.” It will be clear from
this that the relations between different religious sects
were cordial. Even during the times of Tirumular Jains
and Shaivas lived in peace. It was only later during the
times of Sambandar and Appar that conflicts between the
Shaivas, Jains and Buddhists had developed. The latter
half of the sixth century was a period of Jain prominence;
and that was the reason why the king Mahendravarman
was influenced by Jain teachings. But gradually as the
Bhakti cult of the Nâyanârs rose and flourished, Shaivas and Jains became intolerant of one another and clashes took place, as it was bound to be. One of the Nâyanârs, Ninra Sir Nôdumâr, a Pandya king, was first a convert to Jainism. The Jains, who were intolerant of the growing influence of Shaivism, told the king that they would raise a fire by their mystic power in the camp of Sambandar. But failing in their attempts they actually set fire to Sambandar's house and the miracle happened. The saint Sambandar sang a Padigam and the fire leaving the saint's house attacked the king who felt a burning sensation all over the body. He got rid of the sensation by Sambandar's singing another Padigam. The king then was a convert to Shaivism and did all he could to spread Shaivism in the land. Saint Appar himself was first a Jain convert and got the new name "Dharmasena". But later when he suffered badly from the stomachache he became free only when his sister gave him the sacred ashes. The saint lost all faith in Jainism and became an ardent Shaiva and wrote books on Shaivism. It may be noted that during the time he was a Jain he defeated a Buddhist in a disputation. This shows that there was antagonism between Jains and Buddhists also. Jains were persecuted and there was once a large-scale slaughter of Jains in the place called Palayârai, which is an historical fact referred to by Appar himself in his songs. Gradually the Jain predominance waned and Shaivism prevailed all over the country.

The hostility between Shaivism and Buddhism was not so keen and severe as it was between Jainism and Shaivism. Sâkkiya Nâyanâr was a Buddha first
but got dissatisfied with the doctrines of Buddhism and after study and thought came to the conclusion that Shaivism alone could afford real solution to the miseries of the world. He realized that the four things viz. Atmâ, Karma, Karmaphala, and Pati were real, the first and last of which are not found in Buddhism. The story of Sâkkiya Nâyanâr is the story of a cultured man and shows that Shaivism and Buddhism were at loggerheads.

(VIII) Lastly it was the period of Agamic lore and practices. The Agamas (the Shivagamas), the literature of Shaivism, originated in hoary antiquity and developed into tremendous volumes in course of time. The writings were in Sanskrit and therefore of no avail to ordinary people. It was, therefore, necessary that their teachings should be told in the language of the people. This was exactly what Tirumular did. He rendered into Tamil the Shaiva doctrines as they were found in the Sanskrit Shivagamas, which were current into both Northern and Southern India for several centuries past. Sambandar and Appar were great scholars and they popularized the Agamic Shaivism in their writings. Various references in the Devaram hymns testify to the prevalence of the Agamas. So also from the lives of Nâyanârs it is known how in various places Pâjâ was performed in the Agamic way, temples were built and festivals celebrated in the manner prescribed by the Agamas. The structure of very many temples during the period of Nâyanârs bears out the influence of the Agamic cult of image worship in temples. Also the Agamas were considered equal to the Vedas and in no way inconsistent with the Vedas.
It has been noted above that the Vedas were considered to be residing on the tongue of Shiva, i.e. the Vedas were considered to have been delivered by Shiva for the good of Shaivas. There were also people who believed that the Agamas were anti-Vedic and non-Vedic. But in course of time owing to the prevailing influence of Vedic literature, containing rich heritage of culture, and owing to the adoption by Vedic people of Agamic cult of worshipping a personal god, both the followers of Vedas and Agamas seem to have made an attempt at unifying the teachings of the Vedas and the Agamas in order to show to the people that both of them meant one and the same thing. They tried to show that there was unity of thought underlying their teachings, however much they differed in details. Tirumular was the first Tamil poet to regret the opinion that the Agamas and the Vedas were different and taught distinct principles. * He says, “the Veda with the Agamas is the truth; they are the word of the Lord etc. etc.” The Nâyanâr, Rudra Pashupati, recited Sri Rudram while performing the worship of Shiva in a particular posture. This shows that the worship of Shiva was intertwined with Vedic mantras. So also Sirappuli Nâyanâr was a shivabhakta and recited Panchâkshara with great emotion and performed all Vedic sacrifices in honour of God, Shiva. Thus during the first eleven centuries of the Christian era there were vigorous attempts made at reconciling the Agamic and Vedic teachings and at establishing concordance between them.
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Shaivism, a pre-Vaishnava religion.

That Shaivism is earlier than Vaishnavism is evident from the fact that Shiva was the deity of the pre-Aryan people, the Dravidians, as established in a previous section; while Vishnu was not so. The Mohenjo Daro and Harappa finds definitely prove that Shaivism existed before the arrival of the Aryans in India; and the inscriptions, found at the sites and read and interpreted by father Heras, remove all doubts about the existence of Shaivism in pre-historic times. The Linga worship and the characteristic attributes of Shiva, like the three eyes, the trident, the snake, the axe, etc. etc., found in the inscriptions prove definitely that Shiva was worshipped by the Indian people before the influx of the Aryans. But no such attributes peculiar to Vishnu having been found out in the information available at present of the Dravidian religion, it is clear that Vishnu was not a pre-Aryan deity. Though the description (see page 130 above) of the Black God, Mayon, of the Dravidians resembles that of Krishna of modern Hinduism, it cannot be proved that it was Vishnu that was worshipped. Even if Mayon was really the later Krishna, he came to be identified with Vishnu as an incarnation of Vishnu only later during the times of Mahābhārata and not till then. Krishna, the son of Devaki and a pupil of Ghora Angirasa is mentioned for the first time in the Vedic literature in छाद्यवृत्रियस्मिन; but here he is merely a pupil learning from his Guru spiritual philosophy. He is not an all-wise God of Mahābhārata teaching his perplexed pupil, बड़ौड़े. Nor is he an incarnation of Vishnu in the Upanishat.
Vishnu is purely an Aryan deity. *"In the early times
of ऋग्वेद Vishnu was not a separate deity but only seen
in the capacity of the lord of unceasing activity ( vish
means to be active ). He is said to take three strides
across the universe. As the sun-god he is the god of
time, of space, and of life. He is said to measure the
universe, to determine its worlds, high and low, and to
fix their proper places. He is also said to be a god of
bliss, whose foot-prints are full of sweetness and
ceaseless joy, and whose highest step is consequently
the goal of devoted worshippers. In the early ages of
Rigweda the hymns expressing the ethical conception
of a monotheistic deity are mainly about Varuna. But
Varuna himself is the head of the Adityas, and as
Vishnu was associated with him, it is easy to see that
the conception would be transferred from the one to
the other, particularly for the reason that Vishnu was
the measurer of the world, the determiner of the time,
space and life. Apparently, the Rigwedic god, Bhaga,
the lord of bounty, who distributes the due gifts to all
living beings, also came to be identified with Vishnu
as he was Varuna, Ushas and other deities. There can
be no doubt that Vishnu's coming to be regarded as
Bhaga, whom we may regard as the germ of the god
of the Bhāgavatas, was an important link in the early
evolution of the Vishnu cult." There is one strong
reason to believe that Vishnu was not looked upon
with disfavour as Rudra was done. The latter was
admitted into the Aryan pantheon reluctantly and
almost out of necessity, as noted already on pages
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116-124 above. Rudra, Moreover, was considered an impure deity and made the worshippers impure as evidenced by the story of the शतपथब्राह्मण noted on page 157 above. Vishnu, on the contrary, was identified with the ब्रह्म, the only form of Aryan religious worship. If Vishnu were a non-Aryan deity, the Aryans could never have done the honour to Vishnu of identifying him with their sacred ब्रह्म. Vishnu, being not a very important deity of ब्रह्मेद, was intimately associated with ब्रह्म as his friend and companion; while in the classical mythology he is styled Indra's younger brother. This seems to indicate that a part of Indra's functions and character was transferred to Vishnu.

Narayan, a name of Vishnu, first belonged to ब्रह्म स्वयम् according to Manu. It was only later when Vishnu came to be worshipped as a personal god like Shiva by a section of the public that Narayan was identified with Vishnu.

During the Brahmanic period the theory of incarnation so intimately connected with Vishnu, was associated with प्रजापति. Thus it is said in शतपथब्राह्मण "Having assumed the form of a tortoise प्रजापति created offspring. According to तैलिरियब्राह्मण "प्रजापति raised the earth from the bottom in the form of a boar." But the common opinion ascribes these feats to Vishnu in his tortoise and boar forms or incarnations. Thus Muir remarks in this connection as follows:— § "Here we meet for the first time with the theory of incarnation, which in course of time passed into a generally adopted doctrine and enabled Vaisnavism to absorb

§ Muir's O. S. T. vol. V.
popular cults by declaring the objects of their worship to be avataras of Vishnu. Probably the tortoise and the boar were originally popular therio-morphic deities worshipped by the masses (including Brahmin families) and were afterwards elevated by the same Brahmins to a higher rank by assuming them to be forms of some recognized god. Traces of this process seem to be recognizable in the case of the tortoise and the boar avataras of प्रजापति. For in the तैतिःपण्डिताण, as we have seen, प्रजापति assumed the form of a boar and raised the earth. But in a passage of शतपथब्रजमण it was the boar Emusa who raised the earth and was then favoured by प्रजापति for the deed. Here we have two different attempts to connect a god worshipped under the shape of a boar with प्रजापति. Something similar occurs in the case of the tortoise avatara. For it is first said that प्रजापति took the form of a tortoise and then this tortoise is identified with कर्याण, one of the secondary creators. We observe in both cases a certain indecision; the theriomorphic god was at first hesitatingly identified by the members of the priestly class with one of their great gods. Afterwards, when the theory of the avataras was firmly established, it furnished a ready means of legitimizing popular godlings and heroes. Thus the first avatara of Vishnu and that of man-lion may be accounted for by the assumption that the idols of such shapes had been the objects of popular worship.” Thus it is clear, प्रजापति was a prominent deity during the times of Brahmanas and not Vishnu, who usurps only later the position of जन्म प्रजापति gradually, when he becomes a sectarian god. The theri-anthropic form of Vishnu, namely नरसिंह (man-lion) was still later.
All this shows that Vishnu, unlike Rudra, was not a prominent deity as an object of sectarian worship.

During the time of Upanishads, the principal ten or twelve Upanishads, Vishnu is scarcely mentioned except in कठोपनिषत, in III-9 (सोहवनः परमायति तद्विष्णूः परमं पदम्). But it is not only doubtful but improbable that this Vishnu is the later Vishnu of Vaishnavism; though शंकराचार्य interprets this as "व्यापनशीलस्य ब्रजणः परमायतनः वाहु-देवस।” It is the sun-god, that pervades the universe, that seems to have been praised here, as he is so done in ईशवास्योपनिषत 15-16 and प्रश्नोपनिषत in 1-7 and 8. While शिव is mentioned as प्रत्यंतर in केनोपनिषत, and is made the theistic परम्पर in तत्तवरोपनिषत. From the Brahmainic story of निदुरश्चार, elaborated in दक्षार, कर्णवै, it can be easily seen that Vishnu was not as prominent as Shiva or Brahma in the period of Brahmanas or Upanishads. The story may be briefly stated as follows:—In olden times there was a war between gods and demons (asuras), in which the latter were defeated and their leader Tāraka was killed. The three sons of the demon Tāraka wanted to take revenge upon the gods. They therefore, performed rigorous austerities and obtained a boon from Brahma that they should not be vanquished by anybody except the one that could destroy their three castles by means of one single arrow. They then built three strong castles, one golden in heaven, the second of silver in air, and the third of iron on the earth. They, thereafter, began to oppress and harass gods and sages, who went to Brahma and bitterly complained about them. He replied that it was impossible for any body to overcome them except Mahadeva, by whom
the universe was pervaded and who by particular austerities knew the Yoga and Sāukhya of the Ātman. Thereupon all went to Mahādeva and furnished him with all special requisites of war against the Asuras and entreated Mahādeva to destroy the three castles. To the great joy of gods Mahādeva destroyed the three castles by discharging a single arrow. The gods praised Mahadeva highly and departed. This story makes it plain that Vishnu is not given any prominence. On the other hand, Brahman is, at least formally, admitted to be superior to Mahādeva by Mahādeva himself; because the latter wanted that some body stronger than himself (मन्त्रे भगवतं द्वियम्) should be his charioteer. But in a previous part of the story Brahman himself states that he got the rank of प्रज्ञापति from Mahādeva. It is clear from this that Vishnu occupied a position of inferiority and was ranked with other gods Indra, Soma, Agni etc., and the only two supreme gods were Brahman and Mahādeva, each of whom acknowledged the superiority of the other to himself. It is only in the मैत्रायणविपरिन्यास that Vishnu comes to be made a prominent deity and raised to the status of परत्रथन. This Upanishad is already shown to be a later Upanishad, later than अश्वेक्षितम्. According to * Prof. Ranade the first four chapters of the Upanishad are earlier and the remaining later ones. But it is to be noted that it is in the later portion that Vishnu comes to be so praised and elevated.

Rāma, the Aryan adventurous prince and hero of Rāmāyana, was a human being and not a deity when he invaded South India. It was in later times only that he

* See his "Constructive survey of Upanishadic philosophy" p. 31.
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was deified as an incarnation of Vishnu. At the time, whenever it might be in the dim past, that he flourished, invaded south India, and conquered Râvana, he established and worshipped Linga (Shiva Linga) on the south sea coast, that is even to-day famous as Râmeshwara. During the times of Râma the Aryans were merely a cult of fire; while the Dravidians were the worshippers of Shiva. There is no evidence of Vishnu being so worshipped like Shiva by either non-Aryans or Aryans. If Vishnu was so worshipped it could be expected that Rama worshipped Vishnu somewhere as he did Shiva.

In connection with our statement that Râma, and for that matter also Krishna, were human beings, Lassen after a critical study of Râmâyana and Mahâbhârata† Remarks—

"It is true that in the epic poems Rama and Krishna appear as incarnations of Vishnu, but they at the same time come before us as human heroes, and these characters (the divine and the human) are so far from being inseparably blended together, that both of these heroes are for the most part exhibited in no other light than other highly gifted men acting according to human motives and taking no advantage of their divine superiority. It is only in certain sections which have been added for the purpose of enforcing their divine character that they take the character of Vishnu. It is impossible to read either of these poems with attention, without being reminded of the later interpolations of these actions, and of the unskilful m"anner in which these passages are often introduced, and

† Muir. S: T Vol. IV-166-182. Pages 441-491 may also be consulted.
without observing how loosely they are connected with the rest of the narrative, and how unnecessary they are for its progress."

So also on the authority of various stories of महाभारत अजृत, the Pândava prince, and श्रीकुल्क worshipped Shiva for various boons. Thus Shaivism, was prevalent before Râmâyana and Mahâbhârata events took place. But such is not the case with Vaishnavism. In short there is no evidence of Vishnu being a sectarian god of Vaishnavas before the later portion of वैष्णव उपनिषद्. And it seems that Vaishnavism assumed definite shape as a sectarian religion during the latest period of महाभारत.

The following remarks about the comparative position of Shaivism and Vaishnavism during the epic period will be interesting and valuable, "Lassen remarks that in the epic poems, the worship of Vishnu is but seldom mentioned; a fact which he regards as proving that at the period when they were composed no special worship of that deity had been extensively spread, at least among the Brahmins and princes....The mere fact that a poem in which Krishna plays throughout so prominent a part, and which in its existing form is so largely devoted to his glorification, should at the same time contain so many passages which formally extol the greatness, and still more, which incidentally refer to a frequent adoration of the rival deity, by different personages, whether contemporary or of earlier, date, who are introduced—This fact is I think, a proof that the worship of the latter (Mahâdeva) was widely diffused, if indeed it was not the predominant worship in India, at the period to which the action of the poem is referred" (Muir. S. T. IV–283). So also, Prof. Barth
in his "Religions of India" (pp. 163, 167) says "We have already seen that the Veda does not lead us to anticipate the supremacy of Vishnu. Neither does it appear to us to be very ancient in the Mahabharata, which in general is connected with Vishnu, only in so far as it is with Krishna. Hence the most widely spread cultus is in the main that of Shiva... In the Mahabharata, which however, in its existing redaction, is concerned in the interest of Vishnavism, the cultus which we find most widely spread is that of Shiva."

Dr. Sir Bhandarkar of world fame as a scholar twice remarks casually in his "*Vaishnavism and Shaivism*" without the intention of proving the priority of Shaivism to Vaishnavism, as follows:—The श्रेष्ठत्वान्तरोपनिष्ठ, therefore, stands at the door of Bhakti School, and pours its devotion on Rudra-Shiva instead of on Vâsudeva Krishna, as the भगवद्गृहत्ता did in later times when the Bhakti doctrine was in full swing. Vâsudeva Krishna had an historical basis; and the circumstances which led to his being invested with the supreme godhead, occurred in later times; while in the age, in which the श्रेष्ठत्वान्तरोपनिष्ठ was composed, Rudra-Shiva was alone in the field as the supreme god, and the germs of Bhakti or love, which manifested themselves at the time, were directed towards him; but when Vâsudeva Krishna also came into the field, he appealed more to the hearts of men as the god that had come to dwell among them; consequently the germs of Bhakti speedily developed, and hence he became the object of the heightened feeling in preference to the other." "From all that we have brought forward from the post-Sanhitâ literature, it will

* See pages 157 and 164 of the book,
appear that Rudra-Shiva was a deity whose worship was common to all Aryas, and who was not at first a sectarian god. As above remarked, he was in charge of the field before the Vaishnava or Vâsudevic deities came in to contest his supremacy."

(VII) Rise of the Agamas, their development and contents.

Now we come to the Agamas, the Shivagamas, that form of the scripture of Shaivism. The Agamas are of three kinds, the Shivâgamas, the Shâktâgamas, and the Vaishnavâgamas according as they treat of the deity सिं, शाक्ति, or विष्णु as the object of worship (श्रीदेवता or आराध्य-देवता) and as the cosmic principle and of the religious practices belonging to the particular school. The Agamas are also called Tantras and there is practically no § difference

§ In fact Shâkta literature is in parts unintelligible to one unacquainted with some features of what is called Shaiva Darshana. How otherwise, is it that the 36 धात्वस and Shadadhwas are common to both? (Shakti and Shâkta p. 21). So also ”the Shaiva Schools are so intimately allied to the Shâkta schools that the literature and doctrines of the one are quoted as authoritative by the other.” (The outlines of Indian Philosophy by P. T. S. Iyanger, page 147). Similarly मायवाचार्य uses तंत्र for श्रायम when he says ”तदुक्ति तंत्रतद्यः।” (see शैवदर्शन in his शैवदर्शन-संग्रह). The Agamas are more familiarly known as Tantras (Outlines of Indian Philosophy by P. T. S. Iyanger page 130). Please also see C. V. Narayanan’s ”Origin and early history of Shaivism in South India” page, 380 about the synonymity of तंत्र and श्रायम,
between the two names, especially between the Agamas of the Shaiva and Shâkta schools, as both of them are believed to have been delivered by Shiva to his consort Pârvati. But generally the शिवागमस are called Agamas (कालिकागम, सूक्ष्मागम etc.) and शाक्तागमस are called तंत्रास (कालितंत्र, शक्तिवंतंत्र, महात्मिकातंत्र, and so forth). The शिवागमस are twenty eight in number as mentioned in the last section of the text. Besides the twenty-eight principal Shivagamas there are very many उपागमस or secondary Agamas, enumerated in various Shaiva works like the शिवतत्त्वानाकर, an encyclopaedic Sanskrit work of Keladi Basawaraja, the बिक्रियात्माणि, a Kanarese encyclopaedic work of Nijaguna shivayogi. They are also mentioned by the late Mr. Nallaswami Pillai, a great scholar of Shaiva Siddhanta, in his introduction to शिवानसिद्धियर. Readers will not be interested in the names of उपागमस. Hence such of the readers as may like to know them will do well to refer to the books mentioned containing the enumeration of उपागमस. The उपागमस are connected with or belonging to सुक्ष्मागमस. Some उपागमस are said to belong to a particular सुक्ष्मागम. Thus कालिकागम has three उपागमस belonging to it, namely उत्तर, भैरभैर, and नारसिंह. शोभागम has five उपागमस, विनायिकरंत्र, तारक, बृहद, शारि, and भास्मयोग. The उपागमस continue the topic of the सुक्ष्मागमस and purport to explain the subject matter of the सुक्ष्मागमस.

In connection with the Agamas three important questions arise (1) the age of the Agamas (2) the origin and source of the Agamas (3) and the contents of the Agamas. We shall try to answer these in order as far as we can.

(A) As regards the first question, the age of the Agamas can well be determined from the references made.
to them in various works. Going back from latest to the earliest references we find that:

(1) Appaya Dixit of 16th century A.D. refers to the शिवागमास in his commentary on शिवतत्वविवेकः a work written by himself. Therein he maintains that the शिवागमास are as authoritative as the Vedas and says that it is only the ignorant that think otherwise (see शिवतत्वविवेक verse no. 47). He also maintains this attitude in his शिवाङ्गमासविवेका, an extensive commentary on श्रीकेतुमाध्या (vide his commentary on the सूत्र "पितुरसांमजस्वात्").

(2) The great शायणाचार्य of the 14th century A.D. refers to the Agamas in his जैसन्यायामालाविस्तार. While extolling उक्त or इतिहास, the first emperor of the Vijayanagar Empire, he says—यस्माद्यं भूतं: वेदीच्छवं परं ब्रह्म यस्माचार्यगीतां महेश्वरस्य निर्विवेकः: यस्माच आद्वियाचार्यस्युः: तदात्मनि सांविशाय प्रकारस्ते तस्मात्वर्गे-शस्त्रकर्म राज्याः: etc. etc. The same शायणाचार्य, while commenting on तुविशिष्टा quotes profusely from the शिवागमास in support of his commentary.

(3) आनंदगिरि refers to the Agamas during the आचार्य's discussion with the advocates of different sects (see chaps. 7, 8, 9 of शंकरविजय).

(4) भारवि, the author of किराताङ्गार्य, one of the पंचमहाकाल्यास, refers to the Agamas twice in stanzas 18 and 22 of the 5th गुरु.

In view of the fact he extolls the story of शिव in the book he must have in his mind the शिवागमास. The poet भारवि flourshed in the 7th century A.D.
(5) कुछक्रमेण refers to the Agamas in his commentary on the 10th stanza of मतस्यति, chap. I. in words इदानीमागम-प्रविष्टम्। आयणश्रुतिनिर्वचनं तदेवाय इदंति। He obviously refers here to the ईणावागमाः.

(6) अपरिवर्ध, the commentator of याज्ञवल्क्यस्यति, discusses the authoritativeness of the Agamas, Shaiva as well as Vaishnava, in his commentary on the 7th verse of chap. I of the स्यति.

(7) द्वारित, the writer of a स्यति or धर्मसाल्ब says:—अयातः

वर्गम् व्याक्यास्यामः। श्रुतिप्रमाणं वर्गम्।। श्रुतिः द्विविषय वैदिकी तांत्रिकी च।

This shows that during the times of द्वारित the Agamas were placed on par with the Vedas in point of authority. द्वारित has been mentioned by याज्ञवल्क्य in verse IV of chap. I. द्वारित seems to have flourished about the beginning of the Christian-era.

(8) Kalidas, the Shakespeare of India, refers to the Agamas in verse no. 26 of the 10th canto of रूद्वम्—

* वहुचाप्यागमः सिंहः। पंथाः। विनिपोऽः।।

वस्यंेन निपः। योः। जानहस्य्या इत्यादे।।

Kalidas was a Kashmere Shaiva of the 1st century B.C. He also expresses tersely but most beautifully the शाक्तिविशिष्ट्यां in the invocatory stanza of रूद्वम्—

वाचर्याविव तंतुका वागमयतित्वं।।

जयतः वित्सौ वेदेपा पश्चात्तपयेभुरो।।

* महिनाथ interprets आगम here as आगमः। नयेसंहस्यादिभिर्विश्वेनः।

He explains आगम occurring in the verses of किरातालकर्मिनयु as पुराण in his commentary on the verse no. 18 and as शाख्र in commentary on the verse no. 22. He, thus, interprets the word आगम in any way without any clear idea about the Agamas. He, is therefore, obviously wrong.
This means that सशक्तिविशिष्ट or Kashmere monistic विवाह्यत was a well established doctrine in the times of Kalidas.

(9) Various Puranas mention the Agamas.
(a) Thus it is said in स्कंदपुराण, केदारशंद, अवधाय VII,

धर्मं: पापुपतं: अभ्यं: स्कंदेन प्रतिपादित: ||
झुद्रा पंचाश्री विवा प्रशावी तदन्तंतरम् ||
षष्टीदी तथा विवा प्रशाववं च दीपिका ||
स्कंदात्ततद्भुवासमग्रं येन महाथम ||
पथादाचार्यभेदेन आगमां वर्णोः नवन् ||

(b) In सूत् विहीण references are constantly made to शाविगम. Thus it is said in विभवशालानिधिकंकेंद्र—

अय्यदभुवासानां कर्त्ता सखवाति दुः ||
कामिकादिश्रेष्ठानां यथा देवां मद्भवः ||

(c) In श्रीगंगाना Chap. IX it is said—

शिवागमेव पाण्डैतं वनाशे परदेशरः ||

(d) In शिवपुराण, कादेशिनां, Cha. 9 stanza 39, it is said

श्रीकंडेन शिवव्योक्ता शिवाये च शिवागमाः ||
शिवालितानां कारणात् श्रीयस्माभिकारणम् ||

(e) In कुम्भपुराण reference is made to the fact that Shri Krishna was taught the पाष्पुपात or Agamic philosophy by Upamanyu. It is said—

एवमुल्लवा ददौ झानसुपस्युर्महासुनि: ||
ब्रः पाषपतेऽयं झण्डायाविकिष्ठकपशे ||
संते सुहिन्येषेण व्याहतो मयुसुधनः ||
तकैव तपसा देवां रुद्राराध्यार्थसु ||

(10) महाभारत in chap. 349 of शालिपर्व (Chitrashala Press, Poona) refers to the आगमां indirectly in verses—

उद्यात्मनमुदतिः श्रीकंठो श्रद्धा: कलूः ||
उद्यात्मनिदुर्ममयो झां: पाषपतेश्वर: ||
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Thus based on the Agamas had by now become established religious sects. The first verse quoted above proves that the Agamas taught by Shiva had been prevalent during the times of Mahabharat so as to be authoritative religious scripture of Shaivism.

So also in chap. 202 the worship of Linga (स्वरूप) is mentioned. Similarly in chap. 241 of the worship of Linga is mentioned. All this shows that Agamic of Linga was well known and the Agamas had become authoritative religious scriptures. In chap. 268 of Shantiparva the Agamas are directly referred to in—

(12) In Agamic literature is referred to twice. There the Vedas are considered the only authoritative scriptures of religion; and the claim of other literature as being equal to the Vedas is strongly condemned and people are advised against accepting such a claim and directed not to read them. It is said—अथ वे चान्ये ह द्रुष्या कषाचकुवङ्गिन: कावाचिन:। अथ वे चान्ये ह द्रुष्यांकुथः कुषास्मातेः न वधानतापि। तस्य सर्ववेद समसंस्कारमेव स्वयमविश्वस्यतः।

[Para 15] In the Shastras the Agamas are considered the only authoritative scriptures of religion; and the claim of other literature as being equal to the Vedas is strongly condemned and people are advised against accepting such a claim and directed not to read them. It is said—अथ वे चान्ये ह द्रुष्या कषाचकुवङ्गिन: कावाचिन:। अथ वे चान्ये ह द्रुष्यांकुथः कुषास्मातेः न वधानतापि।

[Para 17] In the Shastras the Agamas are considered the only authoritative scriptures of religion; and the claim of other literature as being equal to the Vedas is strongly condemned and people are advised against accepting such a claim and directed not to read them. It is said—अथ वे चान्ये ह द्रुष्या कषाचकुवङ्गिन: कावाचिन:। अथ वे चान्ये ह द्रुष्यांकुथः कुषास्मातेः न वधानतापि।
Here it is likely that the condemnation may be mistaken as that of the चार्मकास from the words "नैदार्थय" and "उद्धवस्ति" occurring therein, the latter being the traditional founder of the चार्मकम. But there are other words that show that the चार्मक system is not referred to here, namely, वैदिकेषु परिश्वानविभिष्ठिनि. For the चार्मकास always condemned the Vedas unspARINGly and never sought to be वैदिक. Moreover the words that follow show that it is not the चार्मकास that are referred to here. The words are देवाधुर है य आल्मकामा अवदानितिक प्रायतास्थलमे नामस्कृत्योऽः। समग्रन्वयात्मकानो बै तेकुरा अवदानतमेतात्मवस्तुः। तत्त्वम सूच उपजीवन्मित्योऽः प्रत्यायितात:। अवदानितिक: सत्समाध्यार्थः प्रयत्निं इदिवावम्। इत्यथा यदेवेण्यमितिः तत्सन्ति। यदेवेणुपुरे तत्त्वम उपजीवितः। तत्सांहार्थाणि नाबादिकभीतात्मयमः। श्राद्धिति। Here श्राद्ध is said to be the deliverer of the non-Vedic literature. But श्राद्ध is never the teacher of the चार्मक system. It, therefore, only means that the आगमाः are referred to here that claimed to be equal to the Vedas in authority. Moreover the Upanishad upholds elsewhere the वैदिकम्बर्णम and condemns those that discarded it. It says—अर्थाव चार्मक चार्मक रूपितार्थः पूर्वात्मकानो यद्वेण्यपादितम: स्वयमेवावलुप्तम्। स्वाध्येश्वेवावलुप्तम् स्वयमेवावलुप्तम् वा एततः तस्तत्साधिकारणाणि। अनेनोऽस्माते भवान्वयान्यवाहाः। साधिकस्य स्वयमेवः। भिन्नता यो वेदेषु न स्वयमातिकभीतात्मयम् श्राद्धितस्व। आत्ममेतानन्दस्यतत्सन्ति। वेदवैद्योत्तरुपिणात। इत्यतद्वस्तुः। नात्प्रसन्यस्य साधिकत्वात्मकम् कर्मसमिद्रेणेते। Certainly here it is the शास्त्रियs that are referred to as they supplanted the Vedic वैदिकम्बर्णम and admitted the श्राद्धs within their fold. Thus says सुखमानामः—

शिवसंस्कारंश्चपञ्चो हयं श्राद्धं हयं द्रिजः।
शिवपेशः कृतादेन शैर्यम् नरकं ब्रजेद॥
गर्दृश्यस्य हृद्यते हितस्य ब्रह्मस्य तु।
शिवसंस्कारंश्चपञ्चो जानिष्ठेऽन बिबद्यते॥
Now about नैरालम्य which means the doctrine of denying the existence of अत्मन (individual or Supreme). The Shaivas, unlike the चार्वकas, admit the existence of soul (of both kinds). How can the term नैरालम्य be explained, if the passage is taken to refer to the Agamic scriptures? This is no difficulty and can be easily explained away thus. The Agamas treat of a personal Godhead as opposed to the Impersonal अत्मन or the Agamic doctrine of a personal God is condemned by the Upanishad, as being equal to the denial of the Absolute. Moreover the mention made of the Shaivaite sects like कागालिनि etc. makes it sure that the literature referred to is the literature of such sects. In short in the times of the Upanishad the Agamic literature had attained importance so as to vie with the Vedas. To attain that status the Agamas must have taken a time long enough.

(13) The श्रेणाश्लोपासिद्धि is certainly an Agamic Upanishad later followed by other Agamic Upanishads like अथवेक्षिस्य and कैत्तव. It sets forth the Agamic doctrine of theology and philosophy. The technical terms contained by the Upanishad are unintelligible except in the light of what the Agamas teach. Thus the Upanishad teaches, unlike other Upanishads, what the Agamas teach. It is, therefore, an ill-assorted company if placed with other Upanishads, as it teaches doctrines fundamentally different from those of the rest of the other principal Upanishads. It establishes the personal Godhead unlike the Absolute of other Upanishads. It teaches the path of devotion; while other Upanishads expatiate on the path of knowledge. The theistic परब्रह्म
of this Upanishad is said to possess शक्ति or the wonderful inscrutable power, by means of which the Lord works the wonders of projecting, protecting, and reabsorbing the Universe. This is षात्तिविविषयादेन or विवादेर as may be seen in—

परास्य शक्तिविविषया च ध्ययेत्।
स्वाभाविक्ष ज्ञानवलिक्ष्यम् च॥

The Upanishad, unlike others, mentions many, if not all, of the thirty six तत्त्वाः taught by the Agamas, namely, शिव, शाक्ति, इश्वर, विष्णु, माया, राग, काल, नियान्त्रि, प्रकृति, पुरुष and so forth. This Upanishad contains the principal doctrinal terms of the पश्चात्त्व रेहिन, namely पात्र(VI-7), पात्र (V-I3), पात्र (implied by अनाश्च, अर्घ्यत, अस्म) These three form the very soul of the Shaiva religion, so much so that Kashmir Shaivism is named the शिव system on account of these three being the very basis of the religion. The Upanishad, unlike others, gives the rudiments of Yogic practices that lead to the at-one-ment of the individual soul with the Supreme soul. And the Yoga system forms one of the four divisions of the Agamic teachings. The Upanishad lays stress on the प्रभाव or grace of the Lord as the gateway to मोक्ष or liberation opened by the Lord to the individual soul bound by fetters or प्रभावकंडस as in "छृष्ठतत्त्वस्तत्त्वत्वम् तिमाव और देशः ग्याराश्च।" The Agamas emphasize the doctrine of प्रभाव. Thus in all respects it teaches in a compendious form all that the Agamas teach. The fundamental unity of thought of this Upanishad with that of the Agamas forces the conclusion that the Upanishad owes its origin to the Agamas in whatever from they must have been at the time the Upanishad came to be composed.
The Bhagawadgita itself seems to have written under the influence of the Agamas. The Gita like the श्रेष्ठस्त्रोतेनिष्ट, is in complete accord with the Agamas but opposed to the Vedas and the Upanishads. In the first place the Gita borrows three lines from the श्रेष्ठस्त्रोतेनिष्ट, the thirteenth verse and the first line of the fourteenth verse of the 13th अथवा. And it has been already shown above that the Upanishad is an Agamic one. Secondly very many Agamic passages of the Gita differ but little from various Agamic passages. Thus the following parallel verses may be noted:—

**Bhagwatgita.**

Chap. II, Stanza 20

न जायते स्रियते वा कदाचित्तायं भूत्रा मात्रिता वा न भूपः †
अन्यो निःश: शास्त्रेत्रः पुराणो न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे †

Chap. II, Stanza 39

दुःखेऽ यथो यथा पार्थ कर्मसंयं प्रस्तुति †

**Parameshwaragama**

**Patala XXI S6**

न जायते न स्रियते वा कदाचित्तायं न मृत्रू मात्रिता वा न भूपः †
अन्यो हि निःश: शास्त्रेत्रः पुराणो न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे †

**Patala 1 stanza 56**

मम प्रसाददशोग्यः कर्मसंयं प्रस्तुति †
Bhagwatgita.

Chap. II Stanza 62, 63
ध्यायो विषयन्वपुर: सहस्रेष्ठपञ्चायते ||
सङ्क्षिप्तसंज्ञायं काम: कामाक्षोभिमित्यते ||
कृष्णाध्वरति संमोहं: संमोहालम्भन्तिवचनम: ||
स्मृतिभण्डाशुद्धिनाशो विद्यनाशात्मकपश्चि ||

Chap. IV Stanza 35
यज्ञालों न पुनमोहेय वास्याः पाप्दव ||
येन मृत्युश्चेष्यं इश्वात्मन्ययो मधव ||

Chap. V Stanza 22
शक्तीस्वरूपमो: सांडुः प्राकृत: शरीरविकाळ्यते ||
कामकोक्षोड्रवं वेंग स युक्तं: स सुखी नारः ||

Chap. VI Stanza 11
शुचि देशे प्रतिद्वाप्य स्थिराध्वनमलम: ||
नात्युभिः नातिनीचे चेवाजिनकुशोधरम ||

Chap. VI Stanza 29
सर्वभुवर्द्धमात्रां सर्वभुमतत्वान्व चालानि ||
ईश्वते येवायुक्ता सर्वेन समदर्शेन: ||

Parameshwaragama

Patala VI Stanza 51, 52, 53
न यस्य निरंतर बुद्धि: स ध्यायिष्यान्त्वद: ||
ध्यायो विषयन्वपुर: सहस्रेष्ठपञ्चायते ||
सङ्क्षिप्तसंज्ञायं काम: कामाक्षोभिमित्यते ||
कृष्णाध्वरति संमोहं: संमोहालम्भन्तिवचनम: ||
स्मृतिभण्डाशुद्धिनाशो विद्यनाशात्मकपश्चि ||

Patala VI Stanza 59
तेन शीघ्रं गिरिभुंते सम्यक्रणंति ततो मंवत ||
येन मृत्युश्चेष्यं इश्वात्मन्ययो मधव ||

Patala IX Stanza 55
शक्तीस्वरूपमो: सांडुः प्राकृत: शरीरविकाळ्यते ||
कामकोक्षोड्रवं योंग स यति लघु मभं श्वेते ||

Patala X Stanza 20
शुचि देशे प्रतिद्वाप्य स्थिराध्वनमलम: ||
नात्युभिः नातिनीचे चेवाजिनकुशोधरम ||

Patala VII Stanza 102
जगदभानि संपायतामां जगलक्षणू ||
जगदभानमीक्षणि पश्येन्मयि विद्यात्मकम् ||
Chap. VI Stanza 13
समं कायशीरोण्यं धारयनचलं सिरं नस्तिकां च दिश्यनवलोकयनु ||

Chap. VI Stanza 37
त्यजि: श्रद्धयोपेतो योगालित्तमानसः ||
अपास्य योगसमिद्धी चां गति कृष्ण गच्छति ||

Chap. VI Stanza 42
अक्षिरा योगिनामेव कुले भवति धीमताम् ||
एतादि दुर्लभतरं लोके जनम यदीत्त्वाम् ||

Chap. VI Stanza 44, 55
पुर्व्म्यासेन तेनेव हियते द्विकोशोंपि स: ||
अनेकजनमसंसिद्धस्ती याति परं गतिम ||

Chap. XIII Stanza 9
असानिरधिग्रुङ्ग: वुन्दार्याहादिद्व ||
निलं च समविचित्तविश्वाशंवर्षापतियु ||

Chap. XVI Stanza 23, 24
यः शाश्वशिष्यमुसृज्य बरते कामकारत: ||
न स सिद्धिमानवाति न सुखं न परं गतिम् ||

Patala X Stanza 22, 23
पारिवाणिद्वयो मूला नास्ति गतलोचनः ||
आतिक्रमणनावसन्यो तथा दैवो निवातकः ||
समं कायशीरोण्यं धारयनचलं सिरं नस्तिकां च दिश्यनवलोकयनु ||

Patala VIII Stanza 4
मतस्या मताशा यक्त्य वैस्त्रयसिद्धिरं ||
पुनरायग्य विषयाम् कां गति सिबं गच्छति ||

Patala VIII Stanza 84
एतादि दुर्लभतरं लोके जनम यदीत्त्वाम् ||
तत्तं ते वुद्रिसिद्धों कमतेड्योप्यदेहिवः ||

Patala VIII Stanza 83, 87
पुर्व्म्यासेन तेनेव हियते द्विकोशोंपि स: ||
अनेकजनमसंसिद्धस्ती याति परं गतिम ||

Patala QXII 98
असानिरधिग्रुङ्ग: वुन्दार्याहादिद्व ||
सुखदुःखायमरात्सस्ता परशवं च द्वियापि ||

Patala Stanza 104, 105
यः शाश्वशिष्यमुसृज्य बरते कामकारत: ||
न स सिद्धिमानवाति न सुखं न परं गतिम् ||
Bhagwagita.

तस्माद्याद्यां प्रमाणं ते कार्यार्च्यवाच्यते।
झल्ला शास्त्रविधानानं कर्म कर्त्तव्याशिः॥

Chap. XVIII Stanza 66.
सर्वधर्मरीत्यज्य मामेकं शरणं ग्रनं॥

Chap. II, Stanza 45
कर्मार्च्यवाच्यकार्यं यो भवते वेदान्तः प्रवाहितः॥

Chap. II, Stanza 47
कर्मार्च्यवाच्यकार्यं मा प्रवेध्यु कदाचनाम।
मा कर्मकृत्यसम्यकं ते सद्गौंतकमे॥

Chap. II, Stanza 59
विचारं विनिवर्त्तते निराधारः देहस्वः।
रक्षने सर्वोपन्यासं परं द्रुतं निवध्यते॥

Chap. III, Stanza 17
यद्वारं निरुपाध्य स्यादात्मतुष्टं माननं।
आत्मन्येव च संतुष्टस्य कार्यं न विद्यते॥

Parameshwaragama

तस्माद्याद्यां प्रमाणं दि कार्यार्च्यवाच्यते।
झल्ला शास्त्रविधानानं कर्म कर्त्तव्यवाहते॥

Patala X Stanza 83
सर्वधर्मरित्यज्य हैंं प्रवाहितं नाधीन॥

Sukshmagama

Patala VI 25
विश्वविधानान्त्यक्ष्ठि निर्धं च निरस्यः॥

Patala VI 44
कर्म वा कर्म शक्तिमते महत्त्वं।
निवध्येयर्ष्यं च विच्छेदं संपर्यम् निराधारः॥

Devi Kalottaragama Gnanacharà
Patala Stanza 52
अशानेर्या वायुर्युं पर्यायं ज्ञानक्षुणा।
तदा महति श्रीताम मन्तू विगतप्रभु॥

Patala VI 43
शीवानामृतं प्रेमं महक्यं परक्षिः मूलं।
अंतर्भविपीपितस्य कर्मणं तस्य द्वितिः॥
Bhagwagita

Chap. IV, Stanza 27

प्रकटे: किष्णास्वादे गुणे: कर्मांनि सम्बन्ध: ||
अहंकारविमृद्धाम् कर्तारहितमि मुक्ते: ||

Chap. IV, Stanza 1, 2, 3

इम्ब विशेषे योगं प्रौद्योगिनमहामयम् ||
विशेषानन्देः प्राहं मनुरित्वाकृतेऽवशीतू ||
एवं परंपराप्राप्तामृत राजस्यं वितुः: ||
स कल्लौद्ध महात्म योगं न२: वर्तव ||
स एवायं मयं तेजस्य योगं प्रौद्य: पुरातन: ||

Chap. IV, Stanza 7

वदा यदा हि धर्मस्य ग्राहिनेश्वति मारत ||
अम्बुयान्मयभूमि तदविश्वस्य सृजामयहम् ||

Parameshwaragama,

Patala XXI 9

परिस्थित्याय महतानेवकारं स शिवो महेन ||
बुधिंगम्ध्यः यथं न स मुक्तोऽन संस्कार: ||

Patala XXI 14

एवंकर्ष पुरा देवि प्रलये सति सम्मे: ||
वहतमहाय प्रत्यस्य कृष्णोऽद्यभसा मार्गमुक्ते ||

Patala XXI 16

उपदिस्ति मया तस्मि ज्ञानं योगं स्वाप्न: ||
तदेतदेव वक्ष्यामि शृणु दामना: शिवे ||

Patala XII 39

शिवभक्ति हितार्थं मनुष्यं मात्राश्रितं: ||
वन्दलोकपरिश्रायते खः नात्र संशय: ||
Besides these closely resembling and almost identical passages there are others that differ in wording but contain the same sense, as in the following:

Chap. IV, Stanza II

ये वा सङ्ग प्रकटते तांत्रिकम व मनाममहम्

सम वर्णनानुत्तरे मनुष्ये: पार्थ सबेशः।


चातुर्वर्ण्यं मया सद्भ गुणकर्मविविभागः।

Chap. V, Stanza 18.

विद्याविविधतामुने सहायके व यािहितानि।

शुभी वेष सुपकैं च पंडिताः समदर्शिन्।

Chap. V, Stanza 19.

च्छातुर्वर्ण्यं मया सद्भ गुणकर्मविविभागः।

Kamikagama Shivarchana Patala

चेन चेन वि मात्रेन साधक: संस्मर्तयः।

तत्त्व तन्मयतां याति चितामशिकितविक्षरः।

Parameswaragama, Patala VII 91

विष्णुमेवन मर्यादा मेदा वातानेश्वरः।

कथिता हि मथा मेदा ज्ञातें हि कारणम्।

Patala IX 93 24

न मंत्र न वितान मात्रां न चांदालों न सूयु:।

न गौरीं ज्ञानको हल्ली गर्दीं वापि मेततः।

नोञ्च्च मध्यम मीरां न तृणथित मंगम।

झालझालायुक्तपत्र सममविविभिन्न शिवे।

Patala VIII 8

ईश्वरणनाच्छे झालझालायुक्तपत्र:।

द्वाप्रेयस्यसंपत्त: बीराश्च शिवयागिनः।
Chap. VI, Stanza 10
योगी युज्नित सन्तमानं रहस्य स्थितः॥

Chap. VI, Stanza 17
युज्नात्विविहारस्य युज्नेध्रस्य कर्मसु।
युज्नस्थानाबोधस्य योगी मंत्रितु तुःखः॥

Chap. VII,
मनुष्याणां सहलेषु कवित्वतः सिद्धवे।
यतस्मापि सिद्धानां काठिन्म्यां केदित तत्तत्:॥३॥
श्रिबहुसुप्रभुव्यभिरैभि सर्वभिमें जगत्।
-मोहितं नामिनामानि मामेषः परमव्ययम्॥१३॥
दैवी एवरा गुणमधी मम माया दुर्निधिः।
मामेव न ये प्रप्यते मायामेव तरणि ते॥१४॥

Chap. VII Stanza 15
न मां दुःखतिनो मूढः: प्रप्यन्ते नराचामः।
मायापहत्तथाना आसुरं मायामात्रता:॥

Chap. VII Stanza 17
प्रियो हि ज्ञानिनेवयथमेव सँच सम प्रिय:॥

Patala X 19
विविद्विरास्माहिष्य ध्यानेत्र खदामप्रेरित॥

युज्नात्विविहारस्य युज्नेध्रस्य कर्मसु।
युज्नात्विविहारस्य सर्वशास्त्रविविहित:॥

Sukshmagama Patala VI 38
निष्कामकर्मकार्यणां श्रीसमार्थानुसारः।
बद्धनां नमननमस्ते झाने ध्याने मवेनमति:॥

S. Patala X 26
कर्तारोपेक्ष जगतो त्यारि मायापुरात्तवः नहि जाने नाना:॥

S. Patala III 100
महती खलु सा माया दुःखरा त्रिगुणात्मिका।

Parameshwaraagama, Patala I, 13
(शिवज्ञान) कर्म भविष्यति हिंवे हिंवे मस्तकरणां नृणाम्।
कर्मपूर्वविन्दनाम मन्मायामोहितात्मनाम्॥

Patala VI, 75
यस्य (शानिन:) प्रियोहमीश्चानि समसामाहित: यत:॥
Chap. VII Stanza 19

बहुनां वन्ननामात्ते ज्ञानव्याप्त प्रपहाते ||

Chap. VIII Stanza 67

यं यं यापि समन्तां ध्यातन्ते काठेवरम् ||

Chap. IX 26 27

पत्रं पुष्यं परं तोरं यो में मत्या प्रभाषितं ||

वक्रोष्णि यद्भ्राष्टि यजुर्वैयि ददायितं यत् ||

वत्पस्याघि कौन्तेयं तक्षुरुचं मदर्पणम् ||

Patala I, Stanza 88

गतेषु बहुद्येववुष्ठु वेष्येवुष्ठु जन्मितु ||

मनःवर्गान्ति तद्नाति जापन्ति हितोदर्शनं ||

अनेकजन्मानां माथि सत्त्वे ग्रंजेतु ||

Devi Kalottaragama, Patala 24, 25, 26

यददालेक्ययो जन्तुः कुर्वेति कर्मसश्चयम् ||

तद्भविष्यान्ते यश्मान्ति वालेकं चिन्नत्ते ||

सर्वक्षेत्रं परिणितं महादृढः प्रविचन्तते ||

यों गयं साध्यं व्यक्तवा निप्रशवो विविश्वत्ते ||

Parameswaragama, Patala XXII, 12, 17

पत्रं पुष्यं परं वालं प्राग्यं वा दुर्भोगवितम् ||

समार्पितं समार्थं भक्तं सम महत्वयः ||

शुद्धविनं शीतलं सक्षी क्ष्रयति पयं बहु ||

चुल्लकं वा यथा शायति तद्कल्यं मदर्पणम् ||

Sukshmagama Patala VII, 55

चार्चितं विना देवीं यो नु भुतकें श्व नारके ||

मक्ष्यं मोहार्दिवस्तुवि यो भुतकें चर्चविति ||

सुभकें महमासम् etc.
Parameshwaragama, Patala XXII, 38,39
सुकपीतादिकं सर्वं मध्यसादिविश्वुः॥
सर्वाभिनिद्राकं वृद्धि मसेवाधि नियोजयेत् ।
संप्रदासालिनं मोगं मदर्भितं चार्येत् ॥

Paremeshwaragama, Patala XXII, 9
अतिप्राणिविविद्धं वाहतिपालककारिणम् ॥
अतिनिविदकारणं मम भक्ति पुनाति हि ॥

Patala 11, Stanza 11
नेव चानाति मदर्भष हस्तिहमहण्यः ॥
गजाननोपि स्फन्दोपि तिना मद्धाकयुतमयम् ॥

Patala XXII 38 39
सुकपीतादिकं सर्वं मध्यसादिविश्वुः॥
सर्वाभिनिद्राकं वृद्धि मसेवाधि नियोजयेत् ।
संप्रदासालिनं मोगं मदर्भितं चार्येत् ॥

Patala XX
नोद्विजेतु जनान्व छिछैः जनं चोदेजयेत् ।
हर्षमर्मयोद्वेदगिरुमुक्तं समदक्षुचि: ॥ १२॥
अनेकन्त्र: शृविद्धे उदासीनो गतवथः ।
सुभाषितमण्डलगी यो मद्रुक: स मे प्रियः ॥ १६॥
यो न हृष्टिन न द्रेष्टि न शोचति न कालति ।
श्रुभाषितमण्डलगी भक्तिमान: स मे प्रियः ॥ १७॥

Chap. XVIII

सर्वकर्मण्यापि सदा कुर्माणो मद्यपाण्यः ॥ १६॥
चेतस्य सर्वकर्मणास्य मधी संयोग्य मत्वः ।
बुद्धियोगमुक्तिस्म भविष्यत: संततं मद्य ॥ १७॥

नैतितिकाः च नै कार्यं न कर्मादिकथापि या ।
न प्रायश्चित्तमेवतः तु महाश्रवस्त्र विष्णुः ॥ १८॥
न वै हर्षविषाणामः मायालयं च विकारत ।
नाथं नष्टे तु शोचति न कामे हर्षांतरेत ॥ १६॥

Sukshmagama, Patala, 44

कृतवा वा कर्म सकलमनेते महाफलमुः ।
निवेशशेषत्थैर्चित्त संपतत्तम निराकुः ॥
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It may be argued against this that the Agamas themselves must have borrowed from the गीता and not the vice versa. But this contention cannot stand; for श्रीकृष्ण, the author of the गीता, was himself a devotee of Shiva, as is positively known from महाभारत and other Puranas. He is also said to have learnt spiritual philosophy from Shiva. Thus:—

(a) Appaya Dixit summarizes in his भारतात्मकी महाकवि Krishna’s devotion to and worship of Shiva in the following:—

क्रीष्णासंवधः कुर्वा: संवं ब्रह्मचिलो गुरुमेंगवानु व्यासः श्रीकृष्णमाहात्म्यवर्णनादाः।
शिरणे प्रवर्तिति षष्य्यमः परं ततं दर्शायमाणः।
स्त्री कुर्वा तस्य श्रीकृष्णस्मापः नियमाद्विं निःसृं पृजितं तेनापि कृष्णेन कृष्णा कुपार्ज्जपेने
प्रकारीरहृदीतैः: पूर्वपूर्वेऽः: प्रतापसुद्देवात्मकमुक्तेपे च सतापूर्वमामामिति यथूप
परं मूलं स्वित्रामाकर्षिणयं पुनःपुनः: कथयनु सतं प्रायः संवेद्नापि हि महाभारते
श्रीकृष्णस्य शिवपूज्वः निर्मित्वं तत्राकाद्वेदवासवक्षकवावलं च कथ्यते तत्र ताबुत
हृदिकन्त अभ्यासामान प्रति शिवचन्द्रः।

कृष्णनाथवास नियमेन च।
कृष्णम महाकथा च धृत्या च कृष्णम भक्ति मनसा गिरा॥
वहै यज्ञन्वामाथः: कृष्णनाथस्य कुर्वा॥

tसमाविष्टितमः कृष्णाद्यः: मम न भवते॥

इति। आदिवधारणो च सुमंथापिणियप्रसाध्यः समुद्धार्ये काठिदृढः विशेषे कृष्णेन
शिवश्च पूजाय प्रत्येकः महोदयः।
प्रवर्तित दुर्गम्यपर्वेशन श्रीकृष्णश्च

d्रादशांस्वांविच पाश्चाप्रदेशानुसारं कृतास्यतात्यग्या: च तत्
पूज्यमानित्योऽभिः: कृष्णेन शिवानिदार्यमेव कृषितं प्रविष्ठ: वैष्णवः।
कृष्णजनेन द्रौपद्यान्तरं कृष्णेन श्रोत्कृतोऽक्रमालः श्रुतं बृहद्या विषयं।

dिगितां शास्त्रं

dिक्षिणृ दस्यां दिशो श्रद्धात्मकयमां प्रति मां वाग्य समागतश्च श्रीवेदवासयश्च

d्वद्वादापतयां वचनमू॥
देवदेवतमें झिलम बिलान विभिन्नविभिन्नः
सत्स्वरं संभ शान्ता रिहित च वः प्रसुम्।
तत्रिगजस्वादिकां प्रीति करोति श्रस्मचरः॥

इति तत्त्रेच। कृष्णाज्ञिकी पूर्व नरनारायणानाथः। ताम्भं च भिक्षुस्चनया
प्रियश्रीलोकानि विशमार्गितवर्जयां विभेन अनुवलशीर्यपरामादयो बहुवो
वा दत्ता इति वेदवयसेन काद्विते अहैं किं न शिवपुष्पक इति इतान्योगम-
श्लयामानं प्राति तस्यैव वचनम्।

जन्मकंमेतपोदयोगास्तवोऽत्तव च पुष्कलः॥
ताम्भं श्रीक्रिकानिता देवसर्वाचारिः युगे युगे॥

इति। इत् च मैनाके श्रीकृष्णस्य तपस्वर्णं बहुत्वर्णं मक्क्केश्वरमयं पारिजातविद्वेष्या
शिवं संपूर्वं स्तुत्वन् कृष्णं शिवनेव स्मारितः॥

इति संस्कृतमानस्तु महानं गोकुलप्चनः॥
प्रायं दक्षिणं वाहुं वाहुदेवमन्यावर्तः॥
समितिसारमानं भाषितेस्वकं स्वारः।
पारिजातं च हृदस्व्य भारुं ते मनसः। द्वारं॥
पुरं मैनाकमात्रस्य तपस्वमज्जरः च नः।
तदा सम वा कृष्ण संस्कृत दृष्ट्यमालष्ट्र।
वच्च्चयस्वमज्जरस्य मातः शृङ्गस्तत्या।
भवितार्थोऽन्यं गतत्वा न तदन्यथा॥

इति। एवं श्रीकृष्णस्य स्वर्णपूर्णालिशंत्यां: इति शिवराजने अनेकानि वचनाना-
न्युदाहनानि तस्य मूलस्त्रेण कुतु शिवराजने ततो वश्लमक्केश्वरमयमारण्यपश्चिन्ति
तीर्थयाज्याधिका। दार्शितम्॥

ततो गच्छदुमण्डलान्यं निषु लोककु विभृतम्॥
यत्र भिष्णु: प्रसादार्थ शिवमार्गमवतः पुरा॥
वर्षां चुबंधः देवमृपि चुबंधेनः।
द्वारां श्रीपुष्क्रेण परिस्थितेन भारत॥
अपि चान्यम्: भ्रमणमो लोके कृष्ण भविष्यधि।
स्तन्युञ्जं च जनग्रहखं सत्वत्वति न संख्यः॥
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(b) In chap. 40-(1 to 3) of वाङ्गसंहिता श्रीकृष्ण requests the sage उपमन्यु to teach him the philosophy of Agamas in words:—

अयां श्रीकृष्णां विद्वान विद्वानां विद्वानां विद्वानां विद्वानां

(c) It is also said in कु रुपुराण (chap. 25 stanzas 46-48) that उपमन्यु gave शिवदीर्घ to कृष्ण. It is said—

एसुतविधि धरी ज्ञानुम हस्ताक्षरमयिनः

ववरथो योंगं कृष्णयाग्रिष्कर्मणं

शेष युने युनक्षेत्रम् व्याहतो भवोदयानं

सत्येष सप्तं देवं रुद्रवराक्ष्यत प्रभम
(d) In द्वारणावर्ण (chap. 202 sts. 97, 100) the worship of Shivalinga by Krishna and अर्जुन is extolled. And अग्रहमृत्यु is told that his failure against Krishna and Arjuna was due to the fact that the latter worshipped Shivalinga and obtained boons from him. Thus it is said—

* जन्मकर्णत्तवोदयोगास्तव च पुष्कलः।
ताम्यं श्रिलोक्ती देवस्याचार्यां हुये दुगे॥
देवदेवस्तविष्यात्मा अवेयो विष्णुवंशः।।
सबैवं सभं ज्ञाता श्रिये यं श्रीकृष्णेवति प्रसुः॥
अत्मशूचाक्ष तद्विन्त्रां शास्त्रोगास्तव गावतः।।
एवं देवा वर्जितो हि सिद्धान्त परस्पर्यः॥
प्रारम्भन्ते परं लोकं स्थायुगेव च शास्त्रमूः॥

So also in various other Puranas it is recorded that दुगा was the devotee of Shiva and that he learnt spiritual philosophy from उपमन्त्र, a great devotee of Shiva.

It may be contended that the गीता has been based on the Upanishads and not on the Agamas. Prof. Ranade has, indeed, shown that the गीता has its roots in the Upanishads. But if the Upanishads, the Agamas and the गीता are properly studied it will be found that the Agamas have provided गीता with more material than the Upanishads. The Gita might have borrowed from the Upanishads. But they are not the only source. It has borrowed likewise from and more obliged to the Agamas for the philosophy it teaches. Even though the गीता seems to have borrowed from the Upanishads, it on the whole seems more opposed to the Upanishads in its tone and trend and seems more in consonance with the teachings of the Agamas. Firstly the गीता itself condemns the Vedas in no uncertain terms, as will be evident from what it says:—

* op. cit. pp. 195-201.
By the time the Gita was written the Upanishads had attained the position of equality with the Vedas, though denied by some (नान्यदस्तीतिवादिन्). Particularly the words "वेदवादरतः" and "श्यतिविश्वापेन" are significant. The former exhorts people against concerning themselves with the Vedic lore and teachings. The latter wants people not to be distracted or misled by the Vedas. That is the Gita wants people to give up the Vedas and devote themselves to the Agamas. Except for such explanation the verses quoted cannot properly be construed. The Upanishads themselves disapprove of and protest against, though timidly the कर्मकांड of the four Vedas, the performance of sacrifices; because सच्छ, the fruit promised by the sacrifices, was after all not everlasting but would come to an end after a period however long it might be. Thus the fruit of the sacrifices being ephemeral the Upanishadic thinkers sought a way out of the evil and sought the way of attaining the unending fruit, namely, of attaining the ब्रह्म परमेः, the Absolute, which alone is अक्षर or eternal. The way of attaining the knowledge of ब्रह्म, the Absolute, was तपः (penance) and योग (meditation). Thus the culmination of Vedas was Vedanta, of Vaidika.
Karma was ज्ञान, as is said तेनेविद्वाचार्यन हेतु स्मरति । नामः पंथा अध्ययनाय विचारति। But the attainment of knowledge by means of Upanishadic तपः was far above the ordinary people, who could not be expected to attain शोक्ष through knowledge (of ज्ञान). While the Agamas prescribe a very easy course within the reach of all, the course or path of भक्ति or devotion to Personal Godhead and the worship of Him. This भजिस्मार्ग is much easier than the ज्ञानमार्ग of the Upanishads and is within the easy reach of all people, young and old and high and low. The गीता itself remarks how difficult the ज्ञानमार्ग is in words—

वेदोऽधिकतरस्तेषानां व्यवस्थापनं ज्ञापतान।
अभ्यासः हि गतिपुरुषेऽदहिविधिन्द्रायणः || X\-

Thus the गीता combines the भजिस्मार्ग of the Agamas with the ज्ञानमार्ग of the Upanishads. Stress is laid on and great importance is attached to the path of devotion to Personal Godhead all through the work. Hence the condemnation of the Vedas as noted above (and in some other places). Moreover the गीता refers to the शाश्वतस्तन्त्र in the verse—

* तेनेवेव साद्वर्तं तंत्रं ज्ञात्वा ज्ञात्वा मुक्तिसाम्पन्नवः।
यज ज्ञाशुद्दशास्त्राणि संस्कारो वै व्याक्तो रसनः। ||

This shows that the गीता has been obliged to the Agamas directly. This also confirms the idea of the गीता being a scripture of the भाष्वत sect.

(2) Secondly the गीता contradicts the idea of the अश्वत्थ tree expressed in the कठोनिष्यकः. This has been not-

* Quoted by Aurther Avalon in his "Shakti and Shâkta," p. 19; from what edition of भगवद्गाथा he takes this verse we have not been able to trace.
ed by prof. Ranade (See—the Constructive Survey of the Upanishadic Philosophy, pp. 198, 199). This
the गीता could not have done specially when there was
no reason for it to do so, if it was based on the Upa-
nishads. The केषपनिषद makes the अश्वत्त tree identical
with the Absolute; while the गीता takes the tree to be
the tree of worldly existence (संसारबृक्त्), given rise to by
the कार्मेश्वर of the Agamas.
(3) The Upanishads in general teach संस्कार or
abandonment of कर्म in the interest of बोध. The one
single verse of the इशारष्ट्रित viz.
कुर्मेष्वेश्वर कार्मभि निषेधवपेत ् शतं समाते ।
एवं तथा नान्यथेते जस्तिन न कर्म वित्तेते नरे ॥
cannot account for all the activities of life, when it is
seen that all other Upanishads strongly uphold and
recommend संस्कार. The गीता, therefore, is at great pains
to reconcile the active life and संस्कार, the cessation from
activity of the Upanishads. The Agamas give promin-
ence to मल्लिकार्जुन, which itself is a kind of activity and
teach a life of activity in other respects all through.
Sincere and deep love of the Godhead and his worship
all through life by a simple process of offering whatever
a devotee can spare (पर्य दशम पर्य तोम) is the मल्लिकार्जुन of the
Agamas. It would never come in the way of other
activities of life, which are indispensable and unav-
oidable. But the activities are to be pursued in the
proper spirit, the spirit of disinterestedness, irre-
respective of the fruits to be attained by means of those
activities. Duty is to be discharged for duty’s sake
and not for the sake of fruits. The activities,
duties, or the work of life, if pursued and discharged
in such a spirit, make men happy and preserve mental equilibriuim and peace, which is the cause and basis of the happiness of mankind. This the Gita elaborates all though by interpreting संन्यास and आचार in conformity with this principal, which alone is capable of maintaining and preserving the beauty and joy of life. Such a life of activity is proved to be in consonance with the path of devotion or माहिमान्य लaid down by the Agamas.

The Upanishads are pessimistic in their tone and take a gloomy view of life. The pessimistic tone and the gloomy view of life culminate in the कौशिकी उपनिषद. Not भाक्तिसंबंधी but dry intellectual pursuit of ज्ञान is the theme of the Upanishads. Hence for भाख्यि and निश्चायकमे the Gita is obliged to the Agamas. Thus it is aptly remarked § "The world, of course, appears to be thus blissful in the eyes of every Sâdhaka, be he Vaidik or Tantrik, who by the grace of Ānandmayī has attained Siddhi. There is, however, this difference, that a Tantrika Sâdhaka does not in this, unlike the Vaidik Sâdhaka, see a hell in the Sansâra. The hateful and hideous picture which the Vaidik Sâdhaka has drawn of the Sansâra, full as it is of wife, sons, friends, attendants and other relations, is enough to create a revulsion in the mind of even an ordinary man. But it is a matter for great wonder that Tantrik Sâdhakas have discovered the play of the waves of Brahma-Bliss in this very Sansâra, and have pointed out, as it were with the finger, that every process of cause and effect which obtains in the Sansâra is in a direct manner the stairway of Sâdhanâ. It is a matter of still greater wonder

§ Tantratatva by Vidyarnava Bhattacharya, p. 100.
that Tantrik Sâdhakas, like fish, move yet remain unsoiled in the mud of worldly actions, the mere contact with which would send you or I to perdition."

(4) Theistic monism or Personal Godhead, as opposed to the impersonal Brahman or the Absolute of the Upanishads, is the theme of the Agamas. And the same is given fullest expression to in the गीत, which vindicates the theistic principle and calls it परब्रह्म. The गीत elaborates in simple language this Principale as delineated by the वेद यत्वपनिषद्, which with its successors, the अथवा वैद्यविद्या and कैवल्य, is distinctly theistic and Agamic. The only difference between the वेदाध्ययन and the गीत is that the former makes शिव the theistic परब्रह्म and the latter makes महादेव वासुदेव so. But the principle is the same.

(5) The गीत differs from the Upanishads in respect of Yoga and the practices of Yoga. The Upanishads do not say anything about the system and practices of Yoga. Except for bare mention and a few references to Yoga no information about Yogic practices can be had from the Upanishads excepting the वेदाध्ययन which is Agamic. No rudiments of Yogic practices even in their very elementary form can be found in them. We come across something said about अर्धनाशयन in the last four chapters of the मेत् यत्वपनिषद्. But they have been already proved to be later additions. But the Agamas devote a part of their body to the treatment of Yoga and its practices, by the absence of which the Upanishads are conspicuous. The गीत had, therefore, recourse to the Agamas in this regard.

(6) The गीत is as cosmopolitan as the Agamas. Like the Agamas it extends the benefit of spiritual
philosophy to all without the distinction of colour (कला) and sex. While the Upanishads close the door of spiritual culture against Shudras and women. But the गीता keeps the door open and says in IX-32—

मां हि पार्ये भ्यपार्यें बेन्धर: पार्येंणवः।
कियो वैद्यात्मकः श्रद्धा स्तेल्पि वानिति पशं पार्यः॥

(7) Lastly the doctrine of माया as taught by the गीता is in complete accord with the Agamic माया. भाषा in the Agamas and in the भृतात्मकोपनिषत् is used in the sense of some mystic and inscrutable power of the Almighty and it in no way means illusion. While the Upanishads, though they do not often use the word “माया”, contain various sentences which seem to support the illusion theory of माया, as noted by Prof. Ranade § “We thus see from the examination of various passages from the Upanishads that even though the word माया may not have been used many times in the Upanishads, still the conception that underlies माया is already present there, and even though we do not find there the full-fledged doctrine of illusion in its philosophical aspect as in Gaudapada and later writers, still we find in the Upanishads all the material that may have easily led Shankar to elaborate a theory of माया out of it.” Like the Agamas and the भृतात्मकोपनिषत् the गीता holds the world to be real and only due to the wonderful power of the Lord, the माया, and not superimposed upon the Absolute as illusion. This also has been noted by Prof. Ranade, who remarks, † “In the भगवद्गीता the word माया is used in the sense almost of magical power; and

§ op. cit. p. 227, 228. † op. cit. p. 228.
God, the great magician, is declared to cause the spirit-host to revolve as by the power of His divine magic (XVIII—61) etc. etc." In short the रीत्ता, like the ब्रह्मवेदस्धिपति, is Agamic. The two contain in a sketchy form what the Agamas teach. They are, so to say, the compendium of the Agamas. A very long time must have elapsed between the time that the Agamas were composed and the time when their reputation and authority had come to be established so as to be the source of the रीत्ता.

From all the foregoing discussion it can be well concluded that the Agamas must have begun to be composed during the time of the Aranyakas, as said by Narayanaswami Aiyar * "That such a considerable literature existed even at the time of the inception of the Puranas, lends colour to the surmise entertained by many that some of these Agamas had their origin in times almost coeval with the dim days of the Brahmana period."

(B) The origin and source of the Agamas.

The question of the source of the Agamas is a difficult one to answer. But the difficulty cannot be avoided and an attempt should be made to answer it as satisfactorily as possible. There are three different theories of the origin and source of the Agamas. (1) According to the first, Agamas arose out of the Brahmanas and developed in the same way as the Upanishads did. The age of the Agamas being contemporaneous with that of the Aranyakas, as established above, lends

* Siddhanta Dipika vol. VI page 136.
support to the view. Moreover that many of the Agamas themselves should seek the Vedic authority for their doctrines, as noted in the introductory portion of notes on the last section of the notes, further supports the view. Later on Puranas and great Acharyas of Shaiva Siddhanta like Tirumular, Haradatta Shivacharya, and Shrikantha and others are at great pains to reconcile the contradictions between the Vedas and the Agamas. Thus says Tirumular† “The Veda with the Agama is the truth; they are the word of the Lord; these revelations of the Lord are to be studied as the general and the special doctrines; on inquiry, they are taken to be different as giving rise to two different sets of conclusions; but to the great ones they are non-different.” Haradatta Shivacharya tries vigorously to establish unity of thought of the Agamas and the Vedas in his सरस्वतीसंहिता, in which it is maintained all through how the Agamic worship of Shiva has the fullest warrant and authority of the Vedas. All this shows that the Agamas have been based on the Vedas when they arose. Thus says सुप्रभासितांगम—विद्वान् वेदसारस्वत, and says सुकुमारांगम—वेदविद्वानिं शाश्वेत विद्वान् परमं मतम्।

(2) The second view is that the Agamas interpret the Upanishads and elaborate their teachings. This view is held by Dr. V. V. Ramanan Shastri who says *“The Agamas have their own interpretations to offer as regards the cardinal precepts and teachings of the archaic Upanishads, and hence a thorough grounding

† Shivadwaita of Shrikantha by S. S. Suryanarayanashastri, p. 9.  *Introduction to the studies in Shaiva Siddhanta, p. 4.
in the Agamas, and in such of the Puranas as have visibly felt the influence of, or been nurtured on the same soil as the Agamas, will altogether place the student on a new standpoint, and the Aupanishadic teaching in a new perspective, that is to say, in a setting that will be different to what has till now been considered etc. etc. ” and they † “ bear the same relation to the Upanishads, as the New Testament of the Christian Holy Bible bears to its old Testament. According to this view the Upanishads present the quest, and the Agamas the attainment; the province of the former is limited to Charya, Kriya and Yoga; while the province of the Agamas includes these as well as Gnâna. ”

(3) The third view is the revolutionary view that the Agamas are an independent literature and in no way connected with the Vedas. According to the view it is suggested that the present Agamas are based on the Tamil originals altogether different from the Vedic literature, even though the Tamil originals are now irrecoverably lost. They embody the doctrines of the Tamil originals though they might contain some doctrines that look similar to the Vedic religion owing to their attempts to assimilate their view to those of the Vedic religion. It is now to be seen which of the three theories is correct and stands to reason.

The first two theories are not different but one in as much as they maintain the Vedic basis and origin of the Agamas. They only differ in one respect, namely, according to the first theory the Agamas are a parallel growth, parallel with the Upanishads; thus the Agamas

† Suryanarayana Shastri, op. cit. page 6,
and the Upanishads are the two streams of philosophic thought rising from the Brahmanas but running in two different channels and developing apparently different strata of thought; while according to the second they are subsidiary to the Upanishads only intended for fully expounding the Upanishadic speculations. Still both hold that the Agamas owe their origin to the Vedas.

The first two theories do not seem to be correct, even though they seem to be superficially reasonable. The later attempts of philosophers and the followers of Agamic religion or religions at reconciliation of the antagonism and contradictions between the Vedas and the Agamas do but confirm them. But when the subject-matter and the contents of the Agamas and the Vedas are closely examined and studied, it will be found that the Agamas and the Vedas stand altogether apart as poles asunder. The irreconcilable nature of religions they teach and different fundamental principles they hold make it quite unlikely that the Agamas and the Vedas should have anything in common, though by mutual impact the views of the Vedas and the Agamas came to be so modified ultimately as to be seemingly indistinguishable; much less is it probable that the Agamas should be based on the Vedas and originate from them or Brahmanas. Thus it is well observed that *“The distinction between the Agamas and the Vedas was well understood in ancient days, when the Agama cults were the rivals of the Vaidik cults; but as the two have now become amalgamated for several centuries, the distinction between them is not

* History of the Tamils, pp. 103, 104.
realized by moderns, all the more so as the theory is now prevalent that the Agamas are ultimately derived from the Vedas and do but contain amplifications of the Vedic teaching or rather adaptations of them to suit the modern age." The distinction between the Agamas and the Vedas will be quite evident when the difference between what they teach is noted. (1) Firstly the Vedic religion consists in the performance of sacrifices and all Vedic rites and rituals are concerned with the performance of the sacrifices; while the Agamic religion consists in the worship of the deity, Shiva, Shakti or Vishnu and the Agamas lay down rites of worshipping the deity. (2) The Vedic deities were the forces or powers of nature and the Vedic religion was a system of propitiation or constraint of those Nature powers by means of sacrifices and offering into fire, regarded as the mouth of the deities; while the Agamic deity was a personal deity that controlled the forces of nature. In the case of Vedic worshippers fire, who was himself a deity, was an intermediary as it were between the worshippers and the worshipped; while in the case of Agamic worshippers, they were themselves in communion with the deities and required no intermediary. (3) The oblations in the case of Vedic worship, were consumed by the deities through their mouth, the fire; while the Agamic deities took only the subtle portion of offerings exhibited to them and the worshipper consumed the offerings so exhibited as प्रहार or the grace of God. (4) The Vedic religion was polytheistic and the different deities were invoked for different purposes, because each Vedic deity had a different function in the scheme
of the Universe; while the Agamic religion being mono-
theistic, only one deity was worshipped that had all
the functions of the universe in his or her hands. (5)
The Vedas consist of Mantras addressed to different
deities and recited during the performance of the sacri-
fices in honour or propitiation of those deities. So
also every act, connected with the performance however
minute; it might be like the yoking of bulls to a cart
for bringing Soma, cutting a stick for driving the bulls,
grasping an offering with hands etc., was accompanied
by the recital of a Mantra appropriate for the act; while
the Agamas contain prayers consisting of various
names of a deity and salutations addressed to the deity.
(6) The Vedic Ṛgveda consisted of the offering made to
the gods; while the Agamic Ṛgveda was Ṛṣyā or personal
service rendered to the god, like washing, decking, and
feeding him. (7) The Vedic gods or deities being the
forces of nature had no physical representation required
by the worshipper; while the Agamic deities were re-
presented by means of a visible emblem or image. Even
the personal belongings of a deity, like the weapons
held by him, were worshipped and they received all at-
tentions from the devotee as the deity did. In short
the Vedic religion was the fire cult; while the Agamic
religion was the deistic cult (8) The Vedic method
of worship and that of the Agamas differed fundamentally
in one respect; namely, in respect of the place or
abode of worship. The Vaidikas performed the sacri-
fices on the banks of rivers or groves of trees in temp-
orary sheds or mandapas raised for the purpose, innu-
merable references to which are found in subsequent
Sanskrit literature. There is no trace in the Vedic
hymns of the temple worship. While the worship of the idols of a god in temples is purely Agamic. A temple is called "the House of the Lord" in the Agamas, where devotion, humility and unselfish love were practised. Thus in all possible respects the Vedic religion and religious practices stand in total contrast of the Agamic religion and religious practices. The Agamas contain, it may be noted, all details of temple-building and temple architecture on account of the temple-worship. (9) Another great difference between the Agamic rites and the Vedic rites is that the latter were and are restricted to a portion of the public and the rest of the people were excluded from those rites. This restriction and exclusion led to the watertight division of the people into Varnas (वर्ण:) and to the development of rigorous Varnashramadharma, in which the last Varna, the Shûlras, was altogether excluded from the study of the Vedas and religious practices and sacraments. The people that composed the last Varna were thus for ever condemned to be serfs for serving the three higher Varnas, who were the sole heirs to the intellectual and spiritual culture with the result that the door of Sanyâsa was open to dwijas only, which indirectly meant that मैथ, according to the Vaidic path, was reachable by dwijas alone. The Agamas, on the contrary, kept the door of religion open to all without distinction. All were considered equal in the eyes of the Agamic God and all were, therefore, equally entitled to religious rites and sacraments. This exclusiveness of Varnashramadharma keeping the doors of spiritual culture closed against a large section of the public was and is the ugliest blot on the Vedic religion, whatever may be
its genesis. The Agamas, hence, are out and out cosmopolitan in spirit in sharpest contrast with the Vedas. It is aptly remarked * "The Agamas on the contrary were open to all men; so much so that even today, a Pariah who has received Shivadikshâ can give this diksha to a Brâhmana and thus becomes the 'Guru of the latter. The institution of the Sanyâsa too spread among the followers of the Agamas. The Vaishnava sanyasins were called "Ekantins" and the Shiva sanyasins "Shivayogins;" according to the fundamental principle of the Agamas. Sannyas is not a necessary preliminary to Moksha, for Bhakti open to all castes can steer even a householder across the ocean of Sansâra; if these Bhaktas became sanyasis, it was because the practice of Yoga became a part, not necessarily integral part of the Agama teaching, and the practice of Yoga was rendered easy by a life of sanyasa." (10) Lastly in one important respect the Agamas are most antagonistic to the Vedas, namely, in respect of keeping the door of religion and religious practices and sacraments open to all, men and women alike, while the Vedas shut their doors against women. This is really quite ununderstandable. Have women no souls to save? How the Vedas did not understand this is passing strange. It is fittingly said § "The Aryan Veda is too pure to be touched by a Shudra or a woman. A person of a Shudra or a woman of any caste is not entitled either to learn or hear the Vedas. Thus all women as well as Shudras are not people privileged to obtain salvation. The Tamilian religion, on the other hand, is the common property of all, either men or
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women. Its essence is love of god and neighbour. Unalloyed love is the only pivot on which the Tamilian religion turns, unlike the Aryan religion where gods and men act towards each other from motives of selfishness; the devotee prays and pays adoration, impelled by a motive to desired blessing; and the gods too bestow grace by the same self motive, on a devotee, in return to his sacrifices offered to them to appease their hunger and thirst. But the Tamilian, like his god, is unselfish and is bound by sincere bhakti to Him. " (11) Moreover the Agamas treat of Yoga Philosophy and Yogic practices which are altogether absent in the Vedic literature. **The elaborate rules concerning the regulation of breath and the the high importance attached to it in Yoga have scarcely any trace in the Vedas. Nor is there any clear reference in the Vedic literature to the various sitting postures mentioned in the Tantras.** (12) According to the Agamas **"diksha"** (दीक्षा) is the only important sacrament. It is given by a Guru to a novice into the secrets of the practices and philosophy of the religion. Anybody can be a Guru if he has the requisite qualifications. But according to Vedic Dharmashastra there are sixteen शंक्वारास or sacraments, many of which are ridiculously unimportant and scarcely deserve to be called a religious शंक्वार in the real sense of the word. These sacraments were forty during the सृज period, but were later reduced to sixteen. This also shows the different trend of thought of the Agamic and the Vedic religions. Besides the Philosophy of Shadadhwas and Shadadhwashudhi is not at all found in any Vedic literature and therefore marks off the Agamas as being different in essentials from the Vedas.

* Indian Historical Quarterly, vol. VI, page 118.*
The Agamas also differ from the Upanishads fundamentally. The differences between the Agamas and the Upanishads have been noted above in connection with the ग्रंथाण्वतरंगिणिः, an Agamic Upanishad, and other Upanishads as well as between the गीताः and the Upanishads. Nothing more is required, therefore, to be said here. However it is to be noted what is said † "The thirty two vidyas taught in the Upanishads are the forms of discipline through some of which one ought to go before he could reach the goal. The charyā and kriyā (i.e. the first and second) books of the Agamas describe the means of worship of Śiva or Vishnu; but as the discipline of bhakti has in many cases to be supplemented by some psychological discipline in the form of Yoga practice, the third book of every Agama text deals with Yoga; the fourth book of Agama deals with jñāna, not the jñāna (i.e. ज्ञानमार्ग editor.) above referred to, but jñāna in the sense of the exposition of the philosophical principles underlying the Agama teaching. The philosophy is absolutely different from the Vedanta, since the latter posits only one reality behind the Universe, Brahma—and the former posits tatvatrayam, threefold reality, Ishwar, the individual and matter. Though each Agama thus possesses a Yogapāda and a jñānapāda, the Agamas are primarily the scriptures of Bhakti Mārga, as the Upanishads are the scriptures of the Jñāna Mārga. The former is for the many and the latter is for the select. The former is an easy path and the latter a difficult one."

From all the foregoing discussion about the fundamental differences between the Vedic and Agamic teachings it

† History of the Tamils, page 107.
appears conclusive that the Vedas and the Agamas have nothing in common and that the Agamas have not their source and grounding in the Vedas. The Agamas and the Vedas are two different streams of thought running in two parallel channels acting and reacting upon each other so as to ultimately blend together indistinguishably. This is the reason why later thinkers came to hold that the Agamas and the Vedas are one and the same, being taught or delivered by the same god, Shiva or Vishnu.

What is then the source of the Agamas? We maintain in reply that the pre-Aryan Dravidian culture and religion was the source of the Agamas. Already in section II the Dravidian culture has been noted and outlined; and in section III the nature of Dravidian religion and religious ideas have been noted and outlined. The culture and religion persisted and descended from generation to generation in spite of the struggle and conflict between the Dravidians and the Aryans, until they ultimately prevailed and were embodied in the Agamas.

The theory that the Agamas are the translation of Dravidian religious literature in the Tamil language is not unlikely, though no positive proof can be adduced in favour of such literature previously existing, except the Mohenja Daro and Harappa inscriptions interpreted by Father Heras. The interpretations have been cited in section IV at various places. These inscriptions, as interpreted, are in the Tamil language, a very old form of Tamil language. The oldest book in the Tamil language now extant is Tolkappiyam, which is a treatise of Tamil grammar incidentally giving some information about the Dravidian social and religious life. And as grammar is
based on literature previously existing, there must have been Tamil books on various topics. But unfortunately no such books that formed the basis and background of Tolkappiyam are available. Any how the Tamil language contained in the Mohejo Daro and Harappa inscriptions and the Tolkappiyam are a proof positive that there was Tamil literature in some form or other between the time of the inscriptions and that of the * Tolkappiyam. How they have come to be lost irretrievably it is impossible to answer. And it would be a fool's errand to attempt an explanation of the absence of Tamil literature during the intervening period. It would be similarly foolish and dogmatic to assert that there were Tamil originals of the Agamas now altogether lost. But whatever may be the case of Tamil literature it cannot be doubted that the Agamas are based on the Dravidian philosophy and practices of religion as

* Regarding Tamil literature before the time of Tolkappiyam it is said, "This book refers to previous treatises on the grammar of poetry, none of which is now available, and presupposes the existence of a vast volume of Tamil poetic literature, on which the grammar was based, most or all of which is lost. Tolkappiyar: describes hundreds of incidents occurring in the course of love and war which are proper subjects of poetic treatment. With regard to each one of those incidents he must have had in mind a few odes which had been composed by poets who lived before his time; for it is absurd to think that the critic analysed a priori the course of love and war into a series of possible incidents and then poets began to sing about each of those incidents described by the critic. The earliest Tamil poems which are now extant
belong, almost all, to the age that succeeded the time of Tolkappiyanar and commentators on the Tolkappiyam find it difficult to discover in this later poetry illustrations for many of Tolkappiyanar's rules; sometimes their illustrative questions are inappropriate and oftentimes they fail altogether in their attempt to illustrate Tolkappiyanar's rule and tell the reader to find his own illustrations when he can. From all this it is evident that a vast Tamil literature was composed before Tolkappiyanar's time. Five centuries would be a modest estimate for the period during which this literature grew. Before this literature with its petrified poetic conventions began, there must have been another literature in which these conventions were realities when for instance the poet did not merely as a matter of form attribute the birth of love to the hill country, but reflected in his songs the life conditions of each natural region. In that far off age temporary separation of lovers was not conventionally referred to the four tracts—Mullai, Neydal, Marudan or Palai—but the poet living and singing in each region described the pangs of the separation of lovers which he noted in that region. It will not be an exaggerated estimate to ascribe a period of five centuries to the development of what, one might call the natural poetry which preceded the conventional poetry on which Tolkappoyanar based his grammar. We thus reach about 1000 B.C. as the later limit of the birth of Tamil poetry. The culture that led to the evolution of this poetry and was reflected in it must have taken ages to grow and we can hence conclude that the early culture of the Tamils must have been reached by them a few millennia before Christ. (History of the Tamils, page 70).
sketched in section III above. It would not be irrelevant to reproduce here briefly the practices and philosophy of Dravidian religion. Thus (1) The Dravidians worshipped Linga, the amorphous representation of the Dravidian Godhead, Shiva. (2) They had temples, the House of the Lord, in which the Linga was worshipped. (3) They worshipped the Godhead by अर्चन, sprinkling Linga with water or milk, by offering prayers and by meditating on the deity. (4) They held religious festivals and enjoyed feasts which were originally of a purely social character. Their religious philosophy was that (1) Their God was self-subsistent and great and He was the only one. He was omniscient, benevolent, and had the power of generation and destruction. (2) The great power he possessed was his counterpart as a Goddess. The two, the Lord, An, and the Goddess, Ama, were later Magna Pater, and Magna Mater, or later Shiva and Shakti. (3) They had the idea of judgment after death, which was the basis of virtuous life leading to heaven and vicious life leading to hell. This idea later developed into the various kinds of मोक्ष: साधन्य, साधन्य, साधन्य, साधन्य etc. All these of religious practices and philosophy were ultimately embodied and amplified into Agamas.

Apart from this background of Dravidian religion and philosophy Tantrikism and Tantrik rites, which form the germ and nucleus of the primitive Dravidian religion of the Agamas or Tantras, support our view of the non-Vedic origin of the Agamas. The Tantrikism and Tantrik rites come from hoary antiquity and form a common feature of the antiquated religions of all the primitive peoples of the world, Dravidians included.
It is, therefore, observed that § “Whatever be the age of the Tantras and however varying may be the views regarding their authority it will be seen that rites closely similar to those that are found in their works have in many cases a hoary antiquity. In fact some of them in some form or other seem to have come down from primitive times and are known to be prevalent even in the present days among people with primitive culture not in the least affected by modern civilization and culture. And many of them seem to have universal character being popular among peoples distantly situated and having no cultural or ethnic affinity. It is true that we miss in these the philosophy and spiritual significance, associated at least in a later stage with Tantrikism in India, but still the close and outward similarity would naturally induce one to put them under the same class or type and that not quite erroneously....It will be seen that Tantrikism if not the Tantras had a long history of uninterrupted popularity in India.” Tantrikism and its universal characteristics that prevailed among the primitive peoples may be briefly stated as follows: — * the Tantrik shatkarmas or the six magical rites the use of charms and amulets, the revolting rites of Kaulas, the use of intoxicating drugs for producing ecstasy, the belief in the efficacy of Mantras consisting of apparently unmeaning syllables, are found among the various primitive peoples.

§ Antiquity of Tantrikism by C. Chakravarty, in the Indian Historical Quarterly vol. VI, p. 114.

* Thus, (1) The practice of what is called sympathetic magic is known to have been very widely prevalent in old days. It was by this means that various attempts were made to acquire control over other persons. (2) Enemies were destroyed or injured with the help of imitative magic. "Perhaps the most familiar application of the principle that like produces like is" says Dr. Fraser, "the attempt which has been made by many peoples in many ages to injure or destroy an enemy by injuring or destroying an image of him." (3) The use of small figures of wax or other plastic materials fashioned with incantations in the likeness of some enemy and then pierced with nails and pins, or melted before fire, that their human counterpart may by these means be made to suffer all kinds of torment, is known to have been prevalent among Semetic peoples. It was considered more effective to obtain some portion of the victim's nails or hair...... as an additional connection whereby the wax-figures may be brought into still closer affinity with its prototype. (Semetic Magic; Its Origin and Development—R. Campbell Thomson, pp. 142-143.)

As a matter of fact the Persian Zarthus-f-nameh relates how the enemies of † Zoroaster accused him of sorcery by secretly placing hair, nails and such other impurities in his room and got him imprisoned for sorcery. This clearly points to the use of these things as instruments of magic.


† The founder of Zoroastrianism (the Parsee Religion) who lived about 2000 years B.C. (editor).
The use of charms and amulets is known to have been a very wide-spread custom among primitive peoples of different ages and lands. (Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. iii, pp. 392 ff.) Rings were used with the object of preventing the entrance of evil spirits into the body. (Golden Bough-Frazer, vol. I pp. 402, ff.)

We have long and nauseating accounts of rank and unmixed sensualism forming part of religious observances in many a land. These undoubtedly give a rude shock to the modern civilised notions of religion and morality.

Impure and revolting practices having religious significance clustered round the worship of Pan in Greece and Rome as also in the island of the Southern Pacific Ocean. (Sex-worship and Symbolism of Primitive Races-Brown, pp. 27-28).

Sex-worship was practised frankly and openly by primitive people all the world over and it is supposed that with the advance of civilisation the worship came to be carried on by means of symbolism. And many of the religious practices even now are traced to an idea of the deification of the sex. “This worship has been shown to be so general and wide-spread that it is to be regarded as part of the general evolution of the human mind; it seems to be indigenous with the race rather than an isolated or exceptional circumstance.” (Ibid., pp. 23, 29-30).

G. H. Hartland in a detailed and informative article on Phallism dealt with the subject in a sympathetic tone. He shows how sex-worship forms a part
of the history of religion and how it is found to exist in different countries among peoples belonging to different strata of culture. (Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. ix, pp. 115-31).

Wall has gone so far as to find traces, direct or indirect, of sex-worship in almost all kinds of religious practices. "All religions are based on sex," says he, "Some like the ancient Egyptian, Greek and Roman or the modern Brahmanic worship of Siva more coarsely so, according to modern civilised thought; others like the Christian religion more obscurely so." (Sex and Sex-worship-Wall, p. 2).

The use of wine and various other intoxicating drugs is supposed to have been one of the various means adopted by primitive peoples with a view to produce ecstasy and other morbid exaltation for religious ends. Different kinds of bodily exercises resembling the mudras, asanas and nyasas of the Tantras, were also undertaken for this purpose. (Primitive Culture-Tyllor, third edition, London, vol. II, pp. 410, 416, 419, ff.)

The power of the word is believed to be very marked in all systems of magic. Sometimes names of inexplicable and perhaps esoteric character are used. This is said to be in accordance with the well-known rule that in magic a mysterious name is the most potent of all. (Keith-Religion & Philosophy of the Veda & Upanishads, p. 313.)

There was this belief in the efficacy of words among ancient Iranians too. "Peculiar words," says Geiger," were thought peculiarly efficacious in certain
cases and regarded as a counter-charm able to repel the attacks of evil spirits. (Geiger-Civilisation of Eastern Iranians in Ancient times, p. 16.)

It is thus abundantly clear that rites similar to many of those prescribed in the Tantras were quite well known among primitive peoples of all countries.

The influence of Tantrikism on the Vedas is clearly observable. It is not only in the Atharvaveda, the latest Vedic Samhita, that all the elements of Tantrikism are found but they are also found even in the earliest Vedic work, the Rigweda, as well as in other parts of Vedic literature. Thus Vashistha was accused in the Rigweda of worshipping evil spirits and of practising magic arts, as noted on pages 120, 121, 122 above. And the Rishi is at great pains to repel the accusation only, it seems, to retain the status of being an Aryan. The magic rites here referred to are all due to the influence of Tantrik rites that the Aryans borrowed and adopted from their intercourse with and admixture of Dravidians. The influence of Tantrikism is distinctly traceable on the Atharvaveda, because "† Taken as a whole, it is a heterogeneous collection of spells. Its most salient teaching is sorcery, for it is mainly directed against hostile agencies, such as diseases, noxious animals, demons, wizards, foes, oppressors of Brahmans. But it also contains many spells of auspicious character, such as charms to secure harmony in family and village life, reconciliation of enemies, long life, health and prosperity, besides prayers for protection on journeys, and for luck in gambling.

† Macdonell, Sanskrit Literature, p. 185.
Thus it has a double aspect, being meant to appease and bless as well as to curse. In its main contents the Atharvaveda is more superstitious than the Rigveda. For it does not represent the more advanced religious belief of the priestly class, but as a collection of the most popular spells current among the masses, who always preserve more primitive notions with regard to demoniac powers. The spirit that breathes in it is that of a pre-historic age." The last sentence is significant and all this seems to be due to the influence of Tantrikism. The Veda borrowed the Tantrik § Shatkarmas or magical powers and elaborated in its body. It is very probable, nay, almost certain, that owing to the advocacy of some such rites that the Atharvaveda had to face a strong wave of popular aversion against itself and had to demonstrate its merit before it could be accepted as genuine and pure, i. e. a Veda proper. But owing to the dominance of Vedic literature and greater importance and higher authority attached to the Vedas * "The upholders of Tantras have however gone to the extent of attempting to demonstrate the Vedic origin of everything found in the Tantras. They had to resort occasionally to considerable twisting and farfetchedness to find traces of various rites connected

§ The शतकर्मिः are—मारणम् (destruction); उचास्तनम् (driving away); कारणम् (bringing under control, which includes hypnotism); स्तनम् (arrest, that is staying a storm, striking a man dumb); हिमिष्यम् (causing antagonism between persons); स्वस्थ्यम् (curative and healing power in disease, misfortune and danger):

* Indian Historical Quarterly vol. VI, page 119.
with Tantrikism in the Vedas." But just the opposite seems to be the fact. The Tantrik elements found their way into the Vedas but could not be well assimilated with other portions that form the real character of the Vedas, namely, the performance of fire-rites. The non-Vedic elements borrowed and adopted by the Aryans are an extraneous and heterogeneous matter and become easily understandable only when they are traced to Dravidian Tantrik rites and practices instead of attributing their origin to the Vedas.

When the Tantras come to be written after the age of Vedic Samhitas and when the Tantric literature continued side by side, influencing and modifying each other, it was the Vedic literature and not the Agamic literature that retained its predominance over the other. Though the Tantrik literature was looked upon for a time as ध्रवि, the Vedic literature reasserted its supreme importance and the Agamas or Tantras came later to be counted merely as secondary like a by-product of the Vedas. And the Tantras had to seek shelter of the Vedas only to invest themselves with the same sacredness and importance as that attaching to the Vedas. This gave rise to the mistaken notion that the Tantras had their origin in the Vedas, the Saubhagya Khanda of the Atharvaveda, though the Atharvaveda seems to be wholly and solely based upon the pre-historic Tantrik culture and rites. However the attempts of the Tantras to be Vedic are so ill-disguised as to be easily betrayed. (1) Thus for instance the Rudrayāmala (chap. XVII) calls Mahâdevî Atharvavedashâkhini, so also Buddheshwârî, though
curiously the worship of the goddess is, in the same breath, definitely put down as Vedabahishkrit or un Vedic. (2) Rudrayamala (chap. XVII) and Brahmayamala (ch. I, II) describe how Vashishtha, unable to attain perfection by the performance of Vedic rites had to take lessons from Buddha in Tantrikism. If the Tantras were derived from the Vedas such a step of Vashishtha would be quite meaningless. (3) Nityatantra (chap. I) admits the un-Vedic character of the Chakra worship of the Tantras. (4) * The followers of the Pancharatra system of Vaishnavism trace the origin of the system to an unknown Vedic school called * "Ekayana Shâkhâ". It seems to be an attempt to trace to the Vedas what was really non-Vedic in origin.

That the Tantras or Agamas are un-Vedic is evidenced by the fact that from a very early period they are regarded as un-Vedic in character, as noted just above. Moreover the Tantras are condemned directly as actually being un-Vedic in the Brahmanic literature, the Dharmashatras and Puranas. The un-Vedic nature of Tantras is also indirectly evidenced in places where different forms of worship, i.e. Tantric as well as Vedic, are mentioned side by side. (1) Thus Bhâgavat Purana (XI 3-47, 48, XI-3-22) definitely prescribes the worship of Vishnu and Maheshwara both according to the Tantras and Vedas. Varâha Purana also does the same. (2) Yogini Tantra (XIII-51) refers to Vedic and Tantrik Dharma (3) Hârîta, as noted already, mentions two classes of Shrutis (शृंदित्व द्विविधा, शैविको तंत्रिकीच ). कुलार्पवंतस says for each Yuga a suitable shastra is given in—

* Kalpalataparimala under Brahma Sutras (II-2-42)
So also in कुल्लिकालंत्र it is said “In the three Yugas of कल्य, त्रेता, and द्वापर, the gods should be worshipped according to rules laid down in शृवति and सृवति. In the Kali Yuga they should be worshipped only according to rules prescribed in the Tantras. In the Kali Yuga Gods are not pleased with the worship performed according to rules laid down in any other शास्त्र.” (5) The काक्षूपाख्या-प्रिणत्तम त्रस को tries to establish the superiority of the Tantras over the Vedas by saying वेदां च वैष्णोद्वेष न सिद्धिस्तेन बाये। (6) The Kularnava (कुलरनववत्त्तम), XI-85, and विज्ञानाध्यायत्तम point to the dignity of the Tantras over the Vedas by comparing the former to high-born women and the latter to public women. It is said—

वेदा त्रचु पुराणानि सामान्यगणिका हि।
या पुनः शांभवी विशा शुप्ता कुलवधूरिव।
प्रसंगेष प्राणालंि स्थाति संख्या शंख्या न संशयः।

All this shows that the Tantras are quite different from the Vedas. Otherwise there is no meaning in stating Tantrik form of worship as distinct from the Vedic form, if the Tantras and Agamas were derived from the Vedas. (7) Besides some Tantras seem to look towards the Vedas with eyes of ill-feeling and aversion because one initiated into the Tantrik rites is advised against observing any Vedic ceremony. Thus अपरार्ण (see his commentary on वाज्निम्वसंस्तुतिर्त 1—7) quotes from some unknown work the rule—

दीर्घितम ह च वैदिक आदिकामि विगैर्तस्तम।
इत्यवं वैदिकाभावद्यं नादीक्षिताति।
दीर्घितामि करतेया दूरोदिष्टयवाच्याधिनी।
So also श्रीशङ्कानन्दचंद्रिका quotes some verses that purport to say that the followers of Vedic and Agamic paths should not mix together but should avoid one another. They are— (see page 59).

तंत्रेषु दीर्घितय मयों ैविद्वेष न स्थितस्वादः।
वेदिक्षाय तंत्रेषु दीर्घितय न स्थितस्वादः॥
राजा तु वेदिक्षानुप्रास्तांत्रिकानुसारिनित्यः।
अर्णकारणितया मित्य स्वपयेन्मतिमानवः॥

So also it quotes verses in which it is maintained that those that fall away from the Vedic path should follow the Tantrik path. All this shows that the Vedas and Tantrasy are distinct and different.

The verses are—

वेदमार्गःप्रच्छुतानां तंत्रमार्गःवेशनम्।
श्रीशङ्कानन्दचंद्रिकानुसारितः॥
शुतिपथगातिनां मानवानां हि तंत्रम्।
शुतिपथनिररतानां तत्तवः नैव सेव्यम्॥

(8) Some of the Puranas are quite outspoken in their condemnation of the Tantras. They not only denounce them and undermine their value as being un-Vedic but also assert that they lead astray the people if not on their guard.

Thus says सूक्ष्मचित्रकोकिका—पांचराजादिमार्गाणां वेदमूलस्तम्भतः।

नैत्र स्वतेतिनैतितिमुनिन्वेषना॥
ब्रामपाल्लपानांवैत्तिकानां परिवर्मः॥
पांचराजादिव्यां प्राचार्यानांस्वातिकारणां॥

So also it is said in अम्बेन्द्र—

विद्वानांस्वयः कोचित्कप्रशस्तृभुपणः।
वैव्या: पांछुतात्वान्ये पांचराजास्तथा ये॥
तथाचार्ये बुद्धार्थान: त्वेऽपंख्युद्दैवतः।
पार्श्वेन्द्र अशीवाचन्द्र नवत: पायान्मतः॥
तं वेंद्यन्ति यस्माते पारंदास्तैन हैदुना॥

2-37
Similarly it is said in पराशरोपपुराण—

पांचरात्रि प्रशंसनित केविन्द्रागवतं सुने ।
केविन्द्रां धातं प्रशंसनित केविन्द्रामं तथैवत ॥

अन्यायि वानि शाङ्खाणि विरुध्धाणि महामृते ।
स्वतं प्रमाणभूतं वेदेनाग्रातुकेन वै ॥

तान्येव अद्वय युज्या: परिपुष्ट विजनतय: ।
आचरितं महापापं: युगान्ते समुपस्तिते ॥

बराहपुराण (70-41-71-9, 5355) tells how Rudra compiled the Tantras for deluding the people fallen from the Vedic path. In another place it is told how Shiva composed the Tantras with the same object at the request of Vishnu. The same story has been related by कृस्मपुराण (XII-255259). Bhattoji Dixit quotes in his तंत्राविचारनियम similar passages from वचिन्द्रपुराण, लिंगपुराण, संक्षिप्त and others to demonstrate the unauthoritativeness and deceptive character of the Tantras. It is, therefore, clear, that the Agamas being condemned as अवैदिक (non-Vedic) and intended only to delude the people away from the Vedic path, are non-Vedic in origin. (9) Some Puranas divide आगमास and तंत्रास into two classes, शैव and ब्राह्मी. Thus says वायुपुराण—(उससमाप-24-177-178).

शिवायमोऽपि द्विविधं शैवोऽऽप्रायैव संस्कृतं ।
शुतिक्षारमयं शैवं स्वतं: हतं: स्वतं: ॥

Here the division of शैव and ब्राह्मी is meaningless. तंत्रास or आगमास should either be Vedic, i.e. originated from the Vedas, or non-Vedic. शैव only means that the Agamas conforming to the Vedic principles, i.e. those accepted by the Vedic people and not directly militating or preaching against the Vedas. It is impossible that the Agamas should originate from or be based on the Vedas and teach
against the Vedas. Hence अश्वित means non-Vedic in origin and directly teaching non-Vedic principles.

(10) The followers of one School or sect indulge in vituperation and feelings of disregard and contempt against another. One school condemns another as being non-Vedic and a mere fabrication. Thus *वेदोत्तम in his पांचरात्रात्मापास्माद not only makes an attempt to undervalue the Shaivas and Shāktas by declaring their scriptures to be un-Vedic and hence unacceptable, but by declaring them to be nothing but the fabrication of an ordinary person called मद्ध्यश्र. Similarly the Vaishnava Tantras were supposed in some quarters to be the composition of a cheat called Vāsudeva—

§ बाणदेवामिषानेन केनचिद्रिपतिलिङ्गु न।
प्रणीतं प्रस्तुतं तंत्रं ईश्व निधितुमिः वसम्।

So the पांचरात्राः claimed their Agamas to be Vedic and condemned the शिवागमाः to be non-Vedic. The Shaivas do the same and both betray themselves. From all the foregoing discussion it can be well concluded that the Tantras and Agamas had their origin in and were based on the pre-Aryan Dravidian culture.

Before we proceed further we might meet a question that might arise pertinently in connection with the chorus of condemnation of the Tantras as to why they should be so condemned. The answer is brief. The deep and strong have of resentment and denunciation is not unmerited owing to the abuse of Tantrik rites by the ordinary ignorant followers of Tantrikism, attached to, bodily pleasure and morbid cravings of the flesh. The riff-raff masses, that formed a stratum of the sect, could

understand the inner meaning of the ritual, the art of religion. The deep significance and inner meaning of the ritual was far above their head and they superficially hought of नव, गांव, मेघुन etc. of Kaul rites as the way to inal liberation from the mortal coils. They, therefore, reely indulged in them losing sight of the inner purpose or which the things were intended. Their life was vicious and immoral and they became the dregs of society. The stories contained in संक्षरविचय give an idea of what the life of some of the followers of Shaiva and Shakta sects was, after an allowance for the exaggerated accounts is made. The Tantra वर्तरमास also were misused by some selfish and self-seeking followers of the Tantras; and they drew not only upon themselves but on the rest as well shame and opprobrium. All followers of the Agamic religion or religions were subjected to a fire of strong and abusive criticism. This is why those parts of the Agamas and Tantras that treated of such mysterious rites were condered वेदकाय and not because they alone were based on non-Vedic doctrines. It is said, therefore:—

† "It should be confessed by an unbiased critic that the denunciations of the Tantras were not wholly unmerited. People had begun to take part in all kinds of excesses from an early period under the cover of Tantrikism. As a matter of fact the Tantra rites that have been tabooed for the ordinary man for the excessive difficulty involved in their performance came to be regarded as the easiest means leading to salvation. The popular view with regard to these rites is reflected in a short stanza spoken by a Kapalika (Saiva devotee) in the 'Mattavilasa' (1-7) of

† K. B. Phatak commemoration volume, pp. 218, 219.
Mahendravarman of Pallava dynasty. He is glad that Lord Pasupati has found an easy way to salvation, e.g. through enjoyment resulting from the drinking of wine and looking at the face of the beloved lady. The Karpūramanjari (1, 23-24) of Rajāsekhare echoes the same thing when the Kaula path is praised in that it makes provision for the use of meat and the wine and when the Lord Pasupati is eulogised for his showing the path of salvation through sexual enjoyment and wine. In fact there had actually come a time when, as Prof. Bendall has put it in the introduction to his edition of 'Sikṣa-Samuccaya,' the Tantras developed a form of religion which was brought to the level of very thinly veiled Kāmasūtra. The Tantra form of worship had at that time actually reached such a stage of abject degeneration at the hands of at least a section of its followers that it naturally invited all kinds of vituperation against it in general.

Before we proceed further we beg to quote the following in support of the conclusions arrived at:

† "The system of philosophy, he (Abhinavagupta) has attempted to formulate and to elaborate, is non-Vedic; not because its doctrines are fundamentally opposed to those of the Vedic systems, but because it does not recognize the Veda as the final authority. It was, therefore, ignored by the Brāhmin community, which alone has kept alive the literary traditions connected with various schools of Indian thought as a matter of religious duty. This non-Vedic trend of thought, however, was very popular among the Brahmans of Kashmere, who had the opportunity of

† Abhinavagupta, an Historical and Philosophical study, page 164.
knowing it better than those elsewhere." * "Recent research shows that at a remote period in the history of the Tamils answering pre-Vedic times, a class of high-souled seers called Arrivars developed a rare system of metaphysics and psychic science and taught the same to the disciples and followers. It appears that originally there were four great saints of old and later on, a group of five saints gave birth to twenty eight mystic works corresponding to Shivâgamas of the day. These two sets of books were regarded as the highest authority by the ancient Tamils. Superfluous it is to refer to countless minor books based on them. During the Vedic age we have reason to infer that the Tamilians or Dravidians inhabited this land from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin and beyond, and that several of the Tamil princes in Northern India were well versed in the philosophy or the Arrivars. Probably it was to one of these rulers that the four Brahmins of the Chhandogya Upanishad resorted for spiritual enlightenment. It is interesting to note that the prince was surprised to see that they were the first Aryan priests that approached him for the attainment of divine wisdom. In process of time, it came to pass that many of the ideas and words of this system found a prominent place in some of the Vedic songs and Upanishads, and a cycle of Sanskrit literature called Tantric or Agamic came into being as adaptations of the mystic lore of the Tamil saints. This event is of infinite importance from the historical standpoint; for it served to preserve at least in rough Sanskrit garb fragments of the traditional system of the Arrivars etc. etc."

Because the rise of the Agamas was during the period of Aranyakas it is not to be thought that all Agamas and Tantras were written during the period. The growth of the astoundingly voluminous Agamic literature was gradual and went on up to very recent times as may be seen from the references to later events. Thus पारमेश्वरागम speaks of the Buddhistic religion and others in—वैद्योगितशास्त्रज्ञानादित्विभागः (1-8). Later the well known event of the impalement of Jains is mentioned in the उत्तरकामिन्यागम, about which T. A. Gopinathrao says *“We find it laid down that on the seventh day of the mahotsava of Shiva, the impalement of the Jains, said to have been carried out at the instance of Tirujnana Sambandhar, ought to be celebrated; even now the name of that day’s utsava is given as the impalement of the Jains and is celebrated at Madura, the historical scene of the occurrence. When an event of this description, associated with the life of this Shaiva saint, is found mentioned in the कारनागम, need we say that it must be a work belonging to a time later than the time of Tirujnana Sambandhar? And he is understood to have lived in the middle of seventh century A. D.” Moreover, many of Shivagamas enjoin that the Dravida-Vedas are to be recited in temples as part of service there. The Devaram hymns composed by Tirujnanasambandhar, Appar, and Sundarmurti are the Dravida-Vedas. The last two are said to have lived in the seventh and ninth centuries of the Christian era respectively.

So also Basava, the founder of the Lingayat Religion, is referred to in the पारमेश्वरागम in † verses—

† बीरसचिव, printed at Deshikendra Press, Latur.
Similary अहम्ब्रसु, the great विवेकेन्द्र, and चन्द्रवर्धन, Basava’s sister’s son are spoken of in the उत्तरार्कुल in the following:—

Thus the Agamas have taken such a long time for their growth before they reached their final shape and form. There is nothing strange in this. The Mahabharata, Ramayana, and the Puranas will be an apt analogy in respect of such a long continuous growth into vast literature. The Vedas themselves have taken centuries together before they attained their final shape and form. The only difference is that different Vedic Mantras are ascribed to the authorship of different Rishis, the seers of the Mantras. But in the case of the Agamas there could be no such thing, as they are believed to have been delivered by Lord Shiva Himself to His consort Parvati. But it is a secret to whom the conversation of Shiva and Parvati, that makes the Agamas or Tantras, was revealed.

(C) The contents of the Agamas.

We shall be brief about the contents of the Agamas. The Agamas are divided into four parts or quarters

† Quoted in विद्यात्मकात्मक चरित्र, page 1.
called the Padas, किया, चर्या, योग, and ज्ञान. वायुकाव्य mentions these briefly in his वरदशनेश्वर (vide वैद्वतीय) as follows:—

विष्क्रियाकाशाक्षाक्षत्तोऽपि दत्तस्तवुद्वषस्य महात्मविविधानं तथा वस्माधस्तर्यस्य व्यासः महादर्शक्षणकालान्तरालस्य पर्वं: प्रथमसुवेशः। वेतनमाधक्ष्याभिमानान्तरालस्य तदानंतर'यम्। अवविधानाः पाणिनां अंते विनिवेश तत्र कमनिन्य:। दीर्घाय: परमसुष्कारेश्यावताराः पाणिनेवस्तर्यस्य विवाहान्यास्य प्रथमसुवेशः। विशिष्टायके क्रीटी बिना निवादवित्याविश्राकायार्तवर्ताव्याधिकोषकर्मा विवाहादश्य प्रथमसुवेशः।

अनेकविधांगी विक्रियाकाशाक्षकस्य क्रीटी अदश्य तदानंतर्यम्। योगेव बिना नामितात्रार्थिति संग्रामयाग्यापर्कस्य योगपादस्य तदानंतर्यम्। विशिष्टार्थिति निवादविंदवाच्य नामितात्रार्थिति संग्रामयाग्यापर्कस्य योगपादस्य तदानंतर्यम्। विशिष्टार्थिति निवादविंदवाच्य नामितात्रार्थिति संग्रामयाग्यापर्कस्य योगपादस्य तदानंतर्यम्।

So also the contents have been noted briefly in वेतनमाधक्ष्याभिमानान्तरालस्य, page 420, in the following:—

अर्था ज्ञानक्रियाकाशाक्षिः: स्वाभिद्यः।
पाणिनां महेश्वर स्वरूपं विपदाय:।
आर्थिकाकक्षान्यान्यां प्रकाशःकक्षस्यः।
सत्कारकक्षान्यान्यां स्वरूप्याश्वानामपि।
पाणिनापि पंचानां स्वरूपमि बिस्तरात्।
खुड़े: प्रकाशकक्षेत्र स्वरूपमि विस्तुष्टः।
परमेश्वरस्य: सुवनासि प्रथकः प्रथकः।
इत्यति योजनानीति परिवर्त्यकमस्ति:।
सुवनासि तदीशानां रूपमिविविशेषतः।
तत्र प्रकाशः: प्रवर्ते सुखेश्यापि प्रवर्तमः।
महात्मतदिशाश्चार्यां प्रमेयसिद्धस्ता।
एवमाधानि बहुवा प्रतिपादाति तत्र द्वि।।
क्रीटिपादे तु मानसां उद्वारस्त्यक्रूर्तिते।
सत्कारकृष्णकपोषाधिकार सर्ववतः।।
समयानां विशेषविशेष निविधानां च संश्चियः।
आचार्यस्वाभिद्यकृष्ण दीक्षा चैक सुखप्रदानः।
According to *Prashanvhit* *“Kriya embraces all acts from ploughing the ground (for laying the foundation of the temple) to establishing the idol (III-1-6).”*

During the earlier period the Agamas of the three main Agamic cults (Shaiva, Shâkta, and Vaishnava) maintain the Supreme Real Being of the Universe that corresponds to the Brahman or the Absolute of the Upanishads. He is Narayana according to the Vaishnavagamas, Shiva, according to Shavagamas and Shakti according to Shâkttagamas. The position, in early times, of Shiva is much in the background when compared with that of the Shakti he possessed and the Shakti stands more prominent owing to all cosmic functions attributed to her. Lakshmi, the wife of Vishnu, is His Shakti and Kali, the wife of Shiva, is His Shakti. But shortly later the male gods Vishnu and Shiva, become more prominent than their Shaktis who become the handmaids of their Lords and there rose different sects.

* Outlines of Indian Philosophy p. 133.
The main three Agamic Schools (Shaiva, Shâktâ, and Vaishnava) maintain three तत्त्वas or ultimate realities, namely, (1) A Supreme Being with the male or female aspect predominant. (2) The class of individual souls. (3) The objective universe, as real. These three तत्त्वas are given different names in the three different Schools. Though their attributes and mutual relations do not differ much, the terminology differs in all the three Schools.

All the three Schools are agreed in opposing and demolishing the मयावâda or the illusion theory of the Vedanta. Thus says भृकुटरागम — * "If the world is an illusion of the conscious being; the effected world will be a hollow unreality; how can the world, which is established to be really existing by all methods of proofs, be a false transmutation of consciousness?" The Agamas, therefore, do not regard the world as a false show. Bhâskararâya, the commentator of श्रस्वासहस्रâम, refutes the illusion theory in his commentary on the name no. 735, मिद्राञ्जनविध्वजनâ, as follows:—§ Really according to the belief of the Tantrikas, who hold (the doctrine) that the world is a transmutation of Brahma, the Universe is real; because as there is absolutely no difference between Brahma and the world just as (there is no difference) between a pot and the clay (of which it is made); the reality of the universe necessarily follows from the reality of Brahma. As we accept that the difference (between Brahma and the Universe) is false, we accept all the texts declaring non-difference. From the unreality of difference (the Brahma and the

* Outlines of Indian Philosophy, p. 133. § Ibid. p. 134.
Universe) it follows that the relation of the supporter and supported is false. Hence the Vedanta theory of the illusoriness of the world cannot be accepted."

Intense devotion or sincere Bhakti to the deity forms another common feature of all the three Agamic Schools. It is expressed in the worship of the images of the deities. The images are anthropomorphomic or only symbols or some formal representation of the deities which are really formless or all-formed.

The movement of Agamic devotion gave rise to the art of temple-building and the making of images, which in India, in south India specially, has reached a high order of perfection. It also gave rise to devotional lyric poetry full of poetic imagery. So also music, singing, dancing and gesticulation developed fast under the influence of the Agamas, because all these accompany the worship of images in temples, being considered different ways of expressing devotion to the deities.

There was no love lost between the Agamikas and Vaidikas and they indulged in strong mutual fault-finding and condemnation. The Agamikas considered the Vaidikas as Pashus or bond souls and therefore unfit for receiving Shivadiksha. The Vaidikas in their turn reviled the Agamikas as being heterodox.

"Kumarila Bhatt classes them among the atheists as we read Amarsimha accordingly classing Devalas, who are generally Pashupatas, Pancharatras, and other Tantrikas that are addicted to image worship, among Shudras."

But the two streams of thought, the Agamic and the Vedic, gradually gravitated towards each other. After running side by side for a long time they acted and reacted on each other and modified each other’s practices in religion. The Vedic fire-cult languished and decayed and has been replaced by the Agamic worship of images in temples and in all houses without exception. Almost all Shrauta Karmas have ceased to be observed except a few minor ones like the Agni ādhānā, a much simplified Vājāpeya, and Somayaga, are performed here and there by only a few Hindus now. The Smārta karmas also have been almost totally neglected. So that judged by the standard of Vedic Karmas the dwijas (द्विज: ) are a microscopic minority. No real Brahmins are to be found if tested by the test of Vedic rites. By the profound influence of the Agamas on the Hindus of India the religion that is practised by them today is almost entirely Agamic and nothing of Vedic religion remains. *“The living Hindu religion of today from Cape Comorin to the remotest corners of Tibet is essentially Tantric. Even the few genuine Vedic rites that are preserved and are supposed to be derived straight from the Vedas, e.g. the Samdhyā, have been modified by the addition of Tantrik practices. Equally profound has been the influence of the Agamas on the development of Vedanta Philosophy. Shankara was a professed Shākta and his Adwaita exposition of the Vedanta, though overtly independent of the Shākta Agamas, is influenced by Tantrik theories and his discipline by Tantrik practices.”

* Outlines of Indian Philosophy, page 130.
The living Hindu faith of today is seen in the image worship; and all the rituals and religious practices are embodied in the methods and forms of the image worship. The Bhakti or devotion of the people is the reverence to the deity expressed by the worship of images. Different Hindu sects and subjects of different faiths have adopted different symbols and images, anthropomorphic or otherwise, of the deities they worship. Shivalinga, as the symbol or emblem of Shiva, is universally the object of worship of the Shaivas. It is to be seen now what the meaning of Shivalinga is.

Before beginning the next section we may sum up the discussion as follows:

(1) That the antiquity of the Agamas goes back to the period of the Aranyakas, based on the earliest references to the Agamic literature in the Maitri Upanishad viz. (1) आम्योऽत्र न आनाति वेदविवांतं ह यद, which may be translated as—the deluded people do not understand (the real nature) of what is called another Vedic lore. (2) वेदादिशाजःस्थितंवर्गविभागावासिन्धविन्थत्वतेतवित्त। अतो नैनाम-निधीयत। अन्वयस्य। (3) तत्सार्धाम्ययो व नावैदिकविधीयत। So also the reference contained in the गीता, namely, नानायस्तीतिस्वदिविनः shows the existence of Agamic literature in the time that the गीता was written.

(2) That the श्रेत्रावृहंणिनि is the first Agamic Upanishad that teaches the Agamic principles and doctrines of theistic परमाणुः. [It cannot be said that the Agamas themselves are based on and rise after the श्रेत्रावृहं came to be written; because very long time must have elapsed for the rise and development of the Agamas that they might claim equality with the Vedas by the time the
Maitri Upanishad came to be written. And by the modest calculation of time backwards the time of Aranyakas seems to be the time when the Agamas rose.

(3) That the धीर्म has been based on the Agamas, as its teachings are quite in consonance with those of the Agamas; and that the धीर्म is on the whole opposed to the Vedas and Upanishads.

(4) That the Agamic literature claimed equality with the Vedas and equal authority as that of the Vedas, is indicated by the words of the Maitri Upanishad.

(5) That later the authority of the Agamas as much as that of the Vedas came to be admitted, as evidenced by Hârîta’s statement, viz. शुरुतिन्य द्विविधा वैदिकी तामिको च.

(6) That the Agamas have been based on the pre-Aryan Dravidian culture and not on the Vedas, on account of the fundamental differences in the teachings of the Vedas and the Agamas.

(7) That the Vadas and Agamas acted and reacted on each other so that their teachings were modified to the effect that they seemed to teach the same thing. Attempts, therefore, were made later to reconcile the differences between them and to establish the unity of thought.

(8) That the religion of the present day Hindus has long since been wholly Agamic.

(VIII) The meaning of Shivalinga.

There is much misunderstanding regarding Shivalinga or the symbol that represents Shiva. It is generally considered to be the phallus of Shiva by almost all scholars of religion and religious philosophy. This
deep-rooted prejudice has long since persisted; and the idea of the Linga being the phallus of Shiva is based on the following different considerations:

(1) There was phallic worship among the primitive peoples and the Dravidians could not be an exception to it. (2) The misinterpretation of the compound विश्वास occurring twice in the Rigveda. (3) The meaning of Linga as phallus given in lexicons. (4) The shape in general resembles phallus (erect membrum virile). (5) Various verses of the Shâkta Tantras about sex worship.

We have to consider how far the interpretation of Shivalinga as phallus is reasonable. We shall first examine the data, on which the interpretation is based, and then give the explanation of the symbol.

The data, on which the interpretation is based, are at first sight so plausible. But on deeper consideration of the matter they will be seen to be quite wrong, though mischievously capable of misleading readers. It seems that Linga is taken *prima facie* to be phallus on account of the phallic worship of some of the primitive peoples and then arguments are brought forward to support the assumption without adequate consideration being given to the symbol, which is only the amorphous representation or emblem of Shiva, the theistic परमवर्त्त of the Shaivas distinct from the Absolute of the Upanishads.

That there was phallic worship among primitive peoples has been well established. † "The attention of the reader may here be drawn to a little book, entitled

† Elements of Hindu Iconography, page 70 of vol.II
“Primitive symbolism as illustrated in phallic worship by Hodder M. Westrop, published by messrs. Geo. Redway in London. In this, the author has collected information about the existence in the past and present, of phallic worship in several countries—Greece, Egypt, Rome, Assyria, ancient America, etc. Linga worship or worship of Priapus, or fascinum, or Pripe-gala continued to exist, according to Boudin, till the 12th century A.D. in Germany, Slovakia, and France. In France a document "Sacerdotal Judgements on crimes" of the 8th century A.D. is said to contain the following:—If any one performs enchantments before the fascinum, let him do penance on bread and water during three lents.”

* "The worship of Linga is not confined to India alone. In ancient times it was prevailing in Asia and Europe, as also in Egypt. It was the Priapus of the Romans, and the phallic emblem of the Greeks. The Egyptians, Romans and the Greeks had temples dedicated to Priapus under the same form as that of the Lingam. The Israelites worshipped the same figure and erected statues to it. Scripture (I Kings XV) informs us that Asa, son of Rehoboam prevented his mother Malachah from sacrificing to Priapus whose image he broke. The Jews caused themselves to be initiated into the mysteries (Belphegor), a divinity like the Jangam when the Moabites and Midianites worshipped on Mount Phegot, and which worship in all appearance, they received from the Egyptians. When Judah did evil in the sight of the

Lord, and built them high places, and images and groves on every high hill, and under every tree, the object was Baal and the pillar, the Lingam was the symbol. It was on his altar, that they burned incence and sacrificed into the calf on the fifteenth day of the month, the sacred monthly period, the amavasya of the Hindus; the calf of Israel was the bull Nandi, the Apis of the Egyptian Osiris. According to colonel Tod the Lingam is identical with the Arabic Lat or Alhat. The worship reached France, doubtless with the Romans and the figure of Lingam is still to be seen on the lintel which surrounds the circus as Nimes as well as on front of some of the Churches, particularly on that of the Cathedral of Toulouse and on some Churches at Bordeaux. Plutarch says that the Egyptian God Osiris was found every where with Priapus exposed.

Linga worship was conducted in Phoenicia (Canon of Scripture) in the worse aspect. According to Lucian (De Syris Des) after the return of Bachus, he placed the colossal phalli each 300 fathoms. In the great Bachi pomp celebrated by Ptoloamyy of Alexandria we read (Ayjenius, Lib. V) of a golden Phallus 129 cubits high. There can be no doubt that the God Baal, whose votaries the Hebrews frequently became, is identical with the Lingam, and the god Chium in Amos V is Shiva, whose name the races dwelling along the valley of the Indus pronounce Chivin and Shiva. Yet there is nothing to show which race brought the Lingam worship to India and when. It seems to have been introduced about the beginning of the Christian era from the basin of the lower Indus through Rajputana, and to have
displaced the Nature worship of the Vedas. (Balfour's Cyclopaedia of India p. 716, 717)."

Linga worship having been proved to be pre-Vedic and prevalent during the times of the Mahabharata, the conclusion that it was brought to India about the beginning of the Christian era is wrong; and it seems to be a fact that Linga worship, perverted into phallic worship, was borrowed and taken from India to other countries.

But it is difficult to understand what it has to do with the Shivalingam. The phallic worship of some primitive peoples has no connection with the Dravidian worship of Shivalingam when detached and impartial consideration is given to the form of Shivalingam and the philosophical idea on which the form is based. Because some primitive peoples worshipped phallus it does not necessarily follow that the Dravidians also must have worshipped the same. The root cause of this deep prejudice and misunderstanding lies in the idea and the gratuitous assumption that the Dravidians, at the time of the Aryan invasion of India, were merely a primitive people with having no civilization of their own. It was imported, it is thought, by the Aryans and spread over India. This basic wrong idea has been mainly responsible for the misunderstanding in respect of the Linga being phallus as in other respects. The contemptuous epithets of abuse bestowed by the Aryans on the Dravidians (as noted above) has given rise to this wrong idea. But the high form of civilization of the Dravidians, as established in a previous section will, it is hoped, disabuse readers of this wrong idea, as it ought
to. The Dravidians had no such debased idea of Linga as being equivalent to phallus. They had a much deeper insight into the nature of the Almighty as the creator, protector and destroyer of the Universe. They had already formulated their notions about the Godhead as being, self-subsistent, omniscient, and benevolent, possessed of greatness and wondrous power or शक्ति. Is it in any way possible that they should identify such Being with phallus? Can it be expected that they should attribute such powers of Divinity and greatness to phallus? It seems obviously impossible that they should do so. On the contrary they could well find an emblem of their Godhead who was the creator and sustainer of the universe. The universe, they must have thought, was after the creator and the image of the God was reflected in the spherical universe and was represented by it. To all outward appearance the universe is a hemi-spherical thing bounded by the circular horizon and placed on something. This idea has been later expressed by the Puranas that the world-globe is balanced on the hood of Adishesha, the king of the snake-world. And the Linga with circular basis and the semi-spherical top placed on the circular basis represents the universe, the child and image of God. This was the idea of the Dravidians about their Godhead; and it has been philosophically explained in later religious literature, as will be noted presently.

Then how is the phallic worship of other primitive peoples to be accounted for? What was its origin? It seems to be as follows:—The Dravidians were the most ancient people of all other peoples of the world.
They were ahead of all others in developing human civilization. The finds of Mohenjo Daro and Harappa have revolutionized the idea of the movement of civilization from place to place. The idea heretofore was that civilization moved from West to East with the migration of the Mediterranean race in that direction. But it has been established that the reverse is the case. The civilization moved from East to West with the intercourse of peoples of East and West. The Western people must have borrowed the idea of the worship of the Godhead from the Eastern people. But the emblem or symbol of God was misunderstood and wrong construction was put upon it by the Westerners, who having misunderstood the language misunderstood the significance of the emblem. That was how the Linga was taken to be phallus and the phallus came to be worshipped by them. It was in this way that ancient Egyptians, Greeks and Romans borrowed the Linga worship from the ancient civilized Dravidians; but in their pitiable ignorance construed it as the phallic emblem. The Dravidians are not responsible for the idiotic mistake committed by the imitators and they can not be charged with the debased idea. Hence the blasphemous idea of the Shivalingam being the phallus of Shiva is unfounded. We request readers to understand our acceptance of this item of Tantrikism in the light of these remarks.

(2) A proof of phallic worship is sought from the word "विपन्द्रकः" occurring twice in the Rigweda. The interpretation of the word as "those whose God was phallus" also seems to be due to the obsession that
there was phallic worship existing before. However opinion is not only divided about this interpretation but goes against it on the whole. The foremost evidence against such interpretation is that of यास्क, the author of निरक्त, who says that विस्रृंदेवा: means अवश्य, and his is the most authoritative interpretation, as it must be, he being the earliest interpreter and nearest to the Rigwada in time. His was the higher criticism of the Vedas though his critical movement was not continued later. Yāska, the philologist interprets Vedic words, that had by his time become well nigh obscure in sense for ordinary people, in accordance with the material then existing and coming down by tradition. हुण्डामय, the commentator of निरक्त, explains the word as विस्रृंदेवा: एकथ्यन्ति कौड़न्ति इति. सायणामय also interprets it as विस्रृंदेवा: एकथ्यन्ति कौड़न्ति इति. In spite of this reasonable and rational interpretation Prof. Macdonell takes the opposite view and categorically asserts that phallic cult was in existence in the Vedic period and says "A symbol must have been used at a later period, in the phallic worship which was known by the occurrence in two passages of the word विस्रृंदेवा: (those who have a phallus for their deity). Such worship was, however, repugnant to the religious ideas of the Rigweda; for Indra is besought not to let the विस्रृंदेवा: approach the sacrifice (VII-21-5) and he is said to have slain the विस्रृंदेवा: when he won the treasure of the hundred-gated fort. (X-99-3). In the post-Vedic period, the Phallus or Linga became symbolical of Shiva's generative power and its worship is widely diffused even at the present

* Vedic Mythology, page 155.
day. " Muir on the contrary rightly thinks otherwise. He does not take the interpretation of वास्तक, इश्वाचार्य, and ताध्याचार्य at the face value but proceeds to examine it critically. While examining the word occurring in VII-21-5 he says "'The same word occurs in X-99-3. If this word is correctly rendered as above, the demons in question may have some affinity with the Gandhar-was, who are represented as objects of apprehension in A. V. IV-37, in consequence of their propensity for women, whom though themselves hairy like dogs and monkeys, they attempted to seduce by assuming agreeable forms (V.V-12). The author of the hymn accordingly wishes that they may be emasculated (V-7). Prof. Aufrecht also thinks that the word बिहृदेवः being a Bahuvrihi compound must mean lascivious." After an elaborate process of arguments he concludes "'However interesting it would be to find a proof of the existence of phallic worship among the aboriginal tribes contemporary with the Vedic Rishis it must be confessed that the word (बिहृदेवः ) does not supply the evidence." Dr. Bhandarkar, however, does not agree with this rational and impartial analysis of the question and says "'Here evidently those whose god was Shiśna or phallus, are meant as the enemies of the Vedic Aryas, who disturbed their Vedic rites. Notwithstanding all that is said about the matter my own belief is that the persons here referred to were really some tribe of the aborigines of the country, who worshipped the phallus." But it is a statement of his

* Muir's Sanskrit texts, IV, p. 409. † Vaishnavism and Shaivism, p. 163.
own belief and one is not bound to accept it without sounder and better evidence. The word विश्वदेवः refers to the immorality of the Vedic times and illicit love intrigues. There is nothing strange if there were love intrigues, notwithstanding that the average woman was chaste and a loving husband and wife are compared to the chakravāka bird and its mate, birds well known for being referred to in later literature as emblems of love and constancy. References to libertinism are found in various hymns. Thus evil-disposed wives, hostile to their husbands, for whom a special hell was created by the gods (R. V. IV-5-5), were unfaithful to their spouses. They seem to have received lovers in their houses. There is a whole hymn (A. V. IV-5), by means of which the paramour of an amourous lady sought to lull all the folk of the house to sleep, charm the dogs into silence and prayed to Indra to help him to escape free from death and harm during his visit to his inamorata. Giddy girls, not well looked after by their brothers, went astray (R. V. I—I-5-5), fondly went to the illicit unions and were abandoned (R. V. II 29-1); and one such castaway, the son of an unwedded damsel, Agru, was thrown into an anthill, but was saved by Indra and became a Rishi. Some women sought men, “mounting their cars to gather riches” (R. V. I-124-7) and “went about displaying themselves with glittering ornaments like the heavens with stars” (R. V. I-87-1). Brahmin women were not regarded sacrosanct but could be restored to their husbands after being seduced (R. V. X-109-6). Curses are levelled against people who “shut up” within their houses a Brahmin’s wife
(A. V. V-17-11), thereby proving that this was not uncommon. All this shows that शिष्टेत्वा refers to love-intrigues of beaux and belles who sought to satisfy their passion by means fair or foul.

One thing is remarkable that there are only two hymns in which the word शिष्टेत्वा occurs. If it were the phallic worship of the non-Aryans the Aryans, who took every occasion to condemn their enemies, would not have failed to speak of their phallic worship as many times and in as many ways as possible and condemn them for the debased form of worship in all possible ways. Barring these two deceptive and misleading references there is no mention of phallic worship anywhere else in Vedic, Brahmanic and Upanishadic literature. Hence शिष्टेत्वा cannot be a proof of phallic worship.

(3) That phallus is one of the meanings of लिंग is known from lexicons. But this is not the primary and prominent meaning of Linga but merely secondary and is a later growth. In अमरकोटिक the synonyms given of the male genital organ are—मण्डः वानिज्जयोः: शिष्टा: मेंढ़क मेहनशेखरी।
शुष्कोऽवकोशी: बुधण: त्रृणवशाचरे विपक्ष।

It is only in the नानाबंधों that लिंग is given as a synonym of बेफ़स्ख (लिंग बिनेशेशके।।) इत्यादि in his अभिधानस्थलमाला does not give लिंग as a synonym of शिष्ठ in—भागो योगिस्थथ्य वरांग स्मारमणविविश्च।
शिष्ठ: शेफ़ोग: मेंढ़क गुल्मे मेहनशेखरी।

Even in the verse—उपकरणं करणं प्रकिणे लिंगे च यातनाय च।
सेनागे संसिद्धि माणनशोः: प्रयोगं: स्वात।

(V-36).

The meaning of लिंग is साधन or देह In ब्रजयती of यादव-प्रकाश बेफ़स्ख is only an alternative sense of लिंग—लिंग बेफ़स्ख बेंडके
2-40
All this shows that phallus is only a secondary and not the primary sense of लिङ्ग. The primary sense of the word is "a sign or mark." And it is in this sense that it is more generally used. It is used in the sense of "middle term" by logicians, as ह्वायुध gives. In course of time the word began to convey other meanings as well and among them is that of male generative organ by the common law of degeneration of words, which is not peculiar to Sanskrit only. Generally decorum requires that words indecent and obscene should not be uttered by refined men while expressing such objects as do not admit of open mention. Thus toilet is a decorous way of expressing of what is otherwise expressed in indecent words. Genital organ is one such; and phallus as the prominent mark of masculinity came to be expressed in decorous language by the word लिङ्ग and not because it was the primary sense of लिङ्ग. In Upanishads it is invariably used in the sense of a mark, a symbol etc.” e. g. in the following:-

(a) अत्यायात्र घर: पुरुषों व्याप्ते उलिंग एव च। (कठ-VI-7).
(b) न चेव्यात्र नैव च तस्य लिङ्गम। (श्रे. VI-9).
(c) महौद्य विशेषांत्र लिङ्गम। (भै. VI-10).
(d) पुरुष: अध्यवसायंबाल्याभिमानलिंग। (भै. VI-30).
(e) स्वैवलिङ्गमेवः । (शै. VI-31). etc. etc.

These instances are sufficient, though many more can be given, to show that in philosophical literature the word is used in the sense of a mark or symbol and in no other. It is passing strange that it should all at once mean phallus in सिवलिंग and not merely a symbol or emblem of Shiva. We, therefore, conclude that the lexicographic secondary sense of लिङ्ग in सिवलिंग as the male organ is due merely to the preconceived prejudice of phallic worship of some peoples in ancient times.
(4) That the shape of Linga resembles an erect membrum virile is also a mistaken notion. In small-sized Shivalingas the top is always semi-spherical. But in big Lingas the top is generally elongated, as the proportionately magnified top does not look well. In many cases the proportionately magnified top is retained. But in more cases the elongated top is adopted to impart goodly shape and appearance to a स्थावरलिंग. The top is, therefore, proportionately elongated and not magnified. The peculiar shape of the Linga at Gudimallan, Kalattur, and Kudumiya-mlai had led (rather misled) Mr. T. A. Gopinathrao to believe and conclude that the Linga is only the phallus. He says *"The Linga itself is composed of two parts, the nut and the shaft of the membrum virile, each of them shaped exactly like the original model, in a state of erection. On plate II are given the front, and the back views of the Linga, a reference to which will enable the reader to form an excellent idea of the exactitude with which the sculptor has modelled this Linga in imitation of the human phallus." This also is merely prejudice and the result of the obsession of the idea of phallic worship, when it is seen that innumerable Shivalingas everywhere else in the land are all of a common shape having not even the slightest resemblance to the phallus answering the description of the the Lingas of the places. The three exceptions in those places need not prejudice and lead to the idea that all Lingas are phallic in shape. They should not be seriously taken and affect the inner meaning and the basic idea of the Shivalinga.

(5) Lastly the various verses of the Tantras about sex worship and sexual interpretation of the form of

* Hindu Iconography, vol. II page 68.
Linga are simply due to the degenerate Shâktas, who failing to understand the significance of Shâkta faith and ritual, fell a victim to degenerate practices. A few verses may be noted as follows:—†

(1) गुप्तानांदविमा शापि विंगमृत्युर्जप्र विंचि।
    तयामिनशुनक्षशल्यं जगान्नदावरणम्॥

(2) सा मगाध्या ब्रह्मात्री विंगमृत्युर्जप्र शिबेदिका।
    शिबेदिका अगाधान्न द्वायों ज्ञात्संक्रियोलोकम्॥

(3) उदापि मगाध्या विंगमृत्युर्जप्र च। etc. etc.

The advocates of the worship of Shakti, residing in Kula or perineum, misunderstood the meaning of Kundalini or the universal power lying in a static condition with downward face (अधेशुमुखी) and cooped up there. The power is to be roused and put into a dynamic condition gradually to be raised (अधेशुमुखी) by stages to union with the Universal consciousness (अत्माविस्मर्ष). The inability of the followers, कौलक्ष or बामास as they are called, to understand the meaning and significance of the Shâkta rituals led to the debased and perverted forms of Shakti worship. They gave free rein to sexual instincts, quite an inexorable physical demand, and consequent sexual excesses. * “No where have the sexual emotions been more deliberately exploited in the name of religion, no where have the animal instincts and dark imaginings of early man been given greater scope.” Their literature also embodies in many cases these wrong and perverted notions of Shâkta rituals and ceremonies with the result that they brought hellish odium not upon themselves but upon all other Shâktas and Shaivas, the two Schools being so allied. Their

† Ibid pp. 61. * The Shaktas of Bengal (Heritage of India series) page 5.
literature was a kind of veiled कामशाळा (as noted above). It is thus that the Philosophical terms, some of them at least, came to be misunderstood. e.g. भौतिक is not cohabitation as it is ordinarily understood and as understood by the Kaulas, but means cooperation or concerted action of Shiva and Shakti, the परमहम्म and his power. The verses, quoted above and similar ones, are not to be taken literally and should not lead readers to the prejudiced idea of Linga being phallus, just as गोि, used so many times by खेलाझुत should not be understood as "female genital organ" but merely as the source or prima causa of the universe.

That Linga is not phallus was first pointed out by Swami Vivekananda who maintained § "The worship of Shivalinga originated from the famous Lingam in the Atharva Veda Sanhita sung in praise of यूपस्लंभ, the the sacrificial post. In that hymn a description is found of the beginningless and endless stambha or Skambha and it is shown that the said Skambha is put in place of the eternal Brahman. As, afterwards, the sacrificial fire, the smoke, ashes and flames, the Soma plant, the ox used to carry it on its back, the word for the Vedic sacrifice gave place to Shiva's body, his yellow matter hair, his blue throat, and the bull, the Yupa-stambha gave place to the Shivalingam and was raised to high Devahood of Shree Shankar. In A. V. the sacrificial cows are praised with the attributes of the Brahman. In the Linga Purana, the same hymn is expanded in the form of stories meant to establish the glory of the great स्तम्भ and superiority of Mahâdeva. Later on he says that the explanation of Shivalingam as Phallic emblem began in India in her

§ Siddhanta Dipika, X-21.
most thoughtless and degraded times.” So also it is said "There is nothing like the phallic orgies of antiquity; it is all mystical and spiritual. The Linga is twofold, external and internal. The ignorant who needs a sign, worship Shiva as a "mark" or "type"—which is the proper meaning of the word "Linga"—of wood or stone; but the wise look upon this outward emblem as nothing but, and contemplate in their minds, the invisible, inscrutable type, which is Shiva Himself. Whatever may have been the origin of this form of worship in India, the notion upon which it is founded, according to the impure notions of European writers, are not to be traced in even the Shiva Puranas." Similarly "Much harm has been done to many of the Shaiva Schools of thought by well-known European writers, in whose minds the idea of Lingam is, somehow or other, so closely associated with the phallus that they cannot but see some hidden trace of phallic obscenity even in the highest philosophical interpretation of Lingam by some of the masterly writers of this school."

What then is the Linga? What is the meaning of the symbol? It is the amorphous representation of Shiva and the least anthropomorphic, as maintained by Dr. A. K. Kumar-swami who * says "The Lingam is not properly an instance of sex symbolism; it is probably not of phallic origin but derived from the stupa, and is now regarded as the highest emblem of Shiva, because the least anthropomorphic. True sex-symbolism in Indian art or literature

† H. H. Wilson on the Puranas, page 72. † Shakti or Divine Power, p. 214.

* Amis of Indian Art, Campden, 1908.
assumes two main forms: The conception of the relation of the soul to God expressed in terms of the passionate adoration of a woman for her lover; and the representation of the energetic power (shakti) of a divinity as a feminine divinity.”

Shiva Para-Brahman is the highest Divine Principle in intimate union with Divine Power, the प्राचार्य. The only positive qualities of this Divine Principle are सदृश, भिन्न, and आनंद. He has आत्मत्रित्व i.e. He is conscious of Himself. His self-consciousness or आत्मत्रित्व is philosophically expressed as “अस्तित्व, प्रकाश, निवृत्ति.” He is the cosmic पुरुष but is निराकार or has no particular form and has no distinguishing mark, as said by शेषात्स्वतर “नव च तत्त्व हिन्मु.” He is therefore inconceivable बदिः (तदक्षयन्नित्तम् श्रे. 3-10). The inconceivable form is expressed by शिवांतिशिवाखानि as—

अस्तित्व शाक्तिस्वाकारमन्नक्षणपद्यास्तम्।
निविन्दितर्व निराकारः निरस्ताश्रयविभवम्।
परिवस्तद्विज्ञ्ययं अपवाचातीतवेशम्।
अन्त्बिक्ष्याविभावणामागोचेरयो विच्छिन्तम्।
स्वप्रकाशविराजन्तमन्नक्षणमन्नैपलम्।
साध्वं सर्वम्य शातं सर्भसङ्क्षिप्तम्य निरंकुशम्।
शिवस्वमहाद्विगुडविद्परिवीतातम्।
अद्वितीयमनिदेश्यं परं अन्नं सनातनम्।

That God cannot be known by the mind or the physical senses is the verdict of all sages. It is in this sense that Herbert Spencer, than whom there are few greater names in European Philosophy, speaks of God as the “unknown and unknowable.” What he means is that Deity per se is “unknown and unknowable.” Commenting on the meaning of these terms, says that faithful discipel
of Herbert Spencer, John Fisk, in his "Cosmic Philosophy", that † "Deity is unknowable just in so far as it is not manifested to consciousness through phenomenal world; knowable just in so far as it is thus manifested: unknowable just in so far as infinite and absolute—knowable in the order of its phenomenal manifestations; knowable in a symbolic way as the power which is disclosed in every throb of the mighty rhythmic life of the universe; knowable as eternal source of moral law, which is implicated with each action of our moral lives and in obedience to which lies our only guarantee of the happiness etc. etc." Shiva is thus inconceivable. Not being conceivable He cannot be worshipped. Yet a religious mind hankering after eternal happiness cannot be satisfied without worship and cannot do without worship. He, therefore, requires some representation or some symbol of God; for without some concrete symbol of God, God would be to him a formless abstraction devoid of meaning. And it is inevitable that this should be so, for to the ordinary mind an idea of God that disregards symbols and ceremonies cannot but be unintelligible. It is therefore to satisfy the spiritual hunger and thirst of those, who are babes and sucklings and who cannot digest abstract ideas of God, that temples are built and images, representing God in his different powers and attributes, are consecrated. Whatever may be said against images in temples and against rituals and ceremonies, no one can gainsay the fact that they are indispensable at a certain stage of the spiritual evolution of man. Macaulay points out this necessity in his essay on Milton. He says "Logicians may reason about abstractions. But the great mass of men

† S. D. XII 202.
must have images. The strong tendency of the multitude in all ages to idolatry can be explained on no other principle. Reformers have often made a stand against these feelings, but never with more than partial success. They, who have demolished the images in Cathedrals, have not always been able to demolish those which were enshrined in their minds." Hence the symbol of Shiva was found out. For शिवकार Shiva, who is अमूनि or formless in his अमूनि condition, is मूर्ति or साधकार in his manifest condition, manifest in the form of the Universe. He assumes eightfold forms and is, therefore, called अमूनि, ether, air, fire etc. i.e. the whole universe is his form, which, as remarked above, is to all outward appearance a hemisphere placed on something; and this the Linga represents. Shiva is both मूर्ति and अमूनि as said by ब्रह्मचर्य अमूनि-वानि। "दे एव वस्तुणि स्तरे मूर्ति अमूर्ति त।" The Linga, the amorphous symbol of Shiva, represents the मूर्ति form of Shiva. The Linga, thus, signifies what is अविभाज्त or Shiva that has no special form or mark. The round basis with the round semi-spherical top placed on it admirably answers this description of the idea of मूर्ति.

Such is the explanation of the Linga as अर्थवृत्त or phenomenal manifestation. But there is another side of the explanation of the Linga as वाष्पमय. शिवसव वाष्पमय is the cosmic पुष्प having आत्मविरमिस्ति. He first vibrates in his वृक्ष towards creation. The vibration is नाद, the first expression as नाम or name. From this नाद proceeds बिंदु, (dot), i.e. the form. These two नाम and रूप or नाद and बिंदु, are what is known so well as तोकार or प्रणव. The बिंदु is the disc-like पीठ and नाद is the line supervening the पीठ. The line stands on the बिंदु like a cylinder with a rounded
From another point of view also the symbol of Linga is well explained. शिव पाशुन्म हस has no particular form but is all-formed. He is, therefore, called शिवलय (ते विश्वाधर्म विश्वाध-वे-VI-5). He is the creator of the Universe and assumes all forms in the Universe. (विश्वाध शताभं महर्म.बे, V-13). He, the one God, is hidden in all creatures; He pervades all and forms the inner soul of all. He is said to have a thousand heads, a thousand eyes, and a thousand feet. He has hands and feet in all directions; He has eyes, heads, and faces on all sides, as is said in (पुजास्तुक्क शरूबार) श्रेष्ठाण्वर in –III-13, 14, 15:— चहलस्वरथ: पुजास्तुक्क शरूबार।
शरूबार: पाणिनां तस्फलतोऽक्षस्रोपुजास्तुक्क।
शरूबार: सुतीभिषज़के स्वरुपमात्मा तत्वावत॥

The semi-spherical top supervening the round basis admirably represents this description of the cosmic Purusha, with whom Shiva was identified by His devotees. The round top on the round basis really consists of thousands of heads, each of the size of a point. The sides of the cylindrical figure represents equally truly thousands of eyes, heads and faces in all directions. The semi-spherical top, resembling the visible horizon, is truly symbolical of the universe that surrounds the earth on all sides. Though the symbol has no eyes and feet, and eyes and ears, it has thousands of hands and feet, heads, eyes and ears, in all directions, just as a circle has no face all round but it has faces in all directions at every point of the circumference. Thus the Linga is the closest possible representation of such a formless or all-formed God शिव. This explanation is borne out by several passages in the Linga Purana, e.g.
(The Supreme Being who has no characteristic marks is the source of characteristic marks. Imperceptibility is spoken of as the mark (of Shiva). The Linga (Shiva-Linga) is remembered as pertaining to Shiva. So also-

( the image (form) of the world created itself from the indistinguishable (अलिंग). If the words लिंग and अलिंग are properly understood there can be no shadow of doubt that लिंग does not mean phallus but merely a mark or symbol. If the word लिंग is taken as meaning phallus the passages become meaningless.

All classes of things in the universe must have different shapes and forms. The class of beings called the Gods must have different shapes and forms, though nobody knows what those shapes and forms are. And much more so must have the Highest Being. It is only the fancy of the human beings that has endowed Gods with anthropomorphomorphic forms. But there is no proof of that. And the presumption is that Gods have shapes and forms different from those of human beings just as human beings have shapes and forms different from those of other animals, worms, insects etc. Thus if Linga is the phallus of Shiva, he must have a human form; but it is a gratuitous assumption and a mere fancy without any proof, simply because some men have imagined Gods to be after themselves. Moreover, even if Linga is phallus why should it be the Linga of Shiva only? Did Shiva alone have phallus and no other Gods? It is certainly unimaginable. And why should
phallus of Shiva alone be the object of worship and of no other God? No satisfactory explanation can be given to this question. It is, therefore, clear that Linga is not phallus but only a mark. It is only deep-rooted prejudice that has misled readers from the inner meaning of Shivalinga. It was in the thoughtless and degraded days of India, as Swami Vivekananda has remarked, that Shivalinga was taken to be a phallic emblem; the days when internal quarrels between the different sects were rampant and were waged with implacable hatred. The story of Linga being sundered by a curse does not at all account for the origin of the Linga but merely a supposed and fanciful tale as it was a general practice in antiquity to invent fictitious tales for the purpose of explaining names of which the origin was lost in obscurity. The thick mist of ages began at first to dim the true significance of symbol, till in the long distance of time the significance was so entirely lost, that people at a comparatively later stage began to tax their brains and ingenuity to unravel the mysteries. Many of the indecent practices of Soma, Kapalika Bhairava, and Shaktta sects (Våma and others) began to appear in their religion and Tantras came to be written. The Vaishnavas began to hate Shaivas and vice versa and condemned each other in all possible ways. During the days of such mutual vilification that Linga came to be taken as a phallic emblem. But the real meaning is different as is shown above.

(IV) Ishtalinga and image worship.

Shivalinga, the amorphous representation of Shiva, is the image of Shiva based on the inner meaning as
explained already. The Linga worn on the body, technically called इश्लिङ्ग, is the miniature of स्थावरलिङ्ग worshipped in temples. It is made of light grey slate stone obtained from Parvatagiri in the North Aroct. To be kept intact all through the wearer’s life, it is coated all over with fine durable thick black paste of cow dung ashes mixed with some suitable oil. Sometimes it is made of ashes mixed with clarified butter. The coating is called कांति or covering. The question arises whether the Ishtalinga is as much an image as a स्थावरलिङ्ग and its worship is as much image worship as that of a स्थावरलिङ्ग. The suspicion of the worship of इश्लिङ्ग being image worship is likely to be supported by the worship by Lingayatas of images at home of particular family deities, which vary according to local customs and prevalence of local deities, male or f: male, more generally male deities. The answer to the question, whether इश्लिङ्ग is an image and its worship is image worship, is an embhatic no. इश्लिङ्ग is not image or प्रतीक of Shiva and worship is not प्रतीकोपासना. It is Shiva himself and its worship is अहंमङ्ख्यापासना. We have already noted the difference between प्रतीकोपासना and अहंमङ्ख्यापासना in our notes on the texts (see pp. 20-27). There it is stated that द्रश्यापासना is not the मानसोपासना of the प्रतीक of पश्चम्बू, but is the उपासना of the इश्लिङ्ग, the उपासना or प्राणलिङ्ग worn or borne in the heart, i. e. residing in the heart. The उपासना of the devotee is the अहंमङ्ख्यापासना of परशिव. The इश्लिङ्ग or the Linga in its gross form is परशिव himself; and theउपासक, who is the microcosm of the macrocosmic soul, is brought face to face with परशिव, the उपास्यदेवता, by अहंमङ्ख्यापासना. In the प्रतीकोपासना, on the other hand, the उपास्यदेवता is not face to face with the उपासक or the devotee.
It is merely the representative or image of the deity that is worshipped. In the scheme of philosophy of the Lingayat religion, the Linga (समुष्टिसिव) and अंग (the devotee of a human being) are only the twofold manifestations of परिशिव, the निर्वृणिसिव, in his sportive activity called उपास्योपासकलीन्या, as is said in अनुमानपूर्ण—

उपास्योपासकलीन्या स्थायिक हिंसाभिवेदः।
शिखरशतुमुखायम् श्यार्दृशतुमुखायम्॥
उपास्यश्व तथोपासकलीन्या च परमः: हिंसाः।
अवच्छुद्वत्समेदेन स्थितः: सल्लाल्लीन्या॥

This हिंसा is the उपास्य form and अंग is the उपासक form of परिशिव. Similarly पराशिव कोषिक्षु becomes twofold, कोषिक्षु associated with हिंसा and माँक्षि associated with अंग or the individual soul. In this way अंग with माँक्षि is the smallest possible model or the very abridged form of Shiva and his Shakti. The उपास्य is, therefore, अवच्छुद्वत्समेदेन, because the Linga and Anga are one and the same (see notes p. 24). Linga is threefold (1) माभालिन्य or Linga the ideal corresponding to (कारणशारीर) of the devotee (2) प्रणालिन्य or Linga the vital or mental corresponding to (सृजनशारीर) of the devotee (3) इश्वरिन्य or Linga the gross or physical corresponding to (स्त्रूतशारीर) of the devotee. इश्वरिन्य is connected with the प्रणालिन्य and the माभालिन्य. The devotee starts with the उपास्य of इश्वरिन्य and reaches by stages the प्रणालिन्य and the माभालिन्य with the idea of his being a part and parcel of परिशिव through all the stages, though cooped up in the human form. इश्वरिन्य, therefore, not being an image but only a modification of Shiva, is Shiva Himself. Hence it is not an image or प्रलीन and its worship is not प्रताकोषिक्षुन्न or image worship.
Such a kind of उपासना or mode of worship is called दशमार्ग based on the योगाशास्त्र of the दिव्यारागमास or the Divine Shaiva scriptures. This corresponds to the remaining three modes of worship based on the remaining three भाग्याचार of the Agamas, the चर्याचार, the दिव्याशास्त्र, and the ज्ञानाशास्त्र. They are respectively called the दासमार्ग, the सत्यतमार्ग, and the सुन्दरमार्ग.

the दासमार्ग, or the path of servant following the master, is the discipline of the चर्याचार. It consists in the search of the lord in the objective भवन and has for its object the disposition of the ancillaries connected with his worship under the form of a material प्रतीक, the singing of his glories ever and anon and the extension of आद्य प्रार (honour and hospitality) to his genuine servants. The सत्यतमार्ग or the path of son serving the will of his father takes a higher step of worshipping the Lord under a mental प्रतीक formed in the mind in accordance with the description in the Kriyapada (क्रियापद) of the Divine Agamas. In this stage the rites significant of the purification of स्थूलहारि of the worshipper and the symbolical and mental imaging of the सुन्दरहारि of the same are added on to the externals connected with the worship of the Lord under a material प्रतीक. The worshipper behaves towards the Lord as a son does towards his father with a combination of reverence and affection. The सर्वमार्ग, that is contemplated by Veerashaivism, is pure subjective worship of the Lord. Here the Jiva is slowly disentangled from the lusts of flesh and its bondage to corruption and joined on to the Lord. The Jiva is taught to discern for itself, that its inveterate identification of its own self with
the vrittis of Chitta and Indriyas is due to an inherited Vasanā, and that its own station is in the Lord, in Whom it lives, moves and has its being. For achieving this end, the whole of the Yogapadas of the Agama is devoted and their practical bearing on the daily conduct of the search after God, is fully brought. Here the worshipper behaves towards the Lord as an associate or a friend. Lastly the सन्मार्ग, the highest mode of worship, is the only the next step or stage of the Veerashaiva devotee, in which the subjective worship of the Lord is further inculcated in spirit and in truth for attaining to the condition of Sāyujya or Sāmarasya, in which condition the sense of चिन्तन ceases to operate, the subject and object become indistinguishable, and the Lord alone is seen in place of His prapancha that we all see. This is the श्रानन् श्रामार्ग where the devotee becomes possessed of सहस्रमार्ग. The चार्य and किंया disciplines are temporary or व्यावहारिक and योग and शान disciplines are real or पारमार्थिक. The सहस्रमार्ग is a stage preparatory to the सन्मार्ग, in which the objective conduct of the worshipper in सहस्रमार्ग, is eliminated. In the सहस्रमार्ग the worshipper starts with the idea of being similar (समस्य) to the Lord and attains शाहध्य which by the सन्मार्ग expands into सायुज्य or श्रायांगमामस्य, as it is called technically in Veerashaivism. The goals of the four modes are, शालेश्वर of the दासमार्ग, सामीश्वर of the सायुज्यमार्ग, नास्थ्य of the सहस्रमार्ग, and सायुज्य of the सन्मार्ग. Hence the Ishtalinga is not the अतीत of the Lord but the Lord himself and its worship is not that of अतीत or image worship.

✔ So far as the image-worship at home of Lingayatas is concerned it has no scriptural sanction behind it. It is
merely an imitation of the image worship of other Hindus which is universal in India. It is certainly a base imitation by the Lingayat as, as there is no necessity for image worship when every Lingayat, man and woman and child, has इल्लिंग to be worn and worshipped. The इल्लिंग is given to a child as soon as it is born and it continues to be worn and worshipped throughout the life of the child till its death; and the इल्लिंग is buried with the wearer. To lose it is to lose one’s life in the literal sense of the word. The author of Lingadharanachandrika refers to this in section VIII of the text on page 42. Thus to seek support for the image-worship by the Lingayats, from their present practice, is futile, in as much as the custom of image-worship is an excrescence on the Lingayat religion and has sapped the life and spirit of the religion.

(X) Schools of Shaivism.

We have traced the history of the development of Shaivism from the earliest times to the end of the eleventh century of the Christian era. We have seen that in ancient times the Shaivas formed a sect of men and women, high and low, without the distinction of caste and creed. The prominent characteristic of the Shaivas from its very inception was that they discarded the Vedic form of worship, of performing sacrifices to the deities representing the forces of nature; and their worship was mainly अचेतन and ध्यान of the deity, the cosmic principle. We now proceed to see when the worshippers formed into a distinct sect, which in course of time developed into various sects. A sect is a religious body or denomination, in which distinct religious doctrines and principles are formulated and which has a distinct religious philosophy and common forms of worship.
that distinguish one particular sect from another, either of
the same religion or another religion. It is rather difficult
to determine the time when Shaivism was reduced to
definite principles and shape. The philosophy and practice
of Shaivism have been set forth in very general terms in
\textit{Bhagavata Purana}. But in the \textit{Shantiparvan} it is found to
have attained a more definite form. In this \textit{Upanishad}
there occur the special technical terms of Shaivism, such as
\textit{pāt}, \textit{pāt}, \textit{pāt}, and \textit{pātupāta}. The \textit{Upanishad} as well enjoins
that one should undertake the \textit{Pāshupata} vow which is
explained in words “In the inside of the heart there exists
the subtle body, in which there are anger, greed, and
forgiveness. Destroying the greed, which is the root-
cause of human motives, one should be moderate in eating
and drinking.” The form of worship is also laid down
therein as the meditation on the deity resulting in the
perception of the deity (अवणति), the muttering of the मन्त्र,
\(\mathbb{O}\), and the application of भक्ति to the body. All these are
common to all different sects that arose later in due course.
A Shaiva sect however, is mentioned by Patanjali in
his \textit{Mahabhashya}, \textit{P. V. 2-76}. He mentions Shiva-Bhagavatas,
the ascetic devotees of शिवभगवान्, moving about with iron
trident in hand. The date of Patanjali is second century
B.C. In a section of \textit{Shantiparvan} of the \textit{Mahabharata}, called
“the नारायणिय section” it is stated that \textit{Pāshupata} is one of
the five schools of religion. There it is stated that Shiva-
Shrikantha, the consort of Umā and the Lord of spirits,
revealed the tenets of that school. § In the \textit{Vayu Purana}

§\textit{Kūrmapurāṇa} also says that Lakulīsha was an
avatāra of Shiva in chapter 53. The following may be
quoted:—


(chap. 23) and Linga-Purana (chap. 24) it is said that Maheshwar told Brahmadeva that when Vasudeva, the best of Yadus, would be born of Vasudeva, he would incarnate himself as a Brahmacharin by the name of Lakulim at a place, called Kāyāvatara or Kāyāvarohana, and that Lakulim would have four pupils of names Kushika, Garga, Mitra, and Kaurushyā, these would be Pāshupatas for their following the religion of Pashupati; that they would sprinkle their bodies with ashes and would in the end go to the world of Rudra after preaching Māheshwar Yoga. The modern Karvan, a town in the Dabhoi Taluka of the Baroda State, is the Paurānik Kāyārohana. The same story of Lakulisha’s birth is elaborated in a dialogue between शिव and पार्वती, in three chapters called “कारणवाचाल्यम्.”

So also in the Sutras of Uttaramimansa the पाशुपतवाङ्ग is refuted in चूँ “पत्थरसांमस्याय” (II-2-37), which has been interpreted by all commentators as containing the refutation of Pāshupata doctrines, in which पाशुपति is maintained to be the Lord (पति) of the cattle (पाषु or the universe containing the animate and the inanimate creatures). The date of बादशाहम is about two centuries B. C. From all this it appears that the पाशुपत School arose in the second century B. C. and that it was founded by Lakulisha, the holder of लक्ष or लक्ष्म (a club or staff). The doctrines of this
school have been summarized by बाबुराजर्षि in his सर्वदशनसंग्रह, under the caption; 'बकुलीशपानिस्तदशन।’ By-the-bye it may be noted that बकुलीश is considered the last of the 28 incarnations of Shiva, as mentioned by the Puranas, and that he had four disciples, as all the 28 incarnations had four disciples each. This conclusion of Lakulisha being the founder of the भाषुपतशाश्च is confirmed by later inscriptions, which may be briefly stated as follows:—* “In an inscription in the temple of Nātha near that of Ekalingi, 14 miles to the north of Udaipur, Rajputana, it is stated that Shiva became incarnate as a man with a club (Lakula) in his hand, in the country of सृपुक्त्त्व, being propitiated by सृपु. Sages, Kushika and others, conversant with the Pāshupata Yoga, and using ashes, wearing bark-dress, and matted hair, are mentioned. There is another inscription, usually called the Chitra Prashasti, which states that Shiva became incarnate in the form of Bhattāraka Shri-Lakulisha, and dwelt at Kārohana in the Lāta country. There appeared in bodily form four pupils of his names, Kushika, Gārgya, Kaurusha, and Maitreya for the strict performance of the Pāshupata vows, and they became the originators of four branches. ” Thus Dr. Sir Bhandarkar says † “We may, therefore, place the rise of the Pāshupata school mentioned in the नारायणीय (section of विज्ञानार्ल), about a century after that of the Pāncharâtra, system, i. e. about the 2nd century B. C.” Subsequently during the first millenium of the Christian era there arose different schools or sects of Shaivism. They hold different theological and cosmological views and have different

* Shaivism and Vaishnavism pp. 166-167.
† Shaivism and Vaishnavism, page 166.
religious practices. The doctrines of the different Schools will be sketched later on. But it is not possible to give dates except approximate, when the sects arose. Some of them are earlier and some are later. But all are earlier than the Lingayata religion which comes last of all and is an improvement upon all earlier ones. Lakulisha Pāshupata religion is the first and earliest school that assumed a definite denominational form as noticed above. All the rest seem to have improved upon the Lakulisha Pāshupata doctrines under different names. All the sects have the same common name, namely, Pāshupata, having पलि, पशु, and पश्च, the main and central doctrinal principles, common to all. The term *“Pāshupata” seems to be synonymous with “Maheshwar”, derived from Maheshwar, a name of Shiva. The term “Lākula”, signifying the Lakulisha Pāshupata School or sect, founded by Lakulisha, was the general name by which all the Shaiva sects were called. This will be evident from the following discussion.

§ “Samkara says that the Māhesvaras maintain that Pashupati has revealed five topics. (Br. S II 2.37). Thus the sects were known by the general name of Mahesvara, and Pashupati or the god Shiva was believed to be their founder. Rāmānuja under the same sutra, which however is numbered 35, speaks of the systems as the “tenets of Pashupati” Srikanta-Sivacārya calls them the believers in the Agamas revealed by Paramesvara or the great god.”

* माधवाचार्य in his चर्चार्चनलंब्राड़ speaks of Lakulisha Pāshupatas and Shaiva Siddhantins as केवल माहेश्वरः। and Kashmir Shaivas as परे माहेश्वरः। and so on

...§ Shaivism and Vaishnavism, pp. 170-172.
The name Mahesvara is the old name as is evident from the fact that Wema-Kadphises, as noticed above and several later princes especially of the Valabhi dynasty, called themselves Mâhesvaras. Hiuen Tsiang, too, as we have seen mentions temples of Mahesvara at which the Pāsupatas worshipped. It also follows that all these sects were known at the same time by the name of Pāsupata sects. And the founder of them all was believed to be the god Pāsupati.

The same conclusion is to be deduced from the Mysore inscriptions that have been published, the only difference being that the original teacher is called Lakuli or Lakulisa. In one inscription dated 943 A. D. referred to above, it is stated that Lakulisa, being afraid that his name and doctrines would be forgotten, became incarnate as Muninatha Cilluka. This appears to be a general name applicable to all systems. In another dated 1078 A. D. one ascetic is called an ornament to the Lākula School and another is spoken of as a "hand to Lakula." This appears to be the general name and does not point to a specific sect. In the third dated 1103 A. D. Somesvarasuri is spoken of as having caused the Lākula doctrine (siddhanta) to bloom. He is called a Naiyayika and Vaishesika. This shows that he belonged to the specific Pāsupats sect. In a fourth dated 1177 A. D. certain ascetics are called upholders of the Lākutagama; Samaya is a system based upon works of Lakulin, and adherents of Kālāmukhas. Here evidently the Kālāmukhas are called Lākulas, which is the same as Pāsupatas. The names of the ascetics mentioned in this inscription, end in the word Shakti and Jiya, which appear to be characteristic of the Kālāmukha sect. In a fifth dated
1183 A. D. is noticed a grant to Nāgasiva-Pandila, who is called an upholder of the Lākula system and the names of his preceptors in two preceding generations end in the suffix Shiva. Nāgasiva is praised for eminence in Āgama and in Sivatattva. From the ending suffix ‘shīva’ in these names and the mention of a proficiency in Āgama and in Sivatattva, it appears that Nāgasiva was a follower of the Shaiva School, and at the same time, he was a Lākula, or Pāsupata. A sixth dated 1199 A. D. notices a grant of land to Bammadeva, son of Nagarāsi, the promoter of the system based upon the work of Lakulin the suffix rāsi is found in a great many names of the devotees of Shiva. Whether it is a characteristic of a specific sect is not clear but it appears that the bearers of it belong to the Pāshupata or the Kālamukha school. In a seventh dated 1213 A. D., a certain religious man is represented as the upholder of the system known by the name of Vagi-Lākula i.e. the system of the learned Lākulin. In an eighth dated 1285 A. D., the grantor is called a supporter of the new system of Lakulin. This perhaps refers to the later school of Lingāyatas."

Though शंकराचार्य discusses and refutes the doctrines of only one school under the common appellation of Māheśhwar i.e. Lakulīsha Pāshupata School of Shaivism, on the contrary in शंकरविजय of आनंदगिरि, a disciple of शंकराचार्य ten different sects are mentioned. The leaders of these different schools, says आनंदगिरि, went to शंकराचार्य to establish the superiority of their particular schools but were defeated in the end by the great philosopher. Thus in chap. IV of शंकरविजय it is said—भस्मविर्भागरसः केति: । काले विश्रुतविद्धः । रौद्रः । हुन्दूर्यं दमहरारिमः उषा: । काहे लिङ्गचिन्द्रविद्धः मद्द्रत: ।
Thus in all there were six schools on account of their practising different rites. In chap. V two more Schools have been referred to and defeated in the end by the आचार्य. Later in chap. 23 and 24 two more sects have dealt with. In the colophon of the 23rd chapter it is said—कापालिकेकदेरशनिवेशम् and in that of chap. 24 it is said कापालिकेकदेरशनिवेशम्. This last seems to be that of the कालामुख school or the sect of कालामुखाः. The six kinds of Shaivas mentioned in chap. IV seem to have belonged to one School, though they differed in their religious practices. This is evident from what is said about them in the next chapter in words—कस्यं सन्यासिनः मायाविषयारथम् समाधाय पद्धतिशैवाचाराः परिधाज विद्वालीवारादीनः मतचातुर्य हृद्वा इत्या etc.

In chap. V two distinct schools have been refuted, because it is said—एवं परिधातोः शेषवमैकर्षेषिनोः नुसस्य मायालेखण प्रत्यवतिति अवलोकनाय: इति। Thus in all शंकराचार्य meets and defeats in discussion five different schools of the Shaivas. But it is not possible to identify and name the five sects, as no clue to tenets of any particular school has been given in the discussion, which is only very general about the superiority of Shiva to all other gods. However the commentators of Shankaracharya's माथ्य mention only four Schools or sects, namely, शेष, पाश्चिंत, कास्कृथिदातर् and कापालिकः. The third is named as कार्वचिकिदातर् by वाच्यवितिमिथ्, a renowned commentator of शंकरामाथ्य. Râmânuja and Keshava Kâsmirin mention the same four schools; but they mention कालामुखाः in stead of Kârukasiddhântins. The word कालामुख is probably the same as कीर्ष्य, the third of the four pupils of Lakulisha, by corruption. It seems, therefore, that in course of time the five Schools or sects came to be only four, by one of them being absorbed by one of the rest
troatH of tho priniploH of four schools of Shaivas in his सबेदभेदसंवाहत. They are (1) भुजवपाध्याय (2) नैर or माइस्हर (3) अखविन्डक and (4) रेखर The last does not deserve to be a separate school, as the only one thing that is special with the followers of this school, forming their differentia as it were, is that they tried to make their body everlasting and indestructible by taking a special preparation made of mercury. Their object in making the body permanent is stated as follows:—* अरे माइस्हर: परम् तात्त्वात्मत्वान्तोऽन्ति प्रिन्दविध्य रत्नाविन्धता जीवन्युक्ति: सेस्तततत्त्वाय निर्दयधिशैपाय पार्षदिस्वेदेव रथेव लीलरत्ने।......नैरभावातिरायि जीवन्युक्त्वुणि नेः बालमविकयुक्तक- मतीतिन्ध। पद्मायि दशस्रेष्ठ देवस्ततत्ततं सुक्ष्मरक्ततव तत्र विभासायुतः नित्यविचलितवत्वते।....तस्माजीवन्युक्ति सर्वायुहतमन आयुगा प्रभम देशतालितविश्वय। This attitude of the Siddhas has been explained well philosophically by Dr. V. V. Ramanan Shastri in the following words:—

† "The Siddha is emphatic that when a man dies, he is already habited in a new body, for the old body can fall off only in the presence of a new one; the subtle body, of which the gross is the natural product and appointed protective covering, will not keep from instinctively habiting itself in a fresh gross body when the existing one tends to give out from transmigrational stress. The triune natural body of man, formed of impure matter ( asuddha-māyā ), is divisible into three inter-connected vestures, a gross, a subtle, and a super-subtle, one. The gross vesture is the out growth of the subtle, and the subtle that of the super-subtle. The

* सबेदभेदसंवाहत (Poona edition) pages, 202, 303
† Cultural Heritage of India, pp. 307, 308
grational circuit, when through, cleanses the substance of the triune body of its dross of impurity and also unitizes the body by a process of regular reduction and telescopement of the less subtle into the more subtle vesture. But the riddance of impurity from the unitized body, induced by transmigrational cleansing, is but artificial, and cannot therefore compare favourably with the supernal grade of natural purity characteristic of pure matter (suddha-māyā) out of which impure matter has evolved. It may be passingly noted here that impure matter is always corruptible just as pure matter is always incorruptible. A special method must consequently be resorted to for bringing the purified corruptible matter of asuddha-māyā completely into line with the incorruptible and naturally pure matter of suddha-māyā, and transubstantiating the former into the latter, with a view to freeing the human body from the demands made upon it by the scheme of animal economy. And for resorting to that special method the spontaneous intervention of a true mukta of the Siddha-mārga (path) is essential. Till the unitized body of asuddha-māyā is thus transmuted into one of suddha-māyā, bodily death and hence transmigration cannot, cease even in the absence of any karmic liability, as the asuddha-māyā of the unitized body, however cleansed, cannot be rid of its native corruptible quality and is therefore directly under the clutches of the laws of animal economy. But such transmigration will not be long in evidence without the transmigrator's spiritual urge suddenly bringing to him vis-a-vis a real mukta of the Siddhamārga, ready to help him further forward along the correct track for eschewing bodily death.
When, however, the transmutation of the asuddha-māyā into the suddha-māyā has become an accomplished fact under the gracious guidance of the mukta in question, the body becomes incorruptible and cannot thereafter be faced by death; and life’s innate longing to be freed from the thraldom of impure, that is to say, from animal limitations and disabilities, including mortal agony, receives also its first satisfaction. The body incorruptible is named pranava-tanu (body consisting of Aum) as it draws its ceaseless nourishment from sources ambrosial, which keeps it in excellent fitness for the purposes for which it is appointed to be used. The man with the pranava-tanu is known as jivanmukta, being in touch with both the world of impure matter and the realm of pure spirit. But his touch with the world of impure matter is bound to be only of short duration, as he is on his way to permanent spiritual freedom (para-mukti), a state in which we all find Him in the realm of pure spirit, in a transfigured body of glory and power, rid of every point of contact with the world of matter, pure and impure. This transfiguration of the jivanmukta’s body of suddha-māyā into the paramukta’s body of maha-māyā, that is to say, into the body of glory and power called the jñāna-tanu or “spiritful body” of the finally redeemed, occurs when, at the end of his stay in this world in his pranava-tanu for the sole purpose of guiding the spiritually qualified, the jivanmukta permanently takes leave of the realm of matter, sensible and insensible, pure and impure, and suddenly disappears with his body into space in broad day-light. Consequently the human body, according to the teaching of the Siddha, must in any event be
purified and transmuted and transfigured, and made eternally into one with life in the most uncompromising sense, if death, which is only another name for the separation of life from the body and therefore metempsychosis is to be prevented; for to speak, as the non-Siddha does, of a post-mortem condition as deathless sounds like a stultifying, if not mocking, paradox, where, by his own showing, life has no co-existent body to save from or lose by death—where, in other words, the sole objective of the crusade against transmigration is wholly missed by reason of the riddance of that very body through death, and where again, by his own showing, it will be meaningless to think of life, since life per se is always deathless. The great work, therefore, that lies before man, the Siddha would over, is so to purify his body and sanctify his life, and integrate the two into an eternal monad, that body and life become one and identical, that is to say, absolutely proof against any liability to their mutual sunderance known as death.

Therefore § "In their aim to render, by varied Physio-chemical processes, the human body deathless and perpetually alive to the light and shade of the sense-world, and capable of wielding the eight standard supernatural powers (siddhis) of a perfected thaumaturge, the Nātha-Siddhas are closely allied to the more ancient Raseshwar-Siddhas of the Doab or Antarvedi, an order of spagyrists who achieve the same result by 'reverberating' 'cleansing' and 'projecting' the body

§ Cultural Heritage of India, page 313.
with the help of a special elixir vitae prepared out of the blended ens of mica with the ens of mercury."

But this sect seems to have died out in course of time, when their theory of जीवन-मुक्ति in a deathless body was convincingly disproved by Allamprabhu of 12th century and a contemporary of Basava. The following slokas will be found interesting, as they contain the disputation of Gorakhanatha and Allamprabhu.

*रोमकाष्ठ भस्म न प्राप्त तनोऽपि स्वरूप: \( \) पिन्न्दिता स्वाद्विषिण्याक्षः।
माया कर्ये वा विनिधा भवेत्सा मौक्षः कर्ये बाहस्थु मुनेर्मार्वः।।

क्षरं समस्तं किष्ठ मृत्युभारं कृष्टं एवाक्षर इत्यावृष्ट।
क्षराक्षरजयेश्व: हरशादवस्वनस्त्रस्वत्मकामतेन्ध्यति मौक्षदलस्य।।

तस्मात्तेषुरक्षयतं न विज्ञान्या ततुर्भवत्ति तावक्षीना।
इत्युक्तं भस्मस्वयं देवं गोरक्षनाथ: सहसारस्वीरच।।

कथं परिवर्त्य वहुभक्षयां युक्तं तूः निश्चितं कृपां।
निवेद्यश्रवणेऽव च त्वदीयं मदीयकायेः तद्रीयाः।।

मद्दीयकायेऽयं यदि रोममार्श रङ्ग्वते चेतात्ति न कायसिधि:।
अहं क च चोके न भवामि सिस्कुलस्तं वुपे प्रत्यक्षयासु पदः।।

रोमकाष्ठोक्तं वस्तउत्तमं प्राप्त प्रसुज्ञर्ग्येन स्वाधीनः।
परीक्षणं हासरमामर्मिति मंतं न चास्मदकृतसंस्तं तनु।।

छिन्नेत चेतात्वक्षमागमेतप्रत्य चतुर्ण स्वाभुवित सिद्धमा:।
एवं विघोक्ति: सघ्विजेता फिष सहस्तमार्गः किमु मृत्युमार्वः।।

अस्मात्वात्म न पुरे न वेष्टं वक्तुमात्मा मरणादिर्धे।।
न पुरुषये संगत्येन चोके सो गोरक्षनाथ: प्रसुमान मूयः।।

सुदेहाराति परिमुच्य सहस्तस्तवादियेन मम वक्त्रनात्ल।
ख्ल्रेन मे नासित चिन्हादशेष: सिद्धः प्रकाशीकः मामकीमः।।

*भाविष्यंकुर्णाभ-प्रभुमहिमगोङङ्ग (Sholapur edition) chap. X 50-79.
ममामिलां परिपूर्ववें न खड़ वाराहितमंतरं
बैतो न ज तुवंदितान मामकिंकां निविष्यामानो इद्योगिनांभूत || १० ||
पत्तस्य चिन्तं विकलनं न सूयात्स्यां शारीरे निविष्याम वादं
मृतो वदि स्मारिस्यां विविष्यां; राज्यानि गोरक्षकायीम्यां || ११ ||
हि प्रेमसत्तकरद्वशश्च स्वपीतस्य हृदा निविष्यां विविष्याः
सुस्था तस्वैः तस्य ददं गृहिता धाराः विधृतन्तु निविष्यां तत्वंगे || १२ ||
तदास्तिस्मृतिस्मृतिजोतिरशाहार्यवचाल भूविद्धिणणांकमेव
नानिष्कतात्वि क नू होममात्र राण वज्रहत्स्तैवायवत् || १३ ||
नायक जगाद यथिंमनं न हि सिद्धिरेण वास्य प्रपंचजाटिकरणं तत्तोस्ते
संपा विदं बलु वृथा यद्यं राणाद्वेषोशित यथं मृतिरज यथा ध्येयमेतत् । । ।
कि वाक्संहखार्ये: प्रलयं विविष्यां काय्यन्त विविष्यां सिद्धिरिति या त मृत्यु
प्रवाहः ।

d्वं सिद्धं: कर्तलसिद्धतंत्रमुकुटिः त्यक्तं न्याययथं सुमस्थर्थं । । । ।
हि सिद्धं: कथयमा: प्रत्ययात्सुद्दर्श्याय्यासिद्धान्तमाऽनि बिःवायक्तस्य विखलस्य काहः ।
यत्राविनिष्कपिः द्वितमेवः वस्तु तत्त्रक्वीमि शुरूः वेदविशारदस्य । । ।
वातात्पर्यायान्तिकुण्डिलिकेश्वरपीढङ्गो यो रुग्जरमरणवालीविण्डिवर्तेभ: ।
संबंधवक्रसिद्यात्मक इर्ष्येर्ष्य पूर्णां समाधिमिहिः शारीरिस्यस्य । । ।
भूतानि नर्तगुणाणां विविष्य बाह्यप्रेमस्यस्यकहः । । ।
हर्दौऽपि: दैवदिकीण्डेष्विदैःतुर्जुर्यो यः कायाविनिष्कपिः शिष्य स पव
योगी । । ।
हि वक्तुमवक्रसिद्य: गुरु गुर्णां गोरक्षनाथमुनस्य स्य क्षमाणी ।
काचित्वद्व धृतिवार्यं माई परीक्षा संभावयामि महानीयत्वेति मेन । । । ।
संगृहा तं सुनिशितं करवालसुध्याधाराविप्रृत्तनचनं: कर्तलाधवे ।
सन्यासस्यािविधाय विभेद मूर्ति सर्वें सिद्ध चिन्तागतिः विमोनेमोचन्त || २० ||
तेनान्तं गणविक्ष्माविद्रमास्तीर्यस्यतः तत्त्व विष्यं सुरूपं ।
नि:शाश्वतप्रकाशितिचिन्ताकालान्तरं द्यव यमो स बुधाः विचवारः

भूयः । । । ।
उत्मृत्यु मूर्तेनि निपत्य पद्मचिन्डपि पारास्त्रितो मुक्तकाशुष्णाणापि ।
सर्वें सिद्ध चिन्तागतिराधातथिशुद्धश्चेष्टौ रोमां शं संभिषु चक्रार करप्रसारं || २२ ||
The Kālāmukhas and Kāpālikas were also two different sects of Pāshupatas. Dr. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar identifies the Kālāmukhas with the Mahāmuktas on the authority of Shivapurana (see his "Shaivism and Vaishnavism" page 18). But this goes against the classification made by दिनेश्वर, a Jain author of जोगेन्द्र. He says—ıt is sometimes possible that the Kālāmukhas and Kāpālikas were also two different sects of Pāshupatas.
From this it seems that it is not कालामुख स that were महात्माकार: but it is rather the कापालिकाः or skullmen. To identify Kapalikas with the महात्माकाराः we have the authority of Jagaddhara who explains that Mahāvratadhāra are Kāpālikas in his commentary on Mālatiinādhava, act I. The Kālāmukhas are hardly distinguishable from Kāpālikas. But they are surely a subdivision of Pāshupatas like the Kāpālikas; for we have the authority of रामानुज and केत्यवधानिन to substantiate this. Says रामानुज—तत्न तत्तात्त्वकारिणि: ( पाशुप:तत्तात्त्वकारिणि: ) चतुर्भिपि: कापालि: काळामुखः पाशुपतः केत्यवधानिन ( श्रीपाण्ड: II-2-35 ). So also the विश्वासनवास sometimes divide Shaivas into Shaiva, Pāshupata, Somasiddhanta, and Lākula ( वैष्णव-पाशुपतं सोमं लकुलं वैष्णवसेवकं: ) and in other places they divide Shaivas into Shaiva, Pāshupata, Kāpālika and Kālāmukha. This seems probably the arrangement in order of superiority. In the above classification the first three sects are identical in both cases. But we learn from प्रवाहेन्द्रिय: of कुषणमिष्ठ: that Kāpālikas are Somasiddhantins. Thus Kālāmukhas were a separate sect. § “The Kālāmukhas appear to be so called because they marked their forehead with a black streak, and they are said to be born of नर and राज्य parents.”

The Kāpālikas seem to be very ancient as they are mentioned in the Maitri Upanishad ( अथ वेचावनेह्वा द्रुष्या क्षायकरिणि: कापालिन्: ). They have rites as revolting as those of Kālāmukhas. Ramanuja briefly states about

these Shaiva sects in his commentary on the Brahmasutra (II-2-35) as follows:—

Krishnamishra in his Pravachan Chaddha in his Pravachan Chaddha introduces a Kapali, as a character in the drama, who describes himself and his practices as follows:—

| नारायणमालाकृतचारस्मृतिः |
| सम्भावनाय सुकुमारम्ब्रजन: |
| पर्यामी ध्रुपांजलिश्चरुचिः |
| जगद्धितो भिन्नमिति ज्ञात: ||

अर्थां प्राप्त सम्भवामाक्षमाराम्य।

शरित्कावनविद्धिश्चरितम्हांस्माहात्रूपितवित्वा

वन्धौ प्रभुकानातकं सरितज्वालानार्तिन न निर्माणः

वद्य: कृतकुंडलं चश्चरितकल्लितां विनाशितां झड़ेतः

अध्यां न: पुरुषोपहारविविक्षिदीवो महामहेशः: ||
This is शोभिि, which has been explained by the commentator of प्रकृष्णचंद्रवाद as follows:—उत्तमः सहितः शेषः। सोग्यं वांशं पार्वत्यं शह कैलासे मोदते पत्रत्र तद्रुषः पार्वतीतुल्यकृष्णश्च चिह्नः। नष्टं इष्टश्रमघारी कैलासे मोदते सैव मुखः। शाश्विषेकं मुखःं विक्षथिते तथोमद्रिष्ठा निशाचार्यवर्त्तनात्। श्रीपार्वतिकाकर्मिकं कथिते नात्र कार्यलुमानमवत्तति। तत्र श्रीभेमानिधित्वतिरिक्तं खसांतं नामिः। श्रीधरश्रिवादसंहिंशः। तदस्वसंस्ह दुःखानिमभूमिति विशिष्टविक्षमिति शोभििस्य इथम्। कापालिकश्चाश्रीशिक्तानानेव शिवाकृतस्वास्तकारः नामश्रमाम्। The description of the कापालिक sect, as found in शंकरविषय, is quite similar. And Shankarâchârya dismisses them as an incorrigible set of Shaivas. It is certain that this sect freely indulged in human sacrifices, as may be known from Mâlatimâdhava of मवमूली, where a Kâpâlika was attempting to sacrifice Mâlati for attaining मन्त्राविष्ठि। बादिशालसूरिः also describes in his शंकरशास्त्र the preparations made for two human sacrifices, for which two pretty little children were decoyed and taken to the altar but fortunately saved from the catastrophe. So also in बेनालवचिदाष्टि: a graphic description has been given of how the intrepid king विक्रम was being decoyed into being sacrificed and how he was ultimately saved by the बेनाल.

The Kâpâlikas and Kalamukhas seem to be very ancient sects of ascetics of an extreme form. In the beginning they must have renounced the world for attaining liberation and practised an extreme form of ascetic life. But as such an extreme form of asceticism is impossible for ordinary people a number of hypocrites must have begun to lead a disgraceful life which ultimately proved ruinous to their sect. In the name of religion they led a bad life of ease and pleasure. They put on a garb of Shivabhaktas for their selfish ends, and by the inequity of their lives they aroused social opprobrium. These
misinterpretations of ascetic life and wrong teachings afforded ease and pleasure, indulgence in flesh food, drinking liquor and promiscuous intercourse. And at a time when Buddha and Mahâvîra successfully and effectively preached the principle of अहिंसा or non-injury, the Vaidikas were forced to give up flesh and liquor. Still some people with a taste for lower passions, not finding the surroundings congenial to their tastes, might have turned renegades and joined the ranks of the vulgar Kâpâlikas or low class Shaivas. However it could not be expected that such a state of moral depravity attended with conduct and life unfit for any society could be tolerated by others, and in the long run by the saner members of the sects themselves. They, therefore, set themselves to cleanse their path of the filth and evolve a system of philosophy and a line of pure conduct. In this newly evolved Shaivism, also known as शुद्ध शाविविन्ध, none of the evils complained of are met with. Those that persisted in it, the Kâpâlas and the Kâlamukhas, have gone to the wall in the contest and are lost for ever. Thus it seems that by the time that Mâdhavâchârya lived the vulgar sects ceased to exist and there remained only three schools of Shaivas whose doctrines have been sketched by him in his अववैशिन्यसंगमहः.

(1) The followers of Nakulisha (Lakulisha) Pâshupata School maintain five categories, as noted by बांपृचाबाणे in his commentary on Brahma-sûtra (II-2-37), viz. कारण (cause), कार्य (effect), विधि (ritual), जोग (union), and विद्वांत (end of pain). कारण is the Being who is endowed with the powers of creation, preservation and destruction, the Lord Parameshwar. Ganakârikâ (Gaikwâr’s Oriental
Series XV, page 11) describes त्र यक्ष्यापि गुणधर्मोपदेशार्थमाग उकोऽन्यपतिलिपियादित जितिन्तिविविधाति। निरतिरतिवरितिविविधाति: पतिवं, तेनेवथं नित्यसंविधितं सत्यं, आनांसुकै ध्वरयतिमाध्यं, सम सत्यनस्तहिृतित्त्वमाजात्त्वं, महामूर्तिसंहारकथवं भयोऽन्यवं, परमेक्षवं गुणधर्मोपमेतसानामामुखियावं वा, स्वेच्छया भोजेष्टकार्योत्तक्ष्तमदृश्यादिकरणस्मात: क्रिया, तद्विवरितं देवरवं-सिद्धांतक-पदुम्यः परतं ज्ञेष्टतं, शमीश्चाचिर्न मनस्यंसंयोजकतं हयतं, कर्मदिनिरपेक्षस्य स्वेच्छयाशेषकार्यकर्त्तृत्वं कामिंत्वं, शमुतुचनिविवाणकतवं शंकरवं, अंतरसुग्रहामपि संहारकृत्वं कालतं, कार्यकारणायायां कालां स्थलवर्तीरादिभावेन संयोजकतनं कलिमिरकतवं, धर्मादिविधानां ग्रहेऽयं गुस्तिचालबोधकाशेषपकर्त्तृत्वं बलप्रमथनरं, सर्वेद्वितानुत्तरिस्तुं रतितिज्ञानिविवाणाकर्त्तृत्वं सर्वभूतदमनरं, सकलनिक्षादस्याय: तुल्यस्कित्वं मनोपमनमलं, शुकरानांलश्चरीरिधिष्ठात्तवं अधरवं, दु:ृश्चकरानांलश्चरीरिधिष्ठात्तवं घोरवं, सर्वेद्विधानां ज्ञातप्रिष्ठात्तवं पूरणं, यथेष्टितानांलश्चरीरिधिष्ठात्तशक्तिः: पौरुषस्य। तद्भवं भगवत: पुष्टव- सुच्चतेः। ते भगवत: पुष्टव-सुच्चतेः। His attributes are Jananashakti and Kriyāshakti, which are eternally with him, not as are acquired after a stage by the perfected human souls.

These Pashupatas believe also in the divine dispensation, which need not be based on the good or evil Karma of the soul (कर्मदिनिरपेक्षस्य स्वेच्छयाशेषकार्यकर्त्तृत्वं कामिंत्वं) In this respect they differ from all other schools of philosophy. In all other systems of philosophy a कार्य is defined as that which follows a कारण or cause; but these Pashupatas call all dependent objects as effects or कार्य (अस्तराङ्गां सः कार्यं) In conformity with this definition of कार्यं, they bring जीवात्मा or Pashu, which they admit as eternal, under the category of कार्यं; because it is dependent on Paramātman or Pati. This कार्यं is of three kinds (तत्र विभागः: विधा कलं पद्भवितः) विधा is cognition. कलं is all the inanimate creation dependent
on animate beings or individual souls (चेतनाध्वितिले सति निवेदनाकळा). पशुपतंबर्धी पुष्प: is the individual soul that is bound by fetters.

Vidbi (विधि) or the rules of conduct of these Pashupatas is the most interesting part of their religion. Bathing their bodies thrice a day in ashes, lying down on ashes, making noise like ahâ, ahâ, singing loudly the praises of their god, dancing either according to the science of dancing or in any manner, curling the tongue and roaring like bulls,—This noise is called “hudukkâra,” making prostrations and circumambulation, repeating the names of Shiva, all these constitute their daily charyâ or observances. But these strange acts are strictly forbidden to be practised in places where there are other persons present. Besides these the Patshupatas are advised to behave actually like mad men. Thus for instance, pretending to be asleep when not actually sleeping, begging for food, shaking limbs as if attacked by paralysis, walking like one with rheumatic pain in his legs or like a lame man, exhibiting signs of lust at the sight of women, doing other acts befitting lunatics such as making meaningless noise—these are enjoined upon the Pashupatas. To get rid of fastidiousness, they are enjoined to beg for food, eat the remnants of the dishes of others and do similar objectionable acts. The five false lunatic acts are called ढ़ाराणि. And their purpose is stated in Ganakârikâ (page 19) as—किंतु अपमानाविनिष्ठादकवर वेन परिभव गद्देदिम्मुल्यन्देशादृश द्वामितुवक्स्येन अपमानाविदिकतमस्थविबिति।

Yoga (चित्तदर्शन आत्मेश्वरसंबंधेतथेकथा:) or the union of the soul with Pati, may be attained in two ways. In the first, it is attained through, अषु, ध्यान, and other कर्माः. While in the second by strictly exercising control over the senses. By this Yoga of two kinds of मेंश can be obtained.
The end of pain is the fifth category and is of two kinds सात्मक and अवात्मक. The latter is the absolute freedom from pain. The possession of ज्ञानङ्गकि and ज्ञानशक्ति is called सात्मकमोक्ष. Perception of even the most minute and the most distant matters, hearing of every kind of sound, being well versed in all shastras, the possession of these and similar powers is called ज्ञानशक्ति. The accomplishment of every object, quickly assuming every form according to one's own desire, is known as ज्ञायाशक्ति.

(2) The second School of Shaivism is the Māheshwar or Siddhānta school of Southern India i.e. the Madras Presidency. It is intimately allied to the Shākta school and has not been attributed to any prophet as its founder. It is, therefore, a gradual evolution of the tenets of the Agamas on which it is based. The 28 Agamas, Shivagamas, are the source of Shaiva philosophy; but it has been explained elaborately by § Nilakantha or Shrikantha in his commentary on the Brahmasutras on Shaiva lines (usually called the Shaiva Vishishtadwaita) and in a voluminous Tamil literature of the last fifteen centuries. This Shaiva school is * "the living system which exercises at the present day a

§ K. Subramania Pillai, does not agree with this. He says in his "Metaphysics of Shaiva Siddhanta system" page 21—"In the Saivaites group, (Akam) the Shivadwaita doctrine has been influenced by monistic views, and its best exposition is by Shrikantha who is a great commentator on Brahmasutras. This creed should not be mistaken for the Siddhanta system which has its origin in Tantric literature." Nallaswami Pillai and others hold that Shrikantha is an exponent of Shaiva Siddhanta.

* Pope's Tirnvāsagam, pp. IX and LXX IV.
marvellous power over the minds of the great majority of Tamil people" and it is * "the most elaborate, influential, and undoubtedly the most intrinsically valuable of all the religions of India."

This school maintains three categories, which are the three ultimates and have been lucidly explained in the विद्यापाद of चुंग्राम, an उपागम of कामिकागम. These categories or ultimates are (1) पति (2) पञ्च and (3) पञ्च. The whole position of the school is compressed into one verse:—

श्रीपदार्थ चतुर्खाद्य महामवर्य जाग्वलित: ।
दुर्भेद्येन दंगुत्र ग्रह विस्तरित: पुनः:

And this verse forms the basis or starting point of Mādhavāchārya's discussion of this School in his सूत्रवर्तिणम. पति is Shiva † "Who is without beginning, free from defects. He is all-doing and all-wise and removes the meshes of bonds that enshroud the individual soul ( अव or पञ्च)." His acts are five ( पंचक्षलिनि ) § "creation, preservation, and destruction of the universe, obscuration ( लिपिधान ) and extending grace ( पञ्चाद) to or liberation ( of the individual soul) through the agency of fruit-bearing actions. Moreover § "The creator of the universe must be self-existing; otherwise there will be a regressus ad infinitum and there will be no cause of final release. The essence of consciousness ( चैतन्य ) is the act of seeing existing in the Atma at all times and on all sides; because we learn that it is perfect in the liberated souls. Though it exists it is not manifested ( on the bond souls ); hence it may be inferred that it is obscured. It is under the control of one whose powers are not obscured ( i. e. the पति)

* Pope's Tiruvāsagam, pp. IX and LXX IV.
† सूत्रवर्तिणम II-1. § सूत्रवर्तिणम II-3 to 7.
until the liberation (of the पङ्खः is effected). The meshes of bonds (पश्चात्) are of four kinds, the enveloping (पश्चिम), the will of the Lord, (ईशवरः), कर्म, and the work of माया. Their names declare their nature.' The परिवर्त्तन or the characteristics of the Lord (पति) are stated by the Âgama as follows. § "Because the body and other things are obviously of the nature of products, we can infer that there exists their Maker different from them. Being not limited by time He is eternal; being not confined to a particular locality He is all-pervading. He has the power of creating gradually or simultaneously. (कर्मावश्या विशेषाकिन्नरः), because creation is both gradual or simultaneous. He possesses the instrument of action, because (it is seen that) no action can be done without an instrument. And because all work has been without a beginning, the instrument cannot be adventitious. This instrument (of the Lord) is nothing else than Shakti which is not unconscious but conscious. She, though one, appears infinite in cogition and activity on account of the infinite number of objects (with which she is concerned). The action of creation (etc. is not the result of) the seed (of Karma) or of प्रकृति or of the individual soul; thus it is of the ever free Mahesha that remains." † Action is always possible only in the case of beings having bodies like us. The Lord, therefore, must have a body like ours. But His body is not like ours, as it is free from all taints. His body is composed of Shakti. It is composed of five Mantras that subserve His five actions.' ‡ "He is all-knowing, being the maker of all; because it is a well established principle that he alone can do a thing that knows the means (of doing the thing), the constituents of the thing and their results."

§ Ibid. III-7 to 5. † चौंग्रेश्वरम् III-7, 8. ‡ Ibid. V-13.
The second category or the second ultimate is पशु or cattle that is owned by or subject to the Lord (पति). पशु is क्षेत्र or the individual soul. क्षेत्राधिपदेशाये: जीवत्मा पशु। He is characterized by cognition-action (हृदिया) obstructed by limitations. Pashus are eternal and all-pervading and become Shivas when the limitations and fetters are removed. They are of three kinds (1) विज्ञानकल (2) प्रत्ययकल (3) and सकल. The three have been described by भोजदेव in his तत्वसाधारिका as follows:

पशुविविविचा ज्ञान विज्ञानप्रलयके सकल: ।
मल्लयुक्तार्थायो मल्लमम्मुच्छो हिताये: स्यात् ॥
मल्लम्मम्मुच्छो: सकल: ।

That is, the first is beset only by मल, described as—

* मलायो वंश: आत्मान्तः स्वप्नप्राणिकथावारकः आत्मान्तात्त्विः पूर्वपृथभूत्वा इत्यशीते व्यावहितसेरक्षितंशीते मिलः व्यापकः जडस्त्रयं च मवति। कर्मं is deeds of the individual souls and the impression produced by the deeds. माया is the material cause, described as—†इदाः मायात्तः निस्ये व्यापकः समस्तान्तर्क्षितस्यदमू। स्ववृत्ति-

व्यवहारण ज्ञानिकियाधार्तीकामदृष्टि मोहकः.

Pāsha is the third category and is of four kinds. शंभुदेव in his शैवचिदं तपस्या says that there are five kinds of पाशा (आणक्षमाधामायेंद्रीर्वायमाधायस्वप्नकलकश: संसारी पुल्ल): भोजदेव maintains that पाशास are four:

पाशादिविचा: स्यु: पुः मल्लकर्षो मति प्रथमी।
महिषयकाधिकवि शास्त्रितमुज्जो चायः ॥

शंभुदेव later on reduces them to four only in words—रेखाक्षत्तमकः: पाशो मायाय यकामाणवेशस्य पाश बुद्धिः। िद्वं महेश्वरिश्व शिवादितीय उपचारात् पाशा इत्यथयते।

According to this school the three, शिव, जीव, and माया (i. e. पति, पशु and पाश) are eternal. The creation is intended for the good of the individual souls that they

* शैवसिद्धांतशास्त्रिया, Sholapur edition, page 5. † Ibid. 7 2–45
may have an opportunity to attain salvation by following the prescribed paths to salvation. Thus it is said by तत्त्वज्ञानेवचिदंचिदानुसंहितं निपदम् यथा उपेन्द्रः। The commentary on the line runs as—विषयं हि विद्वाननामसङ्गीमोक्षं कर्तु-मिच्छः तेषां महाप्रायं कर्मनोगर्भं च सृष्टिपरी ज्ञाता पाशास्त्रविद्यामुखें सत्त्वप्राप्त-शास्त्रोपायादीनां करोति।

विषय is the efficient cause; his कार्य (हत्वा, ज्ञान, किया etc.) are the instrumental cause; and माया is the maternal cause. The creation takes place in accordance with the will of the Lord, giving rise to 36 principles or तत्त्वास, as in the following table. (See pp. 255, 256).

Of these 36 तत्त्वास the five, from विषय to इंद्रियविच्छ, are called इंद्रिय or the pure road; the next six from माया to कल, are called मिश्रत्व, the pure and impure; and the remaining 25 from पुष्प to पुष्पप्राप्ति are called अन्त:विर: or the impure road.

Besides the three अथवा s (कल, तत्त्व, सृष्टि (as stated in the table above) there are three more अथवा s, namely, 51 वर्णाः, 81 पदां, 11 संज्ञाः. In all they are six अथवा s (कल, तत्त्व, सृष्टि, वर्ण, पद, संज्ञा) forming the पुष्प. Each preceding one is dependent on each following one (कला is dependent on तत्त्व and so on). Thus they all are interconnected. We merely state the अथवा s without explaining them fully for want of space.

सृष्टि is the only and the most important religious sacrament (संरक्ष) The गुरु or preceptor initiates or introduces the disciple into the principles of the religion, explains the philosophy, and teaches the path of attaining मोक्ष, which is साक्ष्य, as is said by भौतज्ञान— चिदंचिदानुसंहितं किता यो मोक्षं: विवशमानतान्तः: (तत्त्वप्रकाशिका—36). The path to मोक्ष is of four kinds, चर्ग, किया, योग, and ज्ञान.

† तत्त्वप्रकाशिका, 27.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kalās.</th>
<th>Tatvas.</th>
<th>No. of Bhuvanas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Śūnyatā-kalā.</td>
<td>i. (Shuddha-tatvas)</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Shivatatva</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Shakti-tatva</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. (Shudhāśuddhatatvas)</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Māyā</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Kāla</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Kalā</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Vidyā</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Niyati</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Rāgā</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Purusha</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Śhānti-kalā.</td>
<td>3. Sadāsivatatva</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Īśvaratatva</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Shuddhavidyātatva</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Vidyā-kalā.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Prakriti</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Buddhī</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Ahankāra</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Pratishṭhā-kalā.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalas.</td>
<td>Tatvas.</td>
<td>No. of Bhuvanas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Manas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Srōtra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Tvak</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Chakshus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Jihvā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. Nāsikā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. Vāk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. Pāni</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. Pāda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. Pāyu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. Upastha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. Shabda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. Sparśa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. Rūpa</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. Rasa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. Gandha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. Ākāśa</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. Vayu</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34. Tējas</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35. Jala</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total... 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36. Prithvi</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total... 224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 36 principles have also been arranged as in the accompanying table facing this page.
And they have been treated elaborately in the four quarters (पार्श्व) of the Agamas. Readers will have an idea of these paths from the description given of them incidentally in connection with the Nāyanārs in a previous section. So also they have been described in a later section, the section on "इत्यः and the image worship." (3) The third school of Shaivism is वंद school of Kashmir. It was founded by वंद in the ninth century A. D. after, it is said, he found the Shivasūtras lying under a huge stone, of which he was apprised by Lord Shiva in a dream. The Shivasūtras are the first and the most authoritative groundwork of the school; and they purport to summarise the teaching of the Agamas. Subsequently there rose various works by different authors of note and authority, सोमानंद the author of विम्बंदि and असिनवंद, the author of वंदेलक and वंदामार, being the most prominent among them.

Shiva according to this school is the ultimate and the highest principle. वंद is the throbbing or spontaneous vibration (आर्ताविम्बरी) of बिंदु, or ब्रह्मन, or परशिव, and is the cause of all cosmic processes.

The philosophy of this school does not differ much from that of above, except in one respect that forms the fundamental and the vital point of difference, namely, in respect of माया. माया, in the case of this school, is the विररतानशक्ति, as is said * "This माया, as will be seen presently, is what may be called a force, namely, of obscuration, and therefore, as a force or Shakti, is and can be, but an aspect of the Divine Shakti. Its chief function is to obscure and thereby limit the experience

* Kashmirere Shaivism by J. C. Chatterji, page 76.
in regard to the true nature of what is experienced and experiencer himself.” भाव्यतम विश्वसतानाधीनता भाव्यतम: शाक्तिभेदः तथा. And it is not the third eternal ultimate, the material cause of the universe, as maintained by the second school. The chief difference between the two schools thus lies in metaphysics. The Kashmiri school stresses and insists on विद्वद्व, (1) the active aspect of the परमात्मा, (2) and the unreality of a substratum, the material cause, of the universe apart from Shiva.

Creation of the universe with all its countless variety of objects is only the manifestation of a power of the Almighty, as is said—विद्वद्व महाविद्वान स्वरं श्वेत महाशयं। तत्र तत्त्वज्ञानान्तः स्तुर्णि (प्रवर्णिताः पृष्ठ 3). So also गोविन्द in his शिवचरित स्वामिन्द्र सुकुमारिकाङ्क्षाः। अनितं द्विधाप्रकाशाः प्रसर्षाभिद्रवं शिवः॥ (सिद्धांत दू. ७.)

This manifestation is called आत्मा or आत्माः and is real and not an illusion as maintained by the school of Shankaracharya. Universe is, therefore, only an expansion of the power of परमेश्वर। More will be said about this aspect of परिवेश्वर while बाळ्यविभेदः will be dealt with.

The idea of मोक्ष also naturally differs from that of the previous school. आत्माः भव्य विभव्यां विभव्यां हस्तिः as it is called, is मोक्ष and not आत्माः. The individual soul, when it gets free from the three taints (आत्माः, आत्माः, and मोक्षाः), becomes completely at-one with परिवेश्वर, from whom it is separated by the working of भाव्य, the विश्वासात्माः.

The individual soul, therefore, has to strive to be free from the three taints to attain recognition that he
is Shiva Himself. The discipline prescribed by this school is called अर्थभिषेक त्र त्र which is, hence, only the शाख of the methods of attaining मूर्त and is only esoteric to संदर्शां. अर्थभिषेक means the unbroken recognition of man's essential identity with गंगव इ. Earlier writers laid stress on the संद aspect of God and treated the discipline of अर्थभिषेक as esoteric. But as the tradition of अर्थभिषेक was getting lost, the later writers emphasised the अर्थभिषेक discipline and did not treat much of संद or आन्वितर्क. There is, therefore, no difference between the संदक्षां and अर्थभिषेक, so as to be called two schools. And it is a mistake that some scholars should hold the two aspects as two different schools.

दीर्घ is, in this school, as much necessary for attaining मूर्त, as in the case of all Shaiva schools.

Before we proceed to the next section we may note that Shaivism and Shaktism are intimately related to each other. The one great and important difference between them is that Shiva is the highest deity of Shaivas and Shakti is subordinate to him and serves His behests, and is inseparably connected with him. While in Shaktism Shakti predominates over Shiva, who is considered quite helpless unless energised by Shakti. So also both Shaivism and Shaktism differ widely in religious rites and rituals that are the way for devotees to attain Moksha, though the underlying principles are the same. The points of intimate relation are:—

(1) They are based on scriptures that are said to have been delivered by Shiva to His consort, Parvati.
(2) They have the same 36 principles common to both and the process of evolution of the principles is the same.

(3) Bhakti and Yoga form the common features of ritualism of both, though Yoga is more stressed in Shâktism to rouse Shakti from her static condition and raise her to the ultimate end 'moksha'.

(4) Dîksha is the most important and the only विवेक in both.

(5) The idea of 'moksha,' the ultimate union or at-one-ment with the ultimate 'chit,' is the same. And both schools are monistic schools.

Though Shakti is given predominant position in Shâktism, it is at the same time said that the relation between Shiva, the possessor of Shakti, and Shakti herself is one of identity. The one cannot be without the other, as fire cannot be without heat and the moon without beams. The attempt to indentify Shakti with woman is an error. Shiva is commonly said to be the male principle and Shakti the female principle. As a matter of fact they are neither male nor female nor neuter. The man who worships the wisdom aspect of Reality, commonly called the male principle, is a Shaiva; and he who worships the power aspect, or the female aspect, is called a Shâkta. The worshipper of Shiva worships Him as the benign ruler of the universe; while the worshipper of Shakti worships the principle of activity or energy that pervades the universe.
XI  The rise of the Lingayat Religion and its founder.

Now we come to the most knotty and intricate question of determining the time that Lingayatism was founded and the Prophet that founded it. The question has not been tried till now historically; and certain things have been taken for granted, which have made confusion worse confounded. The things taken for granted are based on some hollow tradition and handed down from generation to generation, so that they have become a kind of gospel truth, too sacrosanct to be touched. But if truth traced historically is to be respected more than tradition, that is often fictitious and baseless, it is necessary to determine the truth historically. We are aware that we tread on a dangerous ground, indeed, but truth impels us to attempt the task unmindful of dangers and difficulties.

The things handed down traditionally are (1) that the Lingayat religion was founded long ago by the five great prophets (वंचाचायोः), namely, Revanārāđhya or Rewanasiddha, Marulārāđhya or Marulashiddha, Ekorāmārāđhya, Panditārāđhya, and Vishvārāđhya (2) that they rose out of the five great स्थावरविश्वास of Kollipāki (Balehalli or Balehounur), Mysore state, Ujjani, Bellary district, Himavat Kedār, Shrīshail Mallikarjuna, and Kashi or Benares, under different names in different yugas or ages as follows:

शशोजातश्र प्रथमेव वानेदेशी हिन्दुविश्वः ||
अशेषाः तूतीमस्थत तत्पुरुषांतुष्कतः ||
ईशानं पंचमञ्जेति सुखालि मम पर्वेशः ||
तात्मायानानि गीत्राणि वेदोकानि न संस्थः ||
शशोजातो भवेत्सुनिवर्तेतेवस्तथा जलम् ||
अशेषिर्स्मित्स्त्वस्तुस्तुवा वापुरुषामिति ||
ईशाने गणनाधारः पंचत्रमुद्धयं जगतः ||
The above is from श्रोत्रोधागम, which professes to trace the origin of the Acharyas to the five faces of परमशिव. But the श्वरभूमिगाम tells the origin of the Acharyas as follows:—

(see पंचाचार्यपंचमोत्पत्तिप्रकरणम्).
It can be easily seen how the two Agamas differ and contradict; and the contradiction cannot be removed, unless we suppose that the five श्वारकिंगास (we cannot understand why and how only those) represent the five faces of Shiva. Now we have to see from the data available at present whether and how far this is the truth; and if it does not stand historically we must determine who founded it and when.

The first and a very authoritative work in Sanskrit on Lingayatism is सिद्धांतविश्वामणि. This is the first work, because it does not refer to any work except § शिवचर्चार्य and शिवस्पर्ष and the Agamas; while this work has been referred to and quoted in authority by almost all the Sans. books now available. It professes to narrate the dialogue between Renukasāhārya or Revanasiddha, the prophet, and Agastya, to whom the prophet reveals a part of षट्स्थल philosophy. It is in verses of simple बन्दुकस् metre except those in different metres coming at the end of every chapter (परिच्छेद). Most of the verses have notes prefixed to them, explanatory of the subject matter of the verses. The author is Shivayogi (शिवयोगीश्वारणके शान्तके कवितमाहेश्वर:). In the first chap. the author gives some account of the line of अचार्यास to which he belongs. In chapters II-IV he states how Veerashaiva or Lingayat religion came to be preached and promulgated in the world. And in the remaining chapters the 101 षट्स्थल or steps, that are but the elaboration of षट्स्थल, are explained. It is said that Renuka, one of the Pramathas or divine attendants of Shiva once committed an indiscretion of violating the order of precedence in his eagerness to receive the श्राव of Shiva in the divine assembly in

§ The two works are on Shaivism in general.
Kailas. Shiva did not like the precedence of Dāruka being superseded by Renuka. He, therefore, cursed Renuka that he be born as a human being in the world. Renuka repented and begged forgiveness of Shiva, who thereon relented and modified the curse that Renuka might regain his position in the divine order of the pramāṇas after preaching and promulgating the Veerashaiva faith. Thereafter Renuka is said to have risen out of the Linga (स्यानरक्षिल) at Kollipaki in Telangana or Telugu country, as recorded in the verse—

अथ निद्रिलस्विषये कोल्लिपाक्ष्याभिषेके पुरे।
सोमेश्वरमहालिङ्गङ्गादुरासारं रेणुकः।

Kollipaki is the modern Balehounur, Mysore State, and cannot be otherwise, as it is a well known pontifical seat or Math of Renukāchārya or Revaṇārādhyā and his successors. Again this Renukāchārya is identical with Revaṇasiddha as will be evident from the following:—

उच्चाच शात्यं बाच्चा रेवणं सिद्धेश्वरः। इव-38.

Thus Renukāchārya, Revansiddha, and Revaṇārādhyā are one and the same. If the five Achāryas were the founders of the religion, is it not strange that the book should mention Renuka or Revaṇasiddha alone as having descended to the earth and founded the religion to the exclusion of other Achāryās? This is quite ununderstandable.

Moreover the attempts of the author at making Renuka or Revaṇasiddha as the founder of the religion are quite ill-disguised and unsuccessful; because the Renuka of the book is none other than the author himself, as may be unmistakably known from the colophons subjoined to
every chap. except the * first. They are—

(1) इति श्रीसिद्धांतशिष्यां रेणुकदासकावलयः नाम द्वितीयः परिच्छेदः।

(2) इति श्रीसिद्धांतशिष्यां रेणुकदास भूलाकावलागतिनाम तृतीयः परिच्छेदः।

(3) इति श्रीसिद्धांतशिष्यां रेणुकारण्यसदेशन्यासंग्रहः नाम चतुर्थः परिच्छेदः।

(4) इति श्रीकारण्यमस्तिक्षिप्यं विद्वानिशिष्यां भक्तिकारण्यसदेशन्यासंग्रहः नाम पञ्चमः परिच्छेदः समासः।

(5) इति श्रीकारण्यमस्तिक्षिप्यं विद्वानिशिष्यां भक्तिकारण्यसदेशन्यासंग्रहः नाम षष्ठितिच्छेदः समासः।

(6) इति श्रीपद्युक्तसङ्ग्रहः विद्वानिशिष्यां प्रणिते श्रीवाश्वसनसिद्धांतशिष्यां भक्तिकारण्यसदेशन्यासंग्रहः नाम सप्तमपरिच्छेदः समासः।

(7) इति पद्युक्तसङ्ग्रहः विद्वानिशिष्यां प्रणिते श्रीवाश्वसनसिद्धांतशिष्यां भक्तिकारण्यसदेशन्यासंग्रहः नाम अष्टमपरिच्छेदः समासः।

(8) इति पद्युक्तसङ्ग्रहः विद्वानिशिष्यां प्रणिते श्रीवाश्वसनसिद्धांतशिष्यां माध्यमरस्य नवविधस्वस्त्रसंग्रहः नाम नवेंद्वितिच्छेदः समासः।

(9) इति पद्युक्तसङ्ग्रहः विद्वानिशिष्यां प्रणिते श्रीवाश्वसनसिद्धांतशिष्यां माध्यमरस्य नवविधस्वस्त्रसंग्रहः नाम दशमपरिच्छेदः समासः।

(10) इति पद्युक्तसङ्ग्रहः विद्वानिशिष्यां प्रणिते श्रीवाश्वसनसिद्धांतशिष्यां प्रवृत्तिः सत्तविधस्वस्त्रसंग्रहः नामकालश्वस्त्रपरिच्छेदः समासः।

In the same way all the remaining chapters have identical colophons except in respect of the subject-matter treated in a chapter. It will be seen from the colophons how gradually the author goes on telling something more.

* The Sholapur edition of the book has no colophon at the end of the first chap. But the manuscript copy in the Madras Oriental Library has the colophon as follows—

इति श्रीकारण्यमस्तिक्षिप्यं रेणुकारण्यसदेशन्यासंग्रहः नाम प्रथमः परिच्छेदः।
and more about himself and from chapters IX-XXI he identifies himself with Renuka. It is irrefutable and makes it quite evident that Renuka was none other than the author himself. Very funnily the author takes himself back to the times of Bibhishana, the brother of the Dravidian king, Ravana. For it is said in the last chapter that Renuka goes on a tour to Lanka and instals three crores of Lingas there. The relevant verses of the event are:—

रवणस्तु मम ज्ञाता महेश्वरिशिखामणि ||
अहस्यजुलवार्धं शस्वस हि जगतत्यम || २० ||
स तु रामायणविवधं केंद्रस्तलवितीशिष्टः ||
अवशिष्टं सर्वातिकम् मामवाहिक्तुः खितः || २२ ||
विमोचणं विशेषः महाबुद्ध्रे दुधालिकः.
अवशिष्टं परिश्रमं ओस्सत्वं रक्षयो मामगौरवात || २४ ||
नवग लिंगकोटिनां प्रतिप्राप्तमिह स्थले ||
हि संकल्पितं पूर्वं मया नवविश्वयते || २६ ||
कैंतिकतः तु लिखानां मया साधु प्रतिविऴम ||
कृतिकत्र तु लिखानां स्थापनीयमतत्वया || २७ ||
हि तत्व चच्चशुवा दीनवद्ययमार्पयतः ||
तथा साधु करोमीति प्रतिज्ञातं मया तदा || २८ ||
गुप्तविविविलिमां कृतिकयमहतमम ||
प्रतिप्फांम् यथाशास्मिनि से निर्भक्षनमभवत || २९ ||
लिंगकोटिनराजेष्ठु सुगप्तवयाकाविव ||
अविनेन्द्रमाचार्यः महेश्वरकृतिमतिविविय || ३० ||
शिवशाखविवशेष्शर शिवशाक्षानिविविविविवान ||
आनायशभाक्षासाय मम पूर्व वाचितमम || ३१ ||
तत्स्वयं वचने धश्य राशिद्रवय शीतम ||
तत्स्वयं प्रतिज्ञानां सम्मेधो गणनायकः || ३२ ||
तन संहुविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविवि
It is very difficult to understand how this event of the first magnitude has not been recorded in the Rāmāyana, if it were a fact, specially when it is seen that very minor incidents of Bibhîshana’s life have been recorded therein. It is passing strange that this event should be omitted in that great work. It is quite obvious that the author wants to show that Veerashaivism is very ancient, being founded during the times of Bibhîshana by Renuka in ancient times. But as shown above that Renukâchârya was the author himself and makes the ill-disguised attempt at pushing back the religion to pre-historic times under the idea that antiquity of a religion was the proof of its being the best. Not only that but the author makes an attempt of showing how Brahmâ repeatedly failed to bring into existence the universe, how he requested Shiva to help him in the work of creation entrusted to him, how Shiva asked the प्रवश्च to help Brahmâ in his work, and how he did his work successfully with their help. All this is evidently an attempt to show that the creation took place in a particular way and was distinct from, though similar to, that described by other Hindu religious sects. Thus the philosophy of creation is shown to be peculiar to Veerashaivism in order to mark it off from other religions of India. It seems that all this attempt is due to the author’s conviction that old alone was gold and that later the religion the inferior it was.

Now the question arises who this Shivayogi was and when he lived. The answer to the question is furnished by the author himself. In chap. I he gives some information about the line of Achâryas to which he belonged. In the first prefatory note in the beginning of the work the
author says that he belonged to the order of the Achâryas of the name of Siddharâma that was born (to his parents) by the favour of Revanasiddha, who, first known as Renuka, taught the principles of Veerashaivism to the pot-born sage (Agastya) after the Kali age set in, in words—अन्तः कल्पितार्थमेवान्तः लोकहितार्थम् रेवुकामणेश्वर इति प्रसिद्धः रेवा-सिद्दश्वरः कुमःसंविधाय वीरवैवाच्यसुप्रदेववान्। तदन्तः रेवासिद्दश्वरसदृष्टिगमेहसंभूत-सिद्धरामेश्वरसंप्रदायसिद्धः सकलनिगमागमपार्गः शिवयोगीश्वर इवमिखानवान् कविन्माहेश्वरः एते एते। This information well tallies with the Pauranik account that Siddharâma of Sonnalige or Sonnalapur (modern Sholapur) was born to his parents by the blessings of Revanârâdhya or Revanasiddha. The following extracts will make it clear:—

Revanashiddhagarale, chapter 5, page 41.

"सिद्धराम तजिंन विस तवं आश्वायितः।
संग्रहस्य नैशर्षयं विस्मयविविश्रेैः॥

Bommarasa’s Revanashiddha Purana.

"श्रवणसुतके संग्रहस्य नैशर्षयम् विस्मयस्मिविविश्रेैः।
संग्रहस्य रूपमात्रस्मिविविश्रेैः॥"

Gururaja-charitre.

Hence the Siddharâma referred to in the book is the Siddharâma of the Puranas. He was the disciple of Allam-prabhu, a great Veerashaiva Shivayogi, and went over with him to Basaveshwar at Kalyâna. Thus Shivayogi, the author of Siddhântshikhâmani was post Basava. Moreover the author refers directly to Basaveswvar in the prefatory note (IX-30), where it is said—वीरभद्राचार्यवाचारं यूँचनलं मच्छाचारं
It is, therefore, conclusive that the author lived after Basaveshwar. It should be wrong to think, as is likely to be done that, the prefatory notes are by the commentator. That they are by the author himself can be well established by internal evidence. All the notes must either be by the author or by the commentator. It is not only unreasonable but ridiculous to think that some notes should be by the author and some by the commentator. The note no. 1 in the beginning, in which the author gives some account of himself, is undoubtedly by the author, as is customary with authors in general. This has been made doubly sure by the reference made to it by the note (V-1) where it is said:

If this note were by the commentator the reference to the author's previous statement in the introductory note would be meaningless and would stultify the position or assumption that the notes are by the commentator. Nor is it possible or reasonable to think that the first alone is by the author and the rest by the commentator. Such a thing is quite absurd and unimaginable.

The author invariably speaks of himself in the third person; and all references to the author in the third person fit in well with the treatment of the subject-matter in the book. In a note to IV-50, however, the author refers to himself directly in the
first person in words "कोई हिमालोकांशायामाह्." This unconscious slip on the part of the author makes it clear that the references to the author in the third person are by himself to himself and not by the commentator. That the notes are by the author will also be plain from the fact that a note is affixed to VIII-49. If it were by the commentator he could have included in the commentary (which is merely "स्थाप्त") all the statement contained in the note. But as it is not so done it is sure that the commentator has nothing to do with notes. Nor is it likely that the commentator should subjoin a note instead of commenting on the verse. It is unusual no doubt that a note should be affixed; but evidently the author gives his final explanation of पञ्चार्थीमेंत्रज्ञ and concludes the chapter with the note. From all the foregoing it may be concluded that (1) Renuka, Revanasiddha, and Shivayogi are one and the same. (2) and that Shivayogi lived after Basaveshwar.

In the first chap. the author states that there were three Acháryas before him in the line. Thus Shivayogi was the fourth in the line founded or named after Siddharáma (सिद्धरामेश्वरांवर्त्त). Calculating at 30 or 35 years for each Achárya that preceded the author we may well hold that about a hundred years must have passed before the author came to succeed, i.e. the author must have lived about the middle of the 13th century A. D.* The same conclusion has been arrived at by Rao-Saheb Hayavadanarao, Bangalore, who bases his conclusion on the data furnished by a different copy of

* Introduction to Shrikarbhâshya, pp. 54, 55.
Anyway it is clear that Shivayogi, the author, is post-Basava.

After settling the date of Shivayogi we have to face the worst paradox, that is sure to confound readers most and that arises from our conclusion. The paradox would be if Shivayogi is identical with Revanashiddha, he cannot be a successor of Siddharâmeshwar, who, as is professed, was born from the favour of Revansiddha, i. e. he preceded Siddharâmeshwar; and if he preceded Siddharâmeshwar, he cannot be his successor, as stated in the work. Such is the absurdity in which we are landed by the author's account and needs be cleared up. Hence Revanasiddha, that blessed the parents of Siddharâma, must be a person different from the Revanasiddha with whom the author identifies himself. This is exactly the position and cannot but be so. The thing, as furnished by various books, is that there was one Revanasiddha, an older or senior contemporary of Basaveshwar. He was a Shaiva and had a son named Rudramuni who was asked by his father to join the band of the saints (sharanas) that followed Basava, Channabasava and Siddharâma. Rudramuni joined them. But unfortunately the catastrophe, that fell upon Basava and his followers in their fight with Bijjala, whose prime minister Basava was, broke the the band of neo-religionists and dispersed them. As a result of the catastrophe almost all the members of the band ran pellmell in different directions and either died or lived in obscurity. Before the dispersal took place Rudramuni was asked by Channabasava to go and work for the spread of their new religion. Rudramuni did
as much as he could and had a Shishya or disciple named Muktimuni. Muktimuni had a disciple called Digambar muktimuni, who founded a Math at Rambhapuri; and Balehalli, the exact Kanarese translation of Rambhāpuri, is the present Bālehonnur. And the Math founded by him is the present pontifical seat of Revanārādhya, considered to be an avatār of Renuka- chārya. Digambarmuktimuni, the founder of the Math, named it after Revanasiddha, the father of Rudramuni, out of respect for him, as he (Revanasiddha) was a great Shivayogi, and out of humility, as generally great men do out of humility and out of respect for their predecessors. Such in short is the history of the Math of Revanasiddh. We shall note in more detail the history presently. But the time that Shivayogi came to succeed to the line of Siddharāmeshwar this Math must have attained eminence and earned reputation in the cause of the religion, the Lingayatism. Shivayogi then must have thought fit to father the religion upon him (Revanasiddheshwar) after whom the Math was named. In his eagerness to make the religion very ancient, as already remarked, Shivayogi has attempted to make Revanasiddha an avatār of Renuka and takes him back to the times of Bibhishana. But he has failed so badly in his attempts, as has been proved irrefutably from the internal evidence given by the book itself. Any how the example furnished by Shiva- yogi was imitated by his successors, who conveniently started the tradition of the remaining Achāryās also being the founders of religion, gradually as their Maths came to be founded in due course and attained reputa- tion in the cause of the religion. But history does not
corroborate this. On the contrary it tells a different tale altogether, which is going to be noted presently. Before we proceed to determine the prophet that founded the religion we like to examine the theory of five Achâryas being the founders of the religion in more detail collectively and severally in order to explode the myth of their being the founders.

In the first place Siddhânta Shikhâmuni is the only book, in which Revanashiddha, an avatâra of Renuka, has been stated to have preached and promulgated the religion. In no other Sanskrit book he has been described as the founder of the religion, much less the other Achâryas. Even in Panditarâdhyacharitra, a big sans. work by Gururâja of 15th century A. D., Panditârâdhya the hero of the book (one of the five Achâryas) is not described as the founder of the religion. There is no mention of other Achâryas. This also is significant and shows that the founding of the religion by the five Achâryas, collectively or severally is not at all a fact. While in that very book Allamaprabhu, Basava, Channabasava, and some other sharanas of Kalyâna have been praised. Why should it be so if Panditârâdhya and other Achâryas were the founders? The reason is obvious that it is not so. The following slokas will make this plain:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{श्रीकृष्णज्येष्ठैं केदारां वर्तारं चित्तिक्यात्मकं} & \\
\text{जगश्वरि चतुर्मलिकाशैंन वेषमातमसंहू} & \| 1 \| \\
\text{प्राणालीहवहवाहानसहुस्ये तेन दर्शिताम} & \\
\text{जगदितां तस्मै मतमवेप्रमवेनम} & \| 4 \| \\
\text{कुपश्रवश्वर्वकिदम्भवि तेन प्रकाशिताम} & \\
\text{खित्रीयशंहुं सत्यम् तं समांमि वसवेश्वरम्} & \| 5 \|
\end{align*}
\]
There is no mention of the four Achāryas, much less their being the founders.

If we should believe that Renuka taught Agastya the doctrines of Veerashaivism, we should also believe Basavpurāṇa professed to have been written by Vyāsa. In that Purana it is stated that Agastya goes to Shiva’s son Skanda and requests him to tell the story of a great Shivabhakta in the following words.

अगस्यः सर्वसिद्धांतकौनिकः करणानिषिदः।
ह्युः वारकृत्तरेषु कृमाः चक्रायास्यधः।
मका महीनेन सन्ति हिमवत्पुरेनासन।
सर्वधेतेनु भक्तेभू मका कौतु महत्तरः।
तिम्नान्तरः कौतु कौतु दिबादन्तने रतः।
एवंद्विपुणः लोके तिघमचचं दुष्कालं।
वधुमहसूसि देशवश मनाय ते प्रहणन।

Skanda then goes on to relate the life of Basava in the Purana. If we have to believe this we shall have to believe that Basava existed before अगस्य, which would be absurd. Similarly we shall have to believe Prabhulingali, which is a part of भविष्यत्तुल्लण written by Vyāsa. We shall have to consider that Allamaprabhu was an ancient person but we cannot do so because Allama and Basava are 12th century persons.
At the same time we fail to understand the motive of the enthusiasts that strive to make Revanasiddha a mythical figure and father upon him and the other Achâryas the religion. It is a wrong notion if it be their motive, that the excellence of a religion depends upon the founder being a mythical or an ancient figure. If it were so Jainism and Buddhism would not be important or intrinsically valuable, their founders being historic persons. Zoroaster, the founder of the Parsee religion (Zoroastrianism), though ancient is not a mythical person. Does it mean that Zoroastrianism has no merit in it? Shikhism, founded by Guru Nanak only five centuries back, does not lose its importance or worth simply because it has been founded so late. So also the Brahma Samaj and the Arya Samaja would not be much worth, being founded only during the last century, if the idea of our fanatical enthusiasts were the criterion. But nothing depends on whether a religion is founded early or late or by this person or that person. Everything depends upon the principles of a religion that impart intrinsic value or worth to the religion. The founder becomes great because of the principles that he teaches; and not because he is ancient or Pauranik. Thus if the Lingayat religion is of value, it is not so, because it is founded by the Achâryas or Basava or any other person, but because it has sound principles that are a beacon light to the bond souls, guiding them on the road to eternal happiness.

Apart from historical information there are two more considerations that do not allow us to push back the Lingayat religion to ancient times. (1) Kashmere
Shivadwaita, on which the Shaktivishishtadwaita of the Lingayat religion is based with an improved appropriate name, did not exist before ninth century. (2) There is no evidence of the existence of Ashtavarana (अष्टवरण), Shatsthala (षट्ठल), and Panchachárar (पंचचार), that form the connotation of the religion, before the twelfth century A. D. We shall see how.

(1) That शिवावद्वात is named शक्तिविषिष्ठद्वात in Lingayatism will be evident from what is said in § "शक्तिविषिष्ठद्वाता नामार्थो शिवावद्वाते." शक्तिविषिष्ठद्वात is therefore, the basis of Lingayat religion and philosophy and is a principle or aspect of monism like other monistic aspects or principles of other schools of philosophy. It means that Shiva is the Parabramhan. He is characterized or qualified by Shakti (Divine power or Energy) that resides in him in intimate union * "सामस्यंबितत्वं दर्शनसंयं वर्त्त्वाम।" His Shakti is capable of working wonders. † "शक्तेर्पदन- घरनापदीयस्मात।" Shivaparabraman creates, protects, and reabsorbs the universe by means of His Shakti. There are clear and unmistakable references to the आत्मविष्ठ of Kashmere Shaivism in the treatises of Lingayat religion, the आत्मविष्ठ being another name of चित्र, प्रारंभित, चित्रावती and शक्ति. That शक्तिविषिष्ठद्वात is only the modified or improved name of Kashmere Shivadwaita will be evident from the following:—

शिवाभिष्ठं परं भगवं जगत्मांतुविच्छया।
स्रवुपमार्थें ऊँचित्रदातव्यंतविजैतकृतम्।
निरस्त्रदायंवंचं निश्वाचित्कृतव्यवम्॥

This will prove that शक्तिविशिष्टादृति is based on Kashmiri Shivadaita. If further proof is required we may note what is said in विवाहद्रैतमंजरी, page 26—एवं स्थिते प्रकरणस्तावस्तु श्लोका-वास्तवावेन वेतनवातू तत्त "शक्तिमयास्" तत्ती शिवेन सूत्रेल्वात् शास्त्र्विवशृष्टः एकार्यान्तांतेन विरोधमयावात् वास्तवात्य विमानद्वीपम्। This establishes how Kashmiri Shivadwaita is adopted as the basis of the Lingayat religion. बहुत, the founder of Kashmiri philosophy, has been proved to have lived in the ninth century. Hence शक्तिविशिष्टादृति cannot be early and ancient. Moreover it is admitted that श्रीकंठसूरि, the author of रंगमय, was a Kashmiri Brahmin. It is said—अस्य प्रकरणस्तु कर्ता श्रीकंठसूरि: व च रामकंठमंजरी च प्रतिमाति। आचार्यवश्चात् थर्मस्तोऽक्षर्कृतानि न इति स्मर्यते: प्रायवः संस्कृतिवते। (आह्मत्र्काम्यपदम्यात्यम् भूमिका, p. 2.) This shows that Kashmiri Shaivism had influence on South India. Over and above all this in a. 2-48
Kanarese work called "चोरबक्षणपुराण" (a Purana of Basava, thief,—the term "thief" has been used here as a term of endearment out of liberty, love, and devotion of the author to Basava) it is elaborately stated how Basava arranged and managed to bring some Shaiva pandits from Kashmere, who were probably unwilling and were stolen or persuaded from the place, as it were. All this shows that Lingayatism is not an ancient religion existing in the times of Bibhišhana.

Next, the three, (1) अष्टावरण (the eightfold coverings or protective shields that ward off the devotee from the evils of Mayā), (2) पुष्पस्थल (the six localities or steps to Mukti), (3) पञ्चारार (the fivefold modes of living) form the connotation or differentia of the religion. Ashtāvarana consists of Guru, Linga, Jangama, Prasāda, Pālodaka, Vibhūti or Bhasma, Rudrāksha (plant beads), and Mantra. All these existed before the twelfth century but not in the form in which they are meaningfully connected in the ritualism of the Lingayat religion. Guru or the preceptor, one that shows and explains the path of religion and religious rites to मुक्ति is not peculiar to Shaivism but is common to all religions. And he existed before.

So far as Linga is concerned it existed in the form of स्त्रावर्धिंग and not in the form of द्वारिंग worn on the body. There is evidence that Linga worn on the body also existed before. For instance in *शंकरभिज्ञ अनुदानगिरी of Anandagiri there is a reference to the Linga worn on the body, as it is said in it—फाल शिवाचं द्विशिंग अः शास्त्रक्तिक्यं च धारिण्यं चांण् उक्षमसः।

* The evidence based on this book is not quite authoritative, as according to Prof. S. S. Suryanarayanashastri, the work is very late. See शिवाचंद्रित of श्रीकृष्ण, page 120.
Here undoubtedly means the miniature Linga borne on the body. But better evidence is that of हरिमद, a Jain author of repute of 10th century. In his बड्दङ्गनम्बुधय he says—तः च वंधामिकावनपरः करे जनादेशः च राणिर्गम्यन्वायिः सब्दित। Here there is a statement that some Shaivas carried a small Linga, as dear as life (राणिर्गम्यपरः). But it does not mean at all the राणिर्ग (Linga, the vital or mental) of the Lingayats, because they were the worshippers of fivefold fire (वंधामिकावनपरः) which the Lingayats never do. Undoubtedly the Linga carried by the devotees on their bodies was miniature राणिर्ग for facility of worship wherever they went. The Shaivas in their movements from place to place must have felt the want of राणिर्गम्याः in all places, without worshipping which every day these devoted staunch Shaivas could not be happy, specially because those were the days, when Jainism, Buddhism, Shaivism and Vaishnavism were each contending to be prevalent to the exclusion of the rest. Hence gradually they must have felt the necessity of carrying a miniature राणिर्गम्य with them so that they could do their daily devotion without difficulty. And the Linga being so holy they had to bear it on their head or tie it round their necks or arms, as is well expressed—यथा यदि चः राणिर्गपुजकाः अर्थान्तः देवालयस्यसूर्तिपूजकः प्रसिद्ध सहस्राब्धिः इलाियमन्वयवहारायं रामातं यदि गंधुक्षमा: स भवितः तथा तत्र देवालयोऽनात्तत् चेतृ क्षितं लेन ततं राज्य-मयं त्राज्ञ: यथा स्वरामस्यदेवालय एव तत्र नेत्यः दिति विचारे किंचि-मणे सति नतं तत्त्यायशपे दोष: यथा तद्विर्यको अन्त्याभ्यादि: देवालयविःस्क्रियसाधकाः एव। अतः एवार्दः देवालयधर्म्यं स्वयंपापकेष निर्दिते कार्यमिति अशः लिङ्गसेवावधार्यं व्रत्चपादा-मयेचक्कुवाक्यायिंति ।—राणिर्गचर्माङ्काः; page 17. But this Linga is not the Linga of the Lingayat system i. e. इलाििनिः; because nowhere this small Linaga has been explained, and significance is attached to it in the way, in which it has been done in the Lingayat religious literature. It was merely a
custom growing out of necessity as a matter of facility for offering the daily devotion to the deity by the devotee. But it was later incorporated with the ritualism of the Lingayat religion with philosophical meaning given to it.

Jangamas were there before the 12th century but not the Jangamas of the Lingayat religion. The Jangama was an itinerant yogi (Shivayogi), moved about in the country to preach and teach devotion to Shiva as a means of attaining शुभि. If there were Jangamas of the Lingayat religion, there was no necessity for God Shiva, as is stated in Sans. Basavapurâna, to assure (Basava) that He would Himself tie Linga round his neck on his coming to birth. If there was Lingayatism before what reason was there for God to assure Basava? Basava’s mother, Mâdâlambikâ, could not understand why Sangameshwar should go to her lying-in-chamber and give Linga to Basava, as expressed in the following—

इदानीभाषात् चेतयमिथोर्वं सूक्तिकासी।
लोकेष्वरसिन्धुपद्धा संभू स विशालित कहाजन ॥
कर्यं वोतिकर्षण तूफामायाभिमिनाय भावत न ॥
मादालंबिकार्वर्षय शिवः कि समुपागतः ॥
लिङ्गाधारणेकटिं गमभेषथय शिजोः कथम् ॥
न दैह न शुद्धं पूर्वं महासिंहमनस्तिकः ॥
तोर्के ते तिर्थार्थ जाता: संभह वर्णानुसारः ।
तेषा नास्तीदसं रूपं सबनेनावकुठनम् ॥ IV-56-39.

This shows that there was जननसूतक, that is done away with in Lingayatism; and there was no Lingadhârana at the time of Basava’s birth. It was altogether a new thing, neither heard nor practised before (न दैह न शुद्धं पूर्वं). It is, therefore, undoubtedly an anachronism on the part of the writer of the Purana. It seems that he was in a
dilemma that such a great prophet of Lingayatism like Basava should be born and not have दिलोमा at his birth. Hence the anachronism committed by him to be out of the dilemma only to be betrayed. The Jangamas referred to in the Basavapurâna are not the Jangamas of this religion. There is another circumstance to prove that there was no Lingayatism before Basava. In Lingayatism all the sixteen वर्णश्रमचर्ये are given the go-bye. There are only two real वर्णश्रमचर्ये, namely, लिङ्गधारण, peculiar to Lingayatism and दीक्षा that is common to all Shaiva sects and Shâktas. दीक्षा, in Lingayatism is ceremonially connected with the eight अवरणाः and not an ordinary दीक्षा of other Shaivas. Thus if Lingayatism existed before, Mâdirâj or Mâdaras, the father of Basva, could not have urged Basava to undergo the उपनयन ceremony. The father's attempt to perform the customary ceremony caused serious difference of opinion between the father and the son and led to complete cleavage and separation between them. Basava strongly argues out in the assembly (of Pandits called together by मâdirâj) the inutility of उपनयन and vanquishes the upholders of the वर्णश्रमचर्ये in the disputation. This topic forms the most important and interesting chapter in all Puranas of Basava, Kanarese or Sanskrit.

प्रसाद and पादोज्ञ were there; and they still are in all other Shaiva schools. But they differ in the meaning underlying them. In other schools, and for that matter in all other sects of Hinduism, प्रसाद is merely the thing addressed to the Godhead and taken by the devotees as a holy thing. But among the Lingayats the प्रसाद is anything and everything that is taken by the devotee for enjoyment and
It is clear that śivaśeṣa composes the book and inserts it in the vaishnavagam as vaishnavatattvänta. This is one instance that we have found so far. Thus it is very unreasonable to believe on the authority of the Agamas (whose origin goes back to the times of Aranyakas, as already proved) that the persons referred to in the Agamas existed before the Aranyakas. Hence the references to the Achāryas in them are later additions, pure and simple, by their enthusiastic admirers, whoever they were.

If we have to believe what is said in śrutvopāgama and śrutv-śrutvāgam about the Achāryas (already) we must also believe what is said in śratvśrutvāgam about Allamaprabhu and Basava. It is said in it Allamaprabhu appeared in different Yugas with different names, as nīrbuddhā in kṣatryuṣya, nīravidūḥ in ṛṣita-yuga, nīravdūḥ in āśīraḥ and āsphuv in kālavyūha. So also it is written that Basava was kṣanda-gāṇeśa in kṣatryuṣya, nīveśhā|hātīgāṇeśa in ṛṣita-yuga, kṣemagāṇeśa in āśīraḥ, and vāsaghāṇeśa in kālavyūha. So also yogajagama says—

(1) इववघावसूत्रेष्व वर्त्तमानिन्ये पारंपर्यकर्मो नाम प्रयोगविषमार्थं सम्पूर्णम्।

(2) इववघावसूत्रेष्व चित्तवार्तात्तंत्रे प्रथमविन्यये स्थलाधिकारः नाम

(3) इववघावसूत्रेष्व प्रथमविन्यये मित्रस्थलाधिकारः नाम तत्त्राधिकारः सम्पूर्णम्।

(4) इववघावसूत्रेष्व प्रथमविन्यये वर्त्तमानिन्ये वसांकार्यविन्यये नाम

(5) इववघावसूत्रेष्व प्रथमविन्यये मित्रस्थलाधिकारः सम्पूर्णम्।

(6) इववघावसूत्रेष्व प्रथमविन्यये वर्त्तमानिन्ये स्वातांत्र्यवादिनव नाम

(7) इववघावसूत्रेष्व प्रथमविन्यये मित्रस्थलाधिकारः सम्पूर्णम्।

(8) इववघावसूत्रेष्व प्रथमविन्यये मित्रस्थलाधिकारः विन्ययविशेषतिनामाध्यमाधिकारः सम्पूर्णम्।

It is clear that śivaśeṣa composes the book and inserts it in the vaishnavagam as vaishnavatattvänta. This is one instance that we have found so far. Thus it is very unreasonable to believe on the authority of the Agamas (whose origin goes back to the times of Aranyakas, as already proved) that the persons referred to in the Agamas existed before the Aranyakas. Hence the references to the Achāryas in them are later additions, pure and simple, by their enthusiastic admirers, whoever they were.

If we have to believe what is said in śrutvopāgama and śrutv-śrutvāgam about the Achāryas (already) we must also believe what is said in śratvśrutvāgam about Allamaprabhu and Basava. It is said in it Allamaprabhu appeared in different Yugas with different names, as nīrbuddhā in kṣatryuṣya, nīravidūḥ in ṛṣita-yuga, nīravdūḥ in āśīraḥ and āsphuv in kālavyūha. So also it is written that Basava was kṣanda-gāṇeśa in kṣatryuṣya, nīveśhā|hātīgāṇeśa in ṛṣita-yuga, kṣemagāṇeśa in āśīraḥ, and vāsaghāṇeśa in kālavyūha. So also yogajagama says—
All these are attempts at making these persons mystic and divine figures under the wrong notion that such mystic and divine origin alone would make them important and venerable. But we beg to differ. Great persons are always great not because they are ancient or mystic figures but because of their messages. Shakespeare, Kālidās and Count Tolstoy, Tukārām, Shankarāchārya, Lakshmīsha and Shādkshari, are immortal, not because they are ancient or mystic persons but because of their message to human beings. Similarly Allama Prabhu, Basava, Chānnabasava, Veerashaiva Sharauas and the Achāryas will ever live on account of the doctrines they have taught, the message they have delivered, the right path to mukti they have shown, and the work they have done. We have every respect and all reverence for the Achāryas. We adore, venerate, and worship them in deep gratitude for what they have done to the Lingayat religion and the Lingayat world by propagating and stabilizing the religion. They chose important centres in India from which to do the work in service of the religion and the creed. Their work is simply admirable, their exertions are simply praiseworthy and they have made themselves immortal, not by founding the religion but by propagating and stabilizing it.

There is one more reason why Revanaśiddha, an avatar of Renuka, is not the founder of the religion. If he were the founder of the religion, why did he not teach Bibhīshana the principles of the religion founded by him and
convert him (Bibbhishana) to it? Instead of doing so he simply establishes three crores of śvāvaraṅgīnas, which goes against his own creed of Ishtaling worship. He himself says that śvāvaraṅgīnānimīlāy (anything addressed to śvāvaraṅgī) is unacceptable in the following—

śvāvaraṅgīnānimīlāy

nal śvāvaraṅgīnānimīlāyaśvayuṣyate

brah śvāvaraṅgīnānamaya: pariṣṭhate

tathā sāpanāvibhāṣyatis mohāraṃ samāścërt

świadc. IX–34, 35.

All this shows that śvāvaraṅgīnas may be protected but their śvāvaraṅgīnas are not acceptable; because the Lingayats rise superior to the worship of śvāvaraṅgī on account of their wearing and worshipping the śvāvaraṅgī. Shivayogi, therefore, has bungled badly in his enthusiasm of pushing the religion to remote antiquity.

Now we proceed to examine the information about the Achāryas collected from various books extant.

They are the five traditional Achāryas associated with the Veerashaiva religion. In the minds of men that have any knowledge of them their figures are dim. Their memories are curiously mixed up with men and matters belonging to different ages. Agastya, Bibbhishana, Rajendra Chola, Bijjala, all come to be their contemporaries regardless of the fact that historically ages yawn between Bijjala and Bibbhishana.

But then, these Achāryas are not altogether a myth. Their devotees in their enthusiasm to make them and their religion ancient have exaggerated things about them to the extent of mysifying their personalities. The maths, which they are reputed to have founded are still in existence. Again we have clear reference to
them in Kannada literature. Even some works in Kannada and Telugu are attributed to them. And above all it is a fact that they tried to propagate the religion. That is why their names have come down to us in connection with the Veershaiva religion. But with all that that they are responsible for the religion is a myth. Those who try to establish that they originated the religion in pre-vedic times involve themselves in a chain of contradictions. According to them Shiva is said to have explained the religion to Parvati. Then Shiva is the founder and not the Acharyas.

We are told that the five Acharyas originated from five faces of Shiva. We are again told that they are the five of the Shivaganas chosen by Shiva and sent down to the earth to found the religion. These two statements evidently contradict each other. If they cannot be true together which of the two is true?

How can five Acharyas be founders of a religion at one and the same time? The order in which the names of these five Acharyas are usually mentioned gives one the impression that they came down to the earth one after another. If they did so, how can all the five be credited with the founding of the religion? Must it not be that only one of them founded it and the others only promoted it?

The Acharyas are said to have risen from Sthavara-lingas with a view to preaching the religion of Ishtalinga, the soul of Lingayat religion, can anything be more absurd than this?

Even supposing that they rose from the Sthavara-lingas to found the religion of Ishtalinga, how to reconcile
their preaching of the worship of Ishtalinga with their establishing of Sthavaralinga? (Renukâchârya, for example, is said to have established thirty million Sthâvaralingas at Lankâ for Bibhîshana instead of preaching the religion and philosophy of Ishtalinga).

Even supposing that they originated from the five faces of Parameshvara at one and the same time and that they founded the religion on earth at one and the same time, how possibly can we explain their founding it four times in the four successive Yugas?

They are said to have lived for fourteen hundred years. Even supposing that they did live for fourteen hundred years (which reason cannot accept) how can we possibly make that period cover the lives of Bijjala of the 12th century and Bibbishana of the pre-historic age?

What explanation is there for their having lived incognito for seven hundred years out of 1400 years? What purpose did they serve by living incognito?

And now about the Puranas of the Achâryas. Puranas are after all Puranas and we have to be very cautious in the matter of gleaning historical facts from them. They are usually a confused medley of facts and fiction. It is a common characteristic of them to make their heroes come down to the earth directly from heaven. They are sent down to the earth by God to keep dharma intact, and it is through miracles that they keep it intact—the miracles true or false—more often they are false than any thing else. But if rightly used and if facts are properly sifted from fiction they afford good clues to solve the puzzle of the past.
The Panchâchâryas have come to be the heroes of Puranas. Consequently they have all been deified and legends replete with miracles have grown round them. Even then we find in them certain pieces of evidence to help us to establish the dates of the Acharyas and their relationship with the Veerashaiva religion. The pieces of evidence from Kannada Puranic literature given below go to prove conclusively that they are not the originators of the Veerashaiva faith.

Wherever the Acharyas are mentioned Renuka invariably appears first in order. In point of time also he must have been the first to appear. The first book written about the Achârayas is that about Revana by Harihara, the well-known (Veerashaiva?) poet. (It should be noted that there is no Sanskrit work about Revana) * The date fixed for Harihara, by R. Nara-sinhacharya, the author of Karnataka Kavicharite, a stupendous work ever attempted in Kannada, is 1165 A.D. Harihara’s book goes by the name of Revanashiddha Ragale. It is the life story of Renukacharya written in the Kannada metre known as ‘ragale’. Harihara being nearer to Revana than any other Kannada poet who has poetised his life, what he says about the first of the five Acharyas we can safely believe to be authentic, making at the same time allowance for certain exaggerations indulged for the glorification of the hero.

In the ragale it is said that Renuka was ordered by God Shiva to take brith on earth because of a fault committed by him. It should be noted that he did not

* Karnataka Kavicharite part I Page 224.
originate from one of the five faces of Parameshvarā. This is to show that the ragale differs from the Shivagamas.

* Revana is said to have come down to the earth expressly for the purpose of purifying the earth by performing miracles. There is not even a remote hint to the effect that he descended from heaven to found the Veerashaiva religion.

§ (i) One Bijjala of Mangalwad (ii) one king Vikrmāditya (iii) one Rajendra Chola are mentioned to have had the benifit of Revana’s darshana (interview or meeting). All these three kings are historically true; they were all contemporaries.

The Bijjala in the Ragala must be the Bijjala of Kalyana. Mangalwad has been only another (translated) name for Kalyana. We are not without an evidence to bear this out. This very poet Harihara has used Mangalwad for Kalyan in his Basava-raja-ragale in connection with Basava and Bijjala. There Sangameshvara asks Basaveshvara to go to Mangalwad the royal city of king

* Revanashiddha ragale page 9.

§ Revanashiddeshvara Ragale. Chapter III.

(I) [Text not legible]

(II) Chapter II:— [Text not legible]

(III) [Text not legible]
Bijjala*. On the evidence of inscriptions the date of this Bijjala has been finally settled.

As he was the king of Karnataka at the time of Basava under whose leadership and spiritual influence Veerashaivism had sprung and had reached the height of its glory in Karnataka, the settling of his date has shed considerable light on things connected with the Veerashaiva faith. Seen in that light Revanashiddha clearly emerges to be the contemporary of both Bijjala and Basava. So he belongs to the middle of the 12th century A. D.

§ According to inscriptions of Mahadevaraya No. 2 and 3, one Guttarasa Vikrama was ruling in Guttaholala, a place near Ujjaini in Bellari district in about 1140 A., D. Most probably it is this very Vikrama that is referred to in Revanashiddha ragale.

According to genealogy of the Chola dynasty given by E. P. Rice Raja-Raja-chola was ruling in 1146 A., D. Kulottanga Chola had the title of Rajendra chola. Rajendra chola of the ragale must be either of these two.

These, then, put together point to the conclusion that Revana must have been living about the middle of the 12th century. A. D.

In the ragale there are two more facts to support the date. One is about Siddharâma of Sonnalige (modern


§ Veerashaiva Matacharya kalanirnaya by Karla mangala Shrikanthiya page 31.
Sholapur) and the other is about Rudramuni. * Revanashiddha foretells the birth of Siddharama of Sonnalige. This Siddharama we all know to be one of religious colleagues of Basveshvara; and so Revana lived in about the same time.

And then there is Rudramuni. He is said to be the son of Revana by one of the daughters of Rajendra Chola. This Rudramuni is the same as the one referred to in Channabasava Purana of Virupaxa Pandita. According to Channabasava Purana, Rudramuni, one of the chief Charapatis, who was with Channabasava, at the time of the breaking up of the band of one lakh and ninety six Jangamas is, subsequent to the disappearance of Basava, its originator, from the scene of action at Kalyana in order to merge into Sangameshvara, asks his disciples to tour the country and to destroy the enemies of the Veerashaiva religion. † It is the disciple of this Muktimuni that sets up the pontifical throne at Balehalli (of which Revana is reputed

* Revana-Siddha ragale Chapter 5 page 41.
† Channabasava Purana. Canto 5, Sandhi 9, Stanzas 36-41.
to be the first pontiff) in order to put down the enemies of the Veerashaiva religion and to protect the Sharanas. In Sharana-lilamrita also we find the mention of Rudramuni and Channabasaveshvara together in connection with the breaking up of the band of Sharanās. In this case also Revana must have been a contemporary of Basava though older.

There is one more evidence. Revana is stated to have got his son Rudramuni to initiate one Havina Haleya Kallaya into the religion of Shiva.* Perhaps this is the same Havina Haleya Kallayya whom in his Kannada Kavicharite Part I, Rao-bahadur R. Narasinhacharya has included among the Vachana-karas of the times of Basaveshvara. The date assigned to him is 1150. A. D..§ This Kallaya again appears in Bhimakavi's (1369) Basava Purana.†

Crowning all these we have an inscriptive evidence. The stone inscription of the Shaka year 1109, corresponding 1187 A. D. in the temple of Shiddhalingeshvara of Shiriyala in the Nizama's Dominions (published in the Shivānubhava magazine for the month of May, 1929.) may be seen. The incidents mentioned in the six stanzas of the inscription correspond exactly to those mentioned in Harihara's Revanashiddha Ragale, Bommarasa's Revanashiddha Purana and Basavanka's Revanashiddha Sāṅgatya.

* Revanashiddha-ragale:

§ Karnatak Kavicharite Part I Page 204.
† Basava Purana Sandhi 55.
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The inscription containing the six stanzas runs as follows:-
The first stanza gives in a nutshell the popular story narrated in the works mentioned above, that when Revanasiddha begged the king Vira-Bijjala for alms, at Mangalwad Vira Bijjala offered him boiling Payasa.

The second stanza refers to the popular incident that while rescuing the daughter of one Sule Mayidevi from Vira Bijjala's sacrifice Revanashiddha, without using a ferry boat crossed the stream by his own will power.

The incident mentioned in the third stanza is that when once Revanasidhda uttered the word Siddha, all people took objection to the same, upon which Revanasiddha made the earth shake.

The incident referred to in the fourth Stanza is that Revanasidhda showed Tavanidhi (treasure) to Gānada Kallishetti and his wife and thus ended their poverty.

The incident mentioned in the fifth stanza is not clear. The incident mentioned in the last stanza is that Revana took to dancing and behaved as a mad man when he worked in the house of Ganada Shetti mentioned above.

The Renuka or Revana of the Puranas, then, is the same as the Renuka or Revana of the inscription. Only the authors of the Puranas, in order to heighten the glory of their hero, have tried to push back the date of their hero with the result that Revana has become a mythical personage in the Puranas.

So the real Renukācharya lived in the 12th century, more or less a contemporary of Basava. If so, he could not have been the founder of the Veerashaiva faith.

Nowhere in the Ragale it is said that Revana originated the faith. Not only that, the word Veerashaiva has
not occurred even once in the whole of the Ragale. Revana is spoken of as merely a Shaiva saint who performed miracles and promoted devotion for Shiva on earth. He toured the Dravida country worshipping Shivalingas that he came across. One wonders as to how Revana who worshipped Sthavara Lingas could be credited with the founding of the religion of Ishtalinga. Again nowhere in the Ragale has any mention been made of Asthâvarana, Shatsthala and Panchâchâra the differentia of the Veerashaiva religion. The impression that we get from the perusal of the Ragale as a whole is that Revana was not a Veerashaiva, at least not when Harihara-deva wrote his Ragale. The Revana of the Ragale is a † Lakulish Shaiva. But Basavaraj, the hero of another Ragale by the same author (Harihara), is pictured as a perfect Veerashaiva as he needs must be. It may not be out of place here to quote from the two aforesaid Ragales of Harihara to note the glaring contrast between Revana and Basava from the religious point of view.

Harihara’s Revana toured the Dravida country and worshipped Sthavaralingas.

Harihara’s Basaveshvara worshipped Ishtalinga and found jangama in his Linga and Linga in jangama.

* 19–20 (Revanashiddha Ragale)

† Revansiddha Ragale: அவசான அசுரைசை.
Harihara describes his Revana to be a Lakulish Shaiva.

Harihara's Basavaraja is shown as He who, having reached the stage of knowledge, set out to become a Shaiva. All these are the epithets of Basava and they indicate some of the Ashtavaranas which form the special feature of Veerashaivism.

Revana gives Shaivopadesh (initiation into the Shaiva faith) to his son Rudramuni.

But Basava's son is described as one with the Ishtalingam (worship of the Ishtashiva)

Why does Harihara depict Revana as a Shaiva and Basava as a Veerashaiva? What conclusion does this point to? The conclusion can be none other than that Revana was not a Veerashaiva when Harihara wrote his Ragale and that he was certainly not the originator of the faith.

The picture of Revana changes in the works of subsequent Kannada authors. The hero from the Shaiva Saint becomes a Veerashaiva saint. But even in these later works we do not get any evidence to the effect that Revana should be looked upon as the founder of Veerashaivism. As to the miracles and other like incidents they are the same as in Hariharadeva's work and they are narrated almost in the same sequence.
Now the question arises: How to reconcile the Shaiva Revana of Harihara with the Veerashaiva Revana of later authors? This apparent contradiction, however, can be explained away in two ways. Either the Veerashaiva authors after Harihara have ascribed their own religion to their hero, or the hero, first a Shaiva saint, might have embraced the Veerashaiva religion afterwards. The latter, however, seems to be more probable. In that case Revana, Basava and Harihara become contemporaries, more or less, and the date 1165 A. D. assigned to Harihara by R. Narasinhcharyya gets support. Harihara, himself a Shaiva first, appears to have become a Veerashaiva afterwards under the prevailing influence of Veerashaivism in the South in general and in Karnataka in particular, in the latter part of the 12th century owing to the activities of the great Basava of Kalyan and his colleagues in the realm of religion.

Now among the authors, who have written about Revana after Harihara, Bommarasa, (1450 A. D.), Siddhananjesha (1650), Sampadaneya Parvateshvara (1698) may be mentioned as important. Revanashiddha Purana, Gururajacharitra and Chaturacharya charitre are the books written by them respectively. They have, one and all mentioned Vikrama, the king of Ujjani, Bijjala, the king of Kalyan, and Rajendra Chola, Rudranuni and Siddharama of Sonnalige * who, as has been already pointed out, throw light on the question of the date of Revana.

* Bommarasa’s Revanashiddha Purana.

Gururajcharitre

"करंश्रे, भिक्षुनः नमस्ते नमस्ते नमस्ते भवधा स नमस्ते भवधा'...

"सरस्वतीं गीतिके नमस्ते नमस्ते नमस्ते भवधा सरस्वतीं गीतिके".
In all the works about Revana the hero is depicted as a saint performing a miracle, and in none as the founder of the Veerashaiva religion though the title such as the first of the Veerashaiva saints ( ರೇವನಾ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ), the preacher of the Veerashaiva religion ( ರೇವನಾ ವೀರಶೈವ ಸಾರಾಸ್ತು ) are in a very loose sense used here and there in the books. Revana was a Veerashaiva achârya but not the founder of the religion. In Sanganbasaveshvara vachanas ( 1300 A. D. ) we have clear evidence to the effect that Revanasiddha received instructions in the Veerashaiva religion at the hands of one Nirlajja Shantayya who himself had been instructed directly by Channabasaveswara and indirectly by Allamaprabhu. It is further stated that Revana, in his turn, gave the instruction to those who came to him and became his disciples † That is why he is looked upon as the first Achârya as such. The word Achâraya is significant and throws light on the point at issue. The word ‘deshika’ ( ದೇಶಿ ) is also significant. It means a preacher and a teacher and never a founder. Let us by all means regard him as the first Veerashaiva achârya; but to regard him as the founder of the faith is to lay the axe at the root of the truth.

† Sanganbasaveshvara Vachanagalu, edited by Rao Saheb Halkatti. page 1:-ದಾಖೆಲ್ಲಿ ಎಣೆಣೆಣೆ ದಗಿ ನಾದ ನಾದ ನಾದಯಲ್ಲಿ ರೇವನಾ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ರೇವನಾ ವೀರಶೈವ ಸಾರಾಸ್ತು ರೇವನಾ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿ...ತಿಂದ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ...ತಿಂದ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ...ತಿಂದ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ...ತಿಂದ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ...ತಿಂದ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ ಸುತ್ತ...
Marulārādhya.

Next in order comes Marulārādhya. Marula seems to have lived at the time of Revanārādhya; though a bit younger than Revana. We have but little information about Marula in Kannada literature. Many books about Revana are extant; but about Marula only a few are found so far.

* In Marulashiddha Sangatya the date of which is not known, Marula is said to have been the disciple of Revanārādhya. Gorakha, § Maraya, Mukta, one Vikrama, king of Ujjaini are mentioned as having been contemporaries of Marula. If Revana announced the birth of Siddharama, Marula predicted the coming of Prabhu (Allama) to Ujjaini where Allama Prabhu would dispel doubts of Mukta.

It is stated there that he was also called by the name of Marulashiddha. We know that the second of the so-called Panchacharyas is the founder of the pontifical throne at Ujjaini. May we not say that the Acharya and Murularadhyā are one and the same?

* Marulasiddha sangatya chapter IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marulasiddha: Chapter IV.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) the first five sayings were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(II) the first three</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ Marulasiddha-Sangatya : Chapter IV.

(1) the first three sayings were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marulasiddha-Sangatya: Chapter IV.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter III.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Marula Sangatya : Chapter III.

The third of the third sayings were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marula Sangatya: Chapter III.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter IV.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The account of Marula in Guru-raja-charitre is very brief. Nothing is mentioned there to help us to fix his date. Again, there is nothing in it to show that he was a Veerashaiva, much less the originator of the Veerashaiva religion. He is merely described as a Siddha, a Saint of Great psychic powers, though the author has made a passing mention in the first chapter that Marula founded the religion along with the other Achâryas. The only incident that is narrated about him is that he killed the demoness, Maya, at Kolhapur.

In Chaturâchârya-charitre of Parvateshvara also we get little or nothing to decide the date of Marula. Again, we are left as much in the dark about his founding the Veerashaiva religion. *Only once in the whole account is Marula stated to be a Veerashaiva.

The Marula-siddha of the Sângatya, however, is nothing if not a Veerashaiva. In the Sângatya there are clear references to Ashtâvaranas, though the term ashtâvarana itself does not occur therein. Marula is instructed in ashtâvarana by his master, Revana. Perhaps Marula was one of those disciples to whom, as has been already mentioned in these pages, Revana imparted religious instruction he received indirectly from Allamaprabhu.

To sum up, as Revana and Marula lived at the time of Basava, the spirit incarnate of Veerashaivism, as they preached and promoted the religion and as they were known at their time as Acharyas, they in course of time have come to be regarded as the Veerashaiva-Sansthabhâpanâchâryas.

* Chaturacharyacharitre canto 3 Sandhi 1 stanza 9.
Panditārādhya.

It is difficult, to say who is the third āchārya and who is the fourth. If in some Kannada works Ekorāma is given the third place and Panditārādhya the fourth, we find the order reversed in others. We shall however give the third place to Panditārādhya.

About Panditārādhya we seem to tread on surer ground than any of the other āchāryas. Happily we have much information regarding him in literature, at least in Kannada literature. He is intimately connected with Veerashaiva religion and with Basava; he was a contemporary of Basava, though a little younger.

† It is said that he was eager to have the darshana of Basaveshvara (whom perhaps he had not seen before, but about whom he had heard much in connection with the Veerashaiva religion which was then gaining ground in the country around) but before he could have it, news reached him that Basava had merged into Sangameshvara. The news caused him intense grief which expressed itself in a lyric. †

* One whole chapter has been devoted to this incident in Aradhya charitre of Nilakanthāchārāya.

† Gururajcharitre: Sandhi 2 Stanza 25.


* Aradhyacharitre (Kannada) Sandhi 9.
(1845. A. D.) Therein the Pandit laments the end of Basava and says—"Who else is there to found and promote the Veerashaiva religion?" † Some thing to the same effect has been said in Sanskrit Guru-raja-charitra by Guru-raj (1500 A. D.).

* Panditāradhyā’s devotion towards Basaveshvara was so great that he was able to see the figure of Basava in his own Ishtalinga even after the death of Basava.

The incident is narrated in the Panditāradhyā-charitre of Palkurike Somanatha (1195. A. D.) written in Telugu. The same Somanath wrote Basava Purana which was later translated by Bhimakavi in Kannada. Palkurika Somanath seems to have equal devotion for Basava and Panditāradhyā, and as he is much near to Basava, his information must be given due credit and must be regarded as authoritative and trustworthy. So we can safely put down Panditāradhyā’s date to be the latter part of the 12th century.

Panditāradhyā is said to have proved the superiority of his religion over other religions such as Baudhā, Charvak and Jain, in the court of one Chola king. This Chola must have been Kulottunga the Chola who lived in about 1178. A. D.

† Gururaj-charitra (Sanskrit) Mahima Sandhi Stanza 56.

श्रीकृष्णवस्मयं संस्कृतम् परिभाषा
अविचितां स्थापितं को वा वाचो महीनः ।


अयं ऊपरदर्शनं संज्ञानं संख्यायनं दिव्यं विवेकं भवते संस्कृतं ॥
Panditaradhyya must have been a Shaiva first. Afterwards under the influence of Basava's religious activities he must have become a convert to the Veera-shaiva faith. † We have support for this in Kannada Guru-raja-charitre wherein it is stated that one Kotipallaradhyya invested Panditaradhyya with Linga. Mallikarjuna Pandit is credited with the authorship of Gana-Sahasra-nama, Ishtalinga Shastra and Basava-gite, all of which give him out to be a Veera-shaiva. Basavagite, as its name indicates, a eulogy on Basava, is said to have been composed in Kannada. Panditaradhyya was a Telugu man, and there is a story how he learned Kannada at once by a miracle. † The story tells us that Basava sent him Bhasita (holy ashes) and that as soon as he applied it to his body Kannada rose to his lips. It was then he is said to have composed the encomium on Basava. The miracle, however, can be explained in this way. Pandita was a Telugu man Basava was a Kannada man. Basava's Vachanas, a literary treasure of Veerashaiva religion and philosophy, are in Kannada. Panditaradhyya learned Kannada afterwards in order to acquaint himself with the Vachanas of Basava and his notable colleagues in which the religion and philosophy of Veerashaivas are couched. Because of his earnestness and devotion for

† Guru-raja-charite Sandhi 2 stanza 21.

† Guru-raja-charite sandhi 2. stanza 32
his new religion he might have picked up the language in a surprisingly short time.

In Shiva-tattva-sara written by Panditārādhya he has very affectionately referred to * Basava. In that work he has dedicated three stanzas to the praise of Basava. The stanzas in Telugu are quoted below:

\begin{align*}
\text{అమస్త్రం నంది సంహరా} \\
\text{సామాన్య నాయం పాట్టి-మానం కారణం} \\
\text{| నాసగారం పాట్టి మండా} \\
\text{అమస్త్రం నంది మాధవ పాట పాట్టి ||} \\
\text{మాధవం విచిత్రం తుంగ కారణం} \\
\text{పాట్టి మాధవ పాట్టి మండా} \\
\text{పాట్టి మాధవ పాట్టి మండా} \\
\text{సామాన్య నంది పాట్టి మండా} \\
\text{గంగాయం విచిత్రం తుంగ కారణం} \\
\text{పాట్టి మాధవ పాట్టి మండా} \\
\text{పాట్టి మాధవ పాట్టి మండా}
\end{align*}

With all this there seems to be a fundamental difference, as has been pointed out by the late T. S. Venkanayya in an article under the caption, ‘Shivatattvasara’ published in an issue of § Prabuddha Karnatak, a Kannada quarterly, between the religion propounded and practised by Basava and his colleagues and that preached and practised by Panditārādhya. In the religion of Panditārādhya the Varnashramic idea and certain Vedic customs are found lingering, whereas in the religion of Basava they find no place whatever. This difference has well been brought out by T. S.

* Shivatattva-Sara: మేని మండా—My Basava.

§ Prabuddha Karnatak vol XVI No. 2.
Venkannayya in the issue of Prabuddha Karnatak already referred to. He writes to the following effect.

"The Vachanakaras (Basava and his colleagues) adhere to the Shatsthala philosophy. They are usually called Shatsthal-brahmih's. In Shatsthala philosophy we have a systematic exposition of the six stages of discipline to be passed through. But not even a bare mention of this Shatsthala philosophy which forms the basis of the faith of the Vachanakaras is made in Shivatattvasara. The Shatsthala philosophy does not seem to have been known by the 63 Tamil Puratanas who were regarded by the Vachanakaras as their models in the matter of devotion.

"There is one more thing to be considered historically. It is about the wearing of Lingam. According to the creed of the Vachanakaras the investment of the Lingam forms an important part of the initiation ceremony. The Vachanakaras and their followers wear the Lingam on their person. In consequence thereof they are called Linga-wearers (Lingawantas). There is no doubt that Panditārādhya was well aware of this fact, for in Shivatattvasara in a stanza eulogising Basava there occurs the phrase 'Shivalinga-sametulu' which means 'one who is with Shivalinga.' It is used to mean 'one who wears the Lingam.' Be it what it may, no where in Shivatattva-sara is it mentioned that the wearing of the Lingam is part of Shiva-dikshā or initiation ceremony. It is doubtful whether this custom existed among the Tamil Puratans. Therefore the wearing of Linga may be said to be one of the special features of the creed of the Vachankaras."
is another question bound up with the two mentioned above; and it is concerned with conduct. Those who receive Shivadikshâ get a new life free from the influences of former lives. Those who are reborn in this way are to give up all their former customs and conventions with the initiation; the former distinction of caste disappears. A Brahmin and a Sudra become equal in all respects. They can interdine with each other. Clearly there is a positive difference between this view of the Vachanakaras and the view of Shiva-tattva-sara. The Shaiva faith as it is expounded in Shiva-tattvasara has a Vedic basis.

“A Veerashaiva that wears a lingam offered to him by his Guru is forbidden to worship any other lingam. But Shiva-tattvasara on the contrary advocates the necessity of the worship of Sthavaralingas (as against the Ishtalinga or the Linga worn on one’s person.)

“When we consider all these things together the conclusion forces itself that a special form of Shaivism arose in the 12th century, spread rapidly because of its intrinsic worth and because of the sincere efforts of the devout Vachanakaras it attracted a great many Shaivas in Karnatak.”

But it is most likely that Panditâradhya embraced the faith of the Vachanakaras after he wrote his Shiva-tattvasara. He might have written it before he started to have the darshana of Basava and his reply (सत्वात्व बसवे शरभनामार्थोऽपायगुप्त प्रेमाः बसवे बहुशास्त्रयोगभेदे) to Basava’s message to him to embrace his faith might have preceded his setting out to have the darshana of Basava.

It may be argued that this Panditâradhya is not the same Panditâradhya who is said to have founded the Veershaiva faith. In that case the founder Panditâ-
rādhya must have either gone before him or must have been a Shaiva, since the Panditārādhya of the Shiva-tatvasarā is depicted as a Shaiva. Surely the predecessor of a Shaiva could not have been a Veerashaiva. Conversely if the original Panditārādhya was a Veerashaiva, the Panditārādhya of Shiva-tatvasara would not have been a Shaiva.

If the founder Panditārādhya came after the Panditārādhya of Shiva-tatvasarā, then he must have been post-Basava, since the Panditārādhya of Shiva-tatvasarā and Basava have been already proved to be contemporaries. If he is post-Basava, then no reasonable person can assert that Panditārādhya is the founder of the Veera-shaiva faith. In either case then Panditārādhya could not have been the founder,

It seems that Panditārādhya failed to assimilate the fundamental tenets of the Veerashaiva religion even after he embraced it. It must be remembered in this connection that Veerashaivism was then a great departure from the old Shaiva faith. The old order was yielding place to the new under the inspiration of Basava. The glamour of the new religion attracted a great many people. Some could enter into its spirit; others could only grasp its form. Panditārādhya seems to have been one of the latter class at-once a Shaiva and a Veera-shaiva, a Telugu man and a Kannada man he seems to present a dual personality. But then he was no ordinary man. He was a Pandit. He had been known as such even before he became a Veerashaiva. His influence might have been great. To add to all this he accepted the new creed that seemed to sweep all the South over. What wonder then if he came to be recognised as one of the great Veerashaiva Acharyas?
Ekorāma.

Now we come to Ekorāmārādhya. We have a brief account of this acharya in Gururaja-charitre of Siddhanañjesh. It is stated therein that he preached the Veerashaiva religion and defeated the learned men of other faiths. In a religious controversy, it is said, that he defeated one very learned Brahmin by name Vyāsa and convinced him of the greatness and superiority of the Veerashaiva religion to which he ultimately converted him, just as Basava had already defeated a Meemansaka and had got him to wear Linga on his body. So here is an evidence to show that Ekorāma is later than Basaveshvāra; but we are not sure how many years after Basava he came to be. He is said to have lived at Mudrāpura at the time of one Veerabhāskara, king of Mudrāpura. But until something turns up to throw light on the date of the king we have got to be content with this much information that Ekorāma is later than Basava.

There is a ‘Purana’ in Sanskrit called ‘Devānga Purana’ in which the story of Devaradasimayya, a contemporary of Basava has been given. It is stated therein that Ekorāma was the son of Dāsimayya. In that Purana the word, Veerashaiva, occurs a few times. But the perusal of the book will make it clear that both the father and the son were Shaivas of a dwija class and not Veerashaivas; for it is stated that both had their Upanayana ceremony performed. If Ekorāma had been a Veerashaiva he would not have undergone the Upanayana

Guru-raj-charitre. Sandhi 2, stanza 70.
ceremony; so he must have become a Veerashaiva late in life. As he is later than Basaveshvara and as he embraced the Veerashaiva religion late in life he could not have been the founder of the faith. It is clearly stated in Guru-raj-charitre that he was given initiation into the Veerashaiva religion by one * Ghantākarna Gagannātha, otherwise known as Rāmanāthāchārya. He in his turn is said to have converted many persons of other faiths to his own faith. Since he helped the growth of the faith he has come to be regarded as one of the founders of the religion by the people of generations far removed from his.

Vishvārādhya

Last of all we have Vishvārādhya. We find very little account of him in Kannada literature. He is not at all mentioned by some writers who have written anything at all about the Panchāchāryyas. The reason seems to be that he is very recent. He must have dawned on the Veerashaiva horizon generations after Basava. A great many authors mention only four Achāryas, starting with Revana and ending with Ekorāma and thus excluding Vishvārādhya. † For example, Bommarasa has mentioned only four of the Āchāryas. Some works go by the name of Chaturāchārya charitre, Chaturāchārya Purana and so on, and in them Vishvārādhya finds no place. The fifth Āchārya then seems to have been very recent. He seems to have been

---

* Guru-raj-charitre Sandhi 2.
† Revanasiddha Purana (by Bommarasa) chapter I Stanzas 4, 5, 6 and 7.
classed along with the other four acharyas only to make the number of acharyas five, corresponding to the number of the five faces of Shiva. The myth of the five acharyas rising from the five faces of Parameshvara must have gained currency only recently. In Veerashaiva Sanjivini of Mummadi Karyendra the following account is given of the birth of the fifth Achārya.

One day Shiva was seated in his audience hall in Kailass. At that time Nārada, the reputed news-monger, made his appearance there. Upon Shiva’s inquiry about the Shaiva faith on earth, Narada replied that the faith in question was on the decline. Thereupon Shiva ordered Sthula Ganesh, a member of his assembly, to go down to earth and to revive the Veerashaiva faith as the four achāryas had done before him. Accordingly, Sthula-ganesh took birth on earth as the son of one Kempa-bhūpati.

It is to be noted that, according to this account, Vishvārādhya did not rise either from one of the five faces of Shiva or from a Sthāvaralinga as mythical stories would have us believe. This account clearly explodes the myth of the Panchacharyas, and reveals the fact that Vishvārādhya, the fifth of the so called acharyas is very recent. In that case how should we believe that all the five acharyas founded the Veerashaiva religion in some very remote time which history dare not approach? It is significant to note that the Acharyas have left no literature behind them. No religious literature propounding or expounding the doctrines of the Veerashaiva faith is left by the Panchacharyas, nor do we find any such literature in any of the Puranas written about them. But on the other hand, all founders of religions that the world knows
of, have given to the world their doctrines in literature of the religions they founded. The Buddha has left the literature of his religion, Christ has left that of his, and the same holds true in the case of the founders of other religions. Of course Veerashaivism has its own literature—aye, ample of it, but the Pancharyas have nothing to do with it and it has nothing to do with the Panchacharyas. But Basava's connection with the Veerashaiva faith reveals a striking contrast to the Panchacharyas, for the literature which Basava has left behind him is simply abundant. It is in a very vague and a very loose sense, then, that the acharyas are spoken of as the founders of the faith.

Nor are the Acharyas the only persons who are spoken of as the founders of the Veerashaiva faith in this loose sense. In Manasavijaya Kavya one Gurubasava who lived about 1430. A. D, is said to have founded the "Veerashaiva mata." Kereya Padmarasa of the 12th century, likewise, is spoken of as the founder of "Shree Shivadvaita Sākāra Siddhānta." In the work, Anadi Veerashaiva Sarasangraha; Siddhaveeranacharya of Sampadane, who lived at the close of the 16th century, is said to have been the foremost of those who founded the religion of Shatsthala. There are other instances also. If all these persons can be called the founders of the faith in question, the Panchacharyas also can be called the founders along with them, and in the same sense.

The foregoing pages hold in solution, the conclusion pleasant or otherwise, and more often than not, truth is unpleasant, that the so called Veerashaiva acharyas are not the orignators of the faith since some of them are found to be contemporaries of Basava and others even later than
If they, as their advocates would have us believe, did found the faith centuries before Christ, and if Revana did instruct the epic sage Agastya in the Veerashaiva religion, then it must have been a very queer sort of Veerashaiva religion which sank into oblivion soon after it was founded and remained unknown for centuries.

If there were the Veerashaiva religion before Basava, why is history silent about it? History speaks of Jainism, Vaishnavism and Shaivism together with its various forms such as Kāpālika, Kalamukha and Lakulisha, but as to Veerashaivism, before the 12th century, we find absolutely no mention anywhere. The same thing holds good in the case of literature. Why should there be no literature about Veerashaivism before the 12th century and why should there be such a flood of it at the time of Basava and after him?

Basava and his colleagues in their Vachana literature have mentioned the names of the 63 Puratanas with great reverence even though they happened to be only Shaivas. Surely they would have mentioned with equal affection and reverence the names of the Panchachāryas if they had really founded the Veerashaiva religion before them. But the acharyas are conspicuously absent in Vachana literature, and hence the conclusion that they are not the originators of the faith.

Who, then, is the founder of the faith? Is it Basaveshvara? Our emphatic answer is: he is. The following evidence will bear out the truth of what we say.
1 Palkurike Somārādhya, than whom we can have no better authority, in his work called Gana-sahasra describes Basava as the spirit of the religion of Shiva and as the first acharya.

2 Chāmarasa (1430) in his Prabhulingalile addresses him as the first apostle of the religion.

3 Guru-raja-kavi in the Guru-rajarāja-charitre makes Panditātārādhya say: “Who else can permanently establish the Veerashaiva religion on earth?”

4 Nilakanthacharyya, in his Aradhyacharitre, in the context where Panditaradhya laments the death of Basava makes the Pandit say: “Who else is there to found and promote the Veerashaiva religion?”

5 Maggeya Mayideva (1478. A. D.) in his Shatakatraya describes Basava as the very incarnation of Veerashaiva religion, and as its first apostle.

6 Maritontadarya in his Siddheshvara Purana (1560. A. D.) prays to Basava, addressing him as the founder of the Veerashaiva religion.
7 The king of Keladi (Basavappa Nayak) writes in his Shivatattvaratnakara that the great Basava founded and promoted the Veerashaiva religion.

In the Vachanas of the Sharanas themselves there is evidence enough to the effect that Basava alone is the founder of the Veerashaiva religion. We quote below but a few of them:

8 Allama Prabhu in one of his Vachanas describes Basaya as the founder of the faith of Shiva.

9 Allama Prabhu in another Vachana says to Chana-basava that they both got linga from Basava; and that they both belong to the same line.

10 Maritontadarya says:—नन्तु बीरशैवमानप्राक्ताद्यावरणवाचार-र्ष्यपनेक्षान्ध्य: श्रीमत्वरभमाराजुहालन्दीश्वरारवादारः  श्रविवेद्यः  etc. etc.

To the solution of the Problem—Who is the founder of the Veerashaiva faith?—We have a clue in the very word 'Veerashaiva.' By the time 12th century was ushered in, Jainism and Vaishnavism had gained ascendancy. Shaivism in the South had reached a crisis and time had come for it to rise or to fall. But down it was not to go; for by the time the century had half passed there shot into space a great hero who revolutionized the Shaivite faith in a short space of time. The attempt was heroic and the achievement was brilliant. Shaivism rose

---

7 सम्बां बसवेश्वरः...बीरशैवमार्तकास्य प्रकाशानमकारेषांतः।
8 तृसंगमणी स्वारोच्चन्तर्वर्णमयममहस्तहोऽय
9 अंतर्यत्तमः इतिविसंबस्तिः यस्मात् तदं एव इति
10 (बीरशैववांशदिविसका p. 447)
triumphant over the trammels of Varnashrama and the result was Veerashaivism. The hero happened to be the prime minister of the then king of Karnataka. He was a Kannada man and what wonder if Kannada became the language of the scriptures of the new heroic religion and Karnataka became the home of the new faith as it is even to day? That was how the new faith came to be heroically founded and that is why it has come to be called Veera-shaiva religion, meaning the heroic Shaiva faith. That was how again Basava became the king of a great religion though the premier of a little province.

We shall next consider that glorious institution of Basava and his colleagues—the Shivanubhavamantapya, or what we may fittingly call the birth place and cradle of Veerashaivism. It was a religious institution organized by Basava and presided over by Allama-prabhu, a tremendously great spiritual personage. It is not a myth created by fancy but a fact that stands pre-eminent in the history of Veerashaivism in as much as it was through the 'Shivanubhavamantapya,' that Veerashaivism emerged. It was a religious academy the like of which never existed before and has never existed since. Basavsehvara brought it into existence, Allamaprabhu presided over the discussions that were held in it, and a great many Sharanas of the time flocked to it to take part in the discussions. So to it we owe that flood of religious literature in Kannada which is usually styled the Vachana literature. In it were shaped and formulated as the result of the discussion of the sharanas, the doctrines of the Veerashaiva religion. From it, above all, did emerge the Shatsthala philosophy which is the most remarkable and essential feature of the
faith and which again is a unique contribution to the world of religion and philosophy. The Sharanas that participated in the discussions about Shatsthala in the Shivanubhavanamantapa are called Shatsthalabrahmis, and the first and foremost of them all was Channabasava, who is called Shatsthalakarta or the creator of Shatsthala. Shatsthala-brahmi also means one who has attained Brahman by means of Shatsthala. The term Shatsthala-brahmi is meant to be a distinguishing epithet for Basava and his colleagues only. Nowhere do we find this epithet used in connection with the Panchâchâryas. "If Channabasava formulated the Shatsthala philosophy, the most distinguishing feature of Veerashaivism, why should Basava be called the originator of the Veerashaiva faith and why not Channabasava?" is a question likely to be raised. The question is reasonable so far as it goes, but the pity of it is that it cannot go in favour of the advocates of the Panchâchâryas. True, Basava was not the formulator of the Shatsthala philosophy; but he was something more than that. He was the leader of the whole movement in whose service the afore-said philosophy came to be formulated. It was he who unfurled the banner of revolt against the Varnashramic tyranny. It was under his leadership that every scheme was planned and executed. It was he who got Allamaprabhu to guide them in the discussions at the Shivanubhavamantapa; it was he again, who got people together to carry things to a successful end. Above all it was he who exemplified the path of devotion by his own perfect devout conduct. *If Kaliketa

* That the Ashtâvarnas, brought together into a ritualistic chain, were due to the Sharanas that flocked 2-53
Brahma systematized the *ashtāvāranas* and Channabasava formulated Shatsthalas under the efficient guidance of Allamaprabhu, Basava showed the practical way to the people to apply them in their everyday life. So the unique credit of having brought religion to bear on the everyday life of men, goes to Basava and Basava alone. He lived the practical side of religion and thereby set a sure example to the masses of people. To him again, do we owe the superb social structure raised on the basis of the practical philosophy of Kayaka (work). All this is revealed to us in the *Vachans* of Basaveshvara and other Sharanas. The whole of Vachanashāstra is a glorious monument to his supreme personality. With all this to his credit does he not deserve the rightful title to be called the founder of the Veerashaiva faith? Do we find anything approaching to this about the Panchāchāryas? If not, why thrust the hollow title on them?

Whereas everything is vague and indefinite about the Panchāchāryas, everything about Basava and his
to the banner of Basava’s new religion while being forged in the Shivānubhavamantapa, will be proved by what is said as follows:—एकाचार्यविधेय पादे हृदयस्वतः पुरातनवसवेश्वर- 
प्रस्तुतमस्मथप्रवाहानुरोधेत बिरावेदांशितमचण्डयकेव शिष्यां 
तत्त्त्वभाविकं मृणं विषयः। So also the following verse will prove that Kaliketbrambhaya was the father of Ashtāvāranas.

कलिकेतब्रम्बानं पुरा श्रोतवता स्फूटम्।

स्थापितं बसवेश्रादिपिंदयनं समांतरे।

युत्वते तथा श्रेष्ठमशृष्टिवैक्रमस।

निविवण्वहु दशत्रस्मयं हृतितीयमवम्।

(See बी.सै.वां.नंद.चंद्रका, pp. 119, 188.)
collagues is definite and clear as day-light. The Puranas of āchāryas are a confused medley of facts and fiction. But the Vachana literature of the Vachanakaras is singularly free from all myth and mystification. They refer to historical personages and propound practicable principles for practical people. In a word, they preach what may be called, a socio-religious conduct of life as obtained from practical experience of life. We hardly come across any miracle in the Vachanas. All we find therein is human endeavour for social and spiritual freedom—human endeavour that resulted in divine achievement only because it was sincere and unselfish. What a splendid endeavour and what a magnificent achievement! Considering the brief space of time of less than two decades, in which this spiritual enrichment of life was brought about, through the Vachanas that have survived the Sharanas, we can clearly see the spiritual heights reached and kept by them; we can clearly see Basava, the torch-bearer enkindling light and love among the masses. This verily was a miracle of miracles and before this miracle all the mythical miracles of the Panchāchāryas fade into insignificance. The voice of Basava still speaks to us across centuries that intervene and rouses us from the slumber in which we seem to be buried; but where can we hope to hear the voice of the Panchāchāryas?

Again we find that among the Veerashaiva poets more have paid tribute to the memory of Basava than to the names of the Panchāchāryas. Not to speak of poets like Palkarike Somanath and Harihara, Bhimkavi and
Shadaksharadeva, who have written their best works about Basava; even those poets who have expressly written their works about the Āchāryas, have praised Basava in their works. We may cite Panditārādhya-charitre and Revanshiddhapurans as instances. No Āchārya has come in for as much share of praise as Basava at the hands of any poet. Sarvajna, the well-known Kannada poet, has lauded Basava to the skies but he has not devoted a single stanza to the praise of any of the Āchāryas. Writing about Basava he says:

Shadaksharideva has dedicated one whole book in Sanskrit to the praise of Basava.

Similarly Basava has been praised equally highly by writers of Sanskrit works of Veerashaiva religion. The following few may be noted (in addition to those quoted already in this section from पंडिताराध्याचरित्र of Gururaj):

नमो बसवराजाय व्रेष्ट्रिपरमुर्तिये ।
वशचरैकिनिमाय शिवाचारप्रवलिनि॥
शिवलत्तुरास्त्रदेवसे योगिने नमः ।
श्रीबसवराजाय पद्मंस्थलमुखवाचिनि॥
बसवसराजादिकश्रेष्ठां गणनां ज्ञानवाचिने
गोपीदात्रान्नस्तति प्रभवे दिवमूर्तिये ॥
बिष्णुदासाभिमोहिन्मानविस्तृक्तविये ।
बौद्ध श्रीकिन्नराजाय अक्षिकंपलमोहिनि॥
नमः पंडितार्थगुरुंवे सर्वेदिते ॥
महोत्सवांमोहनरिनिष्ठित्रचतुर्थे ॥


मादल्गावे महेन्द्र जाते वशिष्ठवीरमणम् ॥
धमेश्वररूपं स्थानं च नमामि चिरसाधनिशम् ॥
द्विक्षाते महाप्रभु कोटिपद्धत्वाभ्यदशिकः ।
वेदवेदानंतरतवः पुराणगमत्रसंवितः ॥

वीरशास्त्रवाच्याध्यापिका-I-3, 4.

ॐ नमः श्रीदेवस्यानादिनमक्ष्वरूपिणे ।
दिवसच्छारंगणाय पदस्थलाध्यपथवर्तिने ॥
जयतु बसवराजः स्थौल्यमात्रलेल्ल्यूजः ।
प्रमदुदाससमास्माद्भौवभास्विनेजः ॥
प्रहतविनमदालितः स्फायदाम्यायपूर्ति: ।
स्थरिदिगमतःकृतितः श्रीदेवश्रीमूर्तिः ॥
वकारे भुरुपं च सकारे विनामेवच ।
वकारश्वररूपं च विविधं वसवाब्द्यम् ॥
वकारे नादरूपं च सकारे विनटुपकः ।
कलारूपं वकारः स्वातं निर्वर्णं वसवाक्षरम् ॥
भवनुराकराक्षध वसवेदक्षरनयम् ।
सदा भक्ता जपेयुत्तपतुलाधिकिषिद्भिम् ॥
वस्य बंके स्थिरते देवि वसवेदक्षरनयम् ।
वामाम्य हतते तत्र सत्यं सत्यं न चान्यथा ॥

अनादिकीर्षोपसारसंग्रह I-14-17.

निमीय वादमपििपदमादिदशक्ताय ।
निमीय तां सुवि निजां विशादं विति नान त ।
गृहिष्ठकारं निर्देशनज्ञं ततु ॥
इष्ठा महत इति प्रसुरपथेऽः ॥
विजय यो विजयभुपमाया ।

निम्बाध्यापिवेदवेदशास्त्रः ।

सङ्क्तिमाहार्मयमदश्च ।
सङ्क्तायामतःकणं च दत्तातु ॥
Basava has come to be regarded by the Veerashaivas as Dwitiya Shambhu, meaning the second Almighty God. Unless he were the founder of their religion there is no reason why he should be so called. It is worth noting that none of the achāryas is so called. Again like the name of God Shiva the name of Basava has been formulated into a mantra. Every letter of the word Basava is explained as a mantric syllable. What is more important is that the mantric significance of Basava's name has been brought out in a book called Shivanubhavashastra, published in Kannada by one of the descendants of Ujjani Marulasiddhamath. If Basava were not the originator of the Veerashaiva faith there is no reason why his name should be treated as a mantra among the Veerashaivas; and certainly there should be much less reason why his name should occur as a mantra in a book published by the descendants of one of the Panchāchāryas.

It is worthy of note that it is stated at the very outset in the said Shivanubhavashastra that the book is prepared in accordance with, and on the authority of † Agamas and Vachanas. These Vachanas must have been none other than the Vachanas of Basava and his colleagues. Nor is this a mere conjecture; for

† ढिकोणानं स्वागतेऽव, गुणोद्घात्सम्यनुष्मानात्‌ सदारुणक्षमं जयते व जयते न जयते सत्कृते द्वितीये.
in connection with Shûnya Lingoddharane in the said book a Vachana by a Vachanakara of the time of Basava has been actually quoted. It is clear from this that it is usual even with the descendents of the Veerashaiva Pachâchârayas to look upon the Vachanas of Basava and other contemporary Sharanas as the scriptures of Veerashaivism, as certainly they are. We give below the said Vachana for verification:

If Marula or any other âchârya were the founder, his authority would certainly have been quoted in a book of this kind. But there is no reference whatever to any of the âchâryas in the body of the book.

There are only two mantras usually repeated by the Veerashaivas; one is the mantra of Shambhu, the great god Shiva, and the other is of Basava, the second Shambhu. So Basava's place, at least so far as Veerashaivas are concerned, is next only to God's.

It is significant to note that none of the Panchâchârya has his name construed into a mantra.

Basava has endeared himself to the Veerashaivas as no âchârya has done. The reason is clear; for it is to him that they owe their religion. It is not uncommon to find among the Veerashaiva people who
rise with the name of Basava on their lips and go to bed with the name on their lips. They usually address him as Basavanna, where 'anna' is a term of endearment. Their favourite mantra is: बसवा शिवा शिवा बसवा—Basava is Shiva and Shiva is Basava. Basava is the most common of the proper names found among Veerashaivas. Though names like Revana and Marula are found only here and there we scarcely come across proper names like, Panditaradhya & Ekorama. There is one more thing that deserves consideration, 'Linga' generally goes with Basava and it is not infrequently that we hear the name, Basava-linga. This only shows that there is some very intimate association between Basava and Linga. Panditalinga, Ekoramalinga are absent.

If there were the Veerashaiva religion before Basava then there was no necessity on the part of Basava to revolt against the Varnashramic faith. It would have been enough for him to become a convert to the Veerashaiva religion and he would have lived contentedly in that fold. But as it was, his very revolt led to the rise of the Veerashaiva faith. There appears to be a curious resemblance between the ways in which the Buddhist and the Veerashaiva religions came into being. The Buddha was dissatisfied with things as they were, went into the forest and lived there a life of meditation. Consequently a way out of the difficulty suggested itself to him; the light that he so received spread among the people and that was the Buddhist religion. Basava got disgusted with things as he found them, went to Sangameshvara and
concentrated his mind on finding a way out of the difficulty. Light did break in upon him and he in accordance with the promptings of his conscience went to Kalyana, the then capital city of Karnatak to spread the light he received at Sangameshvara. His religion was the religion of Ishtalinga. Though the idea of Linga itself was not new then, the idea of Ishtalinga was new and this idea he seems to have received at Sangameshvara. Ishtalinga stood for him as the symbol of both Sangamalinga at Sangameshvara and his own soul: Happily he got the service of great souls like, Prabhudeva, Channabasava and Mahadevi-yakka to contribute to and to propagate his cult. In no other way can we explain the height of glory to which the cult of the Ishtalinga rose at Kalyana and round about, within less than two decades. There is no mention of any other source of Veerashaiva religion in Vachana literature which is nothing but Veerashaiva literature. Basava and his colleagues who were modesty itself would have mentioned in their Vachanas about the existence of Veerashaiva religion before them, if it did exist before them. Again there is nowhere any mention of Basava having got Lingadiksha from any body. He himself was responsible for his Lingadiksha. This is only another way of saying that he and he alone started Linga-diksha or the cult of the Ishtalinga. The Vachana of Allamprabhu which we have already quoted in these pages lends ample support to this. Allamprabhu says that Channabasava and he belong to the tradition of Linga started by Basava.
The first Veerashaiva pontifical throne was that of Allamaprabhu. It was established by Basava for Allama-prabhu. It is known as the Shunyasinhasana. The five pontifical thrones of the five achāryas were established later to propagate the Veerashaiva religion and to protect it against aggression. We have already quoted a few pages back a stanza from Channabasava Purana to the effect that the pontifical throne of Rovana was established close at the heels of the disruption that followed the affair of Haralayya and Madhuvayya, and close at the heels of Basava's disappearance from the scene of action at Kalyana. At such a critical juncture the need was felt of a math for the protection of the faith founded only a few years before. The math that was founded in consequence was done so in the name of Revanāradhya. The other four maths followed suit in course of time and they came to be named after the other four achāryas. The achāryas after Basava are real personages. The achāryas before Basava have no existence apart from miracles and Basava performed no miracle apart from his life. In the kingdom of a Jain king, Basava, in spite of his being the prime minister of that Jain king,

§ Vide chapter on "Channabasavadevara Sampadane" in the Sūnya Sampadane by Gūjūru Siddha Veeranāchārya.
founded the Veerashaiva religion and heightened its story within a decade or so. It was nothing short of a miracle. Nothing less wonderful than a miracle was produced during that short space of time. Whoever turns over the pages of Vachana Shastra, that rich and vast treasure of religious literature, cannot but feel that it is all original. There is a freshness and a vigour about it, which no borrowed literature can ever have. It pulsates with the life and spirit of the Sharanas under the leadership of Basava. It was all inspired by Basava and Basava alone.

We can reach back to Basava, to Christ and to the Buddha. We can reach back to Agastya, to Bibhishana, we can reach back to Revana, to Marula, to Panditârâdhya and to Eköram, the Veerashaiva acharyas who at best only helped to spread and promote Veerashaivism; but we fail to reach back to the achāryas who founded the Veerashaiva faith in all the four Yugas. We fail to reach back to the Agastya who received the knowledge of Shatsthala at the hands of Revana. Only by outraging history can we prove the antiquity of the Veerashaiva faith and make the Panchâchâryas its founders. But Basaveshvara and his connection with the Veerashaiva religion are nothing if not historical. He stands out clear from all myth. His figure stands surrounded by the halo of Veerashaivism. In and through history, in and through the Vachan literature, and above all, in and through the faith we follow today, we can reach back to Basava, the real founder of the faith.

In an article entitled “the Lingayats” published in Triveni vol IX No 11, Miss V. T. Lakshmi M. A, writes as follows:—A study of the course of ViraSaivism is interesting. In the time of the king, Bijjala, of the Kalchurya
line, in the 12th century, his minister Basava gave a popular, if not a political turn to Saivism. The ground had already been prepared for him by a succession of Saiva teachers........originating in Kalyana; the Virasaiva faith soon spread through the north-west of Mysore and according to tradition, within sixty years of Basava's death (1161-1228 A.D.) it was embraced from Ulvi to Sholapur from Balehalli or Balemannah to Sivaganga...The principal Lingayat maths at Chittal-droog, the Balchanur math and a host of others of lesser significance and Basava, Channabasava and their followers, Prabhudeva, Madiraja, Machaiya, poetess Madadevi and others are revered by the Vira Saivas.

"In this connection, a passing reference must be made to Fleets' conjecture that neither Basava nor Channabasava could have been the founders of Virasaivism, in the light of the absence of inscriptive evidences...... But this theory is not sound, in view of the weighty literary evidence.

× × ×

"Such is the brief history of the origin and growth of one of the sanest and most powerful and influential branches of Saivism in South India, in the 12th century. It was as generally agreed upon, a very popular religion in its day...Simple living and high thinking were the ringing watch-words of its worthy founder, Basava, whose views were, however, far in advance of the times. He believed that the religious life of the people was closely allied to their social welfare. In the words of Rice he carried on 'social revolution, side by side with religious reformation.' "
(XII) Philosophy and Practice of Lingayat Religion.

Now we come to the most difficult task indeed, that of giving the philosophy and practice of the Lingayat religion. It is certain that we shall not be able to do justice to the subject. It was much better if it had been treated by a competent scholer of the religion fully and properly. But as none such has been forthcoming it has fallen to our lot. We profess our incompetence and inability to set forth the doctrines of the religion fully and properly, though we shall try to perform the task to the best of our ability, now that it has fallen to our lot.

A religion may be defined as a system of belief in the Superhuman Power, which governs the course of the universe and the human life in it, and is entitled to some form of worship from the human beings for their attaining eternal happiness. The system of belief connotes doctrines concerning the relation of the universe and man to God, the Superhuman Power, and explains how God, as the Almighty Power, creates, sustains, and destroys or reabsorbs the Universe. They also explain and lay down the procedure and methods of worshipping God for the human beings so that they may be free from the trammels of the worldly life and attain eternal happiness by the grace of God, which forms a special feature of God. Thus a religion has two parts (1) the philosophy and (2) the practice. The former explains the work of God with the universe and the latter the way of attaining the grace of God for liberation and final beatitude. The practice of a religion is based on the philosophy of the religion. Such is 2-54
the idea of religion for all practical purposes, however perfunctory it may be. The Lingayat religion has both parts in it distinct to itself and can, therefore, claim to be a distinct religion.

*The philosophy of Liugayat religion is monism and is called Shaktivishistadwaita. It is, as has been noted before, adopted from and improved upon Kashmere Shivadwaita. Though adopted from the Kashmere School of Shaivism it is given the distinct name of "Shaktivishistadwaita" to give prominence to Shakti, the Power or Energy of the Lord, Parama Shiva (the Parabrahman), living in intimate union with Him. The intimate union or oneness of Shiva and His Shakti, as we have already stated, is beautifully expressed by Kalidas in words "वाणीविचि संपृक्ती पार्वतीपरमेश्वरी" पवैती, the Shakti of परमेश्वर, and परमेश्वर are as intimately one as the words and their senses. Words, divested of their sense, are a mere babble and there can be no word without sense; similarly Shiva and Shakti cannot be apart from each other but are inseparably one. The attributes of परमेश्वर, according to Vedanta, are वर, विव and आत्म; these are the only three positive qualities that are attributed to परमेश्वर, which can be spoken of in no other positive terms but only in the negative terms as "नति नति" (not this, not that etc.). According to बाणिज्यितिशास्त्रेन these three positive

* The following sketch of philosophy is based chiefly on Kashmere Shaiva literature and the books on Lingayat religion, namely सिद्धांतिशब्दाणि, शिवान्त्वित्रमञ्ज्री शिवान्त्वितदर्पणि, and the commentary on the first by महितेश्वर. Extracts from शिवान्त्वितिशब्दाणि and महितेश्वरी's commentary thereon will be found in appendix II (a).
qualities of परब्रह्म (परिवर्त) are well expressed in terms of the Lord's Self-consciousness as "अत्मं, प्रकाश्च, नंदामि" i.e. the Lord is conscious of His being, shining, and joying independently of anything else. Hence He is श्रात्मक and His Shakti, in the form of His Self-consciousness, is a part and parcel of His Self. Shiva is the supreme entity. He is the all-knowing, all-doing, all-sustaining being called Prakâsha, the serene Lord, all-pervading indivisible and infinite. He, as the underlying reality in everything, is all-transcending. That is to say, His nature is primarily of two-fold aspect—an immanent aspect in which He pervades the universe, and a transcendental aspect in which He is beyond all universal manifestations. He is the origin and source of the universe and is the परब्रह्म, as the Vedantins are pleased to call him. He is Vimarsha-rūpa, i.e. He is Self-conscious. The vibration of the perfect egoity is His शक्ति and through Her He holds and visualises the entire universe of objects as "This is". The Vimarsha, the Perfect Egoity, is the शक्ति.

The Prakâsha of Paramashiva is the substratum of His psychic images, the result of His reflection, which are merely its modes or forms. Images, psychic or physical, are due to a stimulus received either from external factors or the revived residual traces (संस्काराः), as when one imagines or dreams. The mirror is also a substratum of images. But the images reflected in it are merely the effect of external objects that receive light from some other source and not from the mirror itself. A self-luminous jewel shines on some external object and has its image reflected in it. But neither
the mirror nor the jewel is conscious either of itself or of the object reflected in it. Hence the nature of a mirror or a jewel is altogether different from the nature of the Lord’s Prakāśa, though the mirror, the jewel, and the Lord’s Prakāśa have the capability of receiving images, i.e. all the three can be the substratum of images. The mirror is not self-luminous and, therefore, can receive no image of an external object in darkness. A jewel is self-luminous but is not conscious of its capability of receiving images. While the Lord is not only self-luminous but is conscious of His self-luminosity. The mirror and the jewel are, thus, jada or unintelligent. But the Lord is All-intelligent or वैद्युतिक. This is well expressed by *किशोरसिद्धान्तकृति as follows:—प्रकाशिक्रमणमयार्थाविभागः स्नायुविक्रमी विमवशिक्षा: अस्तित्विरे शर:। अन्वयः प्रकाशात्वापि ब्रह्मणः अस्तित्विन्नक्षयादिविश्वस्तबुद्धिक्षेत्रवात्सन्य साधर्मानदानकनं श्राद्यारामक्षुषन्यान: जुञ्जताति: अनिभविते इति। It is clear from the short extract that (1) the प्रकाशिक्रमण, the प्रकाश, is प्रक्रियक्रमण (2) He has self-consciousness (अत्मविमवशि, ज्ञान, किरण) (3) This ज्ञान is His प्रकाशिक्रमण (4) and इन्द्र, ज्ञान, किरण, are the modes or aspects of that विमवशि. The consciousness of self-luminosity is also called प्रकाशिक्रमण or वैद्युतिक or merely ब्रह्मण. Prakāśa, therefore, is the most distinctive aspect of Shiva. There is another difference between the mirror and the jewel and the Lord’s Prakāśa. The former receive images from objects that are external to them. But the Lord being all-inclusive there is nothing external to Him. All objects are in Him and are merely the modes or forms of His Prakāśa. It is the

* Commentary on V-39 of ब्रह्मांविज्ञानिनमी.
or consciousness of Perfect Egoity that gives rise to the images, which are, therefore, essentially the same (सामर्थ्यम्) as their substratum, the Prakâsha. An individual soul has the residual traces (संस्कारः) of objects external to it and revives those traces. It can also imagine things and can build up some grand object by imagining. The Lord, the Universal Consciousness or Self-can similarly imagine or manifest ideally the world or the Universe, just as a Yogi creates something and holds it up before the on-looking spectators, which they feel as real as the material world. Thus the world or the universe is the Lord’s ideal manifestation or the result of Lord’s Prakâsha-Vimarsha, i.e. the Lord’s imagination or reflection or thinking. It is evident that this reflection or idea of the Lord is different from the reflection on a mirror or a jewel. The Lord’s reflection is the ideal creation or imagination, just as an individual self imagines an object; but the reflection of a mirror or a jewel is merely material or physical representation of a thing in the mirror of the jewel. The upshot is that Shiva is Prakâsha and is conscious of His Prakâsha, which, therefore, is used for that aspect of Shiva which serves as a substratum for all that is manifested ideally, exactly as the Buddhi does for the images that an individual builds at the time of imagination. And Vimarsha stands for that aspect, which is simply a power that may be called consciousness (for want of a better word), a power, which gives rise to self-consciousness, will, knowledge, and action (हृदय, ज्ञान, किरित) in succession and is responsible for selection from what is already within and manifestation of the universe from the material selected at
will, as apparently separate from itself. The Lord's self-consciousness, the power of will, knowledge and action may be said to be different aspects of this very Vimarsha. The creation of the universe, therefore, is nothing but ideal projection or psychic reflection or manifestation. The philosophy of the universe or creation is generally named *Realistic Idealism.

The power or शक्ति of Shiva is a sort of reflex relation of self-identity and is never dissociated from Him. Shakti is unalienated conscious nature of Shiva with all the contents unmanifested. † She is, therefore, the divine nature that supplies the ground of Shiva's realization of His own Self. She is illumination independent of anything else than its own self which is but the power of limiting the all-transcending Shiva. Shiva of unsurpassed blissful joy is the enjoyer, भोक्, and desire and such other contents of His self are His enjoyables (भोगवस्तुः). And it is for this reason that He assumes the form of Shakti. Hence the whole world of diverse names and forms exists as real only when it has its roots deeply struck into the nature of Shiva, the Supreme Being, and is, therefore, nothing else than the externalization of Self-conscious Shiva as the object of His own enjoyment. Shakti in short is आत्मविमर्श or प्रकाशविमर्श and works wonders in obedience

* In our humble opinion "Idealistic Realism" would be better.

† Neither Shiva nor Shakti is He, She or it, and may be referred to by any of these terms. But Shiva is He and Shakti is she on account of the gender of the words that stand for them in Sanskrit.
to Shiva's will, which again is nothing but a phase or mode of His power. She possesses the common nature of Shiva and is styled वर्तनवारिता or the lawfully wedded wife of Shiva acting in perfect accord with her husband's disposition or will. Vimarsha or the vibrating power of Prakâsha is स्वांत्र्य because its existence does not depend on anything else as does will, knowledge and action, each of which depends for its existence upon what immediately precedes. This represents the principal power of the Highest Lord, Maheshwar, as the Self is often so called. This includes all other powers which are attributed to the Ultimate the Parashiva or Parabrahman. The विमर्शणक्षि or Universal Consciousness is given different names from different points of view. It is called वैतन्य because it is conscious of itself and acts for uniting, separating, and dealing in multifarious ways with what is within. It is called संवर्त because it vibrates and represents the essential nature of the Universal Consciousness of परमसत्त्, which is responsible for the apparent change from the state of absolute unity. It is also called महान्वत्ता because it is the cause and अभ्य (substratum) of all that is said to exist in any form. परमक्ष or परन्त्र is another name because it represents the speech in its most subtle form. In short Prakâsha stands not only for the common substratum of all manifestables and the manifested but also for the manifestables and the manifested themselves. Therefore when the Ultimate Principle, Shiva, is spoken of as Prakâsha Vimarshamaya it means that the Ultimate in its aspect of Prakâsha is both the Universe in either the manifested or the unmanifested state and its
permanent substratum; and that in its aspect as Vimarsha it is that power, which is ultimately responsible for keeping the universe in the state of perfect identity with itself, as at the time of Mahapralaya, and for manifesting it as apparently separate from itself, as at the time of creation.

Vimarsha or the power of Shiva resides in Him, as stated before, in a sort of reflex relation of identity. Power without the weilder of the power is unimaginable; and there must be some kind of relation between them. The relation of Shiva and His Shakti is technically called समवाय, which has been well explained by अथाल्ये in his तर्कबंध as follows:—समवाय: अयुनिष्ठिद्वादिति। द्वादश्रेणेकमविनद्वस्तमन्त्रवातिष्ठते तौ अयुनिष्ठिताः। यथावचयायचिं गुण गुणिनी कशाकियावस्ती जातिव्यज्जी विशेषनिष्ठाद्वृत्ते हैं। i. e. समवाय means a relation by virtue of which two different things like a substance [द्रव्य] and an attribute residing on that द्रव्य, substance and कर्म, substance and समान्य, cause [कारण] and effect [कार्य], atoms and विशेष [particularity], appear so unified as to represent one whole. It is, in other words, an inseparable union of essential identity and points to a reality that continues to remain in the character of an undivided organic whole. The two things forming one whole are never joined together (अयुनिष्ठिद्वृत्ते). But the idea of separateness exists in human mind only, when one concentrates one's analytic thought on the compact indivisible whole and tries to separate the content from the unified whole by predicating some definite character to it. It is clear from this that Shiva and Shakti are one indivisible whole. The

* Athalye's तर्कबंध, p. 61.
Lingayat philosophers give a special name "सामरस्य" to this intimate union. सामरस्य means essential identity and is different from नादायिन्य; the difference between नादायिन्य and सामरस्य has been explained in our notes on pages 178—180 of notes. This essential identity or सामरस्य has been briefly but lucidly explained by मरिठिदार्म as *follows:-मंदिराधाओगाय्य किया पूर्वतार कामस नामित्रायूःशक्तिमात्र संयोज्यस्तस्ति शाखाविद्यमानं अवकाशदातात्वात् बिष्णूः: ( श्यामनाशालस्य शिवस्य—editor ) अन्वित्तितपसर्वलेन विचछेदस्यायत् शंभिषेकायाः...

The philosophy of Lingayatism is so far the same as the Kashmiri Shivadwaita. But Kashmiri philosophers have not given any special name to their Adwaitism; but the Lingayats call it "शाक्तिविपिण्डित" to give prominence to the wonder-working power of Shiva. However शक्ति is not so prominent as in Shaktism, where Shiva is so negligible without Shakti that Shiva becomes a kind of जडवस्तु without the Shakti. But according to Lingayat religion Shakti is Shiva's obedient handmaid executing the commands of her Lord. She is in a perfectly harmonious relation with Shiva, the ultimate Reality. Hence Shiva is characterized and distinguished ( विशिष्ट ) by His power or capacity to work, which is only a phase of His प्रभाव in the form of बिमांश. This is शाक्तिविपिण्डित. The Kashmiri philosophers imply the शाक्तिविपिण्डित of Shiva but do not express it in so many words. While the Lingayats express it by naming their Adwaita "शाक्तिविपिण्डित." This is the first point of

*विश्लेषतादिकामणि page 65.
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difference between the two Schools, which is only a difference in terminology and also an improvement in Lingayat philosophy. Hence शिख्त्त does not imply any inseparable union of two or more substances like ब्रज्ञान, जीव, अंचित of the Ramanuja system or of South Indian Shaivism, as maintained by आंकट. शिख्त्त simply stresses the nature of नित्य or प्रकाश that connotes the power to work wonders.

There is another reason why the essential identity (सामर्थ्य) of Shiva and Shakti is stressed and termed शाक्तिविषिद्देत. The reason is that the Lingayat philosophers like the Kashmirians, do not agree with and approve of अन्वार्तेत of शंकराचार्य, the preacher of मायावाद, the theory of illusion. Like the Kashmir philosophers the Lingayats hold that the Lord’s creation is real and no illusion. They reject मायावाद and prove that creation is the result of Shiva’s wonder-working power that is capable of doing things which are impossible for any other agency to do. The capability of the Lord is, therefore, said to be अत्यदन्तनावपदीय. The मायावाद of शंकराचार्य is demolished and शाक्तिविषिद्देत established by शस्त्रार्कार्य in his commentary on—गुणाध्यायिकाशक्ति: प्रकाशिन्ता सनातनी।

The relevant portion of the commentary is:—

तत्त्वज्ञानाविचारांमवादार्थीम: पूर्वपुकंद्राकूटवेनानिर्विचारंसंवेदनं प्रकाशिन्ता सनातनी

The relevant portion of the commentary is:

तद्दृष्टां गुणाध्यायिकाशक्ति: प्रकाशिन्ता सनातनी

The relevant portion of the commentary is:

तद्दृष्टां गुणाध्यायिकाशक्ति: प्रकाशिन्ता सनातनी

The relevant portion of the commentary is:

तद्दृष्टां गुणाध्यायिकाशक्ति: प्रकाशिन्ता सनातनी
" ब्रह्मांदनाशतकोतीनां सर्गस्थितिकालं भवतः।
स्थानभूतो विवशों वस्त्रक्रृंद्वस्थलमुच्यं।
पराधातनमविदितपुर्वविशमं।
सर्वः सर्वः साशी, सर्वः सर्वः मथेशाः।
विशामा महायंविदित प्रकाशिपरुपितम्।
"

एति कल्याणबंधमाणनथप्रायवचनविशेषः।

अन्त शाले: दिवाभवतेन निरवधवतात्। कथे वांशपांचोपादनकारणां।
संभवतीति नात्तंकनीयम्। यथा परमाणूः निरवधवलेौडः पत्तायेनपद्मकदेशस्वाभ-वयप्राप्ता।
विशषोपादनतवर्णब्रह्मिकृत्यते तथा तत्स्यात्तंविशिष्यतात्। मायाशके: সাধবহতসমবাধিদুপাদনত্ব সংবলতীত শাক্তরনবতনাত্তুয়ত্তাত।

अथ भगवदंग्रेषु कु टाविदार्गी-कांग्रापि न संमवति। तस्य दोभ्रुपवेन द्राक्षणस्दा-।
अथवर्म दोपिख्वसंग्रामः।

नतु शाक्तकश्वकंभरमाणसारकं। थवः तत्सवकं न विचयो। तथा ब्रह्मणि।
भासमानविद्या अपि तत्सवकं मात्राचरकत्रो। इति चेतानि जीवेक्षणविदेशः। एव न
स्वात्। अविभासपक्षोभावः। नच प्रतिविन्दः।
तद्विक्रमः। संभवति इति वाच्यम्।
सुतादिबिभवा। भर्गशाहपद्मनाडीख्द्रुपरभाराहारे।
दर्पणमरुपालाबिद्यात्रिप्रभंगकाराः।
संबंधार्कइत्तीहोझं। जल्प्रिनिदुखदयरे।

tতথাপি দৃষ্টান্ত ত্বথায়। অত্বচলায়। অত্বালয়। অত্বালয়। অত্বালয়। অত্বালয়। অত্বালয়। অত্বালয়।

নচ প্রতিবিন্দিত-মাহারিতত।
প্রতি বিবিধপদ্যায়।
অর্থস্তািমূলে ভোকৃতদেবিরপায়তিবাচ্যম।
নচ প্রতিবিন্দিতাদি দর্শন।
নেত্রচারুসত্বতমবিত।
তথায়।

নচ ইহাীলারুপঞ্জীরনামঃ।
নচ ইহাীলারুপঞ্জীরনামঃ।
নচ ইহাীলারুপঞ্জীরনামঃ।
নচ ইহাীলারুপঞ্জীরনামঃ।

নতু বিভাজ্যতত্ত্বভাষ।
তথা।

রূপাছাতা।
There are two great defects in Shankaracharya's \textit{Māyāvāda}, which admits \textit{Māyā} as the शाक्ति of the \textit{ब्रह्म}. But there is no explanation of the origin and abode of \textit{Māyā} as noted by late Dr. Ghate, who says—\textit{"But whence comes this \textit{अविद्या} (Māyā), this primeval cause of ignorance, sin and misery? No satisfactory answer has been given to this question."} The second defect is that the relation of \textit{Māyā} as the शाक्ति of \textit{ब्रह्म} and \textit{ब्रह्म} is not well explained. Hence आधार (substratum) of \textit{Māyā} is not made clear. The two weak points of \textit{Māyāvāda} are criticized and the theory refuted. शक्तिविशिष्टवृत्त explains the connection of \textit{Māyā}, the meaning of which is not अविद्या but something else as will be noted presently, with the \textit{ब्रह्म} in the way noted hitherto.

The extracts (given above), containing the short discourse about the refutation of \textit{Māyāvāda}, will speak for and justify themselves. They briefly state and pull down the theory of \textit{Māyā} of Shankar. \textit{Māyā} is there in the system of Lingayat philosophy as the sixth of 36 principles or \textit{तत्त्वas}, which it is not possible for us to explain here. They are identical with the 36 principles given on pp. 355, 356 above and the table fronting the page 356. But the first six principles, as maintained by the South Indian school of Shāivism differ in their sense and functions from those of Kashmir school and the Lingayat school of Shaktivishistādwaita. It is also not possible for us to note fully the explanation of the \textit{तत्त्वas} by the different schools. But it may be said that the South Indian Shivistādwaita is similar to the Vishistādwaita of Rāmānuja. But the Kashmir and Lingayat Schools differ from both Ramanuja's and Shankar's doctrines.

† The \textit{Vedanta-Introduction}, page 25.
says that शक्तिविशिष्टाःपूर्त is real निर्विशेषाःपूर्त, for the simple reason that there is no विशेष as maintained by रामामुङ्ग. At the same time he means to claim शक्तिविशिष्टाःपूर्त to be real निर्विशेषाःपूर्त rather than that of Shankaracharya's केशवाःपूर्त, which, he means, is not true, being defective and objectionable, as noted already in the extracts given above. भिन्नप्रकारे says in his commentary on—

यत्र विभाग्यतिशत्वः स्वाभाविकम् मुनितम।

नमस्तर्मै महेश्वराय महादेवाय श्रुतिने ॥ १. ७। (सि.)

यत्र नेत्रागमाधिकारिषयसमावर्षितव अनुतमं बेलेस्वामाविके अमायीयं ईशानं

उमामहेश्वरवः विभाग्यत।

चूतकार्यवन्नूदित: सव्विदान्वदलक्षण।

शिबाखेड़ीन भैवारित भिन्न एवं हि सा सदा।

इति सूत्तगळोके: ताऊतम्यं भजेत। तस्मै महेश्वराय “तमीमेबं परमं महेश्वरं” इति सूति: ब्रह्मदिकार्येश्वराय अपरिमीतकार्याय श्रुतिने इच्छा-हानसामेवं

-कियाधिकार्यिर्दर्शन्ने परमशिवाय नम इत्यस्य:। अनेनाय विद्वातौ निर्विशेषनानः

इश्वरलक्षण: इतुधर्माय:।

Here “अमायीयं ईशानं” i. e. the Lordship of the universe not given rise to by माया or अमाय as rejects the मायावाद, in which ब्रह्म is the Lord of the universe brought into existence by माया as its material cause. In this school of केशवाःपूर्त ब्रह्माण, the Supreme Reality, is a mere “sundered abstraction” sitting apart from the phenomenal universe. The conception of ब्रह्माण, the changeless unconditioned reality (कृत्यस्य) is tantamount to some inert principle like the Sankhya पुलस्य, “निर्विशेष” rejects the विशिष्टाःपूर्त of रामानुजा (and for that matter that of the Shrikantha School) in as much as in this school the परब्रह्म has the विशेष in the form of चित्रं (ब्रह्म) and अविचित (जड). These two चित्र and
are separate entities quite distinct from the though in intimate union with it.

So far there is perfect agreement (except in terminology noted already) between the schools of Kashmere and the Lingayats. But now the Lingayats strike a new path different from that of Kashmere School. And the difference lies in the explanation of the sixth principle माया. माया according to the Kashmere School, is शाश्वकार्यसमभाव: शक्ति-विशेष:। It is the Lord's power that accomplishes something that is impossible of accomplishment for any other agency. This seems to be synonymous with the अवधुनंवदन्यायस्ती शक्ति of the Lingayat School. But it is not so. माया in the Kashmere School is लिन्दोधानाशक्ति and begins to operate as the sixth principle (तत्त्व). While it operates it works wonders and accomplishes what is impossible for any other agency. तिरस्चानाशक्ति becomes a limiting adjunct of the Lord and gives rise to the five कंचुकास (sheaths), of the Universal Experiencer (Shiva) with His five characteristics limited by the शक्ति, namely, निर्विवा or eternity, becomes, काल or time of limited duration; व्यापकत्व or all-pervasiveness becomes नियंत्र or space limited; पूर्वत्व or all-completeness becomes श्राप or attachment to something only; विद्या or all-knowledge becomes (अद्वैत) विद्या or limited knowledge; and भेदक्तिरत्व or all-authorship becomes किन्नित्तिरत्व or किन्न.. The Lord is entangled with these and becomes a जीव. The meaning of माया approaches here the *etymological meaning of माया, which being derived from मा to measure, is taken to mean that by which something is measured i.e. the power of

*In South Indian Shaivism माया is derived from मा to involve and या to evolve. See "Shaiva School of Hinduism" by S. Shivapadasundaram, page 49.
voluntary self-limitation. *“The first manifestation of the impure creation is Mâyâ. It is this Tattva, the manifestation of which, first of all, apparently breaks the unity of Universal Self in its creative aspect. It manifests diversity independently of any external helper or promoter. It is conceived both as the power of obscuration and as the primary cause of all the limited manifestations. In its former aspect it is often referred to as “Moha” and in the latter as “parânisâ.” Its effect also by transference of epithet, (upacâra) is spoken of as “mâyâ.” As such, Mâyâ is limited; for, whatever is manifested as apparently separate from the Universal Self is essentially so. It is pervasive, because it is the cause of the universe. It is subtle, because it passes ordinary comprehension. As an aspect of the Universal Self it is eternal.

The impure creation consists of two kinds of limited manifestations, the sentient and the insentient. The Mâyâ, as the force of obscuration, is responsible for the appearance of the one Universal Self as innumerable individual selves, whose distinguishing feature is ignorance of their real nature (svarûpâkhyâti) and consequent imperfection of their powers of knowledge and action;

| Abhinavagupta, an Historical and Philosophical Study, pages 244—246. |
| 2-56 |
tient limited manifestations i. e. as parânisā, contains all the manifestables within:

काथ्या नास्य संवेदन्ति कल्यंविद्यनीश्चतम् || T. A. VIII—4.

Its manifestative activities are controlled by the Maheshvara’s will.

The supposition of Māyā as a principle of obscuration is both necessary and logical. For, if the Ultimate Reality is possessed of all the five powers, cit, ānanda, icchā, jñāna and kriyā, and so is perfect in every way, and the universe is identical with it, it has to be explained: where does the plurality of selves with all their limitations come from; and what is the cause of the limited creation which forms the object of experience of the limited beings? To account for these facts, or rather, to answer these questions it is that the Māyā is supposed to be the force of obscuration. As such, Māyā Tattva hides the true nature of the Self so that not only all its five powers are obscured but the universe also, which was in relation of identity with it, disappears. Thus there arises the occasion for the other aspect of Māyā, viz., as the cause of the limited universe, to come into play and produce the limited universe in all its parts almost simultaneously much as emblic myr̩pbalan (āmalaki), being forcefully struck with a staff, lets fall its fruits.”

Thus in Kashmere School माया, as a mode of स्वातंत्र्यकार्य, causes phenomenal diversities. But the Lingayats differ in their philosophic explanation of माया. *Supreme Shakti, they maintain, is nothing but the very self of माया. They

* cf. तत्स्य मायाध्वहाया नमः परमास्त्वकम् | झ. I. 9. वेंदे महेश्वरी शक्ति...
admit the Kashmerean conclusion of माया as a mode of Shiva’s स्वातंत्र्याशक्ति. But they go a step further and identify the Supreme Shakti with महामाया or श्रद्धामाया (Pure माया) consisting of सत्य only untainted by either राजस् or तमस्. They hold that महामाया or बिंदु is the pure limiting adjunct (श्रद्धागच्छ) causing the first five principles (महाध्रुवन्) that are free from bondage, as there is no confusion of matter and intelligence. This महामाया is अद्वैतमाया (Higher माया) as distinct from अद्वैतामाया or Lower माया, which is अविष्कार or अविनाश. अद्वैतमाया does not produce any confusion of knowledge or illusion in the substratum or abode of Consciousness, on which it stands *(स्वाध्यायामोहकारिणी). While Lower माया or अविष्कार is the impure path (अद्वैताध्रुव) of mixed gunas (सत्य, राजस्, and तमस्) and therefore, causes confusion of knowledge in her abode (अविष्कार). It gives rise to illusory forms of perception and acts as the indivisuating principle and causes plurality of Jivas or individual souls. The Lower माया is the sixth principle and brings into existence the five कंजुरस or sheaths in the same way as the तिरोधानक्षेत्र of the Kashmere school. The Lower माया or अविष्कार is beautifully explained by मरितोद्वर्य in his commentary on verse No. 39 of विद्वानविद्वामणि chap. V. The explanation is not only original but philosophically sound and satisfactory. It is as well psychological because it is concerned with consciousness (Universal though ). It is as follows: — "परस्य शाक्तिः विशिष्टेऽशये श्रये। स्त्राभिविक्रिया ज्ञातिः इति विद्वानेच्छानाजनक्यामहरुपिणी। स्त्राभिविक्रिया विविधाशाक्तिः बकारस्य अतुत्कारश्रावक्षकल्तन्। तत्र विद्वानन्दय: अष्टम्बलो विविधोमादिनात्, इत्या विशेषकाली विशिष्टतमभवान् भेदभिन्द्रस्वाश्रयेऽस्मां विद्वानेच्छानाजनक्यामहरुपिणी। स्त्राभिविक्रिया विविधाशाक्तिः अविष्कारपाराशब्दाश्रयाः स्वस्था विभागपराशब्दाश्रयाः गुणायतारिका भवति। कथामिति वेदम् उच्चते। तद्वर्ति—*

* विद्वानविद्वामणि, V—
By analysing the extract it will be seen that (1) Reflection of Perfect Egoity is natural to Shiva and is His Power. (2) that primarily the Power is of fivefold nature (चिन्ता, आनेद, इच्छा, ज्ञान, क्रिया). (3) that इच्छा, ज्ञान, and क्रिया having implicit reference to objects there arises internal agitation in Parama Shiva causing भेदभेद i. e. diversity of objects (भेद), but being the result of the same cause (विभि) they are all one with or non-distinct from Shiva (अभेद). (4) that the Shakti is quiescent before manifestation takes place, which then is not separate from Shiva i. e. all manifestables lie hidden as waves do in the ocean before they arise on the surface. This is अविभाग. (5) At the time of manifestation after agitation with the desire of creation the Shakti assumes the nature of threefold gunas. (6) अंशकाले...गुणावलमिका contains the explanation of the three gunas सत्य, रज्य, and तमस (a) सत्य is illumination or intelligence (विद्या) and is the knowledge-portion of Shakti free from
the Highest Agenthood (i.e. of the Supreme Self—उत्तमकृत्तातिनिश्चलक्षणोऽ) This शत्र is manifestability or tendency to manifestation. (b) रजस्तु arises from the activity portion free from knowledge-portion with the mixture of शत्र and तमसः (c) Last comes तमस् which is ज्ञान or ज्ञायिक, the Lower मया and arises when at last the close inter-connection between the two portions of ज्ञान and क्रिया as the different aspects of the same Vimarsha is completely lost sight of, leading to an apprehension of their mutual negation (अन्योन्याभावबुद्धि) she attains the form of तमसः. Here it is to be noted that the Lingayat philosophers do not accept अन्योन्याभाव as Vaishešikas, Naiyayikas and some other schools of philosophy do. अन्योन्याभाव is a myth, though for practical purposes it may be recognized. Both भौतिकदैवी और स्वभावनिदेशवाचिव, the author of शिवाधित्तमात, pull down the theory of अन्योन्याभाव: says स्वभावनिदेशवाचिव—एवं सिद्धें तत्र विदानंदे में कह्यिन्द्रियोऽस्र अन्योन्याभाववाचिव. इत्यादिशास्त्रानि मन्त्राः मन्त्राकामस्वाभाववेव हेदाहेदीविविशिष्योऽस्र इति ज्ञात्त्व वेदाहेदीवेव तत्त्वाने हेदाहेदीविविशिष्योऽस्रृष्णरूपाकामस्वाभाववेव, तत्त्व भविष्यवाचिव. अन्योन्याभाव विश्रामस्फूरतिरेषिः नृसाधुः। तत्त्वाने प्रकृत्वाने प्रतियोगरूपेवः किच अन्योन्याभाव विवेधनेदेशवेव अत्यन्तेन विविधोः। न वच तत्त्वाने तत्त्वाने अथावावाचिव। तत्त्व अन्योन्याभाव यस्तयोऽस्र, पदार्थतीव पदार्थतीवप्रसंगलाः। न वच पदार्थतीवतत्त्वाने स्वभाव: इति न उच्योः। इति वाच्यम्। तत्त्व विवेधपतितत्त्वाने अप्रथ्विषयवाचिव भेदः। शास्त्रावर्गवृत्ताणिप्रभुत्त्ववेय। प्रश्नविषयवाचिव । किच घटायते पसरत: स्वभावः पदार्थतीव पदार्थतीवप्रसंगलाः। इति शत्र अर्थावात्त्वावाचिवप्रसंगलाः। अप्रथ्विषयवाचिवप्रसंगलाः। भेदः। शास्त्रावर्गवृत्ताणिप्रभुत्त्ववेय। प्रश्नविषयवाचिव । किच घटायते पसरत: स्वभावः पदार्थतीव पदार्थतीवप्रसंगलाः। इति शत्र अर्थावात्त्वावाचिवप्रसंगलाः। अप्रथ्विषयवाचिवप्रसंगलाः। भेदः। शास्त्रावर्गवृत्ताणिप्रभुत्त्ववेय। प्रश्नविषयवाचिव । किच घटायते पसरत: स्वभावः पदार्थतीव पदार्थतीवप्रसंगलाः। इति शत्र अर्थावात्त्वावाचिवप्रसंगलाः। अप्रथ्विषयवाचिवप्रसंगलाः। भेदः। शास्त्रावर्गवृत्ताणिप्रभुत्त्ववेय.
Maritontadayaa’s refutation of the doctrine of अन्वेषणांवाच is more elaborate as given in the appendix II (b) to which readers may be referred for their information.

The philosophy being idealistic, the explanation of all principles is psychological. Hence the evolution of the 36 principles is ideal or psychological. The Lingayat philosophers satisfactorily explain the evolution of the *principles. According to them the ज्ञानमात्र, (Pure intelligence or सत्सत्य) causes the ज्ञानाध्ययन or the Pure Road containing the first five principles or तत्त्व’s viz. (1) Shiva, (2) Shakti, (3) Sadāśiva, (4) Īśwar, (5) and Shuddhāvidyā (also called Vidyā). Then comes the sixth Principle Lower Mâyā, the तत्त्व or अविद्या. This operates in the direction of producing अन्वेषणांवाच or the Impure Road containing the five principles, which are but the five unlimited prominent characteristics of Shiva limited. They are (1) विद्या (अविद्याविद्या) which is all knowledge or all vision of Shiva limited by माया. This is किंचित्त्व (2) कल्भ or limited authorship (किंचित्त्वकल्भ) is the all-authorship of Shiva limited (3) Shiva is all-interested or all-complete. His all-completeness is limited and becomes राग or limited attachment. 4) Shiva’s all pervasiveness is limited and becomes नियति or किंचित्त्वपकल्भ [5] Lastly Shiva is eternal. His eternity is limited and becomes काल or किंचित्त्वकाल or limited duration of Life. These are five Kanchukas with which Shiva comes to be entangled and becomes जीव.

The last part of the extract refutes the theory of परिणामवाद of Sankhyas indirectly, where प्राथम, the Primor-

* Vide appendix II (c) containing the explanation of the 36 Principles, as given in विबंधितमञ्जरी.
dial matter, has the same three qualities or Gunas. But the gunas are three substances or modes of matter; while according to the Lingayats the three are psychological variations suited to the idealistic philosophy. According to the Kashmere and the Lingayat Schools the universe lies hidden when unmanifested in Parashiva as the waves, foam, bubbles etc. are hidden in the sea and appear on the surface when the sea is agitated; or as the ideal images lie hidden in the human mind and stand before the mind’s eye when the mind is set thinking. So the universe is nothing new. It is only the rehash of the material already within the Universal Consciousness. The universe, therefore, is nothing but the विकार or modification of चित्त or चिद्वस as said

*यत्वोदितस्यादिभाष्यः प्रकृतेऽत्तत्तत्त्वतचः | This is the difference between the Sankhya materialistic Gunas and the idealistic Gunas of the Lingayats.

This theory of gunas, as different forms of psychological working of परावृद्धि, differs vastly from the gunas of Mâyâ of Shankara’s Adwaita School. Mâyâ in the ultimate sense is never given a place by the side of the Highest Reality, Brahman, in the strict School of Adwaita, but is always viewed with suspicion as the “Supreme Author” of all evils. They adopt the Sankhya conception of the gunas that form the constituent elements of Mâyâ bringing forth the illusory forms of perception. But the position of माया and her connection with the Brahman are inexplicable (अनिहेन्निय) and therefore, inconceivable. The position and connection are themselves illusory as माया herself. And

* सिद्धांतविखमणं I. 3.
Shankaracharya escapes the dilemma by simply saying that the position and connection being (अबनस्यि) beginningless the question does not arise. This theory of Māyā is defective in this respect in spite of its wide popularity. But if students of philosophy were to carefully study the theory of Māyā (illusion) they will find that Shankaracharya could not go beyond his own conception of Māyā, much less could he explain the real meaning of Māyā, its origin and working as the Lingayats have done.

The Lingayat philosophy of Māyā is an improvement upon the Kashmerean theory, where there is no explanation of what the real Māyā is; the conception of the three gunas comes in connection only with प्रकृति the thirteenth principle. They have no explanation of the श्रद्धांजन; and their idea of Māyā, as the sixth principle is very vague as the विरोधानशति and no proper psychological explanation of the principle is given. But the Lingayats have clarified all these obscure points and satisfactorily explained the evolution of the principles from the idealistic point of view. This is the second point of difference in the two schools. We may bring to the notice of the readers that the extracts given on pages 437, 432, 438 and 447 form one complete whole of Maritontadarya's commentary on the verse No. 39 of निविंदकर्तव्यामणि, Chap. V. It contains a brief but lucid statement of the philosophy of Lingayatism. The commentary is given in a connected form in appendix II (a) for ready reference of readers.

Before we proceed further we should explain what is meant by स्कूपंडकस्माय which is resorted to often by
in his commentary, lest it will cause some misconception if not explained. नशुंगर्ग्रन्याय implies that the contents of the egg contain the prospective bird in a subtle hidden condition like a tree contained in a seed or like flowers or fruits contained in the tree. The misconception will be that the contents of परविश्व are as material as those of the egg from the illustration itself. But it simply means the unmanifest condition of the universe contained in the Vimārsha of Parashiva in His tranquil state. And nothing more. The illustration, therefore, is not to be stretched too far. Otherwise the philosophy would be the philosophy of the Ramānuja’s School of Vishistadwaita, if the unmanifest universe were to mean the subtle material condition.

The sketchy description of the philosophy of Lingayatism given so far will show that it agrees with the philosophy of the Kashmere Shaivism except for the points of difference noted above. But hereafter the Lingayats differ widely from their brother philosophers and follow a different line altogether, when they come to the evolution of the relationship between the worshippers and the worshipped (उपास्योपासकभाव) that forms the very foundation and basis of the practice of the religion. The treatment of this topic forms a prelude, as it were, to the next portion devoted to the religious practices of Lingayats. *We shall try to explain this relationship.

* The following treatment is mainly based on शिवदीत्वार्ण, शिवदीतमंजरी, and अभ्युश्चर्त्र, though other books also have been consulted.
The word here has a special technical meaning, which will be explained presently. Parashiva is Purashiva, Linga the Highest. He is Purusha. Parashiva as the Upanyoṣdevata is characterized by sixfold forms of Linga (Upanyoṣa), the worship of which in a graded course leads to atone-ment (समरस्मुक्ती essential identity) of Ang, the devotee, and Linga. (Purashiva) Purush (Purusha) is characterized or distinguished by Shakti of primeval purity in the form बिद्विविधविद्विध, the reflectional modification of बिद्विविध, as opposed to Jivas. बिद्विविध is modified बिद्विविध, the result of the mental reflection of Consciousness (Vimarsha) as explained in the book a little later in words—*असममते प्रज्ञामध्ये: चक्ष्ये; चिच्छिक्षितस्य तत्वात्तीतिविद्विधयाः: अचिच्छिक्षितस्य इवसंगीकारण चिच्छिक्षित-तितीविद्विधविद्विध: प्रज्ञामध्ये विरोधाध्यावेच शास्त्राध्यावेच सम्भविष्य एकपैि सूक्तनिदिम्बिद्विध:}* 

† शिवाङ्क्ताक्षर page 3. * शिवाङ्क्ताक्षर page 8.
It is evident that consciousness is only reflexional or ideal representation and no physical representation or physical image. If it were otherwise consciousness would only amount to Ramanuja's Vishishtādwaita or South Indian Shaiva Vishistādwaita. But it is not so. For further elucidation of consciousness we may note the following:

† भौतिकविश्वाच्य भौतिकशक्तिच्यां श्रद्धातांसरज्ञता ।
अर्थशौचचेतस्य जडमयक्षत्रते॥

Thus consciousness is only consciousness modified in the way that consciousness is in a very much concealed or indistinct form.

"In the phenomenal world there is nothing absolutely conscious nor absolutely unconscious. Consciousness and unconsciousness are always intermingled. Some things, however, appear to be more conscious, and some are more unconscious than others. This is due to the fact that Chit, which is never absent in anything, yet manifests itself in various ways and degrees. The degree of this manifestation is determined by the nature and development of the body in which it is enshrined. Spirit remains the same; the body changes. The manifestation of consciousness is more or less limited as ascent is made from the mineral to man. In the mineral world Chit manifests as the lowest form of sentiency, evidenced by reflex response to stimulus, and that physical consciousness which is called in the West atomic memory. The sentiency of plants is more develop-

ed, though it is, as Chakrapani says in the Bhanumati a dormant consciousness. This is further manifested in, those micro-organisms which are intermediate stages between the vegetable and animal worlds, and have a psychic life of their own. In the animal world consciousness becomes more centralized and complex reaching its fullest development in man, who possesses all psychic functions, such as cognition, perception, feeling and will. Behind all these particular changing forms of sentiency or consciousness, is the one formless, changeless Chit as it is in itself (svarūpa) and as distinguished from the particular forms of manifestations."

अचित, therefore, is प्रकृति, the thirteenth and the rest of the 36 principles. We may note by-the-by, that विद्विप्त includes all the 36 principles. विद्वत indicates and includes the first five principles of the ज्ञानाधीन; विद्विप्त the next seven principles from मात्र to पुरुष; and अचित all the rest 23 from प्रकृति to the solid earth. अचित means all objects of sense for the enjoyment of पुरुष (जात्र).

Now we have to see what स्थल means. स्थल, लिंग, and अंग are very special and quite technical in the Lingayat theology and have their own etymology. स्थल, which ordinarily means place (आधार), means here the ultimate substratum or abode of the universe. स्थल thus means the Ultimate itself. अचित is the ultimate and is the prime and primeval स्थल (substratum) of all. अचित is, therefore, described as—

* चतुर्विद्विप्तमण्डलं चतुर्विद्विप्तामुक्तमण्डलं

निष्कलं निष्किंचितं शाश्वं स्वतंत्रं स्वप्रकाशिनि च ||

* निष्कत्वादितमंज्वर page 26.
This बनलिंग, as the substratum of all principles and the universe, is स्वल which is explained etymologically as—

† यत्र दी स्थायिते विश्व भास्तम पौर्णय यत: ||
    जीवाते पुनर्ते च स्वले तत्रीषाते तत: ||
स्वलकारः स्थानवाची स्वात लकारे लक्षाचकः ||
तत्यः काश्चर्तुं यत् तदेव स्वलमुच्यते ||

These verses bring out the full sense of स्वल, which is not only the source and the abode of the universe but also the place into which the universe loses itself at the time of destruction (प्रलय). स्वास्थान is specially applicable to the individual souls because they become समरस with बनलिंग when they attain Mukti. So स्वल is ब्रह्म, in the sense of being the ultimate substratum. All this is very briefly but finely expressed in विवाहितमंत्री in words—†कलपन्नवस्त्री स्त्रिपदविस्मान—भित्तिभूतं वस्तु स्वलश्रेणिमिधायते || तद्वस्तु उस्कालक्षणृपलणप्रकाशरक्विश्रदेक्ष्यते परिवेशतवं। This बनलिंग, out of compassion for the Jivas, entangled with the world and subjected to all sorts of miseries and afflictions of the worldly life, becomes उपास्थ-देवता, the Linga. All this is well expressed by—

§ चिद्वर्त परम परमेश्वरों कर्षाक्षरम्।
    चिद्वर्त हि परम परमेश्वरों विवाहकार्यम्॥
    मन्तविश्वकार्यं मन्त्रां मन्त्रिकलयम्।
    नायानदिरस्तुवस्त्रिकान्दुक्चक्याद्यम्॥
    अप्रभेमानस्तेन्द्रेव मुनुविश्रिपातितम्।
    परं ब्रह्म महालिम्बं अवचारात्मक्याद्यम्॥
    अपरिचित्वस्त्रिकान्दुं नसंगं ब्रह्म स्वातान्त्रयम्॥
उपास्थनार्थमेंतस्य परिचित्र स्वमाया॥
    तस्माकार्यित र्यांति स्वतं विचारलक्षम।
    वह्वान्ते हरणात्म मोहार्धा भविष्यकरम॥

† अनुभवसूत्र, II, 4, 5. ‡ page 26. § विद्वानविश्वामण pp. 91–93.
This is quite all right. But the question may arise as to why should श्रद्धा create the universe and become Linga? All philosophers are agreed in their explanation that it is the जीव (sport or play) of परमेश्वर without any particular object to be gained, as He is all joy and there is nothing wanting in Him. It is so maintained in ब्रह्मसुतः (II-1-33) "श्रद्धान्तः लिङ्गाकेरहाम्." Lingayats also cannot be an exception. They also admit the जीव of God. But they hold quite a different idea underlying the जीव. जीव, they say, is actuated out of compassion for the jivas as His devotees (Angas) and He becomes Linga, the उपास्येवता. So it is said— *अङ्गाकमकालं क्षुद्रविद्वं क्रमानुश्रवणविविधानन्दसुदुर्गममेव एवंविधपरिपूर्णीतातत्कर्मविविध सूर्यपृष्ठकलियाय निश्चर्यसुदुरे तरंगीयोपतः प्राकू लहरीव आसनं ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते। ईवचलन ईवचलन सरस्वती योगादि विक्रम, आकर्षणोपलेखता तरंगीयो तरंगीयो आहरितां ईवचलनमुत्तचते।

* शिच्यात्मकरी पृष्ठ 27.
In short the Lingayats, as religious beings, start with Linga and end with Linga and therefore they are Lingayats and not merely because they wear Linga on their bodies.

Linga is explained etymologically as—

Such is the exalted and pure idea of Linga not only as the उपास्येऽवत् but also as the ultimate resort of the jivas, where they go and become essentially at-one (समरस्) in Mukti. To a Lingayat Linga is the Highest Reality capable of being realized through devotional worship and meditation. The conception of Linga, as the representation of the thought-symbol of the formless or the all-formed Almighty, is lofty and edifying and there is no trace of either superstition or any impure and dirty idea attaching to it. We have already proved that Linga in general is in no way connected with the phallic worship and phallic emblem and that it is merely the amorphous representation of the formless (निराकार) God, Shiva. But European scholars, mixing up the phallic worship found elsewhere with the Linga-worship in India, have proved themselves so incapable of divorcing Linga from the phallic emblem that they stretch the same idea to the Linga of the Lingayats

† विशालदीतर्पण p. 43. † अनुच्छव धृत page 10.
and make unfair and sweeping remarks about it and the creed of Lingayatism. All this is due to their gross ignorance of its doctrines and creed. If they had studied the literature of the religion carefully they would never have said so. For instance says Barth*: "In passing from this system (i.e. Pratyabhijna of Kashmere), which we know only in its learned form, to the sect of Lingayats, which is known to us as a popular religion, we descend from the heights of the Tiinaeus down to the level of the grossest superstition." So also Hopkins says † "Thus what philosophy the Jangamas professedly have is Vedantic, but in fact they are deistic (not pantheistic) followers of Shiva's priest Basava, who taught Shiva-worship in its grossest form, the adoration of Linga (phallus); while his adherents, who are spread all over India under the name of Jangamas or Lingayats, are idolatrous deists with but a tinge of Vedantic mysticism." We do not know what to say to this except that their study and knowledge of the doctrines and creed of the Lingayat religion was very shallow and superficial and based their assertion not on the study of the literature of the religion but on the prejudiced and scandal-mongering hearsay. Otherwise they would never have said so if they had studied the literature with care so as to have an insight into the principles of the religion. On the contrary C. P. Brown, who cared to study the religion better and had an insight into its truth and ideals says § "This symbol (Lingam) is as separate from indecency in the Hindu mind as circun-

cision in the Mahomedan mind. The Brahmins with
their usual love of filth have connected a variety of
obscenities with Linga worship, but they are wholly
unknown to the Jangamas, who look upon this idol
(a mistaken notion—editor) just as the Catholics do upon
a reliquary with deep veneration—

Hanging a golden stamp about their necks
put on with holy prayers"—Macbeth-IV-3.

....Some very obscene stories regarding the origin of the
Lingam have been published by various authors. These
stories (with which I never met in Hindu authors) are
perhaps Brahmanical; they have nothing to do with the
Jangamas; in their books there is no mention of the
subject; and I have not met with any Jangama
acquainted with these fables." Such is the emphatic
statement of Mr. Brown made with dispassionate and
impartial spirit regarding the misinterpretations of the
sublime symbol by European writers. *"Much
harm has, therefore, been done to many of the
Shaiva schools of thought by well-known European
writers in whose mind the idea of Lingam, somehow
or other, is so closely associated with the phallus that
they cannot but see some hidden trace of "phallic
obscenity" even in the highest philosophical inter-
pretation of Lingam by some of the masterly writers of this
(Lingayat) school." This is obviously all due to their
superficial study and consequent lack of insight into
Shaivism and Lingayatism. The unreasonable aspers-
sions cast upon the Linga and its worship by Lingayats
and the exalted philosophical creed of Lingayatism, have

* Shakti or Divine Power by S. K. Das, page 211.
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caused the digression so far; but it was unavoidable in the vindication of truth.

Now about Anga (अंग), a Jiva devoted to the worship of Linga, as will be clear from the explanation given of it as follows:

† अनावरम्भमेज ौ तत्वं परम प्रति ।
यद्ययतित मद्धार्धया तदगमिति विषितम् ।
भ स्वेत परमः ब्रह्म तदर्तत तत्साध्यम् ।
अंगस्वास्मिति गङ्गुरंगत्तविवारङ्गे:॥
ामिति अद्गङ्गमात्रं गम्भीति गम्भुच्यते ।
हृद्देश्यागमिति प्राज्ञुरंगत्तविविधतिः॥

So any individual soul (जीव) cannot be called an Anga. Anga is the उपावक arising out of the उपास्योपासक जीला of परमशिव. Jiva is defined as—*स्थूलशिवसिद्धिश्रविविधिः जीवः। But as every जीव is expected to be intent on being free from the trammels of the worldly life he is in general taken to be an Anga. Hence it is said in the preceding sentence—ततार्गपञ्च्रवाचकः अहृततिविचितः जीवः। But a Jiva becomes Anga only when he becomes an उपावक of Linga. Therefore, it is further on said (p. 40 of the book) —&व स्थूलजीवतंत्रसिद्धिविविधाः जीवः: अनेकजनमार्जितं गुकत जन्मस्वकम् परिपकवेदन विश्वमलवानः निबानुबंधितविनैवेदशिवायार्दिनितानिशिवप्राप्तामावन्
शूद्वांश्च यदा जाते तदस्य किंचित्तेनिचित्रकं तुदत्वाविदंशतो अविशिष्टेण परिवर्तिनि तदाणि जीवः अंगपदवाच्ये सत्ब्धः। The definitions of शिव and
जीव differ only in respect of जीव and स्थूल that qualify चित्रिन्थितशिवसिद्धिः स्थूल therefore, means in contradistinction with
मलयविविष्ठः (*स्थूलशिवागमिति मलयविविष्ठं अत एव अशुद्धतिमिश्यिः अवधारः). शिव, thus, is of pure or unlimited power natural to Him.
While जीव is शिव Himself with the powers contracted or

† अनुसचरः IV—2 to 5. * शिवागमिति p. 22.
limited. Both are one and the same, though for the time being they are only apparently separated on account of the activity of His Power. This is most beautifully expressed (in the book on p. 36) as follows:—

This is most beautifully expressed (in the book on p. 36) as follows:—

It should be noted that the three taints have been explained slightly differently in the book (on p. 35), as follows:—

This latter explanation tallies with that given in the book as—


*Shivâraâmâhiâvîśâsmin, Kashmîre Series of Texts and studies, p. 15, footnote 70.*
It may be noted that the five कंजुर (that become six by addition of माया) are the result of मायामय. In short the Lingayats bring the individual soul (अंग) into close relationship with Shiva in the form of Linga. And because the jiva is none other than Shiva Himself limited by His Shakti, he has to be free from the limitations and become Shiva again. Thus technically the two Shiva and Jiva are Linga and Anga respectively, ज्ञात्स्वयम्भूर्वश्च ज्ञात्स्वयम्भूर्वश्च and the result is the उपास्योपासक्षम. It will be evident that Lingayats, deeply imbued with spiritualism begin with sublime religious conceptions about श्रव्य and develop their own philosophy and build up their own theology with minds saturated with sincerity of devotion to their Godhead.

Jiva in his status as Anga is impelled by the desire of attaining at-one-ment with Shiva that he may be altogether free from the miseries of the ever-revolving world and cycles of re-birth. He has to strive and struggle for it and must have the capacity to do so. That capacity is given him by Shakti. Shakti as the gracious nature of Shiva is described as—

* अस्तुतियः प्रपन्नां वा शुविद्याप्रदायिनी
   अहंकारस्वस्वं वदेत तास्त्रात्मायत्वात्रा || इ. ए.

अमूल्यं मुल्यं प्रपन्नां शरणागतां वा शिवस्वरूपतां || शुविद्याप्रदायिनी... तत्र कालविभिन्नतां श्रव्यश्चित्तिक्षिपति नारायणोऽन्यशिवाप्रदायिनी || तां शिवार्यार्यां

* शिवालस्वरूपां, Chap. I. 12 with दीक्षा.
Shakbi furnishes the jiva with knowledge spiritual, intellectual and philosophical, when the jiva seeks her aid. It in short means that capacity to strive for Mukti is given to jiva by Shakbi. Shakbi, the gracious nature of Shiva has similarly to undergo modifications corresponding to the modifications of Linga. This modification of Shakbi, the primeval शक्ति, is a theological necessity. Linga (चन्दनिं) being the theological synonym of Shiva Parabrahman, His Shakbi can never be separate or dissociated from Him. Without the Shakbi the conception of Linga, as the ज्वास्य of Anga, is impossible. Shiva as Linga is impelled by a spiritual yearning and can listen to the prayers of Anga and help him out of the mire of worldly existence. This Shiva can do by infusing into Anga something of His own active nature. This means that when चन्दनिं (Linga the Highest) undergoes two-fold modifications of Linga, the ज्वास्य and Anga, the ज्वास्यक, Shakbi also inevitably and simultaneously undergoes two-fold modifications, कथा associated with Linga and कथा associated with Anga. All this is beautifully told in the following:—

लिंगिन्खेला ह्यंस्य प्रकासात्मका तथोत्कीये।
स्वर्ण चिन्मालख्याततातुर्विविध श्यामिकर एवं हि॥
तथात्म पर्यं एवं श्यामिकर तैवै त्यास्तिः॥
यथा स्वर्ण द्वितिया भूति तथा शाक्तिकीदित्याबवतः
शाक्तिप्रतिमा शाक्तिदित्याबवत श्राक्षेत्रिणि।
शक्तिर्मिता शाक्तिकीदित्याबवत श्राक्षेत्रिणि॥
शा शाक्तिकीदित्याबवत भूता श्यामिकर्षय्यवेतन हू।
श्राक्षेत्रविन्किणालैं विनया भक्तिज्वला॥

* अनुक्रमवस्तु II—17-22.
We must note the meaning of भक्ति here. भक्ति generally means the feelings of devotion or attachment to a Godhead. But here भक्ति means उपासना (मनसा). This is not to say that worship or उपासना can be performed without devotional feelings. The feelings of devotion are always there at the bottom of मनसा or उपासना. But the main feature and sense of भक्ति is उपासना or activity of worship. Mere devotion or devotional feelings will not be able to do anything. It is merely a mental attitude which cannot accomplish the desired object without proportionate activity. Mental attitude of devotion must be aided by activity physical or mental. This activity through devotion is उपासना, मनसा. And this is what भक्ति expresses here. Mental attitude of devotion or feelings of devotion should express themselves in physical or mental activity. Such mental attitude of devotion and consequent activity is worship or उपासना. Moreover उपास्य and उपासक must have उपासना to make a complete set, as the author of खंगारणं चंद्रेन सays on page 4 of the text "किंच उपासनाविवेचयात् उपास्योपासनोपासकानां ब्रह्माश्च विबेयवैण्य वैति।" Here लिङ्ग is the उपास्य, and अर्थ is the उपासक. Necessarily, therefore, भक्ति means उपासना to make up the triad. That भक्ति means devotional worship (उपासना) of the Godhead will be clear from the description of the methods given of it in Chap. IX of सिद्धांतविश्वामणि, where भक्ति is said to be of three kinds. It is of three kinds because worship can be performed physically, orally or mentally. So it is said—
Here भक्ति is called सेवा, the devoted service of the Lord and termed भजन: Hence भक्ति is not mere feeling of devotion but worship of the Lord in devotion.

The Lingayat School thinks भक्ति superior to शक्ति, even though the former is a modification of the latter. They hold that भक्ति is superior to शक्ति, because शक्ति has the tendency towards creation and worldly life that is full of countless miseries; while भक्ति has the tendency towards unification or at-one-ment of Shiva and Jiva. Shakti operates towards evolution or the manifestation of the universe. This is प्रवृत्ति or forward current. As opposed to this भक्ति operates towards the destruction of the प्रवृत्ति (of an individual soul though). This is निवृत्ति or the reverse current. Shakti therefore, produces the veil (आवरण) and veils Shiva and Herself. While भक्ति attempts the removal of the veil. Shakti is clouded by the veil and is, thus, darkened. While Bhakti shines brightly while removing that veil. All this is expressed very beautifully and tellingly (in continuation of the verses quoted just above) and deserves to be noted carefully as follows:

वथा महानन्दवान्लाय विश्वकार्तिले \|\|\|\|\|\|
तथा महेश्वरी शक्ति: विभक्ता भक्तिहिःपिणी ||
ज्वाला तत्समादी त्रितिका दौष्टिकार्षिनां ||
तस्मात्स्वासना शक्तिमिन्नरधिष्णो मता ||
भक्तिमहेश्वरा हिँडा मृत्युभा दोमना परा ||
स्विद्रांन्दरहा स्थातुः भक्तिमुक्तिकलपदा ||
शाक्तिरं स्वातः भक्तिक्षेत्रव हि सा खासा ||
These verses show how भक्ति or उपासना is highly applauded. The underlying principle is that the जीव should be a devotee, a sincere devotee of the Godhead. He should be Godly and never ungodly. All individual souls are expected to be spiritually minded in all sincerity and strive to follow the path of भक्ति until at-onement is reached and they are all immersed in eternal happiness. Lingayats are, therefore, a monistic school of sincere Bhakti without the least tinge of superstition, that is so unreasonably attributed to it by European writers like Barth and Hopkins on account of their superficial study and knowledge of the religion.

The Linga, Anga, Kalâ, and Bhakti, the result of the modification of परशिव (called चन्द्रिंग) and his भक्ति, further undergo six-fold modifications. In the first instance they become threefold each. Then the threefold modifications further become twofold each. Thus Linga becomes first three, namely (1) चन्द्रिंग Linga the Ideal, (2) प्राणिंग or Linga the Mental or Vital, (3) इङ्कि...
or Linga, the Physical or Phenomenal. The भावाविन्द then becomes twofold (1) भावाविन्द or Linga the Great, प्रसादविन्द or Linga the Gracious, (2) भावाविन्द becomes विन्द or Linga the Itinerant (dynamic) and श्रवणविन्द or Linga the Auspicious and (3) श्रवणविन्द becomes गुस्तविन्द or Linga the Preceptive and आवाविन्द or Linga the Practical. Similarly Anga becomes three, योगां, the devotee (in the stage of) अतोनेम, भोगां, the devotee (in the stage of) एन्थ्यमें (in the company of Linga or Shiva), and अथां, the devotee (in the first stage of) अबन्दीम of the world or or detachment from the world. In this stage the Anga conceives an aversion towards the worldly life as being worthless and begins to cultivate spiritualism in a graded course so as to ultimately to attain Mukti. This is called technically एन्थ्यमेंलक्ष्य. Further योगां becomes two, एक्ष्य or अंग (in the stage or condition of) आत्मेन्त and दरण or अंग (in the stage of) सुन्दर्न; भोगां becomes two एन्थ्यविन्द or अंग the Psychic and प्रसादी or अंग the Grace-earning; and अथां becomes two महेस्वर, अंग the Peaceful or उपवन्दि and भक्ता, अंग the Devoted or Devotee. As regards Shakti there are no names given clearly of the first three modifications; nor have the latter been clearly stated. However we may take these three modifications as प्रकाशन, विंशन, and आभासन. These three are co-existent with the first three modifications of Linga. प्रकाशन is mere Universal Consciousness without संबंध or vibration. But in the second stage of evolution there is संबंध or vibration. Hence it can be called विंशन or Universal Consciousness with संबंध. In the third stage of आभास, the संबंध assumes shape, in which इंस्ता or thisness of the phenomenal world becomes a distinct thing though not yet separate as phenomenal.
world or visible manifestation. All these will be explained presently. The अभावान has in it two Powers (or aspects of Power) विच्छालिति and परशालिति, Universal Consciousness and Transcendental Power; विमर्शन has twofold aspects आदिशाक्षि Origative Power and इच्छाअधिति the Power of volition or Will; the twofold aspects of अभावान, the Power (in the stage of) manifestation are ज्ञान or knowledge or Perception and क्रिया Activity or Action. The क्रियास or the phase of Super-peace or complete tranquillity, ज्ञातित्वत्व or the phase of peace without vibration, विद्वातित्व peace with vibration, भव्य or the phase of conception, भव्यत्तत्त्व or the phase perception or formulation and भावत्तत्त्व the phase of explication or effectuation. Bhakti correspondingly has first three forms भव्यत्तत्त्व, or the state Purity in which there is complete renunciation or detachment from the world; भव्ययपक्ष or the state of psychic culture preparation or development; the state of attachment or submission to the Lord. The later twofold forms of the three forms of भव्य respectively are—समस्त or the stage of identity and आनंद or the stage of joy; अभव्य the experiential (the first stage of experience which after further development progresses towards आनंद or joy) and अभव्य or the state undivided attention; भव्यत्तत्त्व or firm or unshaken faith in the Godhead or the state of fixity of faith, and भव्य the state of faith in God or attachment to the Lord.

The first three modifications of Linga have other equivalent names, namely, इश्वर, विद्वेद, सत् of भव्यत्तत्त्व, द्वितीयम, बृहस्पति, नाद, विद्वेद of प्राणतित्व, विमर्श, आनंद of इच्छाअधिति. In the same way आनंद, तैत्तिक and बृहस्पति are the names of भोगानं, भोगानं भागान respectively. When tabulated they will be as follows:—
It may be noted that बिंदु in the table means परंबिंदु or the primeval source (परशिव or तत्सतातीतशिव in super-tranquil state) and is to be distinguished from बिंदु (the dot) or शिवशक्ति in the state of stir (स्वेद) tending towards evolution. Similarly नाद sometimes means परशिव or चन्दन्य in the state of perfect tranquillity as distinguished from नाद the sound in the state of stir or vibration tending towards evolution. Hence नाद and बिंदु are synonymous with each other or different from each other in accordance with the sense given them in a particular place. Similarly चित्र, the second of the three modifications, means चित्र in the state of vibration and should be distinguished from चित्र, the first of six modifications in the state of highest tranquillity.

It is very important to note that चन्दन्य, भिंग, भाविंग, and महाभिंग are one and the same. In the same way चित्र and शांक्ततीतोत्तरकल्प are one and the same. This is natural because Anga in his progress towards at-one-ment by stages of spiritual development reaches the highest state or stage of essential identity (सामरस्य) with परशिव i.e. महाभिंग which is भाविंग, which in turn is भिंग or चन्दन्य, the Highest. So also चित्र and शांक्ततीतोत्तरकल्प are one and the same as the highest phase of शक्ति of चन्दन्य. These six modifications of भिंग, शक्ति, अंग and मक्ति all corresponding and related to one another, are पद्द्धति, the six localities or stages. They are six localities because भिंग and शक्ति are located in the body of जीव or जन. They are six stages because Anga attains at-one-ment by these six distinct stages of spiritual development in his progress towards Mukti by a graded course of उपासना. All this means पद्द्धतिारोगकरमानि.

Thus परशिव, the परशुराम, the only one Almighty Lord, is theologically चन्दन्य. The चन्दन्य undergoes twofold
modifications on account of His wonder-working Power, महामाया or आदिमाया. His Shakti also simultaneously undergoes modifications as कल्याण and मक्ति. The कल्याण operates towards creation and मक्ति operates towards the unification or at-one-ment of Anga and Linga. Hence according to Lingayats the creation of the phenomenal world in all its details is expressed and explained as the result of पूज्यपुज्य हलीयं of the Almighty. The चन्द्रिन्द and the 36 principles (तत्त्वाः) expressed and explained theologically, are identical with तत्त्वातत्त्वपितां and the 36 principles of other Schools of Shaivism and Shaktism. They agree perfectly in sense and import but differ in terminology. The difference in terminology is due to the special standpoint (पूज्यपुज्यहलीयं) taken by Lingayat philosophers. We should now note how the principles are identical.

(1) The Transcendent Parama Shiva is He *'Who is of the nature of Bliss itself and all complete in Himself.
He holds in himself the still unmanifested Universe as an idea, rather, as an experience of his own, which is also the root of all that afterwards becomes expressible in terms of discursive thought and speech. At the same time he transcends even this supremely ideal Universe or which is the same thing, this universal experience. So long as He is this, that is, so long as He is both the transcending Reality, Bliss and Intelligence as well as the one all-including Supreme experience of the perfect, because the supremely ideal Universe, there is no need of a universal manifestation,'"

This is the चन्द्रिन्द of the Lingayats already described. He is technically महामाय; and आदिमाय, चैतन्य, or परासंवेदित is

* Kashmere Shaivism, page 61.
His Shakti, technically विक्रमक, the first of the six modifications of Shakti.

(2) The second is शिवतत्त्व। "The Shiva Tatva is the first manifestation and the power of “being” (विद्व) predominates in it. It is purely subjective, and has no objective or predicative reference. It is free not only from the impurities of Karma and मृय but also from that impurity which is technically called अनंवमाला. The experience of this state, if the use of such a word is permissible, is pure "I". This experience may be compared to that of Nirvikalpa Samâdhi. It is wrong to use even such a predicate as “am” in reference to it; because “am” also implies some kind of relation of identity, which presupposes both the self-consciousness and the consciousness, however vague or indefinite, of something apart from the self.”

This is the श्रावंकिंग of the Lingayats with पराशक्ति or Shakti, the transcendental. The Shakti is also called महामाया, अभिमाया, or श्रद्धमाया of the pure road (आद्वाध्व).

Both परमाशिव and शिव, the first तत्त्व, come under the first of the first three modifications, namely, बावलिंग, "Linga the Ideal." In the condition of बावलिंग (the तत्त्वारतंतिसिद्ध) He is all-transcending and the Universe is in the supremely ideal condition. In the condition of शिवतत्व He becomes immanent and the Universe is still in the same state. Therefore, बावलिंग is "Linga the Ideal" and is mere Prakâsha. The Shakti of बावलिंग is प्रकाश, if it may be so called. Both these aspects are included by श्र्व. The first positive quality of ब्रह्म. The Universe is in the noumenal stage.

† Abhinavagupta, an Historical and Philosophical Study, pp. 239-40.
The third is शक्ति, the second तत्व, that follows विषतत्व. * "The next category, the manifestation of which follows that of the Shiva, is the Shakti. This can scarcely be called the second तत्व. Its manifestation takes place almost simultaneously with the first, for unless there be consciousness of what is manifested, how can it be said to have been manifested at all? It is, however spoken of as the second, because the consciousness presupposes the "being" as the rays do the flame. Just as there can be no rays without a flame so there can be no consciousness without "being". But still just as in the successive manifestations of the light energy flame undeniably precedes the rays, so, in those of Universal Self "being" precedes consciousness. Though the experience of the being belonging to this state, like that of the preceding, is without any objective reference, yet it is not altogether without predicative reference. The experience of the Shakti is marked by the additional element of "I am" to the "I" as "I am."

The Shakti of this तत्व is अविशालकि or Originative Power, because it gives rise to the first conception in Shiva of the Universe. This is वरिष्ठ or movement towards the manifestation of the Universe.

The fourth is चदाभिषेक, the third तत्व. This is so called because there is for the first time the notion of being in the experience as "I am this." † "This is the third category and the power of will (इच्छा) predominates in it. The will, as our experience tells us, is not altogether without any objective reference, nor is its object so dis-

* Abhinavagupta, an Historical and Philosophical study, page 240. † Ibid page 241.
tinct as that of knowledge. Therefore, this Tattava represents a very faintly affected state of the self. It is a transitional stage between the unaffected state of Shiva and Shakti and the distinctly affected state of the Ishwar Tattva. The affection of the Universal Self at this stage may be compared to that of the limited self of an artist when the desire to produce first arises within him. It may also be compared with the extremely faint outline of an intended artistic production on a canvas. The experience of the being of this tattva may be represented as "I am this." It has, however, to be remembered that the "this" which represents the Universe, the cause of affection, is so faint that it can be said to affect the universal beings of this tattva as little as a picture does a canvas when it is represented by extremely faint outlining dots only."

The Shakti here is desire, will, or volition (इच्छावस्त्र) because now arises desire or will in Shiva for the first time to produce the Universe. This is the Shivalinga of the Lingayats. Linga the Auspicious wishing well of the Jivas (Angas) in their attempts at attaining mukti in the universe. Both these tattvas (शक्तितत्त्व) and (बद्धविविधतत्त्व) come under प्राणालिंग, Linga the Vital or Mental; Vital because it is for the first time that there is the vitality of the universe in the form of conception or the Universe is in the conceptual stage.

Both these aspects the third and the fourth are included by बिन्न; the second positive quality of बन्धन and the universe is in the conceptual stage. The Shakti of प्राणालिंग is विमलेन.
(5) Next comes इश्वरत्व, the fourth तत्त्व. *This is the fourth category. The power of knowledge (श्व) predominates in it. It is marked by the rise into prominence of the *“This” element of the Universal Self which had but very faintly affected the self in the Sadâshiva tattva. It is but natural that the objective element should predominate in it, because knowledge is nothing but an affection of the self due to internal or external causes; and the distinction of the state of volition from that of knowledge is only this that the affection of self in the former case is very faint but in the latter it is so very clear that the element of the self, which predominates in the former case is thrown into the background in the latter. The difference between these two states of the Universal Self may be compared to those of a canvas; the former to the one in which the intended picture is faintly outlined in hardly perceptible dots; but the latter to the other in which the picture is fully drawn and the canvas is thrown so much in the background that ordinary people instead of calling it cauvas call it picture. The idea of the predominance of the objective element in the experience of the Ishwar state is conveyed in the Trika literature by giving the first position not to “I” as in the case of the Sadâshiva state “I am this” but to “this” as “This I am.” It is perhaps to imply the idea of predominance of the objective element that this category is called “Ishwar tattva”, because the lordliness of a lord consists in his holding what constitutes his lordliness, to be more important than his self.*

† Abhinavagupta, an Historical and Philosophical Study, page 242.
This is शूलिङ्ग of the Lingayat philosophy, Linga, the Preceptor, directing the Anga in his attempts at Mukti. The Shakti of this tattva is ज्ञान (knowledge) or formulation (concrete planning) of the universe.

(6) Lastly comes विषय or खंडित्या. *“It is the fifth category and is marked by the predominance of the power of action (क्रियाशक्ति). In this the objective element is neither so obscure as in the Sadāshiva, nor so predominant as in Ishwar, but it is, like the two pans of an evenly held balance (सम्बन्धतुल्यपुस्त्वयेन), in a state of perfect equality with the subjective. The experience of this state may be expressed as “I am this”.

This is आचारलिङ्ग, Linga, the Practical or devotional activity. Here the universe appears in the full-fledged form. The Shakti of this tattva is क्रिया or activity that brings the universe into existence. Here the Linga puts Anga (the devotee) into devotional activity for his attaining Mukti. Both these aspects come under शूलिङ्ग Linga the physical or phenomenal, as the whole universe is in the manifested condition. The universe is in the perceptual stage, as it assumes the state of being perceived as the phenomenal world. Both these are included in the आनंद, the third positive quality of प्रत्येकाश्व. The Shakti of शूलिङ्ग is आनंद.

It is evident from the forgoing that the six Lingas of the Lingayat philosophy are identical with the शूलिङ्ग-परासिंह and the first five tattvas of the other Shaiva schools. The theological equivalents of these are called (1) विषयक, ।

* Abhinavagupta, an Historical and Philosophical study, 242. 2–59
We may tabulate the six as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>परशिव—शिव</th>
<th>शाक्ति—वदाशिव</th>
<th>इंद्र—विधा</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>महालिंग प्रभादिंश</td>
<td>चालिंग—शिखिंशिंश</td>
<td>शुलिंग—आचारिंश</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आलिंग (दलिंग)</td>
<td>आलिंग or चित</td>
<td>इश्लिंग or आलंद</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आलिंग or सत</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The corresponding Shakti will be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>चित — पति</th>
<th>आदि — इच्छा</th>
<th>शान — किंग</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>प्रकाशन or सत</td>
<td>विमाशन or निव</td>
<td>आभासन or आलंद</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In support and explanation of what is described above the following verses from अनुललित (वृत्ताधिकरण) may be noted:

प्रथम मातिविंग स्यात् द्वितीय आलिंगकम  
दूराधिविंग स्यात् इस्लेवं निविंग स्यतमय || 5 ||

निकंकं मातिविंग स्यात् भावधां परलाम ||
सममात् मातिविंग स्यात् इति निष्ठ भीत महालमन्न || 6 ||

आलिंगं मनोग्राहं सवतंशकलिनिककम ।
तद्यातितमभीं दिमाहं इति श्रुति: || 7 ||

सभं हुकलभारं इश्लिंगस्थयं महतु ।
इश्लाविंकरं साक्षात्तन्त्रपदिर्शाकम || 8 ||

सहूं मातिविंग स्यात् चितंश आलिंगकम ।
आलंदवर्मसााधिविंगसुदाष्टम || 11 ||

Such is the Shaktivishishtadwaita philosophy that explains the why, the what and the wherefrom of the creation and human life in it, as every system of philosophy of religion does in its own way. And the foregoing treatment will make it evident how this
philosophy differs fundamentally not only from the philosophy of non-Shaiva schools but also from that of other sister schools of Shaivism. Here Linga or Ghanalinga creates the universe in his लिङ्ग, Linga being the उपास्व and Anga being the उपासक. The creation of the physical universe is not wanton but purposeful, for it is meant for supplying the necessary stimuli for varied experiences of individual souls and for their attaining at-one-ment with the Universal Soul, the Ghanalinga. So it is said in ग्हनालिंगस्य, page 44,— अनुभावितक्षेत्र, ग्हनालिंगस्वेवः। अनुभावितक्षेत्र अंगस्वस्तेः उपासकम्।

The individual souls or Angas are mere manifestations of the Universal Self and their acts of knowledge are wholly dependent upon it. It is the very Universal Self, which sees and knows through the innumerable bodies and as such is called the individual. It is the very life of the means of right knowledge, through which the existence of the external objects as such is established. Thus Jiva or Anga is Shiva limited by the power of Māyā. Shiva is macrocosm and Jiva is the microcosm.

Here the question naturally arises as to how the Anga encaged in the small human body be Shiva, the Universal Self, or how Shiva and Jiva be one and the same, so that the latter may become समाधि (essentially one) with the former? This is met by the reply that आकाश, the subllest element, is all-pervasive; and though it is limited by a jar or a cave, as is seen in this limited world, it does not lose its all-pervasive character. Similarly the Universal Self, though all-pervasive, is limited and confined into the human
body: by the inscrutable work of Mayā for the time being but it does not lose its all-pervasiveness. This is discussed in वियान्त्रपृष्ठ (pp. 38, 39):—

किंतु परोस्त्रयवाचिं जीवस्य तदनाविष्ठनि विग्राहिन सवह अभेदबोधसंबंधये
तपस्यात्िकसमेतये दुर्ज्ञात्मिति चरणुये। यथा प्रमदशुयवाचिं जीवस्य अकारां
हरस्य उपयाचिं भेदोपपादनुपि तदनाविष्ठनि महाकाशिन सवह अभेदबोधः उपयोगे
तथा तत्त्थर्थर्थं भेदोपपादनुपि तदनाविष्ठनि विशिष्टतृष्णं तथाभेदबोधः
उपयोगे। तथाच श्रूतेः वातुलेशे:—

महावदग्धदेवि यथाकारः प्रतीयेः।
प्रतीयेः तथा बैक्ष स्खं लिहिंगमेवुः।

Now the question again arises how Shiva as Linga is in the human body and how he is known to be there. This issue is raised and discussed and the presence of Linga in the human body is established in the book (on pp. 44—46) as follows:—ननु परोस्त्रयवाचिं जीवस्य अबेदवत्वस्य
हरस्य अाभेदवाचिं जीवस्य लिंगवाचिं विग्राहिन सवह कर्त्य अभेदः व्याहिति वायथम।

तथेष्येऽह ज्ञात्र ज्ञात्र स्वपः स्वपतुः।

लिंगं गुरुप्रदेशं शुद्धतिःत्त्मा माननि।

प्रकाशलते ज्ञात्र कुम्भ वेतनस्य निःशर्मम्।

इति वादुलेशे जित्रेऽर्तिष्ठित्स्य श्रीमुल्यणः दीक्षाध्रेणायाः जीवस्य माम्ब्रह्म अपनोय शरीराये
पायिताक्रमग्राहव्यवस्थषधोत्तथा लिंगविग्राहमाः अस्य सवन्द्रेषु सर्वस्तोस्थु च सवह लिंग-
संबंधेति अंतर्विद्विति कुन्ते रये शरीरान्तिकिंत्त्वस्यसंकाशः।.... ननु भवन्तरोधाः
हरस्य लिंगविग्राहमयं कथनुपदचारे शरीरान्तिकिंत्त्वस्य लिंगवशयः योजना-
दिति चरणुये। शरीरान्तिकिंत्त्वस्य लिंगवशयः योजनेऽपि तत्त्थमयमिय महादः
लिंगाभिसंक्षेपे वृक्षबुद्धा स्वरूपमाचूः तिच्छयति। एवं केवल सवन्द्रेषु परि तत्त्थमस्य
योजननमवदत्त्वम। तदुक्तः—

आयाबिऽति ग्रामाद्वि वहस्तवल्म्बमाः।

निवस्तिकत्वमेति रांगपरम्रणसाहिन।

गुलिंगं तु विन्दधाय स्तृष्टस्य ज्ञात्रसंबंधः।

प्रतिष्ठाक्येऽपि र्वस्त्रक्षणसाहि:।
This is better explained in शिवाहृतमंजरी, page 28, as follows:

The long and short of this is that प्रभु or शिव मंगिंग, thus enclosed in the human body, is Himself जीव, which is, therefore, शिव confined in the human body. The body is the miniature of the universe, being composed of the five elements (पृथ्वी, आत्म, तेजस्, वातु, आकाश) and having all 36 tattvas in it. The presence of the
Universal Self is indicated by the six localities it occupies in the human body and its activities are exhibited through the five organs of knowledge (ज्ञानद्वितीयांग) and the five organs of action (किर्मेद्वितीयांग). All this is described lucidly in the above two extracts. It may be noted by-the-by that the six Angas are connected with the six Lingas, as clearly stated in the first extract above “आचारिः प्राणायं इत्यादि.” But the evolution of the six Angas as the devotees of the corresponding Lingas is very clearly stated in the following verses of अनुभवदर्शन (pp. 13, 14.)

It will be seen from the above that the Lingas and Angas are very closely related to one another as the
Man in meditative posture is Lingarûpa.

ध्यानस्थः योगी लिंगमूर्तिः।

(Referred to on page 483)
EXPLANATION.

The picture on the back is intended to show that the Linga is the human body in Yogic meditative posture. Ishtalinga, placed on the palm of the hand as the object of meditation, is the symbolic microcosm of the macrocosmic deity. Anga, himself being the microcosmic form of the Universal Consciousness, looks upon Ishtalinga as himself and worships it with the idea and conviction that it is himself, though his identity with Shiva is now veiled and temporarily lost. Anga thus becomes practicable and real. While Ishtalinga worship, on the contrary, being the worship of the deity, is image worship. Another thing is that at the time of the Guru infuses the Linga with the life-spirit of the devotee, as noted on pp. 623, 624 supra, and puts the Linga into the third ventricle of the cerebrum through nerves of Optic Thalamus connected with the Universal Consciousness (विष्ठि) is thus said—

The devotee by his अइंथेहिङ्ग्न्या gradually develops his spiritual power and attains union with Universal Consciousness in the third ventricle in the cerebrum through nerves of Optic Thalamus connected with आहार्थक. Universal Consciousness (विष्ठि) descends there from above to meet जीव ascending from below. Hence आहार्थक is said to be the final and sixth stage for the union (सामर्थ्य) of विष्ठि and जीव. This explains away the apparent difference between the seven stages of Pâtanjala or Shâkta Yoga and the six stages of Shivayoga by Shatsthala.
cause and effect respectively. The Lingas in short pervade the human body and are at the bottom of the organs of knowledge and action. It may also be noted that the philosophy of ब्रह्म being confined into the human body and being at the bottom of the sense-organs is maintained by the Vedanta; because it is said in क्रेनीपञ्चिश्चत्—

क्रेनीपितं पतति प्रेणितं मनः क्रेण प्राणः प्रथमः प्रेण वुकः।
क्रेनीपितं व्राहमिमां वदनि चक्षुः प्रेणां क उ देवे चुमकि॥
वृंंधस्थः श्रेष्ठं मनोऽन मनो यथावेच ह वचं द व प्राणस्य प्राणः।
चक्षुः कश्चः आतितुच्यपि: || प्रेष्यतां माहाकाइविता अवभिन्न॥
यथावाचानस्यदिति: श्रेण वाण्युक्ते॥
तदाय प्राण तदिति नेन्द्र यदिवस्युक्ते॥

The human body is Lingarūpa, not merely figurally or philosophically, as explained heretofore, but actually. The devotee in his meditative or contemplative posture is Linga itself, i.e. the श्रवणमित्र, the amorphous representation of परिश्रव, as may be seen in the accompanying picture. The human body when initiated into the secrets of the spiritual philosophy and the graded course of devotional worship becomes मंत्रवरी (the body consecrated and elevated by the sacramental rite called "श्रवणमित्र") and becomes the counterpart of श्रवणमित्र. The Ishtalinga worn on the body, the minified replica of the Lord, is the object of meditation and concentration rather than that of mere formal worship; and the devotee looks upon it as his reflection and follows a graded course of subjective culture of the soul, so as to be free from the three taints and the five sheaths. He then naturally comes to be essentially one with the Lord. That this स्थ्रवणमित्र is Lingarūpa is stated in the following:—
These verses describe मंत्रविध्वंस of the body but they also give an idea of how the parts of the body in the meditative posture correspond to the parts of a Linga, the amorphous representation of the Lord. It is therefore, said further on in sequence इतिवाक्यातुतलच्छर्ष्ट्र्यापि मंत्रलिखित्वंतसिद्धतथापि यात्रछर्ष्ट्र्यापितिवाचार: तावत, किमयांसमुचयेन उपासनाविधानात, शरीरायांवर्त्तं लिमांगणामार्थचारणमभाषाहितमेवति मंतवाः.

From अहुभवस्तु it is known that the first three Lingas are in the body; for it is said:—

| भावालेग परं तत्रं प्राणालेगं तु सुहस्तं ||
| इश्लेगं समेतं सधूं तथादिलेग्नायं स्थरं ||
| सधूं वायुमित्वं प्रोक्तं सुखामश्यंस्तरं स्थरं ||
| सशान्तं सततं, परभिमियाशिते ||
| देहाभानामस्य निकांवंववयोगत:—III, 13, 14, 15.
| इश्लेगं तु वाहांगी प्राणालेगं तयांतरे ||
| भावालेगं तथाविचिनास्यांगी हुपातितितम, ||—VI—5.

We learn from these verses that the gross physical body is इश्लेग and is the cause and the substratum of gross physical activities. प्राणालेग is the subtle inward body, the cause and substratum of vital activities; and भावालेग is the highest principle, the soul, the cause and substratum of all intellectual activities (प्रोग, the prime intellectual cause of both vital and physical activities.)

The other six Lingas, the modifications of the first three Lingas are also in this gross body and they

* शिवाङ्क तद्वर्ण page 49.
occupy the six specific regions in the body. These six regions are none other than the six chakras (approximately the six nerve centres or plexuses) which are six analogues of the subtle body. Thus the आचार्य is the residence of the आचार्य, स्वाभिषेक of the गुढ़कोण, मणिपुर of the शिवकोण, अग्नि of the वर्णकोण, विषुकोण of प्राणकोण, and आलंकार of the महालंक। All this is stated in Sanskrit Basavapurana canto. IV as:—

नकारोस्तिन्म भ्रामणे मुखार्दे चतुर्दशे।
आचार्यवर्जनानासै पृथ्वीविश्वसूचक॥
स्वाभिषेक सकारोस्तिन्म गुढ़कोण वाचकः।
जलक्ष्याक्षेमन्ये वेदितत्वाय विकलने॥
शिकारो मणिपुरोस्तिन्म शिवकोण वाचकः।
तेजस्तवाक्षे सार्व नात्र कायं विचारण।॥
अग्निद्वे तु वाकारः वर्णकोण वाचकः।
वाजात्वेन्मयः साहित्विद्वादेः परिकौतितम॥
विषुद्वे तु नकारोस्तिन्म प्राणकोण व वाचकः।
आलंकारस्य लक्षणः भ्राम्बिणः प्राणविशेषः
अकाशके वनाहः परिकौतितम॥
बायकारः मनस्तवालः प्राणबन् प्रवरः॥

It may be noted that the Lingas residing in the chakras are connected with the six letters of षट्क्रियायम् "ॐ नमः भिष्माय", each Linga, beginning with आचार्य, being connected with letters in the reverse order. Thus the body is गुढ़कोण, the vital movements proceeding from the nerve system (specially autonomic) is the प्राणकोण and the head containing the cerebrum is the आलंकार, the seat of परमास्थ। It is, therefore, clear that the human body is the microcosm.

The five elements, the पंचमहाभूतानि, पृथ्वी, आप्, तेजस्, वायु, and आकाश along with the आस्त्र, the prime source of the five, are connected with the six अंगस्थालास। Thus पृथ्वी is 2–60
connected with भाजल्प, आप् with माहेश्वर्णक, तेजस् with प्रसादिस्थः, बायु with प्राणालिगिन्धर्म, आकाश with शरणस्वः, and lastly आत्मन् with अन्वयस्वः, in which there is the at-one-ment of Anga and Linga. So it is said:—

अत्मनाकाशमभूतिरकाशात्मकुसुमभवः
बायोतिस्वनियसिद्धापः उदाहितः ||
अरुध्वस्फूर्ति प्राणालिगिन्धर्मप्रभावः ||
अंगानामद्वुता तेजसं अंगलक्षणमुद्यते ||
अत्माणवैक्रमयैव स्वातु वोयोगमां शरणस्वः ||
बायोवै प्राणालिगिव स्वातं अत्मलोगं प्रसादिः च ।
माहेश्वरं जलांग स्वातं भूत्यंगपुरुषः।अनुभवसूत्र IV,35,93

Thus आत्मन् and the five gross elements ( पंचमहाभूतानि ) are the causes and effects, the one preceding being the cause of the one immediately following. The Lingas and Angas are connected with one another in order. Atman is subsidiary to अन्वयस्वः of the Anga, because it is there that the अन्वय of Linga and Anga takes place; आकाश is subsidiary to शरणस्वः, because it is in this lower stage that Anga is in stage of surrender to the corresponding Linga that shows his grace to the Anga; बायु is the subsidiary to प्राणालिगिन्धर्म, because in this stage the Anga has complete control over the vital airs in his yogic practices; तेजस् is subsidiary to प्रसादिस्थः because here the Anga attains the peace of mind ( मन्: प्रसाद or मनोनित्य ) by rising above तेजस्; आप् is subsidiary to माहेश्वर्णक, because in this stage the Anga attains contentment by conquering tastes of worldly objects by rising over them and by being firmly rooted in moral life; प्राणी is subsidiary to भक्तस्वः, because it is in this stage the Anga rises above the world and the worldly life by cultivating spiritualism in its initial stage, so as to disentangle himself from the lusts of the flesh and its bondage to corruption.
It is to be noted that आत्मन् and आकाश are closely related, being subtle and all-pervasive, and they form one group. बायु and वेजस् are connected and form one group. Their close relationship is borne out by modern physical science; because motion,* the characteristic of "mass or object in the form of wind that blows and shakes tress", produces heat and the greater the molecular motion the greater the heat. Lastly आपु and द्रूष्णी are closely connected as may be seen from the fact that water or liquid substances solidify in low temperature and solid substances become liquid in high temperature.

Thus they form one group. These three groups come under the first three Lingas respectively, namely, मायलिङ्ग, प्राणलिङ्ग, and इत्यलिङ्ग. Similarly the six chakras and the Lingas residing therein are divided into three groups (1) आज्ञा and विपर्य (2) अनाहत and मणिपुर (3) स्वाभिंशान and आधार, become subsidiaries of the three Lingas respectively of मायलिङ्ग, प्राणलिङ्ग and इत्यलिङ्ग. In short Shaktivishistadwaitsa is not merely speculative or a matter of "Theological prejudice," as some have said of Kashmir Shivadwaitsa, but is scientific and is based on the physical and physiological sciences. We shall try our best to explain physiologically the phenomena and working of the Lingas and Angas and their interrelation and mutual action and reaction when come to the practice of बुद्धवंश.

Before we proceed next to treat the practice of the Lingayat religion we may note the connection between the organs of knowledge and organs of action of the human body. The organs of knowledge and action are connected with the qualities of the elements. Thus शब्र, the quality

* Athalye's पक्षसमा, pp. 9, 114.
of आकाश, is perceived by the ear which is, therefore, ओष्ठं दिब्र्यम्. Touch is the quality of बाह्य and is perceived by skin spread all over the body and in the body. So skin is the ऊष्ठं दिब्र्यम् both internal and external. रूप or colour is the quality of light (तेजस्) and is perceived by the नेत्रं दिब्र्यम्, as light is located in the eye. रस or taste is the quality of भाष्य and is perceived in its varieties by the tongue, which is therefore, रसनेत्रियम्. Lastly ऊष्ठ, the quality of earth, is perceived by the nose, which is, therefore, प्राणं दिब्र्यम्. The (corresponding) organs of action are (1) The mouth and the tongue (2) The hands (3) The feet (4) The genital organ and (5) The excretory organs. The close connection between the ear and the mouth and the tongue is quite clear, because the mouth with the tongue produces sound and the ear perceives it. But the connection between the other organs of knowledge and the organs of action is not so simple. Skin, the organ of tactual knowledge, has hands as the corresponding organ of action of touch. The hands are the ready servants of touch sensation. Whenever any unpleasant touch sensation is felt anywhere on the body the hands readily go over there and remove the sensation either in the waking condition or the unconscious condition. The service of hands during the latter condition is of greater importance. Even a child requisitions the services of hands in connection with tactual sensations. The feet also may be used sometimes for similar purposes. But their service is only out of emergency and very limited and does not extend all over the body. Moreover the hands contain more touch corpuscles than other parts of the body as is said by Furneuax—

“Touch spots are of different varieties. The largest of these are oval bodies having a diameter of from \( \frac{1}{10} \) to \( \frac{1}{15} \)
of an inch. They are called Pacinon bodies, after Pacini the discoverer and are abundantly distributed in the skin of the palms and soles and in tendons and joints.... Other small bodies called tactile corpuscles of Meissner are abundant in the papillae of the catis vera of the fingers and toes, lips and the top the tongue....

The degree of the sensibility of the skin may be measured by the power of distinguishing between two or more sensations produced at points very near each other. For instance, open a pair of compasses till the points are about an inch apart. Apply these points to the palm of the hand, and two distinct sensations are produced. Now apply the points to the skin of the arm, and the sensation is such as would be produced by the application of a single point. Hence we say that the hand is more sensitive to touch than the arm." (Human Physiology, p. 252).

This establishes close connection between the skin as the organ of tactual knowledge and hands as the corresponding organ of action.

The eyes are the organ of knowledge for colour that manifests forms of objects in their varying shades of colour. The corresponding organ of action is asserted to be feet. But the connection between the two is not quite clear; and it is very difficult for us to understand and explain what it is, except that the feet when very much used in walking cause irritation to the eyes; and conversely, when the eyes are irritated their irritation is soothed by the rubbing of the feet with oil as is ordinarily done and seen. We confess our inability to offer better physiological explanation of connection between the two organs. We may also say that when we see an object at
a distance and wish to go to it our feet take us to the object readily, as no other organ can do. This is what can be said in this connection and no better modern physiological explanation can be given. There is, however, an explanation of the connection of eyes and feet in the Indian anatomy and physiology, as stated * in the “Serpent Power”, which is an explanation of घ्रणकनिरूपण. The connection is that “Gândhûri, to the back of the left sympathetic chain,—supposed to stretch from below the corner of the left eye to the left leg. It was evidently supposed that some nerves of the cervical plexus come down through the spinal chord and joined on to the great sciatic nerve of the sacral plexus. Hastijihvâ, to the front of the left sympathetic chain, stretching from below the corner of the left eye to the great toe of the left foot, on the same supposition as before. Pathological facts were believed to point to a special nerve connection between the eyes and the toes.” It is probable that feet contain element of light more than any other part of the body, as hands do more touch corpuscles! Is it because of this that गौतम, the author of न्यायवाच्य, developed तेजस् in his feet and had his eyes there and is called अक्षयपद? As regards the connection between the remaining two organs of knowledge, the tongue as the knower of different tastes and the nose as the knower of different kinds of smell, and the corresponding organs of action, the genital organ and the excretary organ, looks very strange. But the explanation of their connection is that the genital organ is the organ for discharging the liquid matter (urine), waste though it is. And urine being आपदार्थ, the genital organ is the organ of action for आपदार्थ.

* Serpent Power p. 114
Similarly the excretory organ (rectum) discharges solid waste matter of the body; and that is why it is the organ of action for पृथ्वी. It is in this way that the connection between the tongue and genital organ and between the nose and the excretory organ can be established. Such is our explanation of the close connection between the organs of knowledge and the organs of action. The following verses of अनुमबध्यम may be noted in this connection:—

* श्रीनवासाचार्येवदेवोद्विर्मितिश्रव्दस्यबचनस्यच।
  स्पष्टमाशार्योत्सवतः सेवोऽन हि कर्त्तव्यः॥
  न नेत्रपादवेद्योऽर्थस्य गमनस्यचः
  सेवो नानवदर्दश्चेत्र विचारायोत्सवः॥
  नाशिकाष्ठाद्वेद्वेदो नासिकंविर्मितिः
  अस्ति चेदप्राप्यं स्थायुविद्विनी॥

Lastly the heart is both the organ of knowledge and action for आत्मन्, the soul confined to the body. So it is said further on in the book:—

ङ्गानकर्मोर्वन्ति वारंभाते इद्यं स्वतः
 आयात्यवात्वामेवल्यात् ज्ञानकर्मेभायामकं २७॥
  इंद्रियाणि तु समयस्मवक्षयाप्रदृश्यः
  हृदयाकाश स्वेततः प्रवच्यथे महितस्मातः॥ २८॥

(B) Practice of Lingayat religion.

We now come to this topic that is the sequel to the philosophy of the religion for the attainment of Meksha, the last and the most important of the objectives of human life. The practice is based on the philosophy and is the reverse process of that of the evolution of human life. The practice takes the individual souls back to the original source in the same way

* वष्णुविचारण, 9–11, 17, 18.
in which they come into existence and are involved into and entangled with the life in the world.

The practice of the Lingayat religion is expressed very well by the definition of the word "वीरशैव" given in various treatises of the religion. Jiva, as the result of the activity of आदि, comes to be affected by the three taints (माया:) and covered over by five sheaths (or by six including माया). As a result of आणवमल he is covered over by the five sheaths (कंडुकानि:); and as a result of कार्मेमल, which is the contracted form of Shiva's वर्तेवृत्त्वादि, the jiva retains the vague hankering after doing something, which produces tendencies of the mind (बाज्या:) and कर्मसंस्कार. He has to be born as a human being in order to be free from the कर्मसंस्कार by enjoying the fruits of कर्म or by destroying the accumulated कर्म that stands to his credit. That he can do by undergoing a course of strict spiritual discipline and by living a holy life of devotion to the Godhead. Such a life of devotion and the course of spiritual discipline forms the practice of the religion, as it does of other religions, and enables the jiva to get rid of the three taints and the five sheaths.

The वर्तेवृत्त्वादि is stated in the definition of a Veerashaiva, the jiva that adopts and follows the Veerashaiva or Lingayat religion, as, "अध्यात्माद्विश्विन्तन्यामार्ह्यातिविश्वासिः।" A better definition given of it is "निरर्थविकाःप्रयोगार्थस्यपविश्वासिः।" कालेर्ष्टवायुर्विशेषपविश्वासिः। वर्तेवृत्त्वादिकृत: अध्यात्माद्विश्विन्तन्यामार्ह्यातिविश्वासिः। भोजसे:। वर्तेवृत्त्वादिकृत:। वर्तेवृत्त्वादिकृत:। वर्तेवृत्त्वादिकृत:। वर्तेवृत्त्वादिकृत:। वर्तेवृत्त्वादिकृत:। In the first definition given by विशिष्टदत्तर्धिः, the term परम्बल्गः (and परम्बल्गः)
follows (ष्ठूष्ठ्यङ्गन) is omitted but only apparently, because later it is said that the jiva's object is at-one-ment with चनलिंग, which is ष्ठूष्ठ्यङ्गलत्मकप्रथिष्ट. And the ष्ठूष्ठ्यङ्गल has in it comprehensively all that it means, namely, ष्ठूष्ठ्यङ्गिंग, पट्टङ्गंग, पट्टङ्गकुंज, and पट्टङ्गक्षि, the result of the evolution. And the वर्त्तमान is the process of practising ष्ठूष्ठ्यङ्गविष्नु for attaining at-one-ment with चनलिंग. The second definition is more comprehensive in that it refers to the philosophy (विशिष्ठत्र, i.e. शक्तिविशिष्ठत्रैत), the religious संस्कार (विविधदीक्षा-विष्नु), and states the religious rites and course of spiritual discipline (ष्ठूष्ठ्यङ्गन, अवारण, and वंचात्तार). The best definition is given by वैश्वेतक्षणाविशिष्टित्वा as: "सकारणप्रसिद्ध-अवारणष्ठखाचारश्रिष्ठिततया महादीमेवशृण्डेशभक्तिसारेत एकत्रीकृत-तत्तत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वत्त्वरीतिप्रावस्थानिनित्तरतात-स्वप्नदायर-सर्वप्रभावकारके-भूतः-अव-दिनम-क्षित-प्रकाशी-हसं-मन-निश्च-पदार्थ-तुंधनामिषिद्धेमेह-भिस्तुधानानियमीभूत-दश्ठिंग-दाण्डिण्ड-भारणिनिपुज्ञानिनित्ततात्त च विष्ठात्र-दृष्टान्तकंपणः श्रीवैराग्यः संवेदनः। Thus a Lingayat is one who practices (1) अवारण (2) वंचात्तार and ष्ठूष्ठ्यङ्ग. Of these ष्ठूष्ठ्यङ्ग is all-comprehensive and includes in it everything that the religious practice expresses and lays down. The वंचात्तार and अवारण are subsidiaries and auxiliaries to the ष्ठूष्ठ्यङ्ग. Thus it is the very life and soul of the Lingayat spiritual discipline and religious practice. To take away ष्ठूष्ठ्यङ्ग is to take away the very life and soul of the religion. For that alone marks it out from all other religions and makes it a distinct religious entity. The third definition given above mentions the chief points of the procedure of ष्ठूष्ठ्यङ्गाचार, based on the six Lingas, with the six Shaktis in the form of कवस, the six Angas with the sixfold मार्क, and the method of offering (अवेत) all things to the deity before they are enjoyed by the
devotee himself during the worldly life. Before the particulars of वचार, अवारण, and वक्तव्य are explained it would be better to note the principles underlying the practice. They are:

1) The first principle is that religion is as necessary for human beings as food is. A man without religion is the creature of circumstances. But the man with religion is master of himself and, therefore, master of all situations and circumstances in life. Man without religion is like a boat on the sea without a rudder. And just as such a boat is left to the mercy of waves to be tossed about by them only to be sunk in the end. Similarly man without religion is subject to the miseries of the world and to the endless series of transmigrations. And to be free from such series of transmigrations he must have recourse to religion that teaches him psychic culture and guides him on the road to eternal happiness, the Moksha. But men seek matter first; and therefore, they miss what they really want. Some people devote an entire life time to the study of science; some spend their lives in the pursuit of an art; others struggle with professions. Success in any line of endeavour is admirable; but desirable above all things else is peace, everlasting peace. Man may acquire endless wealth through honest or questionable methods of business. The wealth may bring him all that he desires but with one glaring exception of everlasting happiness or peace. Happiness, ineffable happiness, is the direct result of a well-planned life conducted on the principles set forth in the religion. Millions of people are living in misery simply because they
have never learnt, the true significance and nature of religion and the importance of self-development and self-realization by means of religion. From the beginning of time man's ignorance regarding himself has been directly responsible for his defeat. The same ignorance has resulted in the downfall of empires. It has made a miserable wreck of countless lives. It has fertilized poverty where prosperity might have blossomed and reared up a rich harvest. It has fostered misery where peace and contentment might have dwelt. The battle between ignorance and light has been ever going on, down through ages, but ignorance has never really won a battle. True it is that there are times when ignorance seems to be fortunate in the achievement; but sooner or later it has to give way to light, which gives a deadening blow to its adversary. That light is religion, which, therefore, is to be devoutly learnt and followed.

(2) The second basic principle of the religion is that it is a personal affair, the affair of the Jiva, male or female, in order that it may be free from the trammels of the ever-recurring births and deaths and miseries thereof. Every Jiva is the driver of the car of his own life so that he may avoid the ditches and pitfalls of ignorance, and follow the safe route of the religion to ever-enduring bliss, Moksha as it is called. The transitory worldly happiness is not the aim. The religion, therefore, says that man is the architect of his own fortune and he has been furnished by God with necessary capacity and power to be his own architect. There are those that claim that fate is entirely beyond their control.
When they fail in some important undertaking they simply accept defeat as if it were a part of the pattern of life and pass on down the path of existence that to them is strewn with obstacles. No doubt life is strewn with obstacles and difficulties and is not free from various problems. These problems have to do with the moulding of fate. But we cannot dodge the problems and have to meet them face to face and find out a formula that will enable us to control fate. This formula or technique of controlling fate the religion gives. Jiva, though in the grips of fate, is endowed with free will and freedom to act. He can, therefore, design and mould his own fate and can realize self. Jiva is made in the image (प्रतिबिंब) of God and is His child. His reason is guided by the unerring wisdom of God instead of by his greedy blundering ego. He can master his own fate and control future happenings in his life. He can attain success where failure seems to be inevitable. To attain success Jiva is endowed with limitless power of mind over body and human destiny. The religion proclaims *“That man is only a conduit of infinite knowledge and power that is behind mankind. It teaches him that if desires and wants are in man the power to supply is also in him; and that whenever and wherever a desire or want is fulfilled it was out of this infinite magazine that the supply came and not from any supernatural being. The idea of a super-natural being may rouse to a certain extent the power of action in man; but it also brings dependance fear and superstition. It degenerates into a horrible

*Rajayoga by Vivekananda, Introduction.*
belief in the natural weakness of man....And makes him forget his infinite capacity and power". The Lingayat religion teaches that the highest bliss cannot be vicariously obtained by employing priests. The agency of priests, as the intermediaries between man and God is a huge joke and hoax. One has to work for one's own salvation by developing and using the power within.

(3) The third principle is very fundamental. It makes no distinction between sexes but gives equal opportunity to both sexes, male and female. The religion declares that both males and females are made in the image of God and both are equally the children of God. The difference in their bodies or constitution is merely and mainly structural; but there is no difference in their mental and intellectual capacities. Apart from conditions imposed upon females in society in any social organization they are equally entitled to spiritual culture for self-realization and ultimate salvation. They have souls to save as much as males, and as such, the the religion says, there is no power that can deprive females of their birth-right to work for their own salvation by following the path of religion and adopting the formula or technique as men can do. The sexual distinction between male and female is of the body and not of soul as is said in श्रीतं श्री न नुसार् etc." Says Swami Vivekananda in his Rajayoga (commentary on Sutra II—30) that "A man who wants to be a perfect Yogi must give up the idea of sex. The soul has no sex. Why should it degrade itself with sex ideas?" Lingayats are therefore perfectly right in placing woman on a par with man in matters of religion.
The religion emphatically repudiates the stupid and meaningless idea of the Varnashramadharma that sexes are fundamentally different and females are inferior to males; the females, accordingly, have to serve slavishly their husbands to attain Moksha. Such an obviously wrong idea the Lingayat religion rejected contemptuously and admitted women readily into the premises of its principles and practice. The women, therefore, came into their own and took their place beside men since the religion was founded by the prophet and philosopher, Basava. The place that woman holds in social life makes it imperative that she should have the liberty to develop her latent faculties and power to work out her own salvation. The religion proves that women are not a chattel but intellectual beings. It irrefutably establishes the principle that the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world; that the same hand goes further and moulds the tastes and destinies of the sons and daughters of mankind. In short the religion proclaims that men and women have equal power and right for spiritual culture and are equally entitled to the secrets of religion. This is the main reason why temporary untouchability of women during their monthly course is done away with for daily and usual religious rites.

(4) The fourth principle is the principle of universal brotherhood of man in matters of religion. The religion, hence, keeps its doors open to all people without any distinction. The artificial barriers of Varnashramadharma between man and man have been torn down and all are admitted within the fold and given equal
rights and opportunities to the principles and practice of the religion to attain self-realization. The religion maintains that spiritual culture and the realization of the self are not the close preserve of a few only. The artificial distinction of human beings into high and low, and therefore, deserving and undeserving of religious rites, is the doctrine of the selfish section of the people for its personal pelf. But in as much as all human beings, the Jivas, are the children of God, all have equal right to the course of reviving the lost divine sonhood and for reclaiming perfection, which is the divine birth-right of all to possess. The religion believes in the fellowship of all human beings and undertakes to give its followers the excellent technique, the proper and the definite method of contacting God step by step. It teaches all how to develop and use their unlimited power within in order that they may regain the forgotten image of God in man. It shows the one scientific highway of self-realization as the common property of all the sons and daughters of Adam and Eve. Man is a very fortunate animal that he is born as man that he may have the opportunity of attaining Moksha by a life of spiritual culture and discipline, as Swami Vivekananda remarks. "The human body is the greatest body in the universe, and the human being the greatest being. Man is higher than all animals, than all angels; none is greater than man. Even the Devas (gods) will have to come down again and attain salvation through a human body. Man alone attains perfection, not even the Devas.

* Rajayoga, page 29 (Adwaitashrama edition.)
According to the Jews and Mohamedans God created man after creating angels and everything else; and after creating man he asked the angels to come and salute him, and all did so except Iblis; so God cursed him and he became Satan. Behind this allegory is the great truth, that this human birth is the greatest birth that we can have.” Such being the case is it not inhuman and monstrous that a section of the people called “Shudras” should be deprived of their right to religion? This false principle of Varnashramadharma of dividing people into the privileged and the unprivileged sections is refuted and rejected by the religion and the principle of universal brotherhood of man in religion established. A glowing tribute of praise has been paid in words * “When all the outer observances of the Veerashaivas are closely studied with sympathy and insight, you will see that the entire religion is a vindication of the principle of the brotherhood of man and its necessary concomitant, the neighbourly love, nay, the universal love, and that of the renunciation of the world, that is, the renunciation of the Prapancha with its various cycle of bitters and sweets, sweets and bitters and so on in never-ending succession. I may safely say that there are few faiths that have flourished on the Indian soil which have so openly preached the equality of man, of the prince and the peasant, of the sage and the sinner, in the social scale. The Veerashaivas did away with the lip-religion of polished commonplaces and of mere moral and spiritual shibboleths, and actually lived with the principles that they taught. The invidious

distinction that is usually shown in India between man and man, as a social being, as a moral being, as a spiritual being, has brought the country so low in real spirituality that sham and humbug and fine phrases exist in place of real religion. Shiva-drishti is not the preserve of any one man or woman. It is on the other hand, the treasure-trove that is buried in the Dahara-pundarika of every rational being. And the greatest Samyakdarshins and Anubhavis, who have kept up the spirituality of India, who have been a standing witness to the truth that God can not only be inferred but can actually be seen, can not only be fervently prayed to with emotion and devotion, but can, in the real sense, be known, have not always been drawn from sections of population, who pride themselves on their pharisaic ritual and superiority of blood and birth.

(5) The fifth principle is that life in this world is in no way incongruous with the practice of religion. It is not necessary for any one to go to a forest for the sake of attaining Moksha. Home and life at home do not in any way clash and conflict with the spiritual life. Happiness, ineffable happiness, is the direct result of a well-planned life, conducted on the principles set forth by the religion, which teaches all how to live a life, pious and religious, in the world as a step to at-one-ment with God. The well-planned life of the Lingayats in this world is called "Kāyaka", as practised by the Lingayat saints that formed the holy band of spiritualists clustering round Basava. Kāyaka or the proper method of living a life is the highest achievement of the band of saints. They actually lived the life and demonstrated to the world that life in the world in the midst of worldly affairs was in no way incon-
sistent with the life of spiritual discipline for the realization of Self. That band of saints, who had realized Self, had in it men and women of various ranks and professions. The prophet and leader Basava was the minister of a kingdom; Gundaya was a potter; Appanna was a barber, Haralaya was a shoe-maker; Kakkaya was a tanner; Ketaya was a basket-maker; Chaudaya was a ferryman; Madiwal was a washer-man. This is to mention only a few. There were, besides, traders, agriculturists and men of different business lines too many to be mentioned here. It is thus proved that Kayaka, the well-planned life, was quite practical and nothing was impossible.

(6) Simplicity and suitability of practice is the sixth principle. The technique is the common scientific highway of self-realization for all. By means of the simple and definite technique of Jivas the Jivas advance as far as they wish up the spiritual ladder. Men differ intellectually. If some are sharp others are dull; if some are active others are slow. But this does not preclude anybody from practising the religion. The technique is so designed that men and women of different physical and intellectual capacity and different temperaments can follow the religion and develop the power of mind over body, health and prosperity. The Jiva, that wants to earn happiness, should take up the practice suited to him and attain Moksha. The religion supplies a long-felt want, because it teaches a simple way, the technique of Jivas with the net of which one can scientifically trap real happiness. The Jivas technique, never revealed before, shows six stages or steps on the ladder of consciousness gradually leading to cosmic Consciousness. For achievement does not come overnight.
Man is born almost helpless. The infant cannot walk at birth, but nature brings about development by degrees; and so it is with the technique. It offers instruction in self-realization and development in a graded course. In short, if the simple course is adopted and followed sincerely and conscientiously in accordance with Kāyaka, all will be obtained by the grace of God, the Linga. This is why it is oft-times repeated “अल्पकियाबुहुकलें” as the main feature and motto of the religion. The practice lasts all through life till death in peace. The course is simple and suited to all individuals and development is gradual by degrees.

(7) The seventh principle is Ahimsa or non-injury. The principle of ahimsa, though not the basis, on which the superstructure of religion is raised like that of Jainism and Buddhism, permeates the philosophy and practice of the religion. In the opinion of the prophet a religion is no religion that does not teach ahimsa, kindness and compassion. This was the reaction to the Vedic religion, the performance of sacrifices, in which innocent animals were slaughtered. Basava’s heart, like that of Buddha, bled for the animals killed in sacrifices and strongly condemned the killing of animals under the garb of sacrifices. Animals are, he says, as much entitled to a happy life as men are. They may be used for the service of man but should be kindly and lovingly treated, as if they were man’s kith and kin. Basava’s heart full of the milk of human kindness, the universal kindness, reached out to the suffering animals and preached ahimsa and non-violence, physical, mental or oral. In this respect Basava stands second to none, though he comes so late after Buddha and Mahāvira.

(8) The last and not the least but most important is the unity of thought and action, a perfect concordance
God is no where to be seen more clearly than in the life of a sincere Lingayat. Of all these भक्ति the feeling of devotion and the worship in devotion is the root and foundation of all other elements of Yoga; because without Bhakti nothing is possible. The feeling of devotion prepares the mind and confirms the mental attitude of a devotee and enables him to act sincerely in religious practices. Unless अंतःकरण is trained and attuned with the true feelings of devotion, the welling emotion of attachment to the Lord, the devotee's acts are like the movements of a hollow life-less automaton and are not capable of doing any good to the entangled soul. They are like the movements of a scarecrow tossed about by the blowing wind but not the movements of a conscious being. The conscious mental attitude, that gradually grows into an unconscious physical and mental habit, is prepared by Bhakti. Hence the Lingayat philosophers give primacy to Bhakti and Bhaktiyoga; and all other forms of Yoga are complementary to भक्ति and hinge on it for the achievement of the highest human ideal. The whole of this is included in धर्मसाधन.

The elements of other forms of yoga are complementary to Bhaktiyoga, because men are temperamentally different and act in accordance with their temperaments peculiar to them. *" According to the classification of yoga philosophers there are four kinds of temperaments, the emotional, the active, the mystic and the rational, the inner understanding is more or less moulded by the temperament. Consequently, the inner understanding arouses an attitude of the Divine Reality specific to a parti-

cular temperament. The aspirant of a particular temperament, therefore, develops an attitude of Divine peculiar to himself, and this attitude brings forth its corresponding subtle transformation of the subjective series of the Super-ego. The subtle result of this particular transformation restrains the modifications of the subjective series of the sense-ego (विनिधत्ति of the जीवाक्षतन). It is in fact, in this way that the Absolute Divine is realized. In as much as the resulting attitude differs according to the temperament, the preliminary means differ accordingly. The preliminary external means for the aspirant of the active temperament is Karmayoga, for that of the emotional temperament is Bhaktiyoga, for that of the mystic temperament is Rajayoga, and for that of the rational temperament is Jnánayoga.

It is a general belief that the Lingayats have discarded all sorts of rites. This is a belief based on the fact that Lingayats have altogether discarded and dissociated themselves from the Karmakânda and Yajnakânda of the Vedas and have repudiated the sixteen samskaras of the Varnashramadharma of Hinduism. But the Lingayats, though they have rejected in toto the rites and samskaras based on the Vedas and Smritis, which have only the पुरुषकल and स्मर्ते in view and which find man to the path अलंकार, have a number of rites appearing like religious externals as absolutely binding on them. The object of these rites is to put man on the wheel of विनिधति (the reverse process towards the Lord) and never on the wheel of दंड. And this is clearly *"The reason why

* S. D. Vol. XI page 216.
Veershaivas, although they have strong objections to the Vedic Yajnas inculcated in the Karmakanda of the Brahmanas, Kalpsutras, Grihyasutras and so on, have special rites of their own, which they observe with all religiosity...the kriyas are extremely puritanical in that they are intended to teach self-abnegation of all the so called good things of the world, and to cultivate in the mind of the Veerashaiva the Jiva Karunyam and neighbourly love.” That religious rites are indispensable for spiritual culture is expressed in:—

It is hereby proved that ज्ञान and क्रिया are at bottom one; to separate them is अविद्या as already stated above.

These puritanical rites of the religion are based on the Yogapada of the Divine Agamas. But this does not mean that the other padas of the Agamas are neglected, viz. Charya, Kriya and Jnana, on the contrary the charya, Kriya, and Jnana padas are fully utilized and are made to subserve Shivayoga. It is therefore, said † “I have told you a little previously that Veerashaivism is a specialization of the Yogapada of the Divyagamas, but you must not infer therefrom that no provision is made therein for the discipline corresponding to other padas. As a matter of fact, the charya, kriya, and jnana-padas of the Divyagamas, find their most authentic emphasis in Veerashaiva mysticism but all those disciplines are steadied and based on the

† Ibid, page 133.
major discipline of the Yogapāda. In other words, we have in Veerashaivism, Yoga-charya, Yoga-kriya, Yoga-śīla, and Yoga-jñāna, the last imperceptibly shading off into the real samādhi, śivārthāvadya, or "Fellowship of the Lord." The truths of the Divyagamas are elaborated with an unmistakable profundity and thoroughness, not only with reference to subjective Illumination and antārangavrittis, but what is most important and the most distinguishing trait of Veerashaivism, also with reference to objective conduct of and attitude towards men and things, or, as we might say, to bahīranga vyāpāra. The subjective culture of the soul proceeds pari passu with the objective training of the attitude of the vyavaharic man towards the Lord's prapancha, including animate and the rest."

The reason why आचार्यार्यां is given primacy and the elements of other yogas are subsidized to it is well accounted for in the following. *"The value of आचार्यार्यां is more or less physical and physico-mental, as it is nothing more than a Sādhanā to still the habitual wanderings of the mind; for when the pulmonary stir is becalmed off, the mind gets to be quiet of its own accord. The fuel for thought is really आचार्यार्यां in motion. But it should not be forgotten that, though आचार्यार्यां is a very good help as an initial step, to suppress thought, it cannot be depended upon to achieve the rest, to चित्ताकारिण्यां, nor even to prevent a backsliding of the mind on विशाय (विश्व), unless there is subjective Ishwarapranidhāna, to keep the aspirant up. Hence, the function of आचार्यार्यां is that of a mere go cart in
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teaching the child of antahkarana (अंतःकरण) to stand on its own legs and walk a few paces; but to expect the antahkarana to achieve for us शिवदायुक्त, is the same as to expect the go cart to help an adult cripple to walk. We see that Hathayogins fall short of the mark, on account of their looking to the Kevalakumbhaka and the Jālandharamudra as their sole supports for planting them on the field of Dahara. When the antahkarana is untrained and unattuned, the true bhakti, which is welling emotion, is lacking towards the Lord, the anubhava of akhaudavritti or even the enjoyment of genuine “Luminous sleep” is a mere chimera. But Veerashaivism has so well perfected in these deep truths of spiritual communion, in its teachings of पद्मचक्षु and विश्वभ्रमालस्य, that we will have occasion to learn more of them presently."

In short, the practice of the Lingayat religion is Shivayoga that includes in it the elements of other forms of yoga; it is based on the yogapāda of the Agamas; the rites of the religion are all its own, which are extremely puritanical in nature; the religion has entirely discarded the Karmas and yajnas of the Vedas and the Smritis and has repudiated the Vedic Varnashramadharma; it has established the universal brotherhood of man in religion; it is permeated with the doctrine of ahimsa (non-injury) and with all-embracing kindness. It may be noted by-the-by that the religion, having parted company totally with the Varnashramadharma and the doctrine connected with it, claims to be altogether different from Hinduism, the religion of Varnashramadharma. It therefore, claims to be a
different religious entity. Now we proceed to explain the details of the practice.

(1) The धर्माचार

Living beings are by nature active. Life without activity is both meaningless and not possible. The mind is incessantly active except during deep sleep. The brain, which is the mind’s tool, must be equally active. Various other parts of the body work as occasion requires. At the base of this unceasing activity of mind and body are the soul’s needs. It is to supply these needs that body and mind are so active. The ordinary needs of a living being are threefold, bodily mental and social. The first two are necessary to the being as a mere individual, and the third as a member of society. The needs of the body are food, sleep, escape from danger, and sexual enjoyment. Of these four, the first three are necessary for the protection of the body, and the last for that of the race. Mental needs are knowledge and recreation, the former for enriching the mind and the latter for relief from strenuous work. Social needs include giving and receiving help, loving and hating, dominating and submitting. But existence of God and close relationship with Him of individual souls having been established, another set of needs arises out of the close relationship and is called religious needs; and action for their supply becomes necessary.

The direction of the human beings in society is largely, nay mainly, by imitation and suggestion, which are, as is well known, are psychological in their operation. An extended form of imitation and suggestion is the adoption of local, social or religious
The custom, are intended to convey to the members of the community the principles of religion and religious conduct in general. by these two psychological operations. These are five codes of conduct, lay down, for the individual members, rules of behaviour as social beings. They are Śiśāchār, Śīmāchār, Āmarā, Mūkhaśīrā, and Gānāchār. The first two Śiśāchār and Śīmāchār are purely personal, but react on other individuals of the community in their intercourse everyday and everyday. Śiśāchār requires a Lingayat to believe that Shiva is the object of worship for the exclusion of other deities. Whatsoever devotional acts he performs, prayers he offers, and thoughts he thinks they must be all about Shiva and none else. This is Shivāchāra. Lingāchāra (Śīmāchār) is the worship of Shiva through Linga, the amorphous representation or symbol of Shiva. The worship of Linga is the worship of Shiva. The worship of Linga, Linga, the gross or physical, is the beginning of daily religious observances, prayers and contemplation, growing into the worship of the higher modifications of Shiva, namely, Śīmāchāra and Śīmāchāra. Linga, the Ishtalinga, is the Godhead of the Anga, the devotee, who should remain faithful to Linga and serve him faithfully, throughout his life, as faithfully as the devoted wife has to serve her husband to the end of her life. This is Śiśāchāra. Śiśāchār requires a Lingayat to follow a profession and live strictly a moral and virtuous life. He should earn money by working in his profession for his livelihood and, for, supporting his
family. He should utilize his savings and surplus for others in their needs. He should furnish his Guru with funds for the propagation of religion and service of the public. He should feed Jangamas, the Jivanmuktas (जीवनमुक्त) moving about over the country in the service of religion and to help individual devotees by guiding them in their religious practices, so that the devotees may avoid errors. By खदानः the members are required to make no difference between one Lingayat and another but should take all to be as respectable and good as Shiva. He should interdine and intermarry freely with Lingayats. Character, right moral and religious conduct, should be the only criterion, and consideration in the intercourse with other members of the community; and nothing else like a high or low profession should influence affairs of Social life. This is खदानः. भूखालार is the devotee's attitude of complete humility towards Shiva and His forms of Linga. So also he has to maintain the attitude of humility towards his guru who gives him all guidance in spiritual discipline and religious practices. Similarly the Jangamas, the Jivanmuktas, and the विन्दारणास should be treated with all respect and in all humility. A Lingayat has to adopt the attitude of service and modesty towards all Lingayats as children and followers of the same God; Shiva or Linga and the same religion. In short the attitude in general of a Lingayat in social behaviour and intercourse should be one of humility, modesty and respect for others; so also he should be kind to all animals and treat them kindly. This is भूखालार; the conduct of a Lingayat as a servant of the society and a friend of all animals. Lastly खदानः is a Lingayat's behaviour.
towards the community as a whole. He should not tolerate scandal of the Godhead and ill-treatment of men and animals by others. As a member of the community he has to strive for its upliftment and development. The short description of the Vänapais will make it clear how they are intended to cultivate in the Lingayats an attitude of devotion and godliness, brotherhood in religion and cooperation between members, a straight forward and honest life, mutual helpfulness and kindness to the animal world.

(2) The अवैरेणाः

The अवैरेणाः are the eight fold shields or protective coverings of the devotee. They protect the Anga from the onslaughts of the वायु on him and guide him and guard him safely to final beatitude after the life in the world. They shield him from the evils attaching to the worldly life by putting the Anga out of the three taints and five sheaths. They guard and guide on the way to enduring happiness by means of the spiritual discipline and exercises. These eight अवैरेणाः or guards have special significance of their own and are the means of उपायन in his religious life day to day. The five-fold आचाराः are rules of behaviour in general in society. But the eightfold अवैरेणाः the details of उपायन for individual members for their own spiritual culture. They are शुद्ध, विन्यास, बाधां, प्रारंभ पादोदक, विभूति or मर्य, ग्राम and मंत्र.

(1) Linga is the centre and basis of all religious practices and observances. It is the very life and soul of उपायन, which therefore, hinges on Ling. All prayers are offered to Linga and devotion is addressed to Linga. Thus Linga is the very foundation of the spiritual course and
discipline. Still यु has the precedence over Linga in these eight guards. The question naturally arises why. The answer is that it is the Guru that initiates the Anga and guards him on in the religious practices and and spiritual culture. It is the Guru that performs the वैष्णव ceremony of the devotee, who by that ceremony receives another or second birth as it were, the spiritual birth, in contradistinction to the physical birth in the world. It is the Guru that gives the devotee real insight into the principles of the religion, explains the inner meaning of the practices and guides him on the path to Mukti. The Guru explains at the same time the difference between the Lingayat religion and other religions and proves and establishes how this religion is superior to all others. He gives the Anga the necessary instructions and training to enable him to get through the arduous course of spiritual discipline. The Guru is the spiritual mother. He by his gracious look of the eyes, expressive of tenderness, wins the Anga and consoles, just as the kind gracious look of the mother calms us down in distress and comforts us. The Guru being an elderly person with his passions well under his control, is of serene, calm and cheerful disposition. He has gained the first-hand knowledge of the world by experience. His affection, tenderness, and saintly life, his vast knowledge of men and things charms the pupil, who, therefore, finds great delight in serving him, imitating him, and acquiring knowledge from him. The Guru lives in the midst of a town or a village but leads a simple, hardy, and exemplary religious life. His association is inspiring to the Anga or devotee, who, therefore,
follows the instructions of the Guru in toto. The devotee proceeds with the study of the principles and philosophy of the religion with the help of the Guru and takes guidance from him wherever necessary. This is the reason why Guru stands first in the list of Ashtavahanas. The Guru at the same time, is worshipped in his meditative attitude, in a particular yogic posture with the control of breath by श्राणायाम, with the eyes fixed on the Linga in contemplation. The Guru is one who is a jivanmukta and is an actual example of Linga-worship and spiritual discipline. He is Guru not only because he gives precepts and oral instruction but also because he is a model in Linga-worship and moral and religious life for others to follow. Hence the significance of Guru is twofold, as a preceptor and as a living example of the religious course strictly followed. The Guru is therefore actually worshipped at least occasionally in every household if not everyday. He is then Shiva Himself being a Jivanmukta. When he is worshipped he is called a Jangama an itinerant Shiva. The Guru is, thus the first guard or shield of the soul against the assaults of Maya.

(2) Next comes the Linga the इलाक्षिण worn on the body by the Lingayats. the इलाक्षिण, Linga the gross or physical, the third of the first three modifications of इलाक्षिण. The इलाक्षिण is what gives the worshipper all that he desires to be worshipped and is, therefore, worshipped every day in devotion. The following will make the meaning of इलाक्षिण clear:

इलाक्षिणिकर सांकलिक्षिणिकराचः।
इलाक्षिण: पूजा चया निलिक्षिण्यं पुजितमाइशस्तः।
इलाक्षिणाधिति. प्रेतसमाविष्ठालिगपौज्जकः॥
The Linga is given to the body at the very birth as is the custom. The Linga is always on the body of a person from the time of his birth to the time of his death. The person should never lose his Linga; because to lose it is to lose his life in the literal sense of the word. The daily worship of the Linga, before the diksha ceremony of a person is performed, may be informal but necessary for the person, so that he may be imbued with deep reverence for the Godhead and impressed with the significance of spiritual discipline. Though informal it has its own significance. It makes the wearer and worshipper conscious of his duty to the Godhead on account of his uncertain and untenable position in the worldly life. It makes him aware of the necessity of religious life and spiritual discipline in order to be on the way to Mukti. The real worship of Linga as the religious exercise begins after the diksha ceremony is performed by the Guru, who initiates a person into the secrets of religion.

We have already noted in section VIII that the worship of इल्लिङ्ग is not प्रतीक्ष्यापत्तना, the worship of an image. The image is merely a substitute of a deity. But the इल्लिङ्ग is not a प्रतीक of the Lord but the Lord Himself. The devotee is also a modification of the Lord and is called Anga. Thus the Anga and the Linga being modifications of the Almighty Lord (चन्दिङ्ग) in His उपास्क-किल्ला, the worshipper and the worshipped are face to face with each other in the worship. The idea underlying the उपास्क is that the उपास्क is in no way different from the उपास्क, the Linga. This is, अहंमाहणपरमात्म, in which the devotee starts with the idea that he is a part and parcel of the Lord, though for the present detached from Him. Hence the
truth expressed by “अइ श्रास्ति” is put into a practical form. This is श्रास्तिगम्य or the path of fellowship or friendship of the worshipper with the Lord. Here the worshipper is taught that he is सदगम्य of the Lord; and pure subjective worship of the Lord is inculcated in him. The Anga looks on the Linga as his associate, a friend and a protector, not living apart from him, as in the case of image worship, but living with and in him and making him a part and parcel of Himself, the all-powerful Lord. Anga is the microcosm of the Lord, the macrocosmic Linga. The Anga has become Anga by being cooped up in the body by the working of आदिमाय, the शक्ति of the Lord. And to be free from the narrow limitations of the body he has to worship the Linga, the superior modification in relation with himself but identical with चन्द्रिक, the macrocosmic Soul. He has to worship with the conviction that he will attain his natural or original condition of Lordship by pure subjective worship of the Lord. This is अंडमयेप्रवेशना. The Anga is taught that his real station is in the Lord, in whom he lives, moves and has his being.

The चन्द्रिक, as the उपास्येवत्ता, is the object of contemplation. The Anga, the worshipper and associate of the Lord, fixes his attention on the Lord, with a view to become one (समरस) with Him ultimately. The विदेश्यात्ता or the thought of the Lord by the subjective worship and subjective इंद्राग्रेशान with the idea of “अइ श्रास्ति” is the highest spiritual ideal that deserves to be carefully and assiduously cultivated. Instead of fixing one’s attention on anything only with a view to steady the mind and not allowed to backslide, so that it may be brought under full control, it is incompara-
bly superior that the mind should be fixed on the Lord in meditation as the ultimate resort and the object of at-one-
ment.

In the preparatory stage Linga or परशिव is श्रृंख्ला of the devotee. He is, therefore, his intimate friend and associate. But later the devotee gradually moves towards the higher ideal of अमर in the advanced stage. In the prepara-
tory stage the सज्ज is in the सविनिर्लक्ष्माधिः; and in the advanced or perfected stage he is in the निविनिर्लक्ष्माधिः.

Linga, the वण्ड, is only the representation of the सज्ज in his meditative posture as may be seen in the picture (see ante p. 483). Thus the Anga is reflected in the Linga, as it were. This makes the idea of अह्नेवाना real or actual. The Linga and Anga are, therefore, the obverse and reverse of the same thing. The Anga realizes that Linga is macro-

cosmic because it is free from all limitations; while he is microcosmic being confined to the body. He has to expand himself by tearing off the limitations. To attain the ideal and objective he has to seek the Highest in himself by developing the power in himself. That power is सज्ज, the modification of the Lord’s सज्ज, as without that सज्ज, the sincere devotion and attachment to the Lord, nothing is possible. That is the root cause of self-expansion.

The real Linga in its various forms is in the body. The six centres of nerve power, called the आधारास of Shakti by the Shâktas and the followers of Râjayoga, are the six places that the Lingas occupy. The worship of those Lingas to develop the human power into vast all-
reaching spiritual power, is the real worship. This is internal worship and the superior or the only form of wor-
ship. But this is very difficult in the beginning before
insculping a thestic and spiritual attitude and cultivating the habit of devotion to the Godhead with the conviction that He is in him. For most men are of emotional tempera-
ment and can be easily attracted to the path of Bhakti. Men of severe intellectual temperament living on the hollow pabulum of abstractions are always rare. Intell-
lectual attitude has to be prepared by emotion. And devotion to the Godhead in some concrete form is nece-
sary. This is done by इश्वरिंग; and herein lies the real significance of इश्वरिंग as the gross form or modification of धनिंग. All this will be obvious by the following discussion:—

* इश्वराणांमार्यां द्विया सांव्यास्थाचे: ॥
बाधितांसंतं चैत खृिंस्चिर्त्वस्कादिभिः ॥
चिद्वृत्तस्य शरीरं शांकरस्य सन्तिराशमुऽ ॥
यततः सत्य धारणं च चतुर्वतस्यमुऽहतमः ॥
तदेव सत्यभूतानों अंतरेत्थवानमुऽचरमः ॥
सूक्ष्मां च हद्देव सूभवे सखरेर्किंगः ॥
योगित्विंग सदा भावित्व पारोश्रावुरागमः: ॥
उपासनायं अंततः यथिर्वं याः स्वायमः ॥
लयं गच्छति तथ्येव जम्भवेंत्वचरमः ॥
पुनः पुन: समुक्तति तलिंग ब्रम्हमार्यात्ममः ॥
आपाभे हद्देव वापि सूभवे वा निरंतरमः ॥
योगित्विंग नववांतां अंतुः संगमाणमः ॥
ये धारास्ति हद्देव चिंग चिद्वृत्तमैसुऽचरमः ॥
न तेषां पुनः अस्ति बोँस्कादिर्मदेहि ॥
तस्मात्स्तवर्श्चान्तस्वर्गशास्त्रांमुऽकः ॥
अंतरेत्विंग चिद्वृत्तमैसु: इश्वरिंगः शक्त एव वा ॥
बृहं च धारायिंग तत्तन्मिति निधिस्वातः ॥

भन्सांतिशिक्षामणी, pp. 91-96.
Hence the propriety of बाणासिद्धिधारण that is necessary for gradual psychic culture. The worship of बाणासिद्धि leads to the worship of बाणासिद्धि in due course. The बाणासिद्धि, taken to be the gross form of बाणासिद्धि, is to be filled with शिवाकल्य or spirit of बाणासिद्धि; and the अंग, a part and parcel of the Godhead, is also to be inspired with the sincere spirit of devotion at the same time. The अंग is to be taught that the Highest is in him and in the बाणासिद्धि. So the भक्त starts with the worship of बाणासिद्धि that he is Shiva and Shiva is jiva. This is बाणासिद्धिपाश्चता pure and simple.

(3) Jangama is the third अवर्ण and is peculiar to this religion. No like of it is to be found in any other religion. He is an itinerant नीवन्पुर्वक moving about in the country for the guidance of the devotees in their spiritual exercises and culture. He is, therefore, considered equal to the Godhead, the Linga, and also Guru.

The goal of the soul is the liberation from the three limitations and mainly from आणविमल; because liberation from that मल makes the soul essentially one (समर्प) with परशिव. The first fruits of आणविमल are the feelings I-ness and my-ness. A person, therefore, that has become free from आणविमल, has neither I-ness nor my-ness, and does not refer to himself as an individual. He has neither pride nor anger, neither sorrow nor fear. He has no thought of his body, his family, his property, and other things that are ordinarily supposed to belong to him. The direct effect of freedom is the free flow of energies to.
know, to desire, and to do. The liberated soul therefore possesses unlimited knowledge. It can transcend time and see the past, the present, and the future events in the universe, though it does not mind them as it has no concern with them.

The products of \textit{mâyā} only serve as means for the soul's activities of knowing, desiring, and doing. But as the liberated souls have nothing in this world to know, to desire and to do, these products of \textit{mâyā} are no more of any use to them. The liberated souls may give them up as soon as they attain liberation, i.e. they may leave the physical body. They require no place to live in, things to enjoy, and get completely out of the domain of \textit{mâyā}. They move about and reveal the ultimate truths of religion to those that need them. They give valuable guidance in the course of spiritual discipline and religious exercises by example of their own. Because they move about for this self-less purposes they are called Jangamas.

We know of ordinary men called the priests who profess to lead others to liberation. They are but blind leaders of the blind. They are themselves not liberated, and therefore, ignorant of ultimate truths, and can give little help to others. The liberated men, the Jangamas, alone possess the necessary knowledge and are able to assist others in their endeavours to attain liberation. They are, therefore, indispensable to them. The love of God, in directing the universe, so arranges the evolution that some become jivan-mukta Jangamas and supply this great need of other souls. But these souls are in no way affected by their mind and body. Having seen the true nature of \textit{mâyā}, they cannot be influenced by such insignificant products of \textit{mâyā} and their bodies and minds,
The performance of action is necessary for the souls bound by the three taints for the acquisition of truth by experiencing the effects of action. As the liberated souls require no further knowledge, they need not perform any fresh action, and are therefore free from the need of indulging in any activity for their own sake. As regards the fruit of past actions, they must all have been experienced except perhaps those that determine the nature of the body. If the body perishes at liberation it means that all the fruits of past actions have been experienced. If it does not it follows that there are some acts left whose fruits it has yet to experience. Hence there are two classes of liberated souls, (1) those that leave the body at liberation, and (2) those that continue with the body even after liberation. The latter are Jivanmukta Jangamas.

When the soul is liberated from आण्वम, it can have a full flow of energy from माया and acquire omniscience. But, if it is deprived of or liberated from माया also, it cannot know or do any thing. It is quiescent. Then the love of God comes to it directly and fills it with divine illumination and makes it one with God. The Jivanmukta Jangamas on the contrary are merged in the infinite love of God and shower that love on the unliberated souls. Some Jivanmuktas remain in their original position as kings, statesmen, or householders, and make themselves useful to others by their acts and lives. Some become religious preachers and tour round the country attracting disciples and followers who try to walk in their foot-steps and are helped by them in their course of religious life. But in the midst of these activities, they remain unaffected, all the acts being automatic and unattached.
Their chief value to unliberated or worldly souls is the dual position they occupy. They are man and God in one and are useful to men in both capacities. As they have been men like ourselves, we can understand them, have direct communication with them, and get from them an idea of true love, true knowledge, and true action. Their very presence uplifts us and gives us joy. We feel no want in their presence and find in them the infinite love attributed to God. They are each, in his measure, the embodiment of God, and thus demonstrate to us the existence of God. Their words arouse in us love for God, and their gracious acts strengthen us and make us masters of the influence of अणवम. They are also the best objects of our worship. They are saints (वित्तश्रणाः) and men of endless spiritual power. If the figures of ordinary men, a little above us in intellectual or spiritual attainments, can absorb our whole attention when we talk to them, how much more can these divine beings, the real Sharanas or Jangamas, influence our minds? They make an indelible impression on our minds and drive out of us petty objects of the world that catch our fancy. When our minds have grasped profound truths and our hearts have tasted endless love, we desire nothing except their example. If we worship them, it will be the first form of worshipping God. This is why the Jangama is the third shield and is to be worshipped as reverentially as Linga and Guru. In fact no difference is made between the first three आवरणाः, the Guru, Linga, and Jangama.

(4) विमुति or भस्व is the fourth आवरण and मस्तवाश्च is the fourth religious exercise. All ritualistic exercises serve the twofold purpose of increasing the love for God
and adherence to the religious life. Every religion has a set of religious exercises for its followers. The wearing of cross by the Roman Catholics is a special exercise intended for reminding them of the great solicitude that Jesus had for the salvation of the world. The cross induces them to accept, and to co-operate with Christ for their personal salvation. Similarly sacred ashes of the Shaivas and the Veerashaivas remind them of the love of God, which reduces to ashes the impurities in them and their six-fold enemies the desire of the world, the anger, the avarice, the infatuation, the pride and the hatred. They make us feel that the Lord's love is with us and creates in us a desire to lead a spiritual life. This underlying idea of जैनमें and its contemplation and wearing are very important ritualistic exercises. जैनमें has been described as:—

* शिवमिहाबायं रत्नोऽक्षं भावनाद्विषते तथा।
महामहात्माति नान्दिकां परमांकं।
केतकै येमहारागां: सुवृत्तस्ति निर्मित्तातिरियः॥

It is said to be of five kinds according as it serves five different purposes noted in the following:—

| विभूतिनिरीक्षितं जैनमें कारं रथेति भवत:। |
| पुतानि पारंपारिक हृदयं: पंचभिषेकस्यम्। |
| विभूतिभूति हृदयायं मंत्रिष्ठ तथ्वभावनात्। |
| पांवायं दशकानात् भवति करणात् गृहमापवामात्। |
| रक्षणात्सन्तासृशे रथेति परिषिध्ये॥

(5) Next comes श्रवण, the fifth आवरण. The origin of श्रवण is described in a Puranik story that Shiva looked up in a meditative and concentrated attitude at the

three castles of राग्म. The tears, that fell from his eyes in the act of looking up steadily, became solid and came to be called राग्म (on account of their falling from the eyes of राग्म). The राग्म is a reminder of Shiva's fixed gaze, the Yogic steadfast gaze. The devotee has to bear this in mind and try to cultivate yogic steadfastness like Shiva, the great matchless Yogin. They urge a devotee on to attain perfection in his Yogic meditation.

(6) पादोदक, the holy water, with which the Linga, the feet of the Guru, and the Jangama are washed, is the sixth अवरण. Water is the most important of the five elements from the point of view of cleanliness. Water enables man to keep clean by washing away all dirt. The body and clothes are washed and kept clean. All washing requires water without which nothing can be kept clean. The taint or dirt sticking to the body, clothes, or anything else cannot be removed except with the help of water. Hence water as the cleansing agent is most important and indicates cleanliness. External cleanliness of the body makes mind fresh and clean. After a bath mind becomes calm and ceases to be perturbed a little while; and the water slips down the feet. A bath in a pond considered to be holy (तीर्थ) makes the mind free from impure ideas for the time being and pure thoughts arise in the mind. This is a psychological effect. But the pity is that it is temporary and not permanent. The पादोदक is symbolical of the washing of three taints attaching to the soul. Guru and the Jangam being jivanmuktas are free from all taints. And their पादोदक is the embodi-
ment of the washing of the taints. The devotee has to be free from the taints attaching to his soul and take a lesson from the पदेवदक that he has also to strive to be free from the three taints, when he takes the पदेवदक of his Guru or a Jangama. The पदेवदक is thus intended to produce a psychological effect on the devotee that he should wash his soul clean of the three taints, as he has to wash his body clean of all physical dirt. The exercise of taking the पदेवदक is the exercise for making the devotee aware of the three taints and the necessity of washing them away from the soul gradually by cultivating a mental attitude of good sense and principles of moral conduct. The पदेवदक is not merely ordinary water called तीथि. It is symbolical of the water of knowledge ( ज्ञनजलि) that washes away the taints that stick to and constrict the soul.

(7) प्रवाद comes next, the seventh shield. प्रवाद generally means favour or grace of a superior being. In religion प्रवाद means favour or grace of God shown to the devotee. प्रवाद in this religion signifies more than this. प्रवाद is the grace of God no doubt. But that is real प्रवाद that leads to the peace of mind by the grace of God. Mind and its impure working becomes the root-cause of all troubles and worries of life by producing कर्मविक्रम, which causes the cycles of birth and rebirth. And if the mind is kept clean and pure and absorbed in the thought of God the कर्मविक्रम is destroyed and all troubles and worries of life vanish. Hence the real प्रवाद is the stable cleanliness and calmness of mind; the purity and equanimity of mind, which is the soul's agent and organ, brings about the
purity and freedom of the soul. Such is the real sense and significance of ।

He is, the Anga in the third stage of development, as devotee, that attains such ।

as is said:—

To obtain the favour of the Lord, the devotee has to constantly keep in mind that all that he does, eats, sees, hears, and enjoys is owing to the Lord. He, therefore, to express his gratitude to the Lord that whatever he enjoys and whatever he does, is his ।

He should address all that he takes or does to, God

* चिन्तकलिप्यांकालौऽ च ॥ दृष्टार्थाविनिष्ठं ॥

मनं प्राणादिर्गणः अवधारीश्वर कथात् ॥

नैर्भवस्य सन्तति प्रत्यक्षा इति कथात् ॥

विज्ञाय विगम्बरस्य प्रवा प्रकरिता विष्णुति ॥

विज्ञापत् यथद्वाय विषयः वितेषेदिनम् ॥

विभूत्य तत्र श्रेष्ठं सन्तयीम्वलयर्णयं ॥

मनं प्राणा विधाश्चः निमोख्मकारणम् ॥

शिवप्राप्ते र्हेक्षवेवः प्रवादीवेल, कथाति ॥

अर्जुनम् हि चर्केनः तर्कविद्धिरहुता ।

शिवेऽवं अद्वैतः हि यमहात्मय सम्बृतिम् ॥

तदेवं सर्ववृत्तं तु सुंगमानि विगतस्य ॥

मनं प्राणादिरु लमं श्राणकारण ॥

आश्मनाशय नियतं यथावदय समाहितिः ।

तत्तत्वमाय देशाय भुजेश्वरविष्णुर्म् ॥

निमलेश्वरे देवेन निरान्नमा भवेताग्नाम् ॥

यथा श्राकर्षितं मुक्तं तत्तत्त्वसारणम् ॥

पञ्च पुंशी फलं तोर्यः प.चेष्टाय नितेषेदिनम् ।

तत्तत्त्वाकार्ययोगेन सर्वार्थाय अमेरति ।

यथा चिन्तकलिप्यांकालौ स्वैवायः चिन्ततस्य ॥

तथा युक्तं प्राणादिर तवेन चिन्तकलिप्याम् ॥

* चिन्तकलिप्यांकालौ च ॥ दृष्टार्थाविनिष्ठं ॥
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before taking or doing the same himself. All this is best stated in the verses quoted above. This is कर्मयोग of the best type. When the mind is trained like this it gradually develops the sense of purity and calmness. The soul gradually becomes free from कर्मेन्द्रतां and ultimately attains freedom from further transmigrations i.e. it attains final beatitude.

All this is during Linga worship. But the practical example of प्रकाश is that of the Guru and Jangama, whose प्रकाश the अज receives. He then learns from them the secret of प्रकाश and the way of addressing to God all that he takes and does. Thus the प्रकाश of युधिष्ठिर and जंगम is an exercise of utmost importance in spiritual development.

(3) The last and not the least is ज्ञ, the eighth shield. ज्ञ, though last is very important, as it contains the elements of ज्ञयोग, the practice of ज्ञ. The significance and importance of ज्ञ for various purposes and in different forms are to be found in Shaktism, in which मंत्रयोग has been fully developed. In Shaktism the practice of ज्ञ forms an integral part of Shakti rituals. And the schools of Shaivism also have their own rites based on मंत्र and मंत्रयोग. It is necessary to know the scientific basis of मंत्र and मंत्रयोग, on which the efficacy of मंत्र depend and which has made मंत्र so important and indispensable in the practice of the religion.

* The word मंत्र is derived from the roots “मन् to think” and “च to save or protect”, and means that which protects him that mutters and realizes it. By the combination of मन्त्र च, that is called मंत्र, which from...

* The following explanation is based on “Studies in मंत्रवाच” by Sir John Woodroffe.
the religious standpoint, calls forth (आभृत्व) the four aims of sentient beings, as happiness in this world and eternal happiness in liberation. चंत्र is thus thought movement, vehicle by and expressed in speech. Its विशेष is, like all else, Consciousness (विच्छेद) which is is the चंत्रन्वेष. A चंत्र is therefore, not merely sound or letters. This is a form in which Shakti expresses herself.

In order to understand what a चंत्र is the cosmic history should be known. The cosmos evolves out of Consciousness, the चिन्तन्त्रक and मायाशक्ति of Parashiva. Consciousness, the ultimate aspect of Shiva, in its aspect as the great "I" first sees the object as part of itself and then as other than itself and has thus the experience of the universe. This is achieved through Shakti that is the pure mirror, in which Shiva experiences Himself (शिवश्वतिनिमित्तलंशर्यादि:). Neither Shiva nor Shakti alone suffice for the creation. Shivarupa is the form of experience consisting in the notion of "I" (आभृत्व). Shakti is the pure mirror for the manifestation of Shiva's experience as "I". (अभ्रित्वश्वतिनिमित्तलंशर्यादि:). The notion is similar to the Sāṅkhya notion of the reflection of पुरुष on प्रकृति as सत्त्वमाली बुद्धि: and of ब्र्ह्मच गाय of the केत्रलस्त्र school. From the mantra aspect starting from Shakti (शक्तितत्त्व) associated with Shiva (शिवतत्त्व) there was produced नाद; from नाद came बिंदु, which to distinguish from other Bindus, is known as the Causal, Supreme or Great Bindu (कारण, पर, or महाबिंदु).

बिंदु literally means and is usually translated as "sound," the word coming from the root बिंदु.
“to sound”. It must not, however, be wholly identified with sound in the sense that which is heard by the ear or sound as effect of cosmic stress. Sound in this sense is the effect produced through excitation of the ear and brain by vibration of the atmosphere between certain limits. Sound so understood exists only with the sense organs of hearing. But considering Shabda from its primary or causal aspect, independant of the effect which it may or may not produce on the sense organs, it is vibration (स्वंदन) of any kind or motion which is not merely physical motion, which may become sound for human ears. There is thus shabda wherever there is motion or vibration of any kind. It is now said that the eletrons revolve in a sphere of positive electrification at an enormous rate of motion. If the arrangement is stable we have an atom of matter. If some of the electrons are pitched off from the atomic system, what is called radio-activity is observed. Both these rotating and shooting electrons are forms of vibration as Shabda, though it is no sound for mortal ears. To a Divine ear all such movements would constitute the “music of the spheres.” Were the human ear subtle enough a living tree would present itself to it in the form of a particular sound which is the natural word for that tree. It is said of ether (आकः) that its Guna or quality is sound; i.e ether is the possibility of स्वंदन of any kind. It is that state of the primordial material substance (प्रकृति), which makes motion or vibration of any kind possible (अकाश: शक्ति). The आकाश or ब्लत is motionless and is known as विवास्थिता. But this आकाश is not created. विवास्थिता is the आकाश in which stress of any kind manifests itself,
a condition from which the creation proceeds. This निदानकाय is known as सत्याज्ञान through its मायावाचि, which is the cause of all vibrations manifesting themselves as sound to the ear, as touch to the tactile sense, as colour and form to the eye, as taste to the tongue and as odour to the nose. All mental functioning again is a form of vibration (स्वेदन). Thought is a vibration of mental substance just as the expression of thought in the form of the spoken word is a vibration affecting the ear. All spandana presupposes heterogeneity (वैषम्य). Movement of any kind implies inequality of tensions. Electric current flows between two points because there is a difference of potential between them. Fluid flows from one point to another because there is a difference of pressure. Heat travels because there is a difference of temperature. In creation (सृजन) this condition of heterogeneity appears and renders motion possible. अकाशा is the possibility of spandana of any kind. Hence its precedence in the order of creation. अकाशा means ब्रह्म with माया, which मायावाचि or stress is rendered actual from a previous state of possibility of stress, which is the Shakti's natural condition of equilibrium (प्रकृतसाम्यावस्था). In dissolution the मायावाचि of Brahman (according to the periodic law which is a fundamental postulate of Indian cosmogony) returns to homogeneity when in consequence अकाशा disappears. This disappearance means that Shakti is equilibrated and that therefore there is no further possibility of motion of any kind i.e. as the Tantras say, the divine Mother becomes one with Paramashiva. शारदातिलक says:
Here सकलपरेश्वर is Shiva-tattva. Shakti is Shakti-tattva. Nâda is the first produced source of मंग and the subtlest form of Shabda, of which Mantra is a manifestation. Nâda is three-fold, as Mahânâda, Nâdânta and Nirodhini, representing the first moving forth of the Shabda-Brahman as Nâda, the filling up of the whole universe with Nâdânta and the specific tendency towards the next state of unmanifested Shabda respectively. Nâda in its three forms is in the Sâdâkhya-tattva. Nâda becoming slightly operative towards the speakable (वाच्य), is called अर्थवंश which develops into विक्रिया, Both of these are in the इन्द्रसाधन. The undifferentiated Shabda-Brahman or Brahman as Brahman as the immediate cause of the manifestation of Shabda and Artha is a unity of consciousness (चेतन्य), which then expresses itself in three-fold function as the three Shaktis, इच्छा, ज्ञान, क्रिया; the three Gunas as सत्व, रजस्, तमस्, and so forth. These are the products of the union of प्रकृति, and विकृतिसाधनि. This triangle of Divine desire or creative will and its first subtle manifestation is the cause of the universe. The great "I" (अहं), developing through the inherent power of its thought activity (अत्मविनाश्य) into the universe, loses as Jîva the knowledge of its true nature and the secret of its growth through अविद्याकृति. Here then there appears the duality of subject and object; of mind and matter, of the word and its meaning (वचन और अर्थ). The one is not the cause of the other, but each is inseparable from and concomitant with, the other as a bifurcation of 2-65.
the undifferentiated unity of Shabda-Brahman whence they proceed. The one cosmic movement produces at the same time the mind and the object which it recognizes; names (नाम) and language (शब्द) on the one hand, and forms (ख्य) or object (अर्थ) on the other. These are all parts of one co-ordinated contemporaneous movement and therefore each aspect of the process is related the one to the other. The genesis of Shabda is only one aspect of the creative process, namely, that in which the Brahman is regarded as the author of Shabda and Artha into which the undifferentiated Shabda-Brahman divides itself. Shakti is Shabda-Brahman ready to create both Shabda and Artha on the differentiation of Parabindu, the root-cause of all Mantras. The Shabda-Brahman is supreme speech (पश्च्च) or Supreme Shabda (पश्च). From the fourth state of Shabda there are three others—पश्चली मध्यमा and वैशार, which are the Shabda aspect of the stages whereby the seed of formless consciousness explicates into multitudinous concrete ideas (expressed in the language of the mental world) the counterpart of the objective universe. But for the last three stages of the sound the body is required and therefore, they only exist in Jīva. In the latter the Shabda-Brahman is in the form of Kundalini Shakti in the Mūlādhāra Chakra. In Kundalini is Parashabda. This develops into the "Matrikas" or "little mothers" which are the subtle forms of the gross manifested letters (वच). The letters make up the syllables (पद) and syllables make sentences (वाक्य), of which elements the Mantra is composed. Parashabda in the body develops in Pashyanti Shabda or Shakti of general movement (शामात्यस्थंद्र) located in the
tract from the Mālā-hāra to the Manipūra associated with Maṇḍap. It then in the tract upwards to the Anāhata becomes Śthana or Hiranyagarbha sound with particularized movement (विखेष्यति) associated with बुद्धितन्त्र; बायु, proceeding upwards to the throat expresses itself in spoken speech which is वैहरी or वितानत्तव्य. Now it is that the मंत्र issues from the mouth and is heard by the ear. Because the one cosmic movement produces the ideating mind and its accompanying Shabda and the objects cognized or Artha, the creative force of the universe is identified with the Mātrikas and Varnas, and the Devi (Shakti) is said to be in the forms of letters from A (अ) to Ha (ह) which are the gross expression of the forces called Mātrikas; which again are not different from, but are the same forces which evolve into the universe of mind and matter. These Varnas are for the same reason associated with certain vital physiological centres which are produced by the same power, which gives birth to the letters. It is by virtue of these centres and their controlled area in the body that all phenomena of human psychosis run on and keep man in bondage. The creative force is the union of Shiva and each of the letters (नाग्न) produced therefrom and thereby are part and parcel of that force, and are therefore, Shiva and Shakti in those particular forms. For this reason the Tantras say that a Devatā and Mantra composed of letters, are one. In short Mantras are made of letters (नाग्न); letters are Mātrikas; Mātrikas are Shakti and Shakti is Shiva. Through Shakti (one with Shiva) Nāda-Shakti, Bindu-Shakti; the Shabda-Brahman or Para-Shabda, arise the Mātrikā, Varna, Pada, Vākya of the lettered Mantra or manifested Shabda.
At each moment the Jiva is subject to innumerable influences which from all quarters of the universe pour upon him. Only those reach his consciousness which attract his attention and are thus selected by the manas. The latter attends to one or other of these sense-impressions and conveys it to the Buddhi. When an object (अर्थ) is presented to the mind it is perceived. This is called a mental vritti (modification) which it is the object of yoga to suppress. The mind as a vritti is thus a representation of the outer object. But in so far as it is such representation, the mind is as much an object as the outer one. The latter, that is physical object, is called the gross object (स्थूल अर्थ) and the former or mental impression is called the subtle object (सूक्ष्म अर्थ). But besides the object there is the mind that perceives it. It follows that mind has two aspects in one of which it is the perceiver and in the other, the perceived in the form of the mental formation (वृत्ति) which in creation precedes its outer projection, and after creation follows as the impression produced in the mind by the sensing of a gross physical object. The mental impression and the physical object exactly correspond, for the physical object is in fact but a projection of the cosmic imagination, though it has the same reality as the mind has, no more and no less. The mind is thus the cogniser (आक्षेप) and the cognised (आक्षेप), revealer (प्रकाशक) and the revealed (प्रकाश), and denoter (वाचक) and the denoted (वाच्य). When the mind perceives an object it is transformed into the shape of that object. So the mind which thinks of the Divinity it worships (इष्टदेवता) is at length, through continuous devotion, is transformed into the likeness of that Devatā. By allowing the Devatā thus to occupy the mind for long it becomes as pure as the Devatā. This is the
fundamental principle of Tāntrik Sādhanā or religious practice. The object perceived is called अर्थ, a term which comes from the root "अर्थ" which means to get, to know, to enjoy. Artha is that which is known and which therefore is an object of enjoyment. The mind as Artha that is the form of the mental impression is an exact reflection of the outer object or gross Artha. As the outer object is Artha so is the interior subtle mental form which corresponds to it. That aspect of the mind which cognizes is called शब्द or name (नाम) and that aspect in which it is its own object or cognized is called Artha or रूप (form). The outer physical object, of which the latter is an impression, is also an Artha or Rūpa, and spoken speech is the outer Shabda. The mind is thus, from the Mantra aspect, Shabda and Artha, terms corresponding to the Vedantic Nāma and Rūpa or concepts and concepts objectified. Mind as Shabda is power (Shakti) the function of which is to distinguish and identify.

Any form can be pierced by the mind, and union may be had therein with the Devetā who is at its core. It matters not what that form may be. And the reason is that all is Shakti and all is consciousness. We desire to think and speak. This is इच्छाशक्ति. We think and know. This is ज्ञानशक्ति. We make an effort towards realization. This is क्रियाशक्ति. Through प्राणवाक्य, another form of Shakti, we speak; and the word we speak is Shakti संवृतप्रकाश. For what is a letter (वर्ण) which is made into syllables and (पद) and sentences (वाक्य)? It may be heard in speech, thus affecting the sense of hearing. It may be seen as a form in writing. It may be felt tactually by the blind through the perforated dots of the Braille type. The same thing
thus affecting the various senses. But what is the thing that does so? The senses are Shakti and so is the objective form which evokes the sensation. Both are in themselves Shakti as Chit-Shakti and the *स्वरूप* of these is Consciousness. When, therefore, a Mantra is realized, when there is what is called in the *Shastra* शयनविद्या, what happens is the union of consciousness of the *साधक* with that Consciousness which manifests in the form of Mantra. It is union which makes Mantra "work."

A Mantra is not the same thing as prayer, though some Mantras also constitute prayers like the celebrated Gāyatrī. Prayer is conveyed in what words the *साधक* chooses. Any set of letters is not Mantra. Only that is Mantra in which the Devatā has revealed His or Her particular aspects, can reveal that aspect, and is therefore the Mantra of that one of His or Her particular aspects. The relations of letters (क्रम), whether vowel or consonants, Nāda and Bindu, in a Mantra, indicate the appearance of Devatā in different forms. Certain Vibhūti or aspects of the Devata are inherent in certain Varna but perfect Shakti does not appear in any but a whole Mantra. Mantra is thus a particular sound form (क्रम) of the Brahman, Shabda Brahman or Saguna Brahman in individual bodies. The produced Shabda is an aspect of the Jīva's vital Shakti (Kundalini). Kundalini is the Shakti who gives life to the Jīva. She is who in the Mūlādhāra charkra (or basal bodily centre) is the cause of the sweet, indistinct, and murmuring ध्वनि, which is compared to the humming of a black bee. Thence Dhwani originates and first being Parā gradually manifests upwards as पद्यन्ति, मध्यमा, and वैशारी, as described above. Just as in the outward space
waves of sound are produced by movements of air so in the space within the Jiva’s body waves of sound are said to be produced according to the movements of the vital air (प्राणवात्) and the process of in and out breathing. As the Swarūpa of Kundalini, in whom are all sounds, is Paramātmā, so the substance of all Mantra, Her manifestation, is Consciousness manifesting as letters and words. In fact the letters of the Alphabet which are called Akśhara are nothing but the Yantra of the Akśhara or Imperishable Brahman. This is however realized by the śākhā when his Shakti generated by śākṣa is united with Mantra-Shakti. Kundalini, who is extremely subtle, manifests in gross (स्थूल) form in different aspects as different Devatās. It is the gross form which is the presiding Deity (अभिधात्री देवता) of a Mantra, though it is subtle form, at which all Sādhakas aim. Mantra and Devatā are thus one and particular forms of Brahman as विन्यासिके. Therefore the Shastra says that “They go to Hell who think that image (idol as it is called) is but a stone and the Mantra merely the letters of the Alphabet.”

A Mantra consists of certain letters arranged in definite sequence of sound of which the letters are the representative signs. To produce the designed effect, the Mantra must be intoned in the proper way according to both sound (वर्ण) and rhythm (स्तंभ); for these reasons a Mantra ceases to be such when translated and becomes a mere sentence. By Mantra the sought for Devatā appears and by success (विनिश्चित) therein vision is had of the three worlds. As the Mantra is in fact Devatā by practice thereof this is known and no amount of theoretical knowledge will do. Not merely do the rhythmical vibrations of the
sheaths of the worshipper but therefrom the image of the Devatā appears, as the बुद्धगंधर्वतःङ्ग says (ch. V):

चूषण देविः प्रवर्गाभिः विजानाः देवस्र्पताश्च
मन्त्रिचारणसङ्ग देवरुपे अजायते

मन्त्रिचारणसङ्ग is the ability to make a Mantra efficacious and to gather its fruit, in which case the साधक is मन्त्रिचारणसङ्ग. As the आपांतकाविनी says (619) “whatever the साधक desires that he surely obtains.” Whilst therefore prayer may end in merely physical sound, Mantra is ever, when rightly said, a potent compelling force, a word of power effective to produce both material gain and accomplish worldly desires, as also to promote the four aims of sentient beings (चतुर्वेदी), Adwaitic knowledge, and liberation. And thus it is said that सिद्ध or success is the certain result of Japa or recitation of Mantra.

We should see in brief what the meaning of वीजमन्त्र is by an example. In the first place the reader will observe that the common ending “इ” or “मू” which represent Sanskrit breathings known as नाद and बिन्दु or चंद्रविन्दु. These have the same meaning in all, They are the Shaktis of that name appearing in the table of 36 Tattvas. They (इ और मू) are states of Divine power immediately preceding the manifestation of the objective universe. The other letters denote subsequent developments of Shakti, and various aspects of Devatā. For example take the great सुखेश्वरी or मायाबीज “दृष्ट” From the Tantrik compendium आपांतकाविनी we get the following explanation. दृष्ट is इ + र + इ + ह + ह is Shiva. र is Shakti. ह is माधामाया. And ह is, as above stated, is नाद, the progenitrix of the universe, and बिन्दु, which is the Brahman, is described for the साधक as the Dispeller of sorrow. The meaning therefore of this वीजमन्त्र is that the Devi in her Turiya or
transcendental state is नाद and ब्रह्म and is the causal body manifesting as शिवालिङ्ग in the form of the manifested universe. Other ब्रह्मांश्चś like “क्रिया” and “क्रिय्या” have similar explanations. Such is in short the scientific basis and explanation of a Mantra and its Power.

After explaining the scientific basis which underlies the मंत्र and मंत्रोपयोग and which is to be realized by careful and assiduous practice we now proceed how the मंत्र, as the eighth आवरण, is laid down as a religious exercise for spiritual culture.

* The only मंत्र of the Lingayats is “तमः शिवाय” and is called पंक्षांकोपन्य on account of its having five syllables. With श्री prefixed to it becomes श्रीकोपन्य. The मंत्र is expressive of Shiva and on that account is identical with Shiva, just as a predicate is identical with the subject. This is explained very well in—

\[
\text{अर्थशास्त्राणि हेतुः परमात्मा मस्त्रारः।}
\]

\[
\text{तत्स्च वाचकमंत्रः अथ धर्ममन्त्रकारणम्॥}
\]

\[
\text{तत्स्चाधिपत्यमंत्रः पूर्वमिथयम् सः स्वतः।}
\]

\[
\text{अभिधिगांधिष्यत्वानंत्राःसिद्धः परः शिवः॥}
\]

परिशिब, the परवर्तन, is the source of all Tattvas. The two letters “शिब” include and express all the tattvas as is stated in the commentary by महेश्वरदास on the second श्रीक quoted above. The commentary is as follows:-

\[
\text{अर्थ मंत्रः तत्स्च शिववस्य अभिधिवानमंत्रः नामो मंत्रः इत्यः। सः शिवः आभि-}
\]

\[
\text{वेषवश तन्मन्त्र्यात्मिषानु योगव स्वतः। अभिधिगांधिष्यवात् शिवाधिबानाभि-}
\]

\[
\text{वेषवात्। मंत्रःदस्यामयात्। परः शिवः सिद्धः। प्रकाशः। मन्त्राणां वज्ञानेवद्विता}
\]

\[
\text{प्रकाशः वेषवात्। मंत्रः। तत्स्च स्ववस्य वेषवात्। किं ताष्ट्रकेती नार्दङ्कनीर्वर्ष शिववस्य}
\]

\[
\text{सक्कलः वेषवात्। तत्स्च कालाधिकारणवत् तद्वित्यवश वाचार्यमयात्। शुकमिति। तत्स्च सक्कलमंत्र-}
\]

\[
\text{सूतवात्। तत्स्च शास्त्रावलिमितिः। तत्स्च शास्त्रावलिमितिः।}
\]

\[
\text{कुत्वैः।}
\]

* The following is based on विभातिशिखामणि chap. VIII. 2–66
Moreover Shiva is वैद्यकांसार, that is, the Highest Spiritual Principle and the pith that the Vedas and Vedangas teach, as is maintained in—

विलित्वसालं नासित यथा तर्कालें महत् ।
तथा विद्वसार्थि मंलीषानां महत् ॥

“शिव एको चिन्द्र:” इसविष्ठुः विद्वसालं परं व्यतिरिक्तं महत् ब्रह्म तर्कालें नासित ।
तथा विद्वसार्थि मंलीषां नमः शिवभाजिति विद्वसार्थिमंलीषां महत् \ मेंतार्थि नासित इत्यः ।

विद्वसार्थि महत्त्वस्तक्का चिन्दराशीनि सुति ।
तथा विद्वसार्थि तस्या शिव इसविष्ठस्वम् ॥

इति पौराणिकोत्त: शिव इसविष्ठस्वम वेदसार्थि तत्र अकार्य स्वभाव- चक्रहरस्वताः, तथो: अकार्यस्वताः, इसविष्ठस्वम चक्रहरस्वताः, तथः विद्वसार्थि मंलीषां भस्म।
Hence the नम्न expresses the Highest Principle and the devotee's devotion to it is needed. The नम्न containing the devotee's देवेन्द्रतत्त्व also expresses the identity of the Jiva or Anga (the devotee), which identity is the ultimate goal of the Anga as is explained in:—

नमः श्रेद्वन्द्वुद्य शिवाय तत: परः।
नमः वनचालो देव श्रेगुदातिप्रयोगः॥

शिवजीवोपलकाशाय नमः श्रेद्वुद्यक्षेत्रवेल च वनचालस्वयं श्रेगुदातिप्रयोगः। धनु मनोहरः अत्तिमाति। अन्तः नमस्कृत्व श्रीवर्धनेन परमहम्मेद्व आकृतिक्षणं अग्नितत्वति चात्मार्थि स्वाभ:।

Thus नमः expresses Anga, that humbly surrenders itself by his salutation to शिव, the देवता (देवेन्द्रतत्त्व), and अन्तः expresses the यामस्त्रु or essential identity of Shiva and leads Jiva to the ultimate end. The नमः, therefore, leads to the development of Jiva's Power within him and to the gradual expansion of his soul, which in the end restores the Anga to its natural and original condition, namely शिवजीव. The नमः again expresses the Pentads that constitute the देवाकार as may be known from:—

अथ किमनं कर्तव्यं कि फलाभान्त द्वादशस्य चक्रमाह ॥
तत्साद्वः प्रहारणो ताम्रस्य दिविग्रिनिद्राधारः।
यथानादिर्महादेव: सिद्ध: यंप्रार्थो चवकः।
तथा वनचालो मनः: संघारक्षकारः॥
नमः मनः: शिवश्रुतं संघारक्षकारक्षणं विश्वार्गविवं च तदद्वास किमिल्लाह ॥

पंचमुत्तनि समाणिपंच तथानुसाराणि च।
श्राद्धित्वाणि पंचानि पंचबद्धित्वाणि च॥
पंचमृत्वाणि पंचाणि क्लेशाणि सहकाराणि:।
बोध्याणि पंचशिविवेणि: पंचस्तरसहायानि:॥
The practice of the श्लोक therefore leads to salvation or Moksha.

With श्लोक prefixed to it the श्लोक becomes प्रणवमीन्द्रन (of six syllables). श्लोक is प्रणव and expresses परिशिव as is said in—

प्रणवेषेकप्रेणेन प्रश्नेषु प्रकाशयते
अद्वितीयं परार्तं शिवाय निष्प्रपपचकम्

व्याख्यानम्—"सिवेन परात्र शुभं निलं सवेयमवचम्" इति शवागमोक्ते; शिवाय, परार्तं सिवं स्यद्वक्षणं, अद्वितीयं "एकोभावादितिमिति" शुष्के: द्वितीयाः नेनानात्किष्ठनं "इति शुष्के: निष्प्रपपचकम्", अत एव प्राप्तिकृतमेव्युथं, परं प्रश्नेषु प्रणवेषेकप्रेणेन प्रणवदेवैवचर्यं, प्रकाश्यते प्रणुष्टितेऽपि; प्रणवशीलमृत-व्याकोलकारस्य सचिवालयं चचकत्त्रादिति।

श्लोक is made up of अ, इ, ए; and the three express the trinity of powers (इच्छा, स्नान, कृपा), which are in turn identical with तत्र, चित्र, and आदि, the three positive qualities of परब्रह्म according to वैदांति. The three powers are the three creative onorgies. The energy (नाद) in वाद्यवत्तव springs from शिव-शक्ति-तत्त्व and solidifies itself (चतुर्वत्तित) as the creative power of the Lord (ऋषि or इश्वरवत्तव) manifesting in the trinity of creative energies. ओम then stands for the most general aspect of that that is the source of all, namely, परिशिव.

The प्रणवादिति (नमःशिवाय) is but an extensol for श्लोक, i.e. श्लोक elaborates or explicatś itself in the form of "नमः शिवाय". This is stated in—

नमः शिवाय तत्त्वादिति दंड उच्यते
तत्त्वां ऋषिकारश्च चतुर्वितिति दंड उच्यति
प्रणवो दर्पणाङ्कर घर्ष ऊपितिस्ववचकम्
नकारात्त्वाकारणं सकारो दंड उच्यति
सिवार: कृपाशारा भक्तिसाराः
सिवार: प्रणवाराः
Thus शिव और नम: शिवाय are one and the same and express परशुर. The six syllables of the मंत्र (नम: शिवाय शिव) are identical with the six Lingas and the six Chakras. Thus न is आचार्यङ्ग in the आचार्यङ्ग; म is पुराणिंग in the स्वाधिशालान्क; सी is शिवालिङ्ग in the मणिशर्सक; य is वर्षालिङ्ग in the अनाहतक; वि is श्रीशालिङ्ग in the विद्वान्तक; and lastly शिव is महालिङ्ग in the आशाचक. So it is said—एवं न नमःशिवायेति पंचाश्रयणी आचार-गुह-शिव-चर-प्रभालिङ्गचार्याश्रयणि। ओऽकारी महालिङ्गाचार्यां जामिति वीरमुख-र्युपावर्यंचार्य एवं बश्चुश्रीजामितिजान्त्यायं। The वीरमुखाः rouse the Shaktis in the form of the six कलाः of the शक्ति. The कलाः thus roused ultimately develop into primeval Power of परशुर and at-one-ment or आसर्व is the result. Hence the practice of मंत्र is laid down for the attain-ment of Moksha.

The practice of मंत्र is said to be superior to the practices laid down by वर्णाधमस्याः. It is therefore, re-marked:—

पंचाश्रयं समुदायः पुण्य तिंगे विनिष्ठित ते।
वस्त्रात सा श्रायस्यार्यो श्रीशक्तिमलिंगे॥
अत्तिर्यत्र वशस्यो बद्र यज्ञाय बहुदशिङ्गे।।
पंचाश्रयंपयाते कोम्यस्वेनाय नो चमा॥

This is मंत्रगोम of the Lingayat religion, which, rejecting other मंत्राः of the Shākta religion, lays vast store by the only मंत्र, by the practice of which the highest end of the human beings, the Moksha, is attained. By the practice of different Shākta Mantras a variety of success (शिव्विधि) is attained. But such शिव्विधि feeds the human vanity and is very likely to deflect the practitioner from the straightforward course and the main objective of शेष. The variety of success is very likely to lead the human beings into the abuse of
the power attained. Hence to avoid such likelihood the Lingayats have retained the only one मंच्र which enables the devotee the expansion of self into utimate at-one-ment with परशिव or Linga called लिङ्गांग्रामस्य.

(3) षट्स्थल.

Now we come to षट्स्थल, the treatment and explana- nation of which is the most difficult and heaviest work. It is the technique of the religious practice of Lingayat- tism, which is Shivayoga for regaining the lost or veiled identity of Anga and Linga, which are one and the same essentially but have now come to appear separate by the operation of माया (अमोकाया). We must first see what Yoga means and what Shivayoga is, for the practice of which षट्स्थल is the technique.

The word "Yoga" comes from the root "जो" to join or unite and means "union with", if the nature of the human spirit is held to be separate from the Divine Spirit, as is held by Dwaita or Vishishtâdwaita Schools. In its spiritual sense it also means the method or process by which the individual spirit is merged in the Divine Spirit, if the former is held to be one with the latter, as is held by the Adwaita Schools. As according to Shaktivishishtâdwaita, with which alone we are con- cerned, this latter position is affirmed, Yoga means the process, by which the identity of the two जीव and शिव, which identity ever exists in fact but is now lost temporarily, is restored by the Yogi, the practitioner of Yoga. It is restored because the spirit is pierced through the veil (the three मलास and the five कंजुक्स) of माया, which as mind and matter obsures this knowledge of itself. In the case of monistic schools Yoga in the
sense of final union is inapplicable, as such union implies dualism of Divine Spirit and human spirit. Yoga, therefore, means appropriately the process for regaining the temporarily lost identity (in the case of monistic schools) of the Divine Spirit and the human spirit.

Yoga is both a science and an art and has been briefly treated first in भेत्तात्वरोपिणिष्ठ. Later it came to be treated at length in the Agamas and the Tantras. There a special part, called पाद, is devoted to Yoga as a method of attaining liberation; and the method or path of Yoga followed by devotees is named आन्तर्गत, the supreme or the Royal Road. But Yoga as a Science and an art was brought into prominence by Patanjali. Thereafter Yoga became one of the six Shastras of Indian philosophy. Patanjali defines Yoga as ‘ज्ञानसमर्थ’ or suppression of the functions or activity of mind. Mind, by the suppression of its functions, becomes quiet or still; and then the soul behind the mind is seen in its majesty. The quietude or complete stillness of the mind effects the destruction of the veil and the soul becomes free from the entanglements of matter, of which mind is a distinct part. According to all schools of Indian philosophy or religious systems mind is material, though very subtle, subtler than ज्ञान or ether. Soul, the Universal Soul, comes to be entangled with matter and becomes ignorant of its majesty and universality. The entanglement is due to the working of अभ्रोमाण्य in the course of the evolution of the universe. Mind is matter and unintelligent but seems to be intelligent, because behind it there is the intelligent or
conscious soul. Mind is only the instrument in the hands of the soul standing behind the mind. Soul is like the bottom of a lake and matter in the form of mind is like water that fills the lake. The bottom of a lake cannot be seen when it is covered over with the waves of water. It is only possible to catch a glimpse of the bottom when its waves have subsided and the water is pure and calm. If the water is muddy and agitated all the time the bottom of the lake will not be seen. In the same way the self is the bottom, चित्त or mind is the water and the waves are the functions of the mind; and when the functions are suppressed the lake becomes calm and the soul will be seen in all its majesty and purity. Yoga aims at stilling or calming the mind, so that the soul behind it is seen i.e. liberation is attained. The necessity of quietening the mind for liberation is expressed in words “चित्तचित्ति चंभारो निधि भेष मेंक एव च.” So शिवबोध, like any other form or variety of Yoga aims at bringing about “चित्रशिक्षितनिर्मिति” by harnessing or disciplining the mind. Yoga, indeed, means the Yoga of the mind.

* Definite is the plan of the Almighty, the Universal Soul, in evolving the universe. The laws by which the solar system is built go to the building of man. The laws by which the self unfolds his powers in the universe from the fire-mist up to the Logos, are the same laws of consciousness, which repeat themselves in the universe of man, the microcosm. If we understand them in the one we understand them in the

* In connection with the two following paras the verse I-43 of बिद्वेशविश्वासलिपि and the commentary thereon quoted on page 455 above are to be noted.
other. When we grasp them in the large the small is intelligible to us. The great unfolding from the stone to the God goes on through millions of years, through the aeons of time. Embodied in the stone, in the mineral world, the forces of the Universal Consciousness grow and put out a little more of strength and in the mineral world they accomplish their unfolding. They then become too strong for the mineral world and press on into the vegetable world. There they unfold more and more of their divinity, until they become too mighty for the vegetable world and develop into animals. Expanding within and gaining experience from the animals they appear as human beings. In the human beings they still grow and accumulate with ever increasing force and exert greater pressure against the barriers; and then out of the human being they press into superhuman. Thus man has behind him the whole of the forces accumulated in this human evolution; and it is the accumulation of these forces that enable him to make the passage upward towards divinity rapidly. The laws of the evolution of consciousness in the universe are exactly the same as the laws of Yoga. The laws and the principles, whereby consciousness unfolds itself in the great evolution of humanity, are the same principles and are taken in Yoga and deliberately applied to the more rapid unfolding of our own consciousness until it regains its universality. The self in us is the same as the Universal Self. Whatever powers are manifested throughout the world those powers exist in germ, in latency, in us. As human beings we have climbed up that long ladder, which separates the present outer form of the Deity in us from his own
form in the dust. The manifest deity sleeps in the stone and the minerals. He becomes more unfolded in vegetables, animals and lastly in man. He has reached what appears as His culmination to ordinary men. With the consciousness so far unfolded it does and should not seem impossible that it should further unfold in the future into the Divine. Yoga then may be defined as the rational application of the laws of the unfolding of consciousness self-applied in an individual case.

The human intelligence may quicken natural processes enormously. The distinction between "natural" and "rational" (because "rational" is also "natural") is a real one for all practical purposes, because human intelligence can guide the working of natural laws. The farmer or gardener cannot transcend the laws of nature; nor can he work against them. He has no other laws of nature to work with save the universal laws by which nature is evolving forms round us and yet he does in a few years what nature takes, perhaps, hundreds and thousands of years to do. And how? By applying human intelligence to choose the laws that serve him, and to neutralize the laws that hinder. He brings the divine intelligence in man to utilize the divine powers in nature, that are working for general rather than for particular ends. For instance let us take the breeder of pigeons. Out of the blue rock-pigeons he develops the pouter or the fantail; he chooses out, generation after generation, the forms that show the most strongly the peculiarity that he wishes to develop. He mates such birds together, takes every favourable circumstance into consideration, and selects again and again; and so on and on, till the peculiarity that he
wants to establish has become a well-marked feature. Remove his controlling intelligence, leave the birds to themselves, and they revert to the ancestral type. So is it in the application of the laws of psychology that is called Yoga. Systematized knowledge of the unfolding of consciousness applied to the individualized Self. Hence the wouldbe Yogi, choosing out his objects, finds in the world exactly the things he wants to make his Yoga a real, a vital thing, a quickening process for the knowledge of self. We must then take it that Yoga is within our reach, within our powers, and that even some of the lower practices of Yoga, some of the simpler applications of the laws of the unfolding of consciousness to ourselves, will benefit us in this world. For we are really merely quickening our growth, our unfolding, taking advantage of the powers that nature has put into our hands. If we take in this light, it seems that Yoga will be to us a far more real and practical thing; Shivayoga of Lingayat religion is demonstrative of that.

According to the difference of stand-point and method of approach for attaining the objective Yoga is variously hailed as मंत्रयोग, लघुयोग, इत्योग, राजयोग and lastly शिवयोग. शिवयोगप्रदीपिका says therefore:

मंत्रो लघो इत्यो राजयोगब्रैमितिविममिता ।
तमाहुः पूर्वसुनवः विद्यः विधवानेतिदिता॥ I—4.

Here the author mentions only four kinds of Yoga; but later he brings in शिवयोग in connection with राजयोग as follows, after noting the nature and special character of the four forms of Yoga mentioned above:

* शिवयोगप्रदीपिका—I, 5-16.
Now we must note briefly the nature and special character of the different forms of Yoga before proceeding further.

'(1) Mantrayoga—We have already noted at some length the basic philosophy of Mantras and their use. The cardinal principle of all forms of Mantras is the attainment of the ultimate mystic communion of the individual Jiva with
the Universal Self with the help of continuous silent recitation of or meditation upon some specific Mantra, a mystical suggestive incantation or a sacred formula. The Mantra may consist of a single syllable or more than one syllable, sometimes words (or even sentences) symbolising profound philosophic principles or standing for nothing but mere sounds. By believing and concentrating upon the meaning of the Mantra the Yogi actually becomes liberated from the shackles of the world and attains the godhead, for which the Mantra stands. Most of the famous Mantra-yoga Schools are out of favour and have almost always been disregarded by Indian philosophy as such. Still an important section of Indian thought, which is now gradually rising into prominence in the form of Tantras, or 'Shaiva' and Shâkta Agamas, was wholly occupied with this mystical and mysterious side of Yoga. The Budhist Shingo School also adhered to some such thing. They held that all exoteric doctrines are but symbols of the hidden esoteric teachings which are only revealed to the initiated.

(2) शक्ति-शाक्त is कुंडलिनी of the Shâkta school and its philosophy, * "Shortly stated, Energy (Shakti) polarises itself into two forms, namely, static or potential (Kundalini) and dynamic (the working force of the body as Prâna). Behind all activity there is a static background. This static centre in the human body is the central Serpent Power in the Mûlâdhâr (Root support). It is the Power which is static support (Adhâra) of the whole body and all its moving Prânik forces. This centre (Kendra) of Power is a gross form of Chit (Consciousness); i.e., in itself (swarûpa) it is Consciousness; and by appearance it is

* Shakti and Shâkta, pp. 650, 651.
a-Power which, as the highest form of force, is a manifestation of it. Just as there is a distinction (though identical at base) between the supreme quiescent Consciousness and its active Power (Shakti), as when Consciousness manifests as Energy (Shakti), it possesses the twin aspect of potential and kinetic Energy. There can be no partition in fact of Reality. To the perfect eye of the Siddha, the process of Becoming is an ascription (Adhyāsa). To the imperfect eye of the Sādhaka, i.e. the aspirant for Siddhi (perfected accomplishment), to the spirit which is still toiling through the lower planes and variously identifying itself with them, Becoming is tending to appear and appearance is real.

The Śbākta Tantra is a rendering of Vedantic Truth from this practical point of view, and represents the world-process as a polarization in Consciousness itself. This polarity as it exists in, and as, the body is destroyed by Yoga which disturbs the equilibrium of bodily consciousness, which consciousness is the result of the maintenance of these two poles. In the human body the potential pole of Energy which is the Supreme Power is stirred to action, on which the moving forces (dynamic Shakti) supported by it are drawn thereto, and the whole dynamism thus engendered moves upward to unite with the quiescent Consciousness in the Highest Lotus (Sahasrār Chakra or the cerebrum). In brief it means that the Power, lying dormant at the basic plexus, is roused and made to ascend through the spinal column, piercing through the five chakras or plexuses (five exclusive of the basic plexus) during its ascent, ultimately to attain union with the Highest Consciousness in the Sahasrār (the cerebrum). This is लय or mergence of जीवनशक्ति with शिव in the head,
(3) **इड्ड्योग:** — इड्ड्योग is very closely allied with all other forms of Yoga but is also opposed fundamentally to them in its technique. The aim of this Yoga, in common with others, is ultimate attainment of समाधि or trance where the individuality of the Jiva disappears with the all-blissful state of the Universal Consciousness, which is free from all afflictions, the Supreme Light. Some think that this is a means to राज्योग.

It differs from other forms of Yoga in respect of the emphasis laid on the physical side in the Yoga discipline. As a matter of fact इड्ड्योग is rigorous in physical discipline. It is generally considered to be a method of forcing concentration by means of very hard physical exercises, penances, fasts and mortifications of diverse kinds in food sleep etc. इड्ड्योग means Yoga by resolve and the word itself is so significant. It is derived from इ and ड which respectively mean इदानि and Pingalā, the left and right sympathetic nerves; and इड्ड्योग means the joining of the two with द्यनुम्ना or the spinal column by means of suspending breath (**प्राणासायन**). All systems of Yoga agree in holding that there is close relation between प्राण and मनः ('mind and breath') It is an axiom with them "control the प्राण which is not merely breath but the very life-principle best expressed by breath) and the mind is brought under restraint." It may be said to imply partly the well known principle of William James that bodily states are determinants of mental states. Body controls the mind very much. And, therefore, if the body is purified the mind also is purified. If the body is fully at ease mind is in great relief. Our subtle body, which is mind in the Western sense, can be affected only through the gross
body, as the mind is intangible and is, therefore, beyond human control except through the control of the gross body. Thus purification of the body (देहपूर्ण is the main object of this Yoga. देहपूर्ण is technically called पद्धति. According to this Yoga शुद्धि or the sixfold practice of धौति, वास्तन, परि, नालित, क्षेत्रतित and क्षेत्रतमत, is essential for the देहपूर्ण. All these are noted in the commentary of शिबशेत्रप्रदर्शित्र. The body then becomes healthy and steady by the practice of Asanas (postures) and Mudras. After this, exercises in breathing and mental discipline are laid down, so that the practitioner of Yoga attains ecstasy.

Some yogins say that देहपूर्ण is merely a course of physical discipline. They maintain that postures, breath-control, glandular and intestinal exercises are the only four essential things of this Yoga. They hold that Asanas make the body light and healthy; breath-control removes all dirt or foreign matter (मल) that accumulates in the nervous system. It is owing to this accumulation that the body is subject to so many ailments. It is also said unequivocally that the technique suits differently to different individuals. Hence only those, that suffer from abnormal and disturbed conditions of the humours of the body (चाल, परि, क्षेत्र), are required to seek the aid of the sixfold practice. But झङ्कुहङ्क्य maintains that breath-control alone is sufficient to remove all the impurities of the body.

After all is said, हास्योग cannot but be regarded as a preliminary procedure for the success in all forms of Yoga. In fact the body being the basis of the mind, has to be purified and made healthy to attain mental tranquillity. हास्योग undertakes to make the body strong and healthy to enable the practitioners of Yoga fit for long and undisturbed meditation.
(4) राजयोगः—राजयोग is generally identified (specially by Swāmī Vivekananda) with the Yogashāstra of Patanjali, which is the first systematized form of Yoga both as a science and an art. But the ultimate end to be reached is कैलायोग or complete isolation of पुनः from प्रकृति according to Pātanjala Yoga. Later on all Vedantic schools adopted this Yoga with certain variations in details of practice for the attainment of the objectives peculiar to their Schools. It is, therefore, necessary to know something of this पातेज्ज्योगः.

For attaining कैलायोग परितन्तः prescribes a long course of eightfold steps, which has given to it a distinctive name of अद्वैतयोगः. First of all he makes it compulsory to observe faithfully some moral and social rules (यम and नियम), which enable a practitioner to adapt himself to the social surroundings. The second step (नियम) consists of certain personal rules of conduct which are intended to turn his mind from worldly attachment to facilitate ultimate success. Then follows a course of exercises in posture (आसन) and breath-control (प्राणायाम). They qualify the practitioner for the complete relaxation of the body and mind so that he may be able to practise meditation unperturbed. It is only after these fourfold practices the true Yoga begins. After this the student has to practise withdrawal of his mind from the objects that attract the mind through sense-organs. He takes some time to withdraw his mind from the sense-objects and stick to meditation. Such a withdrawal is called विक्षाह्य. Then he has to concentrate his attention upon a particular object. This is called धारणा. Thereafter he should meditate on the object continua-2-68
ously until he reaches the rapturous stage of meditation called शमान्तिः. This final stage of शमान्तिः is of two kinds, शंयन्तिः, in which the Yogi knows the truth in its entirety and अशंयन्तिः, in which he is face to face with the Real-Self, quite untouched, unaffected by and detached from all worldly affairs that cause misery and grief. After this the Yogi lives in peace in the world and no longer troubled by sorrows and anxiety. He becomes dispassionate (विरक्त or वैराग्यवान्) and his mind attains equilibrium.

Such is in brief the description of the Yogic discipline of Patanjali’s Yogashâstra. His main objective is complete concentration of the mind. And the alternative methods suggested by him like जीत्रयाविधान, यात्राभिरत्त्वान etc. are a means to the main objective namely, विषयविविषितिभूत्वा.

Patanjali’s course requires a strict mental discipline in addition to a hard physical culture. It seems probable that later Yogins tried to find out easier methods and more suitable courses. Some of them adhered to some one of the above secondary devices and developed it into a complete technical course by itself; and the variety of Yogic Schools was the effect. Such of those as could not stand strict physical course seem to have devoted themselves to several other mental disciplines and developed other independant schools with minor changes in the technique or new combinations of old ones. And the result seems to be अक्षयेय, ज्ञात्वेय, and कर्मयोग,over and above राजैयोग, suited to a man of intellectual temperament. राजैयोग in reality lays greater stress on the last four angas of Patanjali’s योगशास्त्र, viz. भद्दाहार, त्यात्,
In order to establish the supremacy of the mind over the body. If mind is concentrated on a particular object, it comes automatically to be restrained and the body also becomes calm and steady to some extent. आक्षण and प्राण्याधाम are only a help in prolonging the state of meditation and also in guarding against disturbances both inside and outside. राजयोग thus came to be a means of liberation and union with the Highest Soul by physical discipline and mental tranquillity.

The author of शिवयोगपञ्चरीतिका describes in the first verse (quoted above) मंत्रयोग, in the second व्ययोग, in the third हठयोग and in the forth राजयोग. In the fifth he declares that राजयोग to be the best of the four; in the sixth, seventh and eighth he states the three sub-divisions of राजयोग and describes them; and lastly he asserts that राजयोग is the king of Yogas and therefore it is राजयोग. In the tenth he says that practically there is no difference between राजयोग and शिवयोग. But still in order to remove confusion and facilitate the practice of शिवयोग by Shaivas and specially by Veerashaivas or Lingayats he states in the eleventh verse the nature and character of शिवयोग. In the last verse he says that except by worship of Shiva by शिवयोग there is no salvation. बस्वाराध्य, the commentator of शिवयोगपञ्चरीतिका, in his commentary (on I-14) describes the three sub-divisions of राजयोग and states the difference between शिवयोग and राजयोग and also states why शिवयोग is superior to राजयोग. The translation of the commentary (which is in Kanarese) is as follows:—If asked what is the difference between शिवयोग and राजयोग, the answer is that realization of the three Gunas, in accordance with Pātanjala Yoga, is तारकयोग.
(संबन्धयोग being described as the realization of the twenty-five principles of the संबन्ध philosophy). The mergeance of mind in भूति is अमन्तः. And realization of दुःख as being altogether different from भूति, (and the consequent isolation of the two) which is meant for the enjoyment of दुःख, is राजयोग. राजयोग, therefore, cannot compare with विवयोग. The answer to the question "what is विवयोग" is that the attainment of at-one-ment with विवत्तब, the Universal Soul, through devotion to विव, is विवयोग. The at-one-ment follows the mergeance of mental functions into शक्तित्व after the knowledge of the three Gurus, which results from the rousing of इंडिनी. This is in accordance with what is said in—

Before we proceed further to note the nature and character of विवयोग fully in all details and to explain the पर्यथा as the technique and means of विवयोग, we think it necessary to note and describe the meaning of the suppression of mental functions (विवत्तमिनियोग) and how it enables the practitioner to attain his objective. We therefore, attempt here to note this briefly. In the first place it is necessary for us to understand the close connection between the three, namely, the knower knowledge, and the known (i.e. object). They cannot be separated. Whenever there is one of the three the other two automatically arise into consciousness, though not so prominently as the one. These three are called विपुः (the group of the three). The relation of the knower (subject) and the known (object) is called the subject-object relation. But the subject and the object entirely hang on knowledge, which is therefore,
the connecting link between the two. The subject and object depend on the knowledge so much that ultimately knowledge is the thing, in which the subject and the object merge. Knowledge thus becomes the ultimate truth. This is the Vedantic principle and is well established in—* व्रतमवर्तन्त(शाला)द्वसन(कैम)दात; (शाल)चेति; पदार्थोऽन्तरान्तर, असंविदंस्य सूचिप्रशुभूते तथापि द्वसनाद्यावृणृत्त। द्वसन दातिकविषयमूर्तः द्वसनमिति तम्योऽजृतव्रद्धोऽस्विकाप्यक्षत्वे तत्त्वसृष्टय दातिकविषयवधर्मविविधव्यवः प्रके वस्तुसतसतसम्। द्वसनौऽस्नोळ कालिततस्मा दशिक्षं।।* But in the empirical and experimental science of the present day this is quite lost sight of; and even the subject-object relation is not recognized. All scientific inquiry attempts to form a picture of the world in itself and formulates all its theories or hypotheses on the sense-experience, which implies such a relation. It looks absurd to ignore this relation and try to know the object only, because the knowledge of an object fundamentally involves the subject.

For all of us the easiest thing to understand is the concrete knowledge based on the sense-experience, which is accepted universally as a matter of fact. But though we come into contact with the external world through sense-experience it does not bring home to us the actual nature of the world or the objects in it. For instance an elephant at a great distance from us looks very small; and as he comes nearer and nearer gradually he looks larger and larger and his real huge form is seen when he is just near us. Conversely when the elephant goes farther and farther away from us he looks smaller and smaller until at a great distance he appears very

* अद्वैतार्थम् pp. 3, 4.
small like a calf. This phenomenon is very confusing but after repeated experience we ignore the phenomenon and feel inwardly sure that the size of the elephant at a great distance from us is not really small but as huge as ever. Similarly a polished piece of wood looks very smooth and continuous. But when inspected through a powerful microscope it appears to be quite different. It then looks quite rough and discontinuous. In the same way the planets and stars that move through the space look so tiny. But their actual size is realized by means of a powerful telescope and mathematical calculations. Thus for instance the little star Betelgeuse in the constellation called the "Great Bear" is hardly visible to the naked eye. But it is the great distance, astoundingly great distance, indeed, that gives rise to the erroneous idea that it is a tiny thing. But as a matter of fact the star (Betelgeuse) is so huge, as astronomers tell us, that its diameter is over 200 million miles and can contain in it 12,800,000 suns; the star therefore, is a staggeringly huge thing indeed! In short, distance and location influence our senses and the result of perception is optical illusion. So our senses do not present to us objects in the world and the universe in their actual nature and real form. The conclusion is that things that appear one way to our senses are in fact different from what they appear and that the truth is different from appearance. So also the apparently lifeless piece of wood or stone is composed, as scientists assure us, of minute atoms invisible to the naked eye. The atoms are themselves minute solar systems having protons, the nuclei as central suns
and electrons as the planets. The electrons spin round their axes and revolve at terrific speeds around the nuclei of the atoms. We learn that there exists space between the protons and electrons and between electron and electron in a single atom. Again a space-lattice is said to exist between atoms in a single molecule. It is of such molecules that a piece of wood or stone is composed. The piece of wood or stone, though seemingly inert and dull, is an aggregate of certain minute units which have terrific speeds in them. Such is said to be the actual structure of the whole of the physical universe. This corroborates the statement made (see supra, page 455) in the verse नोत्यत्वन्यांनविलुत्त्वं etc.

We may put implicit faith in the scientist. If not, the scientist will prove his conclusions with the help of the modern scientific instruments. We then begin to doubt the veracity of perceptions by our senses and try to understand the reality of objects in the world. This understanding of the real nature of objects in the world or the universe is due to some superior sense that is in us and may be called the Higher-sense or the Higher-ego; and the real picture of the objects may be called the unit-event. It may also be observed that the self or the sense-ego is the subject; and the ideas of the objects (the sense-word) perceived are its subjective series. Similarly the ideas about the unit-events understood by the Higher sense are the subjective series of the Higher-ego. This ego is the higher inner understanding of the Self and it does not come into contact directly with the objects in the world through the senses. It is this Higher-ego or the higher-sense,
which is not based on the perception and observations and which illumines the critical reasoning and judgment, that construes those apparently little twinkling stars to be extremely gigantic and gives us the picture of heavens of an astronomer or the real nature of the atoms of a physicist. We must now see the relation between the sense-world and Higher-ego.

The sense-world, as seen by us, is seen in a modified form. The modified form of the object perceived by the sense-ego hides, as it were, the real form of the object. And when the real form is manifested to us by some means or other, the modified form is transformed into the real form. This transformation is owing to the Higher-ego and is the subjective series of the Higher-ego. The modified form or the modification of the sense-world is only a representation of the real world to the sense-ego. The picture of the objective series of unit-events, i.e., transformation of the real world point out to the fact, though they cannot demonstrate, that the Highest Reality or Divinity is neither the sense-ego nor the sense-world, neither the Higher-ego or the objective series of unit-events but altogether different from all these. The Highest Reality is unlimited, unconditioned and infinite. The philosopher is not satisfied either with the sense-world or the marvellous picture of the objective series of unit-events. He wishes to soar high into the region beyond the modifications of the series of the sense-ego, as well as the transformations of the Higher-ego. Therein the soul of the philosopher searching for the Reality finds solace and cease in that solace. He then by specific processes tries to go beyond the modifications of the sense-ego and also the
transformations of the Higher-ego along with their correlative worlds. This going beyond is transcendence. The transcendence over the modifications and the transformations is achieved by restraining them. This process of restraining them is Yoga or चित्रणितिसिद्धार्थ. चित्रणितिसिद्धार्थ is the state in which the mind exists or is the mode of mental existence. Mind is always very unsteady and its mode changes from instant to instant. So the mind has countless modes of existence. The modes of mind are like a stream that always flows tumultuously and is always ruffled furiously. They are to be restrained or inhibited. They are to be abolished or reduced into absolute quiescence. The reason for this inhibition is the production of a state which allows the higher sense or mind to pour itself into the lower, so that the lower mind, unruffled and waveless reflects the higher, as a waveless lake reflects the stars. In the quietude of the mind and the tranquillity of the senses a man (Yogi) is enabled to behold the majesty of the Supreme Self; परमाःतत्वम or चर्चतत्त्वम.

It is due to an inner understanding or inner urge, which may be called spiritual or religious, that induces the philosopher or the Yogi to strive for the realization of the Supreme Self. In certain cases the inner urge is extremely intense; and the intensity is such that it arouses an incessant and supreme attitude of Highest Reality, which overwhelms and fills up the entire structure of the subjective series both of the sense-ego and the higher-ego. This attitude permeates and blocks up the entire structure, so that the modifications are naturally restrained and the objective is spontaneously achieved. In the absence of such an intense inner urge the inner understanding can be
made capable of kindling the inner urge by the removal of barriers that render the heart incapable of attuning itself to the proper inner understanding. One has to cultivate the conditions for the growth of the inner understanding by proper discipline, study and experience gained thereby. And then after the dawn of the inner understanding, the modifications of the sense-ego and the transformations of the Higher-ego are restrained by the subtle result of the transformation of the subjective series of the Higher-ego, which forms as it were, the expression of the Highest Reality and which is, as it were, an intermediary between the sense-ego and the Supreme Self. This grand transformation is in fact the outcome of the attitude of the Divine Reality, which is cultivated and is by constant trial maintained either (1) by inaction in the performance of action or कृप्ययोग (2) by love or devotion to the Godhead or भक्त्योग (3) by direct psychic control or कृप्योग (4); by philosophic discrimination or ज्ञानयोग. Yoga in short effects transcendence over sense-ego and Higher-ego, sublimation of the subject and its objects, and the attainment of at-one-ment with the Divinity.

Now about शिवयोग. It is a Yogic process of attaining at-one-ment with Shiva, the Highest Reality. It is defined in the verse (already quoted)—

शाने शिवमर्थ भक्ति चैत्य ध्याने शिवाश्मकः।
शिवमर्थं शिवाश्च शिवयोगं हि पंचचा।

This definition states शिवयोग to be consisting of five elements viz (1) शिवयोग (2) शिवयोग (3) शिवयोग (4) शिवयोग and (5) शिवयोग i.e. शिवयोग. The last is the essential portion of the daily religious or spiritual life of a Lingayat and forms the main or first and foremost character of शिवयोग,
as is made clear by the commentator of बिहारिक वक्तृत्व in words *: "The शिवपूजा, being the chief or primary element of शिवयोग, includes in it the remaining four elements. This is the reason why no Moksha is attained except by शिवपूजा, the author, therefore, proceeds to state—

शिवाचैनविहीनो हि पुष्करेव न भंसयः।
शु संवाचेकेलसिन नान्य परिवर्तिते॥"  

शिवयोग, thus comes to mean शिवपूजा that is to be daily performed once, twice or thrice a day.

When शिवपूजा, inclusive of the other four elements, is closely examined it will be seen that five forms of Yoga are contained in शिवपूजा, viz. मंडयोग, इक्ष्युक्ती or क्रयोग, भक्तियोग, कर्मयोग and ज्ञानयोग. इयोग is also included inasmuch as it is made use of in its elementary form, to subserve the cause of the remaining four forms of Yoga (क्रयोग, भक्तियोग, कर्मयोग, ज्ञानयोग) which form, as it were, four different complementary aspects of शिवयोग, or rather into one of which शिवयोग develops in the course of शिवपूजा performed day after day life-long. The development of शिवपूजा into one of the four forms of Yoga would be the result of one of the four kinds of temperaments of the followers of the religion. Readers might wonder why राजयोग is omitted. But the reason is simple, because there is practically no difference between शिवयोग and राजयोग except for the minute distinction as noted before. It is to be explained how शिवयोग includes or comprises in it the five forms of Yoga (including मंडयोग.)

* The commentator's prefatory note to verse (1-16) as “कं हस्तमयज यज्ञसमुदाय, हरिभणर, चर्मश्रीरण तदां ज्ञान संपन्नां राज्योगे ज्ञानदाताय, हरिभणरैवं मनो सर्वसंपन्नां नित्य भक्तियोगे”
In connection with शिवपूजा readers are reminded of the eight आवरणाः (गुरु, लिंग, जंगम, विभूति, ख्यात्, पादोदक्, प्रसाद, and मंत्र) which are the eight shields or spiritual weapons and are said to be eight auxiliaries of बद्ध्वृक्ष or शिवपूजा in its six steps in the devotee's upward march towards at-one-ment. They are also reminded of how Linga is the object of worship and that there is practically no difference between गुरु, लिंग and जंगम, गुरु and जंगम being equal to Linga as आवरणाः except for the fact that गुरु and जंगम are in the human form. It is also pointed out that गुरु is जंगम and जंगम is गुरु with the only difference that गुरु is confined to a particular locality or area and that he performs the दीक्षा or consecration ceremony of devotees, introduces them into शिवपूजा and guides them on ever and anon in शिव पूजा step by step towards the ultimate goal; while जंगम is an itinerant गुरु that moves about over all the wide area occupied by the community and directs the devotees in any stage of spiritual development. Thus Linga is the object of worship and the remaining five आवरणाः or the five things are to be necessarily used in worship. The use of विभूति and ख्यात् is called विभूतिधारण and ख्यात्धारण; the use of पादोदक and प्रसाद is called चेतन; and मंत्र is used in मंत्रण. This is मंत्रयोग and will be described a little later. अम्बेद्योग comes in when the devotee of the mystic temperament attains to the stage of प्रशादी और प्राणदिगमी. अम्बेद्योग is always there throughout the life-time in the daily worship of Linga, if the devotee is a person of the emotional temperament, कर्मयोग comes in when the devotee comes to the stage of प्रशादी and goes on developing it (कर्मयोग), if the devotee is one of the active temperament. श्लावयोग also is there from the very beginning if the devotee develops शिवज्ञान, if he be of the philosophical temperament. All this will be described in due course.
For Shivapuja, the worship of Shiva, शिवप्राण्य is the first necessity; and the Guru (the preceptor) gives that, at the time of दीप, which is the only religious sacrament (धर्मदहार), performed in a ceremonial way. If is indispensable and performed for introducing the devotee (जन्म) into the secrets of शिवभेद and for teaching him the form and procedure of Linga worship. शिवपुजा is to be performed with feelings of devotion, pure and sincere, all through life-time once, twice or thrice a day. So it is said:

शिवाहां वा द्विकालं बाध्यंकारास्मार्थापि का।
अध्याय गुह्यमार्गं पुजयेत्यथा सिवभेदं॥ वि. प्र. I-37

शिवपुजा and शिवभेद are of two kinds, external and internal the former leading up to the latter gradually. It is, therefore, laid down:

शिवभेदं द्विञ्च ध्ययं मन्त्रं निरूपणं तथा।
आदी क्रममार्गमिर्ग व्याविभयं मार्गस्मे॥
अन्तयोऽलोकं भविष्यन्ति द्विविष्यं तत्क्रियात्तरं।
मुख्या चास्वेतरी पूजा सांग भाष्याचनोदिता॥ वि. प्र. I-31, 38.

In this connection the commentator's explanation is noteworthy. It is *"The meaning is that practice of शिवभेद should begin with the worship and of meditation on the Godhead in some concrete form, inasmuch as the devotee's mind would be unable for the worship of and contemplation of something abstract, as the mind is doubtless deeply enamoured of countless number of sense-objects out of the devotee's innumerable previous births."
The word 'वाक्य' in the second verse quoted above means यज्ञ merely and not sacrifice, in which sense the word is used.

* अद्याय अनुभूतं सर्वाह्नं सम्मागा यज्ञापनं अस्तमन्त्रं ज्योत्सनार्यं व्याविभयं यज्ञायं यज्ञायं सर्वाह्नं अस्तमन्त्रं ज्योत्सनार्यं।
in the Vedic literature. The worship and meditation of Shiva thus necessitates the wearing of Linga (लिंगधारण) on the body. It is also of two kinds, बाळकलिंगधारण and अंतर्कलिंगधारण. The Linga for बाळकलिंगधारण is made of crystals or some other material as stated in:

* स्फुटिके शैलं बारी चंद्रांतरमयं न हि वा।
बारों वा सुरेभूणां वा डिल्लेन्के समाहितं॥

The two kinds of लिंगधारण are also stated in the following:

† परं ज्वन महालिंगम अन्तर्चारीत्तमन्ययमः।
तदेव सर्वंचतानामतिश्चाल्यगिरन्तरः॥
मुलांगारि च हुद्दे भूमणे वर्णादिनामः।
ज्योतिंगम सदा भाद्रं यदीश्चारं वायामः।॥
आधारं हुद्दे वापि भूमदे वा निलुत्तरः।
ज्योतिंगम उदाहरं च बाळकलिंगधारणम्॥
अंतर्चारं बिंदु भिंगमशकः च जय एव वा॥
बारीं च धारणेन्द्रियं तदुपविषित निश्चयतः॥

तद्रूप is explained by the commentator in words "तद्रूपमिति इद्दंश्चलाणि विज्ञानयमहालिङ्गस्मति निश्चयतां चंद्रेऽर्द्धिश्चारं धारणेऽत्।
तद्रूपवाणिं अंतर्चारस्मपुर्वते धारयिदिः॥" The बाळकलिंग is the remembrancer of the अंतर्चार.

The दौष्ट्र ceremony, noted already, is the only religious ceremony of the Lingayats (as of other Shaiva schools) and is the most important, because it is intended for initiating the Anga into शिवसेवा. The importance of and great value attached to it will be known from the following:

§ दौष्ट्रते विनिवेष्यति: क्षीणस्ते च मल्लन्यमः।
दौष्ट्रते क्षीणस्ते यस्माद च दौष्ट्रतिः निमशते॥
पाण्डारिशुरं कर्त्ता हितां साप्त्यं समाविषेत्॥
कर्त्तव्रं शिवदेवं स्यावयं पाण्डारिः चिंतनश्च॥

दीक्षा is thus the knife to cut the bonds that imprison the soul in the body. The दीक्षा is of three kinds, बेचारीक, मन्त्रदीक्षा (मंत्रदीक्षा) and क्रियादीक्षा. They are described in the following:

- युगेपालकमादिन्य इमनस्तक्षयेन:।
- भो: विवहसंधिपेशो वेधाक्षेरति दा मतः॥
- मुंग्रातिकृत्ति दा श्रीकं मंत्रमादिन्यपंडितेनी।
- कुड़मंडलकोकोपेता क्रियादीक्षा क्रियालरः॥

श्रीयुगेपालिकमादिन्य इमनस्तक्षयेन भु: जानाकर्मिषामध्यशिवतदुमादपेशो:॥

है सा बेचारीकृति स्मृतेशः। युगेपालिकावः स्थित्वा कर्मक्ये समुपस्थायति:। विनयस्वरुपपेशो वेधाक्षेरति सा मतः। मुंग्रातिकृत्तिनी भो:।

पंक्तारैरेवनेत्रपदेशो योःस्वति सा मनन्त्रातिकृति मुंग्रातिकृति कार्येशः।

कलशंशस्वस्तिकमंडलंयुक्ता क्रियाप्रणामपर्यायकारिकमेता क्रियादीक्षयः॥

श्रीयुगेनिर्माणमादिन्य इमनस्तक्षयेन भु: जानाकर्मिषामध्यशिवतदुमादपेशो:॥

है सा बेचारीकृति स्मृतेशः। युगेपालिकावः स्थित्वा कर्मक्ये समुपस्थायति:। विनयस्वरुपपेशो वेधाक्षेरति सा मतः। मुंग्रातिकृत्तिनी भो:।

पंक्तारैरेवनेत्रपदेशो योःस्वति सा मनन्त्रातिकृति मुंग्रातिकृति कार्येशः।

कलशंशस्वस्तिकमंडलंयुक्ता क्रियाप्रणामपर्यायकारिकमेता क्रियादीक्षयः॥

श्रीयुगेनिर्माणमादिन्य इमनस्तक्षयेन भु: जानाकर्मिषामध्यशिवतदुमादपेशो:॥

है सा बेचारीकृति स्मृतेशः। युगेपालिकावः स्थित्वा कर्मक्ये समुपस्थायति:। विनयस्वरुपपेशो वेधाक्षेरति सा मतः। मुंग्रातिकृत्तिनी भो:।

पंक्तारैरेवनेत्रपदेशो योःस्वति सा मनन्त्रातिकृति मुंग्रातिकृति कार्येशः।

कलशंशस्वस्तिकमंडलंयुक्ता क्रियाप्रणामपर्यायकारिकमेता क्रियादीक्षयः॥

श्रीयुगेनिर्माणमादिन्य इमनस्तक्षयेन भु: जानाकर्मिषामध्यशिवतदुमादपेशो:॥

है सा बेचारीकृति स्मृतेशः। युगेपालिकावः स्थित्वा कर्मक्ये समुपस्थायति:। विनयस्वरुपपेशो वेधाक्षेरति सा मतः। मुंग्रातिकृत्तिनी भो:।

पंक्तारैरेवनेत्रपदेशो योःस्वति सा मनन्त्रातिकृति मुंग्रातिकृति कार्येशः।

कलशंशस्वस्तिकमंडलंयुक्ता क्रियाप्रणामपर्यायकारिकमेता क्रियादीक्षयः॥

श्रीयुगेनिर्माणमादिन्य इमनस्तक्षयेन भु: जानाकर्मिषामध्यशिवतदुमादपेशो:॥

है सा बेचारीकृति स्मृतेशः। युगेपालिकावः स्थित्वा कर्मक्ये समुपस्थायति:। विनयस्वरुपपेशो वेधाक्षेरति सा मतः। मुंग्रातिकृत्तिनी भो:।

पंक्तारैरेवनेत्रपदेशो योःस्वति सा मनन्त्रातिकृति मुंग्रातिकृति कार्येशः।

कलशंशस्वस्तिकमंडलंयुक्ता क्रियाप्रणामपर्यायकारिकमेता क्रियादीक्षयः॥

श्रीयुगेनिर्माणमादिन्य इमनस्तक्षयेन भु: जानाकर्मिषामध्यशिवतदुमादपेशो:॥

है सा बेचारीकृति स्मृतेशः। युगेपालिकावः स्थित्वा कर्मक्ये समुपस्थायति:। विनयस्वरुपपेशो वेधाक्षेरति सा मतः। मुंग्रातिकृत्तिनी भो:।

पंक्तारैरेवनेत्रपदेशो योःस्वति सा मनन्त्रातिकृति मुंग्रातिकृति कार्येशः।

कलशंशस्वस्तिकमंडलंयुक्ता क्रियाप्रणामपर्यायकारिकमेता क्रियादीक्षयः॥

इन्द्रजीतसिंहवामी I—page 86.

दीक्षा starts with क्रियादीक्षा in a ceremonial form, which is further described in the book; but it is unnecessary to state it here, as it is a matter of detail. The three दीक्षा are connected with the three forms of Linga and Aniga; गोपाल with बेचारीक गoes with साक्तिक; योगांग with मन्त्रदीक्षा goes with आशांक; and व्यापार with क्रियादीक्षा goes with श्रवांक. The worth of दीक्षा as a means of psychic discipline and culture and as a means of destroying the three taints (कला) will be evident from the following:

- तुनुस्रवताराजदिकलस्वमो: गुरुः।
- दीक्षात्रेषः निर्देशस्य विनयस्यक्षयमिदिष्टाद।
- तथा स्त्रयत्र दर्शं दुरः दुरःस्वरूपोरिणा।
- तथा स्त्रयत्र दर्शं दुरः दुरःशिकारास्मान।
- केताबापतिकिमाकाराशीती दीक्षा शिखा मतः।
- स्त्रयं दर्शायतिकिमाकाराशीती दीक्षा शिखा मतः।
- तत्तिष्ठाता विनयस्यस्य सर्बनामात्युपास्य।
- रुँ कप्ररमात्यायं तद्देशानुगम्यतिरित्युः।
- एतिष्ठावयायोऽपि: विनयस्यस्यस्यायनं॥

* अनुसरणम् प्रति V—52-60.
We may note here that the author of लिंगधारणविद्वान start with अंतलिम्बार्ण, of which दहोपाधय or व्यासतिलिम्बार्ण is another name and which forms the initial topic of the book for discussion. Further he states (on pages 47, 48) the three kinds of दोष and their connection with the three forms of Linga and Anga.

We think it unnecessary to give details of शिवपुज्य, as it is in general of the form स्थावरलिम्बपुज्य, but differs from it fundamentally in respect of the vital connection of Linga and Anga and starts with psychic culture and leads it on to perfection in a graded course. The only thing to be noted in connection with शिवपुज्य (i.e., शिवपुज्य all through) is that great stress is laid on सम्मान, स्तान्तरण and संग्रह. But सम्मान is considered to be very important and it forms शिवनाथ, as noted by the commentator of शिवण्याप्रदीपिका in his commentary on I–15. He says शिवनाथ is सम्मान and quotes in authority an Agamic text, namely,

अपवाक्यापैः मंगी युद्धीता सम्मानोत्पत्तम
खर्चोपशुल्लन यत्तं वते प्रदेश मनोविशेष:।

Now we come to शवत्थ, the technique of शिवयोग in all its complementary forms. In order to simplify our
explanation of श्लोकः we have to request here readers to have very carefully in mind all that is said before about श्लोकः, श्लोकः और श्लोकः and श्लोकः, as all these are the vital and essential parts of श्लोकः. So also their relations with one another and the relations of the पांचम्हामृताः, the sense-organs of knowledge and action are to be carefully borne in mind.

We have only to add अलम्बन to the पांचम्हामृताः as the sixth and the highest principle in gradation and as being the source of all. The heart is the abode and source of all vital activities. It is, therefore, called ह्रद्याक्ष and is the sense-organ both of knowledge and action of अलम्बन. This is maintained in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{श्लोकःमृत्युमात्राः खण्डाः अलम्बनं हृदयं भवेत्} \\
\text{आलम्बनं स्नेहेऽव्यत् श्लोकःमृत्युमात्रकम्} \\
\text{ह्रद्याक्षा अलम्बनं ज्ञात्व अलम्बनं स्नेहान्तः} \\
\text{ह्रद्याक्षा हृदयाक्षम् प्रथमः मति सम्बन्धम्} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The श्लोकः is based on the six places or spots in the human body that are the abodes of and are occupied by the six Lingas. They are called the आधाराः and are none else than the six specific regions of the सर्वेषांकेश्वराः taken along with their sympathetic counterparts or analogues in the स्तूपमन्त्र. So, when the आधाराः are set in action by विक्षिप्तिनिरूपितः and एकमात्रं, the various subtle evolutes formed out of स्तूपः, स्वरः, and परावक्तिः, which go to make the entire constitution of the स्तूपः, स्वरः, and कारण स्वरः, are shaken out of their torpor and the sundry subjective phenomena become possible. The six आधाराः may also, in a sense, be regarded as the Jiva's or Anga's involucra of consciousness, though they are really regions of the अंगस्वरः, the human microcosm, where the
Jiva may stand on the various forms of the indwelling Lord. The various appearances of God in man, appearing on the liberated soul as light, are only the विरंगनाब्रम्ह of Lingasthala, the Divine omnipresence. These आवास्त भिक्षु are known as सूर्य, स्नान, विश्वामित्र, अग्रहत, विहारिक, and अज्ञा. They are none other than the six Chakras of the Shākta School. The only difference is that the Lingayats hold that the Linga, the possessor of शक्ति, is the weilder of शक्ति, and is therefore, the occupant of the chakras and works there.

The way of Yoga (विष्णुत्रां) followed here has a different purpose from that of others; for its aim is not only to rise out of ordinary, ignorant world-consciousness but to bring the supramental power of that Divine Consciousness down into the ignorance of mind, life and body, to transform them, to manifest the divine life in matter. This is an extremely difficult aim and difficult Yoga; because all the established forces of the ordinary ignorant world-consciousness, in and around, are opposed to it, deny it and try to prevent it; and the Anga finds his own mind, life and body, full of most obstinate impediments to its realization. However if one accepts the ideal wholeheartedly, faces all difficulties, leaves its past and its ties behind and is ready to risk everything and give up everything for this divine possibility, then only one can hope to discover by experience the truth behind it.

The Sādhanā of this Yoga is not to proceed through any set of formal worship of an image, performance of चतुर्स or a prescribed form of muttering चंद्रमा but by sincere devotion, aspiration and self-concentration
inward and upward, to the Divine Power above and its working, to the Divine presence in the heart and by rejecting all that is foreign to these. It is by faith (विश्वास), aspiration (विचार) and surrender (विष्टाव), that this self-opening and self-expansion can come.

The only way is the way of calling down (आर्यन or आराधना) the supramental, the bringing of the Divine down on the earth, i.e. the material, not only into the mental and vital being (रूपशरीर) but also into the body and matter (नयुक्तशरीर). The object is not merely to remove all limitations on the expansion of ego or to give free scope and to make unlimited room for the fulfilment of the ideas of the human mind or the desires of the ego-centred life-force. None of us are to do as we like or to create a world, in which we shall at last be able to do as we like (like विश्वामित्र who created a world in the space for विष्नु). Here we are to do the Divine will and to manifest Its Truth, no longer deformed and vitiated by human ignorance and perverted by vital desires. The work that the Anga has to do is not his own work but that of the Divine, which has to be done in accordance with the conditions laid down by the Divine. The work is not for our own sake but for the sake of the Divine. It is not our own personal manifestation or expansion of our individual ego free from all bounds or bonds but the manifestation of the Divine. Our own spiritual liberation, perfection and fulness is a result and a part but not in any egotistic sense or for any ego-centred or self-seeking purpose. विष्णू implies not only the realization of the Divinity but an entire
consecration and change of inner and outer life till it is fit to manifest the Divine Consciousness and become a part of the Divine work. This means an inner discipline, much more exacting and difficult than mere ethical or physical austerities (अपः and तपः). For this hard, vast and arduous task we must feel the psychic call inside and must be ready to go to the end. The inner psychic call is termed शक्तिपात or शिवायुपह. It is therefore said:—

भो ध्यान महाभाग शिवायुपमहेद्येष ।
आचार्यवर्य संप्रातं रक्ष मां संवेदः ॥
इति हुष्टेन हिष्शेष प्राप्तिः परमे शुद्धः ॥
शक्तिपात समालोचनः दीक्षितः योजयेदुपमः ॥ धि—I, 84, 85.

The complete change down to the physical is to be sought, not for सिद्धि (सम्प्राप्तिः) but for the purification and sublimation of our total being in all its three planes, the Ideal being (काश्च्यातीर, the Ideal being (काश्च्यातीर, mental or vital being (स्थूलश्वरीर), and the physical being (स्थूलश्वरीर) respectively connected with महालिंग and योगांग, प्राण-लिंग and भोगांग, and इद्धिंग and ज्ञानंग.

All consciousness in the human being, who is the mental embodiment in the living matter, has to rise so as to meet the higher consciousness; the higher consciousness has also to descend into mind, life and matter. In that way all difficulties and obstacles will disappear and the consciousness will be able to purify the whole lower nature and transform it by the power of the Supermind, the will of the Divine (महालिंगवृत्त). The earth is the material field of evolution. Mind, life, and Supermind (विश्रान्तति) are in principle involved there in the earth-consciousness. But matter or physical plane
is first organized; then life (जीव) descends from the life-plane and gives shape to and organizes the life-principle working in matter; then mind descends from the higher plane and creates man, i.e. sublimes him. It is the Supermind that is to descend and create supramental man. This is the ideal of शिवशोभा.

In order to attain the dynamic realization it is not enough to rescue जीव from his subjection to and entanglement with प्रकृति. One must transfer one's allegiance to प्रकृति, the thirteenth principle, with its play of ignorant forces, to the Supreme Divine (शिवशक्ति). It is a mistake to indentify the शिवशक्ति (महाशक्ति or भुदशक्ति) with lower माया (अधोमायाः) and प्रकृति with their mechanism of forces. प्रकृति here is a mechanism only that comes in the course of the evolution by अधोमाया. The ignorant intellectual, vital and physical being is not the Divine Itself, though it comes from the Divine. The mechanism of प्रकृति in the form of the twenty three principles follows the प्रकृति in evolution. We have, therefore, to turn towards the Divine Consciousness, Power and Light (परप्रकृति) for our release, perfection and fulness. The realization of the Great Consciousness, calm, free and observing the play of forces but not attached to or involved in them is the means of liberation. The calm peaceful strength and joy (संति and अंतंद) must be brought down into the vital and physical bodies. When this is established there is no longer the turmoil of the vital forces. This peace, the silent peace and joy, is only the first descent of the Divine Power (शिवाजुम्ब or चक्षिपत) into the आधार, i.e. the आचार्यिक is to be made dynamic or shaken out of the torpor. To bring down
the dynamic side too soon is not desirable; for then it would be a descent into the troubled and tumultuous sea of impure nature, unable to assimilate it; and serious perturbations might be the consequence. Hence पद्मावति has devised the method of gradual rise and development of Anga step by step.

As we rise higher, ego and desire appear no longer truths; they become falsehoods disfiguring the true persons and true will. The struggle between the Powers of Light and the Powers of Darkness is a truth here. But as we ascend above it becomes less truth; and in the Supermind and in the third and the highest plane it has no truth at all. Other truths remain but change their character, importance, and their place in our total being. In the Overmind or the mind of the intermediate plane, the contrast between the personal and impersonal is a truth. But it is no truth in the Supermind of the higher plane. So also without purifying the lowest plane, the plane of the physical life of शक्ति and its mechanism, we cannot ascend the intermediate plane. We must climb up the stairs and rest our feet firmly on each step in order to reach the summit, the summum bonum. This is the device of शक्ति.

It is a mistake to dwell too much and thus to yield in weakness to the lower nature and its obstacles, which is the negative side of the शक्ति; they have to be looked into carefully and purified. But preoccupation with them, as the one important insuperable thing, is not helpful. The positive side of experience in spiritual culture and practice is the more important thing. If we wait for the lower nature to be purified entirely and
for all time before calling down the positive experience, we might have to wait for ever. It is true that the more the lower nature is purified the easier is the descent of the higher nature; but it is also equally true that the more the higher nature descends the more the lower is purified. Neither the complete purification nor its permanent and perfect manifestation can come all at once; it is a matter of time and patient progress. The two (the purification of the lower nature and the manifestation of the higher) go on progressing side by side and become stronger to play into each other's hands in cooperation.

Growth and patient progress do not remain as long as the consciousness is not transformed, i.e. there is to be a period of assimilation. When the being is unconscious, i.e. is in the physical plane the assimilation goes on behind the veil or below the surface. In the meanwhile the surface consciousness sees only dulness and loss of what it had got. But when one becomes conscious one can then see the assimilation going on and knows that nothing is lost. It is only quiet settling down of what is gained.

The true being may be realized in two aspects, the आत्मन् (the अंतरात्मन्) or the psychic being) or the soul or जीव (वैमुक्त). The difference is that the one is felt as universal and the other as individual supporting the mind, life and body. When one first realizes the Atman one feels it separate from all things, separate in itself and detached. It is to this that the similitude of a dry cocoanut may apply. But when one realizes the Psychic Being it is not like that; for this brings in the sense of at-one-ment with the Divine and dependence upon and sole consecration to the Divine
alone (शरण शरण), and the power to change the nature and discover the true ideal, the true vital, and the true physical being in one’s self. Both are possible in this Yoga. The “I” or the little ego is constituted by Nature and is at once ideal, mental or vital, and the physical formation, meant to aid centralizing and individualizing the outer consciousness and action. When the true Being is discovered the utility is over and this formation has to disappear, as the true being is felt in its place. Then the three Gunas also become purified and are changed into their divine equivalents; स्वच्छ becomes ज्ञेयति, the authentic pure spiritual light; रस्सु becomes तमस्, the tranquilly intense divine force; तमस् becomes शम, the divine quiet, rest and peace.

We do not know ourselves and have not learnt to distinguish the three parts of our being, working on three planes. These we usually lump together and call them mind, because it is through mind and the perception and understanding through it that we see and feel. We, therefore, do not understand our own states and actions, or if at all we understand we do so on the surface only. It is a part of the foundation of Yoga that we do become conscious of the great complexity of our nature, see the different parts of our total being and the forces that move it, and get over it a control of directing knowledge. We are composed of many parts, each of which contributes to and plays a distinct part in the total movement of our consciousness, our thought, will, sensation, feeling, and action. But we do not see the origin and course of these impulsions; we are aware only of their confused and pell mell results on the surface, on which we can at best impose nothing better than a doubtful and precarious shifting
order. The remedy for unifying and putting into order the confused and mixed parts and their working can come only from the parts of our being that are already or should be turned to the Light. To call in the light of Divine Consciousness from above, to bring the psychic being to the front, and to kindle a flame of aspiration that will awaken spiritually the outer mind, is the only way for the soul to be out of bonds.

The three parts of our being and their three planes are:

(1) The physical or material, quite a submerged part of our being, in which there is no wakingly conscious or coherent thought, will, feeling, or organized reaction, but which yet obscurely receives the impressions of all things and all sorts of stimuli of persistent habitual movements, crudely repeated or disguised in strange forms, can surge up into dream or into waking nature. If these impressions rise most in dreams in an incoherent and disorganized manner, they can and do rise up into our waking consciousness, as a mechanical repetition of old thoughts, old intellectual, old vital, or old physical habits, or an obscure stimulus to sensation, actions, emotions, which do not originate in or from our conscious thought or will and are even often opposed to its perceptions, choice or dictates. This is the subconscient or the physical plane, the bodily mechanism of संक्रिय for the bond soul. Here there is a mind called the physical mind connected with the body and bodily organs. This is the mind full of obstinate विकार formed by our past, obscure, vital, full of the seeds of habitual desires, sensations and nervous reactions, a most obscure material that governs much that has to do with the condition of the body. It is largely responsible for...
our soundness or illness or illnesses; chronic or repeated illnesses are indeed mainly due to the subconscient and its obstinate memory and habit of repetition of whatever has impressed itself upon the body consciousness. This is the भावांग of भेग. Here the earth and its allied higher element, water, predominate. This is the plane where there is the Divine presence in the form of शुभकिंग that first appears as light on the soul to be liberated.

(2) There is the vital plane, the second or higher plane above the material universe or physical plane that we see. (3) There is an intellectual plane above both the vital and the material; these three, the intellectual or ideal, the mental or vital, and the physical, are called the triple universe of the lower hemisphere, the human microcosm. They have been established in the earth consciousness by evolution. But they exist in themselves before the evolution above the earth-consciousness or the material plane to which the earth belongs.

Behind all the vital nature in man his true vital being (प्राणकिंग of भेगांग) is concealed and is quite different from the surface vital nature. The surface vital nature is narrow, ignorant, limited, full of obscure desires, passions, cravings, revolts, pleasures and pains transient joys and griefs, exultations and depressions. But on the contrary the vital being is wide, vast, calm, strong, without limitations, firm, immovable, capable of all power, all knowledge and all joy (प्रसाद or अनेद). It is the divine warrior (वीर) pure and perfect; it is the instrumental force for all divine realizations. It is the true vital being that becomes awake and comes in front within us. In the same way there is also a true intellectual being. When these are manifest
we become aware of a double existence in us; namely that the behind is always calm and strong, that the surface only is obscure and troubled. But if the true being behind remains stable and we live in it, then the trouble and obscurity remains on the surface. In this condition the exterior parts can be dealt with potently and they are also made free and perfect. This is the vital or mental plane of भौतिक connected with प्राणिक. The divine presence of प्राणिक is here. In this plane the देवता and its allied higher element, ब्रह्म, predominate. This second plane is higher above the physical or material plane and is the intermediate plane, a true nexus between the material or gross below and the intellectual or ideal ( सत्य ) above.

(3) The mind in ordinary sense covers indisirimitately the whole consciousness, for man is a mental being and mentalizes everything; but in the language of योगा "mind" and "mental" are used to connote specially that part of nature, which has to do with congnition and intelligence, with ideas, with mental thought and perceptions, the reaction of thought on things, with the truly mental or intellectual movements and formations, vision and will etc. that are part of intelligence. The vital has to be carefully distinguished from this intellectual being, even though some of its elements are transfused into the vital. The vital is the life-nature made up of desires, sensations, feelings, desire-soul and of all that play of possessive and relative (correlative) instincts, anger, fear, greed, lust etc. that belong to this field of nature. The intellectual and the vital are mixed up on the surface of the consciousness; but they are quite separate forces in themselves; and as soon as one gets behind the ordinary
surface consciousness one sees them as separate, and discovers their distinction and can with the aid of this knowledge analyse their surface mixture.

The intellectual being within watches, observes and passes judgment on all that happens in us. It feels and knows spontaneously in a much more direct and luminous way by the very purity of its own nature and the divine instinct within it; and so, whenever it comes to the front it reveals at once what are right and what are wrong movements in our nature. This is the third and the highest plane of ज्ञानम्, connected with मन्नक्षिण, Linga the Intellectual or Ideal, the Divine immanent in man. Here ether and its source the आत्मम्, predominate and stand high above all and behind the two other planes, supporting and watching them.

Yoga ordinarily means union with the Divine; or it means getting into consciousness by which one is no longer limited by the small ego, the personal intellectual, the personal vital, or the personal physical but is at-one with the Supreme Self, or with the universal consciousness; or with some deeper Consciousness within, in which one is aware of one's own soul, one's own inner being and the truth of existence of our total being.

In the Yogic consciousness one is not only aware of things, but of forces, not only of forces but of the conscious beings one behind the other. One becomes aware of all this not only in oneself but in the universe. This is the अवर्मुख condition, the living liberated. There is a force which accompanies the growth of the new consciousness and at once grows with it and helps it to come out and about to perfect itself. This force is Yogic शिवशक्ति. It is
here in the human microcosm coiled up and asleep in all centres or plexuses and is at the base what is called in शिवयोग, आचारालिंग in the सूलाधारणक. But it is also above, in our head and above our head, not coiled up there, involved and asleep, but ever awake, scient, potent, and all-wide. It is there waiting for manifestation; and to this force we have to open ourselves, to the power of the Divine.

In the mind it manifests itself as a divine mind-force or a universal mind-force and it can do every thing that the personal mind cannot do. It is then the Yogic mind-force. When it manifests and acts in the vital plane or the physical plane in the same way, it is there apparent as a Yogic life-force or a Yogic body-force. It can awake in all these forms, bursting outwards, upwards, and all round and can extend itself into wideness from below; or it can descend and become there a definite power for things; it can pour downwards into the body, working, establishing its reign, extending into wideness from above, link the lowest with the highest above us, release the individual into the cosmic universality or into transcendence.

In the process of this Yoga the centres have a fixed psychological use and a general function and have their special powers and functionings. The मु'द्धारा governs the physical down to the subconscient. The abdominal centre, the स्वाभिष्कान, governs the lower vital. This is the plane of स्वागत. These two are the domain of Ishtalinga and are respectively occupied and worked by the two subforms of इद्रिंग, आचारालिंग in the मूलधारा and धुर्द्रिंग in the खाभिष्कान. These two are ब्रववमयकोष that is the basic material of this physical plane. Here the force of the Divine is in a static condition; and here the ego (वाङ्कार) prevails on all
that is concerned with the physical wellbeing. Here the mind, the personal mind, works blindly and arrogates to itself everything. It is here that the intellectual being and the vital being, that work behind this gross physical body, supply the necessary force for the working of the physical being. The personal mind functions here as the subjective principle or the ego and remains conscious through its peripheral vrittis or states (भिषत्वत्वः). The consciousness through peripheral vritti (भिषत्वत्वः) is called शुद्धि which is mere outward consciousness (वैचन or मनः) and is not to be confounded with the fifteenth principle, (निध्वयदुईद्वः), the determining faculty. भिषत्वत्वः is the balancing fly-wheel of the body.

The naval centre or नाभिक्षर, called मणिदृष्टि, governs the larger vital. The heart-centre (हल्वः) or अनाहत governs the emotional being. The two form the mental or vital plane, the intermediate plane. This is the plane of सोपांग and is the domain of प्राणहिम, Linga the vital, because the vital force of consciousness functions here. The vital force, the fire of vitality, the effect of the element of तेजस् works here, as the mind (संक्लेपिक्षपाकाध्यायन मनः) works in the हल्वः. In the नाभिक्षर the egotistic element is more prominent and works in conjunction with मनस् which predominates in हल्वः and there it thinks and cogitates. मनस् is, like the element वात्, a volatile thing. The two subforms of प्राणहिम, शिवहिम and चरहिम, occupy the two centres, the नाभिक्षर and the हल्वः respectively. Here the egotistic sense (आइकार) that predominates and is all in all of the lower physical plane, is greatly subdued and works in submission to the mental or mind, the cogitative principle (मनः). सोपांग of the middle plane has to seek co-operation of the प्राणहिम,
which calls from above the higher force of consciousness of the intellectual plane. It is here the real reformation, sublimation and purification of the Anga begins. Here the Anga seeks the help of राणलिंग in a friendly spirit (वहिमार्फ). मोरांग and राणलिंग co-operate to rise to the higher plane by calling in the aid of the higher Linga, the माालिंग.

The centre विद्युत governs the expressive and externalizing mind i.e. here consciousness assumes concrete form (वेन्हर ) of the शब्दब्रह्म or नाद. The centre between the two eye-brows the आन्तरिक, governs the dynamic mind, will, vision and mental formation. This is the plane of माालिंग, the intellectual plane. Here the highest form of consciousness works; as the true intelligent being. Here भेंग of Anga seeks and finds union with माालिंग, the Universal Consciousness, the Divine immanent. Here the sub-form of माालिंग, the प्राणलिंग and महालिंग occupy the centres, विद्युत and आन्तरिक respectively. The element आन्तरिक is in विद्युत and अस्तर, the cause and source of आन्तरिक and all other gross elements, is in आन्तरिक.

So the Jiva works on the three planes. On the physical or gross plane. खालिंग (the Anga fit to be abandoned or given up) of Jiva works in ignorance and is subject to the play of forces and unconscious of his real being. He is in the grip of प्रृथ्वि and works for material comforts and not for real lasting happiness. He is to be purified and raised higher by his devotion to इलिंग. The vital or mental plane, in which the मेरांग, risen superior to खालिंग from purification and a grade of sublimation, works in unison with प्राणलिंग, Linga the Vital and works for his further upliftment.
and ascent to the higher plane, the intellectual plane. The third and the highest is the intellectual plane, the plane of अंग, where the Anga rising higher to this plane from the vital plane, works for at-one-ment with the Divine immanent or transcendent.

Of the three planes the intermediate plane, the plane of vitality is the most important, as it is with the help of vitality that spiritual development is possible. Vitality is आत्म. But what is it? We must have a clear idea about what it is. It is generally confounded with breath, but breath has very little to do with आत्म. आत्म is altogether different from breath. आत्म is the universal force or energy of the Divine Consciousness omnipresent, omniscient, and omnipotent. *“Just as Akāsha is the infinite omnipresent material of the universe, so is this आत्म the infinite, omnipresent, manifesting power of this universe. At the beginning and and at the end of the cycle everything becomes आकाश and all the forces in the universe are resolved back into the आत्म; in the next cycle, out of this आत्म is evolved everything that we call energy, everything that we call force. It is the आत्म that is manifesting as motion; it is the आत्म that is manifesting as gravitation, as magnetism. It is आत्म that is manifesting as the action of the body, as the nerve currents, as thought force. From thought down to the lowest force, everything is but the manifestation of आत्म. The sum total of all forces in the universe, mental or physical, when resolved back to their original state is आत्म.” Here आत्म is the energy of Divine Consciousness exhibiting itself as concrete force in the form of motion everywhere.

* राज्यों by Swami Vivekananda, chap. III.
It is this आं to that is working on the middle plane, the plane of आंगंग and that of आंठिंग. When that is controlled and developed on the plane the soul rises higher and is sublimated. We should see how.

We have already stated that the human body in the condition of meditative posture of the devotee (अक्क) is विन्दिंग. That means that the human body is God itself in a concrete visible form. There is the Divine encaged. The macrocosmic Soul has become microcosmic in the human body. The Supreme Soul in this microcosmic or contracted form is आंग, which arises out of ignorance caused by his separating आं and दिन्त्र, which are one at bottom, though different phases or aspects of the one active Divine Consciousness (विन्दिंग). The Divinity thus works in double capacity as आंग in the human body and as लिंग in and behind the body, supporting, sustaining and nursing the आंग. The लिंग with its power or energy (शक्ति) in the form of क्षण is working on all the three planes behind the आंग, always helping and awaiting the spiritual development of आंग into its ultimate at-one-ment with the Divinity. And in the cause of this spiritual development or sublimation of आंग, आंठिंग or the vital force of the middle plane is all important, being the connecting link or the true nexus between the intellectual plane above and physical plane below.

But what is आं ? आं is the Divine Force or Energy.

* "It is the आं that is manifesting as motion; it is the आं that is manifesting as gravitation, as magnetism; it is the आं that is manifesting as the actions of the

* राजबीम by Vivekananda chap. III.
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body, as the nerve currents, as thought force. From
thought down to the lowest forces in the universe,
mental or physical, when resolved back to their original
state is called झण. In the human body झण or the
Divine force (झणिङ्क) is exhibited in the form of human
activity, which activity finds channel in the nervous
system. The nervous system is a very complicated
system in the bodily mechanism. The human body
itself is an amazingly complicated system as remarked

* "All-in-all any description of the most astound-
ing mechanism (the human body) in the universe must
necessarily be complicated." The concrete and visible
expression of झण is breath, which, therefore, has come
to be mistaken for झण itself. Our minds have become
externalized and lost sight of झण, the fine motion inside.
झण, as nerve currents, is spread all through the body
bringing life and vitality to every muscle but we
do not feel them. When we begin to feel them
we can begin to control the motions inside. The
nerve currents, spread all through and over the body
through the densest and the maziest net-work
of nerves, are meant for the wellbeing of the body.
The action and reaction of the organs of the body
are due to the impulses and sensations caused by
the environment outside. The nerve currents due to
the impacts from outside are of two kinds the afferent
and the efferent. One is sensory, the other is motor.
One is centripetal i.e. going towards the brain and
the other is centrifugal i.e. going from the brain to
the outer body. One carries messages to the brain

* Sandiford’s Educational Psychology, page 114.
and the other carries messages from the brain to the muscles and organs of the body for the good of the body as required on any particular occasion. The nervous system, though complicated, is very important from the standpoint of mind and mental functioning. So all the movements of the body are due to the strength of the nerves. So also the work of the five organs of knowledge, the five organs of action, memory etc. are dependent on the nervous system. The cerebrum, the main and the biggest part of the nervous system enclosed within the head, is the seat of will, desire and all higher intellectual functions like thinking, reasoning etc.

Some bodily functions like walking, reading, speaking etc. are wholly dependent on will or desire. Some are not so. They are wholly independent and automatic. These do not require any conscious impulses for their activity. They are going on always ceaselessly inside the body for the safety and sustenance of the body. They are the functions of digestion, circulation, etc. Some functions are semi-independent. The semi-independent activity is that of respiration, as it goes on automatically all the while but can be controlled to a certain extent like the excretory activity. Respiration and excretion can be stopped for a while if one likes to do so. The nervous system or the nerves that are dependent on the will of the agent are called voluntary; the one that is not so dependent is called involuntary; but the one that works independently of the agent's will but can be controlled, though partially, is called semi-voluntary.
insight and initiation into the grandeur of the sublime truth of spiritualism. This is the lowest plane (the physical plane) where the two lowest elements of श्वसन and अस्त्र, that form the main grounding or foundation of this material plane, predominate and are to be raised into the higher elements. This is first stage of sublimation in the upward march of Anga. Anga here is purified and divested of the impure thoughts of the worldly life. Here Anga works consciously and conscious of the material environment. The state of Anga is, therefore, called जागृति or waking condition. The two organs of knowledge are नामिका and र्सना, respectively corresponding to the two elements of श्वसन and अस्त्र. The two organs of action are प्रेतु and उत्स्वय. They correspond to the two elements and the two organs of knowledge. This is र्स्तूवङ्गेर.

The intermediate plane is the plane of अंगांग, the Anga in the stage of enjoyment. This is the psychic or mental plane, the plane of प्राणलिंग, where real psychic culture or mental culture is practised. This is the stage where higher spiritual development is attained. Here the Anga is aided by प्राणलिंग, the Linga the Psychic or Mental. In this higher stage the Anga has the cooperation of the प्राणलिंग for his further upliftment. Here Anga has the enjoyment of the material world in so far as it is necessary for the sustenance of the body, the स्थूलव्यर्थ, which is the basis of all life, temporal or spiritual. In this plane the truth, that material enjoyment i.e. the worldly life and spiritual experience are in no way inconsistent but are mutually helpful, is demonstrated. For the enjoyment of Anga is in company
with the Linga; so that everything that the Anga takes or enjoys is in the first instance addressed or dedicated to the Divinity (Linga) and is then taken as प्रयाद. So everything that is taken is taken as the प्रयाद of the Lord. The dedication in the first instance is called अर्पण in a sincere spirit (सद्युव). This is अर्पणबिध्यान. विचारमन्त्रि or aspiration, conscious thoughtful aspiration, is the means to the objective, the objective of oneness with the Divinity with its two sub-divisions of अवधान, the undivided attention fixed on the Divinity in contemplation or meditation, and अनुभव or the partial experience of the Divine life and grandeur of Divinity, partial because the हृदनाग or the sense of duality is still there instead of अद्वैत, sense of all-oneness. The two forms of अन्तिक invoke the aid of the two modifications of प्रापणिंग, शिखिंग, Linga the Gracious, and चरिंग, Linga the Itinerant. प्रयादी, the third modification of Anga, strives with अवधानमन्त्रि or undivided attention to earn the grace of God in his phase as शिखिंग. So also the प्रापणिंग, the fourth modification of Anga attentively meditates on Divinity and attains the stage of partial experience of the Divine life. The form of अन्तिक is therefore, called अनुभवमन्त्रि, the experiential stage of devotion. चरिंग helps the Anga, the प्रापणिंगमन्त्र at this stage to go up to the higher stage of spiritual life. This ascent to the higher stage, the third plane, gives the Linga the name of चरिंग. On the intermediate plane the two higher elements of तेजस् and बायु predominate and form the basis of both भोगावंग and प्रापणिंग. Here the stage of sublimation is attained and greater is the disentanglement of Jiva from प्रकृति, in as much as the two elements take in or absorb in them the two lower elements of पुरुष and जल i.e. the effects of these two elements are no longer operative on account of the soul’s ascent to the
higher plane. The two organs of knowledge are नेत्र and त्वरक्क, corresponding to the elements predominant on this plane and the two corresponding organs of action are पाद and पाणि.

The importance of this plane as the true link or nexus between the planes below and above is as follows. On this plane the autonomous nervous system is made use of. But first the semi-voluntary part of the system, namely the respiratory system is requisitioned into service. The motion of the lungs is the most obvious manifestation of the force of आज्ञा, the force of Psyche or Soul. If that stops all other manifestations of force in the body will immediately stop as a rule. But men can train themselves in such a manner that the body will live intact even when the motion of lungs is suspended. Ordinarily the suspension of breath for a time by voluntary efforts is possible. It may be for a very short time. But by practice (called आन्तान्त) the duration of the suspension of breath can be increased, which may ultimately grow into complete suspension. Such suspension for a long time or complete is called अपनाक in the technical language. आन्तान्त in ordinary parlance is the control of breath. But really it means the control of आज्ञा or psychic force through the control of breath. By the control of breath, which is a form of psychic force, the control of finer psychic forces exhibited in the body, physical or mental, come to be gradually controlled. When the finer forces in the body are controlled all the forces outside the body are controlled. This means that man regains his contracted universal powers and that he gradually comes to tear off his five कङ्कन, which are the
five powers of the Almighty contracted. * "How to control the Prana is the one idea of Prana. All the training and exercises in this regard are for that one end. Each man must begin where he stands, must learn to control the things nearest to him. This body is very near to us, nearer than anything in the external universe, and this mind is the nearest of all. The Prana which is working this mind and body is the nearest to us of all the Prana in the universe. This little wave of the Prana which represents our own energies mental or physical, is the nearest to us of all the waves of the infinite ocean of Prana. If we can succeed in controlling that little wave, then alone we can hope to control the whole of Prana. The Yogi who has done this gains perfection; no longer is he under any power. He becomes almost almighty, almost all-knowing." Hence is the immense importance attached to Prana or breath-control, which gradually imparts greater and greater power to the person practising Prana. The Prana sends down psychic force into the lower plane and purifies and strengthens it, so as to harmonize it with the higher planes and to enable the Jiva to rise higher. Likewise the control of Prana paves the way for the Jiva's upward march and spiritual progress. It is, therefore, that the middle plane of Pranakta and Anga is a true nexus between the two planes the lower and the higher.

On this plane the Anga works unconscious of the material environment, as autonomous system works automatically without the Jiva's conscious or voluntary activity or impulsion. In dreams, when all conscious activity or
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actions are suspended, the vital force of Prâna works all the while. There is the subliminal force of भाष working. Hence the condition of the body on this plane is स्वाग. Here the बूध्मवारी of Anga, the subtle body, works.

The third and the highest plane is the plane of highest intelligence. Here the भाष works on the higher or the highest level. * "The Prâna is the vital force in every being. Thought is the finest and the highest action of Prâna. Thought again, as we see is not all. There is also what we call instinct or unconscious thought, the lowest plane of action. If a mosquito stings us, our hand strikes it automatically, instinctively. This is the expression of thought. All reflex actions of the body belong to this plane of thought. There is again the other plane of thought, the conscious. I reason, I judge, I think, I see the pros and cons of certain things, yet that is not all. We know that reason is limited. Reason can go only to a certain extent; beyond that it cannot reach. The circle within which it runs is very very limited indeed! Yet, at the same time, we find facts rush into our circle. Like the coming of comets certain things come into this circle; it is certain that they come from outside the limit although our reason cannot go beyond. The causes of the phenomena intruding themselves in this small limit are outside this limit. The mind can exist on a still higher plane, the super-conscious. When the mind has attained to that state, which is called Samâdhi, perfect concentration, super-consciousness, it goes beyond the limits of reason, and comes face to face with facts which no instinct or reason can ever know. All manipulations of the forces of the

* Rajayoga by Vivekananda, chap. III-41.
body, the different manifestations of Prâna, if trained, give a push to mind, help it to go up higher, and become super-conscious from where it acts. Such is the highest plane where higher intellectual and ideal forces work and are seated in the head or cerebrum. This is the plane of शोभा गंगा to which the Anga rises up gradually step by step. Here the Anga is in the stage of regaining his one-ness, lost temporarily, with the Universal Consciousness. Here he secures the help and co-operation of भावलिंग, Linga the Intellectual or Ideal. शोभा गंगा in his two modifications, शरण and धृष्ठ, strives for regaining his essential oneness with the Divinity. विशुद्धर्यिक्ति is the means to the end. शरण here is in the purified condition, being shorn of all worldly-mindedness. There is only one feeling, the feeling of surrender to the Divinity and desire for regaining Divinity. The two forms of शरण, आनंदर्यिक्ति and संसर्गर्यिक्ति, invoke the aid of the two forms of भावलिंग, the प्रभावलिंग, Linga the Peaceful, and महालिंग, Linga the Great or Universal, in the two stages. First there is the stage of surrender, i. e. the act and the attempts at embracing the Lord, as does a loving wife her beloved. Great is the joy and peace of Anga in the act. In the sixth or final stage there is secured the oneness with महालिंग, the Universal Soul or the Divine immanent.

The element आक्षात्त and its source, the Psyche or आत्मन्, predominate on this plane. The शरण and धृष्ठ are the two organs of knowledge corresponding to the two (आक्षात्त and आत्मन्). The two organs of action corresponding to the two organs of knowledge are वाक्त and धृष्ठ. The state of the soul on this plane is धुर्यति or complete peace and tranquillity with all force or energy in silent or stirless condition
or the condition of latency or potentiality. The state श्रृङ्खला is the deep-sleep consciousness, when the mental body working in a subtle form is not able to impress its experiences on the brain; then the mind works on its own contents and not on any outer object or objects. Thus श्रृङ्खला is quite different from तपस्या, in which impressions of mental working are left on the brain or the nervous system and therefore they (the impressions or संस्कारस) are recalled. Man, therefore, does not know or is not aware of his experiences during this state of deep dreamless sleep, called श्रृङ्खला. After deep sleep the Jiva is conscious only of the calm and peace that he had in his deep sleep and of nothing else. Hence he simply describes his condition of deep sleep as "I slept in all happiness and was not aware of anything." (स्वरूपरूप सप्तधात्वं न किंचिदेवविषादम्). The state of highest peace, which is co-existent with the highest and purest joy, in the sixth and the last stage is that highest spiritual experience, when there is no worry, no limitation and no taint. All purity, joy, peace, all knowledge and everything that is of the highest is that of the Anga. Anga is no longer Anga but Linga. There is no difference as that of Anga and Linga. All one, essentially one, is what is called समस्मुक्तिः, the result of मक्ति, which in the stage is समस्मक्ति. Therefore समस्मक्ति and समस्मुक्ति are one without distinction just Anga and Linga and मक्ति and शक्ति all become one. The body on this plane in which the Anga works is the कार्णकोष (causal body).

The Adhâras, which the Lingas occupy and where force of Divinity works, are the six chakras or plexuses as stated before. These plexuses are compared to and are considered to be lotuses. The plexuses are thus said to
have petals as the lotuses have. The petals are no other than the main branches of nerves shooting from the ganglia in different directions for the regular functioning of the different parts of the body. The Prāṇa runs through these branches and activates the different parts of the body in the particular locality, in which a plexus is situated. The branches that form the petals are as follows:—

*(I)* The four petals of the मूखाकाष्ठ are the four branches of nerves going out from the pelvic plexus. They are (1) The Inferior haemorrhoidal is the backside sensory nerve going towards the rectum. It controls the excretory action. (2) The vesical in the front going towards the urinal bladder; so also the Vesiculae seminalis Vas Deferanes. (3) The Prostratic at the lower part going to the male generative organ. In the case of females it is called vaginal plexus. (4) Uterine at the upper part going to the gonads or ovaries. The four branches are the four petals of this plexus-lotus.

*(II)* स्त्राशिक्षित or Aortic plexus has six branches of nerves, forming the six petals of the nerve-lotus. They are (1) Spermatic towards testicles (2) Left colic towards the slope of the large intestine (3) Sigmoid (4) Superior Hemorrhoidal towards rectum (5) Inferior mesentric (6) and Hypogastric going to the pelvis.

*(III)* The solar or abdominal plexus, called the abdominal brain, has ten branches (1) Phrenic joining the diaphragm and the Suprarenal glands (2) Hepatic going to the spleen and controlling all arteries there.

*This is based on “ब्रह्मकर्षण व मेदम” by Spripad Mahadeo Vaidya, L. M. & s. of Islampur, Satara Dist.*
(3) Splenic joining the spleen. (4) Superior gastric going to the stomach. (5) Suprarenal joining the suprarenal glands (6) Renal towards the urinary bladder (7) Spermatic going to the testicles in males and the ovaries of the females. (8) Superior mesenteric going to the intestinal covering and the intestines (9) Pancreatic to the Pancreas (10) Celiac to the small intestine and the juncture of the small and large intestines.

(IV) The Cardiac or Heart plexus has twelve branches of nerves (1) Right deep cardiac going to the lungs or right oracle. (2) Left deep cardiac to the back of the heart and the Left oracle. (3) Anterior pulmonary going to the pleura (4) Posterior pulmonary to the lungs (5) Superior cardiac (6) Inferior cardiac—ganglian of Wrisberg (7) Right coronary to the right coronary arteries (8) Left coronary to the left coronary arteries (9) Ventricular (10) Endocardiac to the thin covering or membrane (11) Remak goes to the interior of the heart and controls heart muscles (12) Bidder’s ganglia.

(V) The cervical plexus or विषयभिधिनक has sixteen nerve branches (1) Superior cervical (2) Carotid—to the Aorta (3) Cavernous plexus to the carotid arteries (4) Inferior and external going to the tongue etc. (5) Pharyngeal to the throat (6) Laryngeal towards the lung tube (7) Superficial cardiac (8) External carotid (9) Superior and inferior middle cervical (10) External middle cervical (11) Thyroid (12) Middle cardiac (13) Superior and inferior cervical (14) Inferior subclavian (15) Inferior cardiac (16) External or Vertbral.
Anatomy of nerve centres or Chakras

- Optic Thalamus
- Plexus of command
- Cerebrum
- Cerebellum
- Cervical plexus
- Vagus nerve
- Cardiac plexus
- Spinal chord
- Solar plexus
- Aortic plexus
- Pelvic plexus
(VI) Optic thalamus or the बाह्यचक्र is the plexus of command: There are some hollow places in the cerebrum and they are called ventricles. The optic thalamus has two rather elongated parts on both sides. The two parts form the two petals of the plexus. The pineal gland is in the middle of this plexus and the sensory nerves shooting up from the middle part form the stem of this gland. It is said that it is here that ego, (expressed by आहिं सः...) (which becomes एकः) resides.

It will be evident from this description that the mention of petals shooting from the plexus-lotuses is in no way imaginary but that they are veritable physiological parts of the nervous system. The control of आहिं at a particular plexus controls the functions of the parts of the body. The control of particular functions regulate the bodily mechanism, purify it, make it strong and healthy and facilitate gradual spiritual culture for the soul's progress and ascent above.

We have already remarked in connection with सोगांग that all objects taken and enjoyed by the Anga are in the first instance offered and addressed to the deity and then taken or enjoyed by himself. The objects thus offered to the deity become प्रज्ञाव or the grace of God. The things enjoyed by the Anga are five corresponding to the five gross elements. Thus earthly or solid element in objects is प्रज्ञाव and its offering results in सन्तः. The watery or liquid element in objects is रस्त्यापेय and its offering makes it समवाय. The objects seen are रश्यापेय. But their visibility (रः) is all due to the colour of the objects. And the colour being the property of light, the visibility or रः of objects is तंबरः.
or तंत्रयपाद्य. The offering of द्वाराध्य is श्रवणकार. श्रवण पदार्थ
is that of बाह्य, and श्रवणपाद्य or audible things are of ether
and the grace of these things offered is स्नायुःसाद श्रवणपाद.
Lastly the idea of these five tangible things enjoyed is purely intellectual and therefore, the ideas
of the things experienced or enjoyed are mental or
mentally contemplated. The idea, therefore, is स्नायुः
objects in idea. This belongs to अत्मम्, which
is चित्त or consciousness. The प्रणाद of अत्मम् is the ultimate
end i.e. सत्त्वनाशन and is called परिधानशास्त्र. The offering
of these things requires an instrument for conveying the
objects to the deity. Such an instrument or convey-
ance required for offering objects is called हस्त, analog-
gously to hand, which is the readiest and the most
convenient instrument for conveying concrete objects
to others. Similarly corresponding to the six kinds of
objects offered to the deity the six instruments are चित्त,
ब्रह्म, बहिकर, मनस् ज्ञान and मान.

The psychological explanation of the six kinds of
हस्त, the instrument of conveying an object to the deity,
is as follows. The functioning or modification of the
mind is चित्रित्व or a condition of the mind at a particular
stage of its functioning. The first stage of functioning
is when the mind comes into contact with an object
through a sense-organ of knowledge. This is called
चित्त or sensation. After sensation comes cognition or
awareness of the object. This is the second stage called
ब्रह्म perception (ब्रह्म or ब्रह्मण), the idea of mere something.
Then there is arrogation by ego or self. This is बहिकर
at the third stage. Next comes मनन by मनस् as to what
that object is. This is the fourth stage. Later comes
or full apprehension of the object by analysis and synthesis of the object; lastly comes ideation of the object or the concept of the object; This is अव. This is in reverse order of the evolution of object-psychology from अव to विच्छ. So it is said:—

* विच्छुकी अव उपयोगो भवाज्ञानसंवेदनः।
 ज्ञात्वम: समुन्नम: सन्विशेषसंवेदनमीकृतत्वा।
 अहंकारातीतो वृद्धिप्रदेशविकल्पम:।
 एवेषं व्यक्तिः वहे भावादनामसंवेदनात्।
 अस्तित्वारुपोत्व विच्छुको तत्त्वान्वम: वचनः।
 ज्ञाने व्ययति तत्कथव मनस्तत्तुत वदा।
 अहं तद्विकारो वृद्धिप्रदेशविकल्पाधिकारः।
 विरं स्नेहस्युपेक्षत तत्त्वविवेदस्यक्रमः।

These six instruments are in order handled by the six Angas for offering to their corresponding deities or the corresponding Lingas. Thus विच्छि is the अव of अव to its deity, वर्तक, and so on. All these stages of mental functioning are imperceptible, as the process from the initial to the final stage is quick and seems to require no time but appears to be simultaneous. The Lingas receive the things offered by means of particular respective organs, called सूक्ष्मिनि (faces). The six receptive organs of the deity are the six organs of knowledge, behind which there is the deity in its sixfold forms as noted already. (see ante page 480). The names of the deity behind the receptive organs are गौर्ण इश्वर, तत्त्वन, अशोक, श्रीयोज्यं and वामेव. The organs (सूक्ष्मिनि) are, therefore, called गौर्णमुखः and so on. This is stated in words एवं च महाशन्ति तत्त्व कथे पदार्थसमावेशविकल्पमिश्र ज्ञानात् अवादनातस्वपूर्वगौर्णमुखः।

* अनुच्छेदान्तमं वर्षी—२७.
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The devotional feelings with which the Anga (in his six forms) offers the objects to the deity (in its six forms) are the six forms of श्रद्धा निष्ठा, etc. that correspond to the five gross elements and the शरीर तदन्त, that makes the sixth.

Such is the technique of यज्ञस्वरूप for the practice of spiritual culture. The following will be the tabular form of यज्ञस्वरूप, arising from the creative activity of धनिष्ठा, the परमिन्द्र or the transcendental Divine Consciousness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>तत्त्व</th>
<th>लिङ्ग</th>
<th>श्रद्धा</th>
<th>कल्य</th>
<th>मुख</th>
<th>नानाय</th>
<th>कमांग</th>
<th>स्थान (आधार)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>शिव</td>
<td>महालिङ्गिन</td>
<td>चित्त</td>
<td>शाल्यातिरिचर</td>
<td>गोपि</td>
<td>हृदय</td>
<td>हृदय</td>
<td>अश्वाचित</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सादार्श</td>
<td>प्रसादलिङ्गिन</td>
<td>परा</td>
<td>शांतीनीत</td>
<td>ईशान</td>
<td>श्रोत्र</td>
<td>तुल्य</td>
<td>वाकु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अमूल्य</td>
<td>चर (लिङ्ग)</td>
<td>आदि</td>
<td>शाबनी</td>
<td>ततुरुप</td>
<td>तुक्त</td>
<td>अन्न</td>
<td>पानि</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| सुन्दर | निवलिङ्गिन | इष्टा | विचित्र | व्योर | नेत्र | पाद | मणिपुर 
| कालु | युलिङ्गिन | जन्म | प्रतिष्ठा | नायोआत | रसना | उपस | स्त्रापिष्ठान |
| सत्कलु | अचारलिङ्गिन | निम्न | निद्वस्ति | वामदेव | नायिका | पाय | मुख्यभार |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>अंगस्थल</th>
<th>श्रद्धा</th>
<th>हृत</th>
<th>अर्पण</th>
<th>प्रसाद</th>
<th>अंग (तत्व)</th>
<th>अवस्य</th>
<th>शरीर</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>देवक</td>
<td>सामार्थ</td>
<td>साव</td>
<td>स्त्रक्षमार्थ</td>
<td>परिश्रामभ्रमसंद</td>
<td>आसाम</td>
<td>श्रुतुचित</td>
<td>कारण</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>शारण</td>
<td>आनंद</td>
<td>ब्राह्म</td>
<td>श्रावनार्थ</td>
<td>श्रावसभ्रम</td>
<td>श्रावभ्रम</td>
<td>ब्राह्म</td>
<td>श्रम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>माणिकिन्ज</td>
<td>अनुभव</td>
<td>मनस्व</td>
<td>स्त्रक्षमार्थ</td>
<td>स्त्रक्षमार्थ</td>
<td>स्त्रक्षमार्थ</td>
<td>श्रावभ्रम</td>
<td>अक्ष्म</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रसादी</td>
<td>अवधान</td>
<td>अहिक</td>
<td>स्त्रक्षमार्थ</td>
<td>स्त्रक्षमार्थ</td>
<td>स्त्रक्षमार्थ</td>
<td>ब्राह्म</td>
<td>श्रम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सोहवृक्ष</td>
<td>नैविक</td>
<td>बुद्धि</td>
<td>स्त्रक्षमार्थ</td>
<td>स्त्रक्षमार्थ</td>
<td>स्त्रक्षमार्थ</td>
<td>ब्राह्म</td>
<td>श्रम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>महान्यल</td>
<td>श्रद्धा</td>
<td>चित्त</td>
<td>गोष्पार्थ</td>
<td>गोष्पार्थ</td>
<td>गोष्पार्थ</td>
<td>पुष्टि</td>
<td>जागुचित</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have to add an explanation of how the six sense-organs of knowledge have behind them the six Lingas and as such form the receptive organs (मुख्यान्त्र) of those Lingas. This is made clear in words, *एल्मन *

* शिवाद्वितंतं ज्ञानं page 28.*
This also explains how the human body is लिहितहि i.e. how the Divine works behind the body on the three planes.

The पद्मयत includes the eightfold limbs or (अष्टाङ्गां) of पातजाल्यम, as maintained in the following:

* यमन नियमनेख मन्ये मक इति स्वयम।
स्वरुपसमाध्यमवृत्ति वहे शरीरपदार्थतः।

चिकित्सकस्यांगमार्जितस्वास्थ्यम्।

यथा ज्ञात्मकस्य संवेदने ज्ञातिः वधेतुपमानम।

प्राण कर्मेऽपि संवेदने प्राणसिद्धिः संवेदन्यम

स्वास्थ्यम्।

अत्योक्तिः स्वास्थ्याकालीनः।

यथानिदेहार्दिकाः।

पद्मयतहि III-60-63.

It may be remarked here that some of these eight means of Yoga are to be followed by the devotee strictly and some are to be adopted in their elementary form. Thus the moral codes contained in यम and नियम should be strictly observed; some Asana or other (posture) should be adopted as the devotee finds it suitable to him and he is not required to follow and practise other Asanas, as these are intended for an extreme form of
physical culture as by a इटवोळी. So also प्राणायाम is not to be practised except in its elementary form, as may be necessary for steadying the mind and for facilitating the withdrawal of senses from being tempted away by their objects, i.e. to facilitate प्रसाद्दा. चारणा, ध्यान and समाधि are only to be concerned with or directed towards दिग्न in its last two forms. Thus समाधि of शिष्योळ is different from the समाधि of पलंजाोळ. It may also be noted that there is some change in the order of प्रसाद्दी and प्राणायाम, when the order of the eight means are followed; or the order is not so well fixed up that the order can be changed for convenience. So in the case of प्रसाद्दी and प्राणायाम प्राणायाम and प्रसाद्दा may be understood as being useful and necessary, irrespective of the order of the two sub-Lingas of the intermediate plane. Moreover प्राणायाम in its more elaborate forms is practised by the devotee of the mystic temperament when he wants to experience union with the Divinity in the cerebrum. Now it remains for us to see how the technique of पद्मस्थ्रूळ helps the development of शिष्योळ in all or one of its complementary forms, viz मक्क्योळ, चयोळ, मक्क्योळ, श्यामोळ and कप्प्योळ after the use and significance of the eightfold अंगां of योग are briefly noted.

यम and निम्न are required to discipline the emotions and strengthen the will. Both these come under सक्षम्यतिल and consist of some ethical principles relating to one's self only and some others relating to one's self with respect to society or the nation or humanity in so far as one is an interdependent individual of society or a nation or humanity. The observance of the principles, that have direct relation to
oneself irrespective of society is directly conducive to one's own wellbeing and indirectly to that of others. The deliberate observance of the other principles, relating to one's self with respect to society or the nation or humanity and creatures in general, is the foundation of mutual understanding of the individuals, social welfare, national integrity, and harmony, and is the source of external peace and internal strength and calmness. By an earnest practice of the two types of moral conduct the aspirant devotee acquires an excellent discipline of emotions, great moral courage, and unflinching will. The ethical principles of यम and नियम are twenty, ten for each. They are the same as those of other schools and specially of the Shākta School and have been mentioned in शिष्योपप्रवाहिका (vide chap. II-10, 11). The only difference is that अर्देन्य is mentioned in place of क्रम of other schools. आर्थिक्य, मति, वन, जप and तप are explained to be by the commentator as:—आर्थिक्य is belief in merit and sin that result from the avoidance of acts laid down or doing those prohibited by the Agamas; मति is consciousness of what is taught by the Guru to be right; वन is भक्ति; जप is that of the पंचाश्रीमंत्र (नमः शिवाय) or श्रीमंत्रमंत्र (अः नमः शिवाय); तप is endurance of troubles for the sake of Yoga. भिक्षुमार्गिणि (Vol. I-144) describes ज्ञान as being of five kinds that include जप and तप in the following:—

शिवाय देवसंधीयस्तन्: कृष्णार्दि ने म्भम् ।
शिष्यार्थी कर्म विक्षेप यादवाय यासदिन्नोक्त सदौ ॥
जप: पंचाश्रीमंत्र: प्रणवायाम्य एव वा ।
सदायामार्दिकामाधिन्न न वैद्यम्यनासदितिक्षम् ॥
प्राणं शिवस्य हृदयार्धिनिः नात्मादित्विनम् ।
...is worship and no sacrifice. This shows that the idea of जप, तप etc. is in strict conformity with the non-Varnashramic tenets. The practice of जम and नियम also leads to renunciation of and detachment from the things of this world and the next, arising out of the knowledge of this permanent and the impermanent and the intense desire for and incessant striving after liberation, that characterizes the devotee's aim.

Asanas are postures of the body and are intended to be an aid to clear and collect thought. The test of suitability of an Asana is that which is stready and pleasant, a matter which each will settle for himself. Posture becomes perfect when effort to that end ceases so that there is mere movement of the body. By Asana रङ्ग, the action of which produces fickleness of mind, is restrained. A suitable steady Asana produces mental equilibrium. The शिवायाम mentions ten Asanas (शिदासन, पदासन etc.) and recommends पदासन for house-holders and शिदासन for those that are not house-holders. It further says that पदासन is suitable to all (vide chap: II).

शाणायाम is said to be of three kinds अक्त, वैक्त, and कैकालकुमक. अक्तशाणायाम is natural breathing of all creatures but specially of the human beings. It is called अज्ञात or unconscious muttering of the अन (इः), which is one inspiration of breath (इ) and one expiration (स). वैक्तशाणायाम is artificial regulation or control of breath both in inhaling and exhaling air. It is an attempt to lengthen the time required naturally for inhaling and exhaling. And in between both breath is to be retained
for a time. Such retention is called कुंमक. The longer the retention the better is कुंमक. And if ultimately the retention of breath is for any length of time it is called केवलकुंमक. Apart from the effect of ध्यान on the physical wellbeing and soundness it is useful and helpful for meditation on the Godhead (ध्यान) which is common to all forms of Yoga. But केवलकुंमक is specially helpful to लघुयोग or the taking up of the Pranik force from चुलावार to श्रीरा (the cerebrum), where there will be the union of श्रीम and शक्ति. In वैकुंठध्यान the reverse of ध्रुवध्यान is practised i.e. instead इंस: in inhaling and exhaling breath there come in य: and श्रीम. We shall in due course see what this means.

These first four Angas are more physical and external to facilitate the contemplation of the Godhead. The last four are प्राइंहार, धारणा, ध्यान and समाधि. प्राइंहार is the withdrawal of the mind from sense-objects i.e. detachment of the mind from or aversion of the mind towards sense-objects and धारणा or dispassion is the result; धारणा is the fixing of the mind on the deity (ईश्वर); ध्यान is continuous and ceaseless contemplation of the deity; समाधि is the complete absorption of the mind into the deity. समाधि is facilitated by the preceding three. All these last four are mental and internal.

पद्धर्म is divided into two main parts. (1) भक्त, मेहसर, प्राणार्थी form the first division and the remaining three (२) प्राणार्थी, धारणा and ऐक्य form the second. In the first division action-element is predominant in the worship of ईश्वर; in the second knowledge element is predominant. In the first part, where action-element prevails, it does not mean that there is mere mechanical action
physical or oral. It only means that behind the physical or oral activity of worship there is the mind or inner meaning of the activity. Action has always behind it the idea or inner meaning, that prepares the type of mind or mentality requisite for further progress. By the repetition of the action with the idea behind it, the type of mentality is confirmed and made thorough. Action and knowledge go hand in hand and ultimately belief prevails that action and knowledge are one and the same. In the second division knowledge element prevails; but action based on knowledge is there supporting the knowledge. In both the divisions both the action element and knowledge element are there; it is merely a question of one being more prominent than the other. There is always the consciousness that action and knowledge are co-extensive and form one inseparable unit. Ultimately when action and knowledge are equally prominent they become one and the same i.e. they become indistinguishable from one another and their essential identity becomes established along with the oneness of Anga and Linga.

In the पद्यक्षेत्र the sixfold अंगि is the same for the development of any form of Yoga in all the six stages, that ultimately ends or ripens into विषयोग with its fivefold factors. It is adopted for विषयोग which is the main factor comprising in it the remaining four factors of विषयोग (विषयज्ञ, विषयभक्ति, विषयध्यान, and विषयवत or मस्तकार्य).

* It is, therefore, said:—

अंगः मेहेंद्रश्चेत्रि प्रशास्तिः च कीर्तिः ||
कर्मप्राप्यान्वेशिन्हान्यायोऽस्य कठेष्वे ||
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We shall presently note how.

śīrvāja, the main factor of śīrvāja, is a very simple thing to start with and is to be performed everyday, once, twice, or thrice a day all through life. Though simple to start with and though always simple in its main features, it internally develops into a very stupendous and complex result stage after stage on account of the psychology and inner meaning behind it, which in the end results into liberation of the entangled soul (Anga). śīrvāja is the पूजा of इड्डलिंग, Linga the Gross. The Linga, placed on the left hand, is first given a bath; the bath is followed by the application of जल to the Linga and to the body of the devotee; next comes the putting of अन्न on the Linga and their wearing on the body by the devotee himself. Generally the ज्ञानास are also worn on the body as much as Linga is done; then comes the putting of विल्पन and flowers on the Linga; next incense is burnt and light is waved. Afterwards नमस्कार or salutation in humility, as a mark of submission to the deity (विष्वेल्प), is addressed to the deity and then संज्ञाज is done either silently or inaudibly. Lastly contemplation of the deity in all earnestness makes up the rear. This is शिवपूजा, a simple thing indeed. But all the while when every item of शिवपूजा is performed verses or sentences are chanted in a low voice in praise of every act of the पूजा, specially of मस्मधारण, खासखारण. These and other verses, sung during शिवपूजा, are descriptive of the greatness of the Godhead, the insignificance of the Anga, the ideal
objective to be gained by him, and the importance of the materials of worship like ज्ञान, ज्ञाक्ष, etc., that puts into the the mind of the worshipper or the devotee the inner meaning of the materials. The Anga thereby is made conscious of who and what he is, what his goal in life is, what he has to do and what course he has to follow. All this is intended to cultivate and confirm in the Anga's mind the proper and real sense of spiritualism; and he prays and invokes the aid of the Divine for his purity, elevation and upliftment. By his conscious continuous Puja of the Divinity day after day the devotee rises step by step and stage by stage to his ultimate ideal.

The devotee is all along conscious of being a part and parcel of the Deity he worships every day. He is conscious that he has come to be separated by the working of अशोमाला (अवैोमाला) from his divine nature. He knows that his identity has come to be veiled by the three taints and by his once unlimited powers being contracted or constricted by the working of the same अभोमाला. He thus becomes conscious or made conscious that his real station is in the Lord or he is Lord Himself. But being at present helpless, now that he is cooped up in the mechanism of matter, he has to earnestly and humbly seek the aid of the Lord, Who is ever the friend of the Anga and ever ready to run to the rescue of the devotee मुख. Hence the Bhakta invokes the helping hand of the merciful Lord as much as he seeks the help of his sincere friend. This is चैमार्ग in the first division of शर्त्थ। The Anga is all along conscious that he is the Lord and the Lord is himself (सोहमृ). He, therefore, behaves towards the Lord, the Linga, in all the three stages as he does towards his friend, a real sincere
friend. This is अहंमहृदयान्वन of the Lord pure and simple. The चह्मांगे or अहंमहृदयान्वन, it may be noted, is based on the ज्ञानपाद of Agamas; but here in पद्स्थाल it is modified in the light of गौणपाद of the Agamas, which गौणपाद forms the main basis of the practice of पद्स्थाल.

In the second division of पद्स्थाल, specially of the six-fold अंस्त्य्यल, there is the ज्ञानक्षंड or ज्ञानमार्ग, as contrasted from the कर्मक्षंड or कर्ममार्ग of the first division. In the first there is action-element prevalent over the knowledge-element. But here the knowledge element predominates over the action-element or the physical activity of Linga worship. Still शिवपूजा in all its details is to be always meticulously performed. Concrete worship of Shivalinga or Ishtalinga performed physically can never be dispensed with even at the last stage; the ज्ञानमार्ग in this division only means that the Anga is fully conscious of spiritualism and the importance and the inner meaning of the spiritual discipline. His mind is well imbued with spiritual sense; and he does everything as a matter of habit with a view to refresh and stabilize the sense of spiritualism and the inner meaning behind the physical activity. It is अम्बास or continuous practice, as required by Patanjali, the systematizer of Yogic science and art. The worship of the Lord, performed as usual physically, is more internal or mental. The physical act of worship and the repetition of all usual ceremonials serves the double purpose of rousing and developing the internal worship and making it a concrete example to others. The physical act of worship with well developed sense of spiritualism and the spiritual discipline behind it is a key, as it were, for switching on and winding the key of the mental radio set to the required tune of internal worship.
This is समार्ग, the supreme mode or the Royal road to liberation, the discipline appropriate to and based on the योगपाद of the Agamas. The समार्ग, based on योगवाद, culminates in पद्ध्यल technique, specially in the second division for the pilgrim's progress towards crowning goal of शिवसाध्युत. In the second division also the subjective worship of the Lord (आहंकारोप्यन) is further inculcated. The सद्मार्ग of the first division grows into full-fledged समार्ग. Internal or mental worship of the Lord by contemplation is the real worship but it grows and develops out of the external worship performed by physical acts. This is why the विश्वयोगसमीतिका says—मुख्याचार्यतरी पूजा श्राच बाध्याचिनीदिता। I-38. Hence क्रियामार्ग precedes developing and shading off into the internal worship of वस्मार्ग. In the first division of पद्ध्यल भक्ति, the main motive power of the spiritual discipline, progresses from simple though sincere faith to the phase of निश्चित or confirmed and fixed feeling of devotion to the Lord, too firm to be deviated from the course pursued. It further grows into undivided attention fixed in contemplation of the Lord (अच्छाल). In the second division भक्ति first develops the power of partially experiencing divine life and is therefore called अनुभव, the initial stage of experience. Further it grows into आच्छादनभक्ति, the higher stage or state of experience in which there is the real joy of divine life. Ultimately it rises to the highest stage where full experience of divine life of at-one-ment with the Divinity is attained. It is thus गमरस्मक्ति. In the first part of क्रियामार्ग the first three of the eight limbs of Yoga, namely, यम, नियम and आच्छादन, are practised and perfected. The fourth limb, आच्छाद्याम, is also practised in its very simple elementary form, even from the very beginning for the purposes of मंत्रपि and ध्यान. The remaining four limbs प्राहार and the rest except ध्यान
are practised to the stage of perfection. ध्यान is adopted and practised from the very beginning. In the beginning ध्यान is simple but sincere. It is here directed to the इच्छिक, Linga the Gross, placed and worshipped on the palm of the hand. Later in the second division ध्यान is directed to the indwelling Lord, आणि and वां. This is ज्ञात or अन्तःस्वाभाविक, the internal worship of the Lord. In the third stage of प्राण the Anga attains a further development in his Yogic practice. This is the stage noted for the calmness or freedom from the disturbances or vacillation caused by temptations of the material environment. The भक्त attains this by offering everything to the deity in the first instance. He is therefore called प्राण or one who has प्राण which is मन:प्राण. The मन:प्राण is consequent on the devotee’s idea that everything is due to the favour of the Lord, the grace of the Lord. Here is the germination and initial sprouting of प्राणार that later develops into the complete withdrawal of the senses from the objects. In this connection readers’ kind attention is drawn to the verses, quoted on page 528 ante, which will give good idea of प्राण that vindicates the Bhakta’s appellation of प्राणार.

The practice of ध्यान and निष्ठ �begun by भक्त is further carried on by the महेस्वर. So it is said:—

* अथ यदाचारवर्तितं च प्राण: सूचः श्रवणाश्रयति ।
परंथोसल्लिग्निधुः परसः वराहसुखः ।
शिबायकायमयः शिवायमरमयः ॥
शिबसुनितिरस्वात्रादमोदामण्डः ष्ठिचः ।
शिवोत्धर्षवर्माणां संपादवधिकः ॥
अस्तुर्यमदबंचो माताविनिविशिष्टिः ।
निर्मितां निरस्कारो निर्दल्कृपांमः ॥

* सिद्धांतसिखामणि I—171.
From the analysis of the above it will be seen that all the moral rules of यम and नियम are included for practice in some form or other. सवाचार, शिवाचार, and गणाचार are also included.

One thing to be noted here is that the order of eight-fold limbs of Yogic practice (यम, नियम etc.) is laid down. Some particular limbs come under particular modifications of महि. But the order as laid down by शिब्याचारप्रदेशिका is not rigidly fixed up but they are adopted suitably to the purposes of शिव्युज्य. This is clear from the fact that an भावन is chosen and practised from the beginning, though this second limb comes under महेश्वर. So also भ्यान is practised from the very beginning. भ्यान, therefore, coming under the शारणस्थल is to be understood as the भ्यान of प्रणयास्त्रम and ममश्चर्चण internally. प्रणयास्त्रम is also practised from the beginning for भ्यान and ममश्चर्चण, in the initial stage. But here it is practised in an elementary form for steadying the mind and for steady भ्यान and ज्ञ. But later प्रणयास्त्रम grows into higher forms as required for the higher stages, specially when the devotee of the mystic temperament likes to develop the practice of taking up the Pranik force (शक्ति) to union with शिव in शहीद्यार or cerebrum. So order of eight limbs is changed and adopted suitably as required for शिव्युज्य. In short in the first division of शिवायांग the devotee’s worship of Linga is वाह्य्युज्य or external worship, leading up
to the internal worship of श्रावणिण्य and मायविण्य, of which इत्यविण्य is the external symbol, the reminder and mentor of the higher modifications of Linga. श्रावणिण्य thus grows into श्यासार्थ or internal worship pure and simple. श्रावणिण्य in the श्रावणिण्य is गौण or preparatory; and it grows into परमाक्ष or supreme devotion in the श्यामार्थ.

दीक्षा ceremony introduces the Anga into श्रीवृज्ञ in all details. One important thing to be noted here is that the Anga himself goes to the Guru and requests him to introduce him to श्रीवृज्ञ (vide page 576 ante). His request is proof of his yearning for spiritual life. The दीक्षा ceremony begins with किरावदीक्षा in a proper ceremonial form when the Guru after giving the Anga a holy bath invests him with the Linga (Ishtalinga) and teaches him the details of श्रीवृज्ञ. This is the दीक्षा of लागांग; the physical body (स्थूलाधिकारी) and the devotee is impressed with the importance of spiritual life and is confirmed in his attitude of the worthlessness of the merely worldly life, the bread and butter life. He comes to know that the worldly life is worth-living, only when it is combined with spiritual life and discipline. Such attitude of the Anga is technically called संतविवेकत्व that precedes दीक्षा and that is why he goes to the Guru for दीक्षा. The Anga is taught the method of praying and meditating on the deity. The Guru is enjoined to teach this method in *"श्रीवृज्ञ नाम सर्वं छ बिनामिण्य छ कार्येत्—
सकलप्रायाधितत्वप्रकारतं श्रीव्यायांचं कार्येत्".

Next comes मंत्रदीक्षा, which makes the fleshy body a holy body. So it is said †"अयं मायविं कंमपिं मिथादुः अंतरोपदेवः कण्ठोद्ध सिद्धां आह्". ‡ The मंत्रविवेक of the body is described in the following:

* सिद्धात्विवेकार्ण I—36. † Ibid 17. ‡ अद्वैतद्वस्त—36.
This is connected with भूगांग and प्राणहिंग, as मंत्र is intimately connected with breath, the visible expression of psychic प्राण. The practice of मंत्र effects internal improvement and the psychic प्राण descends into the physical plane and raises up the devotee to the higher plane. Lastly comes the वेषादिष्ट of infusing knowledge into Anga by direct contact. The Guru whispers मंत्र while doing so.

* "By मंत्र in the initiation called वेषादिष्ट there is such a transference of power from the Guru to the disciple that the latter swoons under the influence of it." Such a Guru is hard to get. The disciple who receives this initiation gets all the powers of the initiator. It is said there are Gurus who can at once make their disciples fit for highest aims. It is sad that such Gurus are few and far between.

The investiture of इंद्रहिंग is the first and foremost rite of दोषादि (दोषादिविव: प्राणहिंगधारणपूर्व: ). The इंद्रहिंग is the external visible symbol of the in-dwelling Lord. The devotee has to wear and worship it life-long. It is to be worshipped on the palm of the (left) hand all through life. The wearer of the Linga is always holy and free from pollution or impurity like वर्णित consequent on the death of a relative, as in the case of वर्णितवर्ण. So it is said:

* The Serpent Power, page 84. † Quoted by वि. II-27
The devotee, therefore, is not prevented from the worship of Linga at stated times, as a Varnâshramic may be from performing the daily or occasional rites (and ) during the period of . Females also are free from pollution attaching to the monthly course, so far as the worship of Linga is concerned. It is, therefore, laid down:

† in the daily worship is so imperative in the interest of spiritual culture in a continuous unbroken course that the abolition of such forms of impurity is necessary and desirable. This is the reason that five forms of (impurity) are done away with. The five forms of impurity (including the three mentioned in the verses quoted

* कृति 1—97. † कृति 1—150.
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above) are जातिपूलक, जन्मसूतक, रजसूतक, शरणसूतक and उचिच्छसूतक.
The first is fundamental and illustrative of the principle of universal brotherhood of man in society, which ab initio is religious, as society is no society divested of religion. The abolition of जातिसूतक emphasizes the negation of the distinction of the high and low as religious beings of Society. This distinction of high and low is so much ingrained in the Varnāshramadharma that it has given rise to countless number of castes by permutation and combination of mixed marriages by अदुलैम and प्रतिलैम. The obvious result has been that the Hindu Community has been full of the most warring and jarring elements in it that refuse unity and solidarity, much less fusion. This has also given rise to cunning and selfish sections of the community to trade upon the ignorance of the masses, intentionally kept ignorant, as a matter of principle. All this is by-the-by.

We have only to add an explanation of उचिच्छसूतक, the untouchability of food, once touched by one's self or by others, as is the custom. उचिच्छ is more generally the food left in the dish after eating one's fill. It is a principle among the Lingayats that no food is to be left in the dish after eating, and care is to be taken to have food served in the dish as much as is necessary for one's fill. It is considered a sin to waste food instead of economising and using it properly for those that are poor and too weak to earn food. The question therefore, of food left or उचिच्छ does not arise. At the same time it is also a principle and a religious custom to take a small quantity of food from the Guru or
a Jangama as प्रभाव, as much as food addressed to God is taken as His प्रभाव. Guru or Jangame, being जीवन्मुख are considered to be equal to the Godhead. And hence the food received from them out of their dish is considered as their प्रभाव in a concrete form. It is spiritual food and is enjoined to be taken as the means of purifying the body by the disciple. The food of the Guru is infused with the spirit's purity and is, therefore, capable of effecting purity of the devotee taking it. Such taking of food as प्रभाव also means, apart from its spiritual meaning, the equality of Lingayats and the real spirit of गुरूविष्णुमाय, or the relation of गुरू and शिष्य being one. This is also the spirit of the devotee (Anga) and the Linga, the primeval teacher, being one.

In addition to what we have said in VIII section about Linga and as the third आवरण, we may say that गुरूलिङ्ग given to the devotee is neither an image (प्रतिमा) nor a substitute (प्रतीक) of the Godhead as it superficially looks to be. It is God Itself as a visible symbol. It is one with the spirit of the devotee, the inward Divine Spirit. It is, therefore, the remembrancer or mentor of the indwelling Divine Spirit. The Guru infuses the Linga with the life-spirit of the devotee, and puts the Linga into the श्राप of the devotee i.e. he makes the devotee conscious of his divine nature as a microcosm. It is therefore said:—

* अथ लिङ्गार्णासामास्य कुल्ला ताहिं शिष्यहस्ते स्थापयेदिखाईः
  शिष्यस्य प्राणार्धान्तिं गुरूलिङ्ग तत्र निवासायेत् ।
  ताहिं तस्य तु प्राणे स्थापयेदुविवक्तः ।
  एवं कुल्ला गुरूलिङ्ग शिष्यहस्ते निवासायेत् ॥

* श्ल. I—89.
This is the reason why the strict mandate is given to a devotee that he should never be separate from the इङ्लिंग, as such separation only means separation of the Divine Spirit and the human spirit. The worship of इङ्लिंग is बाह्य्रूपा leading to the internal worship (अंतःपूजा of अंतःंग) in conjunction with the इङ्लिंग. This is clear from:—

* विद्वानेच्छ जबदेशे खुस्ये रश्चित्रिते।
  दिविलिङ्गाश्च युज्या ता बाया मय्यबंध्यं।
  जीवार्ण समाधाय आरोग्यं तु शाख्यम्।
  स्वस्त्य मनस्तथा कुर्ता न हिंचिष्ठिष्ठोदकि।
  साध्यताल महिकरिते प्रोचयं शिवोगिनभः।
  या यथान्विते तस्य जो प्रवर्तन्त धीर्यजित।

Linga, therefore is चिन्मय or चिदूप, Divine Consciousness. It is accordingly spoken of or addressed as "बोधकिंग", "चिन्मात्र", "योयतिष्ठय", "संबिलिङ्ग" and so on. The analytical description and meaning of Linga is:—

† पीठिक्ष परमा वर्तितिंग साधारणः शिवः।
  शिवयशिक्षायें लिंगं विखं तदुपयो।

इङ्लिंग is further said to be merely an expression of the internal योयतिष्ठिंग, as made clear in—

† बाह्यस्तिल्पं परं लिंगं योयदीहं शिवालंकर।
  विद्वाय बाह्यविलिङ्गाश्च बिमुद्रा इति कोलिता।

व्याख्यानं—भूत बाह्यलिङ्गं इङ्लिंगमातिरिक्तप्राक्षतिंगं परं इङ्लिंगस्य बिद्वान्
  चलनेन आंतःमहितम् सर्वं। वि. II—4.

* वि. I—139, 140. † Ibid p. II-8.
Linga thus is neither an image nor a substitute. It is not an image and is worshipped as such. After worship food is addressed to it and is taken as the emblem of purity and the means of purification.

The very important items of Linga worship are and , which in due course of practice develop into and respectively. The latter develops into or in accordance with the temperament of the devotee. Now we proceed to explain the development of the five complementary Yogas in order that ultimately develop into , i.e. of and .

(1) —We have already said a great deal about in connection with as the eighth . Not much remains, therefore, to be said about . However we may add the following by way of further elucidation.

, as , begins after in . Mind is restless and is the vehicle of vibrations of matter, itself being made of very subtle matter, subtler than . Vibrations in the vehicle produce corresponding changes in consciousness and result as . These latter are the cause of the next cycle of birth and all activities in that birth. These vibrations are to be avoided. And is one mechanical way of checking the vibrations, steadying the mind, so that consciousness may be still and free from impressions.

A is a definite succession of sounds, which are . Particular deities are represented by particular sounds. And the muttering of a rouses the deity,
when the sounds representing the deity are produced. A मंत्र is a power (मंत्रशक्ति) and lends itself to any use. A मंत्र, therefore, when rightly used, helps spiritual development. A मंत्र is a manifestation of कुलकुंडलिनी (शिवशक्ति) herself, for she is all letters and चन्द्रि and परमात्मा Itself. Hence मंत्र is used in rousing the शक्ति lying asleep in मूलाधार and taking her up to union with शिव in सहस्रार or cerebrum. The five letters of पंचाश्रीमंत्र are enclosed in order in the lower five आधार or chakras. Thus न is in मूलाधार, म: or म is स्त्राविष्ण्व, etc. श्री, which is the sum-total of पंचाश्रीमंत्र, is in the sixth आधार, the आकाशक. The feeling consciousness is in all things; but it is not manifest without particular processes. So also मंत्र, which is a form of the feeling consciousness of God, is not perceptible without the union of devotee’s power with the power of मंत्र roused. When the devotee mutters the मंत्र in a particular posture in devotion, the letters in the आधार are struck in order. The power is roused and it gradually rises upward from आधार to आधार and at last unites with शिव in सहस्रार.

The method of मंत्रज्ञ is laid down as follows:—

* आणायामश्रयं कर्ता प्रायमुखोद्वाक्ष्यामिव ।
  चित्रवर्ण हुदयांमोक्षे देशदेवं त्रिष्णेकम् ॥
  सर्वलक्षणसंयुक्तं चांतं चंद्रार्चुकेश्रम् ।
  प्रवेशदाता बहुविश्वा शिवश्वामनन्दजीः ॥

व्याख्यानं—स्थः स्थः समाजनविश्रवाचलावस्तरणं सिद्धयादिने नामभुद्रो-द्वारको चेतनविश्व, समम्बाजांश्चक्ति: व्रज शिवशिवाय नकं भूतर—

आयुपुज्य शिवं स्त्रीज्ञपालयमुद्वीरते ।
  संपुज्य न शिवं प्राणान्ते वक्तु न शक्यते ॥

* सि. I—130,
Thus after performing शिवपूजा in the proper form the devotee should proceed to छन्दपूज, which should begin with छाणायाम in its elementary form. In the first division of छन्दपूज, the छन्दपूज effects purification of the Anga on the first plane and ensures calm and peace in the devotee and prepares him for the higher worship of Linga, the अंतःपूजा.

In the छाणायाम stage, the first stage of the second division the छन्द पूज begins with वैकृत्यायाम which is artificial in the sense that there is re-adjustment of अर्थात्वायाम or natural breathing. In the latter the in-going breath is इ (अ) and the out-going is व: (व्याघ्र). In the natural breathing there is the arrogation, or the feeling of अहंकार (or I’ness) prevails. But in वैकृत्यायाम or artificial breath-control the order is reversed and the idea of humble submission of the devotee to the deity prevails, because the in-going breath is made व: and out-going breath इ. This means that egotistic feeling is expelled and the devotee humbly seeks the aid of the Lord for upliftment. This is in accordance with what is said in—

* सर्वत्रस्योपरिष्ठां सक्षिप्तसंधिभाष्यम्।
स्वप्रकाश्यमिदंसद्यमवाइमनस्यध्याचरम्॥

* सिः II, 8.
मंत्रयोग from this stage may develop independently or may go hand in hand with ज्ञयोग on the last plane of ज्ञयोग and bring about the essential oneness of Anga and Linga, the end of ज्ञयोग.

By मंत्रयोग the practitioner may and can develop his spiritual powers and use them for different purposes. The practitioner may attain the eight great powers, like अभिमान, गरिमा etc. He may also attain different minor powers of clairvoyance, clairaudience etc., and he may be an adept in मन्त्रic वस्त्र्नीs viz. सन यथन, श्रीरकाम, उच्चाटन, भारण, स्तंभन and विधेयक. But these are not the purpose for which मंत्रयोग is or is to be practised but for the highest human objective (मुक्ति). It is the charltans that indulge in these for personal ends, self-aggrandizement and self-glorification. But such use of the powers attained is vile and will result in disaster to the practitioner. The devotee practising मंत्रयोग has to steer clear of the siren-like temptation and disaster. शिवयोग enjoins upon the शिवयोगिय in making the one and the only objective of सामरस्य of शिव and जीव.

It remains only to be noted that मंत्रयोग is to be performed silently with undivided attention fixed on the
Godhead. The inaudible, much more than the loud or audible muttering of नमग्र, is considered to be efficacious and therefore is encouraged. We need not quote here the verses in support of this observation.

The practice of the नमग्र, the motive to be consciously kept behind the practice and the ultimate result step by step of निर्णयांग्निग्रन्थन, are best expressed by the following. We quote the following, as it will be impossible for us to express it in our words—

* समाइ खति देंहे दु प्रहसानिदिनिहाथे ।
   देस्थाल्लाभेवांगुसकवचवासेः ।
   सहस्रमनोजन्येकारिष्ये शिवालिखितम् ॥
   प्रभावितार्थिमियें महायुति सहस्रध्यायं तव चद्रवन्ति ॥
   सहस्राल्लाभप्रकाशुपिती तस्मि: प्रस्तो भव जन्तू यें ॥
   प्राणायामसुविवधचवह एवः । समाधिरिततः ।
   प्राणो प्राणहीतकतो वध्वनात्माचारयं विना ।
   ज्ञाते कर्मणि सामि में परम्या सच्चा सलिलितेऽः
   नित्यं वर्तति आर्ताचार्यताचार्यतिविविधां भजनं ॥
   सहस्राल्लाभसाम्लाभसुरुधिशिक्षमभजननिधाता ।
   निश्चति निजानिथ्यायां चरिति हि माहेश्वरस्वेभा जाध्यम् ॥
   ऋषिमिषयस्मृतवा शिवलिखितं शेषवहमवचानाल ।
   विलोकनवन जपति चदा तर्यं प्रभादिकसे प्रजजनीः ॥
   त्वरित्रविवधचाराध्यानं किं चरं स्वशनाध्यायेऽः
   भजनं चदा स्वातुमेवकाऽवं च प्राणाविशत्यवमेश आसे ॥
   मनोवाचारण्यवासुदमतमचाध्यायसाहसुधानिक्षम्
   ऋषिमिषयमुखान्यस्वक्षरं भजति चदा परिणायमेंः ॥
   मनोपह्रमहायुद्धविन्धयकथेवा न्यूतनस्वर्गहमनन्त्रयोऽधाताः
   ऐकश्येकः महतिश्रृवृत्ताचारस्यज्ञय जपतवम् महीनेमेंम्म ॥
   विकाशस्तिकारिष्ये विविधाविन्धियनां गावता ।
   वर्षं प्रमादित्ततं चक्रणेत्रेश्वरिक्षितेऽः

* विषेषाध्यायकाशिका, page 46 ff.
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All this explains वेत्र्येत्रम of the Lingayat religion lucidly and well.

II. Layayoga begins in क्रियामार्ग in मन्त्रज्ञ. In the Second division of ज्ञानमार्ग the devotee may and can practise Layayoga to perfection if he is a person of mystic temperament. It has its development in अंतःपूजा of Linga, the अणािण. The internal worship is considered to be the primary form of worship as the real spiritual discipline to attain the highest spiritual end, mukti. But as internal worship is difficult to perform without something concrete before the mind, the external worship of Ishtalinga, Linga the Gross, has been found necessary. The principle of external worship is expressed in words "न बस्तनाकारसुंदिति बुद्धि: ". This is why शिवयोगप्रवीण says "सुखया चारभंतरी पूजा त्या च बाह्याभिनामिता ". The human mind and understanding are always directed towards and busy with the external material world for physical comforts; and it goes very hard for man to turn them inwards for internal culture. क्रियामार्ग with conscious- ness of the principle behind the physical acts of worship is thus indispensable. During and by क्रियामार्ग the devotee becomes sufficiently adept in and capable of
practising internal worship, which is ज्ञानभाग्य. The internal worship is the devotee's meditation of the Lord dwelling in various शाखाओं or chakras. The internal worship is described in शिवदासप्रदीपिका as well as शिवदग्न-शिखामणि. The former says:—( vide I-40 to 50).

अद्वैतमध्ये विश्वः निम्न निर्वाचनोचयम्।
अचर्यमध्यस्यकामादिनितवर्णितम्॥
परं शिवं हृदि शाला निम्नलोमूतमानः।
यजेदास्यस्यतद्विधशालेन तथा॥
शर्मासुणिरेस्वनं सकलपूर्णावारंभम्।
शिवशिखुण्डलं निविधतयस्य तथा॥
स्वसंविद्वृहत्वेण समाधिकादेवप्राक्षतं।
शिवाय बिनिवेद्येत् प्रकटमनन्ति कुष्ठवर्णिच।
अनितास्तात्तत्तुद्देयेन तद्नियन्त्रितयुणादरकरण हु।
कल्यंशेच चुमुक्तः खर्जित जीवः प्रभुवद्वारामाते॥
राजतमः सत्तुणाशयान्त्यां वृक्षं प्राणनमस्कृतिच।
इत्येवम् संयतसुरपूजन्त्रयाणि संपादय संकरय॥

शिवशिखुण्डलं निविधतयस्य is explained by the commentator as हृदि-ज्ञानक्षिय चक्षुसूत्रम्। शिवदग्न-शिखामणि also considers अंतःपुष्च to be primary and strongly advises devotees to practise the worship of the Linga worn inside the body as noted before on page 570. The book lays down the internal worship as follows:—( vide II-5, 6).

अंतां तत् चिवाकारं लिंग शिवमय परम्।
पूजनं भागुपाध्य: प्राणिविग्यार्थं द्वि तत्॥
निष्ठ कुल पुजनीयभवलयः प्राणिविग्यायभयमात्रेन वर्गितम्। भागुपाध्यः-
पुजनीयभवलयः।
अंतःपवनविश्वरोऽसुरतःश्रवोकस्यते।
मूर्तिवं चेतुविग्यात्रादेशाकातिष्ठते॥
वेशादिनत्वदृश्यो वेशादि हृदाद्यः॥
पद्मापीठ समासोऽनि चिकिंग शिवविग्याम्।
We may also quote the form of internal worship given in विशेषाध्यायभेदोपिनिक (page 7), which though brief is very fine as follows:

- अंतिमांगि सुखं श्रामं: सह मनसं: श्रीदेवगिरिदेवता।
- श्राणं केशरमात्रस्वित क्रुदुं धूरों सवेशीरसमु।
- श्रीपं: कांतिरथचनन्दित्वादिनंत्रेशवंतः।
- तांभुं विनमरियागरश एवेश्यां पूजनम्।

शिवयोगभेदोपिनिक elaborates the materials of internal worship in the form of eight limbs of Yoga. But it will be too much to describe them all here and the above will be sufficient for readers to understand the spirit and form of internal worship.

The internal worship begins with श्राणकिंगस्वर, the fourth form and stage of बङ्गस्वर which he reaches after attaining thoroughness in the first division (किसाल्मार्ग) as भक्त, महेश्वर and अंगाची। In this स्वर of श्राणकिंगिन, the Anga is taught the Divine Omnipresence in the body and His worship and meditation, after the usual process of physical external worship. The nature of the Divinity inside is described by विद्वानतिशिवामणि as follows:
The process of internal worship and the result is described in the following:

In this way the devotee of mystic temperament develops the internal power and takes it up to the cerebrum gradually. When he ultimately attains union with the self in he has to divest himself of the idea of duality so that the temporary union with the self in the cerebrum may ripen into lasting identity of his self with that of the Divine Self. He should regain the veiled identity by driving off the three taints and the five forms of contraction.

The person of mystic temperament is dreamy and moves in the midst of environment as a visionary. He feels that his mind, fixed on the series of desires supplanting and succeeding one another, creates an endless chain of bonds round the soul and finds it necessary to destroy the bonds. He studies the nature of perceptions and watches the working of the inner power. The study, observation
and introspection give him a clue to a right procedure in his internal and external activities. He finds that the functions of the subjective series in relation to the objective series are the functions of the sensory and vital powers. He concludes that the sensory and vital powers are grosser expressions of the subtle power in the subjective series, because the grosser on the subjective and the objective sides are the grosser manifestation of the finer power inside. The aspiring Anga comes to think that the presence of the Supreme, a catalizer as it were, is always there inside and manifests itself in various marvellous configurations of all this external environment and all internal subjective and objective functions. He tries to know how the mysterious Power configures itself in myriad forms and works on various planes. He begins to aspire for the Supreme as the only Reality. He begins to discipline himself with the two sets of the principles of moral conduct (यम and नियम, the two rudimentary common constituents of all forms of Yoga), cultivates a prayerful attitude and to learn how to direct and contract the motor and sensorial energies into the Subjective series by psycho-physical or psychical methods. He later learns that these well directed gross energies become finer and one with the subtle energies inside. His one object is to learn to unify these subtle inside energies by pure psychical methods and thus to attain the mysterious power and finally to hush all the mental functions in order to realize Divinity. He feels the supreme presence of the power Divinity within as श्रद्घ्धिन्यं and मातार्धिन्यं, as the source of all and the only saviour. He thus works for the control of the psychic force through breath-control and ultimately rises to the highest level of at-one-ment with the Lord,
III कर्मण:—कर्मण is the method adopted, followed, and cultivated by the Anga of active temperament. The Anga begins कर्मण in the stage as प्रवासी, the grace-earner, where he begins to learn that all objects he takes and enjoys are all due to the Lord and therefore all are the Lord's favour and grace. The use and enjoyment of objects as the grace of God leads to the calmness of his mind. The Anga has to work for life and physical well-being. The idea of the objects enjoyed as the grace of God leads him to think that he has to work for earning the grace of God; because inactivity, the physical inactivity, will not bring him the necessaries of life. Thus behind all physical activity he finds a kind of Divine mission. So the Anga thinks that he works and can work knowingly or otherwise for fulfilling the mission of Divinity by turning out work in the form of the execution of action. Hence he works, not because the action and the work are his, but because they constitute the plan of Divine Mission—not because the work or its fruits are those of the self confined in the body, but because work and action -turned out serve the purpose of such a mission. The aspirant of the active temperament, therefore, considers it a duty to engage the body and the mind in work in right earnest.

It is with such an idea of fulfilling the great duty, the aspiring Anga of the active temperament busies his body and mind with the performance of work. Non-attachment to the fruits of action makes the person free from the evil effects, the affliction of the mind, of his failure in the case of his objective activity. The non-attachment to the fruit of work, with the notion of the divine plan and purpose, inspires and leads the aspiring Anga through the
right channel. Action becomes instinctive and work becomes natural. Day in and day out work is untiringly turned out with the sense of duty fulfilled, as intended by God. It is no longer a matter of mine or thine but of the Divine. A continuity of this attitude in the midst of ever-going activity effects transformation of the small self to a higher level, to the level of serenity and actionlessness in action. The serene attitude restrains the modifications and mind becomes steadied and undirectional, except towards the higher end, the ultimate end, when there is all joy and all peace in identity with Divine grandeur. The कर्मवेध is best expressed in the following words:—

* प्रसुः स्वतंत्रः प्रभुस्वतंतः प्रयुर्येक्षत्तत्तकमः
पापं च पुष्च च विवेच्या हि हृदयन्तक्तः प्रभुस्वतंतः ||
इच्छाज्ञानिकारकत्वम् बल्महि च प्रसुः ||
स्वतंत्रस्वदीर्घमस्ततेः प्रयम्ब्रुः ||
इच्छित जनातीं करौति सकलं हृदायं करम् ||
इच्छाज्ञानिक्यथा कामयो विव एव नाइभिति शत्यम् ||
इच्छाशक्तिया भगवानं मुखसः सकलमूत्तत्त्वम् ह्यशशत्य ||
शारदी जानातीं श्रेष्ठो निविदहि करारिः किंयास्कृतुः ||
कार्यं च कर्मवेधम्यावत्तति तत्र ज्ञात भोज्या ||
स्वतंत्रायाः प्रभुस्वदू इस्विदे पुनर्हेदगः सके पथ नाइम् ||
स्वाष्टिरित् स्वकक्रमम् करोमि कतन्त नाइं च तस्य फलस्वकु परतलम्भावित्।
भृत्याशेष इह यद्दृशिः हंदः स्वात्मामिनस्तव मया इमेव तत्तः ||
स्वतंत्रवेदिं शंभो मम भीतियं कार्यं हि ||
करोमि पपुपुयाठि संहराम्यात्मानानि ||
अतो ज्ञाता पारंत्यायात्मात्यादिपि में प्रसो ||
पपुपुयाठिं किंचिदिपि नालाती स्वत्तम् ||
तस्मात्मानं पपंच स्वरेन्द्रापि च दुर्गतिः।

* विदेशायमकारः, 11-13.
Such is the attitude of the devotee all through life and he rises higher and higher in purity of actionlessness in activity, cultivates peace of mind, and in the end attains at-one-ment with Linga. In कर्मयोग the motive of personal gain and the sense of egotism or egoism (अहंकार) are driven out of all activities of human life. The activities, therefore, fail to produce and leave impressions on the individual soul. They produce the fire of knowledge that burns the seed of activity itself, as fire springing out of wood burns the wood itself. It is thus remarked:—

* यथा काहेंकृत्रियाः चाहि: कामेऽव विवेदेऽहि |
  तथा कर्मोऽज्जश्चान्य कस्मेव प्रविनाशेऽहि *

IV भक्तियोगः—Now we come to Bhaktiyoga, Yoga by Bhakti, the sincere devotion to the Godhead that ultimately raises the Anga to at-one-ment with Linga and itself rises to at-one-ment with mukti, i.e. it itself becomes mukti. Bhakti is the intense love to God, which inspires a devotee to a real, genuine search after the Lord, a search beginning continuing and ending in the love of the Lord. This love cannot be reduced to any earthly benefit, because so long as worldly desires last that kind of intense love of God cannot and does not come; the devotee, therefore, first sees the worthlessness of the worldly life (संसारहेत्यता) and begins the search after the life everlasting and everhappy. And this he does by means of भक्ति, the real, sustained love of God.

* विशेषार्थप्रकाशिका, page 10.
2-78
The one great advantage of भक्ति is that it is the easiest and the most natural method of reaching the great divine end in view, as men generally are emotional in their mental make-up. Bhakti in the beginning is preparatory; and later it develops and ripens into the supreme form (प्रारंभिक) of experience, joy and union with God. The human spirit or Anga gradually rises higher and higher, step by step, and stage by stage to the highest aim and end, where भक्ति and ज्योति become one and indistinguishable from one another. This is जामस्य.

The Anga of the emotional temperament harmonizes himself with his spiritual understanding by study, training and culture. His inner urge for the life of spiritual discipline in devotion is confirmed and leads the life of devotion all through life. He finds that unlikees attract in the universe and act upon one another; while the likes remain apart and act upon one another in a different way. He sees that attraction and mutual action and reaction, aloofness or inaction are all due to the marvellous play of the love of God or God’s चमत्कार. He thinks that the spark of Divine love pervades all actions and reactions and is the essence of all. It is the faint ray of the Supreme mercy of God that runs through all things in the universe, like a thread running through the beads of a rosary, to knit together all things in the universe. The Anga of such a mould of mind feels that it is the presence of Divinity within that shines as the quanta of Supreme love. He comes to know that love begets love and hatred ceases by love. He adores the Divinity in him and in the universe as the only Reality. Love makes him devoted to the Divinity. Love and devotion breed in him an attitude of
the Supreme Divine. On account of the deep love he feels a personal relationship with the Divinity. He considers the Godhead to be his master, his friend, his beloved, and becomes intensely devoted to him. The love and devotion make his attitude of spiritual life and discipline constant. He begins the worship of the Lord as in no way different from himself. He thinks that the Lord is himself and himself is the Lord. This is अहंमहोपासना, the worship of the Lord in himself and everywhere. He feels consolation and solace in the apparent presence of the Divine within. And when his attention misses the Divine he feels the pangs of separation.

As love and devotion become pure and selfless, their flow becomes steady and undivided. His mind becomes all steady and is absorbed in the contemplation of God. In the end the Anga then attains union with the Divine (नामस्वरूप). The individuality of the small ego is lost and supreme solace comes to be experienced gradually as in the union of a beloved with the lover when the beloved is lost in the lover. The sense of duality vanishes and there is only one sense, the sense of the only Reality.

The Anga’s worship of the Linga in devotion and the gradual progress are described in broad outlines in विशेषार्थप्रख्यातिका (pp. 7, 8) as follows:—

महास्वमेव बुधास्वाने भूतिस्यद्भावार्थम् ।
कथा भजनं बुधतत्तमा ततो माहृत्रस्तयः ॥
पवश्च इरं मय।मत्यायास्तनिष्ठाः इति ।
प्राणादिर्यकायम् लिंगं हर्तेववधानतः ॥
प्राणान्तिनिष्ठ्ये पूजनं विधाय स्वामभूतितः ।
ततः श्रीरायणं कुत्ता स्वातंद्रत्वाच्छरणस्तथे ॥
But it is better described in the following words:

And thus the Jñāna Yoga, pp. 28, 29,

V. Jñāna Yoga.—It now remains for us to note Jñāna Yoga, really a difficult form of Yoga. This form of Yoga is adopted and practised by the Anga of rational temperament. The world he experiences by day and the star-lit heavens by night, the mysterious, regular and rhythmical working of the universe excite wonder in him and begins to inquire into the mystery in right earnest. Such an inquiry and the study of the mysterious universe are more pleasing and palatable to him than anything else. He thinks that any insight and understanding in that direction is worth more than any worldly possession. He comes to think that the pursuit of worldly life, however glorious, and attach-
ment to the environment, however attractive, deprives him of his leisure for his studies and contemplation of the reality of life and existence. He, therefore, engrosses himself with the investigation and study of the more serious problems of life and reality. He carefully observes surrounding nature and collects data of his observation. He systematizes his data collected and draws conclusions from them. He watches the functioning of the perceiver and the perceived; and by a critical study he understands how objective events influence the senses and how this influence is affected by conditions both external and internal. Gradually he comes to understand that the universe and its functioning, the functioning of the subject and the object, are all due to an agency that is far beyond the ordinary human comprehension, and therefore, strives to understand the mysterious agency behind the universe and all. After serious attempts he comes to the conclusion and conviction that the Divine is the only reality and moulds his mental and physical activities accordingly. He tries to maintain his attitude in the midst of the worldly life and follows a life of devotion to the Godhead. He attempts to purge out selfishness, vanity and self-conceit, as he understands ego of any type to be superficial, ephemeral, and phenomenal. He tries to dispel the ego-centric attitude, because he considers that the Divine within is all-in-all and the only Reality. He strives to live upto the principles of moral conduct even under trying circumstances. He does not wilfully err and falter and he tries to proceed always in the right direction, guiding himself with the view to attain essential unity, and unique oneness. In
this way he gains holiness of heart, strength of will, balance of mind and equanimity. He strives to escape from the prison-hold of the sense-ego and to shatter the golden fetters of the higher-ego. He tries to transcend them and to aspire for the realization of the supreme light and knowledge.

He learns from his Guru, the spiritual guide, all about the Divinity and His inscrutable Power (शक्ति). He leads a life of earnest devotion and gradually concentrates his attention on the Divinity in meditation, first on the symbolic form as श्वेतमित्र, then as the Pranic force within (प्राणलिङ्ग) and lastly as the Great Divine (महालिङ्ग), awaiting union in the cerebrum. The eight fold limbs of this Yoga differ in form and nature from those already given. They are:

* पुरुषोत्तमविभागानि हृदेत तामि सिद्धानि च।
  एकालोककल्पेण कुतानि च मया धृष्ट ॥
  ब्रह्मरित्यादियेशद्विषेषाधाराशीतात्वत्वत्पूक्षानि ॥
  जयं शांतिः संस्कारं: शति: शति: साधियति स योगः ॥
  भक्तियुर्विररमस्तवत्वत्वजनकः निष्किर्तं स्वस्थवागततत्वतुद्धि: ॥
  एकात्वाधरता च भवेनिवृत्तिविवशयमभाव हृदि ये नियमालं एव ॥
  हस्तमें सदाकालाधिकतत्वं छधासयं ॥
  सर्वस्तह्युद्धवीनाभावभस्तभुयच्य ॥
  नुहुँचा नुकपूर्व्यं बंधुपञ्चमन्दिराद्यग्निस्यनाति ॥
  प्राणसिध्दलक्षणो जगरस्य विश्वासितिः स प्राणसिद्धभवः ॥
  चिन्तामण्डृकेन प्रतिहतत्वृत्वेत्वन्यक्षोभजाल ॥
  स्नेहयक्षरं नानाविदुर्मतिविकारस्य संक्तिरिव ॥
  तत्तत्विकारस्यनिमित्तस्य कथा कथयते गोगविविकः ॥
  प्रख्यात: ष्ठ एवंसिचितस्मन्नस्तमेव भजामि ॥

* शिबंधोग्मद्विशिष्या, page 82 ff.
In this Yoga the path, on which the faculty of intelligence (ज्ञान) is used, is predominantly the path of a metaphysician or a philosopher. The Angathus turns inward, ever seeking to find the self by diving deep into the recesses of his own nature. Knowing that the self is within him, he tries to strip away vesture by vesture, envelop after envelop, and by a process of rejecting them he reaches the glory of the unveiled Self. To begin this he must give up concrete thinking and dwell amidst abstractions. His method then must be strenuous, patient, long-sustained meditation. Nothing else will serve his end; strenuous, hard thinking, by which he rises away from the concrete into abstract regions of the mind; strenuous hard thinking, further continued, by which he reaches from the abstract regions of the mind up to the regions of उद्देश्य, where unity is sensed; still by strenuous thinking, climbing yet further, until उद्देश्य opens out into आत्म, until the Great Self is seen in His splendour, with only a film
of consciousness, the envelop of Atma in the manifested fivefold world (पचमहामूलानि.

रण or dedication of objects is also in ज्ञानयोग as in आत्मयोग and कर्मयोग. The dedication in आत्मयोग, and कर्मयोग is called क्रियार्थ and that in ज्ञानयोग is called ज्ञानार्थ or intellectual dedication. The offering or dedication of objects in concrete tangible forms, as physically enjoyed is शुद्ध or gross; and offering of objects mentally conceived and enjoyed is called उपन, imaginative or intellectual. The three forms of dedication, corresponding to the three Lingas, are शुद्ध or उप (gross), अभिविध्य or रिति (appropriated or absorbed), तृति or आनंद (satisfaction). They are respectively physical or external, absorbed or internal, and intellectual or conceptual. The three are of इत्यक्ष, आणाक्ष and आविक्ष in order. So it is said:—

* या या किष्कन दिधाभवा प्रसुता जायें जुछाः तां तां कुर्याम् जातेव परम्परणायु बुधिष्:।
तातीर्थविशाति ५ष्ठ सत्तकाः समावेशबिमेवदत्।
विषेयते सदैवाश्च स्थूलभोगाय चालन:।
आत्मोपयोजातानि द्रव्याणि निविधानि हि।
न्यूत्वायं अभिविचारायानंतराचारसिद्धि तिर्या।
न्यूनत्वायं भवेद्वाच अभिविक्ष निविधेतु।
आनन्दस्तु स्वेतुसिधानेव पुस्पकफामात।
बिहिस्तापे रूपमंतरंगाप्ये रचि:।
आत्मसंगमं आशादानंदप्रणुमड:।
आत्मोपयोजनेनातृपितिसविधायते।
रूपमंतरप्यो विश इत्यक्षमसम्भवात।
रितिसिधार्थपं: वाचात्श्राणिरे तु तैजष:।
आविक्षमेव सत्य आनंदपूर्व उच्चते।

* अनुमसूत्र, pp. 37, 38.
The object offered to इत्यादिः becomes त्रुण, addressed to मनोद्रष्टा is सत्त् and addressed to मनोद्रष्टा is दमिन्द्र. All this means that objects are first taken and enjoyed physically by the body (इत्यादि); they are then absorbed by the body by the action of राज्ञा (प्राणेऽवूति); the ultimate result is the well-being of the body felt intellectually (मनोद्रष्टा). The object taken at the time of शिर्पूज्ञ after offering to the deity is pure and auspicious and is impure and inauspicious when taken at other times. This regulates physical life of the devotee and develops spiritualism. All this is कभारण्य with mentality behind. ज्ञानार्थ is merely psychological or intellectual. The readers are referred to and requested to recall the six forms of राज्ञा, कंप्रकार etc., the six instruments of conveying the offering to the deity, विचि etc., all described previously and stated in the tables on page 606 ante. All this is mystic, as it cannot be illustrated by concrete instances. It is therefore, said to be purely a matter of internal and intellectual experience (वाच्यस्त्रेष्वमनोद्रष्टा). This is described as follows:

* ज्ञानार्थस्तो बच्चे स्वाष्ट्र्यकोष्ठे।
स्वार्ज्ञसुन्तकास्मि दुविव्यास तेनकथे॥
श्रीयं बद्धकल्पवेत सताशिवमुष्कार्थिनम्॥
प्रावधानसंरेष्व स्त्रयः धिंदं समाधुते॥
बद्धकल्पके विंगे बद्धः इन्द्रियिनि॥
तत्वेत् वा प्रिंतिं सब्जमवद्यः: वृहत: बद्ध॥
क्षेमिति जागुरुकं शास्त्रमहति न मेवति विषाचिनि॥
संपर्ष्कल्पं मंत्रः: पदवको मंत्रनायको जयति॥
न मेवति जागुरुकं शिवाचिनि समझिनम्॥
अभिद्धित्वं हृद्वात्रात्वं मण्डुः भास्मकारकः॥
तस्मादार्थस्त्रेष्वमनोद्रष्टं मंगणेत॥

* अनुमममुद्र प. 40.
The last verses show the humble and submissive spirit of the Anga to Linga in devotion. They also explain the meaning of the नम (नमः सिवाय) used with reference to the act of dedication.

According to Swami Vivekananda मक्षि and ज्ञान are practically one and the same and there is not much difference between them. He says § "There is not really so much difference between knowledge (ज्ञान) and love (मक्षि) as people sometimes imagine. We shall see as we go on, that in the end they converge and meet at the same point. Knowledge, and Love and Yoga are harmoniously fused. Three things are necessary for a bird to fly—the two wings and the tail as a rudder for steering. ज्ञान is the one wing, मक्षि is the other, and Yoga is the tail that keeps up the balance. For those who cannot pursue all these forms of worship together in harmony, and take up, therefore, Bhakti alone as their way, it is necessary always to remember that forms and ceremonials, though absolutely necessary for the progressive soul have no other value than taking us on to that state in which we feel the most intense love of God. There is a little difference of opinion between the teachers of knowledge and those of love, though both admit the power of Bhakti. The Jnanins hold Bhakti to be an instrument of liberation; the Bhaktas look upon it both as an instrument and the thing to be attained. To my mind this is a distinction without difference. In fact, Bhakti, when used as an instrument, really means a lower form of worship and the higher form becomes inseparable from the

§ Bhaktiyoga, Chap. I.
lower form of realization at a later stage. Each seems to lay a greater stress upon his own peculiar method of worship, forgetting that with perfect love true knowledge is bound to come even unsought, and that from perfect knowledge true love is inseparable.

We are nearing the end of our task, weighty but difficult, of explaining the practice of the Lingayat religion and its technique, षड्याङ्ग. Psychologically speaking the process may be viewed either functionally or structurally. But function and structure are interconnected and interdependent. Hence to attain liberation the Anga has to extricate function gradually from the clutches of structure, the bodily mechanism. The aspiring Anga can and should enable himself to change the underlying structure of the mind only by the re-orientation of its functioning. The षड्याङ्ग technique furnishes the scientific apparatus and procedure, which if followed carefully step by step, will enable the Anga to attain his objective. To the devotee the details of the physical acts of worship are necessary only to strengthen his will; except for this they are of no use to him. For he is following a path that is fitted to lead him very soon across the hazy and turbulent regions of reason to the realm of realization. Generally through the mercy of God he rises to a plane where pedantry is powerless and reason has no scope. Instead of groping through the dark intellectually he comes in due course to the daylight of direct perception. Hence the details of physical worship in कियामार्ग are of immense importance.

First the worship of the deity is in its gross form (साकार) which is इष्टिक्रिया. This is technically called षड्यक्रिया.
Next stage is that of the worship of Linga लिङ्ग and मिश्रकार, both with and without form. This is प्राप्तिक क्षेत्र and is called संकलन हन्दस, an intermediate stage and state between संकलन on one hand and निष्कलन on the other. The latter is महालिंग. In किंतुतमार्य there is the Anga’s attempt of disentangling the function from the structure by gradual psychological culture in harmony with physiological functions. Here all forms of Yoga, as complementary of शिवकृपाग, are practised. But they do not assume any very distinct shape and form in किंतुतमार्य. They are mutually helpful and directed towards the same end by gradual psychological development. भक्ति is at the root of worship ( लिङ्गपूजा ), external or internal; for without the feeling of devotion, Godward attitude and spiritual discipline are in no way possible. Meaningless acts and performances like श्रवन are dry and hollow and serve no end. The performance of श्रवन with all intricate numerous details has given rise to priesthood which void of real spirit of spiritualism has degraded itself into charltanism and tended towards preying on the ignorance of the masses, who are given to understand that they would attain the summum bonum of life vicariously through its kind offices. Lingayatism has repudiated this and given to the devotee, male or female, an apparatus for the culture and sublimation of the confined spirit, as a personal affair for personal liberation. It teaches that the life’s problem of external happiness does not admit of vicarious solution. One important thing we have to place before readers is that during गुरूत्व, the Anga has to learn and cultivate the proper sense of gift or दान, which is divided into three kinds, उपाधि, निष्पाधि and दशन, technically called उपाधिविमान,
etc. All books of the religion are eloquent on दान, giving of charity or making of gifts. विद्वानिविद्वानिव describes these as follows (vide I-161 ff.)—अथ,

देहदानारथ स्वाधिकृत दानारथ मिन्नूति।
प्रामाण्यात् स्वाधिकृतं सर्वं स्वरूपं सेवनं।
अथ योगजायमनवलुक्तमेण गुलिबिग्रजमोहिन्योन यथावाक्यां दानं कुमारद्विजः।
अथ तदनं निहृत्यति।

दानं च तिनिषयं प्रेमं सोपाठिनिवाधिकम्।
सहजं वैति सर्वं तं सौंदर्यविद्यार्थे॥
फलाभिष्रवयुक्तं सर्वं यथिद्वितं सतेत॥
तत्सौपाठिनिवाधिकारं समुस्तात्मनाः॥
फलाभिष्रवमुक्तमोक्षारितारितारितां॥
लिङ्गाभिष्रवकारं दानं दानविद्यार्थे॥
वातुदातुदेयां शिवभावं विद्वितायथै॥
अारम्भं कर्दं मादे न गर्तं सहजं सतेत॥
सहजं दानसुक्तं सबवदनोत्तरतमां॥
शिवालार्थं पंबं अन्नमोगविवितकम्॥

This shows that भजन has to earn money by righteous means by following the rules of यम and निमित्त and has to use it properly for the use of all. This mutual helpfulness of the individual members of the community is called कार्यक (righteous ethical living), which the Lingayat Prophet and saints, वन्धन and his followers, that extra-ordinary band of socio-spiritualists, practised and laid down for all to follow.

अक्षि, the main motive power of spiritual discipline, is considered greater than the Shakti of Shiva, though a modification of Shakti, for reasons—stated on pp. 467, 468, ante. It is lauded to the skies and laid down as the first and foremost requisite of Auga. अक्षि is likened to the mythical touch-stone or the alchemic liquid that
converts metals like iron into gold by contact. He is, therefore, recommended to have recourse to Bhakti as his saviour from the countless series of metempsychosis and for his attaining the status of gold i.e., the condition of Divinity. It will be sufficient to reproduce here a few verses in praise of Bhakti:

* न हैरान न तपेयो नाचोकम्: कोमजनि न विजयः।
आलमे विश्वामर्ते अस्तिरक्षे प्रसादेषः।
यथा विद्ये कृषि वृक्षाकारः।
कुशीत्स्कृते नथा भक्तिरिति श्रवण गुणार्थः।
अहं कर्ता समस्तस्य चम्पीधरयास्य कर्मणः।
हन्तेनामिनामेऽनि कर्मकोंडेऽस्युध्यः।
नाहं कर्तित्वा कहृत्वा नेत्र दानी स्वातः।
हन्तेनामिनामेऽनि श्वात्संवेदित्वा गुणयुञ्चः।
न क्षतिं न दानी च विच एवति कर्मणः।
हन्तेनामिनामेऽनि भक्तिकोंडेऽस्युञ्चः।
श्रद्धिं कर्म पदं धरेनेवदलं ज्ञानं पदं भक्तिक्रमः।
तस्यायं श्वासं वं रीविश्वासं बिधुः स्थितस्तलकर्मात्।
ञ्जाफलं विस्तरत्वाक्षरं: अनेद् नानाः गतो।
हन्तेन श्रवण काव्यामिनि परतरा भक्ति कथान्वें।

शब्देन और ध्यान आर्य और ध्यान श्रवण के मूल कारण हैं। वे अर्थात् अष्टकम् श्रवण के मूल कारण हैं। वे अर्थात् अष्टकम् श्रवण के मूल कारण हैं।

In the second division of yoga (शान्तार्थ) they enable the Anga of a particular temperament to develop the form of Yoga suited to his temperament. Generally in this division शब्देन और ध्यान श्रवण के मूल कारण हैं। वे अर्थात् अष्टकम् श्रवण के मूल कारण हैं।

* अनुभवस्त्र, page 48 ff.
Lord with undivided attention. The शिवपूजा by the Anga of active temperament will also develop into निष्ठामकर्म when he meditates on the Lord in proper spirit, working all the while in the worldly life. The spirit of कर्मयोग, that the Anga cultivates, will be evident from the following:

* कर्म कारिता कर्म कारण कार्यमेत्र च ।
शब्दात्मात्र भाति प्रसादात, परमेश्वरात्॥
भृजा भोजनिता भोगो भोगोपकरणारणि च।
शब्दात्मात्र भाति प्रसादात, परमेश्वरात्॥
फलमात्माया कर्मकर्मन प्रतिबिध्यते ।
न कर्ममांसकर्मण तत्समात्मकविरूण खजेतद्॥
यथा निर्मलसागरं विभागो नैव बाधते ।
तथाद्वैत किमाणं न विलासो नैव बाधते॥

The final result to be achieved by शिवयोग is शिवसामारस्य or शिववाल्यम्. सामारस्य is not तदास्त्य; and the difference between them is pointed out in our notes on pages 178-179. of notes. शिवशक्ति, which according to the Shakta religion is कुंदलिनी, is to be roused, the शिवशक्ति lies in a static condition coiled up in गुहार. Then the roused current of शिवशक्ति, ego-centred, blinding and binding, is to be reversed and made to ascend from the lowest impure plane to the highest pure plane for perfect experience of Divine Consciousness. मन्त्रयोग is one such means of rousing the Shakti. Bhaktiyoga or the way of self-surrender, devotion and love is of special efficacy. In fact any kind of Yoga will be found useful and helpful in rousing the power, which otherwise grinds us and under which we groan. The Bhakta or the Jnani may not sometimes, have consciously and deliberately to set himself to the task of rousing the शिवशक्ति and making her rise through the centres of energy. But this does not

* अनुभवस्थृत, pp. 51, 53.
mean that the शक्ति is let alone there by the aspirant. She is as well roused by मन्त्र or ज्ञान as by मंत्र. It is hardly necessary to point out that शिवशक्ति, the Divine Power in man is not mere physical energy. It is physical, vital and mental, the three forms of the power of Universal Consciousness. The power is to be roused and developed for final emancipation; and शिव योग is the technique for such rousing and developing the power.

शिव योग is not a mystery. It is eminently practical as a means of realizing the highest objective of human beings. For the common aspirant, it serves out a mixed prescription of कर्म, मन्त्र, ज्ञान, and अर्थ, all scientifically combined, graded, graduated and regulated according to varying needs and conditions. शिव योग is a scientifically framed ग्रहण. It is not merely tentative like a theory or speculation. Its motto is "Live the life actually as required by the technique of शिव योग and prove and verify." Like the science of medicine it is experimental and wants only to be tried. Nothing need be taken on authority such as "शिव योग". But initially you must feel it as worth your while, to undertake the experiment and see for yourself. For this it is required that you follow the lead of those that tried the experiment before you and then follow their example and attain the end (सिद्धि) yourselves. शिव योग as a practical experimental science of expanding spiritual experience, gives the right method of approaching and pursuing the highest objective, mukti. Though aiming at the realization of the supreme end, it also provides for the lower ends, कर्म (virtue or duty), अर्थ (wealth) and काम (desires of the flesh), i.e. it says that worldly life is in no way inconsistent with spiritual life. Only the spirit and attitude, in which
the subject, whether in the higher or in the lower forms, should be approached, is precisely that in which a scientist has to investigate the problems of physical, biological and psychological science without prejudice and with a settled resolve to experiment and see himself.

Our task is over. We are aware that our explanation is neither complete nor satisfactory, though we have tried our utmost to give to the readers the meaning of विषयव्याप्ति and its technique, पद्मक्षर. Really पद्मक्षर, including six Angasthalas and six Lingathalas have further 101 subdivisions, 44 of the Angasthalas and 57 of Lingasthalas. These are various upward gradations or steps in the pilgrim's march towards the goal. There are also 482 functional variations of Lingांगवषय, 216 of the Angasthala and 216 of the Lingasthala. These variations are due to the action and reaction of the five gross elements and the आलमन. Thus, for instance, Linga is the force or energy of the Universal Consciousness and the bodily mechanism is the vehicle for the expression of the activities of the force confined in the body. The activities of the force through the body are six corresponding to the five sense-organs of knowledge and mind the internal organ. They are smelling, tasting, seeing, touching, hearing and feeling or knowing. These six are primary. Each of these six again becomes sixfold in the following way. When a flower is seen there arises a desire to smell it, hear its description, taste it, touch it, to see its details and to know fully what it is. This is consequent on seeing the object or the activity of the organ of sight. These are six secondary activities. The six primary activities multiplied by the six secondary activities become 36. The six forms of
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objective psychology from sensation to ideation (noted before, etc.; see pages 604, 605 ante) go with everyone of the 36 activities. Thus there will be 216 functional variations in all. These again become twofold with reference to Anga and Linga, making the total 432. Apart from the functional variations the 101 steps, एकत्रिशततत्त्वस्राविन as they are called, are more important. But it will be too much to treat them all here, as we have already passed the limits of an introduction. We have to request, therefore, readers to be pleased with the explanation given so far of the philosophy and practice of the religion and its technique, वद्वध, however perfunctory it may be. We shall feel amply and adequately repaid, if readers have an idea of the philosophy and the practice of the religion and specially of वद्वध, that forms the very life and soul of the religion.

XIII. The author of Lingadhâranachandrika & his work.

Lingadhâranâ is the most prominent mark and feature of the Lingayat religion and denotes what it is. All philosophy and practice of the religion hinge on it. Rightly therefore, the author of the book, Nandikeshwara, thinks fit to vindicate and establish the creed of wearing Linga on the body mainly on the authority of certain *Vedic texts

* Very recently late Mr. S. D. Pavate, B.A., LL. B., pleader, Hubli, interpreted the following text as laying down the wearing of Linga on the body. He was a well read Sanskrit Scholar.

मतेव यदुरस्य पंग्रहानो जनं जनं धायसे चक्षुसे च।
वशों वशे वर्षे यदुचन: परिश्रमना विषुरुपे विज्ञापि।
which in his opinion would silence carping spirits and fault-finders of the creed. It is not only the Vedic texts, he says and maintains, but the whole range of authoritative Sanskrit literature like महाभारत, Puranas, and Smritis, supports and justifies the religious principle of wearing Linga on the body. At the outset of his work he states the objections to this principle and starts discussion. He begins with the discussion about the अंतःकिन्द्रण in the form of the search of ज्योतिलिंग (Linga the Light), as it is the very basis of अंतःपुष्पा. He next proceeds to बाह्यकिन्द्रण for बाह्यपुष्पा. The author interprets the Vedic texts as laying down Lingadhārana with all pros and cons, with all possible objections raised, refutation stated and finally the conclusion arrived at. In this respect he is like all other commentators or भाष्यकाराः of the philosophic literature. It is for scholars to see how far he is successful and how much he is justified in his interpretation. In our opinion he has performed the task admirably well, however fanciful it may look.

The author takes three texts from the नारायणोपनिषत्, one from the तैलोपनिषत्, one from श्रीवद, and two from the छर्वेद. He explains them as enjoining the wearing of Linga (इद्यलिंग). His interpretation is, therefore, severely controversial and polemic. He shows his skill in dialectics and dialectical treatment of the subject. He seems to be quite well versed in Vedic, Puranik, and Smriti literature, in the literature of different religious sects, (Vaishnava and others) and in the six schools of Indian philosophy, like तात्त्विक, न्याय and शैवानात्माका (पौर्णिश्चर्वनात्माका), specially in the last. In the course of his interpretation he adduces
in support of his arguments. He quotes profusely, specially from Puranas and Agamas, in support of the view-point taken by him at a particular stage of the discussion and at the end of his explanation of a particular text. In our notes we have amply, almost exhaustively, commented on the author’s statements and references; we need not, therefore, say anything more about the particulars of the author’s treatment of the subject.

Our information about the author is next to nothing. It is only from the colophons of various manuscripts that some meagre information can be had. The colophon of the printed edition, printed and published at Benares, gives no information about the author except that he was an authority on विष्णुशास्त्र, which he could establish in disquisitions and which he held to be the essence of the teaching of वेद, वेदांत, ज्योतिषम्, Puranas, and history ( महामार्ग ); he was the destructive elephant to the lotus of non-believers (in Lingadhārana); he was like a sun to the frost in the form of पंथभक्त or Vaishnava system; he was a lion to tear off the temples of the elephants in the form of dualist schools of philosophy. From this it is clear that he was a bigoted Shaiva and a Veerashaiva. One remarkable thing to be noticed is that he never names the अद्वैत philosophy of Lingayats as वाज्यिकशास्त्रित but only as विष्णुशास्त्र. In this respect he seems to be a follower of नीलकंठकविवाचयम्, who himself is the follower of श्रीकेतु, a noted commentator of ज्ञानसृज्ञ. The colophon of the manuscript B contains more information about the author that he was a descendant of the family of one पंडितारम्य; he was a son of one बीकरभाराम्य; and he wrote the work on account of the inspiration
caused in him by his brother and by the grace extended to him by his brother, शर्मेन्द्र. We regret we have not been able to collect more information about personal history of the author.

As regards the date of the author it can be fixed approximately from internal evidence. He refers to various authors in his work, from some of whom he quotes. The prominent authors he refers to are शिवायोगी (author of विद्वान्सूक्ष्माभास्मण), काल्हसिद्धान्तकृत, मण्डलण, विभागोत्षय, and अष्टकमिद्दितित. पंडिताश्च था probably बसक पंडिताश्च, the author of the commentary on दुमसुक, नारायणोपनिषद्, तैचौरियोपनिषद्, etc., as there is no work found so far by पंडिताश्च as such. पंडिताश्च himself refers to अष्टकमिद्दितित in his work. The author of लिंगलघारणकृत्तिक, therefore, comes later than both अष्टकमिद्दितित and पंडिताश्च. We therefore, put the author in the 17th century A.D. It is likely that he was a बीमोद्र आचार्य, being a descendant of आचार्यांस of the Telgu country.

One noteworthy thing is that he discusses the objection raised that the Vedic text "अष्टकमिद्दितित स्थापत्यं पाणिनिनिन्दि " has not been commented upon by विद्वारण (सायगाचार्य) the illustrious exegete of the Vedas, in the way the author does. We have noted all about this in our notes. But he does not say anything but keeps silent over the different interpretations of सायगाचार्य of the two Rigvedic texts. The author does not attempt at explaining away the different interpretations.

The author's work on the whole is a notable and successful attempt at establishing the creed of Lingadhārana in spite of any criticism that may be made
against his explanation. Another noteworthy point is that indential interpretations of all the Vedic texts taken by the author are to be found in विद्वान्तविश्वामणि, which is a very authoritative work in Sanskrit on the Veerashaiva एकोतरसत्त्वः philosophy and practice, which 101 stages or steps are sub-divisions of षट्सप्तः. The author’s explanations of the Vedic texts are a dialectical elaboration of the very short explanations of these texts in विद्वान्तविश्वामणि in simple अनुस्सू metres. All these have been noted in our notes. All later Sanskrit writers of religious books follow the lead given by विद्वान्तविश्वामणि. But it may be said to the credit of Nandikeswar that the polemic dissertations are remarkably successful. We leave it to our readers to judge for themselves about these dissertations. The last section of the book is devoted to the vindication of the authoritative ness of Shivagamas. This is similar to वासुनाचार्य’s treatise ( अगमप्रामाण्यम् ) written to etablish the authoritatiiveness of Vaishnavagamas. In this connection we refer readers to our essay on the Agamas in section VII and to our notes on the last section of Lingadhāranachandrikā.

(b) The commentary and the commentator of Lingadhāranachadrikā.

The work has been commented upon by Pandit महामहोपाध्याय विचुकमार of Benares. The commentary is named "शरत्" as signifying to throw brilliant moonlight on the text so as to make it clear and easily intelligible to readers. He has done his work well. But it is a sorry fact that the Pandit,
though a विवरक, does not know anything of the Lingayat or Veerashaiva religion. His commentary is naturally profuse and elaborate on the Vedic texts quoted by Nandikeshwar. But his commentary is very brief and does not throw any light on the principles of the Lingayat religion. It may be none of his fault as the commentator was no Lingayat and had not studied, or rather, had no reason to study Lingayat religious books well. In many places he explains wrongly. For instance his commentary on "विवरक दुहरोपावतोज्ञपुत्रविधाने न देवतात्माविधानेन विवरकस्थतिविषयस्वते: " (text, page 4) is quite inaccurate; because he takes दुहरोपावता as प्रतीकोपावता, which is repudiated by Lingayatism on account of the अहंशहो-पावना taught by it. The relevant portion of the commentary is:—

अनियतविषयकस्वताप्रतिरिति। ननु शालप्रामे जलादृ चैतकिले व्याख्यानावने केवल तत्त्वावलोचन पूजाधिक्रियाप्रतिक्रिया उपासनमेवैः न देव इति चेष्मेभवम् etc. etc." In some places he is very unsympathetic and adverse to the author. The commentary on the सूत्र "वज्जेवपुत्रा-शंकाचिकित्सकारवता," quoted by the author (see page 70 of the text), will make this evident. It is:—यज्ञावलोऽहम्मदायुपावकधरकायत्वमप्रदोपलकारवतविष्यप्रज्ञालयमभिपी नायकम्। यज्ञां हृश्य अधिनत्वप्रवृत्तमयं इति इस संगमचंतं इतरं विचारतं अद्वाल्यते: बहुतं स्वार्थवातानां छल्लवन कर्तविद्यायत्वादशरिकवात्यावतेन निष्ठोप्याविकल्पाद्वृधने अभोजनसावार्थ।

The commentator was paid for the commentary and he did his duty accordingly as a hack-writer. He makes no secret of this and he says in one of his invocatory verses:—

ब्रह्मोक्षणा सवसेया वण्यप्रतीकः।
The commentator, therefore, does it as a matter of business and not because he wanted to explain the religious principles well for the behoof of the students of comparative Religion. Other commentators like बाच्चस्यामित्र, विज्ञानिक and a host of others have immortalized themselves by explaining the works they commented on, because they loved the Shastras and loved to explain out of admiration for or full faith in the principles of the Shastras. Theirs was sympathy and love for learning for its own sake and desired to convey the learning through their commentary. But in the case of Pandit विबुद्धार्थ it was a different matter, viz. monetary gain. He was neither a Lingayat nor a student of Lingayat religious literature. He, therefore, lacked the equipment required and expected of a commentator, namely, sympathy and real insight into the religion. We do not and should not reasonably find fault with his commentary. We may simply point out that the Swami of Kashimath (Jangamwadi of Benares), a pontifical seat of विज्ञानाध्य, one of the five Lingayat आचार्यांच, could find no competent Lingayat scholar to comment on the work. It shows a sad bankruptcy of Sanskrit scholars among the Lingayats. The Swamis themselves, the heads of such high sees and similar big influential maths, should lack in requisite scholarship and insight into their own religion, for the promulgation and propagation of which they are intended, is a regrettable commentary on the present state of affairs and the present state of the Lingayat religion. It was therefore, thought proper not to print the commentary along with the text.
XIV The status of Lingayat religion.

We now come to a knotty problem of determining the status of the Lingayat religion, whether it is a separate religion or a sub-religion of the Hindu religion, or one of the Hindu religions. Lingayats are generally considered to be a sect among the Hindus or a subsect of the Shaivas. Shaivism itself is generally considered a Vedic religion or a sub-religion of Hinduism, which with its grand name means either every thing or nothing as a religion. If it is so it is not to be expected that Lingayat religion should have any recognition as a separate religion. In the first place it has fallen into such deep obscurity that it seems rather difficult that it should rise up from the obscurity it has fallen into and stand out in bold relief and shine in its glory that it may naturally claim to have on account of its intrinsic worth and merit, which we at least boldly assert it has. In the second place even Lingayats themselves do not know what it is, much less others. It is no wonder then that its worth and merit are not known to others. Thirdly European scholars, who are mainly responsible for bringing into limelight the Indian cultural heritage all over the world, have neither studied nor cared to study the religion and its literature as much as they ought to have done. They formed some superficial idea about the religion from what they learnt about the religion from hearsay and superficial study of a book or two, which could give no idea as to what it really is. Hence the very damaging remarks passed about it, as we have already noted before in connection with the explanation of Linga. Lingayats are themselves 2-81
to blame for the obscurity into which the religion has sunk. Generally the Swamis themselves, who are intended to be defenders and propagators of the faith, are so only in name in the sense that they have no insight into the inner meaning of the religion and its principles. They only repeat parrot-like, the eight आवरणां, the पंचाचार्यास and the पद्वल, particularly the आवरणां, and are not in a position even in the least to explain the fundamentals of the religion, when they are asked anything about the religion. To add to all this there is such a sharp division and difference of opinion and of religious practices among the Lingayats themselves of different parts of India that they are almost divided into different camps on account of different customs, manners, views about themselves and their religion. For instance the Lingayats of Maharastra or Marathi country perform आद ceremony in honour of the dead and are somewhat Bramhанизed in religious life and customs and have their own prejudices. The Lingayats of Mysore State and Telgu districts are somewhat like Aradhyas or Aradhyabrahmins that once held the field of religion after they half-heartedly embraced the new religion. They by themselves form *“ The class of Aradhyas that exist in Northen Circars, ceded Districts, and elsewhere, half-hearted Lingi-Brahmins, because they combine in themselves, the sacramental rites of the सामाजिक and वीरचेतत faiths and thus please neither the सामाजिक nor the वीरचेतत”. The Aradhya Veerashaivas,

* Veerashaivism, a phase of Agamanta, S. D. vol. XI, 3rd article.
being an intellectual class, imported into the religion some ten peculiar ceremonies, like Bhamhanic ceremonies, which they called दशकर्म and follow them in a special form and procedure, called दशकर्मविद्या. Nobody knows since when they came to be imported into the religion. But there they are now. They take pride in being called Lingi-Bramhins. It seems they are carried away by the glamour of the word "ब्राह्मण" and hence their attempts at making their customs similar to those of Brahmns. Lingayats of those parts perform all ceremonies with Vedic hymns chanted in accompaniment. But as a matter of fact there is no religious sacrament among the Lingayats except the दीक्षा ceremony, which is intended to be performed to give a real spiritual insight to the novice wishing to be introduced to the practice of the religion. The Lingayats of Bombay Karnatak are different from those of Maharastra or Mysore. They have their peculiar customs but do not follow any Brahmanic customs. The Lingayats of Hyderabad State and S. M. States are no better. Everywhere there are to be seen so many different caste-like divisions among Lingayats of all parts. This is an excrescence that has grown on the real religion and is eating into the heart of the religious community, which on that account is stagnant. This is the most painful thing, indeed, that defies, defiles and traduces the real spirit of the religion. In short there is little unanimity in religious rites and customs or real religious life among the Lingayats, except that everywhere they invariably wear Linga on their bodies and worship on occasions Swamis or Ayyanavarus, which have made a class of their own and call themselves
Jangamas, though they are no better than birth-made pretentious ignoramuses, but like Brahmins of the Hindu fold simply prey upon the masses ignorant and stagnant. Alas! What a lamentable state of affairs, what grievous parody of the religion, what a tragic condition into which the community has fallen!

To determine the status of the Lingayat religion among the Hindus, whose descendants the Lingayats are, it is necessary for us to know what the Hindu religion is, which the Hindus as a body social, political and religious are expected to profess and to have. But it is next to impossible to say what Hindu religion or Hinduism is, if it is to be a common denominator or the highest common factor of all the Hindus of the Hindu communities of India. Generally Hindu religion is taken to be the religion as taught by the Vedas. But what is the religion that is taught by the Vedas? This is the most puzzling question; and the answer to the question is bound to be equally puzzling and controversial. The Vedas do not teach any one religion but a variety of religions; they do not teach some common religious philosophy but a variety of philosophy by different schools of philosophical thought; they do not lay down any common religious practice and customs but a multiplicity of rules of religion and customs. It is this variety that has been an object of pride for the Hindus, who say with a sense of elation that Hinduism is a form of eclectic religion having everything in it. At the most it may be said that the Vedas, especially the Upanishads, are a literature of profound learning and thoughts being the result of inner spiritual experiences of great ancient sages, regarding the cosmic principle, the cosmic evolution, involution and
life, the working of the Universe and the individual souls and advice given to the individual souls to follow a spiritual life to be free from the trammels of the worldly life. But they do not teach any common principles of religion and spiritual life with the consequence that different schools of philosophy arose out of the teachings of the Upanishads. The four main Vedas (Rigveda etc.) and the Brahmanas mainly elaborate the performance and procedure of sacrifices, though some portions of Rigveda, though few and far between, contain verses full of deep philosophical thoughts. It is the Aranyakas of the forest dwelling sages and the Upanishadas that contain most vivifying and everlasting thoughts of spiritual experiences and spiritual life. But they do not give any one consistent form of religion for all to follow. They are merely rich in philosophical speculations and experiences too abstruse to be understood.

Hindu religion is said to be the religion of Varnashramadharma, which having its origin in the intentional exclusion of a particular section of the body political and social is based on the principle of innate inequality of human beings, & therefore, lays stress on the inherent incapability of some of the constituent human beings of the body political and social to have equal right and share in social and religious practices. The Varnashramadharma may be fundamentally reduced to three main Characteristics of social and religious life. (1) The four castes or colours (वर्णः) (2) The four stages (आश्रयः) (3) and the duties assigned to the four castes and stages. The third characteristic is further elaborated into (1) different worldly duties assigned to be dis-
charged by the four castes (वर्णमाला;) (2) and sixteen religious वैश्विक सिद्धांत or sacramental rites like गर्भाधान, गुर्ज्रन, जाभा, नामकरण etc. These are called आध्यात्मिक/अध्यात्मिक. These sixteen sacramental rites are the special privileges of the first three classes. The Shudras, whose duty is only to serve obediently the first three castes like slaves are altogether excluded from the sixteen rites. The exclusion of a particular section of the community from these religious rites and the consequent exclusion from intellectual and spiritual life, is quite an inequitous and therefore obviously opprobrious thing in the world. It seems that at first members of the community were classed as different castes in accordance with their mental and intellectual calibre and physical fitness for particular worldly duties. Then there was some meaning in the वर्णश्रामधार्म. But gradually it came to be based on birth alone. This made the वर्णश्रामधार्म the most unjust social institution. Being excluded from the sixteen sacramental rites the Shudras came to be reduced to the status of serfs to serve the higher three castes. Another most notable thing is that women also even of the first three castes are considered equal to Shudras in status, and therefore, excluded from the privilege of the rites. They are assigned the duties of domestic affairs and of serving their husbands to attain Mukti. They are thus considered to be merely an object of pleasure and as the means of race-propagation only. This also is an equally inequitous thing. It is not possible to understand the meaning of the exclusion of all women from the वैश्विक सिद्धांत. It is also not possible (for us at least) to understand the meaning of गुर्ज्रन, which apparently means the causing of the birth of male children.
If the वंशवाल may have been intended to have male children only and if they were efficacious it would amount to say that there would be only males and no females. Consequently there would be no propagation of the race. The वर्णश्रामधर्मम्, based on birth, as it has long since come to be, has been an inequitable institution in spite of its champions and defenders. The Lingayat religion has done away with it and ushered in a new era of socio-religious life. The abolition of the वर्णश्रामधर्मम् from the new socio-religious system is to be found in all Lingayat religious books. The status of Lingayats as a high class community of अतिरिक्तता is (those above the वर्णश्रामधर्मम्) is specially discussed in बीरर्ति and बीरर्ति. In the latter in its last chapter the matter is fully discussed and the superior status, superior to the वर्णमालम्, of अतिरिक्तता as a socio-religious system is established. We may quote the relevant portion of the discussion from बीरर्ति, the portion that the Lingayat religion is above the वर्णश्रामधर्मम् by excluding it from its socio-religious system and by teaching and inculcating a different system altogether. It is:—

न्यु तिविधिष्ठालि विश्ववस्मिकमानादान्या वीरस्वालो वर्णमाला न सम्बन्धित, तदनुप्रसारं ज्ञातसमानामभावत्। तथा तदनुप्रसारं वर्णमाला न सम्बन्धित, तदनुप्रसारं ज्ञातसमानामभावत्। तदशाधारणं तदनुप्रसारं ज्ञातसमानामभावत्। तदनुप्रसारं ज्ञातसमानामभावत्।

We may quote the relevant portion of the discussion from the portion that the Lingayat religion is above the वर्णश्रामधर्मम् by excluding it from its socio-religious system and by teaching and inculcating a different system altogether.
In short the Varnâshramadharma based on birth is inequitous in so far as it excludes from it a large portion of the community from real religious life; it makes a difference between men and women in religious life; it makes the sacramental rites a close preserve of a particular section of the community. It, in brief, shows that the community is merely a socio-political body. Thus Hinduism, if it is Varnâshramadharma, can in no way include Lingayatism in it as a sub-religion. The Lingayats are Hindus in the sense that they are descendants of the Hindus and that they are no people coming from outside India like Parsees. They are Hindus as a race but not as a religion. They are a different religious entity: a distinct religious fold. In this particular respect they are like Jains, who are a different religious fold but are Hindus in the sense that they are descendants of the Hindu people; from amongst whom they violently broke away by discarding the Hindu religion and forming a different religion of their own. But Jains differ from Lingayats i
one respect & are therefore safe in their claims as a different religious community, in respect of disowning their allegiance to the Vedas and disavowing their faith in them. In this respect Lingayats differ from Jains, as they seem to respect the Vedas though they do not own the Vedas as the basis of their religion. They profess and own the Agamas being the bases and parents of their religion. However their respect for the Vedas has made confusion worse confounded and the position and status of the community very anomalous.

In section VII we have established that the Agamas contain the culture of Dravidians. In a short time of the rise of the Agamas they became so popular that they shortly came to be regarded as equal to the Vedas and called तांत्रिकशृण्णि. But in order to avoid the cleavage between the followers of the Vedas (ऋक्षेत्र etc.) and those of the Agamas there seems to have been a mutual understanding with the consequence that the two sections gradually came to be reconciled and rupture avoided. The Agamists began to respect the Vedas and adopted the Varnāshramadharma, partially though. The Aryans or the followers of the Vedas, recognized the Agamas as religious scriptures and adopted the Agamic form of worshipping the deities in images. The Vedic religion was the worship of natural forces and powers by performing यज्ञas. But by the adoption of image-worship the performance of यज्ञas came to be gradually neglected except on occasions and the worship of the images of the deities became not only prominent but all in all of the Hindus as their religion and the religious practice. The remarks of late Mr. P. T. S. Iyangar are pertinent in this connection. * "The religion as practised to-day by

* History of the Tamils, page 103.
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the Hindus is almost entirely based on the Agamas and has little or nothing to do with the Vedas. The Vaidic cult began to decay after the War of the Mahabharata and has to-day almost died out. The greater part of Srauta Karma has entirely gone; only a few elementary rites, such as Agni-adyana, a much simplified Vajapeya, Garuda-chayana, and Somayâja are sporadically performed by a handful of people. The Smârta Karma is also fast dying out, so that judged by the rule that the family of a Brahmin, whose members have neglected to tend the holy fire for three generations, loses its Brahmanic status, few can be regarded as true Brahmin ones. Yet India is intensely religious; but the intensity of the religion is confined to the cult of the Agamas and not to those of the Vedas. Hence image-worship is the religion of the Hindus, if religion can be so defined. But herein also Lingayats are not Hindus in religion because they are no image-worshippers. Only in one respect they are Hindus in religion, namely, in respect of worshipping one of the (now) Hindu Gods, शिव. But mere worship of a God is no religion, if it should have philosophy and practice forming its differentia. And because Lingayat religion has its own philosophy and practice distinct to itself it cannot be a sub-religion of Hinduism.

Shortly after the religion came to be founded, the community became independent of other Hindus and very prominent. Questions seem to have been certainly raised regarding their status among the Hindus and their religion (Hinduism) whatever it was, on account of the new community altogether severing its connection with the Brahmanic priest-hood. The followers of the new religion had
to answer the questions and assert themselves. They tried their best to maintain their position as being अतिवर्णाधिमिष्ट. Besides they claimed to be (अप्राकृत व्रज्ञान:) अप्राकृताधिकरण-हनस for the simple reason that they had no clear idea of their status as an independent religious community. Moreover it seems that they must have thought it honourable not only to be Brahmins but Super-Brahmins, which term they christened with the name of अप्राकृतव्रज्ञान:. The question of अप्राकृतव्रज्ञान has been discussed in some Sanskrit treatises of the religion and established. वीरसेवानन्दाचार्य discusses this in the same chap. and says on pages 452, 449.

तथाच अतिवर्णाधिमिष्ट: आध्यात्म: असाध्यात्मः, घ एषांतर्क्ष्याधिमिष्ट:। अथवा आध्यात्म एवं सम्बंधाधिमिष्ट:। अतिवर्णाधिमिष्ट: आध्यात्मः:। इत्यद्वर्ण-राधिमिष्ट: वीरैवेशु सम्बन्धः, पुरुषविकिर्तियाधिमिष्टः। वीरैवेशु सुमुद्रविकिर्तियाधिमिष्टः। अथवा आध्यात्म: अतिवर्णाधिमिष्ट: सम्बन्धः, पुरुषविकिर्तियाधिमिष्ट:। वीरैवेशु सुमुद्रविकिर्तियाधिमिष्टः। अथवा आध्यात्म: अतिवर्णाधिमिष्ट: सम्बन्धः, पुरुषविकिर्तियाधिमिष्ट:। वीरैवेशु सुमुद्रविकिर्तियाधिमिष्टः।

यथा गंभीराधिकरणकारिकायेन तदन्तर्काधिकारिकायेन विभवदर्नविभवधिसंयोगम बहुत: तदन्तर्काधिकरणकारिकायेन विभवस्य बहुत: तदन्तर्काधिकरणकारिकायेन विभवस्य बहुत:।

तथाच बिधानान्तर्क्ष्याधिकारिकायेन—

विद्याण्डा: प्राकृताधिकारिकायेन विद्याण्डा: मानुषाः स्तुता:।
विद्याण्डा: प्राकृताधिकारिकायेन विद्याण्डा: मानुषाः स्तुता:।
विद्याण्डा: प्राकृताधिकारिकायेन विद्याण्डा: मानुषाः स्तुता:।
विद्याण्डा: प्राकृताधिकारिकायेन विद्याण्डा: मानुषाः स्तुता:।
विद्याण्डा: प्राकृताधिकारिकायेन विद्याण्डा: मानुषाः स्तुता:।
But the best explanation of अप्राकृतवाच्यपरिणामम् is as follows:—

* "The Virasaivas also say that, according to the Sthāvaralinga form of worship, which they call prākrit, man can attain Mukti only after three births, which Mukti I take to signify krama-Mukti, by means of the Charya, Kriya and Yoga, the last straightway landing him in Jnanam or Siva-sayujya. But the Jangama-linga form of worship, which is aprākrit, is said to secure Mukti for man within the present birth alone, and no further need to wander along the wearisome race-course of metempsychosis.

The riddle-loving Hindu mind has the inveterate habit of clothing serious truth under puzzling allegories, and what is, at first sight, apparently repellant, sectarian and intolerantly dogmatic, proves on close, thoughtful and sympathetic examination, to contain sterling truths. The true meaning, therefore, of the Virasaiva tradition is that the Adi saivas who were the descendants of the Rishis like Kasyapa and others, slid away from the true aim of the temple-worship or objective worship, which is Atma-puranam, Atma-darsanam and Siva-darsanam, whilst in the flesh, entered on the never-ending path of pravritti, by worshipping Prakriti and Her modifications and evolutions, and thereby became Prakritic or worldly."

All this confusion regarding the status could have been avoided if it was maintained in so many words that they were an independent religious fold without explaining it as अतिवर्णप्रव्रतम् or अप्राकृतवाच्यपरिणामम्. The

* S. D. Vol. XI, 2nd article named, Veerashaivism, a phase of Agamanta.
explanation maintains the independent status indirectly but not expressly. The confusion became much worse later, when support of the basic principles of the religion was sought from the Vedic, especially the Upanishadic literature. लिङ्गधारणविद्वान was one such book. But if the creed, the tenets and principles of the religion are closely studied it will be clear that the Lingayat religion fundamentally differs from the Hindu religion which eludes definition. The position of Jains and Sikhs is safe as both have thrown off their allegiance to the Vedas. All Jains are descendants of Hindus. So also many Sikhs are Hindus. But they have maintained their position clearly by asserting the distinctness of creed, tenets and principles. Any way we tread on a sure and safe ground if we boldly maintain that Lingayatism is an independent religious entity, inspite of the confusion and dubiousness caused to it by the trend of discussion noted above regarding the status of Lingayats and their religion. वीरवैवाचार्यविद्वान itself maintains in the following words the independent status of the religion. It says—on page 442.

When reduced to a tabular form it will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Vedic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( non-Vedic and non-Agamic )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charvakas Bauddhas Jains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Extinct )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vedic-Agamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varnashramic non-Varnashramic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingayats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaivas Vaishnavas Aryasamajists etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We may state here that the present Arya-samaja, founded by Swami Dayananda, only in the last century, is nothing but the revival of Varnâshramadharma based on the principle of गुणक्रम or personal intellectual capacity of its followers and the abolition of the image worship. They maintain that the present Hindu community is no real Hindu community and there is no real Varnâshrama in it. They further hold that the Vedas never lay down image worship. Hence they are up in arms against it and abolish it. They are purely the followers of the Vedas and the Vedic religion, whatever it may be. They say they are revivalists of the real Vedic religion and claim to be an independent community and are classed as such. If this be so the Lingayats have better and more substantial claims to be an independent religious entity. We avow that we have no quarrel with the Vedas or their religion. We do not in the least mean to be entertaining any separatist tendency. We discuss this question purely on principles as a matter of academic interest from the academic point of view. And we leave it to the readers to judge for themselves and see how far our conclusion is right.

XV Lingayat religious literature and scriptures.

The confusion, as described in the last chap., naturally leads to the question why it should be so. Readers may ask if there was no literature at the basis of the new religion that could avoid such confusion and be a guiding light of the religion. Our answer is as follows.
It is already established that prophet Basava, the prime minister of Bijjala, founded the Lingayat religion by giving a different shape to the then existing form of Shaiva religion mixed with Varnashramadharma. He gave a different turn and form to Shaivism by separating from it the Varnashramadharma and sifting out of it all crudities. He borrowed from the Agamas the 36 fundamental principles (तत्त्वं); he adopted the five materials of Shiva-worship (विभूति, श्राव्या, तीर्थे which he called पादोदकृ, प्राध्याद and मंत्र) and wove them together in a ritualistic chain of शिवपूजा; he adopted शिवविंग, that was till then put on the body by some for reasons stated in chap. XI, and gave it a definite meaning and made it the central and vital point of the religion; he made Jangamas the peripatetic gurus to guide the followers of the religion for explaining and removing the difficulties at any stage of the practice of Shivayoga; he found the necessity of gurus as instructors of the devotees in matters spiritual. All these eight formed the बाबना of the religion. He made religion a personal affair, of course under the constant guidance of Gurus and occasional instructions of Jangamas. He destroyed the artificial barriers put against women from the privileges of religious life. In the same way he did away with the inhuman exclusion of a section of the people branded as Shudras from the privileges of religious life. He thereby turned Shaivism into Lingayatism by these far-reaching and astounding changes that worked like a miracle and changed the socio-religious life of the Hindus of his times. He framed विवेचन, the technique of शिववैयम on scientific basis. For this stupendous work
He started शिवाजुभवमर्मण or ज्ञानमर्मण for thorough discussion of the principles. He extended all facilities to the band of his saintly followers to practise the principles and prove experimentally the practicability and efficacy of Shivayoga. He was specially helped in his stupendous undertaking of the new religious movement by his nephew, Channabasava, the genius that formed the brain of शिवाजुभवमर्मण, and by Allamprabhu, the matchless Yogin that demonstrated to the world not only the practicability and efficacy of Shivayoga but its unfailing power of raising the practitioner to the heights of Yogic attainments. All this was done in a short period of about nine years like the work of Christ. The new movement spread like wild fire and attracted streams of followers; and in a short time the new community became very populous by conversion and admission into the new fold of all new comers. In order to popularize the new movement Basava followed the wise example of the prophet, Bhuddha, of preaching and conveying to the people the principles of the new movement in the language of the people, Kanarese, which thus became the best means and medium of carrying conviction to them. The result was the Vachanas of the members of शिवाजुभवमर्मण, who every day sent to the people messages by means of Vachanas or sayings. The Vachanas are like Upanishads in their poetic fervour and profundity of meaning, fresh from the oven of spiritualized hearts. They are short sentences, very telling, thrilling and soul-stirring and unfailing in their effect. It is voluminous literature now coming gradually to light and immensely appreciated.

The Vachana literature of the band of saints (sharanas) that flocked round the banner of the new
movement unfurled by Basava was followed suit; and the result was the growth of similar Vachana literature of post-Basava period. Later writers of the new community wrote works after works in Kanarese and period that followed Basava goes by the name of Lingayat literary period of the history of Kanarese literature, like its predecessor the Jain period that was pre-Basava period. Thus the Vachanashastra of Basava and the Saints or Sharanas is the basic scripture of the new religion.

It may be asked whether the Agamas are or are not the scriptures of the new religion. The answer is, they are, specially because it is a form of Shaivism, though a distinct form being shorn of all crudities, and because all basic elements of the religion (like the śivas etc. noted already) are all taken from the Agamas. The twenty eight Shivagamas are as much an authority to Lingayatism as to Shaivism. But there are special portions of the Agamas that treat of the new religion, its creed, principles, and practice and are called उत्तरांक्ष्यामणि clearly remarks (in vol. I—page 57) in this connection as—

विद्वांतवाज्येव महात्त्वं कामिकावेच्छविवेचिति |
निरिड्डुष्टेऽर्थं भागे कैश्वैवमतं परमः ||

Thus it will be seen from this statement that each of the Divine Agamas has to be divided into two parts: (1) The Old Testament or पूर्वविवेशविभाग (2) The New Testament or उत्तरविवेशविभाग. The former is devoted to the school of Shaivas, called Shuddha Shaivas, & the latter to Lingayats or Veerashaivas. Dr. Ramanan Shastri discusses this and states the clinched truth in words:—
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Thus you will see, from this statement of Renuka-Sivayogi, that each Divyagama has to be divided into, an Old testament (purva-visesha-vibhaga) and a new Testament (uttara-visesha-vibhaga), the former being devoted to the Suddha-saivam and the latter to the Virasaivam. This amounts to the same thing as saying that the Virasaiva mysticism builds on that of the Suddha-saivam, and perfects it, by adorning it with a cupola of its own, gemmed with all the iridescent brilliants, which the yoga-pada of the Divyagamas is capable of yielding to the true searcher after God. The entire body of the Agamic Canon comprising the twenty-eight Divyagamas, is, according to another classification, divided as a whole into a Purva-vibhaga and an Uttara-vibhaga, a Saivie section and a Raudric section, or an Old Testament and a New Testament. This division is characteristic and significant in that the dominant note of the Old Testament is Pratyabhijnâ mysticism, while that of the New Testament is Virasaivism. But none of the twenty-eight Divyagamas can, as an organic whole, be said to exclusively advocate any single phase of Saivic mysticism, though all of them are solely and profoundly inspired by the Sivadvidasidhanta philosophy, Paramartha-vâda, or the teaching about subjective illumination, known as the Agamanta. 

We have already proved that Veerashaivism, a phase of Agamanta, S. D. Vol. XI, 2nd article.
So far we have been able to say so only regarding वावलब्ध-नरलेन्द्र, of which भूमिका व्यक्ति and विशेषार्थकार्य are two sections.

After the religion came to be founded the Lingayats became quite independent of Hindus and Hinduism on account of their severing all connection with the Brahmanic priesthood. Questions seem to have been put by old religionists, specially the Brahmanic Shaivas, regarding their status. The followers of the new religion had to answer the questions and assert themselves. ब्रह्मण-शिष्यबच्चन is a prominent instance of such a controversy.

Treatises began to be written in Sanskrit in explanation of their religion and its fundamental principles; and सिद्धांतसाहित्यम is the first religious treatise in Sanskrit, in order that the querulous critics might understand the religion. In their enthusiasm the writers lost sight of the basic original literature (the Vachanas) and began to seek support not only from the Agamas but Vedic literature as well, specially the Upanishads. There is some justification for their doing so; for in their Sanskrit works the support of Kanarese Vachanas quoted would be ill fitted. सिद्धांतसाहित्यम is one such, though late. वेदांसारसींवेदांसीविवृत्ताम is full of quotations from Vedas, Upanishads and Puranas besides those of Agamas. The book is an attempt at establishing concordance of the Vedic and Agamic literature in regard to Lingayat tenets. Writers of Sanskrit treatises, later than विद्वयंतिस, the author of सिद्धांतसाहित्यम, lost sight of Vachana Shastra as the basis of the religion and
as the basic religious scriptures. This was so because they could not quote from the Vachana literature in their Sanskrit works. They had also to have recourse to write in Sanskrit because they were surrounded by the Vedist Brahmanic Shaivas that adopted and followed Varnâshraddharma and put queries in Sanskrit. The enthusiastic followers of the new religion had to meet their opponents on their own ground. They had to prove their view-point by quoting from Sanskrit literature and to explain the authorities quoted suitably to their own tenets. All this resulted in the confusion described just before; and Vachana literature came to be kept in the background.

Our attempt is only a beginning in the direction of studying the new religion as well as its literature both Sanskrit and Kanerese from the historical point of view. It is no use taking for granted all things as they are. How are we to believe that Basavapurana is written by Vyâsa? So also how are we to take for granted that अमुकिलम forms part of भविष्यपुराण written by Vyâsa? Mahâbhârata and eighteen Puranas are ascribed to the authorship of Vyâsa. But scholars have proved Mahâbhârata was originally a much smaller work. Later on so many things came to be added by interpolations time after time, so that ultimately it has become such a voluminous literature of the form of a cyclopaedia. Though it is a mine of information still the fact remains that it had additions from time to time till it attained the present form. Scholars have come to the conclusion that there were three redactions of Mahâbhârata. Similar is the case of Puranas, which like Mahâbhârata gave so much scope for later writers of different parts of India and of
different schools and sects to insert their own stories and
statements in the Puranas. We have already remarked
about this in chap. V on page 96 ff. The result has been
that there is no unanimity in the manuscripts of Puranas
and other works of different parts of India regarding their
contents, that this is so is admitted by all. There is no
explanation, except that given above, about such a variety
and divergence of contents of different works ascribed to
the authorship of Vyāsa. Lingayat authors also followed
suit and wrote Basavapurana and Prabhulingalila in the
name of Vyāsa. How are we to believe all this unless we
assume that Vyāsa lived from very ancient times to the
very recent times for writing all the contents now found
in all these works? It is for this purpose, we think, that
Vyāsa is considered to be a निरंजनिन न still living somewhere
incognito. At the beginning of the second canto of
Prabhulingalila it is said—

Similar statements are found at the beginning of all
succeeding cantoes. This shows clearly that the author was
some विकिरणरश्योगी. But in order to impart sanctity and
authoritativeness to his work he makes an ill-disguised
attempt of ascribing his work to Vyāsa as a part of नविध्वणः.
Similarly in the last (forty third) canto of Basava-
purana a funny story is related that Vyāsa, the author of
महामार्ग and eighteen Puranas, went to Shiva in Kailas and
asked as to why his work Basava-purana was so popular
and read in preference to his other works. Shiva then got
weighed in the presence of Vyāsa all his works with
Basav-purana in order to put down his pride of his other
Puranas. Basava-purana was found to be weightier than all other Puranas put together. The following verses will show this.

\[\text{वृहामालि तवैकामिनि निश्चिप्य शिवकामतम्} \]
\[\text{बसेश्वरपुराणः तदन्तरिमना पारतसमः} \]
\[\text{निश्चिप्य तुर्यमार्गिय ब्रह्मवच्य शिवायतः} \]
\[\text{बैयाधिकीनि सद्वार्थ कृतीनामुज्वलार्यामनाम} \]
\[\text{पूर्णामेतत्स्वरूपं स्वेतममभूतमहि} \]
\[\text{दुखो विस्मयमादो व्याहः संधोष साधिजी} \]
\[\text{स्वेतज्ञ पुरण्यु भ्रूदार्यमिति चानवीत} \]

We have to take all this in the spirit that it was the enthusiasm of the admirers of Basava that caused such statements. We shall be simply glad and amply repaid if scholars hereafter will devote their labours in the direction of studying Lingayatism and its literature historically and arrive at truth, which should be the aim and end of their work. Let Lingayat religion assert itself and shine by its brilliant intrinsic worth, its basic weighty and superior principles and creed, and not merely because it has its origin in the Vedas, Upanishads or Agamas. We, therefore, appeal to readers, at least to such as are Lingayats, to work in the field of research for the truths of this religion and for gathering rich harvests of real truths and principles and for effecting real reformation in the present sad state of the religion; so that the religion and the community should feel re-animation and attain rejuvination. We conclude our work with hearty prayers to God, the Universal Consciousness, nameless but named Shiva the Auspicious, and His consort Shakti, Vimarsha, also nameless but named Ambika, the Great Mother.

--- Finis ---
विषयावतारः

ते क्षल्येवमाहः — लिङ्गार्णं तावच वैदिकजनपरिकारः
अवैदिकलात्। वैदिकेन हि वेदेवद्वानितात्त्वित्यप्रकारतः नियमकम्।
नहि तत्र तदन्यतरेऽस्त्रायम्। नेव वा वेदमूलस्मृत्यविग्रहितद्वायम्।
मन्वादिकसृष्टिसत्त्वाय तद्यापकारतानि दृश्यन्। यदि मन्यः महालावाचारः

1 अ पृष्ठ, 2 अ अमलम्, B वायरस्फल, 3 अ वदनम्, 4 अ omites
बन, 5 B अथ न।
(२)

स्येवानुमेयवेदमूलकतः तद्न्याशामाध्यमः। लिङ्गारणस्त्र सकलराजानाचारत्वेन कविताबन्नजनात्वः वेदांमौऽपकलाभावात्। तथा चालिंगप्रमणान्विभूतिस्य लिङ्गारणस्त्र कथं वैदिकजैनपरिष्कारात्मामेति। तत्त्र।

वेदांशुक्षपुराणेशु कामिकायायामेवः।
लिङ्गारणमाल्यां वीरवाक्सनिष्ठर्यात्॥ १ ॥

इति सिद्धान्तोऽकः। अस्वादः। वेदेऽ यजुर्वेदाविकमः। वेदसंह भारतस्याभास्याप्रकर्मः। "भारतः पद्मो वेदः" इत्यभियुक्तोऽकः। शास्त्रं स्मृत्यः। पुराणानि स्कान्तवरातुसहस्रासीनि। अगमः कामिकायः।

१ ज्योतिलिङ्गामुलस्त्राहनरूपान्तलिङ्गारणप्रतिपादनम्।

यजुःवें तैत्तिरीयायायाम ज्योतिलिङ्गायमुलस्त्राहनवान्तलिङ्गारणं विध्यते। तत्त्रः —

द्रूपः विपायः परवेशम् भुतम्
हर्कुण्डरीकं पुरमध्यसंस्थम्।
तत्त्रापि द्रूपः गगनं विभ्रोकः
तस्मिन् यदन्त्तस्थुपासिद्धव्यम्॥ १ ॥

इत्यनिर्तितनामस्यः किंचिदं वस्तु उपायमित्युपासिः विधाय तत्किंमित्याकांक्षायम्।

यो वेदादी स्त्र: प्रोको वेदान्ते च प्रतिविटः
तस्य प्रकृतिलिङ्गस्य यः परः स महेश्वरः॥ १ ॥

इत्यनन्तः "शिवशृणु महेश्वरः" इति कोशावगतस्तुत्वा
शिवविकान्तिकहृदयपदावरुपुवायक्येन उपास्यवस्थ्वविधानात्। उपासनाया

१ A वेदेश्वरः, २ B ल, १ B omits जन, ४ A reads ग, ५ B वैदिकान्तिकहृदयपदावरुपुवाय, ६ A प्र, ७ B उपासनोः,
गुणविषयके तत्किंगणकार्याकाःकाः "अतं सत्यं परं ब्रह्म"
यथिमेत्र रससिद्धार्थगुणविनात्मक ० रिवतत्वतवि । तद्विन्य- गम्यते ।
ननु अष्ट्योपसानीशि "सहस्रश्रीं वें " इत्यनुवाके सहस्र- शिशुलिङ्गकृष्ण नारायणस्यामिनीतः तत्वैः वहऽरोपासनोपास्यतवं किन न स्यादिति चेत् ।

हस्तुःपदीं विरजः विशुद्धम्
विपिनः मध्ये विशारं विशोकम् ।
अविनयंवकमनन्तत्तरम्
शिवं प्रशान्तमृतं वहयोनिम् ॥ ।
एवादिमथानतलविहीनम्यकम्
विमुः चिदानन्दस्मृतमुलम् ।
उमासहारं परमेण्वरं प्रमुखं
निलोचनं नीलकणं प्रशान्तम् ॥ ॥

इति कैलास्योपानिश्चाहकेयः ।

"वालामभारं हस्यस्य मध्ये
विशेषेवें जोळवें वरेण्यम् ।"

इत्युक्तमोक्षसहारस्मृतपरमरश्वेतेैकन्तिकार्यवर्षरोकेषनेन।'अहу-\nघ्रातः पुष्को व्योतितिवामुकः। इशानोभवम्यस्य । इति
काव्यान्त्रेयं च हंसोमुन्यायेन तेवेक्षणायतापेनन् अथ
"यद्विदमसिमु ब्रह्मवरे वहरे पुण्डरिकें वेशम्। वहरोः-

1 A adds पुष्कं छधारिष्टुः । २ A Omita शिबतः .................गम्यते
१ B तदांविः । शास्त्रम omitted । A reads जातेवें । २ B omits ।
६ A reads पंडः for पंजः.
इति छान्दोद्योगवाच्येन च शिवस्य दृश्यः परिप्रेक्षिणाय अत्र देवतानन्दन-विधानेन नियतविधाय कदलवते।

"किं चोपासनाविधिः उपास्योपासनोपासकानां नवाणामात्रिभिः विशेषत्वेनोपासकाकांसायाम् नारायण महाभाषाय।" इत्यावधिभाय।

इति वृहस्पदिकदशनने अपरिमेये शिशन्तं इत्यारकाधिकरणन्यायेन सादिध्वस्तनारायणपृष्ठियो-नान्यनिरीक्षणयोगावसृष्टिवेक दृश्यार्कोपिकान्तियोगित्वाय स्वीयाहृद्ये वस्त्रस्यास्यामात्र शिवस्य नारायण दृष्यार्कयोगसृष्टि। अति च।

ततोव्यायत्तम स हरि: श्रुत्स्यज्ञानश्रिक्षिन्यम्।

दुर्गानन्दस देवाः मुनिरिहितगैरस्वरम्। ॥ १ ॥

इति बामनपुराणवचनेन नारायणस्य हुद्यान्तीरित्वाणिगिपसनादने। भगवधीतसः च:–

तेव्र चाच्छ पुरुष यथा।

यत: प्रदृष्टि प्रसूता पुरुणी। ॥ १ ॥

इति कार्येन स्वपण्डितनेन अनुस्य प्रदृष्ट्य कोवालितुकोः।

1 B किंचित, 2 B विशिष्ट, 3 A नारायण पूर्व, 4 A omits शिवस्य... सिद्धार्थ, 5 B वाक्यशुद्धितातः.
(५)

उद्धमः पुरुस्वत्वः परमात्मेतुवाहतः।
यो लोकायमाविश्व विमर्शन्य ईश्वरः।
ईश्वरः सर्वमूतानं हृदयेऽज्जूंमितिः। १।

इति स्तोत्स्युस्वत्वः हृदयान्तर्वितिः: शिवकान्तिकेशवरपदे
निर्णयकर्त्येन च दुहरोपासनादिकरणहृदयसमानतिमिताया
नारायणस्याक्षर्योः-स्वप्येतला।

अथ एवमुक्त्वणालया परमशिवस्य दुहरोपासनोपास्यत्वसिद्धार्थपि
तत्रतयस्य लिङ्गानुपले प्रभाताभावत नानातिरिमाहारणसिद्धार्थिति
चेतु भैरवम्।
हंसोपनिषदायामेवृहुक्तवामनसुराणेऽपि तत्स्य तद्दृष्टवासायत।—तथाहि
‘‘एषोसो परमो हंसो भानुकोडियस्वायास्य भेदेन्’ व्यायाम।
तस्यान्तर्वितज्ञतिः।
पूर्वप्रके पुष्पसुभिनि:। आभेये निद्रालयस्यायो भवन्ति।
यामे कौशीमाति:।
नैत्रेक्ते पापे मनोधा। वाराणाय क्रीडाः। वायवे गमनादौ बुख्छः।
सौम्ये रत्नीश्वरे:। ईश्वरे नुवावामसू।
मधेये वैरामसू। केशे जारूरस्था।
कर्ष्णीकायाः स्वपः। लिङ्गे सुपुष्पः।
पपुष्पाः तुरविमसू। यदा हंसे नाहे
विहीनो मन्त्र्ये भवति तदा तत्तुरायातीतिमिति। ५।
अत् ‘‘लिङ्गे सुपुष्पः” इति
हृदयान्त्वितिः: शिवस्य लिङ्गस्मृतं सम्यः।
आगमवाक्यानि हूःः—

आप्रेते कनकस्यं हृदये विद्विमप्रममः।
भूमये स्फूर्तिकथायं लिङ्गं योगी विभावेतु॥ १॥

इत्यादि सिद्धान्तशिखामण्यादिविचनान्युनस्येवानि।

अथ अस्त्यामुपनिषद्यं दुहरोपासनाविवधे नारायणस्योपासकर्त्याः
शिवस्यापास्यसिद्धार्थमिति निर्णयेन सहस्रीविशिष्यन्युनवाकृतम्
“नारायणपरं बहः
तल्यं नारायणं परः”।
इत्यादिवाक्यानि विहितेऽरेतिः मास्साढ्याः।
(६)

तदार्थभावलक्षणः नारायणश्रावलितसाधारणहुः श्रवलितविलिङ्गग्रामः
नुसन्धानसामथिन्द्रेण तथार्थतृतिशीतलः शोकात्मकः शाख्यवादः।

केषितु "नारायण परं ब्रह्म" इत्यथा "नारायणातु परं ब्रह्म" इत्यथः। अत् प्रव नारायणः परं ब्रह्मसत्यनुक्तवा नारायणपरं ब्रह्मसत्यवाभिनीतम्।
तथा चोकरविया तपस्यं शिवस्वयमेऽति न कष्ट्यिदिरोइ हि प्राहारित्वायमधिति-
विस्तरेण

२ इत्यलिङ्गमूलवाचलिङ्गधारणप्रतिपादनम्।

एवमस्याभावनिष्ठि ज्योतिर्लिङ्गमानसन्धानस्मृतिलिङ्गधारणविधाय,
इत्यलिङ्गस्तवाहलिङ्गधारणमाति विधीयते "सर्वलिङ्गं स्थापयति" हि।

नन्दस रथार्थवत्तातः लक्ष्मणेन विद्वानः बधिसम्भवः। न च
“ब्रह्मी नृः प्रोक्तसैः” "ब्रह्मीवहनः" इत्यत्र लिङ्गस्तवाहलिङ्गप्रतिपादनादि बधिसम्भवः।
तथा विधिसम्भवस्तवद् च किं न र्याच्युः बधिसम्भवः। अतः
विधिप्रयोजकस्तवाहावातः तथाहि,

"विभिन्नस्तवाग्रािः निःसरः पाण्डोऽसति।
तत्र चात्माः च कामोऽणरक्ष्यते मीर्हते।" || १ ॥
(७)

प्रदृश्ते "सर्वङ्गः स्थापयति" इत्यत्र नापूर्विविधः। लिंगधारणः राजस्य "सर्वकालशिरोधिवः" इति श्रीताश्रेष्ठरोपनिषद्वाक्यानन्तरेऽपि प्रमाणान्तराप्रमाणभावात्।

"सर्वाननिरोधिणिवसर्वमृतगुहाशयः। सर्वावशी च भगवार्तस्मातःसर्वगतः शिवः।" || १ ॥

इति। अस्त्यायमथः: — सर्वां लिंगधारणायोग्यानां आनन्दशिरोधिवः। अधिकरणं यस्य स: सर्वाननशिरोधिवः। धार्मिकाण्तसनू तन्त्रसिद्धांगल-पृष्ठ स्थितार्थवः: इत्यथः। सर्वमृतगुहाशयं इत्यत्र सर्वत्र गुहायां गृहायां वहरपुर्णशीर्ष: शोते "लिंगो सुनिष्टः" इति पूर्ववाहिन्द्रसाहित्यानन्तरलिंगात्मकस्थित प्रर्थि:। सर्वावशी निषिद्धपवरि-चछेदराहितः अत: एव सर्वगत इति।

नन्नच सर्वाननशिरोधिवः। इत्यत्र स्वस्विशेष्यभूताशिरोधिवेन समानविशिष्टविशेषायान्तरस्य चामुदेष्ठोन्निष्ठायान्तरस्य कर्ष भेदार्थरूपात्वकरणातितीति-रितिचेदैवैं मंस्थः:। समानविशिष्टविशेषार्थे। अधिकरणात्यमत्यायकलस्य "आनन्दमृतगुहाशयः" इत्यावधिकरणो नीलकंठाचार्यरचरणर्गुरुकृतिवतः। तत्र च यथा: प्राच्यरूपालस्तीकरण आनन्दमृतगुहाशयः। इत्यावधिकरणो नीलकंठाचार्यरचरणर्गुरुकृतिवतः। अनन्दमृतगुहाशयः। इत्यावधिकरणो नीलकंठाचार्यरचरणर्गुरुकृतिवतः। अनन्दमृतगुहाशयः। इत्यावधिकरणो नीलकंठाचार्यरचरणर्गुरुकृतिवतः।

भेदवादिभिरानन्दत्रीमीतिविद्यादिभिमिति "यस्मादेऽसाहित्यस्य नामस्थः: सर्वविस्मे ज्ञानमयं तस्मात्। इति वाच्यविशेषेन" विज्ञानं ज्ञानं इत्यतः। सर्वविस्मे ज्ञानमयं तस्मात्। इति राज्ञानितिमयः।

१ बृहदेश्वम् २ अ o m i t s ल्, ३ बृच्छ, ४ अ रित्ये के पण्डित वाच्यविशेषेन
(२)

बन्ध "इत्युक्तम्। लौकिकेऽपि बहुकर्पौदेश्यं वदः हस्यादौ
तथा हस्यिमि।

न रूपस्यान्यस्रोधिभिः इत्यथायान्यस्रोधिभिवामात्राविकरणकलिङ्गवर्त्ते-
कल्य तद्वस्तू सर्वास्त्राखिन इति वाक्योरूप स्म इति वाच्यम्। भक्तानुग्रहावर्त्ते-
धर्माः स्नानकपरिच्छेदनेवलिङ्गारुपे गृहस्थान्यस्रोधिभिः सर्वास्त्राखिन सेवकास्मी तद्वस्तूएव
सर्वन्यायां च भगवानु इत्युत्तरकार्यस्मृत्य इति योजयितुं शास्त्रानां।
अत एव वृद्धायाँगतपरिच्छेदनेवलिङ्गमुक्ति र्यां। सर्वन्यायां च भगवान्यवन्यात्र
चक्रादायसाध्यं। अथैवविधि:

उच्चमाङ्गो गरे वापि कुशी विषुक्तपेशः वा।
तथा हस्ततेव वापि प्राणिकलिङ्गं धरेसयुः॥ १ ॥

इति सिद्धान्तशिखामाणिवचनेन।

कुपी विषेऽर्थ वर्तमान्य विषाणां वेदितं।
मस्तके किररे कुशी वक्तव्ययं करस्यले॥ १ ॥

इति स्कन्देऽ, शास्त्रसंहितावचनेन च शिरेऽहो विषाणपादसिद्धिपि
आनीते तद्वस्तूकर्मकं नवधितेनासामायिनेऽपि—

मनुनांत्यते यस्मात्रस्माननाम्ने अधिनिः।
वाच्यवाचकरुपेण द्विजाम मन्त्र: प्रकीर्तित:॥ १ ॥
वाचको वर्णसूत्र: स्थाद्याच्यवश परमात्रायः।
मनुन्देवतयोरैः तस्मात्राहृत्यं यन्ति॥ २ ॥

इति व्यासानिरुक्तं।
(९)

नमः पीठामिति मोकं शिकारं मध्यमीरितम् ।
वाकारं गोकुलं वृंचं यकारं गोऽपि स्मृतम् ॥
अऽच्छारं लिंगमास्त्यां पद्वर्णं लिंगमुच्यते ॥ १ ॥

इति सिद्धान्तसारार्हिकवचनेन च फल्नाशरीमन्तरालिन्ययोऽकैवेन मंत्र-
रूपेणान्ते लिंगरूपेण शिरोभीवोधिविषय इति वक्तु शक्यत्वात् ।

अतः च ब्रह्मिनिर्भेजत यस्यभिजुज्त्वन पुरोड़कशिष्यानन्दनेनस्ये-
कतेन यथा विकल्पस्तवलक्षणाचिचित्तरसि कदाचिकृतवीरविष्णु वा धार्मिकल्यक-
मंत्रवयम् ।

अधि चास्तापुरुषविशदि " क्षण प्रभानं अभुताक्षरं हरः " इति
परमेश्वरं उपक्रमणः

लिंगधारणमास्त्यां द्रिधा सर्वर्धिसाधके: ।
वास्तवाभ्यंत्तरं चैव मुनिसभिमा काश्चकाशिमि ॥ १ ॥
आविरो हुद्वेद्व वापि भूमिष्ठेव वा निरस्तरसम् ।
ज्ञोतिंतंगानुसन्धानं तंदुरस्तपुष्यते ॥ २ ॥
अन्तर्विशतिः लिंगशक्तिशक एव वा ।
बाह्यं च धार्येतिंतं तद्वर्ण्यनि निशान्यात् ॥ ३ ॥

इति सिद्धान्तसहितािमाितिविकिावतासय मुख्यविववधारणमपि:-

" तन्त्राभिशानायोजनानात्मकमावात् " इत्यनेन तस्ताभिशानात्
ज्ञोतिंतंगानुसन्धानं तंदुरस्तपुष्यते योजनाविदितंकस्थाप्ये संयोगाविशिष्ट
प्रवाहं कुम वरीवामिति आकाशायां धारणार्थकरणस्वरूपार्थ प्रूचमिर्दं
सर्वनाशिरोरोधीव इत्यावाक्यं तत् मुहाशयः इत्यन्तरितंगाधारणस्थानं
प्रवाहं वहितं गाधारणस्याम्बुर्वे सन्नभविरोधयो व्रजस्वायते ।

| १ A गोकर्क | २ A ओमिट्स अत्यं तदुः | ३ B पण्योकर्क | ४ B प्रभुमिर्दं |
ननु सर्वनाशीर्धीव इत्यथार्थिकरणतालोकपदसत्रे सर्वमिलेबे स्मातचात्र नास्तीति चेन्नामू। आनन्दीशीवा: अधिकरणवोनास्य सन्तीति मतविधिमायच्येन पूर्ववेतर्थपत्त्विनायाराय “कर्म हि वाक्यावे-साध्योल्यमात्रस्तर तक्षणा ” हर्दी न्यायेन तत्कान्त्व वा तद्विद्वाराः वार्ताः।

अभयमात्रं च पूर्वतन्त्रे। “एकादशपोषोरवदनानि। तानि द्विव-चाति।” इत्यज्ञ पाशुके हविवि “प्रह्लादविधुक्ताटि कर्तव्याः” हर्दी छोटवेतनेव द्विवचात्राभि तानि द्विवचात्रार्थविवाधवाक्ष्य क्वैयथ्यविन सर्पस्थिति यथाविधि “चतुर्वादि यज्ञान: पव्वावोने वया कान्याः” हर्दी वाक्येल बपपदमुदा हुत्यादिसांसारेतः पाशुकेविन विनविनक्षणं सत्यं हृदयादिवर्य पन्नापदमार्गिण कार्यविभिन्ति तत्कार्योऽस्य साधिभिभिन्ति सर्व सुस्थायित्वमयः पच्यः।

पूर्विचायस्तु。“सर्वोऽस्य स्थायिति।” इत्यज्ञ पानुविधि: पाणिनेन परिवर्तिति विरोषणस्य वद्यकाण्डीयाः पाण्यदिकरणकूपजात्प्रतिपुदा क्षमं अभ्यासन्तनेन तदव्याधार्णस्य लिङ्गधारणाः वैकालिकायापूर्वाभवाः इस्यूँ:।

ननु मास्वपुराविधि: परस्तु “याजनाव्यापनप्रति श्रीमाहोऽधम-जनाणू।” इत्याविरिव निवाविभिरिव स्थायिति चेन्दः गभा कुक्षुमदाधिकाराः।

1 A adds 2 A adds 3 A कायी 4 B चारणोऽ 5 B पूर्ण 6 A सार्धकवे 7 A omits पदिश्र
(११)

रण अनुकरोति। मुकेश विश्वेश्वराचार्य भाष्यस्वरूपो न्यायाभ्यासप्रकाश
भूषणस्वरूपो न्यायाभ्यासप्रकाशी \\
चिन्ता निषेधितं न्यायाभ्यासप्रकाशे निषेधितं न्यायाभ्यासप्रकाशे।

पिण्डतापिण्डविख्यातं संसारात्मकहेता।
वीक्षालिम्बारोश्रव विभूतिरपि धारणम्। १। ॥
रुद्राक्षाधारण चैव पञ्चाक्षुरजपतया।
भक्तिमार्गकृत्य चैव गुरोऽलिम्बारोश्रव वाचनम्। २। ॥
योगीनन्दन तत्त्वं हेऽब्र स्वाधूस्थीतिततया।
प्रताप्य शीतमधुसूदन करिबर्णि प्रयत्नेत्। ३। ॥

इति सिद्धान्तानि शामशिक्षामिणि स्वेताम्बरास्यकलोकि।

ननु तद्भिं लिखितंत्वपीक्षाविक्षेपपूर्वकार्यकर्तव्यात्मककथारणातिरंभै भूषणस्वरूपो चेन्नेवम्।
तत्कर्तव्यात्मककथायोगेकिं दिपसक्या समुच्चायांकविवेकवधिति पारिर्संक्षायोगार्थद्वितिः पूर्वपक्षः।

अनोजयते। "सार्विङ्ग स्थापयति" इत्यतानुप्रूविधिः न च धारणस्य स्वेतांस्यक्षेत्रिताः। इति वाक्यविहितकलन न चैकालिकापारातिति विचयम्।

अस्य वस्त्रवित्वाक्षरिकरणभित्र गमिलिम्बाराधारणविधायकसहविलिम्बाराधारणसाक्षेपकलनेन उपजीविकेनोपजीवेऽन्यायसिद्धांतोगोऽति।

न च भास्य स्वर्णानाधिकरणलोकायोजनात्मकात्मका भावादरदितिः वाक्याविहितत्वाधारणाधिकरणनिःस्त्रक्षेत्रेण न सर्विङ्गवाक्यसाक्षेपत्वाचयम्।
चेष्यात्। अत्रानिरंतराधारणलोकायोजनसिद्धवेष्टेन स्थापयतीति धारणविधायकपदः।

१ बुधितिचे। २ भाष्याचार्य। ३ अन्वेषण, ४ धारणस्य। ५ तोमितस नि।
(१२)
नच हौकेबुद्धिकरणे व्याकरणादिना गृहितशािकोपलोकि-शाक्तानाने वैदिकलाल्लिंगमें "पुष्यां ज्येष्ठं" इत्यादिपशवादिविशालानां शाक्तिशाह व्याकरणादिपेशसीपते रूपस्थितिबिहारी हि न स्थादर्दिति वाच्यम्। व्याकरणात्ती मानसवािमायोगिकत्वं तथापितिअत्र यावद्वारायथार्थविचारां बिना हिंसाविचारानामस्तत्त्वं एव सर्वर्गायुर्धवस्य विधायक्षेतस्तिः। किंतु इति "सत्त्रािपि च समवानु" इति हिंसात्तिति-सम्प्र्योग अर्थवायुर्धवस्य सत्त्रािने तदन्न्/ािधियोगािचः।
भच्चेऽस्मि पाणिपन्नमतिर धिशेष्यप्रतिपािववार्थीन्यथानुपत्त्या तस्य 
पािवने विच्यासम्भव हि तत्र। अस्यापि सर्वर्गायुर्धवस्य सामान्यते
धारणविशेषकरणातिशेष्यस्यसम्पन्नक्षेत्रः तदुपजीविके तदन्न्/ािधियोगािचः।
पाणिपन्नमतित्वस्य धारणें मन्न्याध्यात्मिनि मन्न्यमतिं मायिर्यास्यार्य ध्वये कृते मन्न्यमहािणि भासी। मन्न्यम पाणिपन्नमतिथ्यः।
"
तस्माद्वार्यं महािणि मानपिन्नमतिति मन्न्यः।"
हि तस्माद्वार्यं महािणि मानपिन्नमतिति मन्न्यः।
अत्र च अभिधीपतं जुहोतीति वाक्यविहितिनिर्षिकराणायामानकां
हेमस्यीकरणास्यस्यक "आिध्यनि जुहोती।"
हि वाक्यस्थलं इति सर्ववाक्यविभिन्नविभिन्नः पीढ़िकरणातिशेष्य भासिये। पृक्तः पापायाविन्दिकमैवति नियमो विधीयत हि।

अत्र च अभिधीपतं जुहोतीति वाक्यविहितिनिर्षिकराणाथिवाहनमुख
हेमस्यीकरणास्यस्यक "आिध्यनि जुहोती।"
हि वाक्यस्थलं इति सर्ववाक्यविभिन्नविभिन्नः पीढ़िकरणातिशेष्य भासिये। पृक्तः पापायाविन्दिकमैवति नियमो विधीयत हि।

सर्ववाक्यविभिन्नविभिन्नातिशेष्यस्य समीपिन्नविक्षेत्रः तथाज्यत्र तदन्न्/ािधियोगािचः।

लुम्सामीस्यातिनात्रायात्मकरणातिशेष्यस्तमस्तिः। पविवावशेष्यम् "ज्योति परस्मपविवाक्यम्।"

अस्तुिकालायुर्धवमण्डलकापािविविध्यनिर्मसन्द्वरा पविवाक्यविशीयते।

1 A व. 2 T विधायकततवारिधः। 3 A अथि प्रयोगके बीच इत्य अन्द शास्त्राचे
(१३)

न चानेकविधाने वाक्यभेद इति वाच्यम्।

“आयोद्धाकपालोमावासायत्” इत्यज्ञ “अपाले विधीयने
वृत्तोऽचकलत्” इति न्यायेनानेकविधाने दोषाभावादिति।

नन्येवमभ सर्वविंश्य स्थापतीयनेन भूपयामेव हिंगस्थापनं
विधीयते। स्थापतीतिपदस्वारस्यन सकलजनानारिकिरकत्वने
चतुर्वात्वकवश्यकतात्। तथा च सति पाणिमन्त्रे पवित्रमिति
विरोषणमिति पाणिनाभिमित्रितं
पहचानोधानादिना संस्करं ज्ञात एव पवित्रमित्वेषतं सतू
सार्थकं वहतीति चेत।

अत्र वदान्ति। स्थापतीस्तुत्य मूलिकश्रीसाधारणेनेव हिंगस्थापन- विधायककर्मित्वसे
प्रवर्तित। शृद्ध: देवधिगुप्तद्रिणिगमकामावाच।
किन्तु “सनातने स वाक्यरोपात्” इति न्यायेन पाणिमन्त्रे
विरोषिष्ठितता वल्लभाच्छिरि एव हिंगस्थापनविधायकतेन
सिद्धित। पुराणादिन मात्र इत्यन
पुजार्थकर्त्तने प्रसिद्धसाधितत्वस्त्र मानन्यशब्दमर्ग पुजार्थकर्त्ता
मननाभावः नात्रायत इति मन्व पाणी मन्वे पाणिमन्त्रे इति
सिद्धे पाण्यविधायकर्षणपूजायाः
स्थापत्रेस्तुत्यम् शारीरिकशिरंगपर्वसायत।

न च पाणिना मननात्मायत इति तृतीयसमाधानयोः
स्थापरेपि
न विरोध इति वाच्यम्। तथा सति सापेक्षसमाधानयोः
समर्थपरिभावाभुः। तथा सापेक्षेदायि गमकत्वाश्मावीशीते
इति चेत
पाणिपदेशपर्यायोः।

न च मननात्मायत इत्युक्ते मानसादीनामापि
करणस्य प्रसरणात
तद्विवचवद्वाराः
पाणिपदेशमिति वाच्यम्। "शिवपृज्ज्वालिक अकारः

1 A इस्तेव निरीक्ष्यते। २ B पशुस्त्रम पुजार्थः कसर्वात। ३ A adds c between
मिनकालयं और प्रस्त्र। ५ R मनः.
मनोवाक्यकर्मिनः " इश्यमियुक्तेष्वा तेषामिपि करणतःप्रकरः। किव तुतीयासमासात्त्वेन एकदेशान्वितः। न च सचिवित्वुत्सासात्त्वेषयेषपि एष वेष इति वाच्यम पाणिपुस्त्य विशिष्टेनावन्त्वस्वीकारादिति।

यथोक्त्र पाणिनाभिमानितात्मिततः पुराणसिद्धपुजाज्ञानाचक्रस्याभिमानितार्थकाभ्येकोऽन्यायस्वीकारादिति। न च प्राप्तात्मितः। "तत्रेषु ऐशुत्" "तां अपैशु ऐशुत्" इश्यालिङ्गमात्रिकारणेण "प्रायः पाठानुरोधा" इश्यालिङ्गक्रियामात्राय प्रथमन्वित्तत्त्वात् साधके जनक गौणार्थकशाल्लव्यवस्थितिः सत्त्व तथावित्तवात्। मुख्ये सम्बन्धतः गौणार्थकविकारस्य जन्यात्वेऽव च मुख्येश्वक्रियामात्राय ब्रह्मपरमेवतः निर्मितिः।

अन्तः बूढः "निधनन्तःनः नमः" इश्यार्थः "एततः सामस्य सूर्यः" इश्यातः सर्वोदयपर्वतः। तत्रः ।

अल्पार्द्धमेकं हिंगं यस्तचेत गुरुणा परस्मृ।
मात्राणेष्वेन ब्रवः भूते नगतेः।। १। ॥ इश्यालिङ्गस्वाति आचार्युपालिः ।
पारिवास्ये इति श्रीके श्रावणामविशारादी।। २। ॥
पाणिलिङ्गस्वाति तेजावायुमेय तथ।
शिवलिङ्गवराभिमेयं लिंगं देवं वर्ताणिः।। ३। ॥
व्योमस्वार्थिं हिंगं प्रसादायं महाकरम।
आत्तत्त्वमयं प्राक्क महालिङ्ग महाभृंभृं।। ४। ॥

इति सिद्धन्तोक्तर्वर्कचनोनं द्वारविधालिङ्गानि नमोऽत्: स्तुति-ध्वनिते। तत्र ि" ऊद्ध्वलिङ्गाय नमः" इश्यालिङ्गमुच्चये। तत्स्य सर्वमेकेश्वरोऽपि कृत्यमृत्स्वयमकस्थितिवात्। "हिरण्यलिङ्गाय नमः।" इश्यनेन प्राणालिङ्गाय स्तुते।

¹ A महिष्या। ² B भूै। ³ अन्तः ⁴ महेन्द्रः ⁵ नमोऽत्।
(१५)

तमकाव्यनसंदृशाः कांदुच्छानसामाधितयः।
योगिविधश सदा व्येच्यं प्राणादिगं विकृत्युषा: || १ ||

इति सिद्धान्तसारारविवक्षणेन तस्य काव्यनमयवलनिष्ठयात्। "सुवर्णीय नमः" इति सिद्धान्तार्थार्थात्।

नमः पीठमिति प्रेकं शिकारं मध्यमरीति।
वाकारं गौङूरलं दृतं यकारं गोलकं समतम || १ ||
ओकारं हिंगमाल्यात् पद्वर्णं हिंगमुख्यते।

इत्यनेन हिंगमालिरवसनकल्लेनेव सुप्रभाृविशालसारसुवलनिष्ठयात्। "विद्यालिंगाय नमः" इत्याकाशशक्तिपविद्वानसहिंगमुहुः। द्विदि मवविद्यामिति व्युक्तया तयोभेदात्। "शब्दिलिंगाय नमः" इत्यनेन गुरुलिंगळव: क्रियते।

जेष्ठा जलमग्नी तत्र स्थितियुपदानरुपिणि।
वास्तवीश: स ज्ञेशो ज्ञेषा तवट्टिकरीतित। || १ ||

इति जलतवारिविद्विदमुहल्लिणेन महाहिंगामेतात्। 'शब्दिलिंगाय नमः'
इत्याभारलिङ्गस्य।

वामात्मपुष्ठितिविपुलतवंमानिकाय यथा।
सुः: प्रवत्तिः वामा सा शवः हिन्तिमूर्तिः || १ ||

इति सिद्धान्तसारारविवक्षणम पुष्ठिततवामिनि: आचारलिङ्गस्य
शरीरहिंगामेकविद्वारायदृवात्। "शब्दिलिंगाय नमः" इति शिवलिङ्गस्य।

अष्टेश्व रुद्रसल्पस्त्रीस्त्रेषु तद्भवंष।
स वै पशुपती रुद्रे रैडीं तवट्टिकरीत्यते || १ ||

१ शुरुवलिङ्गायः.
(१६)

इस्में तेजस्वामिमानिश्वलिंगमय शिवपदस्थानापरमरुपवाच्यमेवप्रति इति "ज्वलतिलिंगाय नमः" इति चरलिंगस्य।

प्राणस्य कालस्पर्शवात् कालशाक्षुस्त्र वाचवि।

वायुमृत्यु उपस्तत स काल इति विश्रुतः। ॥ १ ॥

इस्में वायुस्वाभिचित्ररसतिलिंगस्य उपस्वाच्यज्वलतिलिंगमेवद्विश्रवयात्।

“परमलिंगाय नमः” इत्यास्मत्वामिमानिनो महातिलिंगस्य। “आत्मलिंगाय नमः” इति कारणशारीरिकविशिष्टतालिंगस्ये। तथा चार्थवाच्य आगमोकारारूपिकोहविभिन्नशारीरस्तिलिंगविषयकः चरलिंगमेव स्थायितवाच्यस्य र्नावरलिंगविद्यायात्रे विच्च्यवाच्योऽयंकारण्यापि। इति।

उपकरोपसंहाराक-प्राध्यायोऽपूर्वतंकथम।

अर्थवाच्यपति च लिंगं तत्त्वनिर्णये। ॥ २ ॥

इति पद्धितताप्राप्तिलिंगानां मध्ये असन्नत्वारिहोऽधिकः। उपकरोप "बेदी वा प्रायदरीनात्।" इति वेदेश्वराधिकारणायायेन मध्यवेतने उर्ध्व-लिंगाय नम। इत्याधुपकरोप ध्वनिलिंगवाच्यस्य चरलिंगवाच्यस्य शरीरध्वनि-लिंगविद्यातिरिक्तविष्टले प्रकरणविरोधः।

न च "एतस्मस्य सूर्ये।" ति पूर्वकारमकरारमशक्तिचित्तूऽद्वै सूर्योपनमस्कारामिद्धितवात। प्रकरणाविवेकः इति वाच्यम। उपकरोपसंहारोऽधिकः। शिवपदस्थानार्थवेतने मध्ये सोमसूर्योपनमस्कारार्थवेतने सन्मुखविरोधादियाया।

“सोम एकोभ्यः पचे घृतमेक उपासते।” इत्येव उमाया साहित्सौम इति न्यूयस्या सूर्यस्य। सुर्येश्वरलिंगालेवर्तिनि। सोमस्य "लिङ्गविद्याश्रयप्रत्ययस्य-श्रमावात्। उत्सर्गविन्यासात् शरीरहनुष्ठलिंगपति। ‘‘आदुम्बरो यूनो मकरमुग्व उदम्बर उर्ध्वेश्वरस्य च चरमा चरित्रर्योवृंदुंवरुः।” इत्येवाद्वितीयायंमयीतया विचित्रविद्यां संगमच्चते इति।

१ ब महालिंगस्य स्त्रांति। २ अ आचार्यस्य। ३ B भाजातिरिक्तविश्वक्रमदण्डप्रभेद सर्वलिंगवाच्यस्यसारीसर्वस्तिलिंगविन्यासस्यं प्रकरणविरोधाच्च।
(१७)

अधिवमण्यस्य न नित्याविविल्वम् । "बाह्माप्रच्छरः स्वयं मुनिनिर्मोक्षकारकेशिनं । इति प्राप्तवाहुतिसिद्धान्तशस्त्रामणिवचनेन फलश्रवणाविविद्दी चेन्येवम् । नित्येदिपिृ ।

सन्ध्यामुपासते थे तु सततं संशिलतं ।
विभ्रुपासते गणित बहकोकमनायम् ॥ १ ॥

इत्यार्थवांकक्ष्यथवेन्द्रन सन्ध्योपासनस्यानित्यतापि । यदि तत्र
अनुपास्य त्रिकालेषु सन्ध्यामन्त्रविजुचिभुवेत् ।
स्वान्योनिनातं वल्वा चाण्डालः कोठिज्ञम् ॥ १ ॥

इत्यकर्षन्य प्रत्ययत्वयमघरणाविवित्यत्र नाचकेशिनी नित्येदिपि समानम् ।

भक्तयाविविषो विषं वात्यवादिभविघास्य ।
स्वाष्मायस्यं ताववनेन रचितं भवेत् ॥ १ ॥

इति वानुदेवतिवनेनकरणे प्रत्ययाविभाषानात् ।

बिभेत्याविविष्ठान्ती साधर्यं प्रतेदितृ ।
इतिहाससुराणाय वेदार्थं उपबूहयेत् ॥ १ ॥
वेदार्थोत्थरं स्वयं ज्ञातसखां वेदाचिदि ।
सौमिनिनिनिति तत्तिराणो शाङ्गा स्वाम्महाबमनानुम् ॥ २ ॥

इत्यकलेन अस्यः श्रुतेनकारे उपबूहणमन्यति तथाहि लिंगपुराणे ।

स्रो वेदार्थं शाङ्गसखायु पुराणपूवायमेवु ॥
बाह्माप्रच्छरः समास्यावं लिंगपुराणमुच्चम् ॥ १ ॥

१ ॥ निये । २ ॥ उपाणनस्य नित्यतापि । ३ ॥ व्यवायित्वपि । ४ ॥ वेदार्थं यः ॥
(१८)

पञ्जुर्ण्याह सर्व वै हिंग स्थापनयतीति च।
तस्मादर्यां महालिंगम पाणिमन्वति मन्नत: ॥ २ ॥
पाणी हिंगं अनिश्चित्व विद्याकाले गुरुशिवान्मू।
येन स्तुवांति तन्मूले पाणिमन्नी वदनि हि ॥ ३ ॥
पवित्रलन्कोहशस्य शिवस्य प्रतिष्ठादनन्तः
पवित्रीकरणार्थासं पवित्रितति कर्यते ॥ ४ ॥
अतसवेंद्र कालेषु भारयेडिरेगुजलम्मू।
गच्छविद्वन्न स्वपन्न जायन्तुनिरन्ताधिपिऱिऱः ॥ ५ ॥
शुचिविश्वचिरविधि हिंगं सर्वं धारयेतु॥
हिंगाधारी सदा शुद्धो निजलिंगम मनोहरम् ॥ ६ ॥
अर्धन्युन्न गन्धपुष्पायः कर्षेत समाहितः।
नित्यानि कर्मदीनुदानि तथा नैनिषिद्धानि च ॥ ७ ॥
शिवारपेण्डिया कुमतसम्मू हानाभिवृद्ध्ये।
इति।

स्कान्दे शंकरसंहितायामपि।

यो हस्तपिठे निजलिंगामिद्य
विनयस्य तद्वीनमनः प्रचारः।
वाहक्यासनकुरुङ्गिनेलाभ्या
सम्पुर्णयत्वः स वीरतौ।। ॥ १ ॥
तदेव हस्तमुच्युतपिठेये
निधाय हिंगम प्रसात्मचिन्तम।
प्रपुजयेदैवत्यधियोपचारे।
नरस्तु वाहक्यात्सदुराभिधे। ॥ २ ॥
वाहक्याधारिनविदंकपिठार्थे वरं।
सर्वेऽवा वीरोदानां सुप्रभृत्यः निर्नातस्य। ॥ ३ ॥

१ अ मालयाचे:
(१९)

हित्यादिना पाणिमन्त्र पवित्रमिति वाक्यविहितपापवायुधिनेकपूजाजाग्रेश-चमुक्त्वाः

न तस्य सूतकं वस्त्र प्राणिमागसंख्याम्
जनावधेऽरूपोत्वे वा वख्ये परमार्थोऽत
जातके सूतके वापि न त्यायेऽर शिवपूजनम् ॥ १ ॥

इति हिम्मतारणेण यावनीवद्रीक्षितस्याशुचिकालेडपि शिवपूजादिको कर्त्तव्य-
मित्युक्तम्

देवाचनाधिकं कर्म कार्य दीक्षान्वितेऽपि
नास्त्याशोषविनिष्टेऽपि सूतकं च महात्मानाम् ॥ १ ॥
शैवं देवार्जं यथा यथा चालिणिः
ब्रह्मचारियतीनां च शारीरे नाहित सूतकं ॥ २ ॥

हित्यादित्युपराणेडपि तैववामितिमिति

नन्दवशिचकालेडपि शिवपूजाकरणे कर्मान्तरानुभानग्र्ष्टे तत्परारितिः
जेबेः
नित्यमार्गितस्याहंकर्तव्यं विनिश्चितं नास्त्याशोषाधिकालेडपि
नित्यमार्गितस्याहंकर्तव्यं नित्यमार्गितस्याहंकर्तव्यं नित्यमार्गितस्याहंकर्तव्यं

न विश्रास्तनान्यं योरोषस्तनान्यं योरोषस्तनान्यं योरोषस्तनान्यं

ि

हिताय तत्रुदभानाम्

इति मनुस्मृत्तमुरोडः अनवधनकालकर्त्तव्येडपि न यावदद्रव्यनस्य
कर्त्तव्यं तथा रीत्या यावज्जीवसक्षुभितपर्यादेशानुकारणेउशुचिकाले न
कर्मान्तरानुभानारायरिति

---

1 A यत्तमानाम्। 2 A adds आपि। 3 B नैवेणकान् स्थावन‍षायो। 4 A ततदुक्तिर् या।
ग्‌रीकुपक्रमऽ ्वाप्रायिककारणकाविषयायः। तथापि
वामहस्तस्तयायन्तरक्रमऽत्ततः तत्त तत्करणमुक्ताक्रमऽते " अखडऩिना
प्रि स्वेहिस्वरे प्राप्ने ि " इति श्रुत्या पानकराशषिुविकल्
तत्करणस्वित्येषि अयापुरुषमूढिनान्ति सकलशैलरिकनावक्रात्मकायिन
-तत्करणस्वित्यऽप्रायैवाःधानिभ्रिुवि विश्वस्त्रकारणकारणकाविषयायः।

उससा शिरसा ्मद्या मनसा वच्चा तथा।
पद्माय र्ांयां कृषिङ्गयां प्राणातिकाङ्ग उच्चे।् १।।
इति बोधायनेन कद्दनऽसे कर्त्तवसि परमश्विनमस्कारोधायत्वमुर्द्देशि च
पीठाकैैसि कर् द्धेने पुष्पातिकविवाचि तणशिवृपताकरणे दोषभावात्।

ननु यथापि भवदुकायीत्या सश्र्दुलिंग स्तायीसिद्धसि विगातारणपरवन
सिध्यायि।तथापि बेदार्यण्यूमतिमिशिरायणेस्तत्ततःथत्यायनात्सन्तुवें इति
चेतावदेशुर ग्रहणमुक्ताक्रमऽकरोिले। तैरणस्वातःवेयः प्रायुविकितसिद्धरेण
-प्रितस्तारायणमूलिभित्तत्ततःथत्यायनाः व्यास्तानावात्। विद्यायत्वस्वाभिमित्वःप्रकृ-
तत्खेशुप्रायोगिक्यायायायो दोषायतार्याक्षेपितायि। इतरथा दुघ्मतन्त्यानामाभि
तैरणस्वातःथतः समयमतत्ततलाईैुवऽदा शंकरारणायां दुघ्मपुरुषायिनः
प्रक्षत एव भ्यातु। किव तसःकलशुविचिपुर्णरमववद्वरायणाचार्यवेब्यैसः
अष्टेकार्यनुसारेण सिद्धमुरुस्तोतत्यायनाः वेदार्यण्यूमतिरिजोिसि
, सिद्धान्तशिखामण्यायाद्रुपुरुषस्तितले च सन्त्तह्योगाविद्यि सभामन्त्ये।

१ B adds वि to अख्याय । २ A विनियुकावलि । ३ B उस्योगसि तथोऽ
गावश्यामचि। ६ A नसकारायपोरिकि । ५ A मतत्यातिदेवता माचार्यवेब्यैसि।
६ B श्रीहारा वे वेदार्यण्यूमतिचि । ८ T, B वेदार्यण्यूमति" उरस्वि ।
(२१)

२ मन्त्रान्तरित वाहाकिंगघरणाशिश्चिनम्

॥ ॐ ॥ 

वन्नेन मन्त्रेन न लिंगदारणसिद्धिः। मे धारणमस्तु अहं धारणिता

भूमिसिद्धिः वाक्यहृदयेषु विशिष्टसंरक्षणवाचनेन धारणामात्रतीते।। न च

देवतान्तरित गान्धारणसिद्धिरूपस्य नारायणश्रीतिनिधित्वमेव श्रीकालः

विद्धारणस्य रामाणुजमलसिद्धिलिङ्गमणकरकवेन च तस्येव धारणप्रतियोगि-रि

वेनान्योगमधवात्।

न च अनिरक्षणीतिऎवादविनाशशापिविवेन निरूपणं

हेवेयम्बन्धु तत्र भवतीविराजनमुणाधृदेवं ब्रह्मेयकरकवेन तस्येव धारणान्वेय-भूमिलिङ्गधारणासिद्धिरूपस्यवाच्यम्। पुष्पश्रावविशेषः

विनयसुवर्त्तसाधित्यानारायणस्य तद्धृपणां च वक्तु श्रीकल्यात्रेव तेवामिपि

धारणान्योगसिद्ध्वुक्तोद्विषाधानपातात्। किंत्र

विमृगतिर्यथा निमाते कष्टु रुद्धार्कालिका।

मुखे प्रक्षरो मन्त्रसंत्यजन्त्यजयं यथा।। १।।

उद्धवलेन विपुण्ड्रवेव मनसापि न वेधेतु।

अत्यद्विधायते तरसमात्यामी पतितो भवेत्।। २।।
(२२)

इति भूतिभ्रमार्गाधारणाकरणे प्रत्यवायत्वनेन तयारेचार धार्मिकात्योगिते-नान्यः स्थिरतिः। धार्मिका भूमासमित्यः विद्यासम्भवाशिष्टारिहंक्तेन विद्यासक्कवासम्भवान्। न वा विरेचिरोजकृपसत्वम् सर्विलिंगवाक्येनात्वथा-सिद्धार्थविधिः पूः: पश्चात्।

अन्रैयः। अनिराकरणमुपायेः यद्यंगम्युर्भवं बहुं तद्दार्थरिता भूमासमित्येर्वः: स्थिरतिः। यतु नारायणदृष्टमाघमायमायावशकान्ताः-निराकरणविविक्तमधिति ततः यूके "सर्विमिंद्र बहुविगुहत्रेणा राते संग्रामयुन्ते" इतर्थभविष्यविवादिवान्।

तन्ते कारणारामो जातासास्त्रान्नमेववर्तु।
पिण्डा नियमिता: पूर्वं त्रयोऽपि त्रिभु वर्षमसु। ॥ १ ॥

वहं समें हरिज्ञाणे रूढः संहरे पुनः।

इत्यदिः श्रवणार्यवचनेः नारायणम्योलोकसिध्वपेन। तद्विनिर्यातकन्तुदेः।

चक्रादिन्तनांत्यं न तन विवसं वसेत्।
यदि तितेभंमापुष्पं सहस्रबहुं भुवेत्। ॥ १ ॥

अज्ञानाध्यक्षं शोभावर्त्तमो वा सुर्दीर्मू।
थे कुलान्ते ते द्वृत्ता सेवेन्स नामाचरेत्। ॥ २ ॥

इत्यादिना च निराकृतबेन अनिराकरणस्वेपस्तम्यान्त्रोमाभावः। विद्वेद्विशिष्यः चेदमुपरिदास्वामिः। अस्थः तु "न कारण कारणानां धाता ध्याता कारणानु-ध्यायः।" इत्यत्वाम्बावेन पूवंकनायाधिवेद्यवृहस्विद्यविद्यविद्यविदिनानि-निराकरणदृष्टम्याघुकृतिया हिमाग्रृहितकन्ते च तस्मेव धार्मिकात्योगितेनान्यं इति।

१ आ विषयः। २ आ स्थाप्यताभावः। ३ आ विषयः।
वस्तुस्तूल धारारथिता भूयास्मिति सामान्यतः धारण विधाय धार्य किमित्याकांक्षायां "ममामुख्य ऐ " इयोद्वारावाच्चवककल्लिंगस्य विधानात्। तस्येव धारणेषुवयः। तथा च अनिरकरण उपोद्यमू वेदशास्त्रग्रंथिपालनेन कर्मयो: शुद्धे ऐ ओकारपुत्राच्चमू यन्त्रिक्वस्वसलं लिंगं तद्वारारथिता भूयासमित्यक्षायायः। ननु

ओकारश्चार्यशङ्कर द्वारेती ब्रह्मणः पुरा।
कस्या भिष्या बिनिर्मयं तस्मानमांछलिकाः॥ १॥

इति मंगलार्थकलेन "अकारो वै सर्वं वाको" इत्यकारस्य सर्वावगन्नर्तोकाराप्रकृतिलसिद्धवकृंकार्यं विभुवाचकलेन च न लिङ्गार्थकलसिद्धिरोकारस्यैवति वेदमैवः। "अकारं ब्रह्मणं नामी उकारं विभुं हुदः मकारं सर्वं भूमणेष्व ओकारं सर्वस्वरं ह्रादादयति।" इति ताप्नीयोपनिषद्वारायेन।

एवं तिसुभुरेवत्मानाभिमभिक्षुलं निष्ठा।
अभिधाय शिवाचार्यं बोधयत्यभाषयत्॥ २॥

इति शिवपुराणानवनेन लिङ्गपुराणे विभुकृष्टशवास्तः। "सर्वाश्रय नमस्तुभ्यमोङ्ग्राया नमोऽनमः" इत्यनेन चार्ध्मानवस्यनवाच्चवकल्लिंगस्य परम्पिक्वाचकवकल्लिंगायात्।

न चाकारप्रकृतिकांकारस्य अकारवाच्चविभुवाच्चकल्लिंगमिति वाच्चयम्।
अरोपवाचार्याः अकार प्रकृतिकलेन तद्वादेव वाच्चसिद्धे शाक्कमांचोक्षेपादेन। "अकारो वै सर्वं वाको" इत्ययस्। "अकारेण चर्ववाकं संतुष्टे।" नेवव न्यासादायः। अन्यथा पूर्वपुरुषाणामनुत्तरोत्तरविनायक्यते नाकाराणिनायस्यङ्गामानाक्ष्रियादिनैवेन नद्यामतपत्या तद्वाच्चशिवाच्चकल्लिंगमिति वैपरेरिश्वरः। अत एव मंगलार्थकल्लिंगमिति सिद्धयति।

१ भगवतिकथ्यः । २ अकारवाच्चयः । ३ भिष्यानलेनः।
(२४)

स में भयंति शं निर्यां सर्वत्रोपाकाः।
शिवमिच्छन्ननुष्ठायं तर्मवदेवशिवमृतः।।१।।
समाधवान्ति में सर्वे दानवाञ्च सुराश्रये।
शिवोजस्मि सर्वभूतानां शिवलये तेन में भुरां।।२।।

इति कर्णपर्वाः शिवद्विनिरुक्तव शिवस्य सर्वभूतायमवद्विनिरुक्ताः।

न च ओकारस्य शिववाचकास्वेद्यं लिंगपर्वें किमायातमिति वाच्यम्।
“हिंद्रे सुहु:” इति पुरोवाहारहस्तोपायशिवाक्रेण शिवरूपमः लिंगस्यावसायत।
ओकारं लिंगमार्गायत। इत्यामापनेन साक्षादेव तत्कारावाच।

यथों भूतिश्रवाक्रेव धारणेनव इति तत्र विकन्यायः।
प्राधान्येनात्म्येवो लिंगारायनात्मकात्म्येव। नाथः तदुपस्माप्तवाधारावृहः।
न हि भूतिश्रवाक्रेव ओकार इति कुञ्जापि पारिद्रमृ।

न हि विदित:। इत्यादि:।

केचितु अनिरक्षानिश्चित्नेन भूतिश्रवाक्रेवोहणं ओमिति लिंगस्य
तथा च चतुर्याणामिति धारणेन प्राधान्येनात्म्येव इत्यादि:।

यद्यप्यकाश्मृ भूतिश्रवाक्रेवालीरिहित्त्वें न विदिश्वभव इति तत्तंद्रसृ।
“मेधारी भूतिश्रवमृ” “अहमेकः प्रथमासामृ” इत्येव तत्सध्वलात।
नयं तत्र विदितोजाक्रुपस्तत्वमतं तत्संवेदेयत्र तदुपस्माधारवत्
न विदिश्वभव इति वाच्यम्। अत्रापि धारणिता भूतिश्रवामिति विदितोजारायण।
“सर्वजिंग स्थायति” इत्येनानुष्ठ्यू “पामिनभ्रमृ” इत्यपिकरणमात्रविविधितिंग्यी।
कारे अन्त्यासिद्धायमावेन विदिश्वायत्।

आसांतत्वाद्यमर्थवाचः। तयारां न लिंगधारणपर्वं हृते।
“कुण्यो: श्रुतमार्कारणं क्षुः लिंगमृ” इत्यादिनश् तस्तैव शृवितसर्वमितिनात।
उक्रेनस्य “दूहरे विपायं” इत्यस्य “सर्वजिंग स्थायति” इत्यस्य च।

१ ४ उपक्रममृ २ A adds उत्त to वा १ T स्फूतः।
(२५)

बाहाम्बोतरा। इत्यादिः तत्वकरणगतनमोक्षणेन इत्येतस्य तदन्त्यपररवाचोगचेचाच्यत्मकः यन्त्रवसिद्। उपमृतेऽवैतेवेतेवेते। ब्रह्मांडुराणेः—

नमःश्च ब्रह्मणेतुभयं आचार्यीय महामने।
तत्वकरणं विश्वं जन्यवान्मूर्त्यनेव हि ॥ १ ॥
अनिरकरणं ब्रह्म कारणो वाजितंतनम्।
अनिरकरणं मेघुस्त्र धारणं देशिकोत्सम ॥ २ ॥
बेदशाब्राहुराणेः प्रसिद्धं कर्मःश्चूडम्।
अहं धारितां देवं मूलांसं स्वेताकारणः ॥ ३ ॥
ब्रह्मविष्णवाग्यो देवः प्रसिद्धांश्च तथा श्रुतः।
ते निरकरणालं मृत्युं न सर्वशारणः ॥ ४ ॥
मे निरकरणास्वते न हि धार्मिकः कदाचन।
नाहं धारिता देव्यान्मूलांसं मन्त्रस्तुससुराणः ॥ ५ ॥
न शक्कुविधं मां तर्कस्म मजलं मृत्युमागे।
उद्धै महेंद्र अं हिंग्म मां चामुण्य समाधयः ॥ ६ ॥

इति स्कान्दे कुमार संहिताय याहीलक्ष्णे।

यहात्पाविनां चाथ जतीनां चोगिनां तथा।
शाम्भवानां द्विजातिनां शैवानां हिंगाधारिणाम् ॥ १ ॥
महापश्चुपतानां च मदामश्रत्वारिणाः।
मृत्युः चिदत्वतानां च मदीत्या द्विजसुविनाम् ॥ २ ॥
सर्वास्मिष्ठाः सुद्धानां नितम् द्वें धिरीवर।
हिंगाधारिणां नाम वर्त महेश्वरभारिधम् ॥ ३ ॥
ये धारणं प्रकृत्विन्नति ते यान्ति शेषमन्दिरम्।
वर्त पश्चाप्पते नाम शेषलिंग्याच्यनं सुसम् ॥ ४ ॥

१ पद्यः २ ज्ञायनः १ पदलः २ वीर्यशाया।
(२६)

पाटकालिक त्रिकाले वा एकाकाल महेश्वरम्।
ये पूजयति विषय ते यानि शिवमनिर्माणः॥ ५ ॥

इत्यादियुक्तःपदलकान्यवनसन्येराति।

४ तैतरियोपनिषद्वत्तमन्त्रे तस्येव वाह्यः
लिङ्गधारणस्य प्रतिपादनम्।

तैतरियशास्त्रायामेव "यज्ञवद्यान्यायो विब्धवरुपः।
छन्दोयोक्तं वृद्धमित्रातसमवभूव। सं मे इन्द्रोऽवन्धया स्तूणोतु।
अयुत्स्थ देवधारारो मूयासम्। शरीरं मे विचरण्यम्।
जिन्हा मे मधुमत्तमा। कणार्यं चूरिविशिष्टम्। ब्रह्मणः
कोशस्ति मेधथा पिन्हितः। तुतन मे गोपाय।"॥
इति मंत्रेणापि
ग्रहणं स्वयं।देवधारारो मूयासमित्यन्य देवधारि
"तस्मायेवशिखरस्मृतः।" इति च परमश्चर्योऽयोगदूर्वानात्।
देवतान्तरात्युष्णान्यविधायकप्रमाणावावादावावाः
चाराभावाम धारणशक्ति कर्तिर ल्युग्दतत्वेन च
देवधारारो यतो मूयासं अतः इङ्कः निम्प्रानुयसमः।
सं लिङ्गस्य
शिवः मा मा मेधथा स्तूणोतु सौयोजित्विश्वांध्यातम्।

अनेकं विचारंते। "यज्ञवद्यान्यायो विब्धवरुपः।" इत्ययमनुवाद
इत्यभूस्मतन्यम्। यज्ञवद्योक्तायात्। तस्य च पुरोवादसपेषतलेन
"तस्या
शिखायाः। मध्ये परमात्मा व्यवस्थितः।" इत्यतः
राजोपनिषद्वत्तस्मिन्
मुः। तत् च "पप्पकोशस्स्ति कामः।" इतादिना
निरूपः
"तस्यान्ते सुविरं।" इति तदन्तस्ति मुनिर्विं दशर्थे
"तस्य मध्ये महानमः।"
इत्यावर्माः
"परमात्मा व्यवस्थितः।" इत्येन तदन्तस्ति मुनिर्विं
"सुविरं मध्ये परमात्मनः।"
पुरोवादसपेषतलेन तथाविधमात्रानां यज्ञवद्यान्यायो
मूयास:।

१ B चैकाराः। २ A शुद्धः।
मिति विद्वीयते। तथा च देवधारणः देवश्रय शिखाध्यार्थति परमाध्मनो धारणप्रसन्नवरिणो भूयासामितिः सति न लिङ्गधारणसिद्धिः। किन्तु विश्वसूक्त इति ब्रह्मदिग्द्धमवरिष्ठन्ति "व्रद्धा: कोशोसि" इति निरुपमक्षु-ज्ञातपद्धयोगेण च परमाध्मन एवांत्विरणातोिसैते चेन्नेधारम्। तत्स्मिते देवधारणो भूयासामितिः देवश्रय परमाध्मभो धारणमंतरसनन्तथानुपासनात्मिति फलितम्। तथा च "तस्त्यारिशालाया मथ्ये परमाध्म व्यवहितं" इत्येवतः
पुरोवादपथस्य तस्य "दूहं विपयं परसेभ्वूतं" इत्यादिना पुरोवादकामतेदुपनाविभिष्यविभागने तस्यरूपु "देवधारणे भूयासि" इत्यत्र विश्वसूक्तानीकारे पुरोवादपाराार्थसिद्धिः स्पष्टाः। न हि पुरोवादभाषनमुनयः तद्व्रणं कित्विद्विद्वारुः प्रवृत्त वाक्यं तत्वामेवाय सूचय सर्वत्रं हमते। अतः एव "यदा तस्मतन दिवा न राज्यं सच्चासाच्छिं एव केवलः" इत्यत्र "तम: परे देव एको भक्ति," "दिवश्य देव एको नारायणः" इति तमःप्रकटवेये तमोविधातुवेण नारायणः प्रकृति शिवपद्वापि नारायण-परन्तपमिति पूर्णशस्यकृत् यज्ञा तम इति यज्ञवेङे तमःप्रककितवानकामनात्मपावाचारुः संस विद्वारुः प्रवृत्तिस्य तङ्गात्मिनारारीरितियांविभावकस्य शिवपद्वापि नारायणः पुरोवादपाराार्थार्थकारः न स्वादिति पुरोवादुत्तानात-नारायणः प्रस्वेच्य तङ्गात्मिना शिवपद्वापिति क्षिद्वालितम् कण्व्यांविनिधिः। न चाक्ष्य "तस्त्यारिशालाया मथ्ये " इति पुरोवादतोत्तर-स्तुपास्तल्ये प्रामेय परमाध्ममनूनायामत्त्वेयेणे मोक्षस्य फलं विद्विजत इति वाच्चयम्। तस्त्यापि ब्रह्मणसागरज्य सोलोकादासाप्राप्तिति पुरोवादः एव प्रामेयेव पद्मायताभावात्।

अर्थ भवन्मेतेपि देवधारणो भूयासामितिः स्युलांगकदिग्द्धारणविभागने पुरोवादविद्वृत्तार्थविभागाः स्यादिति चेन्नेधारम्। न हि "यच्छन्दसायमृषो विश्वसूक्तः" इत्यर्थः "तस्त्यः शिखायाय मथ्ये" इत्यमेव पुरोवादः।

1 A पुरोवादः एवान्त्यपालना। 2 B श्रीमितिचर्चाः।
(२८)

इति नियमः। परमुऽ "सर्वंतिं ध्यायति" इत्यमेव ऋषिवादः।

तत्त्वामेव स्थूलांगतिगवाराणमनूय प्रकृतिसतस्येत्यनेन तदवामोक्षार्यं फलं विधियते। अन्यथा वाक्यमेवें व्यर्थं स्थात। न वेदयातः। परंतु दिनविधायकवाचव्यायमपरिहारं "पंचावचा वपा कार्यं" इत्यन्त

लक्षणां स्वीकृतं वैध्यपरिहारं कः। इह तु लक्षणं विनेते वेदवारणोऽभ्यासार्यत्र बहुतिःधारणे मोक्षसार्यविधानेन सर्वामोक्षार्यं को भार इति। न च सर्वंतिंगवाचवाक्यान्यपथार्यादिसिद्धां। सामान्येन विशेषसत्रां

पविधायकस्त्रां ध्यायत्त्वाणिः।

नन्वेयमपि "ज्ञानं महेश्वरादिहेश्नमुक्तिमिहेश्चजनवादानात्" इति

सत्येन जनादेशस्य मुक्तव्यापार्थेन कर्थं हिंदोऽदेशकमुक्तिविधायामाशिचेता।

"ज्ञानं शिवं शांतिमंश्चतंतत्वेति" "ईशं ज्ञातवामूता सर्वंति" "श्रीव एको ध्येयशिवविक्षुः" "सर्वान्न्यपरिवर्तमायं" इत्यादिशृष्टिमितिरनमस्य-

चेष्टपक्षेन शिवस्य मुक्तगुणावलवाराणे। ज्ञातिममुशुरोपिरे विशेषाधिक

न्यायेन हृदेतुष्कुलवागः।

न च "स में इंद्रौ मेधया स्वरूणोत्" इति मेधाजनपितविधानेन

तत्प्रार्थीप्रियमादिन्तरुपासायं तदभिमानिरेव सार्थावि वाच्यम। "स नो

देवशुमया सम्भव्या संयुक्ताः।" इति शुरुया

"हिंदाख्याक्रमानि चतुर्मुनजेन्य न विवर्तते।

युगपदं ह्नस्तिदिस्तिद्वारतो मोक्षमवाणादात्॥ १ ॥ ॥

इति शक्तिसंहितावचनेन च मुक्तिनन्दनायास्य हिंदाख्यातिस्वाधीनवाच्यपृथ

वाराण्यपरिवर्त्यमानात्। अन्यथा "कर्मणि हि सांस्थिनिस्मायतिः जनकादाय।"

हिंदादिना तिथियात्रमुक्तस्थानमानाद्विनः मुक्तगुणायाकन्तं न स्थात। हिंदा-

धारावस्थायापदं द्वारानान्त्रक्ष्टीती।" अभित।

１ अं हरिरस्यात् २ अं हिंदग्यायत्वापि
(२९)
किशाम्ब्य शरीरस्तरीत्वतिंगविधायकले ""शरीरं भे विशिष्यं। जिव्वा
मे मधुमतम। कृपायां भूरि विरंचितम्।"" इति बहुःपदार्थेऽऽविशेषविधानाः सार्थकं मय।

रुद्रो भूला यज्ञबुद्वं नानाव रुद्रमन्येतू। प्राणहिंगाशुमन्येष स रुद्रो नात्र संसायः। ॥ ॥

इति शंकरसंहिताचनेन तिंगसम्ब्धार्थेन शिवामे। हस्तिपुलियाम्बनो शरीरस्तरीत्वम्
चक्रितसिद्धा। इति शंकरस्तरीत्वतिंगमुन्यसीत्वम्। जलतलावामानिनो जिन्द्रायि
वर्तिनेन मधुमत्वारः। भावालिगक्रितकपसादुलिगस्याकाशत्वामानिनः।
श्रूतानुत्तरनेन भूरिवचनसिद्धं। यथोक्त विशेषत इति बहुलिगमर्य निरुपं
पदार्थमन्येतू च पारिच्छेदालिगमाधरणंसम्पन्नित्विति तदपोरस्त्रीमय।
भकानुठारः परिच्छेदलिगसदर्शपारिवीवार्तवर्तिरि मृुःतिपु ""प्रावदाहः
प्रत्यायेकहः" ह्यादिना सांविल्योपेदेशो शिवपीत विशिष्यस्तवासायात्।
"लिंगं तदवसांसिद्धेतम्" इत्यप्रवधः रुद्रस्तरीत्वितिनिरुपमन्येत
प्रयोक्तवेत् अनुपत्त्वमानवति।

अन्यः ""श्रुति भे गोपायं" इत्यत्र गोपायेत्यन्यन्यापत्या
"वेदयारणो भूवास्यु।" इत्यत्र देवतिपदच्यायः तस्य च गोपायेत्यत्रान्यः।
तथा चातुर्ज्जाराणो भूवास्मिति भावचना न लिङ्गाधाराशिद्धिरिति पूर्ववर्तमान
अवस्मिन देवदार्शीय साविकिरुत्वप्रार्थान्यं परित्यज्य अपरिविन्यातकरणः
गौत्तेन गोपायेत्यत्रान्यासम्भवः।"" वर्तमः कोरोसः।" इति सत्विद्रुत्यस्वः
देवदार्शीयैव विमाक्तिविपरिवर्त्तमानीवै। अन्यथा धारणपदस्य संपुष्यधार्य
कावः तामुत्तप्तवाच्चमोक्षस्तरीत्वासम्बाधि समाधानमन्याहः। अस्यः
शुन्तेऽकारः।

यूः स्थाप्यध्वरमिमां मां भक्तिसिद्धान्तकम्। ॥ ॥
(३०)
मेघलाःत्मशिवालिंगधारण संगविजिततनुः कुरुतेयः।
अंगीजेवदपर्यं भविष्यदुः संगमंगतलं प्रतरेत्।॥ २ ॥
शिवभक्तवान्दाचारानिरतामुनीलिंगकारः
विश्वाराधय सदा भस्मरुद्रासधारिः।॥ २ ॥
हत्यादिन शंकरसंहितारचनानि पूर्वकान्यपि कानिचिकुप्रेरणच्छायाप्रचान्य
नुसंधेयानि इति।

५ श्रीरुद्गमतमन्त्रेण तप्यतिपादनम्।

चियासु उत्तितहत्कुश्रुद्धकादशिनी धतिः।
तच पथ्याक्षरी तत्स्यां विषव हत्यक्षरद्रुः।॥ १ ॥

इति सकलबद्विरिक्षणो शुद्रकादशिन्यव "या तेष रुद्र शिवां तनूर्धरापाप-
काविषनी " इति अतिरिपि। संदुः रोदं संसारुः क्षजनितं द्रावयतीति रुद्रः।
हे रुद्र अयोरा शालंकारा शिवा सर्वभुग्नित्रा या ते तत्। लिङ्गरूपारावर-
चित्रार्चितशिवश्राहं तस्मस्मन्न:ः भक्तमाते धार्यं इति पर्यावसितार्थः। तत्र
जागरूकतेन्तुनुसंधेयं। उपासिताय च सिद्धान्तिरिक्षणोः।

अयोरापापकाशीति या ते रुद्र शिवा तनुः।
ञ्जुषा गीयते चस्मात् तस्माच्छैवोच्चवचितः।॥ १ ॥

यो लिङ्गः विनिमयारामः
निर्वय शिवाराधनक्षुभिः। इति। श्रीः।

१ A अंग अविद्धः २ A कथा मन्त्र ३ A adds after तद्र लिङ्गग्राहीरं
चा अपापकाशी अपापेशु पापविन्सु काशीत इत्यापपकाशीना।
(३१)

6 ऋग्वेदगतमन्त्रेण तस्येव बाह्यलिंगधारणाय प्रतियादनम्

शिवायनमः।

दृष्टिपत्ता दर्जुःवि विधितो लिंगधारणमः।

ऋग्वेदेष्यति तत्तथा कुर्या नलवा बीरेश्वरं मुद्रा॥ १ ॥

पावित्रं ते विततं व्रज्यशप्ते। प्रसुगार्जाणि पर्येषि विश्यतः।
अतिसतनुने तदामोऽशुते। शूरास इड़लेस्तमःसमाते॥ इति।

अश्रुवशायते निगमुच्छते। लीनमथः मयतीति व्यसत्या तदधिककरणत्वातेदेशः। “तांत्रिकं ब्रह्म शाश्वतं” “हिंगं ब्रह्म सनातनं” इति।
शंकराचार्यकुण्डाराकृत्वतेवपि प्रयोगार्जिनाय तत्त्व पारिप्रेषितात तत्त्वर्यक्कसनु तत्र स्थितं इत्यथा। तदविदुःशास्त्रः। परित्रपदभावितपदर्गुणार्थात् कोशार्याभावे कुदृष्ट्वोगमाभावात् विरोषणविशेषभावाभास्मशाभेन विरोषणदृष्टान्तव्याप्तिः।

तथा च हे व्रज्यशप्ते लिङ्गस्पर्शरीराराक्ष्देवन शरीरभावेनाधिकतिपरमशिवं ते तुः ततो ब्रह्मादेवलिङ्गमर्न शरीरं पावित्रं उक्तितः शुच्यशुचिकालेपं च यथा योगं विततं इडार्जिनेति वा बहुविंधघ। प्रमुः निम्नहानुपमाङ्गेन र्क्षतैः विस्ततस्मस्तानी। ( सार्वभविक्षतसिद्ध ) गार्जाणि भक्तश्रीराणि पर्येषि व्याश्रोक्याध्यायमस्तु लिङ्गस्पर्शरीरश्च भक्तश्रीरार्जिनेति इत्यक्ष्य।

ननु “ व्रज्यशप्ते ” इत्यत्र ब्रह्मपदेन स्थावरलिङ्गमुच्छते। तत्तथा हे व्रज्यशप्ते शरीरभावेन स्थावरलिङ्गधारितिः परमार्जः ते ब्रह्मपदवाच्च लिंगः।

1 अन्वर्यामात्रः 2 भक्तश्रीरार्जिनेति added
पात्रत्र अध्वरोधानाविनों संस्करण विनों परिशुद्ध विनों व्यक्तिशुद्धता-
दीन नानाविद्वस्थते: किन्तु स्थादितिते चेनवें। स्थाधिलगस्त शरीर-
धारणासन्बन्धन भागुकाधिकार गाणाणि प्रवेण्य विद्वत्ता इथ्य्यानन्धापते:।
न व तस्यान्वपरिधिशुद्धकरण भक्तारिष्टन्व्योक्तस्तिती वाचयु। तत्थि
अपरिशुद्धत्वेन ब्रह्मविद्वस्त्वातिहस्य वक्तव्यत्वेन वक्तव्यत्वेन भक्तगा-
त्र्यात्मस्वायत्त्वेन प्रयोजनाभावात।

ननु पवित्रमित्येन्मन्त्रस्य सोमदशापवित्रानुमन्त्वे विनियुक्तते
कथे लिंगधारणपरलं। यथेत्र विनियुक्त तस्य तस्यप्रलेब। सन्न्यावन्दनका-
हीनतचद्वेंतोपल्लनित्येनेनि भक्तग्राम्यमश्चिद्मन्त्वायथा तथावकविद्वदितः।
कित्व सोमप्रकरणमपूर्वस्य मन्त्रस्य लिंगधारणपरले गकरणनिरोप्तेश्वरतित
चेतु।

तद्यथासर्वः विनियोगमहास्य पूर्वांवहात्योगवाणधितकंहलिङ्ग-
परत्वमक्तक्षक्षायोगात। अति चान्यपराणाविवि मन्त्राणां अन्यत्र विनियोगः।
"अभिन्नार्थान दिव: कुक्तः" इथयाधिपत्राणां वाचकशुद्धतिवाताकाराधि परा-
णामेव महयो भौजाकविद्वायां विनियोगस्वरीनात। "येजयुश्वुक्तने धनेन
शिष्यज्ञविमूः" हिते देवतान्तस्याधि पुरुषसुक्तस्य धनदयजते विनियो-
ग्नार्थात्माः।

यथेत्र विनियुक्तप्रमिति नियमस्तु प्रक्ततार्थवाचपक्षविनिवीतमन्त्रविनियो-
गस्य एव। न द्रत पवित्रशास्त्र विनोगविधार्थकते किविधिनामकस्व।
तथापितायकश्रुतंसृतिविनियोगस्य त्रुट्कर्ताकारणोऽयुक्ति कथामिन्ति चेतु। "कदा-
चनस्तर्रसिमेन्द्र सार्थस्य सुनुषः" इतिन्त्रस्यात्मकारण मन्त्राधिन्यमः गाईद्यट-
मुपात्तत्त्व इति गाईद्योपस्यांविनियोगस्य मन्त्राधिन्यमाधिन्यमादिपन्द्वपरलं
न हीते। प्रक्तप्रकारणं तु लक्षणादिना भवतीत्वात्मविकरणन्यायेनावां-
तमिन्ति।

ङ्ख अव्याप्ताः
(३३)

युक्त प्रकरणविरोध इति तदृशम न। "सोमः पवते जनिता
मातिः जनिता विनो जनिता पृथिव्या: जनिता सूर्यस्य जनितेन्द्रस्य जनि-
तेत विनोः।" इत्यत्र जडीमूलसोमलतः: नारायणदर्जनकल्वासम्भावे-
नोमया सहितसोम इति सोमप्रक्षेपमाहिन्ना शिवस्यापि प्रसज्जवेन तमाद्वृय
tसिद्धिरिति सिद्धान्तिवेदेन दिंगाधारणप्रकरणस्यापि सोमप्रकरणेऽविरोहा-
भावात्। किंव "अं तोम: कपार्धीम।" इति श्रुत्या सोमयागरस्योत्ति-
बिशिष्टिशिवसम्बन्धोपनेन "रुद्ध आहूतः।" इति श्रुत्या सोमप्रकरणेऽ
रुद्धप्रक्षेपेण सोमयागस्यरुद्धादिल्योपनेन—

"अहें हि सर्वहविःन्यो मोका चैव फलः!।
सर्ववेवज्ञान्यायाय सर्वसंस्कृतम्।।" ॥ ३ ॥

इति कृमीपुराणे शिववचनेन च शिवस्य सर्वहविमोक्तकरंसाधस्वप-
तिपादैनेन सोमयागस्य रुद्धेवतात्विनायायतर्कणपत्तिस्यायतयस्त्र मन्नस्य
दिंगाधारणपरस्य प्रकरणविरोहमावाच।

नन्वातां तावुंकरिद्या प्रकरणाचारविरोधः। तथापि "पवित्रतते।"
इत्यतनमने लिङ्गाद्वाचनेन न विद्वत्सम्भवः। न वा विप्रमोजकरुपमतिः
प्रत्यन्त्यतितिलिङ्गाधारणस्य तत्वाविविध्यस्य च। "सवैलिग्न वधायते।"
इति विधिमालवेत्तामिष्यासिद्धान्तविदिः चेष्मर्यमू। "तस्माताविविं तत्त्वं
भार्थ शैवनमायमस।।" इति वस्यामाण्यमुंहानुरोचने। "प्रशुमीन्ताणि पर्यायि
विश्वत्।" इति मन्नलिग्नेन च तत्त्वं भार्थात्मिति कल्पिततु श्रोतेनावाच।

यक्ष्यन्यासाधुस्वेति विधिमोजकरुपम नास्तीति भार्थरमांथेनोक्ते
तदस्युर्वः। शालामेऽत| न हि शाखान्तरविविधास्यशाखान्तरेन्द्रन्यात-
सिद्धिस्म्भवः। तथा सति युवाशालाविविधास्यभेदः केशावितकेशवेवेक-
विहितवेन तप्तिभायाकाव्याः प्रसन्नकतत्वापूष्करित्यन्त्र प्रस्तानुभुम्सकतयाः।

४: प्रकरणवेन
(१४)

एवं "पवित्रे ते" इत्यार्थः "परेषीविवश्वतः" इत्यन्तेऽलिङ्गाधारणं
मद्यस्बाचर्विन्दुक्रिया सख्षुद्विचित्रविहितैःयथःयथायहितःफलात्वाधारणं
कम्बक्तेत्वार्यि क्षेरानिञ्जडानामापिराशिकोपात्वार्यि भगवतीः श्रुतेरः-
मुक्ता उपायान्तरयथाचेदसुखाय व्यतिरेकमुखः लिङ्गाधारणस्य
प्रयोजकश्रमाभिवृत्ति।

"अतरतनुर्न तदामोऽशुते" इति। तत्त्वा वेधान्तलक्ष्यात्मकोऽवेलः
निर्देशार्थायुजः तनुर्यस्य साः न भवतीतपततनुः विषाण्यायर्हितः। आः
अपरिक्रांतःर्णः सनू तस्तरिषिवस्त्रूः नाशृतः। एवं च "हिंगाझः वशीः
वसस पुनर्जन्यः न वियतः" इति शंकरसंहितावचनाधरोऽधिने वीक्षायमेव
मुक्तावसाधारणकारणायि फलितार्यः।

७ रामानुजायकृतमन्त्रायःस्वप्नः

रामानुजमन्त्रायाहिताय सु "पवित्रं चरणं चक्रं" इति कौशासनसिद्धवा
पविचारस्य चक्रार्थकम्। बहुअण्डत इत्यज बहायर्दं चतुर्मुखवहारायायिः
ततः पादः "नारायणदूरं बहाजायत्" इति श्रुत्या जनकर्षेनाधिवेशः। तथा
घे बहारायस्य चतुर्मुखाच्छायादृश्यः ते पविचारं चक्रं वितमतः व्यां। नाम्
विष्णुभूतनियमदकारस्य गाञ्जारणि भक्तालि पविचारप्रामोऽत्यः। अत
पूवच "अतसतनुर्न तदामोऽशुते" हिंगाझन्वर्थकः। ततः वाक्संस्तमस्य चक्रायः
पूर्वः वपराधिवृवीक्षार्यांशस्य तनुर्यस्य तादृशः न भवतीतयत्पततः
वैभूति चक्रार्थर्हितः तद नारायणात्मकर्षेनक्रस्तृः आः। अपरिक्रांतःकरणो
नाशृते न प्रामोऽत्यः। इति व्याचः। तदुपनदवः। यथपि "पविचारं
चरणं चक्रार्थि " धूतिभिन्नकल्पितस्य कोशाय एव विवादः। तथापि
तुष्टतु दुःखिने इति व्यान्त्रायुत्तय निराकरिते। मनः स्वकारार्थाविचारका-
भावाः। न च "गाञ्जारणि पविचारविवश्वत्" इत्यतदेवियकः। तस्य
विष्णोऽर्थे भक्तासंबंधविचारकल्याः।
ননু "প্রত্যেক " ইতি বিগুনঃসাংবাধিকামিভায় " ভাষ্যঃকি প্রত্যেক বিশ্বত: " ইত্যন্ত ধারাঃবিধানানারায়ণস্য ধারাঃপ্রবন্ধুপ্ত চক্রঃপুঞ্জ সিদ্ধিরিতি চন্দ্রেভায় । বিকল্পানালঙ্কার তথাহি চক্রঃচক্রেচক্রঃ নালেন ধ্যানাঙ্কৃত্ত তাংস্রবৃত্তনানাহিনিবার্তায়ানায় । নায়:।

" কৌমুদিকঃ গুদাখাদ্য নিবেকঃ কৌমুদি মণি: " ইতি কৌমুদিকামিত-তাস্তান্তনাংনাবা: 

সাবান তাবী তদস্তস্তস্যায় চক্রনারায়ণস্য অস্তশ্চমিষার্থার্থার্থার্থার্থার্থা তদাপলিতায়ানায় ।

নোত্ত: পার্থ : চরিত্রবান স্বর্ণলিখিতে শাস্ত্রাকর্ত্তাবচ্ছিল্লপ্রতিশ্রুতঃ- 

মায়েক্ষিংহৃতব্যাপ্তিতত্ত্বত্ত্বমাত্রাঙ্কারায়াঃ নারায়ণস্য সূচননবেদনাদি করণাপত:।

" শ্যুকরপত্তনতনুভ তথাকালীনাঃ " ইত্যন্ত তাস্তদরিতি তথ্য নির্ভুলমীরাদায় বর্ষাকারামেচ্ছানুভূতনোনীতিঃ।

বাংলাদেশ তদৃশোনা সর্বদেশসমাধিত।

সা চতু সন্তাপিত। রাজঃকি চক্রমায়স্য পালকমূ। ॥ ১ ॥

গভীরকালার্তো বাধ্যে বজ্রমূলগর্ততো বাধ্য চক্রকালিতনু হস্তরুপপুপ্পতে সুর্য জয়েচ্ছ। ॥ ২ ॥

জয়েচ্ছ পীঠমূ সুকুমারনাথা রীফে ব্রোজেত ।

মন্ত্রণে চ্যাননে বিগৃহং চক্রকালিততো ধ্বং ।
वेदांतविज्ञानवादी सोपानि वृहत्याससमं कुलम् ॥ २ ॥
तत्त्वादि धर्मशास्त्रवस्ते समुदायारण्यं निविष्ट्वते कतर्लीकुश व्याख्याना-सम्बन्धं कृत्तीतेव व्याख्येयतवात्। किशास्य मंत्रवः सोमपरविकृतत्वयं चक्रवारणपरवस्य प्रकरणाविरोधः।

न चालिसः न तद्वाति। पूर्वमेव निरसितत्रात्।

येथेवमण्डलसन्तरित्व्यूः हृदानागत्वा चक्रसंतोषश्रीसर्वकल्पवानस्य-करोणि तदा “अकरो विषुवाचकः” इति समरणेन आय विषयं विषय-थिर्मित्वत् यावत्। तता नृप्त्वत्र सोजत्तयतनुः। एवेत्मृतं आः: अपारिक्रमः-करणसनूः तथु बहसस्वरूपः नाश्रुते। परंतु शृङ्खाय इति धारायोः। शृङ्खलः। तता संतं: इचापार्जनं किंवं वहंतं: तत्क्रियमेव समाशते प्राणुनित्वतित्वारथः। स्यात्। प्राणुकानिषेवानुरोधः।

अवेकमणि परिसपदस्य कोशासिद्या चक्रार्थत्वमावश्यकोऽत्पविवा। न पावियादिबोबः। सति बाधके कोशास्य शाक्याष्मालवान्यानिकारत। अत एव नीहो घर। शुकः: पत इत्यादि। “शुङ्ख्यु शुष्कावः: पुंसो मुनितिमासं तद्वस्ति।” इति क्षेत्रो नीठादिक्षितः हृदवाचकवेदिप्य समानविभावनिकपद-स्थले: भेदसम्भोवाहसम्भवेन उपविवतं दातर्याकाराको गौरवेण च निरूद्धक्षणैवांगिकृतः।

रूदेयःपापाहारक्षाविविजिनेऽन्द्र। रूदेयःपापाहारक्षात्मर्मः स्यञ्चत्थर्थावकाशस्त्रं एव। अन्यथा पंक्रमानयेत्तरदी परस्परेऽपि योक्ष्येनः न स्यात्। पक्तरे तूक्ष्यदिशा चक्रार्थकतवं वाहितमेति। एतेन “ततं च च”

परिस्थल्यः प्रवृत्ति।
(१७)

दिमुळे धार्मिक " इति विषय एव चक्षुसरणसिद्धिश्रुतिः प्रस्तुततमः।

पद्यान्तरसांकसांक सूचनाहैतकानां पादसार्थार्थात् ततथा श्रुतिकर एव विवाहतः।

यदि च विष्णुकिर्णीशालाकापारीकम्भुपृष्ठ-तथावतं अंगरक्षोभि

तयापि न तेन तास्तादः। यागुकसिद्धसंहिततवात्। निबेदशाखानु-

रोधासा।

" सत्तौ वाक्यमिति " न्यायेन भुजदनोदेशोऽन्न चक्षुवारणहृदविधाने

शंखावरणसिद्ध्या,

दक्षिणे तु भुजे विशेष-सिद्धान्तादेशासुलिनम्।

सत्तौ तु शंखे विद्यादिति वाक्यविदो विदुः। ॥ २ ॥

इति वचनविरोध आचारविरोधेष्यतिमसाविरोधेन।

गुरुजरणास्तु वहळसाते इत्यनेन "विश्वाशिको लड़ो महर्षि: हिरण्यगर्भ

जनयामास पूर्व् ।" "को प्राणां लिङ्गायति पूर्व् ।" हि यदि श्रुतिमहीनि

च-परमेश्वरहिततत्वेन परिस्ग्रहणेऽस्मि परमेश्वरकारणाश्रेीतः।

पवित्रपदम् लिङ्गार्थं

"सर्ववेदं स्थायायति पाणिम्बं पाँविन् ।" इत्यः लिङ्गादसामायानिकधरणात्।

लिङ्गादसामायानिकधरणाविविधश्रूतं कथं लिङ्गाकल्पनिति चेन्। "ब्रजं

यथा मर्कटशक्तिकर्षिगम्।" इति रामायणः सोक्ष्यायाने। "ब्रजं वा

आज्ञयम्।" इति श्रुतिमहवारङ्गादसामायानिकधरणेष्य वचनसाध्यं श्रुतार्जु

पर्यूक्तं महेश्वरीश्रीमांभिसंवयिकतः। न च प्रकृते पवित्रपदम्

मंज्ञादसामायानिकधरणेष्य न लिङ्गादसामायानिकधरणायति वाच्यम्।

मननात्त्वायत इति न्यूनत्या मंज्ञादसाध्यान्ति लिङ्गाकल्पनात्।

भाषेन चक्षुसरणामात्

॥ १ ॥


(२८)

वाच्यावाच्यकल्पे द्विया मेंतः प्रकृतिः।
वाचको वर्णस्यः स्यादाच्यायः परमशिवः॥ १ ॥

इति निरुक्षेत। तथा च हे बहुणस्ये परमशिवे ते तव पवित्रे लिंग वितते
इत्यतिवेदनानेकविविधीवार्तस्ते प्रमु: अस्तम्भजागृहानियायकर्माः गात्राणि
भक्तिरारणि विष्वत: समन्तानु पवित्रे

सर्वभीष्मु च सर्वेऽर्थ सर्वदा सवतो मुखम्।
लिंगं गुरुपदेशेन सुपतिधितमापने॥ १ ॥

ह्यारस्यः

एकमेव परं लिंगं अनेकसिनु सुपतिधितमु॥
सर्वत्रोपर्यावराति नामचात्रक्रियात्मना॥ १ ॥
हरतिंगे तु बाह्यमे प्राणालिंगे तथान्तरे
भाविंगे तथावतिः आभागे सुपतिधितमु॥ २ ॥
हरणागे महाभिंगे शृंगारे तु प्रसादकम्
रघंगे चरलिंगे च जगंगे रिचलिंगकम्॥ ३ ॥
निम्निंगे गुरुलिंगे स्यातासिंकं तथेवच।
आचारलिंगमात्रां सुपतिधितमेव हि॥ ४ ॥
यथा ज्ञानेद्रियागिनु क्रमालिंगं प्रतिधितमु।
तथा कर्मेद्रियागिनु क्रमालिंगं प्रतिधितमु॥ ५ ॥ इति

वातुलागमोतरभागेनुस्माचः स्त्रियाः च समस्तम कौण्डानथविद्याध्यानाः
पद्यार्थाच स्वते व्यायमोत्यर्थः इति प्राहुः।

अन्ये तु पवित्रे ते विततमित्यव वितस्तकमाः इति वातुलागमोतर शरीरार्थः। बहुप्रकं लिंगार्थकमु। तथा
(३९)

ये ब्रह्मणपते लिंगाधिवानक पर्मशिव, ते विततं लिंगस्परशीरीं पवित्र
शुचिश्रुविकालेः पि धारणयोगं प्रमुः तात्त्वशाशीरको भुक्तिसुकिफलमः राता
भक्तशाशीराणि पवित्रे व्याप्ते लिंगशाशीराकृतिविशासिंशिवो भक्तग्रामेशु धार्ये
हत्यारायं इत्याह! ।

गुरुमते विनान्विशेषः। “उद्देश्यवचनं पूर्व विशेषयत्र ततंः परम्”
इति मिथ्यकारिकानुरोपेन पवित्रं ते वितताभिमयं पवित्रपद्यं लिंगाधिकके
वितताद्वाच्यविशेषतत्त्त्वसं मेवेतेनैः देशविशेषवाचकशः योः पार्वत्यं
सिद्धति। वितताद्वाच्यश्च लिंगाधिकके पाकविकष्ठं विधेयत्तले तु वैपरीत्यपालित।
उकारीनुरोपेनावश्च मंगस्त्रेषुपूनः हृदण्डमणि असि। लिंगपुराणे।

कीटो अभयशीरो भवति ध्रुवम्।
मानवाशिवशीरो भवति निष्क्रियं।। १ ॥
ब्रह्मविनयवेदं देवा मनयो मौत्तमाद्यं।।
धार्यणिः सदा लिंगं उत्तमः विशेषतः।। २ ॥

इण्युपक्रमः।

कहेति लिंगमाध्यातं ब्रह्मस्पर्शरीरं।
पवित्रं ताद्वः विष्यातं तस्मात्पक्वाचुंशश्चिः।। १ ॥
अध्यैतः पवित्रं ते विततं ब्रह्मणपते।
तस्मात्वाद्वितं तानांध्या रैवथत्तमामयम्।। २ ॥
अल्पततनुरुषं च आमस्तस्कारवर्जितः।
दैवत्त्वाहर्विन्द्रसाक्षात्युग्ये लिंगमुक्तम्।। ३ ॥
यः करोति ततः पूर्वं स दप्ततनुरुप्ये।
परिको विमोक्षाय सोप्रदुः लिंगाधारणम्।। ४ ॥
ह (५०)

न करोति तपः पूवं सोऽक्षतपतनुरुच्यते ।
अष्टकोशं विमोक्षाय नाशते लिङ्गाधारणस्य ॥ ५ ॥

इति। अत्र ब्रह्मलोकेऽपि लिङ्गाधारणात्मिति तदद्वाद्यात्मिति धार्य शेषमिति चोकारे योन्वेश्वरमिति सप्तमृ। किब्रह।

इति सम्बोधितः शिष्यो गुणुणा शाख्बवेदिना ।
धार्येन्द्रियां लिङ्गं शरीरं प्राणयोगं ॥ ६ ॥
लिङ्गस्वरूपं धारणं पुण्यं सर्वप्रपन्निणाशनम् ॥
आद्ये मूणिमिथ्वः रागमाधिबिप्ज्ञानवः ॥ ७ ॥

इति लिङ्गमिदेः साक्षादनिधिपिरारकम् ।
धार्येद्वाराभानेन शरीरं सर्वं अः ॥ ८ ॥
धार्येद्वाराभानेन लिङ्गं तदुपुरुणात्मिन ।
प्रमादाल्पतिते लिङ्गे प्राणात्मिपि परिस्थितेऽः ॥ ९ ॥

इस्यदिर्श्वकसहितगतिसुद्धन्तिराज्ञिद्रविद्वयचनायुक्तायोणात्मेश्वरकाथायणमुनसंह्य्राय

नीति।

८ ऋग्वेदान्तर्गतसिद्धान्तान्तर्गततात्प्रियानिदनम्।

ऋग्वेदेपि न केवलं "पवित्रं ते' इति मन्त्रेश्वर तत्सहिद्: ।
किन्तु "अर्थं में हस्तः" इति मन्त्रान्तरं परापिपतदेव सिद्धिः।

अर्थं में हस्तो भगवान्यं में भगवत्तरः ।
अर्थं में विष्णुमेष्टोध्यं शिवामिनिर्वेश्न: ॥ १ ॥
अर्थं माता अर्थं पिता अर्थं जीतुररागमन: ।
इदं तत् प्रसर्ष्यं सुध्वन्धेश्य निरीक्षिः ॥ २ ॥
(४१)

इति। अत्र भगवंदवन्तेन परमशिव एवोश्यते। "अथैनं भगवन्ते रुद्रे कुमारः प्रच्छ।" अथ कालाशिरः भगवन्ते सन्तकुमारः प्रच्छ।" हि श्रूतिः हि संस्तुयमानस्तु भगवानुभवाय। हि हरिवंशाविष्ठु च शिवे तत्क्रियागातु। एवं चार्य भगवानु पिणालवाणिवः मे हस्तः हस्तगतः मे मसाक्ष्रेणी अर्वं शिवः भगवधरः हस्तरः।

ननु हस्तगतो भगवानिति वकन्ये हस्त इन्द्रिकः कथामिति चेत।

अद्विन्ये भगवान्सूपे नीलीवाचवीलोचनः।
अपीयते सहस्राणुः सामग्राम्योहोतुभिः।

हि श्रूतिपुराणवचनेन,

"य एषोन्तरापि हियययमः पु烃ो दश्यते।" हि हरिमन्यमः
"अमर्कपात्र उमात्रे पञ्चपत्रे नमोऽमः।" इत्यते तैरिरेषिवचनेन।

सौरमण्डलमाध्यस्य साम्यं संसारकेवज्ञमः।
मण्डलान्तरगतं हिरण्यं आज्ञामनवपुप्पम शुचिसिद्धमः। ॥ १ ॥

हि श्रूतिजनेन्त्रादित्यगतवेत् प्रतिपादिते परमशिवे शिवादित्ययः। अविभाज्यसम्बन्धोतनायकित्यगतकिलोतवेत् हि ज्ञुका। आदित्यनिर्लोतवेत् हि ज्ञुकीविद्यमें हस्तो भगवानु हियनापी हस्ताशिवलिंगयोगपी अविभाज्यसम्बन्धसूचिनाय हस्तगत हियनुक्तवा हस्तो भगवानु हियनकिति वच्चै शक्यतवात्। एवं चोमयोरविभाज्यसम्बन्धयोपपत्याः—

संस्कृत्य गुरुणा दृष्टं पद्मचन्द्रापुर्वकस्म।
वामहस्तगतं लिंगं सावधानेन पूज्यभुतः। ॥ १ ॥
धार्येकस्तु हस्ताधी लिंगाकारं शिवं सदा।
तदव हस्तिष्ठतं निश्च लस्तवं सम्पदाः पद्मः। ॥ २ ॥
(४२)

इति वातुल्मकरमाययुण्वदायिनि। धाताद्वितीयेन लभ्यते इति। शिलानिष्कृतो वचनावलोकिताय।

धार्मिकविधानेन तदु गुप्तार्थिनम्।

प्रमादायतिते तद्भन्न प्राणानि परिव्रजेत्। १।

पल्लेद प्राणाद्वितिः परवाङ्गाय प्राणान्यथे नराधमः।

स च चन्डाल इति द्वेषः शिवस्नेही न संशयः। २।

हस्तसिंहसानेन तद्भन्न भयंकरे धार्मिकविधानेन।

प्रमादायतिते तद्भन्न सह प्राणानु परिव्रजेत्। ३।

शिलानिष्कृतारपिनिन्द्रक न हृदिः भ्रमरेत्।

भूमि प्रतिपितां तिरं धुनिर्भूतायत् यथा।

केवल प्रतिपितां तिरं धुनि न विभ्रम्यते। ४।

इर्यादिण्डासेविभागे देवोदिपाधिक्षिपकुलसहिताविद्वाचाणार्थमिनि संगतानि।

तद्वजनानमिनि शरीरबिम्भक्षिक्षिपकुलसहिताविद्वाचाणार्थमिनि वाहनमिनिगतिमेव वा। असन्यथे तु भजयानन्दायायित्वानित्यमानसरसस्य तालाबं इति द्वृत्तसरसस्य अत एक्षारभिमानिनिनि।

"तेन त्यक्ते न मुखीथा: मा गृहं: कर्षयस्विद्वन्।" इति।

तेन कारणेन त्यक्ते प्रमादाविना शिलानिष्कृते सति पुनरसस्ये च सति न मु-जीथा: परत्वनानाविना शारिरस्य विवृक्तते। कर्षयस्विद्वन् अन्यायीयं चन्द्र लिंगं मा गृहं: न स्वीकृतिः। "धनं वेदिनामी" ति कौशलकर्ष्यतावित्रितिः

ननु "नारायणोपि भगवान् देवकीनन्ये हि।" "ततसस भगवान् जस्ते वहा लोकपितामहः।" (सन्तकुमरो भगवानि) त्यादिस्य देवर्ष-साधारणेय प्रयुक्तायाय प्रभुस्वामस्य प्रभुस्वामस्य कथा शिलानिष्कृतमिनि चेता।

१ व प्रकरणं, २ अर्थार्थ्यरीतिः प्रीतिः।
हस्तानावयति सुब्रेणावयति स्वधितिनावयतीनित्यः अवचाननावयताकारणस्वायत्नीत्यः हस्ताहत्रिभिमण्डलाचितः येन तत्तज्ज्वालानिर्देशस्त्रूः गुण।

किंचि शिवाभिषेकः इति वाक्यशेषः हायम शिव इत्यमभिमुखः परामर्शतः इति। शिवाभिषेकः शिवाश्रयाभिषेकः इति याविक्षिप्तार्थः हस्तानावयति स्वधितिनावयति स्वायत्नीत्यः हस्तालिंगार्थः भगवत्च्छदुस्स्य शिवालिंगपर्यावर्त्यावर्त्यावर्त्यावर्तावः।

एवं हस्ताती हिमगार्थः विधाय तस्य लिंगस्य सृष्टि च कृत्तवेच्छ्वार्थः वादः किम्। तत्रायं माता अर्थः पितृति सृष्टकृत्तवेच्छः। अर्थः विभेदः

नन्दवर्ष्यायाम् इत्यहिमग्राम्यायाम् प्रागुक्तकः परामृष्ट्यः। शिवमित्रुदति चन्द्रनेत्रपान्यादि निम्मवातिति शिवाभिषेकः।

तथा च वर्धार्थः बाणमकतलिंगार्थः वाक्यायाम् चन्द्रनेत्रपान्यानिलिङ्गमित्रुदति रुपानि यस्तः स्वभावाण्यादि भगवत्मातृवान्तविनिलिङ्गमित्रुदति नार्थः किम्। नाथः मन्नो हस्ताती हिमगार्थः विधाय इति इति इति चन्द्रम्।

हस्ताय्यात्तत् नैव तत्र भगवत्मातृवान्तविनिलिङ्गमित्रुदति सुंभवायान्तविनिलिङ्गमित्रुदति सुस्वर्णमित्रुदति सुस्वर्णमित्रुदति सुस्वर्णमित्रुदति सुस्वर्णमित्रुदति सुस्वर्णमित्रुदति सुस्वर्णमित्रुदति सुस्वर्णमित्रुदति जन्मकालः।

अन्व एव "सोपः फलेय जनिता मतीनाः" हद्यादि सोमलत्या मंत्रोक्तगुणसम्बन्धायायाम् समवेतासम्बन्धायान्तर्गत्युम्यायाया सहितस्याम् इति श्रेष्ठमहिन्ना परमाशिवाभिषेकः।

१ B Adda अर्थः बीघान्त्रीकार्याध्यायिकः स्थायित्वदिवसः। २ समवेतान।
किंव निखिलभवनन्दननाथद्वारा शिक्षा दानकर्मिनं संस्थापित हस्तस्थायीमानानं विभागितम्।


नाथमनोजने कविन्द्रमयी-विभागितम्। नाथमनोजने कविन्द्रमयी-विभागितम्।


नाथमनोजने कविन्द्रमayी-विभागितम्। नाथमनोजने कविन्द्रमayी-विभागितम्।


नाथमनोजने कविन्द्रमayी-विभागितम्। नाथमनोजने कविन्द्रमayी-विभागितम्。
वेशकालोभ्याधिकरे हस्ताक्षराधीकरणं तथा विधाशीर्षासम्बन्धेन हिंग- धारणसिद्धः। येन कारणेन शिवामिर्मलः अत एव जीवात्सर्वीवनौधमः ।

मे हस्तः सुचनां परम्परी तवें तत्त्वां अनुसरणमगम्याः । तेन मे हस्तं

प्रहपिताः सर्वदा तिष्ठ । तथा च वाक्षरहस्तस्य शिवामिर्मलवें नेत्रह-
स्तस्य तद्विकारणेत्र च सर्वकालिकशिवसर्वविशिष्टः करोदमयोहिते इति
भगवंभवमृतविश्वास्वादिना स्तुतिरपपयते । सर्वदा शरीरस्य शिवालिगसम्बन्धे

शिवसंहुल्लां च कैषभुनितानायासिद्धम् । "प्राणधिमांसम्बन्धी स युगोऽ

नात्र सर्वश्। इत्युक्ते। अहो हिंगाभाषामाहात्म्यं हस्तदृष्टरथ्यातः वित्-
करण्तविनियुक्तेऽपि सर्वशास्त्रवाचारादीधिनिय्यापनेन च सर्वप्रवो शरीरं

शिवायश्चिति सरास्माः । अस्या अन्तेनां करते--

याबनीविविदं दूरं इमां समान्यमः ।

करांजःपीवे विद्वान्य तद्विद्यानासंक्षमानः ॥ १ ॥

हस्तालिगसंहुल्लां च सादृश्यात्मकः मुनि: ।

सर्वोपनिषद्विधेशभवानवराण: ॥ २ ॥

पर्यं पर्ष्ठालिग्यं शिवालिगसाय: हेतु सवः ।

यस्येवेत् करार्यपीवनहितार्किकः ॥

स भ्रामी स पुरातनस्य स महान महेंश्वरेषुतमो-१

मर्याद्येन वाचार्येन सहस्य विद्येत देवोधिपवा ॥ ३ ॥

लिंगवन्नोपदेशाः करार्याचरणं जप: ।

माणिकदारणं त्रां दोकाचार्यवर्तनमु ॥ ४ ॥

शंकरसेविनासिकरणामवचारनन्यप्रयोगङ्कनकायन्तुसन्वेद्यानि ।

अधिच।

"तिरुपणं ये विद्यनृत्ति निन्दनृत्ति शिविषेत् ॥"

धारणन्ति तू ये भक्तयो धारणन्ति तथेव ते ॥

}\n
1 A adds युक्तिः । 2 B. वनभेष । 3 B. इसे । 4 T. reads first line only.
(४६)

इति जात्रारिपानिषद्वाकथमि तद्विपयकं भवति। तत्र हि।

नेत्रेत्त पूजावेदलेया नरं वत्स वाहिन्तकम्।

dश्याविना गौतमेन येन शास्त्रवाहणायमः। ॥ १ ॥

कलाववतरिपथ्वस्ति निन्दकावे वाहिन्तकः।

वाहिन्तरा भविष्यति कलाववतरिपथ्वस्तिकः। ॥ २ ॥

बहुलम्प्रसुरापाणवचिते यक्त: पुरा।

वाहिन्तरा भविष्यति कलाववतरिपथ्वस्तिकः। ॥ ३ ॥

इति शिवायतिर्यूक्ताना पापात्मानं वाहिन्तकायत्वपरिवाद्वनेन ताशिन्द्वा: पापेतु-त्वं तत्साद्वां त्रिपुण्ड्रानिन्द्वाय: प्रतिपिन्ति ।

हिंदायानकं नाम वर्त महेश्वरामित्वस।

जे धारणेयः प्रकृति ते यानिति परमा गतिम: ॥ १ ॥

इत्युप्तप्रसुरामुर्वेन हिंदायारणस्य मोक्षायारणकारणलभम्वायः तवीप्यं त्रिपुण्ड्रायारणामित्वसमं । तत्र साधरं नाम तद्मत्रचले सति तद्वत्तुसोद- मारस्तुपुमेय । तथा प्रकृते हिंदायारणाम्बन्ते सति तद्वत्तुसुविकल्पकादिधिम- वतः त्रिपुण्ड्रायारणेव कक्षमु । पव्व सति “ सदृश्यां प्रतियोगिरिक्षणाभ्याय- मभावो हि निरूप्यते।” इति न्यायेन प्रतियोगिपिसिद्धिः विनाभाव- प्रकप्योगेनांकारिकाति उपमाणुकारस्त्रे उपमाणसम्बिद्रारश्वकाल्वालिकं-धारणासिद्धिः।

नाच धैर्याण हिमस्रावित्यादृष्ट साधश्वाचकेवाष्ट्रस्त्रे न्यायेपि प्रकृते तद्भवात् साधश्वापासाध्वकेवाचष्ट्रस्त्रे न्यायेपि। इति हिंदायारणामित्वसमं वाच्यमु इतिश्रवावकेत्वा।” वक्रपुत्रेव वृहस्ति: हितादिकं गम्यामनसाध्य- पापात्मकेवाप्रतियोगिताय तस्रत्।।

यद्वा हट्टानांत्स्वऽनां वाच्य स्वकृत्यायेत। तथापि हिंदायारणसिद्धिर्दुर्वर्य-रैव। “चेष्टा शिवप्राप्तिविविवत्वहे द्वानास्त्वद्वल्लकृति:।” इति क्षणे कस्तुष्ट: भ्रमोऽः

१ A adds अवधायः। २ B न वा उपमाणसाध्वारावेन नाचविद्व।
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लिङ्गांगसमन्वयकोषनावपुने वाहालिंगादारण प्रतिपादनम् ।

श्रीचित्रयामनमः—लिङ्गांगसमन्वयकोषमहावाक्यार्थ्योऽधिकः "तच्चकमि अहं बहहिमुः" इति वाक्यं द्वेषेनाय लिङ्गादारणसिद्धिनिन्त्याये है। नन्त्रतच्चमासि इत्यादिभिप्रासितवहं पक्षीव जीवेऽवतिष्टित्तित्वाधिकुलक्षेत्रधिकाकरणव्यव- चिददसार्थसर्सिंहतो जीवरंसाध्यवाच्यः। " "साधारणे प्रकृति विच्चारणाय तु महाश्वेतः " इति इत्यादिभिप्रासित्वायाधिकुलक्षेत्रधिकाकरणव्यव- गुणाकरणकार्यविशेषः परमात्मसत्तवाच्यः। एवं विद्यधार्मि दस्तोहेम्योयोरीसबोधसम्बन्धव तत्त्व पद्योविभाषणतिनुसरत्तत्त्वशक्तिकर्म- गीकुल्याभेदाः वैभवतं इत्यभुन्युक्तम् । अहं बहहिमुं इत्यादिभिप्रासित्वाचे।

तत्र च न लिङ्गांगसमन्वयकोषः इति देवत।

अभिशापयमनवात्तानाः। अहं लिङ्गांगसामन्वयकोषविभुराणं मीठम्।

रक्षानुक्रमिकापरणायगमतवदोषेनाः नैतिकोवम समकारं करोति। तत्र

1️⃣ A omits य A २ तथा महिमैः । ३ B धाय ले । ४ A एवं च ५ B ब्रृद्धे
(९८)

कोशाहितः शिष्यस्य प्रश्ने गुरुणा हस्तमस्तकसंयोगःपवेदाश्रीश्चया योगागमपरनामकारणामावःच्छेः च जीवे माहिःकृत्रिम संयोज्य योगागमपरनामकसूक्ष्मावःच्छेः मनुद्रीश्चया पाण्डिः संयोज्य त्यागमागपरनामकसूक्ष्मावःच्छेः क्रियासिद्धेष्ठिं योजालिता तत्समसिद्धकम्। तत्प्रार्थिता शिष्यस्तु।

हीनं गच्छति यासिनु सा माया वर्षकारिणी।
तत्तंगिति सन्मारं श्रुतं परास्तथेषः॥ १ ॥
एतत्समात् कारणदेव श्रुतेन श्रुतंहि तत्तमः।

इति शंकरसहितावचनानुग्रहेन मायोपाधकलिङ्गस्यशरीरवच्चित्रमकृत्व तत्वद्वाच्यः।

अत्तमिति शब्दसमात्रं गच्छतीति गमुच्चते।
सुनयेंप्रागित्ति प्राज्ञमृगतविविधित्वः॥ १ ॥
सन्त्साराभवसंसारकः जीवसंसाराभविकः।

इति वचनानुग्रहेन बृहादार्यपासनाविरोधीविवाहस्थवर्णं अं श्राहां परमविं गच्छतीबंगं च पदवाच्यो जीवः। अंगवस्य शरीरसाधितविशेषि। "यस्य चातमा शरीरः यस्यावयक्ष्ठ शरीरः" इति श्रुतः श्राहो जीवशरीरकलवणोम-शरीरसूतिवो जीवसावपवाच्यः।

लिङ्गाङ्रुपयोर्योगःसंयोगशिवन् विवाखः।
एतत्सङ्गः सुहडः समस्यं इति स स्मृतः॥ १ ॥

इति वचनेन सम्यकोऽमः संयोगः इति व्युत्तव्य जीवश्रेष्ठकल्याणपरामक-नीतीरस्ते र्योगामात् अवभावश्रृंगमोष्णिपवाच्यः। अथवा

विग्रहं देवतवक्ष्म जगदस्तराचः।
एतत्रत्वं न जानन्ति पशावः पश्चावृङ्गः॥ १ ॥ रथा।
इति रीत्या बहुशारीर्युवांगपावच्यकल्वरांतरपर्यंतः पदार्थः। लिङ्गा
किंतूपरमादिवस्तनवशः। तयोरविवादिन्योगादिः पदार्थः इति 
कुश्या लिङ्गाल्पविस्तरस्याकल्वरांतपुर्वाच्यसमस्यासंगणांसमवाच्यं पद्ध-
क्यविकरावेरव अथे इति विजनानाति। तदनंतरमहं वहात्माविद्याक्षण्डमहावा-
क्यार्थसमुचवन्स्वरूपान्स्वरूपान्स्रीविभ्रमानन्दायान सः 
चविना स्वाभाविकार्यमाछां भविष्यतीति यावदुविकार्यावध्यक्षकान त 
वचमानि

ds.धृतितिर्योगवैद्धिः गुहुं परमकारणं।
गुहुत्तरतमसीत्याह सर्वार्थं कहुःनिपियः। "

इत्यादिनि बहूलि सन्ति गन्धविस्तरसमावेशं विलिस्यन्ते। लिङ्गांसंपर्योपादान-
र्थानां चालबोधकाणि कर्मचिदुपारितं। तथाहि स्तान्ते शंकरसंहि-
तयाः—

लिङ्गे किंभिमापिते किं समवन्ते: कर्त्येत्यन्ते:।
लिङ्गांसमवन्तपिप्राण्येवमेव विशिष्यत्व:। !! १।।
लिङ्गांपह महावेषः सत्विद्वांदवक्षः।
अंगिरपह यि जीवान्मा समवानिन्यक्षः। !! २।।
ततद्वेणौन्यंते सिद्धिर्ग्रहसभाविशिवः।
त्वं पदेनांग्रुः हि जीवसंसारलक्षणः। !! ३।।
त्वमेऽव्याच्यकालो यस्मोद्धू शन्धार्थ एव हि। !! ४।।
त्वमहं पदार्थायतापूर्व वेदशावित्तुः।
न तत्थ्वादवाध्यवस्य विदुर्वादूः स्वेतः हि। !! ५।।
त्वमहं पदलस्यार्थो जीवान्मा चांगस्यकः।
अशिवस्ये तत्वावन्स्ततो नैव विद्वेषः। !! ६।।
जगवराचरं चक्षुचत्तं पूर्ण लिङ्गात्मकः।
शुद्धां तद्वेदग्रुः हि तत्वमार्थां न संशयः। !! ७।।
तत्वं पदविश्वेत् लिङ्गांग्रुःयोगान्यविलिस्यম्।

१ क्रिया है । २ मुल शेष्व।.
उपाधिकृतवाच्यार्थं स्थानं संबितसुखात्मकम् || ८ ||
लक्ष्यार्थमविरङ्गं रचितवं तद्वित्य या माति:।
स सम्भवनं इति प्रीको वेदान्तशास्त्रवेदिभि: || ९ ||
लिङ्गहो नामदवः पूर्णवित्तन्त्यस्त्यस्ि:।
भाति यस्मोऽहस्योऽहं जीवात्मां न चापर्: || १० ||
यो भाति चांगुर्होऽहं जीवात्मा परमात्मन:।
सोऽयमात्मा महादेवो लिङ्गहो महेषः: || ११ ||
यो मात्रापाध्यो क्वः लिङ्गी पञ्चाशिवः:।
सोऽयमात्मां भूत्वा भवत्येनस्वरूपनान् || १२ ||
तत्रपौन्यच्यते लिङ्गं त्वं पदेनागमार्थितम्।
अनन्तरेक्षा भाषावर्गं सम्प्लोस्ति पदेन च || १३ ||
इति वाक्यानुसम्भवं भासते यथा सन्तान:।
मुनिपदेशशा शिष्यगम्यायति स उच्चते || १४ ||
एवं लिङ्गगं सज्जनधामवना गुणं विद्यते:।
स थोमी स च सर्वज्ञो जीवनमक: स उच्चते || १५ ||
लिङ्गगं दवाच्यार्थं हित्वा सम्याभ्या धनः।
लक्ष्यार्थं लक्ष्यात्तितं तत्र सोऽहमेवेति चिन्त्येत्र || १६ ||
लिङ्गांगपुत्रसम्यात्मकं जन्मात्रत:।
अविधासहकायेण नामपूर्वति भाविज्ञाति || १७ || इति
अनुभवसूत्रे—
लिङ्गं तत्वमात्रायां अन्यं त्वं पदम्जरितम्।
संग्रामोऽसिद्धं प्रकांमणयोऽर्गालिङ्गोऽ:।
इति। एवं परमात्मपरमशिक्षणीतवर्षितत्विहितत्वेन लिङ्गधारणास्य वैदिकजनपरि-
अधात्ममितिः।
इदानीमुः वैदार्थरतिपाद्वक्तमन्वादिष्टितविहितत्वेनापि तत्त्वं तथात्त
प्रद्धयते। गौतमासूत्रे:—

१ भ स्वयं २ अ तु।
(५१)

शुस्ते मंत्रे हृदि ध्यानं मस्तके लिंगधारणम्।
रूपाको च शिखायन इति बाह्यलक्षणम्॥

इति। अत्र हृदि ध्यानं अन्तर्लिंगानुसरणं मस्तके लिंगधारणमिति बाह्य-
लिंगधारणमं चाभिनवस्तम्।

नन्दनु बाह्यगृहोदयेन मन्न्नानलिंगधारणादिष्वविधारणवर्यं
विभिन्ते। तत्वाचारविद्यायु केषुविनिंगधारणस्यधारणोन्नमावात् केषुवि-
लिंगधारणात्माविद्यते।

"मृतान्त समातिक्रम्य चाण्डालः कोडिजसु।"

इति बाह्यगृहोदयेन मुरुदिविनश्वातिक्रमे दृष्टविधायकवस्थेयकाशकाश्यदि-
अतपाधकान्वतीतिभूतमस्तनुयायिनः। य्वतिरितकिषयतात्।

रातिभिषेक काचन सन्निवयते।
विलोचने जाययमंस्ते।
समानवधम्यऽङ्क्षोऽकाशे।
सक्षा भाविललिपिचिरेन कष्टित।॥

इति स्तक्नजनलोचनोदेशैं जागरणविधायकवस्थयः। रामानुजमतानुपातः
प्रत्यतिरितकिषयतवस्थस्यायां। लिंगाधारिविविषयकवावात्। किशमस्तके स्तिम-
धारणामिति सरोपिरववसृविचारस्वपनं सामान्यपरस्पराय प्राप्तां लिंगां-
मिनीन्ध्रावकवस्थायस्वाच्च। नन्दन्यः कलमिन्धारणोदेशैं मन्न्न-
ध्यानादिष्वविधारणसंगमस्य दिक्षकिरूणेन तथा विपश्चिदिवातिसन्त्मानस्यमिति
चेत। इति बाह्यलक्षणािति वाक्यानुरूपेन बाह्यते सति श्वचिनिंगधारणस्य लक्षणमित्वम्
तत्तधारणस्यात्मिति।

¹ A reads खिलासु तथा भस्म ² B omits बिम
१० गौतमादिस्मृतिगतवाक्यं रत्नालिङ्गाधारणाय
प्रतिपादनं ।

अरस्तु तत्त्वः ।
अस्याद्विवसेव शाक्यः परया मुदा ।
पारस्यन्त्यालिङ्गमुपश्व शिवलिंगमहर्षिन्दास ॥ १ ॥ इति

मनुस्मृतिः ।
सर्वकर्ममिकुमक्य ध्यानरतस्यगर्तस्य च ।
न तस्य वहने कार्यं न च पिण्डोदककिया ॥ १ ॥ इति

अत्र समुच्चयोभोक्तकारस्ते ध्यानयोगरतस्य शिवसर्वकर्ममिकुमक्योः प्राधान्यनो
देशवन्तैर्कोऽसो ध्यानयोगरत इत्याकर्क्षायाः ॥

शिबध्यानस्तो भूत्वा शिवलिंगमसंयुतः ।
शिवेकर्मपर्यागी ध्यानयोगी स उच्चते ॥ १ ॥
थथा बाह्सा शिबं ध्यात्वा पूजनं कुर्वितन् मानवः ।
तथा हुः प्रसन्नमेक्ष्यानयोगी स उच्चते ॥ २ ॥

इति तत्र विश्वाजनं सर्वकर्मविश्वास्यध्यायं ध्यानयोगोपत्यतिः प्रायम्योगोपत्यतिः
-ध्यानयोगार्यं चोदितम् दहनाभवादिविधानेन लिंगधारणार्यं ॥ बोधायन-स्मृतिः ॥

सर्वसंगमिनिवर्त्स्य ध्यानयोगरतस्य थ ।
न तस्य वहने वृत्तानासौ च पिण्डकिया ॥ १ ॥

इत्यान्यां प्रायम्योगरत इत्यनेनोक्त्विदिशा लिंगधारणाधिकृतः ॥ शालातस्मृतिः ॥

१ △ उद्वामार्यासदी
(५:३)

वानप्रस्थ योगिनं च लिङ्गक्रमं भिन्नक्रमं यत्मुः
नूषाक्रमानं सत्यं च रसायं निपितेन्मूलम् ॥ १ ॥

इति। अत्र लिङ्गधारणमुद्धिश्च ग्यानविधानादुद्ध्याविगंध्यान्वेन लिङ्गधारणसि-
निरिति।

नन्दनेनोऽवृद्धत्रात्मकांसुति-केस्वेन लिङ्गधारणन्यूजावृंदिन्त्यन्वेन चीवा-
लसांधारणेन यावजीवोभवित्वममभिहितम् । तदनुपपत्तं । दर्शनस्मर्तश्रावण-पायोख्यानां रजसवधानां सूतिकारायणां च धारण्युजादरुत्यन्तिविकुं-
क्त्वात् । यदि तत्र धारण्युजादिकां किंतु तदवशुचिरीशस्त्वन्याशक्ति-
स्थाप्नशिविचाराः पुनः स्तानान्तरसयं पूजाक्रमणतापथः । नहि तदा-
लिङ्गस्तु पुनःसंक्रारः किंतु । भविष्यद्वितीयोभादिति । किच।

श्रवणं पापुपांशेऽव लिङ्गिनं विननं तथा ।
विद्वात्रातिनिशेऽव पाप्यन्ति परिवर्जयेत् ॥ २ ॥
पापिण्डे परिते ब्राह्मण चक्रिणं लिङ्गधारिणस्य ।
तथा वंचका देश्वा सवासास्य जल्माविरोधेत् ॥ ३ ॥
चक्रिणं लिङ्गिनं हदीवा सचेते स्त्रामाचरं ।
यस्तु संसामचा दिष्टेऽक्ततवनुविंशतः ॥ ४ ॥

गार्भाधिकारी स विवेचाः श्रीत्सामात्तिकम्भसु।
मुनेशचं न भोग्यं योगिनं लिङ्गिनं तथा ॥ ५ ॥

इति। शाश्वाधिभृत्वां लिङ्गधारणशक्तियं यथेऽवति पूर्वाण्यत्रात्मकांसुति-केस्वेन
पन्तरास्वादनपत्रविन्यामनं तथा कथाविचय्येमिति केतु। भैवमूः——

न कर्मणं न प्रज्ञा च चनेन त्यामोङ्गिनेनामुमवामानथः ।
नाम्यत्रकर्मसंत्यामनोक्ते विधिति मानवः ॥ ६ ॥

A adds नाम्यपरस्वेन वा.
(५४)

इत्यादिनात्यन्तरं ज्ञातिनात्मकुरुपथयुक्तमुक्तिन्कल्यापितास्यादेवी

न हिंस्यादृ सर्वभूतानि न च मांसे समश्रीयात् ।
नोचिछिरि कर्त्याचिदाचारायत्रात्यात्तानि ॥

न चेवायत्यायां कुर्याचिरि चोचिछिरि क्वचित् ब्रजेन् ॥ १ ॥

इत्यादिश्रुतिमुनि स्मृतिः निविद्वैलेववि पशुविशालमात्संस्कृतत्र कशक्षरं सोमपणानादेव: प्रत्यक्षविद्वैलेववि च “सोमन यजेन” “सोमनोचिछित्रे यद्वीणो-मीयम् पशुमामणेत” इत्यादिश्रुतिपादिण्याहिततत्वार्थम् कर्त्तव्यतः सर्वादनां स्मार्यतात्योपायीविशेष संस्कृतम् कर्त्तव्यतिविधिनां लिंगधारणातत् जावेदयोऽवजीवन्तःकर्त्तव्यतिविधानां—

गृहो गृहस्तः प्रसुता ब्रह्मी सूतकं नारी विहयते ।
लिंगार्जनरतायाब्रह्मी सूतकी नारी न सूतकम् ॥ १ ॥
तथा प्रसुतिकार्यम् सूतकं नेत्र विहयते ।
लिंगार्जनरता नारी सूतकी तु रजस्वला ॥ २ ॥
राविरथष्ठा वायुः: कोठिकोणम्याशुरिं: तद्द्रात्रात् प्रमुखानि जुरविं सूक्षमां ॥ ३ ॥

इति सिद्धान्ताधिकारणीवीरागमवचनेन ।

तथा हासिकसमवेशाचारायो भवति केवलम् ।
तथेति मम साक्षींत्वम् ते प्रकाशितमारुचि: ॥ १ ॥
तैलयुक्तं तु कार्पसं ज्योतिमण्डित: च चेतव ।
स्नेहयुक्तस्य सन्धेकोणिर्ग्यर्योऽलिंगता ॥ २ ॥

इति । पद्मपुराणशीरसः स्वच्छवचननां नरोदेऽन:—

शैवं लिंगार्जनं यथा यथा चालिपरिह: |
वानस्थ्यायिनां च शरीरे नाति सूक्षमः ॥ १ ॥

१ B adds नियत after इत्यादि; २ B विविधः.
इति ग्रांमुद्ध्यानुसारे च रजस्तलादिहृदीणू धारणेचालिकार्ये विरोधभावान्। क्रिया पेनुरिकाविद्वारसाधिकितयज्ञपञ्चमास्थाविद्वारिकाविषये रजस्तलाधौजानामपवादकेत्यामाबाबवाहवनापि ताहादेशाकृष्ये जातासाही दातीनामपवादकेत्यामाबाबवाहवच। इत्याभावने युनिकन्तरक्षणो वा द्वारक्षणसर्पयतनमविद्वाहिनक्याबिवाहस्त्रो मोळ्याचतुर्घणादिवन्तरं होमकाळे श्रीमे कन्यकायास्तवाची अशुमतीले हृदे वा श्रीने वा याज्ञिका: कि कृपानि इति तापयेणः—

विवाहे विते तन्ने होमकाळ उपस्थिते।
कन्यामुद्ध्यमी हथ्या कथे कृपानि याज्ञिका: ॥ ॥

इति प्रथ्ये।

"हविन्मतीर्थिं आपो हविन्मान्देवोध्वरः: ।

इति मन्नेण कन्यकाः स्नापिन्त्वा।

"नैवकायां आज्ञाकृत्य युहुन्त्यां: प्रथमं मन:। "
इति देव आहुतो जुडाहृदिति महीये विवाहक्रेण प्रतिपद्यत्तवे तत्र रजस्तलास्तवाच विवाहदेशाक्षयाद्वाबाबवाहवच। पैतृकशात्त्रूदी पितृपैतृकवाहितानां श्रीमतीशास्त्रियां दुःखितानन्तर-श्राद्धाश्रितानां ताहादेशाकृष्ये जातासाही श्राद्धादेशान् अवाहक्क्षयाकाबाबवच।

तनुयागस्तानानि मल्लस्यमसी गुरुः: ।
दीर्घा ज्वेये निर्भरेचा विमंगलसुप्रस्थितां ॥ ॥

यागविकाले सिंह शरीरान् वियोजेयते ।

इतिमुद्ध्यान्वितारणदीक्षायाः:—

---

१ A अन्य
(५६)

“नित्ये स्वामहस्ताये सावधानने पूजयेत्”

dति तत्तुजाविषयाय यावनीभवित्वेन तादाद्विकाविषये रजस्वलायाः
शौचानाः अपवांदक्षरावस्थायमुक्तेत्यत्तत्।

अत् पूर्वशीर्षनः पञ्चविकल्पतितप्राणिनेत्रिस्तूती कैशिकादित्यनेन।

सूतकाल्नाक समार्थव्यथाने कैतु यद्रकामः।
कार्यिकं तत्त्वावत्तिति न तु वांतावेन जापम्॥ १। ॥
वानवस्थयतिब्रह्माचारिणः शुचयो वताः।
िरत्तेयः समार्थव्यथानेन। शुचयः सवा || २। ॥
इत्यादिना समार्थव्यथानेत्तत्त्वात् प्रकाशिपि तत्त्वावत्तिति
कर्त्तव्यानेत्रेवेत्तुत्तत् कर्त्तव्य कर्मण: को वा प्रारम्भः इत्येक्षेतायाम्।

प्रारम्भो धरणं येः संकल्पो वस्ततत्त्वोः।
नान्दीर्मिलं विवाहाविनं आदेश वाकपशिेहः॥ १। ॥

इत्युक्तमः तस्य चारयमः। येः सहयोगार्दिशाय वाकपशियम्। प्रारम्भः वो
चाँद्रायणतिथिभोवाक्रमकाल्यायाः। संजखोंसकाविद्विषिः संकल्पः
प्रारम्भः। नान्दीर्मिलं विवाहाविद्रिक्करण। आदेश पाकक्रियाप्रारम्भः।
तत्त्वावत्तिति इत्यादिनः समार्थव्यथानेत्रेवेत्तुत्तत् कर्त्तव्यकर्मयः। एवं च।

हिंगधारणका नाम वर्तः माहेश्वराभिमुः।
यावनीभवितं वृत्ताविद्रिक्करणं समार्थेतु॥ १। ॥

इत्यादिकाल्यायामा करीयाः हिंगधारणतृशुजानावतार्यापि मुःकुडकाल्यासात्
यावनीभवित्वेन संकल्परणायां ज्ञावाविद्रिक्कारिकाविद्रिक्करणसकाविद्रिक्करणं
कर्त्तव्यकर्मेऽवत्तित्वावत्तिति। रजस्वलायाः धाराप्रारं यो परिशुद्धसे कर्मान्तरेियः
परिश्रमिति स्वाृद्धिति तुल्यमः। केन्द्रियू बन्तः धाराविनगण्डृशुकाल्यादिना पावित्रादितमुक्तम्।

१ A शुचय-सवा। २ B परिश्रमिति।
मन्नरचारायणः। शुचिवेष्यशारीरिनस्तिवनादायपरिशुचिवेष्यशारीरित्वें विषयें परिशुचिवेष्य निर्धारित्वें कार्याते तदमात्र इति प्राहः ।

यदृच्छः अघृविश्वशारीरिसम्बन्धयन्तीयायशुचिवेष्य शुचिवेष्य शारीरिक तत्कालिकलिङ्ग तथाते इत्याय। तथाय- अघृविश्वशारीरिसम्बन्धयन्तीयायशुचिवेष्य शुचिवेष्य शारीरिक तत्कालिकलिङ्ग तथाते इत्याय। 

यदृच्छः क्षेत्रार्यायशारीरिसम्बन्धयन्तीयायशुचिवेष्य शुचिवेष्य शारीरिक तत्कालिकलिङ्ग तथाते इत्याय। अघृविश्वशारीरिसम्बन्धयन्तीयायशुचिवेष्य शुचिवेष्य शारीरिक तत्कालिकलिङ्ग तथाते इत्याय। अघृविश्वशारीरिसम्बन्धयन्तीयायशुचिवेष्य शुचिवेष्य शारीरिक तत्कालिकलिङ्ग तथाते इत्याय। 

संस्कृतप्रयोग तत्कालिकलिङ्ग तथाते इति।

नित्य शवामहस्ताये साधारणेन पूज्येत। ॥ ॥

इति वजनसिद्धिसंभूतां कांग्रवेश्वरेन अचूकालिक नित्य शवामहस्तायेन शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन तेनापि शवामहस्तायेन ॥ ॥

1. A adds शारीरिकम्बैन B शारीरिकम्बैन. २ A यथा-यथा.
(४५)

चांत्यालीकायांनार्यिच्छिन्न नाशों सकलकर्मणां फलाभावसों कहरेरकवेद-शास्त्रात्यामाण्यपर्वमायेता वैद्यत्मवेदाशये. यदि च "स्वातं एव धन्यः स्वयं च चार्योपसर्व इति अर्द्धावत्तरार्थस्त्वकोटितत्त्वान्षोहिष्णु यज्ञशारीर्स्या-शैलानम्बनार्यकृत्यसंस्कारनाश इत्योत्त्वे तदा तेनेत दिमाधिशारीरिपुण्याती-चार्योर्तिप्रदिते तत्रसंयुक्ता कल्लेन्द्रपरिवारान्ये। किम् श्रीमुनेश्वर-पुरुषोत्तमस्थवरे निवेदनमार्येन परिशुद्धमाद्वे च चाण्डालवार्तकाय-वा मत्यांसं सुपावनम्। इति वैदिकपरिवारहृष्टिखारे नासारा यत् द्वितीयाद्वे मण्डलयोगवसंस्कारसंस्कारसंस्कारान निर्मातां थाम्यित्यकल्पनेन थाम्यित्यकल्पनेन इति अत् एवं तत्र पुनः संवेद्या चार्योपिनी तद्यत् इति अत् विस्तरणः।

यतः "नवान् पशुवतबृंहां इत्यादिशाखानिषद्धेन लिंग-भाषामकस्तेष्यनिः। तद्यथान्यावर्तिनम्। नवान्ये श्रीमुनेश्वर-पुरुषोत्तमस्थवरे निवेदनमार्येन परिशुद्धमाद्वे च चाण्डालवार्तकाय-वा मत्यांसं सुपावनम्। अत् एवं तत्र पुनः संवेद्या चार्योपिनी तद्यत् इति अत् विस्तरणः।

परम्परेने च "पानादं सर्वंयिगः" इति द्रवियानिषद्धेन लिंग-भाषामकस्तेष्यनिः। तद्यथान्यावर्तिनम्। नवान्ये श्रीमुनेश्वर-पुरुषोत्तमस्थवरे निवेदनमार्येन परिशुद्धमाद्वे च चाण्डालवार्तकाय-वा मत्यांसं सुपावनम्। अत् एवं तत्र पुनः संवेद्या चार्योपिनी तद्यत् इति अत् विस्तरणः।

पानादं सर्वंयिगः। इति द्रवियानिषद्धेन लिंग-भाषामकस्तेष्यनिः। तद्यथान्यावर्तिनम्। नवान्ये श्रीमुनेश्वर-पुरुषोत्तमस्थवरे निवेदनमार्येन परिशुद्धमाद्वे च चाण्डालवार्तकाय-वा मत्यांसं सुपावनम्। अत् एवं तत्र पुनः संवेद्या चार्योपिनी तद्यत् इति अत् विस्तरणः।

पाण्डः सर्वंयिगः। इति द्रवियानिषद्धेन लिंग-भाषामकस्तेष्यनिः। तद्यथान्यावर्तिनम्। नवान्ये श्रीमुनेश्वर-पुरुषोत्तमस्थवरे निवेदनमार्येन परिशुद्धमाद्वे च चाण्डालवार्तकाय-वा मत्यांसं सुपावनम्। अत् एवं तत्र पुनः संवेद्या चार्योपिनी तद्यत् इति अत् विस्तरणः।

पाण्डः सर्वंयिगः। इति द्रवियानिषद्धेन लिंग-भाषामकस्तेष्यनिः। तद्यथान्यावर्तिनम्। नवान्ये श्रीमुनेश्वर-पुरुषोत्तमस्थवरे निवेदनमार्येन परिशुद्धमाद्वे च चाण्डालवार्तकाय-वा मत्यांसं सुपावनम्। अत् एवं तत्र पुनः संवेद्या चार्योपिनी तद्यत् इति अत् विस्तरणः।

पाण्डः सर्वंयिगः। इति द्रवियानिषद्धेन लिंग-भाषामकस्तेष्यनिः। तद्यथान्यावर्तिनम्। नवान्ये श्रीमुनेश्वर-पुरुषोत्तमस्थवरे निवेदनमार्येन परिशुद्धमाद्वे च चाण्डालवार्तकाय-वा मत्यांसं सुपावनम्। अत् एवं तत्र पुनः संवेद्या चार्योपिनी तद्यत् इति अत् विस्तरणः।
वेषाधिनानाविधिकालहितमसानात। लीनमर्ग गमगति व्युत्ताय तत्तददनबिष्म-किस्मानाशलातामावितामानां लिंगवद्वाच्याचेतन "आंदिनयंकारां किमां गणतां महसुबरस" इति वर्णनावननाटांगचलिङ्गुपजायामसें प्रसिद्ध-लोग्यतात्त्वात। नर्य पाण्डवांपद्यायपक्षाविशेष्याचार इति वाच्यम। लिंगाभारि- वाहकानामृतपाण्डुवच्यलस्वालिङ्गविवाहात। "पाण्डुपानलम्ब्रसा" मित्याश्रेणानुि पाण्डुपानमुराविष्ठा स्मार्तपर्यं। "सुतेनचे न भोक्तरः" इत्याश्र पाण्डुविवाहानृक्कृ।

चयमानकर्ता पाण्डवमाॆपिन किशिति।

अर्थं न प्रतिमहिल्यातु प्राणं क्रणरतिरि।

इति सर्वत्राष्ट्रावस्थापतिरुपाथिनिष्ठात। किच।

नाश्रोतियनहो स्वतं ग्रामत्राजहो तथाः।ं

वरिया हीनं च हुते मृत्तक ब्राह्मणं क्रियति।।

उपाग्रे मुनकारं च एयाभाच्यमनिर्धारम्।

अनार्तं हृंडामानस्य राजयाः योगिनः।।

दिवस्य न मृदाप्रकममभुतपर्यं।

पिँकानानुपाद्योऽयां स्ताविक्षेपात्रं भो।।

गणनां माणकाशं च विहींथं च विगाहितमः।

विड्धावार्तिकःव्यायांश्च विश्वकरिणो ममय।।

इत्यादि तत्तदानन्विषेधकमृस्त्रुती लिंगाभारिीतनिष्ठावेशी। कस्यस्य ततो आक्षमुक्ताविशेषः विरोधाधिकरणयाययो। स्थापायत् प्रकटवात पाण्डुपानमुस्वार्तम्न स्थायतीत्वादि प्रकटानेकस्मुतिविनियितंतिधिषाधीरणस्य स्मृत्या निषेधात्त्वेन वेष-तुल्यमहाभारतेआनुभावानिकवर्ण।

1 A adds प्राणायात्राशाविधिकृति B adds न च पाण्डुपानसुवालिङ्गपद्यं।
2 A कदु 3 reads लोकेयम् परिवृत्ति।
(६२)

किमाहुर्भरतशेष विग्याः पार्व सनातनं।
रिमिन्नं श्राह्नं वेंव ब्राह्मणं चाप्यलिंगिनं। — १ ॥

इति युधिष्ठिरेण पृष्टे

सङ्गवितशिष्य विज्ञाय लिंगिने चेताराय च।
देवमाहुर्भर्ताराज उम्भवेतै तपस्यिनी। — १ ॥

इति भीष्मचन्द्रेऽन्ति: लिंगपारिःद्वारानां दानपात्रावामावानात् तेषापूर्वतीर्थः
त्यायोगेण च नाननादिगारिणां निम्यलम्। परस्य

यो वै स्वां देवतामतियजते प्रस्वायेव देवतायः चयंते
न परां प्राप्तोति पापियानुः भवति। — १ ॥

इति शुल्या

अथात्तु च चर्मः विगुणः: पर्यमाष्टिनुष्ठितात्।
य चर्मःपरित्यागादन्यवर्मः समारम्भः।

तेन विलेक्यः दुरालमानं कृपातः सुर्योबलोकनं। — १ ॥

भिन्नाति वेदमयीं ष्ठाया अच्छेचत्रंगोचराम।
चारुभक्ष्यायाच चर्मं पापाय उच्यते। — २ ॥

इति भगवद्विवाचननान्ति:।

वर्षं चर्मः विगुणः न पारकः: स्वनुष्ठितः।
पर्यमेऽणं जीवनुः हि सयं: पताति जालितः। — १ ॥

इति मनुष्यस्या। "अत्यजेत निजां यदि देवता उभय-ध्ययने जुशाम-प्रयम्।" इत्याहिम्युज्ञात्त्वाच चर्मंपरित्यागार्यापूर्वकान्यार्थस्वाविकारिणो
निम्य-लोके "बकिं लिङिनाम्।" त्यापि यस्तु प्रथमं हिमिम्तृत्या दुःख-वश्यात्त्वापूर्वकं चक्रीवति प्रथमं चक्रीमूलवा तद्धुरस्य हिंगि हा भवति। "तं दुष्या स्वतैलं स्नामार्थर्तु॥" इत्यवर्त्य: स्मृत्तिर्मिताय:। "यस्तुसत्तावाच
अग्राधित्त्वान्तिनान्ति:।" इत्यस्यापि हिंगुप्रस्तुत्स्त लाभनपर्यवेन संतपत्तकार-
(६१)
दृष्टि च तानि लिङ्गानि च तरंकितत्तनुद्विजः संतप्रावृत्तकथानिलिपि
रिणयः। "बाह्रणस्य ततुषुयः" इत्यादिना प्रागेव चर्काननालिपिधानौ।
शंकचक्राकितत्मु कैण्यवृ शिवद्रुषणम्।
पश्येयथि प्रमादाध्यं कुर्यात् सुर्योवलोकनम् ॥ १ ॥
इन्यापनुरोधाच्च। यदि लिङ्गपद्धश्च शिवलिङ्गपर्वतं तदा प्रथमं तपःमुकितो
भृगवासनन्तरं तदुक्तेष्य सिंहभवति तदैवपरिलम्ब चक्री च भवति सोऽपि वस्त्र
वहिकायं इत्येवं पूवविद्विक्यम्।

क्रमिकीकरणपलंभम्: पश्चः: मुङ्यापिधाः।
पशुभोगपि नरा: एक्षः: तेषु एक्षः: द्विजालयः ॥ १ ॥
द्विजालिपिजः किमि बिमे द्रुतुपुर्वकः ।
कृततुपुर्वक गतिरः: तेष्य: सन्नामथिनोपिधाः। ॥ २ ॥
तेष्यो विज्ञानिनः: एक्षः: तेषु शंकरः ।
नेः एक्षः महामात्र मम लिङ्गांगसामिनः। ॥ ३ ॥
लिङ्गांगसामिपिधाः: पश्चः: द्राग्नानवानु पुमानः।
तस्मान्यथापिनो नाहन्तिः ब्रह्मोऽकृष्टेऽसवदा। ॥ ४ ॥
स कित्यसर्वश्चावि पूवः: संसारविज्ञापिः।
बहुनोकृतं किं वत्स स पवाहम् न सर्वाभ्। ॥ ५ ॥ इति
शिरोदेवोइयाः कणों हस्तते वक्षथेर्देपि वा
लिङ्गाभारणिनो यत् हि व्यजेद्वित्यं यथा। ॥ ६ ॥
कुरुणेऽ गोऽकरं चैव लिङ्गाभारणवार्तितम्।
तथा ब्रह्मवर्ष सम्बन्धं च ब्रह्मायां चरेरे। ॥ ७ ॥
स्थलांगेत स्थिरहितं तु यो न भारत्येते द्विजः।
हृद्या तस्मि सहस्रलावल्लमं प्रचार्यारते। ॥ ८ ॥
मस्तके बादुपदे वा ललानोध्विपदोशाये।

१ A adds स्थिरायं २ T चक्राहिर्त ३ A दक्षाय
(६२)
अतिमधुरिण द्रष्टा कुर्यात् सूर्याबिलोकनं ॥ ९ ॥
प्रो न पूजयते भक्ता लिङ्ग निमुनाने तिरम ।
नासी स्वर्गयो मोक्षयो न च राज्ययो भाजनम् ॥ १० ॥
शिवायोगिनिर्ते तु नित्ये सब्जिनितः शिवः ।
योगीद्रुपम् जनात्मस्त्ति साक्षात् सम्पूर्णितः शिवः ॥ ११ ॥
ये योगिने द्विपंज्ञा सर्वपापेश्वरस्थिता ।
ये शिवज्ञानिन्ते प्रद्धितीह श्रीगिनय ॥ १२ ॥
विकल्पते महात्माने ये मुहाः शिवलिखितगिनय ।
ते भांति पिन्नविन्मि सार्थं नरके न संशयः ॥ १३ ॥

इति शंकरसंहिताराममुकुटासमर्थ्योगिन्तरादिविंध्यविरोधातः । ननु

निमुनालिठय ये राजा चर्चितोपेण कुञ्जवितः ।
रत्नान्विन्तनावतः रोपातनविभिन्तः ॥ १ ॥
असामान्स्व संख्यानाहः चण्डालविश्व विनाहुः ।
कृत्वा तैनिन्त्य ये च चण्डालात्मिनात्मितः ॥ २ ॥
चन्द्रिकाविविष्टाधैः पाण्डपा कृपुनदशः ।
शिवाकार जातिमण्डल योजतियो मुख वत्ते ॥ ३ ॥
स पाण्डप प्राप्ते शोभनं सर्वकर्मविहितः ।
अर्थे ये स्वामपाराध प्रतिति सोडोपिनिते ॥ ४ ॥

इति विष्णुपुराणाय चैथिपदारादिरंतानान्तेव पाण्डपादिकाल्यान्तिनिर्विचनेन "पाण्डप प्रतिति बालत् " इत्यान्ति पाण्डपादवं तत्परसेवेति चेतनवमुः । न हि पाण्डपद्वस्तु निर्यात्वकालम् । धुरा पुराणप्रभासकोशास्त्रिः बहुधा तंत्रित्वनात् । तत्रापि शाक्तिलिंगाकोशानोकं दिशा सर्विमालस्य पाण्डपद्वश्वतिनितिनितिरसागरस्य । तस्य चात्यं देवतोपासकस्यां श्रीज्ञानप्राच्छिन्तने तेषां तद्वालूपप्रयायात् "अतिमधुरिण द्रष्टा कुर्यात् सूर्य-
वलोकनम् " हिर्यादिना नेमादश्रीनीहतः: वज्रवादपित्तवाच्यति। एवं 
पूर्वोऽदाहतनिषण्यश्चनावाना निंद्रपरस्तमंसङ्क्रित्येवमुक्तम्। वस्तुसूः: 
तावद-कर्म्यतं सावधानेन। तथाहि। वस्त्राध्रोधक्षरकारणपदित्ववाणं पालति- 
मित्यादिवाक्यानां:—

तिलकं चतुर्यं वा द्वीपाधिस्थिकादुहारसम।
ललाटे धार्येष्यस्तु न तं प्रज्ञेदुभाविष्णु॥ ॥
लिङ्गाधारणानि यः: तं त्यजेदंत्यं गाधा ।

हिर्यादिङ्गाधारणपदित्ववाक्यानां च कर्मकारणकारणपदित्तवाच्च निंद्रपार- 
वाक्यानां च " नः हिन्द्रा निद्रितुमिते अपि तु स्तुत्यः। त्वाति इति 
न्यायेन तत्स्तककारणविहिततवर्यं शंक्वारसमेव वाच्चम्। अन्यथा।

तपोत्सन्धादरीनां विक्रेतारो हिन्दामा:।
यत्यथा भविष्यति नाहवेद्यामिन कलौ युगे। ॥ ॥
शुक्रवंश जनाधिकार्य मुण्डा: कामाध्यायिणः।
शुद्राधर्म चरित्यानि युगायो समुपस्थिते। ॥ ॥

इत्यिङ्गाधारणकरणे॥

हुमेंद्रजन्दुरावद्वितियात्रहस्त्वरा:।
हुम्बहारदुरावारा व्रथ गच्छितविष्ठात:। ॥ ॥
मातापल्यं तस्य: करिष्यति धनाश्या।
आदम्याणिनिता यंकास्त्रक्षत्वविशारदः। ॥ ॥

1 T omits भक्तम्.
2 A adds—
हिर्यादिनो विहितकथन: पिशुना: कलेहर्ष्वकाः।
सन्यासिनोऽपि दृष्ट्य देवसम्योऽपिताख्यः।
निर्मले खर्म परिप्रेष्य बेदार्यातः सिना।
वर्धमानो भ पर्यासी पताकव न सहायः। इति सक्षेपः।
(६४)

रुप्रक्रियाशास्त्रीत: तत्सम्भाषणविलयः।
सर्वसमुपदेश्यारे कैलाशेण विवर्तितः। ॥ २ ॥
बंजराभ्य भविष्यंति चतुः: कौङ्गनारायणः।
सर्वत्र विचारिःस्य तुषाग्या: गंगारदिवशः। ॥ ४ ॥
वयस्सा पयसा दुन्ना श्रीस्वाल्योद्योनेन च।
यंत्रितेरुसुर्दिनं प्रमाणः पारितो भवेत्। ॥ ५ ॥
काव्यायार्णिः: कैपित्त लोमथा विनोगोस्विनः।
एकदुरालक्षिणदावः मुण्डनम् टोकवंशकः। ॥ ६ ॥
शिशौदरपार्श्वः: वेश्यासकः। तथापि।
कपडः नागितिः: कैपित्तौ वृष्णा वै वेश्यारिः। ॥ ७ ॥
राजसेवा प्रकृती रितानि रविंद्रे प्रे।
खासिनि मांसः राजेन्द्र पित्यां मधु मार्गितः। ॥ ८ ॥
लेखां संस्कृतीनादेव नरः किल्ल्धामानुयात। ॥

इत्यादि स्कंदादित्यपुराणादन्वतयोगियान्मुि निःशयापूर्वे:। एवं च संकल्पे-
विज्ञानविद्याविवाधारेत् दानापास्तवादिना श्रीद्वाराणां च द्वाराश्चात्मानसंस्ततेऽत्यानि
न्धुजनवंद्यातीताः सर्वेषु चार्यश्चानि यवे प्रस्तुमज्जोत्तेऽपि। तेन तत्तत्त्वरुपाधुतवादान्तश्चायाविद्याके
वेदार्थशास्त्रपुराणागमेतिहासोपरिवर्तिः। त्यलम् पृश्चकषणार्थिः सिद्धिनिष्ठनेवनः।

६१ आश्रेपंतरिनाति:।

श्रीशिवाय नमः। ननु माध्बमाहोक्तस्मिन्तिमिहिरांगस्यन्यन्तिस्मु
तथास्यस्यकोः: ब्रह्मव्या "धर्मव्याजित्रसर्वकीर्तिः" क्षत्रियः। इति
सिद्धान्तस्य निःश्चिन्नममध्यमपारित्वमेव धर्मशः क्षितम् यस्य सं
धर्मव्याजितः। सिद्धार्थमेव वृत्तिजीवनम् यस्य संस्कृतिः। निःश्चिन्नानु
प्रकृतीकाव्यो नाम। अव वतान्ते कौशले रति कुष्ठिते रते। यस्य सृवाकीर्तिः।
स्तं प्रत्यधर्मसं श्लोकः। न्याश्चर्षर्षिः नामानीति तक्षया-
(६५)

ख्यानभूतसिद्धांतां लिंगप्रतिपक्षम् मिथ्यानुप्राप्ताजीवस्थवेन व्याक्त्यानां
लिंगप्रारम्बमवन्मेवति चेतन। मनुस्मृतिः।

गभिष्यम्: सदा लुट्ठं: दार्शिको लोकसमकः।
ब्रह्मादिविकलवैचैव हिंसः: सत्तामिनिन्िकः॥

ख्यादीना निम्बानिनिगणये,
अहिंगी लिंगवेषणे ये वुलिमुपरजीवविति।
स लिंगिनां वहस्येनसिद्धेययोगोऽन्र च जायते॥ ॥

ख्यानस्यतरस्मृति। कान्तिलिङ्गाधारितांशकां मध्यिकमङ्कस्वारांविकं ख्याती-
यां एव दार्शामीति नियमवंते श्रुता कस्मिन दूर्ते: स्मार्तः कपट-
लिङ्गाधारितेषु तदुपूर्मस्त्र प्रविशय अजस्वारांविकं गःहीनाः रीति। जयानहें-
सम्यकसमाग्रे हातिरंपदः दानाधी भृतं प्रति स्वीतसुकुलतारूप तथेऽत्र तदी-
यफळपञ्चं परिमुखा गच्छतातिष्ठ थुषणाभानुजिनेयमापि कपटेणारंती उदीय-
पापपञ्चं परिमुखा गच्छति निम्ममन्त्रकारितांवचनं पापपञ्चं तृयंगयोऽन्र जायते
हुकलक्षेमाकोशादितिमसूतिकपुस्यापि तत्तयाश्वयङ्गवावाद । न गुहा-
कृत्वादस्मावविलिङ्गाधारितांशकाः। अत एव मिथ्यानुप्राप्तालक्षणजीविकावातो
नामानीति लिङ्गात्मकत्वलयायनामपि संस्कृतं इति। पुरुषपरस्यनां तु...
सर्वादां स्थापयति " हत्यादि श्रृत्युपटुःपाणेन स्कान्देनिमित्वेत च
नामानुपुकाराबिच्यायकानुष्ठानिः। अन्यायनापि लिङ्गाधारणविच्यायकानुष्ठानिः। तत्त
तात्त्वकपुरां शिबिरात्मच्यां मिथ्याचिविविक्षह्रासेत्वात्मानीतिंकं गात्ति
भाविति लोपपमुद्वाबिमां तमावयन्ती नानातविकरता-
त्यात्मयोऽपि व्यक्त्य इति रावैन बुद्धे निम्मिलसुराजुनेयशाकारोतिकुमकधा-
र्यांजावलब्धीतिदशकाकण्कांकरणमन्त्रेन जन्मनायाप्रापि भवति। ततु
চ পরমশিবপ্রসাদাধিপতিত্বক ত্তৃত্যাত্মই বেদবিশ্বাসমহামমহিমুল-
বিদ्यার্থिनै: भक्तिनिश्चायास्मानोऽहदावः सांवात्रः भूतां दिव्याक्षराधे-
विकं दृष्टिः तेन रचणं निरंत्र सीताः प्रास्मस्िि इत्युक्तानन्तराशादंत्यर्थकं-

(६६)

मोक्षयुगाय्यत: प्राणान्सानुजो रघुनन्दनः ।
लोपामुद्रापानिष्ठावा तस्य तातिष्ठितमामतः ॥ १ ॥

इत्यरथः,

एवमुक्त्वा मुनिभेषे गते तत्स्मिन्नाथागमकः ।

इत्यन्तेनाभिधाय अनन्तराध्याये,

अथ रामगीरी रामः पुण्ये मोक्षावरीत
शिवासिंह प्रतिष्ठानं कृत्या दीक्षां यथाविधः ॥ १ ॥

भूमिभूतितसयो रुद्रालामरणीयः ।
अभिषेकं जते: पुण्यगौतमी सिन्धुसम्भवः ॥ २ ॥

अर्भिष्टव् वञ्ज्युषेः: तदद्वन्दव्यफलेऽपि ।
भस्मच्छत्रो भस्मशायी व्याधिर्मांसने स्थितः ॥ ३ ॥

नाम्ना सहसं प्रजापक्षकापिवभमन्यथः।

इत्याविना इशाराधितपः प्रभावपुपच्छिः समन्तरस्य दुःखरतपः प्रभावावृ साशालकः
तेन परमर्ज्येन पादुपताविविधायश्याकारिः दत्तवा तत्वोपदेशः कृत: इत्यभिहितमु।
तत्थथ शिववाचवसंवादे मोक्षायामकारणकार्यथा भक्तिमार्गः
श्रीनानन्तरः ।

भक्तियोगो मया तोचे एवं कुषु रघुचन।
सवेकामपदानु मन: किम्यन्च्छ्योतुभिष्ठेसि ॥ १ ॥

इति परमर्ज्येवनाभिहिते ।

भगवन्मोक्षमामेऽव: लया सम्मुद्वाहृतः।
तत्ताभिकारिण श्रृङ्ख तत्र भे संशयो महानः ॥ १ ॥

इति रामनाथे,
(६७)

वस्त्रक्षणियविद्वा-द्राक्षेयः चात्राधिकारिणः।
वस्त्रचारी गृहस्थे वानुपवनीतोत्थवा द्विजः। \ ॥ \ ॥
वरस्यो वाजवनस्यो वा यतः पाशुपतवर्ती।
बहुनात् किमुक्तेन यस्य भक्तः शिवार्थि। \ ॥ \ ॥
स एवाधिकारिः स्पाचान्यचितः कथंच। \ इति अधिकारिणो\
विगणयो अनन्तरः।

जडाद्व्यो वधिरो मूको निशाचः कर्मवर्तिनः।
अतोपाहासोसकरः भूतिरुद्राभारः \ ॥ \ ॥
लिङ्गिनो यथा वा द्विते ते नैवाधिकारिणः।

इत्यवर्गाधिकारिनिरूपः लिङ्गांगमिनुक्तकां भौकानाधिकारित्वप्रदर्शनालोकः
धाराणविद्य। \ लिङ्गांमिनुक्तानां अनुपकारित्वप्रदर्शनं लिङ्गघारणवतां
नवासकावितानां भौकानाधिकारित्वमर्थानि-त्रिमित्यज्ञवन्नत्यम।

अर्थः \ "महाजनो येन गतः स पन्थःः" \ इति न्यायेन कश्यपाधिभिरद्वाजादिः-
महर्षिः संजन हिरण्यगम्भीररायणादि-विवक्षामपेन तक्ष्यीसरस्वतीप्रभुमहाशाक्षी-
भिमर्जै:च्छायात्मकायिन्तिर्विवमागारपस्याचारितलेखः तस्य वैदिकजन्य-परीक्षाः
व्यासकामेनापि स्वीकारणियम्। तथाहि \ हेमिः।

कश्यपाधिभिरद्वाजगौतमाया महर्षयः।
भारसन्ति सदा लिङ्गमुक्तमांगे विरेष्टतः \ ॥ \ ॥
नारायणोपि भमवानू देवा बहादुर्योगनयः।
भारण्युपतमांगं रिवान्नितमन्यमयः \ ॥ \ ॥
तक्ष्यीसरस्वतीतिमुखः \ मन्यलोण्डेवैशोऽके।
भार्यन्यमादिन तिमं दिनुक्तिन्नत्यम् \ ॥ \ ॥

इति \ स्कान्दे शंकरसंहितायामः।
(६८)

उरस्थलेह हरिहिंग धृत्वा मूर्तिन दितामहः।
हिंगस्थं मां समाराभ्य स्वं स्वं पद्मवापतु:। ॥ १ ॥
माहिमं महत्कार्यं धृत्वा शक्रपुरोपमा:।
देवताम मां हिंगमचयस्तं पूज्यं स्वं स्वं पद्मयं चुः। ॥ २ ॥
लक्ष्मीसरस्वतीमुख्यादेवि महिमामद्वादृत।
धृत्वा निःजः तद्वीनभावार्जमुः परं सुखमु। ॥ २ ॥

इति। सिद्धान्तसिद्धामणी।

अस्मावभिधवः देवा भुजयो गोतमाद्रयः।
धार्यवेदि सदा हिंगं उत्तरमंग विशेषत:। ॥ १ ॥
लक्ष्मीदिशाकारः सर्वं: शिवभक्तिभविभिविता:।
भारतन्त्र्यकृतिकारः शिवालिगमहानिशाम ॥ २ ॥

इति। अत्र च उत्तरमं गते वायुपीतविवचनानाममितिहिंगारणस्थानविशेषे
प्रदद्दोत्पूर्वे देवर्षिणीं हिंगारण स्थापने। वहिन्नेति।

रैदूं सम्भवत् हि हिंगमाद्री शिलामयं चारु हरिः स्मरक्या।
सुदृढङ्ग वैष्णवमाध्यमन्यप्रमार्बत्वानेष परं पद्मं तत्तु ॥ १ ॥

आदिविज्ञापणः।

बहसा पूजयते नित्यं हिंगं शालमयं शुभमु।
तस्य सम्पूजनादेव प्रातं बहसात्मकुमू। ॥ १ ॥
शकुड्ये देववराजेन्द्रेऽ हिंगं माणिनमयं शुभमु।
भक्त्या पूजयते नित्यं तेन शालमास्तवानु। ॥ २ ॥
इन्द्रनीलमयं हिंगं विषुः पूजयते सदा।
विषुमधु प्रातवास्तवेन स्वकुमां च सनातनम्। ॥ २ ॥
सोमो मुकामयं हिंगं चन्द्रो हेमामालिगः।
बालुः पिचजः हिंगं चन्द्रः कान्सयलिगक। ॥ ४ ॥
(६९)
अभिनव महात्मैव स्फारिंक सिंगमादृरात्
विवाकरस्ताद्यमः पनमगास्तु प्रवालकमः ॥ ६ ॥
असुरा: कार्यं लिंगं पिशाचाहङ्गजं तथा ।
एवं देवः सम्प्रभवः समप्लोगराखसः ॥ ६ ॥
पूजयन्ति सदा लिंगं ईशानं सुरत्नायकम् ।

इति । परशारपुराणे ।

रौद्रं लिंगं महाविष्णुपर्कर्ता शुद्धं शिलामयम् ।
चारुकिंत्र समभव्यं तन्धवानुचारिं पदम् ।

भारते द्वौणिौणि ।

वैदेववस्त्रविन्यासाम अजय्यो विषुर्वय्यः ।
सर्वस्यं भवं ज्योत्स्व लिंगेष्यं तं प्रभुम् ॥ ६ ॥
ताशिम्भग्यविंध्यं प्रीति करोति वुष्कभवः ।

इति कृष्णपुराणे ।

महाभ: सुषिक्कुर्वं विष्णुर्दोषर्वमईनम् ।
स्वर्गाधिपतिमन्दस्य शिवर्गास्य पूजनात् ॥ ६ ॥ इति ।

नन्वत्व भारतज्ञैऽवतरतिः सुरारोकादिवकायानं: सर्वदेवानां अनुवेषां च तत्त्वतलो-देशो नीताद्वेष शिवर्गास्य बुद्धविषुर्वमालमधितिमिति कथं शरीरगुण्डुलिखजापरं तद्वनानामामिति चेन्सैवम् । स्त्रांसन्यासाधिवृद्धः वाह्यक्ष्यभिमि भृगुव्यर्तादिपूजानम्बोधनमघनविध्यास्य शिवादिबिंदुमि मस्तककन्धरादिविधारणस्तायग्नवर्षुअर्तौ लिंघवारणविधानेश्वरं लिंघ-भारिणं कर्पणं पूजाया: साधितवें सं भारतादिवकायानं तद्वर्गावनं यथा गुणावनं शिवर्गास्य हस्तायोकिरकणापुजाविधायकते सिम्भे नारायणा-द्वारकीयं लिङ्गधारणसिद्धेवरेप्राप्तितत्त्वादिति । क्रिया ।
हेंचरे तमहे वन्देमुः दयामः अहँनिमाम्
भजने सह भार्यामिरिन्दजेशा मरुदः

इति। बहुमुखपरिमुः विद्वशसचित्वाचनेयापार्थकार्यानां हिंगार्यां साहसदेव सिद्धं भवति। तत्र "यज्ञे विद्वशसचित्वाचरणां साहसदेव सिद्धं भवति। तत्र। यज्ञे विद्वशसचित्वाचरणां साहसदेव सिद्धं भवति। तत्र। यज्ञे विद्वशसचित्वाचरणां साहसदेव सिद्धं भवति। तत्र। यज्ञे विद्वशसचित्वाचरणां साहसदेव सिद्धं भवति।

यज्ञाफः कालवास्तूः विनाभावतां वाचनायनिश्चारायुत्त्व च यज्ञाकर्यात्र त्वतिकालिकायाविश्वासम्बन्धेन प्रविष्टित तत्सिद्धः। तां यज्ञाकर्यात्र त्वतिकालिकायाविश्वासम्बन्धेन प्रविष्टित तत्सिद्धः। तां यज्ञाकर्यात्र त्वतिकालिकायाविश्वासम्बन्धेन प्रविष्टित तत्सिद्धः। तां यज्ञाकर्यात्र त्वतिकालिकायाविश्वासम्बन्धेन प्रविष्टित तत्सिद्धः। तां यज्ञाकर्यात्र त्वतिकालिकायाविश्वासम्बन्धेन प्रविष्टित तत्सिद्धः।

आगमवधायनाति त यावज्जीविनिपविकार्याविवाहकार्यानिहितसंतोषाः कालाध्येव अन्यायनेषु कामिकादिवानुवंतांगमेयोत्तनामन्त्रयेव विस्तरभावायेव हिमश्वतः।

१२ आगमामाण्यप्रतिपादनम्।

नन्वामनामाण्यप्रतिपादनं तद्वचनितिलिङ्गारायादेः प्रामाण्यविधि चेतः। आगमामाण्यं वदन्वादी प्रत्ययः। किमशेषामामाण्यप्रतिपादनादिपुत्र
“वातुताता: कामिकाया: शिशुस्यका: शिवशामा: " हन्तनेन परम- 
शिवप्रणीतवेन प्रसिद्धानामदाह्रीविश्वानीमार्याय रैवामामामार्याय आहे-
चिष्टारपणवतारविशेषनुस्त्रादित्रित्रितीत्रियहितसाय अर्थसाधनतत्त्वतिपादः 
बेदविरुद्धाणेन्वैद्वयागमामामार्याय वा। नाथः।

“न गायत्र्या: परं पत्रं; " "अंबोरारागारो मन्नो नाशित्व नन्वे 
मुरो: परं” इत्यादिना च वेदमातृगायत्वादिसहारमन्नानित्यानुपासनेरणदर्व- 
शोष्राश्रतानवश्यकते।

जननै जीवनं पञ्चातू पावनं बोधनं तथा।
अथाभिषेको विमलीकरणपत्यायसम् ततः।। 1।
तथाच दूरन्ते गृह्यरूपेण मन्न्यं विधिकाया।
नमं स्वाहा वप्पदुः वीषाक्ष्रेण वृद्धाविकम्।। 2।

इतः ते मन्त्रपन्नम्।

मन्त्राणं पञ्चकः पावः प्रवर्णः शिर उन्यते।
शिरः पञ्चवस्तुनको मन्न्योऽभिविक्ष्यमन।। 1।
अवजु मृदि मुखेष्चद्वः देवतां हृदि विन्यंते।
आधारे बीजशाक्षी च पावयोः कैलकं न्येशत्।। 2।
मुकः सुमो मृतो नन्दो वीर्यहिनो कुष्ठातः।
भुजंगः कैलितः शून्य इत्यस्मन्त्रा वृद्धापता।। 2।
न्यासं विना कवेयूरकुमुः स्मः यस्यास्सं विना।
पञ्चवेन विना मन्नो नमस्त परसिद्धितः।। 4।
शिशिरोहिनी मृतः मोकः वृथा मन्नो गुणं विना।
ञ्जिविवत्चं न्योऽभिविधितस्तु भुज्ञकः।। 5।
मृतो वुष्टाय दृश्यो निवीयश्राधिकारः।
अन्तरं नैकृतिजेन स्याषः कैलितुष्यते।
यस्य जम्यं भृगोत्न्यं स मृतः शून्यं उच्यते।। 6।
(५२)

इत्यादि जननिजीवनाधिकारिनः स्वाहाकुरादिप्रज्ञास्वात्मकः
सारस्वतादिप्रज्ञास्वात्मकः शायानविशेषतास्वात्मकः
नारायणायां मुक्तविद्वानमन्ने
द्वितिरस्वात्मकान्ताणिंद्राधिकारिनाणि
तदाग्रामतिवनामामायामाये
गायत्रीदिवसस्त्रिकन्नानिवन्त्यानुकुलान्त्यां ग्रन्थाद्वितीयायः

शिवसंस्कारिणां चैव स्नानरथवतां सताम।
अन्तःविशारदिमोक्षे चैवापितस्मृतां।
कामिकः योगज्ञ चिन्त्य कारण व्यजिते तथा।
वैपद्य सूक्ष्म तहसं च अंगुलमत्सः मेंदकुम।
विजयः बैव निष्पास्तम स्वायत्वमध्यसतं।
वीरं च रौरवं चैव भुकुटं बिलाते तथा।
सन्त्राण च विभं्ः च पोद्दीं ललितं तथा।
सत्तूः संतानशारिरं प्रारम्भरमेवच।
वातुः किरणम चैवेश्वरिव विशारदितिरहितः।
हंगामे नेतृयेषु नेतृताबोधनिष्ठतु च।
भृणाण शाब्रल्प्तः गोको मुनैमहिः स्वरो महान।

इति। वीरागमोकरीत्या मुक्तिसायत्वेन प्रसिद्धौवामामामायामाये

शिवे श्रीवाचे श्रीवे धर्मं शिवपतिः।
जहांमेण प्राणिद्रगङ्गे शिवाविकरं न सुहः।
शिवस्थानेऽसु नावेः सारास्यान्विकारुः।
विपरीता भवेदु वुत्तिकरुः स्वात स वाहिनरः।
शिवनिर्दार्यस्मृतिः शिवशाख्यविनिवकः।
तस्य नो निष्काशीतिर्र्वा कापि शाश्वेषिपि केन च।

1 A adds तद्विशिष्ठवतम् सर्वः कृत्यादिग्रहितं।
2 A युक्तेऽ
(५३)

इति। स्कान्तारीविधमेंचरावितचनेमेंरणान्तप्रायोजनसूचककन्कृत्यभावादि-
प्रत्याविधवानिविरोधामें। नामामाणिकुशार्यनिवायां दूषोद्घाटनं
युक्त। किंच। स्थायरालंकारणात्मकमन्त्राकाळकर्त्त्वद्वादशसंस्कार-
विधायक।

कुण्डमण्डपानिमाणं तच्चं संस्कारसेवं च।
वास्तुपुजा च हवनं पालिकासु प्रतिष्ठितम्॥ ॥

इत्यादिनाम्। अथ: पद्मकाभास्यपदार्थार्कततस्थानाविशेषं भूततत्वकला-
मंत्रपदप्रविधवायसाधारणायकाचनानां। स्थायरे कर्षणादिप्रतिष्ठानं प्रतिष्ठा-
युत्तरां च कर्षणयुक्तकर्षणप्रतिष्ठानां कार्यकार्यायकार्यायग्राममंत्कर्त्त्वे
नूराणादात्तकेव च तद्राश्यायनेन याधिः पालकस्वाभावेन सकलवैदिकजनाव
शङ्करालंकारणऽप्रतिष्ठादिसिद्धे। अथ च श्रीनीलकृष्णावाचार्यार्चनकृत-
भाष्यशास्त्रवाचार्यनमोक्षमूः प्रसादवस्येतद्विधेन पर-
मशिवं विशिष्य क्षणि नार्त्यानानिहनुष्के:

सर्वज्ञता तृप्तिनारादि ब्राहः
स्वरुपता नित्यमलुन्तताच।
अन्तराशाखेन विशोरिन्धिजा:
षड्युरागानि महेश्वरस्य। ॥ ॥
झानं विरागौत्स्वर्य तपः शक्ति: क्षमा धृतिः।
समात्मतसमोहो हाथिताहुरस्मेव च। ॥ ॥
अन्तियानि दृशातानि नित्यं तिलन्ति शक्ते। ॥

इति श्रीधामयाचनेंगाववानिरुपणं शंकराचार्यकृतप्रसारार्धिणं यथेको
पद्मारुपस्मृतेनात्मानुपरण्योग्यायुर्योग्यान्तरणदिनिरुपणस्याश्चाचने-
नैवेद्य तत्त्वोपथ्ये। न हि भाष्यकौर्याणिकविचरणानुपुरानानि
यन्त्ये। एवं व्यासमन्वादिशानिरुमणीस्मृतितिहासपुराणादीनामिि। “त्रै
(७४)

देवेषु ब्राह्मणोपद्यन्ते मनुष्केषु ब्राह्मणः। विश्वाभिषको श्रवणस्त्रितः। " इति ज्ञानस्थलेन " निर्देहणिनिरस्त्रज्ञानम्। तं नित्यवित्त तथा सतिद्वाराश्रयं शम्पारमाण्यपारापतिवायीवावेदः। न च चरमः। धर्मः। विश्वाभिषकुमारः। वेषभारणसमस्तेश्वरस्मिकाश्रयं रामायानवतीर सवायामभवनाविद्विजनि-तन्त्रायामोपस्य स्वतोपि स्वादुवतारणियेवदरिकुद्वाग्मानं अग्रामणं विडितपि। ननु वृहदभागः।

एवं संचौदितो श्रवणश्रुतिमात्रेषु मुमारिणा।
चक्रार्थो मोहशास्त्राणि कैशावपि शिवेचितः। \| १ \|
कारां लक्षुलां शाकं भैरवं पूर्वस्थिरम्।
पाषां कामणं पातिप्रति तथान्त्यानि सहस्व। \| २ \|

इति शिवकेशस्वरूपायोपरि मोहशास्त्रकर्तुत्थमारप्रतिपादने तथान्त्यानि सहस्व इति अन्त्यक्षुद्वे शास्त्रावगमानमाति। ग्रहणाते तपस्यामाण्यमेवेवति। चेतः। तत्रवः।

निर्मितं हि मथा पूर्वं तत्त्वं पाठमहं शुभम्।
गुहाशिष्यारं मुर्मं बेदसारं विशुच्यये। \| १ \|
पं पाथरपत्तारः सेवनीयो मुमुमलमः।

इति भूतत् शुद्धाश्मारणेः कुपाृतत्राम्राश्रयं त्रिृत्वं त्रपतिपादत्

अन्यानि शास्त्राशास्त्राणि कैशिस्मिभोहनानि। नेत्री।
बेदवादविकुद्वागि। सप्तेश कथितानि। \| १ \|

इत्यूक्तः।—नार्म पाप्पम जैसं लक्षुलं चेव भैरवम्।
न सेव्येतीतकाशितं बेदवाहं तथेतत्र। \| १ \|

\| A adda सिद्धाम् \|
प्राचीन शास्त्राणि दृढ़तर्मः युगेनांस्म्यनिविधानि तृतीयोऽस्मि। कापलो वाचपूर्वक: च कामले यामध्यः। एवं विधानि शास्त्राणि मोहनार्थानि ताति तृतीयोऽस्मि। कमलो वाचपूर्वकः।

इति शृद्धृतस्मृतिविरूपणप्राचार्यस्वीकारादृति। किरानवेशारिपमेवम्बर-पिताखरतन्त्रङ्गद्रवतारणीतितितंक्षुक्खाणपाठाभावामायांनवाद्यसदन भ्रणादृति। नन्दि ताहि शेषायमांनि शृद्धृतस्मृतिसारामां रज्जस्वारूपायाददेश चेतुव्यथे। द्वीर्वेकसवर्धिः। स्थायित्वादियाथनेकशृद्धृतस्मृतिविहितलिंगमारणविद्यायायकल्वें गौतममन्वायं-चारिवर्षायवरिगमितविद्यायायकल्वें कालाकृत्रुद्वरोपिनिदुद्रादिसिद्धृतिभू-तिरुड़कः तिरुवाणविद्यायायकल्वें ततवसीत्यायनेकशृद्धृतिरोपितशीवाओऽवमात्रसुप-लिंगमास्त्रण्योक्तकल्वें छान्दोग्यदृशुसरणकारिकाशृद्धृतविहितलानकार्यकालं। ऐवंलिङ्गमारणस्य शृद्धृतस्मृतिविरुपणेऽतिहासायमग्रामायायकल्वें वैदिकतावृत्ति। वैदिकजनक्रियाकल्वें निप्त्यूपयोग्येन्ति सर्वमनवयम। इति

श्रीमद्वैद्वेदं तुराणगममतिः ससा भृत्यमद्विशयाद्विन्दुमयत्स्मद्धमनव-चार्यं-पाञ्चाचर्ममहागजं-पाञ्चारयं-तेंद्रवंदचाकरणं—हेनुमकमुकुमदनरो-द्वंचानन—श्रीमद्वैद्वेद्विमारितायां लिंगमारणविद्यायं। प्रथमो भागः।

A reads the following between सर्वमनवयमं and इति।

१ T ends at अनेकार्थानवाचेति। २ B reads the colophon as इति।
तास्तु उक्तविशा आगमान्यां प्रामाण्यं। तथापि तत्त्वतिपायां हिंदौधारणस्य
tांत्रिकत्वेन ‘‘अग्राहास्तांत्रिकाचारः’’ इत्यक्तत्वेन कथं ग्रहात्वमित
चेच। क्रिमागमप्रतिपात्तेन हिंदौधारणस्य तांत्रिकत्वमाहोस्वितुं श्रुतिस्मृत्य-
प्रतिपात्तेव सति आगमप्रतिपात्तेन वा। नाथं। नित्येन्मित्तिकादि-
सकलकर्मणं गायत्र्यादिनितिरिथमधुत्तानुदानविधिनामरोपणतानं
आगमप्रतिपात्तेन सर्वं दामिभि तांत्रिकल्पायते। द्वितीये तु हिंदौधारणस्तानेकं
श्रुतिस्मृति-विहितस्थय पूवमेव साधितलेन विशेषणासिद्धे। तत्ति ‘‘अग्राहास्तांत्रिका-
चारः’’ इति निशेषस्य निपिष्यत्वत्वसंगं। इति चेच।

वामपशुपताचाराः पंचरात्राध्या। परे।
श्रुतिस्मृतिविरुद्धवात्र सेव्याते मुमकृम्भ।!!

इत्यादि कृष्णपुराणवचनावगमातू वेदविरुद्धवामपशुपतनामश्रावश्चावरांचारा-
श्रायाचारानामेव निशेषविषयत्वादिति।
TRANSLATION OF THE TEXT.

Verse 1. We address our salutations to Lord शिव, the (primeval) form of preceptor, the consort (lit. the bearer) of the daughter of the mountain (हिमालय), शिव, who is seated as परमात्मार in the plexuses (circles) basic and others, who comes to be expressed (i.e. assumes the forms of) आचारिण्य and others, through the exuberance of grace as the eternal preceptor full of joy, and who again appears in the forms of six-fold Lingas as आचारिण्य etc.

Verse 2. I always worship in the small lotus (of my heart) the lotus feet of शरस (an incarnation of वीरसद), which are a solar disc (in dissipating; the darkness (in the form) of obstacles.

Verse 3. I bow down my head to the feet of my preceptor, महेश्वर, who possessed the wealth of pure learning, being a thorough-going student of (well versed in) all शाखा's, treating of प्रकाश (the Highest Principle) and the holy rites, who was (as competent as) पपुश, (the six-faced son of शिव), in explaining the principles of पद्मस्थल (the six localities and Steps) or the six-fold forms of अंग and लिंग of the Highest Principle, शिव, who was a grand lion in tearing off the temples of haughty elephants in the form of learned men, and who was the sun (in removing) the darkness of evils.

Verse 4. Some persons thinking themselves to be learned do not accept the principle of wearing लिंग, (on the body) out of jealousy (lit. heartburn or intolerance), because they have not studied well (the meaning of) the Vedas and Shastras.
Verse 5. Thou (पार्वती) that hast exercised thy free choice in selecting thy consort, please grant me a boon (viz. the capacity of establishing the truth) that I may, at thy behest, write the treatise "लिङ्गधारणविद्वका" in order to refute those (that disbelieve in the wearing of लिङ्ग).

Verily they say that the wearing of लिङ्ग (on the body) is not to be accepted by the followers of Vedas on account of its being non-Vedic (not enjoined or sanctioned by the Vedas). The rule is that a thing is Vedic when it is supported by the Vedas or the concluding portions thereof. But there is nothing either in the Vedas or the Upanishads in support of wearing Linga. Nor can it be said that it is supported by the स्थलति that are based upon the Vedas; for there are no passages in मनुस्मृति and others in support of this wearing.

If it is said that (in the absence of express Vedic passages in support of this principle) passages may be assumed, just as a Vedic passage is assumed in support of मंगलाचरण (the practice of beginning a work with words of prayer or invocation); this is a mere hope (doomed to be a mirage), because the wearing of Linga is not practised by all great men; as मंगलाचरण is done; and a thing practised only by a section (of the distinguished public) is not entitled to such an assumption. Hence, how can this Linga-wearing, falling outside the sphere of Vedic authority, be acceptable to the followers of the Vedas?

The reply to this standpoint is that it is wrong. For the established doctrines say that "the wearing of Linga by Veershaivas is certainly laid down in Vedas, Shastras, Puranas and Agamas like कामिक and others."
The explanation of this is:—"Vedas" means यजुर्वेद and others. The word "बेद" indicates (the inclusion of; महाभारत, because it is proverbially admitted that "भारत is the fifth Veda." By शास्त्रas are meant स्मृतिः, and पुराणas, such as बायुपुराण, तिंगुपुराण and so forth. Agamas are कामिकागम and others.

I

In (an Upanishad of) यजुर्वेद in its नैतिरिय branch, the search of inner Linga i.e. the wearing of inner Linga is laid down, the inner Linga viz. ज्योतिलिङ्ग. There in the passage "There is the lotus of heart, small and taintless, the abode of the Highest Principle in the centre of the body; in that small heart-lotus there is the Highest Principle, minute, formless like आकाश and griefless. That inner resident of the lotus should be worshipped." Hence some principle, without any name being given to it or any form described of it, is laid down as the object of worship. When there arises the expectancy as to what that object of worship is, it is known that शिव is laid down as the object of worship from "He is महेश्वर, that comes first as the sound श्रव in the beginning (of the study of) Vedas and is established in the Upanishads (like मांसुक्ष्य and others) as the Highest Principle in enjoyment of Nature." And महेश्वर is शिव, because शिव and महेश्वर are conventionally accepted as synonyms and hence they are placed in proximity in the sentence "शिव: श्रवि महेश्वर: etc." in the lexicon. एक

The worship, again, must have (for its object) something having attributes. And when there (naturally) arises the expectancy as to what that object with attributes is, that is (definitely) known to be the principle शिव: for the special attributes stated to be possessed by the Great Lord शिव are mentioned in the hymn "The real, the trit c. the highest ब्रह्म etc."
It may be objected that in the very Upanishad, in the section beginning with "Him of thousand heads" etc. नारायण with attributes like "thousand heads" and others is mentioned. Why then, should he not be taken as the object of worship, as enjoined by देह etc.? This objection is not tenable; for दिव is spoken of in कृद्योपायनिषत् as follows:— "There is the lotus of heart; within that heart there is the Highest Principle free from taint (of passion) and changeless. (One becomes at one with that) on meditating on Him, दिव, (as being) pure, griefless, inconceivable, unmanifest, of countless forms, beginningless, conditionless, endless, all-pervading, self-conscious and joyous, formless, wonderful, united with उम as his helpmate, and tranquil." So also one would conclude that शिव and none else is referred to when one studies in अयन्त निर्देशपतिषत् the words in the beginning, in the middle, and in the end as the following:— "Him minute like the tip of a hair, seated in the heart appearing in the form of all deities, the source of Vedas and the greatest." In a hymn of कृद्योपायनिषत् as well, namely, "the Being of the size of the thumb, blazing forth like smokeless fire, Lord of all creatures, past, present and future." (Here "Lord" means दिव only) according to the logical principle established in the topic of पूर्वमीमांसा viz "झाणो वा मंत्रवणोत्" (that there should be unanimity between the hymns and the injunctions; and from this it was deduced) that the animal meant a goat. On account of these sentences of identical meaning it means "that, viz. शिव, unlimited like आकाश, the inner resident of the abode of ब्रह्म, namely, the small lotus, is to be sought after. Or as per words of झांझोपायनिषत् one should desire to know it." Here शिव, (as determined by the foregoing) is stated to be the object of worship as enjoined by देहरोपासना. Hence if
any other deity were taken as the object of worship, there would arise the sense of uncertainty about the object (of worship and on that account nobody would go in for worship.)

When worship is enjoined, all the three, namely, worship, the object of worship, and the worshipper are to be stated (necessarily). Naturally when there arises the expectancy as to what that worshipper is, it is determined to be नारायण and शिव is the object of worship (seated) in the heart of नारायण. For it is said (in नारायणोपनिषत्) "Him, नारायण, very much to be known": and later small lotus is stated in words “shining in the lotus bud.” It is evident from this that it would be unreasonable to look out for somebody as worshipper other than नारायण mentioned immediately, in conformity with the principle established in topic of पूर्वमांसा. namely, "अपितुमित शिवस्य" (on account of the negation contained in अपितुमित the numbers mentioned in the context are negativèd etc). नारायण therefore, becomes the counterpart (as worshipper) of that seated in बहुरुपरक. Moreover, it is improper to think that नारायण is the object of worship for himself seated in his own heart.

Nor can the objection be raised that ascetics are the counterpart of worship on the ground of their description as "conversant with the knowledge of Vedant etc."; because नारायण should be taken as being positively connected with the “heart”, mentioned in the section treating of नारायण, analogously with प्रयाज (a sacrificial rite) being subsidiary to दशीपूर्णामास (sacrifices performed on new moon and full moon days); because प्रयाज is laid down in “समिोप जयति” (the sacrificer offers sacred sticks to the sacred fire) occurring in the section treating of दशीपूर्णामास. Besides, it is said in बामनदुरण "Then हरी
of imperishable Self, the enemy of (demon) शिव, exhibited to the Gods the Linga (seated in his heart).” This shows that नारायण is the worshipper of शिव, as seated in his (नारायण) heart. In महाभारत also Lord कुण्ड देव states the Being to be attained by him in words “I attain that primitive Being, from whom proceeded the primeval creation.” And further on, when asked what that primitive Being was, he says “Different is the primitive Being termed परमात्मन, who, eternal Lord, supports the three worlds by pervading them. Oh अनुज, that Lord resides in the hearts of all.” From this it is conclusive that शिव alone seated in the heart of कुण्ड is the object of his (कुण्ड) worship; because शिव means शिव invariably, as शिव and शिव are mentioned (in lexicons) proximately (as synonyms). This leads inevitably to the acceptance that only नारायण is meant to be the worshipper of शिव located in his heart per injunction contained in द्वर etc.

It would be wrong to say that, though शिव the Highest Lord, is proved to be the object of worship by the arguments marshalled heretofore, the principle of wearing inner Linga is not established, as the resident of the heart is not (yet) proved to be of the form of Linga. For the form of the resident can be proved to be Linga by (excerpts) from इंसेप्पिच्चु, आगमास and वास्तवपुराण which last has been already quoted. For instance इंसेप्प निष्ठु says “This is the Highest soul bright like million suns, by whom this (universe) is pervaded. The state of His existence is eightfold; in eastern petal (of the heart-lotus) it is pious; in the south-eastern it is sleepy, lazy and the like; in the southern it tends to cruelty; in the south-western it is desire for sin; in the western it is sportive; in the north-western it is inclined to move; in the northern it is love for pleasure; in the south-
eastern it is (inclined to) the acquisition of wealth; in the centre it is freedom from worldly passion; in the filaments it is wakefulness; in the cup dream; in (the form of) Linga it is dreamless sleep; beyond the lotus it is the fourth state (the supreme state); when the soul enters sound he passes even the fourth state.” The description as dreamless state (of शिव) in Linga (form) makes it evident that Linga is a form of शिव, the resident of the lotus-heart. The (following) words from आगम (are to be noted in support of this). Says सिद्धांतशिखातां त “A devote (lit. an ascetic) should know लिङ्ग to be (yellow) like gold in the basis, to be (reddish) like coral in the heart, and (white) like crystal in the middle of the brows”. There should arise no doubt that this conclusion that शिव is the object of worship and नारायण is the worshipper would militate against what is said in that very Upanishad in the section beginning with सहख्त रीवी, namely, “नारायण is the Highest Being; He is the highest Truth”; because this apparent conflict can be reconciled by the explanation that नारायण can be praised in such high terms from the fact that नारायण has attained identity with शिव on account of his wearing the inner bright Linga in his heart unlike others. Some, however, hold that नारायणपरं ब्रह्म means that the Supreme Being is superior (नारायणातूं परं ब्रह्म ) to नारायण. That is why the words “नारायणपरं ब्रह्म ” are used instead of “नारायण: परं ब्रह्म”. Hence they hold that superiority (to नारायण ) is of शिव only; and therefore, there can be no contradiction. This much is sufficient.(in connection with अन्तलिङ्गधारण ) to spare prolixity.

II

The Upanishad after laying down the wearing of inner Linga to be sought after, in the manner aforesaid
proceeds to lay down the wearing of external Linga शृङ्गालिंग in words "One should place Linga (on the body) (in one) of (its) various forms or the all-pervading Linga."

To this the following objection may be advanced:-
Here the verb is in the present tense. There can be no injunction, therefore, for want of imperative or the like (i.e. potential) (which alone enjoin). If it be said that injunction is implied here, even though there is no imperative or the like, just as implied injunction is accepted in sentences, "He sprinkles paddy grains" "He threshes them" though there is no imperative in these. It would be wrong to say so; because in the sentence under consideration there is nothing leading to implied injunction. For it is known from the couplet (of पुर्णमानसा) that an originative injunction is there when that is not at all obtained (elsewhere); a restrictive injunction takes place when an alternative is already obtained; and an exclusive injunction is there when alternatives are obtained there and elsewhere. The meaning is that an originative injunction is there when it is not at all obtained by any other means of proof; for instance "one sprinkles rice." A restrictive injunction is laid down when the action in reference is obtained alternatively; and it restricts, therefore, to one alternative only, as is done in the case of the sentence "one threshes rice." There or elsewhere, that is, when things are obtained simultaneously, exclusive injunction is laid down. For instance it is laid down that only five-nailed animals and no others, namely, the rabbit, the porcupine, the alligator, rhinoceros, and the tortoise are to be eaten, when there are other five-nailed animals (simultaneously with non-five-nailed animals) available for eating. (Applying the rule to the) matter under consideration (we find) that in
the case of the verb "He places" there is no originative injunction, as such an injunction to wear Linga on the body is obtained in *स्वाच्छिन्तापालिनः* in the sentence "स्वाच्छिन्तापालिनः etc." Hence 'there is the absence of complete non-obtainment elsewhere (as required). The sentence in extenso is:

स्वाच्छिन्तापालिनः। स्वभूत गुहाशयः।
स्वभूत्यापि च भगवानः। तस्मात्स्वाभिनः शिवः।

"The Divine Lord is borne in the mouths, on the heads, and on the necks of all (devotees). He lies in the cavity of all creatures, is all-pervading and hence found everywhere." The explanation of this is:—"of all" means "of all those that are fit to wear Linga"; "स्वाच्छिन्तापालिनः" "means" the mouths, or heads or necks are places on which he is worn "; being worn there शिव remains in the form of इक्षुचिं: "Lord lying in the cavity of all creatures" means "He lies in the lotus of heart" i.e. there he is seated as inner Linga, as spoken of in हंसेपूर्वप्रज्ञेन already quoted in words "the Lord has the state of dreamless sleep in Linga." "All pervading" means free from all limitations (in time, space, and visible form); and, therefore, found everywhere.

If it is urged against this that the qualifier "placed in the mouths, on the heads, or necks" is in grammatical equation "शिव" the qualified. And things in equation are, as a rule, non-different (identical). Hence it necessarily conflicts with the location (अधिकरण) which indicates difference, it is wrong. For revered नीकंदकंदाचार्य maintains that sense of location is conveyed even by (things in) grammatical equation, while commenting on "आमेरसप्तस-भ्यासात्" There, after anticipating the objection that the possessive affix (सय्य) expresses the superabundance of the thing possessed. Therefore, joy. (the thing possessed)
and भगवान् (the possessor) stand in the relation of the possessed and possessor. But as joy and भगवान् being in the same case express non-difference (of each other) consistently with Upanishadic sentences, "He came to know that joy was भगवान् “and” भगवान् is eternal and joy." how can there be the relation of the possessed and the possessor? (It would be incompatible, therefore, to assume the relation of the possessed and the possessor.) It was then concluded that भगवान् was the abode of joy and that in no way militated against the sentences expressing (only apparently difference), like "Joy is the form of भगवान्." The followers of आनन्दत्वाय, the exponents of dualism, explain the sentence "भगवान् is the knowledge" as "भगवान् is the abode of knowledge"; and hold that such interpretation is not incompatible with the sentence "He who is all-wise, all love, and possessor of knowledge." (That is, the sentences expressive of difference and non-difference are consistently interpretable). This way of expression (of apposition meaning अधिकरण) may be observed in ordinary parlance in sentences like "बहुक्पालोपयत्व घटः" (The jar is the abode of many potsherds). Nor can it be said that the interpretation of "स्वराजनिर्मिताय: " as an attributive compound (Linga that has mouths, heads or necks as his seats) and the limitation thereby of the existence of Linga to these only would go against the (Upanishadic) statement that Shiva is found everywhere. For (this apparent contradiction between the former and the latter sentences) can be explained away by saying that the Lord of really unlimited form (and therefore) all-pervading shows his existence as योतिलिङ्ग artificially limited to mouths, heads and necks (only) to favour his devotees, and to the heart-lotus as inner Linga in the subtle form of योतिलिङ्ग. It is on this account only that the conjunction "and" coming after the sentence "The all-pervading Lord,"
is significant as bringing it together with the limitedness of the form known from the previous sentence.

We may be asked:—Though all what you say is admitted, yet how can mouth be a seat (for placing Linga in it)? Because लिंग does not mention it in the sentence “A wise man should wear लिंग (हष्टलिंग) on his head, neck, belly, breast or palm.” It is also not included by शाकसर्साहित्य of स्कंदपुराण in the sentence “Always wear Linga dressed in a piece of cloth, on the head, neck, belly, breast, or palm.” (The reply to this is ) that this looks well owing to lack of real grasp of the meaning. Because it is known from the etymological explanation by व्यास, namely, “Linga is मंत्र because he protects when meditated on. मंत्र is of twofold nature: the signified and the signifier; as signifier it is the syllable ॐ and as the signified it is great शिव; it is for this reason that great seers hold the identity of the मंत्र (hymn) and the deity (praised by it.)” It is also known the Linga and the five-syllabled मंत्र are one and the same from the words of सिद्धांतसारावलि namely, “सम:” is the base; the letter “दि” is the centre; “वा” is cow’s head; “य” is the round-shaped top; ॐ is Linga; Linga is thus made of six syllables.” Hence Linga in the form of मंत्र can be placed in the mouth, and in the form of हष्टलिंग is placed on the head or the neck. In this way the seeming conflict can be removed. Here (in the case of different parts of the body) option is given (to the devotee) to wear Linga sometimes on the head and sometimes on the neck; because after all the object to be realized is the same, analogously to the preparation of cakes (when a sacrifice is performed per injunction contained in) “one performs a sacrifice by rice” “one performs a sacrifice by barley.”
Moreover the (अन्तर्ज्ञातिष्ठत) Upanishad first speaks of the Lord in words "प्रमाण the primordial matter, undergoes modifications (and, therefore, perishable); but हृ is immortal and undergoes no modifications. And then (lays down) the wearing of Linga in either form (internal and external) in the passage "By meditating on him, by associating (contact) with him, and by attaining at-one-meant with him." That (this is so) is definitely known from सिद्धांतशिखामणि (which merely reiterates what the Upanishad enjoins) in the following:—

The wearing of Linga in the both of its forms is laid down for those that like to attain all desired objects; (that) Linga, internal and external, is to be worn by those sages that are desirous of final beatitude. That is internal Linga in the form of ज्ञेतिलिंग when, it is always sought after in the basis in the cavity of the heart, or in the middle of the two eyebrows. But whether one is able or not to wear internal Linga, one should positively wear external Linga, the (symbolic) representative of the former. "By meditating on him" means "by internally worshipping Him in the form of ज्ञेतिलिंग." "By associating with Him" means "by putting Him on the body as रक्षकिंग." When it is so said there arises the expectancy "where" (is the Linga to be worn)? The sentence "The Divine Lord is borne in the mouths, on the heads, or the necks of all (devotees)" comes in sequence to point out the places of wearing Linga. If the Upanishadic verse (given in extenso above), after pointing out the place of wearing Linga internally by words "lying in the cavity," were not to point out the place of wearing Linga externally, it would be contextually inconsistent glaringly. If the (above) explanation be not acceptable, the words "The Divine Lord is borne etc." would be meaningless (for want of an alternative explanation). Do they express identity of शिव with
mouth, head or neck? Or do they express His existence on these? In the first alternative शिव would be identical with mouth etc. in accordance with the (grammatical) principle that "all sentences are confined in their operation to the words they contain." This would contradict the (infallible statements of the) धर्म which tells us that धर्म (शिव) is identical with all. Nor is the second alternative is possible; because that would limit शिव to being seated in mouth etc. and would consequently go against शिव being found in all things as is known from "therefore शिव is everywhere." Hence our interpretation is the right one.

It may be said that our interpretation would be right if there were a word expressive of locality. But there is no word expressive of locality. This also is wrong; because this (absence of a word expressive of location) can be explained away by assuming the possessive affix (अच्छ). And the compound would then mean "mouth etc. are the seats of this (Linga)." And to avoid the (dilemma) of the sentence being meaningless we might well express place by secondary signification (indication) per principle "It is better to give secondary sense to a word than to make a sentence meaningless." This principle is established in पूर्वसौम्यa as follows:—(In the animal sacrifice it is laid down that) eleven limbs of the animal should be cut. He cuts them twice each." In this connection an objection was raised that the sentence "He cuts them twice each" was superfluous as "cutting twice" was already obtained by the injunction to perform the archetype (the सौम sacrifice, is an archetype while the animal sacrifice was a derivative) per rule that the rites of a derivative should be performed in the same way that the rites of the archetype were performed. In reply it was said "(It has been laid down in that very section that) though the
sacrificer cuts four times, fat should be cut five times.” In this sentence the word “fat”, being (a part of the body) like heart etc., was taken to mean in the secondary sense any part of the animal (used for) offering. (Naturally) “five times” was extended to heart etc. In disposing of “The five times”, there were already two rites “spreading of ghee” and “dropping of ghee”; and when two (of these five) times were used for these two rites (one each), the remaining three times would (naturally) go to the cutting (of the parts of the body). To avoid this contingency it has been (specifically) laid down “it should be cut twice.” The remaining fifth time should be additionally used either for “spreading” or “dropping” ghee. In this way (the objection was removed and) the significance of the sentence “He cuts twice” was established and everything was squared up. Such is our line of reasoning, (and thus our position sound).

Teachers of former times, on the other hand, have held that there is no originative injunction in “He places Linga in one of its various forms.” For the injunction is already obtained from “पाणिमंत्र पवित्र” (the holy Linga worshipped on hand), and is not unobtained (elsewhere.) The attribute “पाणिमंत्र पवित्र” explained later and otherwise inexplicable, establishes the worship (of Linga) on hand. The wearing of Linga having been thus obtained, non-obtainment elsewhere is lacking (in सर्विंग स्थाप्यति).

It might be said that, though there is no originative injunction in the sentence under consideration, there is a restrictive injunction similar to the one in the sentence. “A Brahmin should earn money by means of helping the performance of a sacrifice, teaching and receiving gifts (and in no other way). But this also is
doomed to be as chimerical as the wearing of a garland woven of sky-flowers. For it is learnt from शान्तस्वप्नति and others in connection with (the attainment of) 'final beatitude that "A person smearing his body with ashes, lying down in a bed of ashes, and meditating on शुद्ध becomes free from all sins (and thus attains beatitude)." And if the wearing of Linga were to alternate with the application of ashes (to the body) and wearing of beads, there would be a restrictive injunction for wearing Linga also and prohibiting the practice of others. But this is (quite) undesirable; because it is known from the following words of सिद्धांतशिष्याधारणि that all these are necessary (for attaining संक्षण). "The knowledge that one is encaged in the body; the thorough knowledge of the body; the nature of the worldly life fit to be abandoned; the initiatory ceremony; the wearing of Linga; the smearing of the body with ashes; the wearing of beads; the muttering of the five-lettered मंत्र; the life of devotion; the worship of the spiritual preceptor; Linga and an ascetic; (i.e. जंगल) and the acceptance (of food etc. from the मुख, लिंग and यति)." It might be urged (lastly) that there is an exclusive injunction, condemning the non-wearing of Linga and (thus) inculcating the wearing of Linga. But this also cannot be; because wearing and non-wearing being mutually antithetical cannot be an aggregate of similar things. Accordingly, there can be no injunction of exclusion.

To meet this (elaborate) objection, (we maintain) that there is an originative injunction in the sentence. ‘विर्गिनां स्थापयति.’ It is wrong to say against this that the injunction (to wear Linga) is already laid down by the sentence "स्वर्णनाशीरोप्रीवः etc." and, therefore there is the absence of non-obtainment elsewhere, for the simple reason that "स्वर्णनाशीरोप्रीवः" is dependant on ‘स्वर्ण-
"स्थापयति" as the latter lays down (expressly) the wearing of Linga, which is the counterpart of अधिकरण (the place of wearing), expressed by the former. Hence on account of the relation of the sustainer and the sustained between the two sentences, it is improper to say that the injunction is otherwise obtained. Nor can it be said that "स्त्र्याविस्मया नाघोजनान्" is not dependant on "सर्वङ्गरधिरोधितः", on account of the former expressing अधिकरण the counterpart of wearing, which in turn has been laid down by "तस्याभिषेकः नाघोजनान्" occurring in the same Upaneshad (in which "सर्वङ्गदिरोधितः" occurs and is, therefore, related to and dependant on "तस्याभिषेकः नाघोजनान्" etc.) For great is the difference (between the two sentences) ("सर्वङ्गरधिरोधितः" and "तस्याभिषेकः नाघोजनान्" etc.) The sentence "सर्वङ्गरधिरोधितः" is in an (enviable) position of vantage (lit. stronger than the other) for uncommonly containing the words "लिङ्ग" (the thing to be worn) and "स्थापयति" directly expressive of wearing; while the other (having no such words) takes time to express (wearing). If it is further objected that it has been decided (in पूर्व्मामास्तः) in the topic (discussing the unity of meaning) between vedic words and popular words i.e. words in currency, that the meaning of Vedic words is determined by the help of popular words, which derive their expressive power from grammar; and though the words "animals" etc. in the sentence "He should worship by (offering) an animal" are dependant on grammar for their expressive power, still they are taken as laying down (the performance). In the same way why should not "सर्वङ्गदिरोधितः" enjoin (even though dependant upon "सर्वङ्गरधिरोधितः")? This objection does not hold good, because grammar etc. are only useful in imparting expressive power to words (and there the matter ends). But the sentence under consideration though similar.
so far as dependance is concerned, is still unable to express injunction before the meaning of the sentence as a whole is grasped; while (in contrast) injunction is at once known from the sentence "स्वर्णन्दिः स्थापयति." Moreover it is definite that the sentence "स्वर्णन दिरोगीवः," is a missionary assertion as may be gathered from "The all-pervading Lord" (following "स्वर्णनन्दिरोगीवः") which purports to applaud Linga. Hence, there is no obtainment elsewhere (in स्वर्णनन्दिरोगीवः as supposed).

What is (also) said that there is no originative injunction in "स्वर्णिंगं स्थापयति" on account of the same being obtained by the attribute "पाणिमेत्रं पवित्रं" which is otherwise meaningless, is also not right. For the sentence "स्वर्णिंगं स्थापयति" lays down the wearing of Linga in general; but the attribute specifies the place where it is to be worn. The latter, therefore, is sustained by the former. Hence, there is the absence of the injunction being obtained elsewhere. (The meaning of पाणिमेत्र is:-"मंत्रः Supplement - a prayer to be uttered in accompaniment, becomes by the possessive affix "अर्थः" in the sense of a thing to be worn i.e. Linga. (Therefore) "पाणिमेत्र" is "पाणी मंत्र लिंगम," as is borne out by what is said in हिन्दुपुराण namely, "Therefore, the great Linga is to be worn by uttering the prayer "पाणिमेत्रं पवित्रं" (in accompaniment). The sentence "आहवनिये जुहसति" is an instance in point. A sacrifice called अभिहृष्ट is enjoined. But it is not stated where it should occur. And the sentence "आहवनिये जुहसति" states the place for the occurrence of आभिहृष्ट sacrifice. In the same way when Linga to be placed per injunction contained in "स्वर्णिंगं स्थापयति", it has got localities like altar etc. alternating with hand etc., and the latter is laid down (by पाणिमेत्र). If it is (again) objected that locality is expressed by the locative case in "आहवनिये जुहसति," but there is no such case in
"पाणिमृद्रे पवित्रं" (and therefore, अधिकरण is not expressed by it); it is wrong to say so; because locative case is understood here. The word "पवित्रं" expresses sacredness of Linga worn even at times (when one is) impure or polluted, as it does in the case of "यज्ञोपवीता the sacred thread, is so holy," by removing the idea of Linga ever being impure. It cannot be objected that the sentence lays down more things than one and therefore, will be open to the fault of making diverse statements (वास्तविकेत्); because it is to be understood that it lays down (a rite as qualified by other) rites, as is done in the Vedic sentence "The sacrifice to fire with cakes prepared in a pot of eightfold parts should be performed on a new moon day" in accordance with the rule of पूजामास्त्राः When only one rite is not laid down i.e. more rites are laid down, all are to be combined into one (as one rite qualified by the rest.)

Another objection:— Though all this is granted still the sentence "स्थायते ग्राहयति" enjoins installation of Linga on an altar (lit. ground and not the placing of it on the body), because the obvious meaning of the verb "स्थायति" and the custom of all people evidently point to it. The proper meaning of पाणिमृद्रे would then be Linga consecrated by hand i.e. by the ceremonial purificatory process of बड़क्य (six-fold roads) and, therefore sacred, should be installed (on an altar.)

Some say in refutation of this as follows:— It is true that the verb "स्थायति" expresses the placing of Linga as much on the ground as on the body; for the scripture cannot be restricted in the operation of its meaning. Nor is there anything to so restrict the meaning. But from the force of the word "पाणिमृद्रे" coming in sequence
it means the placing of Linga on the body, in accordance with the rule "whenever any doubt arises, it should be removed from what comes in sequence." (Moreover) It is well-known that the root "मन्" means "to worship" in पुराणा etc.; for instance 'मान्य' is "पुजनीय" (deserving of worship). Hence मंत्र is Linga (derivatively) मन्त्रानि पूजनानि बायने (that which protects when worshipped); and पाणिमंत्र is पाणि मंत्र (Linga on the hand). Such being the case by proof, the worship of Linga cannot be extended to the Linga placed on the altar; but it points to the worship of Linga placed on the body. Nor can it be said that the worship (of Linga) can be extended to (Linga on an) altar by taking the compound to be instrumental तत्तुरुप विशिष्ट: (that which protects when worshipped by hand). And thereby conflict with the established meaning (of मन्) will be removed. Because this interpretation goes against the grammatical rule "समथः पदविचः" (a rule relating to inflected words should be understood to apply to such as are connected in sense) "If it is further said that the compound is acceptable in spite of this syntactical expectance (of one word for another), on account of the connection of the word expected is plainly seen, it is wrong to say so, because in that case the word "पाणिना" becomes superfluous. Again it would not be right to say that mind and others become the means of worship when मंत्र is explained (derivatively) as "that which protects when worshipped", and, therefore, the word "hand" is used to exclude these (mind and others). For mind and others are also the means of worship (as learnt) from what is said "the worship of शिव should be performed by mind speech, and bodily actions." The instrumental तत्तुरुप therefore, confines (undesirably the means of) worship to one thing only viz. hand). This fault will not attach to
locative case; the hand (in the locative case) would go (with Lord शिव as protector) as an attribute.

The explanation of पाणिमंद्र as "that consecrated by hand" is also wrong; because "consecrating" would be the secondary or figurative sense in supersession of its primary sense, in which, as is well known, the पुराण use it. But the secondary or figurative sense is unacceptable as it will militate against (the principle established in the topic) ईश्वरेनाश्चायत्. In that topic the objector held that the secondary or the figurative sense accorded with sentences like "the fire saw", "the waters saw"; and in pursuance of such sentences the secondary sense being admissible, the agency of seeing could be attributed to प्रचार. In reply to this explanation of the objector it has been established that though in some cases words are seen used in secondary or figurative senses, it is improper to think that they are so used in all cases; and that the method of interpreting by having recourse to secondary or figurative sense is improper when primary or natural sense is possible. In conclusion the agency of seeing in its primary sense was attributed to प्रहानः.

( After stating the refutation by others of the second objection) we state ours as follows: (The whole passage) beginning with "निखनयतये नमः" (A bow to the Lord of wealth) and ending with "पतत सोमस्य सूर्यस्य" (This Linga residing in the disc of sun and united with उमा) all is a missionary statement (of the Lord शिव.) There (in the passage) are praised the ten forms of Linga as are described by सिद्धांतशंकर as follows:—"The all-pervading Linga was one; it became the great three-fold, oh, daughter of the mountain, namely. मायालिंग the ideal, प्राणलिंग the vital or mental and द्वारलिंग desire-yielding, the physical or gross. द्वारलिंग again, became two-
fold आचार्यलिंग and गुरुलिंग of (presiding over) the elements of earth and water respectively; so say the scholars of शिवागमस. Oh, you beautiful one, प्राणलिंग in turn became two-fold, शिवलिंग and चारलिंग, of light and air elements; (likewise आवलिंग became two-fold) प्रसादलिंग of ether element and महालिंग the great, of the principle of आत्मन.” अखेलिंग is addressed by “An obeisance to the Linga on High,” as that (High Linga) is seated on the only western petal of the uppermost plexus. प्राणलिंग is praised by “an obeisance to the golden Linga”; because that (प्राणलिंग) is determined to be golden by what is said in सिद्धांतसारारावलिंग, namely, “The wise know that प्राणलिंग is like burning gold, residing on the bulb and always to be meditated on by ascetics.” “An obeisance to (Linga of) brightness” is the praise of द्ध्यलिंग, as known from the following (description given by सिद्धांत-सारारावलिंग), namely, “नमः” is the basis; the letter “वि” is the middle part; ब्र is the cow’s head; य is the round ball at the top; ए is Linga. Thus Linga is made of six letters;” all this description of the form of Linga is certainly of द्ध्यलिंग full of brightness and of good form. “An obeisance to Linga of ether element” is the praise of प्रसादलिंग, which presides over ether, as there is no difference between them (द्ध्यलिंग and प्रसादलिंग) from the derivation of द्ध्य as दिवि (आकाशो) मध्ये (residing in ether). By “An obeisance to मातालिंग” is praised गुरुलिंग; because मातालिंग is in no-way different from गुरुलिंग presiding over watery element as known from “Old is the watery element, the material cause of firmness (in the form of the earth); therefore, old is मातालिंग the form of the Lord; and old is His power brought into activity.” “An obeisance to शब्दलिंग” is the praise of आचार्यलिंग. For the identity of आचार्यलिंग presiding over the element of earth, and शब्दलिंग is established by the description given
by सिद्धांतसारावलि as follows:—Beautiful is the earthly element, the source of all physical creation; from this element springs the beautiful creation. द्रव्य is the (sustainer) of the form of the earth. "An obeisance to शिवलिंग" is the praise of शिवलिंग; because शिवलिंग presiding over the element of air is non-different from (fire), which is the same as ऋद्ध, another name of शिव, as known from "He (fire) is a form of ऋद्ध or पशुपति; He, the Lord therefore, is of the fiery (dreadful) form. The Lord of creatures is (of the) form of ऋद्ध. His fiery energy is dreadful." "A bow to ज्वललिंग (brilliantly shining)," is the praise of चरलिंग presiding over the element of air; and the identity of चरलिंग, as expressed by उम्र and ज्वललिंग is assured from "Life (vital air) is another form of काल or time; the power of time is that of air; उम्र (शिव) is (the sustainer) of the form of air; and उम्र is known to be काल". "A bow to परमलिंग (Linga the great)" is the praise of महलिंग which presides over (individual) souls. "A bow to आत्मलिंग" is the praise of माबलिंग (ideal Linga) which presides over the subtle body. (From the foregoing) therefore, the praise has for its object Linga worn on the body in its different forms owing to artificial limitations and described in आत्मास. And if "सम्बलिंग स्थापयति" were to lay down the installation of Linga on the ground or altar, the injunction and the missionary statement would be at variance (which is not proper). Moreover the beginning and the end, the reiteration, something extraordinary (belonging to a thing), the fruit to be attained (by the thing), and the logical establishment are the six determinants of a thing. The first of these, (when not contradicted) is the strongest, per principle of पूर्वमांस तत्वa established by "चेद्यो ना प्रायदर्शिताः" (the word चेद is prominent). Agreeably to this the words in the beginning of the passage under
consideration, viz. "A bow to the Linga on high" having been proved to mean प्राणंग्रं, the interpretation of the sentence संवेशितं स्थापयति to mean placing of Linga other than that worn on the body, would certainly militate against the import of the section.

If it is argued that पतंग occurring in पतंग सोमस्य सूर्यस्य goes with नमः; hence the bow is addressed to the moon and the sun, consequently there would be misinterpretation of the passage; it is wrong to so argue; because the beginning and the conclusion have been determined to be referring to Shiva; and if the bow were taken as being addressed to the moon and the sun in the midst, it would militate against the context. Therefore, it is inevitable that सोम should mean Shiva in the form of Lingū, by being dissolved as उमया सहितः (associated with उमा), and that सूर्य should mean शिव residing in the disc of the sun, as is done in सोम एके: वते घृतमेक उपासते " (Shiva alone purifies some; he alone takes ghee in a sacrifice). In accordance with this interpretation the sentence संवेशितं स्थापयति means the wearing of Linga on the body; and the presumption of the injunction would well accord with the missionary statement which otherwise would be meaningless. This presumption of injunction as analogous to the assumption (contained in the sentence), "The sacrificial post should be made of उड़ुँवर tree; उड़ुँवर is strong; the animal (tied to the उड़ुँवर post) will be strong, because the post will give strength to the animal (when tied to it).

It may be objected that in spite of all this, the injunction so presumed is not obligatory (on all), because (it is enjoined) for an end (and it is, therefore, laid
down for those that aim at it), as stated in विलायंत-
विश्वासपि already quoted in words "the (wearing of
Lingga both) internal and external (is laid down) for
ascetics that desire to attain absolution". It is wrong to
say so; for the objection would also apply to the prac-
tice of twilight worship, the fruit of which is known
from the praise contained in words "Those of strict
vow that always practice twilight worship become free
from sin and attain the world of ब्रह्मा free from miseries,"
(and thus संयोगपालन would also not be obligatory on all).
If it be said that संयोगपालन is obligatory in as much as
its non-practice is prohibited in the स्मृति which says
"He who takes food (without performing संयोगपालन) will be born a dog in hundred births and becomes an out-
caste in millions of births;" similar is our position
because non-wearing of Linga is prohibited by बहादुरावमृ and others which say "A devotee that supports life (with
food) without wearing Linga commits the sin of eating
dog's food."

It is stated (in महाभारत) as follows:—The Veda is
afraid of a person of small learning that he would belie it.
(Hence) the meaning of the Veda should be supported by
(the statement) of historical tradition and Pauranik
narrative (which re-iterate the Veda). The meaning of
the Veda though understood (independantly) is likely to
be misunderstood (on account of its profundity). So,
when it is made definite by sages there will be no scope
for any doubt:—Agreeably to this dictum there are
passages in support of the sentence (सचलिंग स्थायति). For
instance, दिनागुप्त says by way of preface "The excellent
way of wearing of Linga is laid down for Brahmmins by
Vedas, number of स्मृति, Puranas, and Agamas," and
then goes on to state "Even (an उपजित्तत्व belonging to)


says that one should place Linga (on the body). Therefore, the great Linga should be worn by uttering (in accompaniment) the prayer “पाणिमंत्र” etc”. Because the preceptor places Linga on the hands of the devotee at the time of the दृष्टा ceremony and prays that Linga, they (the learned) say Linga is identical with पाणिमंत्र पवित्र. As (Linga the form of ) Shiva himself is pure and makes men pure, it is termed pure; therefore, the great Linga is to be worn at all times. One should wear Linga at all times even when one moves or stands, sleeps or keeps awake, has his eyes closed or open; the wearer of Linga is always pure; he should worship charming Linga absorbed in devotion and should apply sandal paste to it and offer flowers etc. He should perform all daily and occasional duties with the idea of (all action) dedicated to Shiva. All this will contribute to the development of his (spiritual) knowledge”. In येंकरसाहित्य of स्कंदपुराण also it is said:—He who places the इष्ठालिन on the palm-altar or his hand, becomes mentally all absorbed in Him and ridding himself of all outward distractions worships him, is indeed, a Veershaiva. A man should worship Linga, the symbol of the Highest Divinity, placing it on the palm-altar of his lotus-like hand, with the idea of being one with Him, by means of all sorts of homage without any distinction between things internal and external. In the case of a Veershaiva desirous of at-one-ment the worship of Linga placed on hand is better than that installed on groud. In these words it establishes the superiority of the worship of Linga placed on the hand as enjoined by the Vedic words “पाणिमंत्र” (येंकरसाहित्य) further says:—Oh, my child, one who is devoted to the at-one-ment of Linga (with Anga) is really free from taint or impurity of the incidents of birth or death.
The worship of Shiva (Linga) should not be omitted even when a birth or death occurs in the household. In this way the worship of Shiva Linga worn on the body is laid down even at times of impurity for a Veershaiva who is life-long initiated into it by दृष्टासन ceremony. आदित्य पुराण also says:— Those that are initiated by दृष्टासन ceremony should always perform the worship of God (Linga). These great men are free from the observance of impurity of birth or death. There are no trammels of impurity in the case of those who worship Linga (worn on the body), those that maintain sacred fire and of those that are religious students.

If it is argued that if the worship of Linga can be performed at time impure, there would result (permission for) the performance of other rites; it is wrong to say so; because, though the prayer “मिज्ञा etc.” is allowed to be muttered when the sun is worshipped during twilight, which is a daily rite, though certain hymns are uttered at the time of वैश्वदेव which also is a daily rite, and though Vedic texts are read (even if the performer becomes impure) when newmoon and fullmoon sacrifices are performed, it does not mean that other Vedic texts are to be studied at the times of impurity. महर्षीवति says “There is no objection to hymns being recited at the time of routine household rites. But there is objection to the recitation of Vedic texts that are to be studied on occasions. The daily rites are considered to be the sacrifice to the वैश्वदेव”. So it means that not all Vedic texts are prohibited from being recited. In the same way though the worship of Linga is allowed at impure times, it does not mean the permission to perform rites all and sundry.
Another objection:—We agree to the obligatory nature of Linga worship (on the hand). But it is objectionable to perform the worship on the left hand which is so (dirty) vile. This objection does not stand to reason. For the use of left hand in conjunction with the right is laid down for forming the cavity for the purposes of drinking water per scripture “One might drink water by means of the cavity or a big pot.” So also the use of left hand is indispensable for forming the cavity to hold full pot per injunction. “He brings the full pot,” when that cavity is necessarily used as support to the full pot at the time of offering oblation into the mouth of fire. Likewise the use of left hand, when both the hands are folded together while the devotee bows down to Shiva placed on the altar is found to be fit, and it is also free from objection to use the left hand when the cavity-full of flowers are offered to God Shiva. All this is in accordance with वैधार्यन who says:—The obeisance by the eight parts of the body is made when it is performed by means of the head (bowing down), the breast, the eyes fixed on the deity, mind (thinking of the deity), tongue (lit. words) uttering its prayers, the feet brought together, the ears (intent on listening to its prayers), and lastly the two hands folded together.

It may lastly be objected:—A doubt arises about the interpretation made by you of the sentence “स्वालिङ्ग स्थापयति” as laying down the wearing of Linga, because विधार्यन, the exegest of all Vedas has not commented on the passage (in your way). Tais objection sounds like (the inability) of a deaf man (to hear) when something is muttered into his ears. Because, though the passage has not been commented on by विधार्यन, others (equally authoritative scholars like) काठहसिष्ठयास्वरूप,
and so forth have explained it as we have done. (It seems) that the exegetist विधारण्य has left commenting on it, either because it was not relevant to his purposes or because different interpretations would be productive of evil (to himself). Moreover (if nothing that is not explained by विधारण्य were unauthoritative) the prayers addressed to Goddess हुर्गा, and composed by शोकराज्य, the founder of the (अहैतु) school would be unavailable (i.e. improper) at the time of हुर्गा worship as they are not commented on by him. Again there is no scope left for doubt on account of our interpretation being supported by divine बादराज्य, who stands foremost among personages intimate with the knowledge of the Vedas, in Linga Purana (composed by him) already quoted. Lord शिव Himself lays down (the wearing of Linga) in the authoritative आगामा, as good as Vedas; and lastly it is supported by विधानतिथिवाचमणि. Hence all we have said is faultless (unexceptionable).

III.

Aum:— This (Lingga-dharana) is established by another hymn in the same Upanishad: The Hymn is—My salutations to व्रह्म. Let wearing (of Linga) be my (creed); let me be the wearer of what is everlasting and is heard of in Vedas; let that (Lingga) be never separated from me.

It may be objected as follows:—This hymn does not establish the wearing (of Linga); for in the two sentences "Let wearing be mine" and "Let me be the wearer," there is stated merely the wearing and there is no word mentioning the special thing (to be worn). It cannot be argued that the wearing of Linga is the only alternative left on account of there being no scriptual authority for or
custom of wearing any other deity. Because though no other deity is known as the object of wearing, the (marks of) conch and disc representing Narayan are worn according to the doctrines of Ramanuja on the support of scriptures; they are therefore, to be taken here as being the object of wearing. If it be again argued that निराकरण (the rejectable thing) is the visible world fit for rejection, being subject to creation and destruction. That, which is not so and therefore acceptable, comes to mean ब्रह्म as the object of wearing. This evidently leads to Linga as the thing to be worn. This is wrong because this method of establishing the acceptable thing by explaining its parts can be well extended to नारायण and his weapons; and the weapons can thus be proved to be things worn. Every thing then will be free from the objection advanced. Moreover, sacred ashes and beads can be established as the object of wearing, in as much as non-practice of these is condemned per statement contained in “He, on whose forehead no ashes are applied, round whose neck no rosary put, and in whose mouth there is no पंचाक्षरिमंत्र muttered, should be abandoned as if he were an outcast. The non-practice of covering the body with ashes and three-striped mark (on the forehead of ashes) should not even be thought of. They are enjoined by scriptures. Hence he who abandons them is a man fallen” In the sentence “May I wear” there is no injunction, as the benedictive mood does not lay down. At the same time the sentence lacks the nature of originative injunction, as it is obtained by the sentence “सत्वेलिंगः स्थाप्यति.”

We meet this objection as follows:—The meaning really is that the thing acceptable is the ब्रह्म in the form of Linga. And let me be the wearer of that. What
is said that Narayan and the articles of his armour can be taken as things acceptable by explaining the parts of word is improper. For they are proved to be rejectable and cannot, therefore, be things acceptable. Because, अत्यथाश्रयश्चोपनिबन्धन says, "All this is ब्रह्म; ब्रह्म, विष्णु and रुद्र are created ", Shivapurana also says "The three ब्रह्म, विष्णु, and रुद्र have a cause; they are produced by महेश्वर Himself. They were intended by their father for three purposes, namely, ब्रह्म for the creation, विष्णु for the protection, and रुद्र for the destruction (of the Universe)". नारायण is thus known to be born. As for his conch and disc (it is said) "One should not stay even for a single day where there lives a person with the mark of a disc. If one does so, one becomes a great sinner and contracts the sin of killing a thousand Brahmins. If one sees such a person, the destroyer of the race, that bears such a mark through ignorance, greed or sentiment, one should have a bath in full garments. By means of these and such others they, in themselves rejectable, cannot be proved to be acceptable. We shall later give a fuller explanation. But शिब having no birth on the other hand becomes the acceptable thing on account of his being the producer of नारायण and others and the object of meditation from what is said "There is no cause (of the Great Lord). He, meditating on Himself is (the cause) of all things that (apparently) look to be a cause. He, the cause, is the object of meditation." He in the form of Linga becomes the object of wearing. What is really meant is that the verb सूपालस्य lays down the wearing in general. When there arises the expectancy as to what is the thing to be worn, Linga alone, that is no other than ओकार, is laid down as the object of wearing by "अः is mine." Hence Linga becomes the object of wearing. "अनिराकरण" is the
thing that is to be resorted to; \textit{दक्षिण} means heard of by
ears as being established by \textit{भ}\textit{व} and \textit{श}\	extit{श}r\textit{श}ras; \textit{व}\	extit{स्त्र} means \textit{विभ}, a form of \textit{शिव}, who is represented by
\textit{अङ्कर}. Let me wear that. Such is the meaning of the
words (of the passage).

If it is objected that \textit{अ} is an expression of
auspiciousness (as known from) "the words \textit{अ} and \textit{अ}\	extit{थ}
broke out of the throat of \textit{जन}; and therefore, they are
auspicious." Further " \textit{अ} is (the mother of) all sounds
including \textit{अ} per what is said "\textit{अ}" is (the source of )
all sounds"; \textit{अ} again is \textit{विभ}. \textit{अ}, therefore, does not
mean \textit{विभ} (but \textit{विभ}). It is wrong to raise this
objection. For it is said in ताप्लीयोपपिण्यत् "The letter \textit{अ}
is \textit{अ}\	extit{हा} in the naval; \textit{उ} is \textit{विभ} in the heart; \textit{म} is \textit{दार्व} in
the middle of the brows; \textit{अङ्कर} is the Lord of all \textit{विभ} at the top of the twelfth petal." \textit{विभ}\	extit{शिवरण} also says
"The short syllable \textit{अ} expresses itself to be \textit{शिव}, after
showing (that it is itself the container of) all by means
of its three constituent sounds." In Linga Purana too
\textit{विभ} in his prayer addressed to \textit{शिव} says, "My bow to
you all-knowing and of the form of \textit{अ}." All this proves
that the short syllable \textit{अ} represents the Great Lord \textit{शिव}.

It is wrong to argue that \textit{अ} born of \textit{अ} the cause
stands for \textit{विभ}. Because if all speech were based on \textit{अ}
and able to express itself only through \textit{अ}, it would be
void of all power of expressiveness. "\textit{अ} is (the basis of) all
sounds " is merely an eulogy of \textit{अ}, just as "All speech
is pervaded by \textit{अ}" is the eulogy of \textit{अ}. Otherwise the
three constituent sounds ( \textit{अ}, \textit{उ}, \textit{म} ) would be congruent
with \textit{अ}, the preceeding sound having merged into the
following one; and then \textit{अ} would be identical with it
and stand for Shiva and contradict your statement
(that \textit{अ} is \textit{विभ}). The foregoing also proves why \textit{अ} is
expressive of auspiciousness. That शिव (i.e. सु) is the bestower of all weal is proved by the etymological explanation (of शिव) given in कर्णपर्व of महाभारत as follows:- He always grants me success in all my undertakings. He wishes well of all things. He is, therefore, called शिव: All Gods and demons have sprung from me. I am (the source of all) good to all creatures. Oh Gods, this is why I am called Shiva.

If it is asked how can झ be Linga, though it is proved to be शिव? We answer by referring to the sentence of इंसोपोपिनेट् already quoted, which proves that शिव appears in the form of Linga, the sentence namely, "The condition (of शिव) of dreamless sleep in Linga." Moreover Linga is directly proved to be झ by the words of an Agama, namely, "झ is Linga."

We shall now consider what is said that wearing has for its object only sacred ashes and the beads. Does it mean, we ask, that they are only the things meant for wearing (exclusive of Linga)? Or that they are the object of wearing along with Linga (i.e. not exclusive of Linga)? The first alternative does not hold good; because there is no authority to establish that they (alone) are meant, as nowhere (in sacred texts) they are spoken of as being (synonymous with) झ. The second alternative is no good, because it is admitted by us. Some hold that sacred ashes and beads are expressed by अनिराकरण and Linga is expressed by सु. So all three become equally well the object of धारण.

What is said, that the verb "अधृतस्सम" being in the benedictive mood, does not enjoin, is stupid. For the injunction is as much possible here as it is in the
sentences like **"Let me be endowed with intellect"** I alone was in the beginning. If it is objected that the sentences (referred to above) have the force of injunction and therefore they lay down. But the sentence under consideration lacks that force and is, therefore, unable to lay down. This objection is meaningless; because the wearing of Linga is laid down by the sentence under consideration and is reiterated by the sentence **“स्वर्गांशं स्त्यापयति”**. And then the place of wearing is only laid down by पाणिनेण पवित्रं. This being admitted it follows that there is the injunction in the sentence and not obtained elsewhere. Even if the sentence be taken as containing an eulogy (of the importance of wearing Linga), it does not lose the capacity of enjoining. Because the thing acceptable, as proved by scriptures, is यो, the Linga. And this simply eulogises the wearing of Linga. In the way aforesaid **“द्वारं विसात् etc.”** and **“स्वर्गांशं स्त्यापयति etc. etc.”** respectively enjoin the wearing of internal and external Linga. And the passage **“यो नमो ध्रुवः etc.”** occurring in the same section cannot but mean the same in a detailed manner at a different place and is otherwise meaningless. That this is so is borne out by (what is said in) अप्रांपुराणः—My salutations to the भ्रात, the teacher and the great; the world is a rejectable thing, because it is produced and is subject to death. But antithetically the eternal ध्रुव is the acceptable object being the cause of all. This eternal acceptable thing may be the thing for my wearing, oh! You best of teachers. It is well known, being treated of in all Vedas, Shastras and Puranas. Let me wear that God, the cause of all. As is well known, the Gods ब्रह्म, विष्णु and others are unacceptable, being subject to death. These being unacceptable let me not wear them. I shall not wear the. Gods that sink (into
They will not be able to save me from sinking into the ocean of death. Let this Linga, the High, the শ্বেতাঙ্গ, be mine. Let it be my support. Also in ক্ষুদ্রবিঘ্নিতা of ক্রদুরাণ in the chapter treating of pilgrimage it is said:

To those that practise rigourous penance, to the ascetics, to those practising meditation, to those twice-born that are devotees of ব্রহ্ম, to those Shaivas that wear Linga, to those great প্রহ্লাদাতas that practise the vow (of muttering) my name, to those great Brahmins that practise মূর্তুজ্ঞান, to those that please me by serving the twice-born (জ্ঞাতার), to those that have attained their spiritual ends, to all those, Oh Lord of the mountain, the great religious vow of মেদেশর, called দিগরাণ, should always be taught. Those that wear Linga go to the abode of শি঵. The worship of Linga, the religious vow of প্রহ্লাদ is blessed. Those that worship Linga (on hand), oh, great sage, six times, three times, or once (in a day) go to the residence of শি঵: These and such others in support of what is said already should be noted.

IV.

In (another उपविष्ट वि. तैतिरिक्षपति of) तैतिरिद्वी branch this wearing of Linga on the body is established by the hymn. “He, of universal form and greatest among the hymns and arising out of the immortal hymns, may fill me with intelligence. May I be the wearer of that God for (attaining) immortality! May my body be strong! May my tongue be sweetest! May I hear much with my ears. Thou art the sheath of শ্বেত covered with intelligence. Mayst thou guard my learning.” Teachers of past times have explained the passage thus. The word
"God" means शिव, because देव is used for शिव the greatest in "Therefore शिव is considered the great God". "अन्न-तमः देवधारणा सूयस्य्" means "let me be the wearer of शिव (in the form of Linga) for attaining immortality". For there is no other deity laid down for being worn: nor is there a custom anywhere of wearing any other deity. देवधारणा has the sense of the wearer of God (Lingga) (he wears Linga) per grammatical affix छुट्, an affix showing an agent. "छुट्: " means शिव in the form of Linga (per derivation) "capable of controlling and extending grace". Let that शिव fill me with intelligence.

Here may be considered the objection raised as follows:—It is to be admitted that the sentence "The greatest of the hymns, of the universal form etc" is the re-statement, on account of the relative pronoun "तद्" which needs an antecedent. And the sentence contained in the नासन्योपनिषद् is the antecedent statement, namely, "The Highest Lord is seated in the midst of the flame". In that उपनिषद् first heart is shown by "like the bud of a lotus"; then the cavity is shown by "at the end of that there is a cavity". Later the cavity and the Lord seated in it are mentioned in words beginning with "In the midst there is great fire" etc. and ending with "the great Lord is seated". The Lord is re-stated (in the hymn under consideration) by words "He that is the greatest among the hymns" and the wearing of that Lord is laid down by "Let me be the wearer internally of that Great Lord that resides in the midst of the flames". The passage, therefore, does not establish the wearing of Linga (externally). It is, moreover, known beyond doubt that the great Lord should be worn internally from the adjective of "universal form", indicative of the Highest तत् and from the use of the term व्रक्ष्ण: unqualified in words "Thou art the sheath of व्रक्ष्ण:..."
This objection is not right. According to the objection the words "let me be the wearer of that Lord" mean the search, that is, the worship of the Lord worn internally. And in this case the text "Let me be the wearer of Linga' is taken to re-state what is contained in "The great Lord seated in the midst of flames etc." (which is considered the antecedent of the text under consideration). But the text "the minute and sinless, the abode of the Highest etc." lays down the internal worship of the Lord (as already established in the discussion contained in the first Section). Hence if the sentence "Let me be the wearer of the Lord" were to lay down the wearing of Linga internally again, there will be nothing new laid down and it becomes superfluous. A Vedic sentence is significant only when it lays down something new after re-stating an antecedent statement, and not otherwise. Hence the passage under consideration would be meaningless.

It is for this very season अप्पवाचकत in his book called कर्णमूल has established that नारायण means शिव in the secondary sense while explaining the sentence "when there was only darkness, there was neither day nor night, neither something existing nor something non-existing; then there was only शिव". During the explanation of this passage, the position of an objection was first stated, that शिव meant नारायण in as much as नारायण was established to be the deity presiding over darkness from the Vedic sentences "there is only one God beyond darkness" and "नारायण is the only divinity". And then it was concluded that the sentence "there was neither day nor darkness etc." was intended to lay down something
not laid down by the antecedent passage after re-stating all that was stated by the antecedent, on account of its containing the relative pronoun (क्षिप्र). It, therefore, re-stated all that was contained by the antecedent passage and then proceeded to lay down something not laid down by the antecedent. And if क्षिप्र meant नारायण nothing new would be laid down by the passage. Therefore, नारायण meant क्षिप्र in the secondary sense. Nor can it be urged that the passage “He, the greatest among the hymns etc.” lays down the attainment of immorality not laid down by the antecedent after re-stating the Highest Lord, that is stated to be the object of internal worship by the antecedent sentence “In the midst of that flame etc.” Because the attainment of immorality is also stated to be the object by the antecedent, which says that he (the devotee) attains at-onement with त्रैणं and the residence in the world of त्रैणं. There is, therefore, nothing new laid down.

It may be objected:—Even when the conclusion is accepted that the sentence “May I be wearer of Linga” lays down the wearing of visible Linga, the sentence lays down something in contradiction to what is said in the antecedent (which lays down internal wearing). It is wrong to so object; because it is not obligatory to assume that the sentence “In the midst of the flames” is the antecedent of “He, the greatest among the hymns etc.” But the text “सर्वबलिंग स्माप्यति” is the antecedent of the passage under consideration. The present hymn first re-iterates the placing of Linga (on the body) as laid down by “सर्वबलिंग स्माप्यति” and then proceeds to state the fruit in the form of immortality, not stated by it (सर्वबलिंग स्माप्यति). Except
for this the text under discussion would be without significance. This contingency (of the text being meaningless) is unacceptable. Because it is already seen that the meaninglessness of the sentence laying down "cutting twice" was avoided by assuming secondary significance (of the word चाव) in the sentence "fat should be cut five times". But here everything becomes sensible without the necessity of a secondary sense being given to "वेतसहरो शुभासु", which lays down the fruit of wearing external Linga, namely, immorality. The position thus becomes so easy. It would be also wrong to urge that the text वस्थत्वादेता etc.," lacks non-obtainment elsewhere on account of "मृत्युदीं श्यामप्रति" laying it down already; because "मृत्युदीं श्यामप्रति" is a general injunction of wearing Linga; while "बघंद्रा etc." makes a specific statement of the fruit to be attained. Hence there is no obtainment elsewhere.

Still it may be objected that जनादेव is the God to grant absolution as is known from the श्रवणि, "One should desire to obtain knowledge from श्रवणि; but one should desire to obtain absolution from जनादेव". Hence how can absolution be attributed to Linga? This would be wrong. Because various scriptural passages establish श्रवणि as the means of absolution to the exclusion of any other deity, such as "Having known श्रवणि he (devotee) attains eternal quiet". "Having come to know the Lord he becomes immortal". "Shiva alone in preference to any other should be the object of meditation, श्रवणि that grants bliss" and such others. And when there is conflict between a श्रवणि text and a श्रवणि text, the former prevails per principle established by पुरुस्मोक्षस्तव in the topic: "विरोधे त्वभवेष्ट श्यात्न अस्ति ब्रह्मानाश्च" (When there is conflict between a श्रवणि text and a श्रवणि text, the श्रवणि text prevails, being self-authoritative and requiring no proof. When there is no conflict presumption of a श्रवणि text in support of the श्रवणि text is allowed).
It may be urged that the words “He, श्र, the great Lord, may fill me with intelligence” makes a statement of the Lord bestowing intelligence, which, being an internal thing, may be better obtained by internal worship. But this is not reasonable; because the knowledge necessary for attaining absolution is dependent on श्र in the form of Linga, the wearing of which is, therefore, necessary, as may be learnt from the Vedic sentence “Let that Lord grant us auspicious knowledge”, and also from the words of शंकरसंहिता as follows:—“Oh! Child, there is no rebirth in the case of the person that practises union of आत्म (the individual soul) and Linga (the Highest Lord). Such a person will attain both knowledge and absolution thereby (in immediate sequence)”. If it were not so pilgrimage and holy ablution in the river Ganges will not be conducive to absolution per what is said “Janaka and others attained perfection (in spiritualism) (an internal thing) by action done (external thing).” Moreover, the wearing of Linga produces some unseen merit, which is an internal thing. Besides, when the wearing of external Linga is taken as enjoined, the special external things stated (in the passage under discussion) such as “Let my body be strong; let my tongue be very sweet; may I hear much with my ears” will also be significant. Because the body will prosper from the at-one-ment with श्र attained by the intimacy (i.e. contact i.e. wearing) of (the devotee with) Linga, as is known from the words of शंकरसंहिता viz. “One should worship श्र by becoming a श्र (i.e. a devotee of श्र). One who is not so cannot worship श्र. One becomes no doubt श्र when one is devoted to श्र (i.e. is in intimacy with it)”. Extreme sweetness of tongue is attained by (devotion to) ज्ञ्योत्तम, a modification of इद्युलिङ्ग, presiding over
the watery element and, therefore, residing on the tip of
the tongue. Great learning is attained by (devotion to)
प्रायाशिङ्ग, a modification of भाविङ्ग, presiding over the ether
element and, therefore, residing in the ear.

What is said:—It is unreasonable to hold that ब्रह्मा, mentioned in the term, "of universal form", and
without any qualification, should mean Linga, the
limited form of (the Highest principle). This also
is not sound, as शिव, the highest principle, has taken the
limited form to favour the devotees. And शिव is proved
to be the Universal spirit by words of अपराप्पमव उपनिषद्
and others such as "I am the eastern quarters; I am
the western etc." He is, therefore, of the universal
form. शंकराचार्य also speaks of Linga in his book अपराप्पमव
as the unqualified ब्रह्म, in words, "Linga is termed
the लिङ्ग". Hence there is nothing unreasonable (in
our position).

Some scholars have explained the passage in the
following way. They first state the position of an
objection that:—In the sentence "श्रुतं मे गोपाय" (mayst
thou guard my learning) the word गोपाय cannot be well
construed (for want of a vocative). Hence "देश"
occurring in "देशवारणो भूयास्म" should be taken separately
(instead of compounding it with वारण), and should
go with the verb "गोपाय" (to mean "Oh! Lord, pr-ect"). Then the construction "अशुतस्य धारणो भूयास्म" (Let me attain immortality) naturally follows. In
consequence the passage so construed does not mean
the wearing of Linga. Then they answer the objection
(and establish the conclusion) as follows:—It is impos-
sible to construe the word "देव" with "गोपाय" after being separated from "धारण", its proximate, in accordance with the principle established in the topic of पूर्व-मीराण "अग्रिमिते सिद्ध्य etc." It is proper, therefore, to construe गोपाय with ब्रह्म in the vocative case, ब्रह्म understood in this modified form of "ब्रह्मन" occurring proximately. Or else धारण (bearing or wearing) meaning union or contact (with something tangible) cannot suitably be construed with अप्र, (immortality) which is something intangible.

In support of the Vedic text (discussed hitherto) the following sentences from शंकरविधिग्रह and some others already quoted should be noted:—May you priests, full of devotion and practising union with अन्निलिङ, preach this religion that grants all objects of enjoyment here and (also) final beatitude". “He, who is free from attachment to other things wears Linga of blessed nature, crosses the ocean of this worldly life having marine fire in it in the form of passions and agitating with the waves of attachment to worldly object”, and “Adore those holy men that are devotees of विष, that live a pure life, that wear Linga, and that apply ashes and wear beads.”

V.

It is also said:—Vedas are the best of all the lore; Ekadasha Rudra is the best of the Vedas; there in the Ekadasha Rudra the five-lettered मंत्र (पंचाश्रयमंत्र—नमःशिवाय) is the best; in that मंत्र the two-lettered word विष is the best. In the Ekadasha Rudra, the crest-jewel of the Vedas, there is a passage as follows:—Oh! Thou Rudra,
that body is Thine, auspicious, merciful, and shining on the body of the sinless people:—This Vedic text also means the wearing of Linga on the body. छ by derivation means—स्त्रे वेदम् =misery or weeping caused by the worldly troubles; he that removes this misery is छ (छे डाव्यति इति). Or छ is बज्जान (ignorance). He who dispels ignorance is छ. Oh! Thou छ, that body of Thine (in the form of Linga), of peaceful nature, (i.e. merciful) is beneficent, that is, is capable of granting all bliss or grace. That body of Thine shines on the body of the sinless devotees (अभारकायिणो). This means that that body of Shiva, appearing in the limited form of Linga, is to be worn on the body of the devotee, self-controlled and free from passion; such is the meaning. And one should be careful about this injunction. This has been re-iterated by शिरेश्वरिकामणि as follows:—Oh, Thou छ, that body of Thine (in the form of Linga) is praised by छुजुर्वं to be beneficent and shining on the body of the sinless. The devotee of शिर (the wearer of Linga) is, therefore, sinless. He, the wearer of Linga, self-controlled and always intent on the worship of शिर (Linga) (should apply ashes etc.)

VI.

Bow to शिर. I have shown that the wearing of Linga is enjoined by श्रवेद्व. Now, after bowing down to श्रवेद्व in joy, I shall show that it is enjoined by छ श्रवेद also. The Rigvedic text (that enjoins the Linga-wearing) is:—“Thou, Lord ब्रह्म, art holy and manifested (propagated in the thirty six universal modifications); Lord, Thou occupiest all the bodies of Thy devotees; he whose
body is not purified and who is, therefore, raw or deficient in spiritual culture (mentality), cannot have Thee on his body; those that have studied scriptures are entitled to have that (body of Thine in the form of इश्तंग on their bodies). Here ब्रज means Linga, from the derivation,—that which reveals the inner truth, is Linga (स्थित अयं गमयति). Hence ब्रज is designated Linga, which being the abode of ब्रज, is identical with ब्रज, in words of विद्याविष्टवामि “That Linga is eternal ब्रज.” Linga is ब्रज everlasting.” It is also seen that वंदस्त्वायं in his poem called अपरापरस्त्र uses Linga as synonymous with ब्रज in words “Linga is the name of ब्रज”. ब्रजण्वति means तस्य (स्थितय) पलि: i.e. ब्रज रेसीdes in Linga; ब्रज appears in the form of Linga. In the first line of text the pronoun तव is to be understood; because पवित्र and वित्त are not given in lexicons to signify Linga. Nor are they ever used in that sense by scholars of old. Hence there cannot be the relation of the qualified and the qualifying between them; and because adjectives cannot be so construed grammatically (without a substantive) there arises the suggestion of the pronoun तव being understood necessarily. The meaning of the text is:—Thou Lord, appearing in the form of Linga, i.e. assuming the tangible form of इश्तंग (इश्तंग), Thou great शिव, Linga, which is another name of ब्रज, holy is Thy form. This form of Thine is holy and is, therefore, fit to be worn (on the body) at all times, pure and impure as already established. The body is propagated (वित्त) in different forms as इश्तंग etc.; श्रु: means capable of controlling and favouring (the devotees). वित्त: means all (in the
accusative, (the affix तत्व is used as an inflection of all cases) i.e. all bodies of Thy devotees Thou occupieth or pervadest. Thou art united with the bodies of Thy devotees by Thy form of इष्टिनम when worn on their bodies by them. An objection:—जान (in जान गयते) means an idol of विव (placed on an altar). Hence जानगयते means, Thou Lord, great विव, residing in an idol placed on an altar. Thy idol Linga, termed जान, is holy being consecrated by purificatory methods. Thy form is वित; that is, it appears in various forms of the well known व्योतिनिगास or sages (like अगस्व) or holy human beings (like इरिस्खर etc.). Why should not the text be explained in this way? This objection is wrong. Because the idol being a thing that cannot be worn on the body, it becomes impossible to construe the sentence “Thou occupieth all the bodies” in its right sense already stated. It would be wrong to meet this difficulty by saying that the Lord is in contact with the bodies of the devotees on account of his being all-pervading, in as much as there is no meaning in saying that the Lord is in contact only with the bodies of the devotees, instead of saying simply that Linga, the form of जान, is all-pervading. It may be objected further that the hymn "पतिव्र ते वितलते" is used in the Soma sacrifice while the woolen piece of cloth is consecrated; it is, therefore, improper to interpret (the text) as an injunction to wear Linga. If a hymn is used in a particular connection, it follows that it is meant only for that purpose, just as the hymn "विव्वस्य etc.", being used only for the deities of twilight worship, is taken as one-intended only for those deities. Hence if this
hymn "पवित्र ते विततं " used for ऋत्सव sacrifice, were to be taken as laying down the wearing of Linga, there will result conflict with the topic (connected therewith). This objection is not sound. Because the mere use of the hymn (in some other connection) does not come in the way of अन्न meaning Linga, in the aforesaid manner. There are instances of hymns addressed to particular deities but used in connection with others. For example the hymn "अशीमृत्व विष: कड़्यू इत्यादि " (Fire is the head; he is the hump of the heaven) is addressed to fire as clearly seen from the words used in it. But it is used in the worship of मंगल in a domestic sacrifice. So also the hymn of Man, though meant only for विषु, is seen used in the worship of the Lord of wealth per direction viz.—"One should worship the Lord of wealth of universal form by the hymn of Man." As for the rule, that a hymn is meant for the deity for which it is seen used, is applicable to those hymns the use of which is shown only by the words expressive of the rite in honour of a deity. But there is nothing in the word "पवित्र " that may so restrict it to mean holy woolen cloth. If it is asked how the hymn "पवित्र ते विततं इत्यादि " should mean Linga-wearing, when there is no word expressive of it, we say that—the hymn "कदाचानरत्सरसिनिदंद्रश- शिच दशुस: " is a hymn sung in honour of इंद्र. And though it is used for the worship of the household fire in accordance with the instructions contained in "He worships the household fire with the hymn of इंद्र", there is nothing to prevent its expressing इंद्रद्वारत by the words it has. Similarly it is to be known that in accordance with the rule established in the topic of पूजनमूर्तिः about इंद्रद्वारत, the hymn under discussion meant Linga by indication (by virtue of the injunction that the hymn contains).
The objection that (the interpretation of the text under discussion) would conflict with its use (in connection with the शोभा sacrifice) does not hold water. For the शोभा plant is praised as the producer of विष्णु and others in the text, namely, “शोभा purifies, शोभा is the producer of intellect, the skies, the earth, the sun, इत्यादि and also of विष्णु.” But the शोभा plant being inanimate, it is impossible that it should produce नारायण and others. Hence, as already proved elsewhere, that शोभा paronomasiacally meant Shiva by being dissolved as “उमया सहितः”. There can be no conflict, therefore, between the texts about Linga-wearing and those of Soma sacrifice. Moreover the Rigvedic text “This Soma (sacrifice) of Kapardin (Shiva)” makes it known that the Soma sacrifice is addressed to (connected with) Shiva as characterized by the act of production. So also it may be seen that Rudra takes the place of Soma (as deity) as known from the Vedic text. “Rudra is invoked”, which proves the identity of Soma sacrifice with that of Rudra. Similarly Shiva is established to be the consumer of all oblations and the giver of the fruits of all rites in the passage in Kurma Purana where Shiva says “I am the consumer of all oblations; I am the giver of all fruits; I am the soul of all, as I appear in the form of all deities; I am everywhere”. All this proves that Rudra (Shiva) is the deity of Soma sacrifice. So the text under discussion, though used in connection with the Soma-sacrifice, can consistently signify the wearing of Linga.

Another objection:—It may be granted that there is no conflict in the way aforesaid. Still there can be no injunction in the hymn “विष्णु ते बिलन्त etc.”, as
there is no verb (in the imperative) mood. Nor can it be of the nature of originative injunction, as the wearing of Linga and its holiness expressed by the text is already obtained by the Yajurvedic text "सर्वनिम् स्थापति". This objection is untenable. Because it can be maintained that the text enjoins the wearing of Linga from the clear indication given by the text itself in words “प्रमुगे न्याग्म परमेषि विश्वतः” and also from the corroborative passage to be quoted later, namely, “Therefore, the holy Linga of Shiva should be worn”. The second objection, that the text lacks the nature of originative injunction, which is already obtained elsewhere, is not sound, because the text belongs to a different branch of the Veda. It is unreasonable to think that the rites enjoined by one branch should prevent the injunction of those rites by another. If it were so some rites, that are enjoined by Rigveda, are also enjoined by Yajurveda and as such they should have no activating force. No further elaboration is needed here.

The text, after laying down the wearing of Linga and its holiness in words beginning with “पवित्रे ते” and ending with “परमेषि विश्वतः”, proceeds to state the fruits of wearing Linga in the negative form. It thereby removes the cause of perverse attitude of dulleards, who might be inclined to think that it is no use wearing Linga for want of good fruits accruing from it, though it is laid down by various Vedic scriptures. It also indicates the negation of other means of attaining the good fruits and states the objective of wearing Linga in words “अवसत्वत्वन्त्वाय अशुद्भे”. “त्सा” means he whose
mass of sins is burnt by the दीघा ceremony of three kinds, viz. बैठा, मनु, and किम्ब. He is (अतलवनः) whose body is not free from sins burnt by means of दीघा ceremony of three kinds, i.e. he who has not received the three-fold दीघा sacrament. “आमः” is he whose heart is (spiritually) raw. Such a person, therefore, fails to attain at-one-ment with Shiva (cannot become Shiva himself). The text thus purports to say that the three-fold दीघा ceremony is indispensable for the attainment of final beatitude, as is remarked in Shankara Sanhita. “Oh, child, he who practices union of Anga with Linga, is free from re-birth”.

VII.

The followers of Ramanuja on the other hand interpret the text (differently) as follows:—“पद्म न स्त्रिय” means a wheel, as is well known from the lexicons that give पद्म, चरण, and चक as synonyms. “नारायणम्” in “नारायणस्ते” means नारायण of four faces according to the Vedic text “नारायण was born of Narayana”. So Vishnu as the producer of Brahma, is his master. नारायणस्ते therefore, means Oh, Vishnu, Thou art the producer of four-faced Brahma; Thy wheel is निकंद (all-extending) and is श्रेष्ठ (is capable of controlling all the universe). Such is the meaning of the text. The sentence, they say, “अतलवनः तदाम अशुद्धः” becomes significant in accordance (with the above interpretation in the following way). “तदाम” means (the body) modified by the heated disk (impressed on the body). The body, therefore, becomes different from what it was before. He, whose body is not so modified, is अतलवनः i.e. the person
not wearing at the top of his arms the mark of the disk and is, therefore, आमः = अरिन्द्रकावङ्करणः with his heart not spiritually ripe); he, therefore, does not attain the form of the Almighty Narayana. Such is the explanation they give. This is unbelievable. That the lexicons should give पतित्र as a synonym of चक is itself disputable. Still this synonymity may be granted to satisfy the wicked (disputant). But its wearing is to be refuted, because the hymn does not lay down the wearing of the disk. It cannot be said that the sentence, contains the injunction; because the textual sentence expresses the association of Vishnu with the bodies of the devotees. Nor is it right to maintain that the hymn (first mentions the disk by words नामिन ने' and then enjoins (indirectly) the wearing of it by "नर्तानिवंत विख्वतः"), in as much as Narayana is never known to be worn on the body; it is implied thereby that his disk is to be worn. Such reasoning is faulty because the implied meaning cannot stand any (alternative) cross-questioning as follows:- Is the disk to be worn on the body, because it is a characteristic mark of Vishnu, or a form of Vishnu or because it is an abode of Vishnu? The first alternative is wrong because, there are so many characteristic marks of Vishnu as mentioned in lexicons, which record that "The mace of Vishnu is called कृषिपा; His sword is called लंक; the jewel He wears is named कृषिपुम" and so forth. There is nothing, therefore, to specify the disk as the object of wearing. The second alternative also is no good. For if the disk is a form of Vishnu it is non-different from Him. It thereby follows that there cannot be the relation of the mark
and the bearer of the mark, which relation necessarily presupposes the difference between the two. The lexicons also are then contradicted (i.e.: they come to be unreliable as giving wrong meanings). The third alternative too, that can be put in the two-fold form namely, (1) is the disk an abode of Vishnu on account of His being all-prevading, as is said by the Vedic sentence "Narayana exists as occupying the inside and the outside of all that (universe)? (2) or is it an abode of Vishnu being a form of His? The first alternative is not right; because Narayana being the inmate of all the things (in the universe), all things can claim to be objects of wearing. The second part of the alternative also is untenable; because if the disk, as an idol of Vishnu, were to stand on the body, there will result the contingency of doing the worship of and offering food to Vishnu residing in the disk, as it is done in the case of various idols installed in temples, the copper images of Vishnu, and शालिपान, all of which are an object of devotion to the Vaishnavas. The objector's attempts at maintaining his position (by the interpretation of the sentence) "अतसदलसंज्ञावत्र शप" are as vain as the expectation of rainfall from the cloudless sky; because the interpretation suited to the wearing of the disk becomes impossible from the prohibitive condemnation of wearing such hot-stamped marks by the scriptural sentences as follows:—The body of a Brahmin is the resort of (occupied by) all deities. Oh, king, the sin of burning it is beyond description. Even if the person devoted to taking frequent baths in the Ganges, or engaged in performing horse sacrifices, happens to see a person stamped with the disk, he should see the sun,
mutter meditational prayers and the hymn of Man, only to avoid the रूप part of the hell. If a Brahmin has his shoulders stamped with disk will bring fiery destruction on his family to the seventh generation, in spite of his being a knower of the Vedas and ( the principle of keeping ) holy fire”. The wearing of hot-stamped marks being thus prohibited and the interpretation thereby becoming impossible, our interpretation alone is right. Moreover the hymn being used in connection with the Soma sacrifice, the interpretation will clash with relevancy of the topic. This last argument cannot be advanced against us, as it has been already explained away. If, in spite of what has been said, the term अत्मपुरुष: is interpreted to mean a body heated by hot disk-stamps, the interpretation will then lead to the following. “अ” means Vishnu because it is said in a Smriti “अ is expressive of Vishnu”. अम means विपुल: i.e. for the sake of Vishnu. He whose body is not heated for the sake of Vishnu is “अत्मपुरुष:”. Such a person is spiritually raw and therefore cannot attain the form (similar to that) of Parabrahma. Besides “प्रतिष्ठा:” derived from the root ष्ठ, अम, to burn, will mean those whose bodies are heated. They will thereby suffer from painful wounds (इत्र) i.e. they will get only that much. Such would be the meaning agreeably to the condemnation already stated. If however the word “पित्र” must mean a disk on the support of a known lexicon it will cease to express (the prominent वीणहड़ sense of being “holy.” Moreover a word loses its power of expressing its conventional sense (here गुप्त) when there is something that militates against it. For instance the words “white etc.” express colours (when used by themselves and are then in the masculine gender). Still they cannot but be identical with
substantives to which they are in apposition (as adjectives and they then take the gender of the substantives), in accordance with what is said (in Amarkosha)-the words "white etc." are in the masculine gender (when they express) particular colours (as independant words); but when they go with substantives (as adjectives) they take the genders of the substantives (and express the substantives as qualified by colours). Here the secondary sense (of adjectives as substantives qualified by colours) is resorted to, the power of their expressing (the substantives qualified by colours) being considered too cumbrous. If it is urged that the conventional sense (of पवित्र as चक) prevails against the etymologically conventional sense (चेमल्ल्ड of पवित्र a : holy, पुश्ते भोजन इति + इत्र) (we say) it cannot be so; because the conventional sense prevails against or obscures the etymological (or etymologically conventional sense) only when there is nothing militating against the conventional sense. If it were not so the word "पंकज" could express the etymologically conventional sense of क्षुड़, even when its another conventional sense of पवि was contradicted. In the present case the conventional sense (पवित्र as चक) is contradicted as already shown. By this (foregoing discussion) is refuted the conclusion of an injunction to wear (the hot) disk-mark based on the sentence "the heated disk-mark should be worn on both the arms". Moreover the scriptural authority of the sentense itself is disputed in as much as no well read student of the Vedas finds the sentence in the Vedic literature. Even on the strength of the texts taken from different branches here and there the objector's interpretation cannot be substantiated, as it cannot stand the test of alternative cross-
wearing of disk-mark is accepted, the wearing of couch-mark would be excluded in accordance with the principle that a sentence is definite in its operation (and, therefore, cannot be twisted into various senses). But this exclusion of couch-mark would militates against the scriptural texts enjoining the wearing of couch-mark and the custom thereof. The texts are:—A Brahmin should wear the mark of Sudarshana (wheel) on his right arm and that of the couch on his left arm; so say those that know Brahman. No more heated discussion is needed with the crooked people.

My revered preceptor explains the passage as follows:—ब्रह्मगुप्ति means the highest Lord Shiva, the producer of Hiranyakagarbha (Bhamba) as said by the Upanishadic text “Rudra the great sage, that extends beyond the universe, first created Hiranyakagarbha; He first created Bramha.” The word “पवित्र” means Linga, as it is used in apposition to Linga (synonymous with Linga,) in “धर्मवतिपाणिमंत्र पवित्र”. If it is asked how can पवित्र, though used in apposition to Linga, mean Linga? We answer that revered Maheshwar, while explaining a verse in Ramayana admits the synonymity of the word ब्रह्म with the consecrated एक्ष्य both being used in apposition in the Vedic sentence “ब्रह्म व: अन्यथा” (ब्रह्म is butter). It cannot be objected that the words “पवित्र” and “मंत्र” are used in apposition in the sentence, पवित्र, therefore, cannot be taken as used in apposition to Linga. It is wrong to so object because मंत्र means Linga per derivation“मन्तना तत्त्वायन” (that which protects when worshipped). The meaning also agrees with the derivative explanation that “Mantra is of two-
fold nature, as signifier and the signified. As signifier it is the syllable श्रे, and as signified it is the great Shiva. "वषमस्यः therefore, means Oh, great Lord Shiva; पवित्र means Thy form, Linga; विविध means "extends : (itself) in various modificationa like इष्टहिः etc."; Thou art प्रसु, the controller of all the universe; Thou, therefore, occupiest the bodies of Thy devotees all round, Thou that art proficient in performing the impossible. The following verses from the latter part of Vatulagama and Anubhavasatra may be given in support of the explanation given above, namely, "Linga with faces all round is seated well in all bodies everywhere and always. That Linga is well seated in us, as may be known from the precepts of the preceptor." This is the beginning of what is said in the books mentioned above; and it is further said "The great Linga is only one; it is firmly rooted in its subsidiary (modification called) Anga; with faces all round it shines all round and, has names, visible forms, and actions. As इष्टहिः it is seen externally (worn on the bodies of devotees); as आण्डहिः it is placed internally; as आवलिंग it is seated in the self; शहिः is firmly seated in the heart, प्रसंहिः in the ear, वशिः in the skin, शिवलिंग in the eye, मुखलिंग in the tongue, and आचारलिंग in the nose. The forms of Linga are seated in the (corresponding) organs of action, just as they are in the organs of knowledge."

Others explain the text as follows: — विविध means a body, being derived from the root तन, to spread. वषमस्यः means Linga. वषमस्यः therefore, means Oh, Lord Shiva, embodied in Linga, Thy body in the form of Linga is holy and is, therefore, fit to be worn at all times pure and impure. Thou art mighty i.e. capable of granting
enjoyment and final beatitude in that very form Thou pervadest the bodies of thy devotees, i.e. Thou art to be worn on the bodies of thy devotees in the form of Linga (Thou appearing in the limited form of Linga लिङ्ग). 

But the point in favour of my preceptor's explanation is this. — विचारकर्त्ता lays down that "The subject should come first and then the predicate." If this dictum is to be followed "प्रत्यय" in the sense of Linga and "विन्यास" in the sense of विन्यास, both come in due order as the subject and the predicate. But according to the explanation given by others the subject Linga and the predicate "प्रत्यय" come in the reverse order. There are passages in Linga Purana and others that corroborate the explanation given above, and, therefore, support it. Says the Linga Purana:— Just as an insect becomes a bee by close association with it, so a man becomes Shiva by intimate contact with Him. Gods like Brahma and Vishnu and sages like Gautama and others always wear Linga particularly on their heads. Beginning with this the Purana proceeds to say further, "Brahman is Linga; Brahmanaspati is Lord Shiva. It is known to be holy; by its contact the body becomes pure. Rigweda says "Oh, Lord Thou art spread out as Linga; that beneficent (अनाम्य) Shivalinga should be worn." An ignorant person (a person in the dark) has his body unburnt and has not undergone purificatory rites. Being uninitiated by वैष्णव ceremony he cannot have on his body the great Linga. He, who practises penance first, has his body burnt; with his body burnt he becomes fit to wear Linga for the attainment of final beatitude. He, who fails to practise this penance, has his body remaining raw, and
therefore, cannot wear Linga for liberation”. The words contained in the extract, namely, “Brahman is known to be Linga”, “that is known to be Linga”, and “Shiva’s Linga is to be worn” all plainly support our explanation. Again it is to be noted that the words of Shankara Sanhita and Siddhantashikhamani also support our explanation. They are:—“The disciple thus advised by the preceptor versed in scriptures, should wear Linga, holy and destructive of sin, so as to bring it in conjunction with प्राण (life). That Linga is dearly loved by all sages conversant with the meaning of the Agamas. A wise man should always carefully wear Ishtalinga on the body that is capable of removing all evil. He should attentively wear it when given by the preceptor. If that Linga comes to be missed through oversight the wearer should even go to the length of abandoning his life.”

VIII

“पति ते वितत्त् etc.” is not the only Mantra in Rigweda that establishes this (wearing of Linga); but “अर्थ मे इस्लो भगवान्” is another that also establishes this. It is as follows:—“The Lord Shiva is (the resident of my) hand; He is divine-most; He is the physician to all the miseries (of this perishable world). He is my father, mother, my (source of) life. Oh, Lord and friend, come to this hand (of mine) that is after Thee and never leave it”. Here the word “भगवान्” means Lord Shiva, as it is found used predicatively of Shiva in Vedic passages as the following:—“The young man asked Lord Rudra”, “The sage, Sanatkumar, asked Lord Kalagnirudra; so also in Harivansha the word is similarly used in “Lord Shiva having bull as
his vehicle, being so praised etc." Accordingly means Lord Shiva in the form of Linga. He being resident of my hand is my hand. He, the divine-most, is thus associated with me. If it is asked how the word "hand" is used instead of (the Lord) residing in my hand, we answer that the word "hand" is used instead of "(the Lord) residing in my hand", in order to show the inseparable connection of the hand with Linga; and this will be the proper explanation analogous with the use of Aditya (the residence of Shiva), instead of the (explicit) use of Shiva residing in Aditya, in order to show the intimate connection of Shiva with Aditya (and, therefore, identical with Shiva), as known from Linga Purana, which says "Lord sun is the blue-throated and three-eyed Shiva; he of thousand rays is attempted to be known by the priests, the chanters, the supervisors, and the sacrificers". The नारायणोपनिष्ट says likewise in the passage beginning with "It is bright like gold that is seen in the sun", and ending with "my bow to the consort of Uma, and of Ambika, the Lord of beasts". So also it is seen said "Him, Samba, the specific against the worldly life, residing in the sun-globe. Him of gold residing in the bisk, of bright form and bright smile". From all the foregoing it is seen that Lord resides in the sun and that there is inseparable connection between the sun and Shiva, to show which it is said Aditya is the three-eyed God instead of Shiva residing in the sun. From such inseparable connection between the hand and the Linga it follows that Linga is to be worn on a part of the body like the hand, as corroborated by the words of Vatulagama and Viragama, namely, "one should carefully worship Linga placed on the left hand by the
preceptor after consecrating by means of the purificatory ceremony of शुद्धिं (sixfold ways). He that wears Shiva in the form of Linga on the hand or some other prescribed part of the body, has at his command (lit. on the palm of his hand) at-one-ment with me, the position of highest good”. So also the words of Shankarsanhitā, condemning the separation of Linga from the body as sinful, fit in with this. They are:—

“One should carefully wear Linga given by the preceptor. If it slips away from the body through oversight one should even abandon life (rather than be without it). The wretch of the person that holds life after श्राणिः comes to be missed, is no doubt an outcast sinning against Lord Shiva. One should carefully wear Linga on the holy altar of the hand. If it is lost through mistake, even life should be given up. One should not even think of a person that lives without it when lost and that therefore sins against the principle (of wearing Linga). Linga that is installed on the body is as inviolable (i.e. cannot be displaced) as that installed on an altar”. These words purport to say that when Linga misses from the body, it is to be worn again with the ceremony prescribed in that connection or after undergoing atonement (for the sin). But death alone should follow if Linga is not re-worn (in the proper way). It is, therefore, said in इशावास्योपनिषद "Therefore when it (Linga) is lost, he (the loser) should starve himself. Do not hanker after having another’s”. (The explanation of this is) for that reason when it is lost, i.e. when Linga comes to be lost through oversight and it is not re-worn, do not take food, but die by starvation. Do not hanker after taking another’s wealth in the form of Linga. "Linga is wealth” says वैष्णववैदिकोपनिषति.
If it is asked that the term भगवान् "Divine" is seen used with reference to Gods and sages without distinction, as may be gathered from "Divine Narayana, the son of Devaki," "Then was born divine Brahma, the grand-father of the world", "Divine Sanatkumar" and so on; how can it be taken to mean particularly Shivalinga? We reply that in the Vedic sentences "He cuts with the hand", "He cuts with a ladle" and "He cuts with an axe", the verb "cuts" is the same in the three sentences for the same action of cutting. But the instrumentality of the hand goes obviously with the cutting of the cake (पुराण), that of the ladle with ghee, and that of the axe with flesh. In the same way the word "Divine" signifies particularly Shivalinga as indicated by the Lord's residence on the palm of the hand, in as much as no other deity is ever known to be the object of wearing on the hand. The signification of Linga as Divine thus becomes inevitable. Besides the word "विश्वमित्तर्कः" coming at the end of the sentence points to this; because it means that Shiva is to be understood by "Lord residing on my hand"; the meaning of मण्डित्तम is determined to be Shivalinga by following the rule established in the topic discussing the गृहीरिहि.

The text after laying down the wearing of Linga proceeds to applaud the Lord, Linga, as the creator of the universe and so on. The words, "He is the mother" "He is the father", speak of the Lord being the creator. The word "He is the physician" means "He is the physician of the diseases of the worldly life i. e. He is the destoryer (of miseries).
Another objection:—The pronoun “This” (इस) coming before “विचारिति” speaks about the hand. It, therefore, means that the hand which touches Shiva while applying sandal paste etc. Hence the words “This Lord, my hand”, praise the right hand that is so valuable, being very useful in applying sandal paste and offering food to Linga made of Banà wood or emerald, when that Linga placed on a wooden altar is worshipped; and it is, therefore, praised as being mother, father, etc. The text, accordingly, does not lay down the wearing of Linga on the hand. This objection is wrong; because the hand being inanimate, it is impossible that it should be attributed with being mother, father, etc. It is improper to accept non-intimate attributes (attributes falsely ascribed to a thing where they are not existing) in preference to those that exist in a thing inherently and therefore, are intimate to it. This is why the Vedic passage “Soma, the creator of intellect, purifies” is explained as containing the praise of Shiva, the consort of Uma, and not the Soma plant, in as much as the Soma plant cannot be said to possess the attributes mentioned in the passage. The word Soma is interpreted paronomastically as Lord Shiva who is united with Uma (उमा सहित), in order to vindicate the intimate possession of attributes. This interpretation agrees with that of other writers. And if the right hand, that is occasionally in contact with Shivalinga, sportively expert in the creation, protection and destruction of the universe, is so venerable as to be praised like this, how much more should be the left hand that is in perpetual contact in the way explained
by us with Shivalinga, whose seat it is, the ocean of jewels in the form of innumerable blessings? The wearing of Linga, therefore, is in no way contradicted. It follows then, that the hand can be applauded as being the divine mother, father and so on, because the hand is in constant with Linga, i.e. inseparably connected with it. It would be wrong also to object that the venerable right hand is entitled to such praise, as it is alone used for applying sandal paste etc.; but the left hand being only the seat of Linga (and not used for applying sandal paste etc. and hence inferior to the right hand) is not so entitled. Because it has been already proved that the left hand is (equally) venerable, in as much as it is indispensable for holding and worshipping Linga on it, in conformity with what is said in Shankarsanhit: “One should carefully and vigilantly worship Ishtalinga always on the palm of the left hand after it is given by the preceptor.” If it is further objected that the injunction to wear Linga is not an originative injunction, as it is already obtained by the hymn “प्रिष्ने तेन ब्रिबृत्तम् etc.” which also belongs to Rigweda, even though “वर्षेतिङ्ग स्थापयति” belonging to a different Veda (Yajurveda) cannot deprive the hymn of its nature of being an originative injunction. This objection is not reasonable. Because the hymn “प्रिष्ने तेन ब्रिबृत्तम् etc.” lays down the wearing of Ling in general; but when there arises the expectancy as to where it is to be worn, the hymn “अर्थ में इस्ते etc.” specifies the place of wearing viz. hand. Hence there is no loss of originality. Former teachers have explained it as follows:—This hand is “विवातिलिन्तैन”
(in all time touch with Shiva), because it always touches Linga all round; and as such all time touch is not possible without the wearing of it, the wearing of Linga on hand is proved in consequence. It is also not right to urge that the wearing of Linga fails to be established, because it is possible to have all round touch of Linga on an altar (if that all round touch is the ground for the wearing of Linga). Because "अभिनवः" (all round) expresses all times and all sides; and this sense of all times and all sides touch is possible for the hand on which Linga is worn. The wearing of Linga is thereby proved. The (left) hand is, therefore, दिव्याभिमार्जन (in perpetual touch with Shiva). The hand further becomes "वाकवः" specific against (the miseries of) the worldly life. Oh, great Shiva, my great friend, my hand has come in contact with you. Please come, therefore, to my hand and always reside on it when Thou art worn on it. The right hand is (only) used for worship of Shiva; while the left, being the seat of Shiva, is constantly in association with it and is, therefore, more venerable. The praise of the left hand, then, as being the mother, father, etc. is fittingly addressed. And the identity of the body with Shiva, on account of its all time contact (through wearing) with Shiva, is much more appropriate. It is, therefore, said "there is no doubt that he, who always practices the unification of Pranlinga with the subsidiary (Anga), is Rudra himself". The greatness of wearing Linga is beyond description. The two hands being respectively used for the worship and seating of Linga, and all (the parts
of the body being the seats of different forms of Linga as Acharalinga and others, all the body is meant for (the worship of) Shiva. This is of special interest, they say. The following extracts to substantiate the foregoing from Shankarasanhita and Kiranagama should be noted. “He, who places Ishtalinga given (by his preceptor) on the altar of his palm and worship it all through his life, is engrossed with meditating on it, and is thus intimate with it is called an all-joy sage. He is the knower of the meaning of all Upa-nishads and is intent on the meditation of Shiva.”

“He, who follows the principle of the six-fold locality of Shiva in the body as the means of attaining at-one-ment with Shiva and who worship Shivalinga placed on the lotus-like altar of his hand, is a man of knowledge, a primeval sage, is the greatest among the devotees of Shiva and is immortal. No God or human being will be comparable to him in the three worlds.”

“The knowledge of Linga and the mystic prayer, worship of Linga on the hand-altar, the muttering of the prayer, the wearing of my Linga, these form the mainspring of all (religious) practices in the world.”

The statement of the जाताकोषनिष्ठ्वद namely, “Those that dispraise the three-striped mark of ashes dispraise Shiva himself. But those that wear the three-striped mark wear Shiva Himself in devotion. refers (indirectly) to the wearing of Linga on the body. There it is said further “Oh, child, one should not see at the time of Linga worship the man that is an outcast. The base Brahmins that are cursed by Dadhichi and Gautama will be born in the Kali age as defamers of
Shiva and are (therefore) outcasts”. So also “Those that were in their former birth murderers, of Brahmins, drunkards and stealers of gold, will be born in the Kali age as outcasts and defarmers of Shiva”. The foregoing declares that the defamers of Shiva are great sinners and are, therefore, outcasts. Defamation of Shiva is, therefore, a great sin. The dispraise of ash-mark is also similar (to the defamation of Shiva.). The wearing of Linga as the uncommon cause of final beatitude is determined by the corroborative statement contained in “The wearing of Linga is a (life-long)vow of Maheshwar; those that practise it attain highest good.”. The ash-mark becomes an object of comparison (on account of similarity) with the wearing of Linga (the standard of comparison.). Similarity means likeness of one object to another; the former though different from the latter has many common qualities. For instance, when it is said “He is like Himalaya in courage”, it means that he, the object of comparison, is different from Himalaya (the standard of comparison), but has many common qualities like courage etc. In the same way, the wearing of ashes has the virtue of of bringing about the final beatitude like the wearing of Linga, though different from it. This being so, just as no negation can be established without its counterpart being well known, per rule that “negation of a thing is proved when its counterpart and the place of negation are well-known”, so in poetics, in the case of simile, it is necessary that the standard of comparison should be well known. Therefore, the wearing of Linga (the standard of comparison) must
be an established thing. It is no objection to say that in the sentences like "पैदेन हिंदुस्तानिय " and others, there is the word “वाच" expressive of comparison; but there being no such word in the sentence under consideration, there can be no comparison. Thereby the standard of comparison, viz. the wearing of Linga fails to be a proved thing. This is no objection because even though the word expressive of comparison is absent, it is understood as it is done in the sentence "He is Brihaspati in oratorial skill," in which the points of comparison and contrast with the counterpart are apparent. Or the figure of speech "द्वारा" (Example), will also be appropriate here; and that too will compel admission of Linga-wearing. द्वारा (Example) is defined as the relation of a type to a prototype, i.e. when two things, different from each other but placed side by side as non-different, on account of close resemblance existing between them, are said to be related as the type and the prototype. In the present case, likewise, the application of ashes to the body, though different from (the wearing of Linga), has the latter as the type, which forces the wearing of Linga as being established. It may be objected that though the wearing of Linga may be established, the wearing of Linga internally will serve the purpose; and the external wearing, therefore, fails to be proved. It is wrong to so object because when a thing is heard and stated to be like another, it is required to fulfil the condition of being like the type. Hence the application of ashes being external, its type, the wearing of Linga, is also required to be external. And that the application of ashes is external is proved by what is said in का१ा१सिम्प्रेपलिष्ठ and others, namely "The first stripe of ashes etc." The three stripes
of ashes represent Maheshwar, Rudra and Sadashiva. And if the ash-stripes representing Shiva are laid dawn for wearing, the wearing of Shiva Himself, in the form of Linga, becomes much more desirable.

IX

My bow to God Shiva:—The wearing of Linga becomes beyond cavil (as an injunction) by the two sentences "Thou art that" and "I am Brahman", which only explain the great sentence that speaks about the (mutual relation as one) of the Linga and the Anga. It may be objected as follows:—That the individual soul is expressed by त्वम् occurring in the sentence "तत्वमाति", the individual soul, that is none other than Brahman, limited by ignorance and, therefore, undergoing mundane existence restricted to the body and its sense-organs caused by ignorance, is established by the शृंगि. The great Lord Shiva is expressed by शिव, Shiva as characterized by the six-fold blessed qualities like omniscience etc., and appearing as Nilkantha and Chandrashekhara under the limitations caused by माया, as known from the Vedic sentence "One should know that माया is the nature, and Maheshwar is the supreme spirit possessing that nature." The identity of the two (जीव and भ्रजन) of mutually opposite qualities being impossible, it is to be understood that the two spirits (क्षतिगात्) are the same in the secondary sense, when they are divested of the false limitations imposed upon Him. The second sentence "I am भ्रजन" is also to be explained similarly. Hence the sentences do not signify, the one-ness of the Linga and the Anga. We refute the objection by saying that:—You have not
grasped the sense. The dullness of those, that do not know what the oneness of the Linga and the Anga is, is simply pitiable. This statement does not cause any wonder to those that are conversant with the principle, taught by Skanda Purana and the Agamas like Kamika and others. There in answer to the question put by the disciple, the preceptor explained to him that:—One should effect union of the individual soul called भौगोलः, a subsidiary modification of the causal form (of the Highest soul), with मानसिंह (a superior modification of the same) after undergoing the वेधादीक्षा ceremony performed by the preceptor by placing his hands on the head of the disciple; one should effect union of भौगोलः, the subtle form (of the Highest soul), with श्रागिलिंग on having मंत्रदीक्षा; and that one should also effect union of भौगोलः, the gross form (of the Highest soul), with इत्रलिंग on receiving the किचादीक्षा. The preceptor then said (in the end) “Thou art that.” Having listened to this the disciple understood the meaning of what is said in Shankarasaññita as follows:—That is Linga, into which भूतः, that is capable of working wonders, comes to be lost. That Linga is the eternally existent Brahman. So say those that know the highest truth. This is why Linga is the form of the Almighty.” In accordance with this it means that Brahman conditioned by माया appears in the form of Linga and that “तुः” points to this Brahman. Further the letter “अं” (of the word अंगः) means Brahman the Sat and the letter “व” means “attaining to” Thus Anga is that which attains (at-one-ment with) Brahman. So say those that have thought about the subsidiary principle Anga. जैव, the individual soul, is Anga undergoing mundane existence.” In accordance with this Jiva is the thing expressed by
which Jiva attains “अं”, i.e. Brahman, the great Shiva, when the shroud of ignorance (enveloping the Jiva) is destroyed by internal worship and other forms of devotion. That Anga means the body (of the Brahman) as known from what is said in the भृदिः, namely, “He, whose body the spirit is, whose body the unmanifest principle is”; that individual soul, forming the body of the Highest spirit, is expressed by the term “लङ्क” Lastly “संघोप” means thorough at-one-ment (of these two) as explained by words “the union of Shiva and Jiva in their forms as Linga and Anga, is the real description of their indissoluble union.” “अति” therefore, expresses the indissoluble union of Jiva and Brahman like that of (a small quantity of) water with (an endless store of) water. Or the whole universe of movable and immovable objects forming the body of Shiva is what is expressed by the term “खं” in accordance with what is said “All the universe, the movable and the immovable, is the body of the God of Gods; but the beasts bound by fetters do not know this.” The great Shiva residing in Linga, is expressed by “लङ्क” The indissoluble union of these two is expressed by “असि”. The disciple comprehends this. But as the identity of the two, no other than Linga and Anga and expressed by the terms खं and लङ्क, is impossible in their primary sense on account of the two being of antithetical nature, he understands that they are identical in their secondary sense only. Thereafter he gradually comes to realize the full significance of the great sentence “I am Brahman” and attains liberation, though living (in the mortal form). There are very many passages in Skanda Purana, Linga Purana, in the latter part of Vatulagama and Veeragama
and in Anubhavasutra like the following, namely, "The disciple in his mortal frame said to the preceptor, the great cause (of salvation), "I am he"; then the preceptor, the ocean of mercy, said the truth (in reply, yes) "Thou art that". We shall give only a few of them, to avoid wearisome length, that teach the meaning of the one-ness of Linga and Anga and that of the sentence "Thou art that". In Skandapurana, the compilation of Shankar, it is said, "What is Linga? what is Anga? what is the nature of their connection? One should think well of the terms that describe their mutual relation as follows:- Linga is the great God, whose characteristics are being, knowing, and rejoicing. Anga is the individual soul caught in the net-work of this worldly life. The sages say that the term "तदृ" expresses the Almighty Shiva; and the term लें expresses Anga, the individual soul of the worldly life; लें that is no other than Anga, is what is signified by "I am he". The great Lord, the knower, is indicated by the terms लें and बहँ in their secondary signification. The terms लें and बहँ in their worldly condition do not express तदृ (Brahman), as they always differ from it. If the individual soul; the Anga were not to be Shiva in its secondary sense, he would never attain (eternal) joy. All the universe, animate and inanimate is pervaded by the Lord's consciousness and is pure. And because it is the Lord's modification, it undoubtedly means, "Thou art that". But as he possesses joy and knowledge though limited, he must be a part and parcel of the Highest Lord. The persons conversant with the Vedas and Agamas say that because terms "तदृ" and "लें", representing Linga and Anga, are mutually opposed in their primary sense, therefore the conflictless second-
ary sense, namely, being, knowing and rejoicing should be taken to be the real sense. He who understands the relation between souls (individual and universal), the great Lord, that is all pervading and all knowledge is what is Anga, I, or the individual soul and none else. He who appears like the individual soul, I, (a part of the) Highest soul, is Linga the great Lord. He (the universal spirit) by His power (माया) becomes Linga. He, again, by that very power of the nature of ignorance, is modified into Anga. तद्, therefore, is Linga and "अं" is Anga. The relation of these two being really one is expressed by the verb "अंि". He, to whom this meaning of the sentence is clear always, by the instruction of the preceptor, is the person that attains at-one-ment of Anga with Linga. He who thus realizes the one-ness of Anga and Linga, is the ascetic. He is all-knowing and stands liberated though living in the mortal form. He who rejects the primary sense of Linga and Anga, has the thorough idea of the secondary sense, should think of the Highest soul as being himself. As soon as the thorough understanding of the one-ness of (Linga and Anga) arises, he becomes free from the effects of ignorance past, present and future. It is also said by Anubhavasutra that:—"तल्" is Linga; "अं" is Anga; The verb "अंि" expresses the relation of the two being one. In the way aforesaid it is proved that the wearing of Linga should be accepted by the followers of (the religion taught by the) Vedas.

Now it will be shown that the wearing of Linga is also laid down by Smritis like Gautamasmriti and Manu-smruti that maintain the teaching of the Vedas.
Gautamasmriti says "He is a Brahmin who mutters the prayer (स्वात: नम: ), wears on his head Linga and beads, applies ashes to his forehead". Here the words "meditates on" state the internal search (i.e. internal wearing of Linga); and the words "wears Linga on the head" state the external wearing of Linga. It may be objected that the six-fold duty of muttering prayers, meditation and wearing Linga and others are laid down for all Brahmins in general. But this does not conform to what is actually practised, in as much as some (Brahmins) do not wear Linga (though they apply ashes). This objection is not sound; because the above sentence is applicable to those Brahmins only that wear Linga and excludes those that do not conform to the injunction, like the sentence "Those, that omit the performance of आदि ceremony on the death-anniversary day, will be born as degraded persons in crores of births", which though referring (apparently) to all Brahmins, excludes from its operation the followers of Madhva sect who are bigotted in observing the eleventh day fasts (and on which nothing of the kind of आदि is performed). So also the sentence, "Oh, eyes, be vigilant and careful; some auspicious night is approaching, when somebody of your species (the third eye of Shiva) will be your associate", lays down something referring to the eyes (of all Brahmins) but ceases to operate on the followers of the Ramanuja sect. Similar is the sentence quoted from Gautamasmriti. And the specific adjective "wearing Lingas on their head" points to those Brahmins that wear Linga and follow the principle of Linga and Anga (in their technical sense,) though the word "Brahmins" shows Brahmins in general. It would
also be wrong to say that the six-fold duties of (muttering) Mantra etc., as distinctive attributes of Lingangi Brahmins, may extend to the Kshatriyas that follow the self-same duties; because the word "Brahmins" restricts the operation of the attributes to only such as are Brahmins and as observe the six-fold duties. Such is in short the import of the words quoted above that mark out Lingangi Brahmins.

X

Let good attend us:—In that (Gatuعامsmriti) it is said "Powerful sages like Axapada and others wear Linga in their hair day and night". In Manusmriti it is laid down that "In the case of the person, that has given up the performance of all rites and of him who is absorbed in contemplation, the body (when such a person is dead) is not to be burnt and no obsequial rites are to be performed." Here by the conjunctive particle तः, the persons that give up the performance of rites and those that are absorbed in contemplation, are mentioned prominently. When there arises the desire to know who those persons absorbed in contemplation are (they are to be known, because) such persons are mentioned later by that very smriti in words "He is the meditative ascetic that wears Linga, a modification of Shiva, meditates on it, and is never devoted to any other deity. The person, who worships external Linga, meditates on it and is likewise pleased and placid in heart is (also) called a meditative ascetic." From this it is learnt that the ascetic is one that has abandoned the performance of all rites and the meditative
ascetic is one that wears (external) Linga. And the suspension of burning and obsequial rites proves the wearing of Linga. Bauddhayana smriti says likewise, "If a person is free from attachment (to the worldly objects) and is absorbed in meditation, he is not to be burnt, no impurity to be observed, and no libation to be offered when he is dead." Here also from the words "a person absorbed in meditation", in conformity with the interpretation given above, the wearing of Linga is proved. It is said in Shatatapasmitri, "An anchorite, a meditative saint, one that has attained at-one-ment with Linga a mendicant, an ascetic and one that is in the last stage of life, when dead should (not be burnt but) be buried under-ground". In this passage where burial is prescribed for one that wears Linga, the specification of the subject (viz. one that has attained at-one-ment with Linga) proves the wearing of Linga. It may be objected as follows:—It is established by the number of Vedic and smriti texts quoted above that it is obligatory on all including women and children to wear and worship Linga all through life. But it is improper in as much as it is undesirable that women should wear and worship Linga during their monthly course, when they are unfit for being seen, touched, or even talked with, or when they are in confinement. If they wear and worship Linga, it is defiled on account of its contact with the impure body (of such women). Worship of Linga is not allowable even after a bath. Nor can Linga be sanctified on such an occasion, as such sanctification goes against your established principles. Moreover;
it is said by scriptures, that prohibit, as follows:—
One should avoid Shaivas, Pashupatas, the wearer of Linga, one that observes a (sinful) vow, one that follows the cat-like manner of deception and the heretics. When one sees a heretic, a degraded person, a wearer of a disc-mark, a wearer of Linga and so also an attendant of an idol, one should take a bath with clothes on. A twice-born, with his body bearing the impress of a heated disc or having Linga worn on it, is not entitled to follow the rites laid down by the Vedas and Smritis. One should not take food from an ascetic, a meditative sage, and a wearer of Linga:—
All this goes to prove that Linga is not to be worn. And as regards the texts adduced in support of wearing Linga can be explained away somehow or other so as to suit the context. This objection is not right; because the wearing and worship of Linga, laid down by Vedic texts like "संभलितं स्तावयति" are as much obligatory as various duties enjoined by special texts like "सोमेन बनेत" (one should worship) by soma sacrifice", "वेंतनाकिंच्छ यद्विनवंशीयं पद्माभासेत" (one should immolate the animal that remains after soma sacrifice)" and others are, though those duties are prohibited and though the slaughter of an animal, the eating of flesh, and the drinking of Soma are obviously opposed by Vedic texts as follows:—"They obtainedimmortality by renunciation alone and not by rites, offspring or wealth; no human being will attain liberation except by renouncing rites." This passage clearly lays down the attainment of liberation, the most desired and the principle among the four human objectives so also it is
laid down by Manusmriti: "No animals should be killed; no flesh should be taken; no leavings should be offered to any body; and none should (overeat and) go out with leavings." The wearing and worship of Linga being thus obligatory, they are unobjectionable in accordance with what is said by various texts. Siddhantashikhamani and Viragama say "there is no impurity (attaching to) the house where a woman is in confinement. The woman, that is devoted to the worship of Linga worn on the body, is not impure during menstrual periods. So is a woman in confinement. The woman thus devoted is million times pure like the sun, fire, or the wind, even when she is in menstruation or confinement. Things like impurity leave a woman when she wears Linga." Padmapurana and Shivarahasya also say "Just as iron when it is put into fire is not iron (but becomes fire), human beings do not remain ordinary human beings by association with me. As a wick wet with oil becomes a flame when ignited, so the man devoted to me becomes one like me." Likewise Parashara smriti says "Those that worship Shivalinga, those that keep sacred fire, and those that are anchorites and ascetics have their bodies free from any kind of impurity." This freedom again from impurity is as unexceptionable as that caused by menses to the wife of a sacrificer, after she enters with her husband the performance of long-lasting sacrifices like Paundarika and others, as well as that caused to the sacrificer (by the death of a relative) after he begins the performance. In the same way when a girl remains unmarried before her twelfth year for financial stringency (of her guardian) or some
other difficulties, and when she comes to be married after that period, and if, after her wearing the sacred marriage thread, she is seen or heard to be discharging menses at the time of (swearing in the presence of the sacred marriage) fire, a question arises purporting as to what the sacrificial priests should do as follows:—During the progress of the marriage ceremony if a girl attains puberty at the time of (moving round the sacred) fire, what should the priests do? It is said in reply by Bhatta in the section about marriage that "The girl should be given a bath and the text should be chanted in accompaniment, namely, "These waters have their oblations; the divine sacrifice has its oblations;" the girl then should be given new clothes to put on (by the priest) with his mind fixed in meditation. Thereafter two offerings are to be made". In this way the impurity of the girl (caused by menses) is considered unobjectionable after she enters the sacred marriage ceremony. Similarly women wearing Linga are unexceptionable during menses. So also during the funeral rites in honour of the ancestors (of a house-holder), if the priests, invited as representatives of the ancestors, come to know of some incident of impurity after they have received (funeral) gifts, they are considered free from impurity (until the completion of the rites). Similar is the position of women wearing Linga, because it is said that the wearing of Linga is a sacrament performed by the spiritual preceptor in accordance with what is said "The preceptor taught the principle of wearing the three-fold Linga after performing the three-fold sacra-
ment of शालः, by which he burnt the three-fold sin besetting the three bodies (the casual, the subtle and the gross). This Linga should not be dissociated from.” So also it is said “One should always worship Linga (worn on the body) attentively on the palm of the left hand”. The sacrament and the worship of Linga being thus life-long, the impurity of menses as being unexceptionable has to be admitted. Kaushikaditya in his Smriti, while determining the state of impurity says as follows: “The religious rites, requiring a number of days for completion and begun before the occurrence of an impure incident, should be performed to an end; all of the rites requiring physical activity should be done; but not such acts like the muttering of prayers, giving of gifts, and the worship (praise) of deities (that is, these should be omitted). Anchorites, ascetics and religious students engaged in religious acts are pure. Even others, after they begin the performance of a rite, are pure.” In these words he says that the rites when once begun should be proceeded with to their conclusion, even when events causing impurity occur in the middle of performance. He further says, in anticipation of the question about what rites and what the beginning were as follows:—“The commencement of holy acts, selection of (invitation to) a priest (for the performance of a sacrifice), a solemn vow to perform rites and sacrifices (of long duration like Paṇḍarika), the performance of auspicious rites (that precede ceremonies like marriage), and the commencement of cooking food (for a funeral feast)”. The explanation of this is:—Invitation extended to a priest for the performance of domestic sacrifices; holy acts like Chandrāyana,
pilgrimage, the wearing and worship of Linga etc.; Satra is a sacrificial session of long duration like Paundarika; सेवक is a solemn vow to undertake such a session; the opening of a marriage ceremony by means of auspicious ceremonies is नायनकुण्ड; and the commencement of cooking food for a funeral feast is प्रकारसिंह. And when a beginning is made of rites stated above, one should persist to the end of the rites, even when an impure event takes place. In accordance with this the inevitability of religious rite of the wearing and worship of Linga must be admitted; because the wearing and worship of Linga is enjoined to be a life-long vow when that Linga is given by the preceptor by performing the Diksha ceremony (in accompaniment), in obedience to what is said in Skandapurana, "The vow called, Maheshwara, of wearing Linga should continue life-long". The vow once begun should go on without interruption, even when any impurity of a woman takes place holds good (not only for wearing and worship of Linga but also) for other acts. Others, on the other hand, maintain that the body (of a woman in menses), though pure for duties about Linga, is impure for other acts, analogously to the mouth made pure by gurgling to mutter prayers, but it is impure even for that, when somebody else spits on the body.

The objection that Linga becomes impure by its contact with the body when impure is quite improper. The impurity of the body having been proved to be impossible for the wearing and worship of Linga by the extracts from Parashurasmriti, Siddhantashikhaman, and other works already given, the
impurity of Linga by its contact with such a body is much less possible. Still we take up the objection only for the sake of discussion and refute it by reasoning. We ask whether the impurity by the contact with the impure body is caused to the Highest spirit residing in Linga or to Linga itself. The first alternative is impossible, because no impurity can attach to the Highest soul that pervades all things pure and impure and that is above all impurity even to a bit as is known from the Vedic texts like the following:—"The universal soul, that is an undivided whole, actionless, tranquil, fault-less, and stainless" and "therefore Lord Shiva is everywhere". The second alternative also cannot stand; because it is impossible that such impurity should attach to Linga, on account of its inseparable connection with the Highest Lord and on account of its being the residence of the stainless Lord. To say that sanctification of Linga by the preceptor at the time of किराडङ्ग by giving a bath of five sweet things and five cow's products, by various seats (on which Linga is placed), by purification of six-fold ways, and by the invocation of कसा, is destroyed by the contact of that Linga with the body, is as good as drinking milk of a female tortoise. The power of sanctification is similar to the unseen power arising from the performance of a short lived sacrificial rite, a visible form of action and desire, which unseen power is indestructible by the impurity caused to the sacrificer by some impure incident happening later before the fruits of the sacrifice are attained, or by the impurity of the sacrificer's wife by menses.
Otherwise the sacrifice as the cause of attaining heaven in due course is inexplicable. So also in the matter under consideration some permanent power (संस्कार) is imparted to Linga by the evanescent six-fold purificatory ceremony and the (holy) seats; and that is not destroyed by its contact with the body beset with impurity in the meanwhile. Otherwise the obligation of worshipping Linga daily becomes impossible till the attainment of final beatitude by the at-one-ment of Anga with Linga, as enjoined by the words “One should attentively worship Linga on the palm of the hand every day. That Ishtalinga is given by the preceptor after performing the purificatory ceremony.” If the destruction (of the संस्कार) is still maintained, then analogously, the संस्कार of the sacrificer and his wife and other kinds of संस्कारas resulting from the bath in the holy Ganges and such other things are also destroyed by the impurity occurring in the meanwhile; and no fruits of such holy rites are attained in consequence. The scriptural texts enjoining such rites will then be meaningless and there will be the undesirable contingency of the Buddhistic doctrines being accepted. If, on the contrary, in obedience to what is said by the extracts of Parasharasmriti already quoted, namely, “He, that worships Shivalinga, he that maintains holy fire etc.”, the संस्कार is admitted to be indestructible by the position of the sacrificer and his wife remaining intact from impurity, the permanent freedom from impurity of the body of the person wearing Linga must also be admitted and the sanctity of Linga in contact with that body will be inviolate. Moreover, if food, when merely offered to deities at holy places like Bhuva-
heshwara, becomes holy and acceptable to the high caste followers of Vedic religion even when it is touched by low caste people, in accordance with what is said "The food offered to me becomes holy even in the part of the village inhabited by untouchables", Linga, the residence of the Highest, who is always pure and free from all taint is (more naturally) free from impurity, even when in contact with an impure body; and consequently there can be no dispute in that regard. (On the analogy of the foregoing) it would be wrong to maintain that the sanctity of the idol of Shiva, placed on an altar by the priest with purificatory ceremony at the time of installing (the idol), is also permanent; because the case (of the idol), is different (from that of Linga worn on the body). In the case of the Prāṇālinga, a particular form of that Linga, is worn on a particular part of the body, and the worship of and food offered to that particular form of Linga throughout life is required to be unavoidably done in obedience to scriptural texts. The assumption of permanent sanctity based on such scriptures that enjoin a person to do the requisite worship etc. at all times pure and impure cannot be extended to the idol (for want of scriptural support). This is why there is seen the re-sprinkling (of the idol with holy water etc. when it becomes impure.) No further discussion is necessary in this regard.

What is said that Linga is not to be worn on the body, as it is prohibited by texts already quoted, namely, "The Shaivas, Pashupatas etc.", is also due to want of grasp of real meaning. Because on reading between the lines our position is not in the least affected, though all persons (stated in the passage given above) are unworthy of being
seen. There the word Shaiva, derived as those devoted to Shiva, means the old Shaivas wearing ashes and beads, the followers of traditional religion, that bow down to Shiva at twilight times and wear ashes, and also the followers of Anandatirtha. It is wrong to say that though the word “Shaiva” derivatively means the Shaivas of a different creed as described above, still etymologically and conventionally it means the Linga-wearing Brahmanic Shaivas; because there is the word “Linga” that specially points to (differentiates from) those other Shaivas. Nor can the word “Linga” be taken as an adjective qualifying “Shaivas,” as such attribution would go against the conjunctive particle “य” that joins Pashupatas and Shaivas. The word “heretic” also points to the followers of traditional creed, as they alone wear various marks like three-striped ashes and vertical sandal paste; because lexicons state “heretics” to be synonymous with “those that wear various marks.” There are also (heretics), the followers of Bhagavata creed (Vaishnavism), that move about in various disguises of Satyabhama, Rukmini, and Krishna etc. and bear various marks. “Linga” means derivatively a badge or mark, i.e. that which gives a clue to the hidden meaning of things; and it, therefore, expresses various special stone or copper marks or badges of various deities of different places. There are heretics, as is well known, that are worshippers of such badges; and worshippers of five such badges are mentioned in the verse “(there are worshippers of) Aditya, Ambika, Vishnu, Gananath and Maheshwar.” “Heretics” and “Lingins” are not respectively the qualifying and the qualified, because Linga-wearing Brahmins have none of
the badges that are attributes of heretics. The word "heretics" mentioned in the passage "The heretics, the fallen, the degraded etc." also refer to the followers of the traditional creed, in conformity with the explanation given already.

The prohibition contained by "The food of an ascetic should not be taken etc." does not harm our position, as acceptance of food in general stands prohibited; because it is said "The sin committed by the host resides in the food offered by him. Hence none should accept food even when one is on the point of death". Moreover the food given by the wearer of Linga is not included in the list of food prohibited from acceptance by Manusmriti as follows:—"A Brahmin should never take food in a sacrifice performed by a priest not versed in the Vedas or by a village priest, food offered (to fire) by a priest's wife or an eunuch. He should not take food given by a person of brutal actions, food prepared for a person in impurity, food remaining in the dish as soon as a person leaves company in a feast, food prepared for persons in impurity during the ten days of impurity, food not offered respectfully, food not prepared for a deity or guests etc., food prepared by a woman without husband or child, enemy's food, food given by a slanderer, food given by a liar, food given by one that sells the fruits of a sacrifice performed by him, food prepared for or by a multitude of false Brahmins, a courtesan's food, the food disapproved of by wise men, a usurer's food which is as good as excretum, and food given by the seller of arms etc. etc." The truth is that, in accordance with the principle established in a topic
Purvamimansa, that युक्ति prevails against a Smriti when there is a conflict between the two. From this it is out of order that a Smriti should say anything against the wearer of Linga, when the Linga-wearing is enjoined by various powerful Vedic texts like "सर्व्वप्रथम स्थापयति". In Mahabharata, as authoritative as the Vedas, in the Canto called Anushasana, Yudhishtira puts a question, viz. "Oh, you best of Bharat Dynasty, the Brahmins versed in Vedas say that a wearer of Linga and a non-wearer are both proper recipients of gifts. (Please tell me which of these two is the proper recipient)." Bhishma in reply says "Both are proper recipients. But gifts should be made to either of these after making inquiries about their character. Both are sages." This shows that the wearers of Linga are proper persons to receive gifts. Therefore, it is impossible that the wearers of Linga should be unfit to be seen. They, thus, are above being exceptionable. On the contrary it is said in the Vedas "He, that worships a deity in preference to his own, loses his own and fails to propitiate the other. He, thereby, incurs sin." It is also said in Bhagavadgita and others as follows:—One's own creed or religion, though defective, is preferable to another that may be better founded. One should look at the sun (for purging one's self of the taint contracted) if one happens to see the wicked person that takes to another religion after deserting his own. He who transgresses the rules prescribed by the Vedas in regard to four stages and castes and goes over to another, is a heretic." Manusmriti also says "One's own religion, though defective, is preferable to a new one that may be better in practice. One that follows another in preference to one's own becomes degraded at once." In
the same way another Vedic text says “He, that goes over to another deity in preference to his own, loses both; he thereby contracts sin”. Agreeably to these, the words “He that wears a disc-mark, he that wears a different mark (badge) etc.” should be taken to mean—“he, that exchanges one mark for another through the sin of mis-deeds by preferring the one to the other, (is a degraded person); and if one happens to see such a person, one should take a bath”. Thus the word “Linga” occurring in the sentence “He who bears the mark impressed by a heated disc etc.” means a mark or a badge (and not Shivalinga). And a twice-born, therefore, whose body bears marks imprinted by a hot disc and others, (becomes degraded and, therefore,) forfeits his right to follow the principles laid down by Vedas and Smritis. Such is the meaning of the passage; and it derives support from the words of censure previously noted, namely, “A Brahmin's body is known to be etc.”. So also the following words support the meaning, namely, “If a person casually sees a Vaishnava, whose body bears marks of disk and conch and who reviles Saiva, he should look at the sun”. Even if the word “Linga” is taken to mean Shivalinga, the interpretation as before should be “He that gives up the mark of disc and begins to wear Shivalinga and vice-versa, should be avoided”. If it were not so, any other interpretation will militate against what is said in Viragama, Mukutagama, Shankarasanhitas, Shivadharmottara, and others, as follows:—Beasts are more intelligent than worms, insects and moths; men are better endowed with intellect than beasts. Among the human beings the twice-born are superior to the non-twice-born. Superior among
the twice-born are the Brahmins. Superior among these are those that have formed principles. Better than these are the persons that act on the principles. Better than these are the ascetics. Better than ascetics are those that possess thorough knowledge (of Shaiva religion and philosophy). Better than persons of thorough knowledge are the worshippers of Shankara. Of the devotees of Shiva those that follow the creed of Linga and Anga being one are pre-eminent. Of them, again, he that knows the truth of the six-fold locality (occupied by Shiva in the human body) is the best. Better than he there is none in the three worlds. He is to be always adored and worshipped by those that desire to get rid of this worldly life. In short, he is myself undoubtedly. It is no use saying more, my dear child." "He who fails to wear Linga on his head, round his neck, on his arm, or on his breast, should be forsaken as if he were a low-caste. He, that sees a Kunda, a Golaka, a person not wearing Linga on his body, or an idol-attendant, should perform the moon sacrifice (to be free from the sin of seeing such a person).

If a Brahmin, that does not wear Ishtalinga on his body, is seen, oh, my child, one should take a bath with clothes on. One should have a purifying look at the sun, if one sees a man not wearing Linga on the head, on the arm, or over the forehead. He that does not worship Shiva-linga, the Lord of the three worlds, cannot attain liberation, cannot go to heaven, or cannot have a kingdom (even). Lord Shiva always resides in the body of his devotees; if such a devotee is worshipped, Lord Shiva Himself is worshipped. The stupid person that hates a Shiva's devotee contracts every kind of sin. Those, that hate the
devotees that have full knowledge of Shiva, and those that carp at such devotees are stupid people, indeed! And they go to hell with their ancestors".

If it is objected that in Vishnu Purana and Skanda Purana heretics are described to be those that are condemned by kings as "Thieves, that are beaten by others in anger for having illicit connection with their wives, that hold intercourse with men of inferior caste, that quarrel with low-caste people and are beaten by them, that live under the shelter of low-caste people, that confine people, commit arson, and administer poison, are heretics. So also the man of cruel nature and the man that breaks away from caste barriers as prescribed by Shiva and, therefore excommunicated from all social intercourse, are also called heretics. The man that transgresses the code of life proper for his caste, becomes degraded". Heretics being people of such description, the same meaning should be extended to the word "heretic" occurring in the sentence (under discussion), namely "The heretic, the fallen, the degraded etc.". We say in reply to this objection that it is wrong; because the word "heretic" being differently explained by Puranas, Scriptures and the lexicons, has not one fixed meaning. Hence the word "heretic" occurring in the passage under discussion, is interpreted as the wearer of various marks, as already explained, on the basis of a lexicon, which fixes up the conventional sense of a word. The sense, "changing (marks or badges of) deities (for want of loyalty to any one)", is accordingly irrefutable. And their unfitness for being seen becomes irreducible, in conformity with the statement "one should look at the sun on seeing a person
that does not wear Linga”). In this way all the foregoing is said by taking the condemnatory sentences adduced against us are meant for reproach. Please listen to the truth of the matter. The sentences like “heretic, the fallen etc. etc.”, occurring in the section dealing with the fourth stage of life, are merely meant as eulogies of the matter discussed, like the sentences, that occur during discussion about Linga-wearing, namely, “No body should see even in an adversity the face of a person, who wears on it a round or square mark, a hollow oval mark, or a mark of the shape of a fig-leaf. One should avoid the sight of a person that does not wear Linga on his body, as if he were an untouchable” and also like the sentences, that are condemnatory of the persons not wearing a disk mark and that occur during discussion about the eligibility of such a mark. This way of eulogising the topic under discussion accords with the dictum “The dispraise is not meant (merely) for condemnation but for praising the praise-worthy”. If it were not so, all ascetics will stand condemned (whereas only the pseudo-ascetics are meant to be condemned), as is said by Linga Purana, Skanda Purana, and Aditya Purana, as follows:- says Linga Purana, “Oh, Brahmins, there will be various (false) ascetics in the Kali age, that will trade on the fruits of (showy) penance and performance of sacrifices (with some worldly object in view). They will have clean shining teeth, steady sight (fixed glances), clean-shaven head, and will wear clothes dyed will ochre. At the beginning of the end of (ह्रास) age, they will practise all unlawful actions of a Shudra.” “Pseudo ascetics, indulging in unsuitable food and frivolous talk, ready to accept gifts not suited (to real ascetics),
taking kindly to luxury and misconduct, elated with unbecoming pride, will establish monasteries from greed for money. They will interest themselves with the affairs of the villages and will be past masters in dealing out charms and amulets. They will preach to the widows and take pleasure in conversing with them. They will assume the role of preaching to all, though themselves void of asceticism (lit. dispassion). Out of greed for money they will be swindlers and move about in towns and villages to earn money by begging. An ascetic, if young and if he takes milk and sweets made of milk and rice every day, and becoming haughty thereby, will be fallen certainly. Some of these false ascetics will wear ochre-coloured clothes (outwardly) but will be attached to worldly pleasures. They will hold a single stick or a triple-fold stick, have their heads clean-shaven and will swindle the public. Some will indulge in sexual satisfaction and earn livelihood and others will be attached to prostitutes. Deceitful and atheistic they will wear ascetic clothes only for show. Some will be in the service of kings; some will eat flesh and some will drink wine and be haughty (elevated). At their very sight people will contract sin". Moreover, if all the ascetics following the duties laid down by scriptures and recognised as proper recipients of gifts, the ascetics of Vaishnavite order, those of traditional creed, ascetics of the Madhwa sect, all adored by numerous followers, if all these were condemned as unworthy of being seen, there will be an end to all worldly affairs and the Vedas, Scriptures, Puranas, Agamas, and historical works, all laying down rules of conduct for ascetics and stating their fitness to receive gifts will be contradicted. It is no use to elaborate this trifling point further, which will be like a mountain in labour only to produce a mouse.
XI.

My salutations to Shiva:—Another objection may be advanced as follows:—It may be admitted that the wearing of Linga, being supported by scriptures already quoted, is not objectionable. Still in Amarakosha in the section treating of names of higher order of beings, the term “Those that earn their livelihood by wearing Linga” is included in the list of undesirables, namely, “Those that wear empty marks of religion, those that live by wearing Linga, those that spend their manhood or power in irreligious acts, those that violate a religious vow etc. etc.” According to the interpretation given by the commentator Lingabhatta the term “भमेष्वजी” means he that wears an empty mark of religion; “दिग्नाहं” is he that trades upon his wearing of Linga (i. e. who earns his livelihood by a false show of wearing Linga); “अवक्रोणी” is one that spends his power (manhood) in an irreligious rite; and “क्षत्रवन” is he who has violated (failed in performing to an end) a religious vow. i. e. one that has violated the rules of celibacy. From the aforesaid explanation of “दिग्नाहं” it is plain that the wearing of Linga on the body is censurable (and therefore not to be practised). In reply we say the objection is unreasonable, because the (aforesaid) interpretation is wrong, the right one being as follows:—Manusmriti first mentions reproachable persons as “He, that puts on a show of religion, that is greedy, a rogue, a swindler of people, a man of cat-like manners (he that puts on a garb of false pious meditation), a person of murderous actions, and a reviler of all”; and it says later, while explaining the terms, “If a non-wearer of
Linga earns livelihood by making a show of wearing Linga, he appropriates the sin of the wearers of Linga and will be born a lower animal”. Hence the term “लिंगमयति” refers to a roguish follower of a traditional creed. Such a rogue, on learning that a strict Linga-wearing Brahmin makes it a rule of giving food and money to a Linga-wearer only, goes to him in the guise of a Linga-wearer, receives gifts from him and thus maintains himself. He thus breaks the rules of religion and will be born a low animal on account of his appropriating all the sins of the donor of gifts. Because it is said in Puranas and religious verses that a guest, that goes to a house-holder at mid-day meal and is fed there, exchanges his merit for the sins of the host. The term “लिंगमयति” mentioned by Amarakosha means such a roguish disguiser and not a Linga-wearing Brahmin, whom Linga has been given by the preceptor at the time of Diksha ceremony performed by him. The interpretation of the term “लिंगमयति” made by the commentator Lingabhatta, as a guileful rogue admirably fits in with this.

Some extracts from Puranas like Skandapurana and Lingapurana which reiterate and thereby corroborate the Vedic texts like “स्वर्गित ग्नानेनि” have been already given. Some others that lay down the wearing of Linga will be reproduced here. In Padmapurana, in a section called Shivagita, which latter is an Upanishad, it is said as follows:—When the sage Agastya, the husband of Lopamudra, went to Rama, who was then stricken with grief of separation from his beloved wife Sita, Rama asked the sage as to what he should do to get back Sita, which was the only means of relief from the pangs
of separation. The sage then told Rama that it was impossible for him to get back Sita except by cutting off ten heads of Ravana, who had grown so proud on account of his being surrounded by sons like Shakrakrit and brothers like Kumbhakarna that were invincible to all Gods and demons, and that it was not possible (for any body) to cut off (the ten heads of Ravana) except by the favour of Shiva. So saying the sage performed the Diksha ceremony of Rama and gave him the Mangalas of thousand names of Shiva, which formed the essence of all Vedas; he then told him that God Shiva would be pleased when prayed with the recital of those thousand names and appear before Rama in person and give divine weapons, with the use of which he would be able to kill Ravana and get back Sita. After this the sage disappeared. The following verse forms the beginning of the story:—"When Rama wanted to put an end to his life along with his brother Laxmana, the sage Agastya, the husband of Lopamudra, came to know of his resolve (intuition) and went to him etc. etc.". The story ends with the verse "When the sage went away to his hermitage after advising Rama like this etc.". In the next canto the story continues "In the mountain Ramagiri on the holy banks of the river Godavari Rama installed Shivalinga, and on receiving the Diksha ceremony, took a bath in the holy waters of the river Godavari he then applied holy ashes, wore beads, worshipped (God Shiva) with wild flowers, and offered Him wild fruits likewise. He (not only) covered himself with ashes but lay in them. Taking a seat on tiger-skin he muttered the thousand names of Shiva day and night with undivided
attention”. The story after describing Rama’s rigorous penance goes on to tell how Shiva appeared before Rama as a consequence of the latter’s penance, how He taught him the truth of real religion, and how He gave him the divine weapons like Pashupata and others. Later in the discussion that ensued between them Shiva taught Rama the path of devotion as the only (uncommon) means of attaining liberation and asked him if he wanted to know anything more in words “Oh! you, best of Raghu’s family, I have taught you the path of devotion. Please follow this and let me know what more you wish to learn from me. I am capable of of fulfilling all desired objects of thine”. Rama then asked Shiva “Lord, you have well explained to me the path of liberation. Please now tell me who are entitled to follow this path. I have grave doubts in this regard”. To this question Shiva mentions as follows the persons that could follow the path, “Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, Sudras and women, all are entitled to this path of devotion. A devotee may be a student or a householder, he may or may not be invested with the sacred thread; he may be a twice-born (or not); he may not be a forest dweller (in the third stage of life); he may be an ascetic and a follower of Pashupata creed; to be brief, he, who is devoted to the worship of Shiva, is alone entitled to this path (of liberation) and not the person that is attached to a different deity”. Further Shiva continues to mention those that are not entitled to follow the path as follows:—“A stupid man, a blind man, a dumb man, one not doing clean work, an ignorant person, a person
that ridicules (devotion to Shiva), one that is not devoted to ashes and beads, one that hates a Linga-wearer, all these have no right to follow this path of devotion (to Shiva)". Here in this list of persons not entitled to liberation, the mention of the person carping at the wearer of Linga as not entitled to liberation, proves the obligation of wearing Linga. It naturally follows that the wearers of Linga and the persons that adore them are entitled to liberation, in as much as the carpers at Linga-wearing are denied that right.

So also if the principle, namely, "If the path followed by the great is the right one (for the ordinary folk) to follow", is conformed to, it has to be admitted willy nilly that the wearing of Linga is worthy of being adopted by the followers of Vedas. Because it is seen that this most adored creed of wearing Linga has been practised by great sages like Kashyapa, Atri, Bharadvaja and a host of them, by great Gods like Brahma, Narayan and others, and by powerful Goddesses like Laxmi, Saraswati and other great ones. It is said in Linga Purana "Great sages like Kashyapa, Atri, Bharadvaja and Gautama always wear Linga on their heads particularly; God Narayana, and other sinless Gods like Brahma wear wholesome (beneficent) Linga on their heads; so also Goddesses like Laxmi and Saraswati wear without mistake Linga, the Lord of the three worlds, on the forepart of their heads." Skandapurana, the compilation of Shankar says:—"Hari and Brahma, the great grand-father, wear me respectively on the breast and on the head; and they attained their respec-
tive position by worshipping me in the form of Linga. The Goddesses like Laxmi, Saraswati, and others wore my Linga on their bodies in love and rose to (attained) the position of highest happiness." Similarly Siddhantashikhamani states "Gods like Vishnu and sages like Gautama always wear Linga particularly on their heads. All female deities like Laxmi filled with devotion to Shiva wear in their hair Shivalinga day and night." From the foregoing where the place of wearing Linga like head or neck is clearly stated, it is obvious that Gods and sages wore it. In Brahma-vaivarta it is said, "Vishnu attained his high and foremost position, so difficult to attain, after devoutly worshipping Rudra's charming Linga made of stone". Aditya Purana as well says "Brahma always worships auspicious stone-cut Linga: and it is owing to the worship that he has attained the position. Shakra, the God of Gods, daily worships in devotion Linga made of a jewel: and he owes his position to this. Vishnu worships Linga of sapphire and attains the everlasting residence, Vaikuntha. Soma (the moon) worships pearly Linga, Kuber golden, Vayu brazen, Vasus made of alloy, Ashwin brothers and Maruts made of crystal, the sun of copper, the snakes of coral, demons of wood, and goblins of tin, in great devotion. In short all Gods, Gandharvas, Yakshas, serpents and demons worship Shivalinga, the Lord of Gods ". Parasharapurana also says "The great Vishnu attained his high position by worshipping in devotion the charming Linga of Rudra made of stone ". In the Drona-parva of the Mahabharata it is said, "Vishnu, the God of Gods of inconceivable
extract of Shankar Sanhita already quoted, which extract, namely, "The Gods with Shakra as their leader wear me in the form of Linga on some part or other of their bodies like head", lay down the wearing of Linga in its gross form with a special mention of the place, on which it is to be worn.

Some extracts from Agamas enjoining the wearing and worship of Linga life-long have been already given. Other similar ones may be seen in the Agamas, of which Kamika comes first and Vatula last. They are not given here for fear of swelling the bulk of the treatise (weari-some length of the book).

XII.

An objection:—The Agamas themselves are not an authority (like the Vedas). Hence how can something laid down by them, like the wearing of Linga, be authoritative? In reply we maintain that this is no objection. We ask (the objector) whether the authority of all agamas is denied; or the authority of the well known twenty-eight Shivagamas, that are known to have been written by the great Lord, Shiva, because it is said, "The Shivagamas are an utterance of Shiva; the first in the list comes Kamika and Vatula the last", is denied; or whether the authority of those works written by Buddha, who is taken to be an incarnation of Narayana, and by Jina, is denied; because Buddha and Jina preach against the teaching of the Vedas that the slaughter of an animal in a sacrifice is as sinful (as an ordinary slaughter and, there-fore, the sacrifices should not be performed). The first
alternative falls to the ground for the following reason:—
The great prayers like Gayatri and others stand foremost among rites and are daily used by all Brahmans, and as such are indispensable for them; because it is said "There is no Mantra like Gayatri", "There is no Mantra like that of Aghora and no principle higher than that taught by the preceptor". The Mantras require tenfold refinement as follows:—Production (composition), enlivenment, testing, awakening, sprinkling, removal of defects, promotion, dedication, brightening and concealment. नमः, खाद्यः, कष्टः, हुः, बँष्ट्रः and पद्यः are the sprouts or blades of a Mantra. The blades are the feet and the syllable श्र is the head of a Mantra. And a Mantra possessed of these two is capable of granting all desired objects. The sage, the author of the Mantra should be placed at the head, its metre in the mouth, its deity in the heart, the mystic syllable श्र at the basis, and the connective at the foot. A mystic prayer is dumb, asleep (silent), dead, nude, effete (weak or powerless), ineffective, poisonous (like a snake) or serpentine, locked up, or void (unmeaning). A Mantra with any of these characteristics is barren of fruits. A Mantra is dumb when not duly assigned (to the sage placed at the head); it is asleep without seat or basis; nude without blades (or sprouts), dead without the head, ineffective without a preceptor (to teach it), serpentine when divested of the author, deity or metre; the Mantra is locked up if it is dead, given to a sinful person, void of strength, over-syllablated, or when it is not connected by the connective (between parts); and lastly it is void if it is heard while being muttered ". If the Agamas, that contain directions about the ten fold refinement like
composition, enlivenment etc., that give all information about the blades ((नमः, र्वाह्वा etc.), about the places like heart etc., and the sage, deity, metre and basis meant for those places, about the methods of purifying the seats etc., of the Mantras for removing the faults of dumbness and others, and that describe the limbs and veils of the Mantras, were to be unauthoritative, there will be no refinement, the preparation and practice of the Mantras like Gayatri and others, which are considered indispensable for all daily rites. The second alternative also is untenable, because it is said in Viragama that “The Shivagamas are the twenty-eightfold utterance of Lord Shiva for the benefit of pious people, that have an insight into religion and knowledge and are introduced into devotion to Shiva. They are (1) Kāmika (2) Yogaja (3) Chintya (4) Kārana (5) Ajita (6) Dīpta (7) Sūkhsha (8) Sahasra (9) Anshumat (10) Suprabheda (11) Vijaya (12) Nishwāsa (13) Swāyambhuva (14) Anala (15) Veera (16) Raurava (17) Makuta (18) Vimala (19) Chandradnyāna (20) Bimba (21) Prodgita (22) Lalita (23) Siddha (24) Santāna (25) Sharva (26) Pārameshwar (27) Vātula and (28) Kirana. The eternal religion of Maheswar is treated in Agamas, Vedas, Vedantas (Upanishads) as the path to liberation.”. To say that the Agamas, the source of the path to liberation, are unauthoritative is to contradict Skanda Purana, Shiva-dharmottara Purana, and others which say “Oh! my son Guha the person who has no right conception of Shiva, His Agamas, the religion of devotion to Shiva and His grace, the unity of Jangamalinga and Pranalinga, the worship of Shivalinga, is the person outcast. The person, who has no right conception (and therefore hates) the
places like Benaras where Shiva resides, is also an outcast. The fool that reviles Shiva and carps at His scriptures has no atonement prescribed (to be free from the sin) in any religious work”, and which describe the negation of expiation and excommunication and which lay down punishment (like starving one’s self to death) and so on. It serves no useful purpose to base moral lapses on the works (already proved to be) unauthoritative. The Agamas (Kamika and others) prescribe the twelve-fold purificatory ceremonies performed at the time of installing Linga on an altar or of wearing one on the body, as is said in “the preparation of a sacrificial pond, and the hall and the manner of consecrating them.” They also lay down the details regarding the entrance-ceremony of a new temple and the offerings to be made at the time; they contain rules about the six-fold purificatory rites of Bhuvana and others, which are required to be performed at different stages, the first of which is marking the boundary of an altar and the last is the pouring of ghee; they likewise give all information about the ceremonies of installing a स्तूपकीर्तिम, the first and the last of this respectively being the preparation of the ground and the placing of Linga on the altar, and also other ceremonies that begin with the installation of Linga and end with the festival. All such are described in Agamas only and none in Puranas. Hence if the Agamas were to be unauthoritative there will be no (guidance) to such religious rites, which the follower of Vedic religion have to perform compulsorily.

Revered Nīlkantha Shivacharya refers in his commentary to the special characteristics of Shiva in words “The great Lord Shiva, the ocean of countless jewel-like
things, having limbs and parts”, and then goes on to describe what the limbs and parts are, in reply to the question that arose about what they are, as follows:—Omniscience, contentment, eternity, independence indestructibility, and possession of endless powers, these six are the limbs of the great Lord; so say those that know the truth. Knowledge, dispassion, Lordship, meditativeness, might, forgiveness, power of creation, self-consciousness, and government of the universe, these are the endless parts that are ever-abiding in Lord Shiva.” And this statement is based on the Agamas only. So also Mantras like Tryambaka and Shadakshari, composed by Shankaracharya and included in his works like Prapanchasara and others, are of daily use and are introductory to all devotional rites. But the constituent parts of the Mantras and their veils are described only in the Agamas. And if the Agamas were unauthoritative, these Mantras would also be unauthoritative, contrary to the custom. Never do commentators quote from (and do anything based on) unauthoritative works. Therefore, authoritativeness of the Agamas is as much unimpeachable as that of Smritis, Puranas and historical books written by sages like Vyasa, Manu and others; because these Agamas have been written by Lord Shiva Himself, the greatest sage, as may be known from such texts as “You are the Brahmin of human beings; I am the Brahmin of the Gods”, and “Lord Rudra is greater than the universe; He is the great sage”. It is also known that He is eternal from “Him, the faultless and the spotless etc.”. The last alternative also is no good, because we admit the unauthoritativeness of the works written by (the great) Buddha, an
incarnation of Vishnu, as the works are written in contradic-
tion to Vedic teachings with a view to delude (perverse) the
world. This case of deluding the world is similar to
Vishnu's assuming the form of Mohini, a world-bewitching
beauty, only to deceive the (sinful section of the) world.
It is also similar to Vishnu's incarnation as Rama wherein
he (showily) deluded himself by sorrow over the loss of
his wife Sita and his brother Laxman.

It may be objected that the (so-called) Shivagamas
are unauthoritative, as they are included by those works
that have been written by both Shiva and Keshava only
to deceive the world, as may be gathered by the words
of Kurma Purana as follows:—"Shiva being thus
impelled by Vishnu, the enemy of the demon Mura, and
Vishnu too being incited by Shiva, wrote delusive works
like Kapal, Lakula, Shakta, Bhairava, Pashupat,
Pancharatra, and thousand other treatises like these".
The words "Thousand others like these" include the
Shivagamas. But this objection also will not stand.
Because in that very Purana it is also said by Shiva "I
have already taught the auspicious (holy) principles of
Pashupata faith, the most mysterious and subtle, the
essence of the Vedas, as the path (to be followed for)
liberation. Those that desire for liberation should follow
this". These words prove that the Agamas are (equal
to) Vedas, as they teach the very things that the Vedas
do, and that they teach the articles of the Pashupata
faith like the wearing of Linga and beads etc. Later on
it is said "Other Shastras appearing like Shaiva Shastras
(superficially) are false ones, meant for deluding the
(perverse) world and are written by me. These being
anti-Vedic in their teachings (lit. outside the Vedic teachings). These different faiths prevalent in this world and opposed to the principles of the Vedas and the Smritis, are perverse ones (being based on false ideas). Kapal, Pancharatra, Yamal, Vama, Arhata, and others like these are simply deceiving.” These words go to prove that those Agamas only are unauthoritative that are against the (teaching of) Vedas and Smritis. By the word “others” are meant the Shabaratantra preached by Shankar when he moved in the form of a hunter and the works written by Buddha, an incarnation of Vishnu. If it is asked how the twenty eight Shivagamas teach the principles in conformity with the Vedas, we say in reply that the Shivagamas teach the same principles that the Vedas do, because they teach the wearing of Linga that is enjoined by the Vedic texts like “स्लिङ्गं स्वाप्नयति”; as has been proved in the foregoing discussion; they teach the same religious customs as are taught by Gautama and Manu Smritis and they lay down all rules (of procedure) regarding the installation of a Shivalinga on the altar; they teach the application of ashes (to the body) and the wearing of beads as taught by Upanishads Kalagnirudra and others; they teach the oneness of Linga and Anga, which is the same thing as the oneness of the individual soul and the universal soul and which is taught by the Vedic sentences like “Thou art that” and so forth; and lastly because they contain various truths, which the Upanishads like Chhandogya and Brihadaranyaka contain. Thus the wearing of Linga having been maintained by the Vedas, Smritis, Puranas, history, and the Agamas, it is beyond dispute that it should be accepted and (adopted) by the followers of Veda and every thing is all right.

A happy finis.
In accordance with the almost invariable custom of Sanskrit writers the author begins the work with मंगलाचरण or prayers addressed to the deity devoted to. The prayers thus addressed are considered efficacious in removing all difficulties that might come in the way of the successful completion of the work undertaken. The custom of beginning a work with मंगलाचरण has been very ancient, though there is no express command to do so in the Vedas or any where else. तक्करकर्तिका in its beginning, therefore, discusses this custom as follows: — विभिन्नितत्वं मंगलस्य नित्यित्वसंतप्तर्थिन्यं शिशुचारमुखित्वातित्वादितां श्रद्धेत् नन्दकारामार्थं मंगले विष्णुविश्वासं प्रथयो लिङ्गचन्द्र बोधिविं प्रतिज्ञानिते। नन्द मंगलस्य मंदिरार्थं कर्त्ताव्यते किं प्रमाणमिति वेदं शिशुचारमुखित्वादितां विभिन्नितत्वेश्रृणात्मकायस्तप्ति मंगलेवेद्विधित्वादितां अलोकिकार्त्तिविशेषतिश्चाविशयन्ति। द्वादशदिवः। राजवस्त in his commentary on शास्त्रालिक says also the same briefly—अभिमतकर्तिकाः तत्समाधिकाः मंगलमाचरणश्चायामानिति बद्याचार्तुमुखिताविभिः परदेवात्नुमममलिकायं मंगलमनुबन्धाः। It is clear from this that शिशुचार or the custom of great and learned men forms the basis of मंगलाचरण. It seems that शास्त्रालिक, with which all Upanishads begin and end, has been the origin of the custom. But whatever may be the cause the custom is there.

The मंगलाचरण does not form the beginning of some well known works, though few and far between. The सांस्कृतिकाः cf. इत्यश्चाय are the most notable instance in point. Still बायपितिकर्तिक, a learned commentator of the कारिकाः, is at pains in accounting for the absence of मंगलाचरण and says in the following words that there is मंगलाचरण in a hidden form:—यथापि हि: सममंगलं तथापि तत्तपिरित्यविवेच्य तद्यथात्: मंगलमेवेति इत्यच। (see सांस्कृतिकास्मृत्वा, the closing part of the gloss on the first
The commentators fill up the deficiency of the work in some way or other. In later times this custom of commencing a work with a benediction seems to have been a little relaxed, as it is laid down that “अधीनमःक्रियाकर्मिनिर्मितीवाथ तन्मुखम्” i.e. The words of benediction, prayer, or words indicative of the subject matter treated in the work should form the opening or beginning of the work. कालिदास’s कुमार-संबव and कुमारादत्ता’s जानकीहरण are instances of वस्तुनिदेशा, as they forthwith start with the subject of the poems without a benediction. Still writers ninety nine out of hundred begin their works with a benediction. The following च्याकरास, (taken from बालेश्वर हस्ताक्षरासिक by श्रीनिवासचार, Mysore) finely sum up the principle and custom of a benediction:

प्रारम्भितसमाप्त्यथा शिष्यः कुवंति तन्मुखम्।
आचार्यउभितत्रुथः तदेवत्वहि सायते॥

संप्रदायमेव महाकाम्यसुच्चते तस्य रक्षणम्।
आद्यप्रथासाकर्मिनिदेशा वाच तन्मुखम्॥

tद्वार्यभूमिः काव्यस्थैर्यांगप्रभुमतिः केचन।
एवं मंगलतत्त्वादिविचारो मंगलास्तमकः॥
मंगलाचार्यसुचारान सिद्धिपाते सन्यासेत्॥

It may be noted here that the author refers to the assumption of a Vedic passage in support of a benediction, while introducing the subject matter of the work.

The Author addresses his prayers to शिव, बीरस्वर in the form of शास्त्र, his गुरु, दक्ष, and to पारमेष्टि or शिव’s divine power (शक्ति).

Verse 1. p. 1. This is an invocation of God शिव, to whom the author is devoted. Shiva is the Highest deity or परमात्मा. इस means soul, the supreme or the individual. Here it means the supreme or the infinite soul and is equi-
valent to परंमेष्ट or परमात्मन. According to पाल्लङ्गिक्षुप्रतिपत्तिः, वैद्यिन्तम and इत्यादि are one and the same and are convertible, as may be known from the words therein, viz. मानमश्वेतेज्ञे, वैद्यिन्तम हेतु हीति. इत्यादि, therefore, expresses the innate oneness of the supreme soul and the individual soul. In this connection the following are to be noted (वेदनांसारसङ्गामिवलितमणि नैपुराणिकां तथां जातिः) नवमसिद्ध मर्यादा देवते श्रेयं नं हृद्यति: अन्वयन न—विन्यासं मात्रान्तर गुरुशीर्षा सं भूसुनििति। अन्वयन न मात्रान्तरिती—लहराये बिझळ्याराज्ञारः तिर्मवे०प्रेण ब्रह्मशिवः हिर्मस्वराज्ञ मित्रसमिर्मः। वेदानान्तरितम—हेतु हीति वे शूक्तः हेतुः नाम सद्युक्तः। अथात्मां सद्रापं ध्यायेन शिरेने पंक्चमूलः। न च जानान्तरितमोऽसः जीवे हिर्मस्वराज्ञ स्वराज्ञ सक्तसत्र इत्यदि जीविकारोपसनः इस्वरानिष्ठपरोऽय्वादिनेष्ठः अन्वयनतत्तः।

The supreme soul, Shiva, occupies the human body and there he is seated in the six plexuses (छक्र), namely, अधरक्ष, स्वैच्छिकनक्ष, मणिपुरक्ष, बाणाह्षक्ष, विषुक्ष, and the अतिद्रह्यक्ष. Shiva first becomes the threefold Lingas, भाविंग्न, माणिंग्न and इत्रिंग्न, the ideal, the vital or mental, and the gross or physical. Each of these three becomes in turn twofold. भाविंग्न is subdivided into महालिंग्न and मन्त्रलिंग्न, माणिंग्न into चार or अंगलिंग्न and शिल्लिंग्न, and इत्रिंग्न into गुहलिंग्न and आचारलिंग्न. These six forms of the supreme Linga or शिव occupy the six plexuses, one each. The sixfold Lingas, आचारलिंग्न, गुहलिंग्न, शिल्लिंग्न, चारलिंग्न or अंगलिंग्न, मन्त्रलिंग्न and महालिंग्न, respectively of the elements of प्रथ्वी, अरु, देवन्त, बुद्धु, and आत्मन, the three-syllabled दृष्टि, occupy the six चक्र, अधरक्ष etc. Shiva becomes the threefold Lingas and then sixfold, as stated above, through the exuberance of grace for the individual souls, when they come to be entangled in the worldly life by the working of the inscrutable मात्रा, the प्राचारुरी of Shiva. Hence the use of the term प्राचालिकःवाच. No individual soul, can be free from the worldly bondage and attain final beatitude except through the grace of the Almighty,
Shiva. This act of extending grace to individual souls (प्रकृति) is one of the five acts of Shiva, namely, सृजना, रस्तितंत्र, लक्षण, संज्ञाति or संज्ञात, तिरिक्तन or तिरिक्तन, and अनुभवकरण. Shiva is, therefore, called पंचतत्त्वादिष्ठयंविशिष्ट।

पंचतत्त्वादिष्ठयम्।
सद्युप्रवत्तिदायोऽति॥
तदद्वृत्तिकरण।
श्रीमं तत्तोद्देशस्य॥

(see मोहदेवीति तत्तत्त्वादिष्ठयंविशिष्ट।).

The following from श्रेयुपराज्ञाते सुतस्हिता are to be noted that without शिवप्रवाह or the grace of शिव no spiritual prosperity or final liberation is possible:—

शिवप्रवाहं विषयं न भूक्तं: शिवप्रवाहं विषयं न भूक्तं॥
शिवप्रवाहं सङ्केतं न विचारं शिवप्रवाहशिवधिकोऽविचारं॥
शिवप्रवाहं शिवस्य संज्ञाति: शिवप्रवाहं शिवदिस्तानम्॥
शिवप्रवाहं युत्तेषु सुवातं न जन्मार्धो समयं सद्यं हु॥

(see श्लोकांश्रव्यावहारसङ्ग्रह II-269)

Shiva first explained to his consort पार्वती and his son श्रवण्युष्क the principles of religion and the highest truth. All his teachings revealed thus are embodied in the अगमास, the twenty eight शिवागमास। It is श्रवण्युष्क who preached and propagated the Agamas to human beings. Shiva is, therefore, the first and the most authoritative preceptor. He is thus गुरुवर्तित। The following may be noted in support of what is said in this paragraph:—( अनादेवीश्रव्यावहारसंग्रह chapter I).

(1) (a) पुरा यथापदेशशोभ श्रवण्युष्कसंविकारसुना।
श्रवण्युष्कवादिष्ठयं द्वितेषोऽश्वाल्पंक्ष्रे।॥

(b) महाश्रवण्युष्कसङ्केतं श्रवण्युष्कप्रत्यक्षिपतम्।।

(c) स्वामिनिष्ठमात्रिकाश्रव्यावहारकार्यां अनादीवीश्रव्यावहारसङ्ग्रहाः
श्रवण्युष्क स्वाल्पमनोज्ञेयं श्रवण्युष्कात् विषयं श्रवण्युष्कानाविज्ञोऽश्वाल्पं।
This verse beautifully summarizes the principles of Veerashaiva or Lingayat religion in a nutshell. इम is परमात्मन्, विदिःशिष्यः expresses His possession of the highest power or शक्ति. इम, also meaning the individual soul, expresses the non-difference or innate oneness of the supreme soul and the individual soul. All this means the व्यक्तिविशिष्टद्वन्द्वम्. Shiva also becomes sixfold through sportive activity and occupies the six चक्ष्य in the human body. इस is पद्मावळ. लिङ्ग, गुर, and प्रवार include within them the remaining five अवर्गम्य by indication and express the अवर्गम्य of the Lingayat faith. The three, व्यक्तिविशिष्टद्वन्द्वम्, पद्मावळ and the अवर्गम्य, form the core of the Lingayat faith.

It is necessary to say something in explanation of the चक्ष्य, which the author alludes to in the verse. The चक्ष्य form an important section of Yoga philosophy, of which the annotator cannot profess to have much knowledge. However it may be stated from what little information is collected by him, that Yoga and Yogic philosophy form an important part of Lingayat religious philosophy and religious practices to attain spiritual culture and final beatitude thereby. The Universe has evolved out of the power of Shiva, the supreme soul in possession of the highest power पराशक्ति. A phase of that पराशक्ति is called माया (िवृद्धमाया), which works wonders in obedience to the desire (िवृद्धशक्ति) of परमशिव. The universe and all the things contained by it are the evolutes of that पराशक्ति in the form of माया. The
human body, the habitat of the individual soul, is the microcosm or the smallest possible model or the very abridged form of the Universe including the परमात्मा, Shiva and His शक्ति, including the thirty-six principles (पूर्वत्रिशसिद्धांतसूत्रम्) of the परमात्मा; Shiva and His शक्ति, are indivisibly or intimately one. As a result of the activity of माया or the पराशक्ति, the supreme soul comes to be limited to the finite form of the human body and is there called the individual soul. शक्ति is also there in the form of some gross शक्ति. This is प्रकृतिशक्ति, and is called कुंडलिनीशक्ति, pervading, or residing in, the human body. The six Lingas or the six forms of Shiva stated above occupy the six चक्र, plexuses or the nerve-clusters of the body; and कुंडलिनी, the power, passes through them and lies in the आधारचक्र in her coiled form with the face looking down. The six plexuses or the nerve-clusters are at the different parts of the body as follows:—

(1) आधारचक्र is the basic plexus and is lowermost in the body in the pelvis, and is called pelvic plexus.

(2) स्वाभिष्टाचक्र is about midway between the pelvic plexus and the navel.

(3) The मणिपुरचक्र is above the navel and is called the hypogastric plexus.

(4) The अद्वैतचक्र in the heart is the cardiac plexus.

(5) विद्युतिक्षित चक्र in the throat is the pharyngeal plexus.

(6) Lastly आश्रयचक्र at the centre of the eyebrows is the plexus of command. The following शैलकोश (taken from शैलकोश शास्त्रप्रकाश, canto IV, published by बारस, Sholapur), will explain what particular Linga occupies a particular चक्र.

नकारात्मकता महामये मुलाघारे चतुर्दशे ।
आधारचक्रमनामस्ती प्रथमत्तवस्यस्वतः ||
The chakras are called Kamalas or lotuses and as such have petals (in the form of letters or alphabets), for both is His instrument; the union of both is creative activity, as is said in the Upanishads:

The description of the chakras is given in many of the later Upanishads like the Chandogya and Brihadhrdaya. The majority of later Upanishads speak eloquently about and treat of the Yogic practices. The following extracts from the two Upanishads mentioned, may be noted as explanatory of the chakras:

Says दोग्धुदासिषी—पदार्थस ग्रंजशादारिः सिंहसंधि व्योमचक्रमः।
स्वरूपं वें प जनिनि तस्य मिट्टिः कर्म सदिता ||
चन्द्रभुः स्वायाः स्त्राणिहारेः नमदारस्य च पहदेव ||
ततः दयार्थं परम्प दुःधिहरे दाशारिणेः।
प्रेमारं बिहितः स्वयं समयं द्विषदेः तथा ||
स्मारदलभानां तत्रारूपेः महापति ||
The second is of special interest as explanatory of all what is said about the चक्रां in the human body, शिखर, शंकु, नाद, बन्धु, कूलक्ष्मी etc. The following शोकां from वातुलाम्य may be noted in explanation of the petals:—

कंजस्य चाँध आधारं बादिलांतं चरुदले।
स्वाधिक्षाने च पर्चके बादिलांतं ततो न्येतेन।
ततो मणी दशदेवं बादिक्षां न्येतेत:।
हुदये द्रादशदेवं कादिलांतं ततो न्येतेन।
पुष्पां कस्ते बाणिष्कके बादिक्षांन न्येतेत:।
आशायं हिर्देवं मर्हं युत्तं न्येतेत:।
From this it is to be seen that the six groups of letters form the petals of the six lotuses (plexuses), namely,

(1) व श श स (2) व भ म य र ल (3) ह द ण त थ द घ न प फ (4) क ख ग घ क ज झ छ ट ठ (5) झ झ झ झ ट ठ ढ त थ द घ न प फ (6) ह झ.

For fuller explanation शिबसंहिता, शिबबोगप्रदासिका and प्रशस्तकनिर्संहण etc. may be seen.

It will be clear from प्रदस्त्यक or प्रक्षुण्य--अंग--योग that the Lingayat religion is a highly systematized yoga in practice to attain final beatitude. Please see notes on the verse 3 infra, for information about the six अंगाः, the six subsidiary modifications of Lord शिव, corresponding to the six अंगाः, the superior modifications of the Lord.

The compound निवानंदसुयसाहसिकाभवात् may be dissolved as follows:—निवा: आनंदः (आनंदसू: or आनंदमयः) गुण: तत् (ईदसु-साहसिकाभवात्) प्रसादस्य विशवात्।

Verse 2 p. I. this verse contains an invocation to वीरभद्र in the form of शरम. वीरभद्र is the son of Shiva, always ready to serve the will of his father, whenever necessary, in the interest of safety and stability of the universe. He had to assume the form of शरम, a kind of mythical terrible creature, a combination of man, bird and beast, arising, out of sectarion activity, as remarked by Mr. T. A. Gopinathrao in his “Elements of Hindu Iconography”. The cause of Veerabhadra assuming the form of शरम has been stated as follows in cantos 10, 11, 12 of शिबपुराण-शरसंहिता. At the behest of Shiva, Vishnu assumed the form of नरसिम्ह, the man-lion to free the world from the tyranny of हिरण्यकशिपु. In that form he killed हिरण्यकशिपु, drank in the blood of the demon, and fed upon his flesh. subsequently नरसिम्ह became so fond of human blood and flesh that he...
began to pounce upon the denizens of the heaven and the mortal world. He thus became a source of destruction of the people instead of protection, for which latter he was meant. The representatives of the people had to approach God, Shiva, to free them from the terrible pest. Shiva was surprised at the audacity of Vishnu to have so transgressed his orders. He, therefore, called his son, Veerabhadra, and asked him to bring round नरसिंह to his senses and to take proper steps to punish him, if he remained obdurate. Veerabhadra went to नरसिंह accordingly, exhorted him for his sinful behaviour and asked him to beg pardon of Shiva. नरसिंह, enbriated as he was with the drink of the demon’s blood and that of others, spoke very haughtily and called names to Shiva. In his mad fury he proceeded to cut Veerabhadra into pieces; and Veerabhadra immediately assumed the form of शरम, flew into the sky, swooped down upon नरसिंह, tore him into pieces, and took his skin to Shiva to make a seat of it. The following few श्रीकास taken from the Purana will give an idea of शरभावतारः—

श्रीकास उपाध:—जगदहवाय संगववतियोजिकिश्रावव।

स्थितिः तन्म प्रयुजिकिष्ण परिशर्मभैवी।
The same story is recounted at some length in चक्रवर्ति by Virupakṣaṇanda, a famous epic-like poem in Kanarese, in the 33rd canto, the contents of which are summarised at the beginning of the canto in a verse as follows, which forms the caption of the canto:—

Verse 3 p. 1. In this verse the author addresses his salutations to his guru, महेशर. युह is considered by the
Shaivas, or rather by Veerashaivas or Lingayats equal to Lord Shiva; because it is the गुरु that gives the real and unmistakable guidance to spiritual attainments and final beatitude. The position of गुरु, therefore, comes first in the list of eightfold coverings or protective (आवरणाः) of the Lingayat religion, viz, गुरु, जिंग, जंगम, पादोदक, महाद, विभूति, स्वाभ, and मंत्र. The idea of the height of position and respect given to the preceptor may be gathered from the following:—(अनादिवैशुष्यसारसंग्रह part I p. 170).

बगापंक्ष्यानोक्तितार्कातुण्डत्रः।
परमोपायकुत्तादुरुदेवः शिवः स्तुतः॥
स एव बंबः प्रतिप्रज्ञपैः।
स एव माता जगताः पिता च।
स एव भूमः स गुरुः शिवः स्वाभ।
झानास्तं च: परम्परापदातः॥

संस्कृतितथाः also says—एतत्तिश्रावहविवेशेन्द्रीष्मेचित्वानक्षानोपदेशश्चेन्त्रां बहुनां विशेषान्तीलाम नानाविश्वातत्तवः श्रन्त्वा किलजनपीतिकर्णश्चायाः निविधविशेषे-श्रणोत्वाक्रमस्तृतियथा सर्वेऽस्रीरिविवेशुस्या परिपुज्ञोत्तलेन सदाचारशैलोक्याधारपादयुम-शाखित्या शिवाभिगत्तो प्रतिप्रज्ञाताः यथेष्व सर्वांतः। (see वैशेषिकानंशन्त्रिक्रिया 2nd chapter).

श्रणुः is the six-faced son of Lord Shiva, also called कार्तिकेय. The author compares his preceptor to श्रणुः for the reason that that it was to श्रणुः, along with पादोदक, that Lord Shiva revealed the आगमाः and the Agamic philosophy. Thereafter श्रणुः taught the Agamas to the people and conveyed to and propagated among them the philosophy. The preceptor महाद has been compared to श्रणुः in his ability to expound the principles of Veerashaiva philosophy to the people. It may be noted that कार्तिकेय, in the name of श्रणुः, is a very popular deity in Southern India, where there is scarcely a village without a temple of श्रणुः.
Aṅgasthāla:—Aṅg is जीव or the individual soul, which is but the highest soul, so limited by the working of माया, the Lord’s power. The परमशाह: Shiva, first comes to be modified or divided as लिङ्ग एवं Aṅg; Linga is the higher or the उपास्य form of Shiva, and Aṅga, an extremely limited form, is the lower or उपस्त्र form of Shiva. Like लिङ्ग, Aṅg first has a threefold division, बोगांग, भोगांग, and खागांग; The three in turn came to be subdivided into twain each, बोगांग into शरण and एक्ष, भोगांग into भाणिनी and प्रसादी, and खागांग into महेश्वर and मक्त. The six forms of Aṅg correspond to the six forms of लिङ्ग. And the individual soul rises by devotion from the lowest form मक्त to the highest form एक्ष and attains at-one-ment with परिस्वय through the worship of corresponding उपास्यलिङ्ग. This sixfold division of Linga and Aṅga forms the basis of वर्मस्य philosophy as the stages of devotion for final beatitude.

The preceptor is also referred to later in the body of the book by the author, while discussing the interpretation of the धृतेदत्र च “पवित्र ने विवर्त” etc. in words “युक्तराणास्तु etc.” (see p. 37 of the text).

Verse 4 p. 1. This verse is not an invocation at all; and as such is quite unsuitable in the midst of मंगलकेक्षाय. The only reason why it comes there is that it becomes the ground for the author’s invocation of पार्वती in the next verse. The verse by-the-bye states why the author wrote the book.

Verse 5 p. 1. This is an invocation of पार्वती, the पराशाक्षि of परमशिव. Though the root cause of the Universe in all its aspects, she is the benefactress of the devotees. She is inactive when परमशिव is in his tranquil mood, i.e. the condition of equilibrium of his powers, इत्या, शान, किया.
When they are agitated, the Universe begins to be manifested gradually. Then sakti also undergoes modification and becomes sakti for the good of the people or devotees. She is also capable of conferring real knowledge on the devotees in quest of absolution, as is said in विद्वानसिद्धांतिणि (canto I):

अस्मुतां प्रपचारां या ज्ञाविद्वाप्रदायिनि।
अद्वितिषमहि वंदे तासीशालनवनोशमाम्॥

Hence the author's prayer to the Goddess is appropriate for furnishing him with requisite capacity to establish the principle of wearing Linga on the body—

याबति स्तवंचराः because she chose to marry Shiva alone. She tried to win over His love that He may espouse her hand in marriage. But Shiva was too much disgusted with married life to be inclined to marry again, after she herself as दात्र रणी (the daughter of दक्ष) had immolated her body in the blazing sacrificial fire that her father had made. But याबति of strong will and bent upon marrying Shiva only performed religious penances, as a result of which Shiva had to marry his beloved. Hence याबति is स्तवंचराः, the first lady to choose her own husband. This story has been elaborated in Puranas like संन्देश. But कालिदास’s कुमारसंवर्त brought the story into limelight. Hariharadeva’s "भिन्नाकल्याण" is a famous Kansrese poem elaborating this story.

The following is a South-Indian legend about याबति's penance, which in all probability is her तपस्व to make शिव to marry her:— (see Gopinathrao’s “Elements of Hindu Iconography” vol. II)
According to this legend, was doing penance on the bed of a river; she had set up a Linga there and was offering worship to it daily with intense piety. To disturb her penance with a view to test her mental firmness, God Shiva suddenly sent fresnes into the river, as to sweep away the Linga and the other materials of worship set up there. When thus suddenly set up with difficulties, not knowing how to avert them, hugged hard the Linga to bosom, so that if it was swept away, she also might die with it. Shiva, pleased with the firm devotion of , appeared to her in person under a mango tree and was joined with his consort.

Every treatise, if it is to be a proper work, has to fulfil four conditions called the subject treated in the work, the object of the treatise, the person or persons to whom matter is taught or for whom the treatise is written, and the proper connection between the first two. The author has not stated them as authors generally do, but it is easy to state them as follows:—linga-prajña-baideśa-pratītyāntinaṃva vishvanātha prajñā pradaksinaś ca viśvānātha pariṣṭhānāya "etān tathāgataḥ. vibhāsā śāstraḥ vā viśvānāthaḥ saṃśaya-pārthivā śāstraḥ saṃśaya-pārthivāḥ śāstraḥ—kāraṇānāṃvāca samādhanaḥ abhidhānya.

P. 1. ते खड कथातः: etc—These words refers to the sceptics of the principle of wearing Linga on the body, already prefixed to in the verse No. 4, supra. The objections of the sceptics end with कथे बैद्धक जनपरिणामम्, the refutation of which makes the whole treatise. The objections are three:—linga-prajña—
It may be noted that all authors raise similar objections and refute them. The following two may be noted:

(a) न वेदांतांत्रिकायत्वम्। एवद्विराज्जुरोऽवेदत् पराणेष्वनातिपाद्यानेन अवैदिकत्वात् वैदिकानुकृत्यात् नास्ति।
(वैराशश्वानंदनंदिक्का page 59)

(b) केवलाद्वारागीर्वयंस्य विविधत्वात् वैराशश्वानुकृत्याधिपाणां तद्वितत्वश्रेष्ठे विदितत्वाम वैदिकङ्कु शुरुति-मूर्तिऽतिहसिः अवैदेशनात् तद्वितत्वश्रेष्ठानेकत्वाधिनां वैराशश्वानां कर्मकारसाकार्यं प्रसाध्यते इति नेनेवम्।
(वैराशश्वोत्तरमंदिरः)

P. 1. नन्दि तत्र तदन्यत्तरः प्रस्याम्—ततल लिंगाधिरेण तदन्यत्तरः वेद-वैदांतिकाः स्नेयात्तरः प्रतिपाद्यानेन न पर्याम्।

P. 1. मंगलावाचर...मुखक्तम्—This has been already referred to in the discussion about मंगलावाचरण. According to the followers of the Vedas every act of human beings must be laid down or sanctioned by the Vedas. Otherwise it has no validily and should, therefore, be discarded. If it is not laid down or sanctioned by the Vedas in so many words, it must have been adopted by शिष्याः (great and learned men), who set up an example to ordinary frōk to follow, as is said in मंगलावाचरण “शब्दाचारति अनेको तत्तदनितरो जनः”.
The act must be practised and approved of by all and not by a section.

All writers of सुक्तः and स्मृतिः state in the beginning of their works that the Vedas form the basis of all वर्माः or duties, social, moral, or religious. For instance मुस्याः तर्थः says:—
It is also said in गौतमसूत्रं-बैद्धः यथमूलः । तद्भवेव दशावर्ष परिपूर्णः ।
From this it is known that Vedas, स्मृतिः, शिष्याचार, one's own satisfaction of the heart i. e. conscience, and संस्कृतम् or customs traditionally coming down from generation to generation, all form the origin or source of धर्म or duty to be followed. संस्कृतम् means स्वःसृतात्मकः: अचारः । Negatively it has been said दिन by चेताः, writer of a स्मृति,
अभीमान्यः बहिःसारः ये चतुर्वे वेदविजितः ।

It may be noted that a pertinent point was raised in स्मृतिपुरसंस्कृतः (by देवगणः) while discussing the origin or source of धर्म as follows—

तदूः वेदविजितः: प्रामाण्यं तत्त्वं इत्यंतरेवहत्यालाभार्याट्मिनम् प्रामाण्य स्थातः । तथा च प्रत्यायम्: तदूः शीर्षेण स्वाधिकः । In reply it has been said—वर्षेण इत्यंतरेव अहस्तयाट्मिनम्। तथापि तेषाः तथापि संज्ञाते इत्यंतरेव अहस्तयाट्मिनम् योगिनां अहस्तयाट्मिनम् न विवधे । अस्मादः: यथा तद्भवेव तत्त्व प्रस्तर्थायाः: । तस्दा आपस्त्रेभः—

अथ तेषाः तेषाः इत्याविचयिते अहस्तयाः: न विवधे ।

It is unsatisfactory, as it is not only halting but ridiculous; because it only means that the mighty could commit any wrong, instead of their moral lapses being condemned and stated as instances not be followed.
विष्णु has been explained by नीलकंठ and रामचर, the commentators of तर्कदीपिका as—

ब्रद्ध ज्ञातत्वशानेन ब्रद्धिितकर्मकारी और ब्रद्धप्रामाण्यवाच्युपगंता I respectively. But गौतम defines विष्णु as अकामात्मा (selfless or disinterested).

P. 2. भारतो मच्छो ब्रद्ध—भारत or महाभारत is the biggest and the most voluminous work written by ब्रद्ध, also called हृदयकथानन. Though it is apparently a history of भारत kings (अरतान महाभारत अधिकांश कुलो अखंड), it is an encyclopaedic work and treats of all topics, in different connections, of history, geography, philosophy, sociology, religion and ethics, law, and so forth. Hence it is also derived as महार ब्रद्धवाच्युपगंति वाहने तर्कोति. It is said in महाभारत, आदिवर्ण, अथ्याय I:—

एकत्रिको ब्रद्धान्म भारत ज्ञातेवक्तः।
पुरा किल भूरः सब्जः समेख तुल्य घुलमु।
चनुन्यः सरस्वतेः ब्रद्धवाच्युपगंति यदा।
तदा अभूति येकिद्विन महाभारतमुच्यते॥
महत्तेन पुरस्ये भ्रमराण्य तस्यधिकम्।
महत्तात् भारतवाच महाभारतमुच्यते॥

ग्रीहपुराण ब्रह्मवीरसंहिता says in अथ्याय I—

ञ्ज्ञपरातीतु विष्णुवत्म विष्णु: सर्वजगमन्मः।
ञ्ज्ञसनान्न्र परारम्भवती श्रद्धार्थर्थः महीतले॥
सं पुनर्द्वारे चाशिन्कृत्येपिपायानापयं।
ञ्ज्ञाश्राविव हृदयाशी सत्ववच्याभ्यात।
ञ्ज्ञात्मवत्माविष्णु येन भ्रद्धमहार्थवादः।
प्राकाश्यात्मानो जनितो येकिद्विन महाभारतचरणं॥
ञ्ज्ञात्त्व न पुनर्द्वारे ब्रह्मवीरसंहितानुनि।

It is clear from this that महाभारत is the four Vedas elaborated in a different form and is considered as important and as authoritative as the Vedas. Mr. M. N. Shrinivasa
Iyengar says in his "History of Sanskrit poets" in Kanarese, 1928—"हस्ताक्षर अद्वैतं श्रद्धां जगदार्थं, समस्तेऽप्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ्फ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ্঩्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ्ऩ্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ्ऩ্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩्ऩ্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩্঩့
manabopasana of the pratiik of parabhrana, according to the Shankara School of advait philosophy. In refutation of a such mistaken notion the author says that dhdrapasa is the upasana of hudramantimaham — the jyotirlingam, which is the same as the wearing of internal Linga.

Upasana is of four kinds as stated by vairachayanandachitraka page 405—upaninipad sutpadapasa, pratikopasana, abhmdhopasana, niruplayopasana. Tatha "vachベンmupasita" isiti padipadapasanaya bhranyadik vibrismuhutavata bhravyadhrapasa. "Aakar.m abhirupsitasita" "mane bhadrupsitasita" ishayadi pratikopasanaya aakaramaman:pranatiti sadatattaranitisheh cudrana abh-o-


In support of abhimdhopasana the following from veantasaramvairasvamithismin (p.p. 6, 203, 245) may be noted:—

(a) abhimdhopasa ko dhavivayam: s eva prabhubhavayo sukhayodhikarit

(b) abh-akramastu sannyayinipad sutpadapasa pradyut abhmadhitam sudhodapasa

(c) chopddhikarit sutpad padapasa manasa ca bhujanchharm.

Dhavritya and dhdrapasa are very prominent in prabhavaya contained in "yaditmasmanmaudhura dhdru bhadraksham etc." of pradhyayopasitv in abhyava viii. The same appears in a different form in natamayaparishott. The advaitas of shankar school interpret it as pratikopasanaya. But writers of vairachayav philosophy interpret it as containing abhimdhopasana; because according to vairachaya or Lingayatas the devotee, the abode of abhasvam, the first
स्वच्छं अंगस्वातं (as explained above), has to start his devotion to Linga in its form corresponding to the श्रेष्ठ form, with the idea that he is in no way different from Linga. It is, therefore, अभिमृत्युमतं. The उपासना of बौद्धिकित्व seated in the हृदयमाल is अंतेश्वरीयाणाः, which is merely a development or a higher stage of भुजिकोम्पावः or स्थलितश्च-पाण्याः, in the form of the उपासना of हृदयमाल worn on the body.

The वैष्णव "इश्वर दिक्षित्ताय विभिन्नतः" is differently interpreted by different writers according to the philosophy of the school, to which they belong. All non-Veerashaiva writers interpret it, as referring to the आकार of their school limited to हृदयवर्तिक, as infinite आकार is limited to a pot (घुड़काशा). This is natural. Thus साहियाचार्य, (a follower of शक्ताचार्य), and नरायण (a Vaishnava), comment on it as follows:—

साहियाचार्यः—

ततष्च ज्ञातुमपर्यपानभुक्तिनुस्ति। वेदेततः पुरुषकेः अधरेः हृदयमाल-मंति। कृत्याः। द्वारं अर्थं अंगूठाग्रामालितस्वादृष्टिः। विषयम् विस्मिलाम्बनलेच पापमहतः। वस्तत्र अंगलेच प्रमालम्बकः। अपलितश्चालनलेच अर्पितश्चालनलेच च वेदम् गृहुः। गृहुमाल्लक्ष्यं हृदयादिशिः। स्वेदवयशः पूर्णं इति पुरं तत्स्य विषे क्षुद्युंस्तिरार्थवस्तं। तत्त्वं अल्पवद्धेः। गानं आकाशवस्तु स्वाधिकमिति। आकारः स्वेदवयशः पितः चाकाशवस्तु उंगलिकार्थकमालास्यामालितस्मृतचते। द्वारं आकारः। आकारः द्वारास्वतकम्पनें निर्णानं। तत्परंस्यं विज्ञानीयमर्यादिलेच भजातीचतुर्य-प्रावहेः वित्तिनांम्।

नारायण-दीर्घिका.

नारायण is a Vaishnava and his commentary is, therefore, interpretative of विष्णु as हृदयमालम् आकारं। In the introduction to his commentary he remarks as follows:— अद्विदवस्य नारायणस्य वंद्वेदस्थेत्तथेनिर्मुखस्य आरामार्वायायिनं जातियोर्थिपरिमिति-पावस्य सुप्रथाः। वस्तुतः गुणातीतस्य नारायणार्थकद्वाराः।

His commentary:— द्वारं द्वारास्वतं वस्तुम् छाणे विकारः। विष्णुम् नारायण निष्पाणं। वरं अभिक हेमभुवं आलमण स्वेदवयश्च गृहुमाल्लक्ष्यं देहंतत्यां तत्त्वं
His commentary is not materially different from the above, except when read with the introduction.

As opposed to the above, the commentary of the author, a Veerashaiva, is as follows:

This last commentary agrees with that of the author who refers later to the text. (see page of the text.) This is probable and almost certain.

The object of worship seated in the heart lotus is not plainly stated; The author therefore says and he immediately proceeds to fix it up as by means of which forms the end of the 12th section of (No. 12 of Press).

The discussion about the passage as laying down the proposition is established. But the first the question that arises is as to what that is. The author proves that to be or god Shiva by means of the verse under discussion in which follows the verse under discussion in the couplet, proves that
to be Shiva, because अमरकोश, the most popular and authoritative Sanskrit lexicon, states विश्वास and मेघेश as synonyms in the line "शोभुकाकः प्रकाशति: विश्वास: शुभे मेघेशः."

The commentators naturally differ in their interpretation of the text:

\[\text{दीर्घिका (of नारायण).} \]

\[\text{स्वर: ओकृपः प्रशिढः उपास्यते निरिढः। प्रशिढीलोकस्य त्वामयेन प्रक्षयान्तकस्य व: परः उक्ष्य: वाच्यते: प्रवचनमूलः। स: मेघेशः परसम्भूः।} \text{this is Vaishnavaite.} \]

\[\text{भृष्माश्चरीय (of भृष्माश्चर)} \]

\[\text{बैंडोति प्रशिढः: बैंडानामवचने प्रशिढः: त्वामयेनवाच्यतः। विश्वासांसहराकोटः अभिः प्रणवटमः: बैंडास्तिदीतीति तस्य टाक्ष्यः महालक्ष्यः बैंडास्तिदीति तस्य ताक्ष्यः प्रणवटमः: प्रशिढीलोकस्य परमस्यः कौन्यः परसम्भूः कौन्यः अविदानं अविदानं तस्य नामाक्षराक्षरावच्चारतामा। विश्वासांसहराकोटः प्रणवटमः उपास्यः। पूज्याः निपरिष्ठाः खैयानिष्ठाः तस्यहृदेशः।} \text{this is Shaivaite.} \]

\[\text{साधारणाचार्य.} \]

\[\text{"यो वैदयाः स मेघेशः" इति प्रत्येकमुपयुक्तः वैदयाः "अभिनिष्ठ नेत्री तुरुषरितम्." "इत्यत् तदेजः स्त्रा " इत्यादियाः आदि: उपक्रमः तारितमुक्रमः चः। सः तथा: वर्णः तुरुषरितम्।} \text{This is Veershuvaite.} \]

This is of शाक्त school.
or प्रणव is ब्रह्म in its unmanifest or primal condition. ब्रह्म, विधेयपरिष्ठ, one of the most important and the first ten उपनिषद्विति, treats of प्रणव at length and says प्रणव in its unmanifest condition is परब्रह्म as follows:

Shaivas and Veerashaivas take प्रणव as expressive of and representing शिव as परमात्मन. The latter trace all शिवाश्चलास and अंगस्वलास and पंचाश्चारिन्त्र from प्रणव. (अ, उ, म) is शिव and (उ, ए, ऐ) is his शाक्ति; from the agitation of शाक्ति (औषधिमुद्रा) अ became इष्ठ, उ, विशिष्टमर्ग and म विराट्क which in turn are identical with मातालिङ्ग, पाण्डिंडिंग or इष्ठिंग, Linga ideal, शिव vital or mental, and Linga gross or physical. The same in अंगस्वला become श्राव, तेजस्व and शिव identical with भोगांग भोगांग and लागाग. The three correspond to the three states of ब्रह्म as described in this very Upanishad, स्वप्न, सृष्टि, and जागृति. Besides the mention of शिव there supports the view.

The following verses taken from शिवपुराण—वमुवद्विति, (chapter vii), put the matter very clearly as follows:

प्रणवों वाचकस्वस्त्य शिवस्य परमात्मनः।
शिवधारिद्विन्दुरां प्रणवों हि परस्परः।
तस्मातेदाधिकरं देवमाहुरागमः॥
That the unapproachable seated in the heart is श्राणिंग is made clear in that very book (page 456.) viz.

हृदयास्थिताःनात्मत्वं श्रवण्यते। ब्रजवाचकम् वरणवचः। श्रवण्यते। विचारणां अस्वाभावः। विश्वासः। श्राणिंग श्रान्ताः सकलाश्चालकम्।

कीवर्णेत श्रिन र्षेष्टे comments on this couplet as follows in his विचारणां अस्वाभावः। विचारणां अस्वाभावः। विचारणां अस्वाभावः। विचारणां अस्वाभावः।

“तस्य बाणक्र: प्रणवः” इति योग-सत्यपुरुषस्य सिवाचकस्य श्राणिंगाः। वेदांतविश्वेदित्वं इति वाचः। “त्तं लोपिनिष्ठं पुरुषं पृथ्विचारम्”

“क्योंकि इस परेश योग-न्यासस्य सिवाचकस्य श्राणिंगाः। वेदांतविश्वेदित्वं इति वाचः। इति तत्त्वात् परेश | यस्य योग-न्यासस्य सिवाचकस्य श्राणिंगाः। वेदांतविश्वेदित्वं इति वाचः। इति तत्त्वात् परेश |
That श्रणि is महादेव or शिव can be known from the prayer offered to the deity by श्राहा in शंकरभाष्य दितलयप्रकरण as—

Moreover this very श्लोक यो वेदांति etc. has been quoted in शंकरसिद्धान्त in chapter viii in proof मेधावी being the source of श्रणि or श्लोक—परस्तात्रात्मन एव श्रणिवेत्तपिरिद्या शिवं एव—

That identity of श्रणि and शिव is also known from the श्लोक—

That साधन यथा प्राकृतिकोनसत्य यथा परस्तात्रात्मन एव श्रणिवेत्तपिरिद्या शिवं एव—

(नमः शिवायेन तत्कालकरणं मेधावी )—सिद्धतिचिन्मणि II page 128.

The श्रणि of श्राहा is described in छद्गाद्यपनिषत and many others. The श्रणिकोनसत्य explain श्रणि as परश्वित for instance see श्राहा विद्यापनिषत and पायुपात्रश्रीपनिषत. The श्रणिकोनसत्य on the contrary explain it as expressive of विष्णु; see for instance रामायणन्त। तारादीपनिषत.

P. 2. उपासनाया युणविषयबेलिन etc.—After fixing up श्रणि to be Shiva as the object of worship, the author now proceeds to state the peculiarities or special attributes of Shiva to make him mentally tangible; because mind requires something tangible as the object of worship, as it is well said वेदांतात्मनायुरुपात्मन तत्कालक्ष्मेव तारादीपनिषत. Thus साधन यथा is merely a step to निगुणेश्वारा। शिवायांनुसारं भिन्विशालात्मपिरिद्या उपासनाया मिश्रितमिति भावः—

उपासनाया: स्वप्नकारिभुवुग्नानातोदेव स्वप्नकारिभुवुग्नानातो निविद्यालात्मिरिद्या श्रणिसत्य स्वप्नकारिभुवुग्नानातो उपासनाया मिश्रितमिति भावः।
But this is not to be understood as श्रीकोपासना or the worship of the image representing the Godhead. Therefore, pertinently says: 

"According to the Lingayats, therefore, the worship of the Godhead in all its stages, from लिंग (ling in its gross form) to प्रणालिङ्ग, from प्रणालिङ्ग to भावलिङ्ग, is the worship of the Godhead with the consciousness that गौर शिव is present everywhere as स्थूल, स्वरूप, and क्षण आत्मा, and the worship is अद्वैतवादात्मन: all through for the devotee to attain सार्वज्ञात्मक with परमात्मन: in his primai: form (समस्तहस्तवत्तकविन orविद्याउपस्थितिनिविद्याहृदयम  

The special attributes of शिव (परमशिवामाधयारण्याः) are mentioned in the hymn "कड़ते वद्यं परं श्र्यम् एवं दुधिंगितम्। श्र्यम् मथं परं श्र्यम् पुरवः कुश्चिंगितम्। उँचाएं द्विहंलेन द्विवहुः वै नमः। शिव, a name of शिव, proves beyond doubt, says the author, that शिव is the deity to be worshipped i.e. to be worn internally. The words कड़ते, वद्य, and others are the special attributes of शिव whose identity is determined by विद्याहृदय. This verse has been taken and commented upon by almost all Shaiva and Veerashaiva writers in proof शिव being the परमात्मन: It is impractical and un-
necessary to note them all here. Hence it will suffice to note one or two of them. For instance, निर्विवाद के अनुसार notes this in his शिस्तत्वस्थ; so also अन्वयावलित quotes and comments upon this in his शिवक्रणु. (See page 53). The latter says:—“कहत सलिंग परं ब्रह्म” इति | अस्मि द्वि संग्रहेन “विभागः” इलामिथानुसार “नामकरणमहादेवं कहत साधारितीक्रमम्” इति कौष्ठिय स्वितज्ञताः विनियोगेन, “अथाते महादेवस्य पादाद्विविधि व्य-स्वास्याम्” इलुपक्रमम् “कहते सलिंग” इति संधिबिषु विश्वासाद्विक्रमो विनियोगेन, “ध्याया परमात्मानं परमानंदविभागः।” उपदेशाविविधें पुरुषं क्रुणापिन्यगम।।

ब्रह्म ब्रह्मपुरि गार्थी दहरावज्ञाकयम्।
अम्लासात्यमहलितं संतस्र्वं च तथा क्रुद्॥

इति योगयाज्यालेय पूवेतिरनुवाकविबिधस्यदेवहरिविशेषायस्यासयसरस्यक्षवत्यथा वदेशवाक्यत्वाय सुडीकरणेन व्यर्थं शिवपरस्तम्।

This verse is quoted and explained in शंकरविचय as follows:—

शिववैव जगत्कारणता निर्वचनीय। एवं किल “कहतं सलिंगं” इल्लामिथा क्षस्य शर्त्वात्मकति थर्तेत। अस्मि:—कहतं अपरस्यपणं सर्वं महादेवं परं ह्रास्य एवदिशेपण-चतुष्कृततुं पुरुषं पुरुसारितमयें द्विरक्रमक्रिया बहिः। प्रदेशेण व्यापकर्त्तव्यं श्रीनि क्रुणापिन्यगमं केतो क्रुणां जतानु पिन्यगमं कथायतं कथायतं विविधार्थं विनियोगे। अन्तःविनिर्दृढः गि अर्धीच् श्रीनि शयनं तं विविधार्थं शिष्यार्थूसृदितिलेन व्यापकलेन विख्रुपं: करम्यं तं नमोऽनमः। इति। चतुर्थीलिताध्रेष्ठोर्वर्गिकारांच्छंदः।।

साकांवादिः’ commentsary of this hymn is as follows:—

वेदतत्तायं ब्रह्म तत्तत्ते अव्यायं | वर्तन्ते च विविधं यवावहरिकं परमात्मकं चेवित। हिरणयांगौ रूपं यवावहरिकं सर्वं तत्कविरुणं पारामार्थिकं सर्वं महाविरुद्धं धरं चत्वर्विन्यत वीर्योत्ते। अत्यतं सर्वं इतरिः। तात्रां ब्रह्म स्वाप्नमाहुप्राय उमामेरे-धारार्थं पुरुषं महतव। तत्र दृष्टे स्वान्त महेश्वरायणे क्रुणांग:। उपास्य वाम-भागे विगलणगः।। स च योनिन वस्त्राकिरं रेतं ब्रह्मांगि धृत्वा उक्तिः। स्वाते।। ब्रजाकाल स्वामतिः।। तात्रां स्वरमसुमुखेयते केष:। विपुलपाय जगत्करणले वर्णरे व्रतांक्रायं विविधार्थं विपुलाय नवम्कृति।।
being a follower of संकराचार्य, is a केवल ईश्वरवादिन. His interpretation, therefore, is suited to his tenets. But Lingayat philosophers take it as व्यास्यक्रममाधिक (i.e. the manifest stage of the consciousness) of शिव (स्वभूमिप्रकाशानामशिश्रिष्ठक्षिप). It is unnecessary to quote here the commentary of वर्णधर्मिताचार्य, as it is obviously suited to the tenets of Veerashaivism.

It is noteworthy that, strangely enough, the text of नारायणोपनिषत does not agree in different editions. Some omit some portion of the text and others omit another portion. For instance, the text of the Bombay series Sanskrit does not contain the 15th section. This fact has been noted by व. व. Bapat-shastri of Poona. His edition seems to contain the full text. Editions also differ in the arrangement of the textual sections and subsections.

P. 3. नारायण अस्ति तेषां....—This is an objection raised by a वैष्णवाधिन, who maintains that श्रीरोपास्क्रम इस the उपसना of नारायण seated in the श्रीमच्छल, as the whole section speaks about and eulogizes नारायण in words—

बिन्ध नारायण इव अश्वर परमेम प्रभुम || etc. etc
All these hymns form the 13th section of the नारायणोपनिषत् and is called the नारायणीय section. The objection is, therefore natural. But the author refutes the objection by saying that नारायण is the उपासक and not उपास्य. He first establishes the latter point that शिव is the उपास्येवंता by means of passages from three different उपासित् and then proceeds to prove that नारायण is the उपासक.

The नारायणीय section is obviously eulogistic of नारायण or विष्णु. Hence the objection raised is natural. The author, therefore, has to prove that the उपास्येवंता is शिव; this he does by producing extracts from कैल्याण, अष्टवेशिः, and कठ उपासनां and finally brings the text under discussion into agreement with द्वालयेष्ठा text of the छांदोपनिषत्. The extract from कैल्याणपनिषत्, evidently a विष्णुपनिषत्, contains the words, शिव, उद्यास, निकृष्ट, and नीलकंठ, which are all Shiva's names. The second extract has no such words; but the उपासनां is a शिवपनिषत्. The third extract contains ईशान, which is conventionally a name of शिव according to अमरकोश quoted above. But it can be easily interpreted as applicable to any other deity, as lording it over the Universe. Still the author takes stand on the conventional sense. But अंगावत्र दीर्घक्षित proves ईशान to mean शिव by योगशाहि as follows:—

“ईशः शरीर ईशानः,” “ईशान: अविशेषः” इत्यभिधानकोशांश्वस्तितिपरंपरा अमानावत्रेन तत्र तत्स्य योगशाहि सिद्धेः। कैल्याणगच्छ शक्तिमात्रांभिप्रेक्षिन् योगशाहः प्रविष्ठलात्। (शिवकर्णोमूर्त page 27).

In शंकरानिजय (पंचमप्रकरण) there is discussed this very श्रेय (सहस्रीय देवं etc.) and interpreted as applicable to शिव only. The discussion is as follows:—

इदाभिपि “सहस्रीयं देवं” इत्यादिना यथेष्ठ नारायणपरमिति च उपसंहारविवेचनातु उपकथायं दीपीयो उपसंहारविवेचनातु उपकथायं संभावितं तथा प्रथमभाषामात्रां शास्त्रं श्रेयश्रेष्ठोपनिषधी पुराणसुकमस्त्वा उपर्यंते च तिथितः।
The commentary on this aspect of the Sanskrit text, a commentator of the narrative, will be interesting though long, as follows:
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The commentary on this aspect of the Sanskrit text, a commentator of the narrative, will be interesting though long, as follows:
It is clear from this long extract that the commentator, being a stanuch Shaiva, is at great pains to prove that नारायण means शिव. This much was necessary for him to do, as नारायण conventionally meant विष्णु. He was, therefore, compelled to have recourse to etymology. नारायण may mean शिव etymologically but not conventionally. Hence he says "शेषिक्ष्रयम्".

Vaishnavas, on the contrary, explain this passage as eulogistic of Vishnu.

Parasharabhedrasristi, the author of द्वहरिचाक्रम, escapes this impasse very intelligently by saying that the devotee has to meditate first on नारायण, residing in the heart of शिव, which is a step to the meditation of शिव residing in the heart of नारायण in the following words:—

अनेन ज्ञात्रते नारायणस्वेत परमेश्वरणे साहाराजविकारो त्रज्ञात्वायोध। एवं च इति पुनः परमेश्वरविभागवने तथा आदित्यनानेन नारायणश्वेत महाप्रभुभ्यविभागवने श्रीमाणानम् नारायणश्वेत इति प्रभु।

This is not only a via media but a very intelligent explanation, indeed, to avoid the difficulty. He indirectly proves that नारायण is the उपाख्य of शिव, which the author proceeds to do next.
P. 3. ह्ये पुरारे....—पश्चात्—All these hymns are taken from कैल्योपनिषत्, which is evidently a शिवोपनिषत्, the last half hymn being:

सहस्रबाहुं तमसः पुरस्ताद।

It is not possible to understand why the author has omitted the last part quoted above, because it clearly says that the devotee, that meditates on the deity, attains liberation which deity is determined to be शिव from the names of शिव, viz, उमासहाय, नितांबर, and नीलकंठ, even though he started with the selfsame object of proving the deity to be शिव, as the object of meditation for final beatitude.

ह्ये पुरारे = ह्ये पुरारे यदवसि तस्मि (वल्मीकि) ह्यायेवार्तने वेदानि।

विरजं = रामदेशादिज्ञातिकारास्योऽऽ।

विशेषं = because शिव is आनंद, one of the few positive attributes he has.

विषुदं = यास्क्करस्वर्ण। "जायते, अस्ति, वर्धते, विपरिताते, अपस्तीते।

विशेषं " इति दाति: पद्मः: भूतानिकाराध्यात्म। (शिवकुमारारंभित)।

अनालं beyond conception, beyond mental grasp.

अनंतं = of endless forms; but शिवकुमारारंभित explains as कालक्रमः अंतत: नावः देशक्रमः अंतत: सर्ववर्त्त्वयापकलम् एवदुभयं

अनंतं विशुदेतरं प्रहितम्।

आनंदतथाविद्यनः = A thing, that has no beginning can have no सच्चातस्या or अंत। But this threefold aspect is stated always in connection with ब्रह्म for emphasis. मध्य, therefore, means ब्रह्मादिविद्यतुर्वस्ता stated above.

उमासहायं = with उमा as his helpmate. Philosophically देव माय is the शक्ति (wonderful power) of परब्रह्म, or
and is, therefore, only another aspect of parśiva, like the reverse of a coin. उम (अ, उ, म) is परशुराम; and उमा is the same represented by the syllables placed in reverse order (मू, अ). भाविन्देव in his अद्वैतमूल says—

The great poet कालिदास derives उमा as "उमेति मात्रा तथो तिथिया पश्चुमास्वयं सुमुखी यज्ञम" (कालिदास 1—26). His derivation of the name उमा is merely a plain and easily understandable explanation of the word, meant for an ordinary reader. The poet himself, a Kashmiri shiva probably, mentions the शक्ति aspect of शिव in the invocatory verse of रघुवंश, namely,

वामर्षाविव मेंपृष्ठां वामर्षप्रशिपतीय ।
अमतः विदर वैद वार्तीपरमेश्वरी ॥

There can be no better and briefer exposition of परशुराम with his conjunct पराशक्ति, as intimately or inseparably one, and the two, therefore, make शांतिविशिष्ट हैति.

The same plain derivation of उमा is given in कालिदास—
मात्रानिपिव्व तरसू यथा उमा अवालुकाया सचमिचावी। बलत्र शक्ति aspect of the शक्ति, in the course of the evolution of the Universe, is noticed.

P. 3एक्रू = अद्वैतमूल, सजातीयविवृत्तिश्वर्यविस्तित ।
प्राकृति = निवृत्तिपश्चिमाक सत्व एकाकारम्। Shiva, being a great शिव himself, is a paragon of a meditator absorbed in himself.
Shiva though all-pervading is limited to the heart and also becomes an individual (finite) soul.

P. 3. अंगुङ्गारात्रिः पुरश: etc. is an extract taken from कतोपनिषत. The word ईश्वर, conventionally a name of Shiva, proves, says the author, that शिव is the परशात्र.

P. 3. ग्रागुपशुिन्ययिन—This न्याय or a logical rule is established in पूर्वमीमांसाशाख of जैनमिति, in the 9th अधिकारण of section viii of अथवा vi in the two सूत्राः, namely, पशुरायमामामामियमे प्रिख्यातृत्र ग्रागुपसुिन्ययिन्। छागो वा पशुमाङ्गारात्रि—

"अथ ग्रागुपाध्यायशुिमवर्त्त प्राध्यायशुिमवर्त्त (विकुलाक्षणाभवत्रि नमवर्त्त) कृति पशुरायमामामि प्रिख्यात्स्ये " ग्रागुपशुियत पशुरायमा पूर्वसुिमवर्त्त। (शब्दिनिर्देश भाचाविस्ततर page 392).

It is clear from the commentary that when the name of a particular thing is not mentioned, it is to be determined from other texts. The author applies the rule here and says that the उपास्येवत् for द्वियावस्तव is determined to be only शिव from the extracts given.
P. 3. तेतकवाचयतापेश्वर—छांड्रापब्बामेन अन्नेन्न अन्वयविधानेन (शिशुकुमार).

P. 3. अष्ट वदिद्रिमित्वा etc. is the well-known sentence in the 8th canto of छांड्रापब्बामेन, that lays down the search of God residing in the heart.

P. 4. रस्तलंतर........पर्यावरणसम्पत्तिः—The author means that शिव is determined to be the उपास्थदेवता in the heart-lotus. And if an attempt is made to interpret the passage under discussion otherwise, there will result the doubt as to what the उपास्थदेवता really is; and everybody would hesitate to perform the worship on account of the uncertainty of the उपास्थदेवता and would give up उपासना altogether, which would be an undesirable thing, indeed!

P. 4. क्रियावसानविनिवेशस्या etc. Here the author introduces the topic of उपासक, that is necessarily expected in connection with the उपास्थदेवता, laid down of the उपास्थदेवता. Now that the उपास्थदेवता is determined to be शिव, the उपासक is to be determined. In the ensuing discussion नारायण is determined to be the उपासक.

P. 4. नारायण महादेवं etc. This is taken from 13th section of नारायणपदनिधन. In this section नारायण is praised, as already noted in foregoing discussion. But नारायण is so highly praised on account of his being a devotee of, शिव with whom he has attained identity. This comes to be noted later on page 5 of the text.

P. 4 अपरिमिति शिष्ठम् etc. This as a सूत्र in पूर्वमोक्षा in अविक्रय X of 8th पाद of 6th अध्याय. It occurs as follows:—

अपरिमिति शिष्ठम् संख्याप्रतिनिधिः। तत्स्मृतित्वात्। कल्पनात्वा वा तुल्यमर्मांगतु। etc.
The commentary of पर्यायवाचयत्रिः (शास्त्रप्रिकार निःशब्दारण edition page 514) is:—अधाजन भूतं “एका देवा पदेष्टा द्वारस्ते देया अन्तुविश्वासितेन्द्रा
The discussion arose in connection with the Vedic text "एका देया……अपरिमितं देयं". The objecter took a stand that अपरिमित, in which the negative particle अ, prefixed to परिमित, a definite number, negated all definite numbers specially those mentioned in proximity viz. एक, द्व, ब्रह्म, etc. and that any other definite number also was negated. The objection was refuted and it was concluded that अपरिमित only meant a great number (ब्रह्म), and that the numbers stated in proximity remained in tact. The author applies this conclusion to the passage under discussion for the purpose of determining the उपासक of Shiva and says that नारायण is the उपासक, because नारायण comes in proximity to the उपास्यदेवता (ब्रह्म) and should, therefore, be the counterpart of the उपास्य. It is, therefore, superfluous and unreasonable to go in search of another worshipper in preference to नारायण coming in close succession to the उपास्यप्रकरण.

P. 4. वैदेशिकाः नविशिष्टाः त्योऽति: etc.—Those words precede द्वरं विपार्यं etc. The objector comes forward and says that it is not नारायण that is the उपासक but the यति or ascetics are the worshippers, as they have been described just before the passage द्वरं etc., laying down the उपास्य. The author refutes this objection by saying that in the नारायणेऽ section there is mentioned the हृदय or हृदक्रम (the heart lotus, the seat of the उपास्यदेवता). And because that हृदक्रम occurs in
the section of नारायण, he must be the उपासक, just as समिति वजित, इत्यादि, तत्तत्पाते वजित इत्यादि etc. are to go with दर्शे पुरूषार्थसाधन, because these occur in the section treating of दर्शे पुरूषार्थसाधन.

The determination of the उपासक is done by applying the माननीय rules, established in connection with विनियम गौतिथ or applicatory injunction. The rules are six—छुटि, सिग, वाल्य, प्रक्र, स्थान, and सत्त्र. Here the rule of प्रक्र or mutual expectancy or interdependence is applied. When two things are mutually dependent, there is प्रक्र and the two are mutually complementary. An instance of this is given in अर्थसंग्रह as follows:—उदा. अन्तर्द्वारा स्मरित वजित इत्यादि एवं कविद्विप्रथम अन्तर्द्वारा अस्वस्तमन साधवेदित बोधानांतर किमिति उपकल्याणंकामिता। दर्शेपुरूषार्थसाधन दर्शेरूसार्थसाधनं स्वर्ण भावेदिति बोधानांतर कथा समन्वितार्थक अभि:। इत्यादि नामकरणं प्राप्तिः दर्शेपुरूषार्थसाधनं।

The author, while applying this rule, quotes the very Vedic sentence दर्शेपुरूषार्थसाधनं etc. The rule is applied to the matter under discussion in connection with हृदय or हृदयम, in “दयाकृत्तमदेवस्मृति हृदयस्मृत्युस्मृतम्” in which there resides the उपासकदेवता, for which naturally there arises the expectancy of the उपासक. In the preceding sentences it is said “नारायण: परमेश्वरा परमेश्वरा नारायणं पर:;” नारायण is, therefore, the great meditator. Here arises the expectancy of the object of meditation. The object of meditation having been already proved to be शिव, residing in the हृदयम, the worshipper is determined to be नारायण, per rule of natural expectancy. As there is no such mutual expectancy in the case of विलिस mentioned just before द्वार etc. they cannot be worshippers.

P. 4. अष्टि इत्यादि तदावस्थायं इत्यादि: etc.—The उपासक of नारायण is further proved by the verses taken from वामनपुराण, a Vaishnavaita Purana, though not wholly so, and the मगविद्वारा. The extract from the वामनपुराण clearly states that
śiv as prāṇāṅgīm (residing in the śāntaṅgachak of the heart) was worshipped by viṣṇu. But the sentences from māyādēśī are not very explicit, except for the word śēm, a name of śiv according to āmarakōṣa, “śēm: śām śēmān: śāmśēmśēmśēm”. The remarks of śivakṣaṅkhyāhīt deserve notice in this connection as—

The extracts from purāṇas are not very reliable, as they are often very self-contradictory. The thing here to be noted is that it is an extract from a vaishnava purāṇa. Prof. H. H. Wilson remarks about the vamanpurāṇa in his “Puranas or an account of their contents” as follows:—The greater part of it relates to the worship of the liṅga, a rather strange topic for a vaishnava purāṇa, but engrossing the principal part of the compilation.... It is of more tolerant character than other purāṇas, and divides its homage between śiv and viṣṇu with tolerable impartiality. It is not connected, therefore, with any sectarian principles; etc. etc.

It should be noted here that dharmavibhāgakāś quotes a large number of ślokaḥ from different purāṇas in support of the position that nārāyana is the worshipper of śiv seated in the hṛśkamal of nārāyana. This position is maintained in the following words:—na nārāyanaśūrathe “satākṣariḥ deveḥ” śādānīnā “विष्नु ज्ञाताय श्रीमय” इत्यादिना च नारायणश्वापि उपास्यते भूषयते। तत्कथं परमेश्वरश्रेय उपास्यते। जन्मते। नारायणश्व उपासकलेखः पुराणेण ध्वनात् तथाहि सौरसंहितायां इत्यादि।

P. 5. ślimaḥpūrṇāḥ etc. This is an objection raised by the opponent about śiv being identical with ślim (prāṇāṅgīm seated in the heart lotus). The identity of śiv and ślim is proved by the words of vamanpurāṇa, already noted, and also from
The words preceding the extract are plainly descriptive of विष as follows:—एवं कल्य ह्रदयपदके इत्यादियाने प्राप्तित। अर्थमिलाम पञ्चावा: सिरः। विद्वतु नेत्रे तुष्ण दृशः द्रष्टानि चरणां बाहुः कालयासनिद्रोऽपि पार्श्वे सत्ता:। पद्मसमागारसै। शिष्याभिषवक्ष: मनवः।

In the extract given in the text only आदलास are mentioned; whereas there must be twelve दलास(petals,) पंवित शिवकर्मार, therefore, aptly remarks—ह्रदयपूर्णरक्ष्य ह्रदयमानः कल्याणे। अथात् विद्वतु अद्वैतज्ञ मध्येकस्वरक्षिणालिङ्गवाक्षरारो भागः: दलमध्ये कल्याणे।

अन्याय गतात्तरोद्भिभाभमहसुदीने पी तस्याठा महन्यत्सदरसिद्धां जगत्नस्भुजमितृयूरी-गायातात्त्वायानां उक्तितवाखलाभावायानेण बोधा:।“शिर्स्य शिरकापूर्वमिति।” अन्यथा पदामध्ये मध्येकस्वरक्षिणानिर्देशेन न्यायेष्व शत्वनिद्धभावाग्ने द्विपिरिति निर्विवर्ण्य स्वादिश्व मनवः।

The following लोकस of विशालोपनियम describe the दलास and their qualities and colours etc. as follows:—

ॐ पूर्वदेशे नेत्रवेदे यदा विशिष्यते मनः। तदा चैवसुस्वयं च धर्मकीर्तितमितिनिश्चिते:।

अभिमोचने प्रज्ञाय यदा विशिष्यते मनः। तदा कामथ कौष्ठ चंद्रे देवमितिनिश्चिते:।

कृष्णवेण दुःखिनादेशे यदा विशिष्यते मनः। निद्रास्तसवर्य देवि मलोऽच मतिर्भवनु:।

कृष्णदेशे नीलवेणे यदा विशिष्यते मनः। तदा कौष्ठथ कामथ मनोविहारमितिनिश्चिते:।

परिधदेशे कपिलवेणे यदा विशिष्यते मनः। तदा हास्याविनोदी च बलसह च मतिप्रभवे:।

इन्द्रस्याय बायुदेशे यदा विशिष्यते मनः। तदा चित्रोद्दत्तणे च वराष्ट्रे च मतिप्रभवे:।

पीतवर्णानादेशे यदा विशिष्यते मनः। तदा श्रवणस्यभोजङ्गा: च कल्याणाय मतिप्रभवे:।

शारीरक्षानादेशे यदा विशिष्यते मनः। तदा कल्याणाने धर्मकी० तमितिनिश्चिते:।
It is to be noted here that though the two Upanishads agree in general trend of thought, they differ greatly in the statement of propensities produced by rest in particular - e. t. the properties of आम्य and दक्षिण दलास are stated in reverse order.

P. 5. दुरीय etc.—दुरीय and दुरीयातील are explained as follows:- आत्मा मनसा संयुक्तत मन इन्द्रियण इन्द्रियस्थे इति चूत्तथसंशिक्षा: जाप्रदेशम्। आत्मा मनसा मन: विषयण इति दूयोः संशिक्षा: दुरुत्तिः। केवलाः संशिक्षा: तृयोः। विस्तरमहीद्विविज्ञानस्तु दुरीयातीतावस्था (see प्रार्थिश्च द्विविज्ञानम् page 31). For नाद see note on the 1st verse supra.

P. 5. आगमवाक्याणि हूँ—The author quotes here the verse No. 19th of chapter VI of राजातिस्मिकामणि. He, therefore, seems to place on par सिद्धांतविश्वामणि with the Agamas in respect of authority and importance.

P. 5. अवास्थापवनिषदि etc.—In the नारायणिय section (No. XIII of नारायणियपनिषदि) following the ददशेखरातीत section (No. XII of the Upanishad.), नारायण is very highly praised as परम्परा, परतत्त्व and so forth; such a description of नारायण would naturally militate against the statement that नारायण was the उपासक. The author answers this objection by saying that नारायण, being a devotee of शिव and having attained at-one-ment (व्यक्तिः) with शिव, well deserved the praise in such high terms. All devotees of शिव do become शिवाः themselves after व्यक्तिः and are indistinguishable from शिव in that
condition, though they can reappear at the behest of शिव, only to serve a particular purpose. But their re-appearance is not rebirth.

P. 6. तद्भवाभावावत्स्य एत्यादि—In this अन्नेशन अपग्रीऽिताः's remarks are to be noted:—कले शिवं भायते नारायणस्य श्रीमाइङ्गमनाभावाविदे: शिवभवं एव श्रव्यभुत इलानंजः। तद्रेषुपश्यन्ति नामः स्मृतिः श्रव्यभुतमयमनाभावावत्। बल एव ततः। प्रस्तुते शिवे प्रस्तुते शति नारायणं वहुंचा परालयं:ैं।

P. 6. केवलम् एति—This might refer to either चयनराजतावर्ल, the commentator of नारायणोपनिषत् or to श्रीपिरविवर्वित, author of श्रीकर्मभाष्य, a very extensive commentary on the भजनसूत्राः.

The former says—नारायणस्य श्रव्य नारायणात् परं यः शिवे। चति श्रव्यं एव श्रव्यं। श्रव्यभुतमयमंशः। नारायण इत्॥ the latter says—“नारायणस्य परं श्रव्यं” इति वे कर्मणांशरं श्रव्यभुतम्। Hence the compound नारायणस्य is to be dissolved as पुनःस्यस्यस्य श्रव्यम् and not as a कर्मद्वारकास्यस्यम्. On the authority of these two the author proceeds to argue: “अत एव नारायण: परं श्रव्यलुक्तम् नारायणं परं श्रव्यलुक्तम् श्रव्यलुक्तम्” This argument seems very strange. It does not necessarily mean that the compound was intended to be पुनःस्यस्यस्य श्रव्यम्, simply because it is not explicitly stated as नारायण: परं श्रव्य:.

The worshipping could as well have been नारायणातप्रत्येक श्रव्य: instead of नारायणस्य श्रव्य:। It is seen that such a kind of reasoning is due to the high sectarian spirit. (see श्रीकर्मभाष्य page 103).

The author may also refer to श्रीकर्मभाष्य, the author of श्रीकर्मभाष्य, in which भाष्य: “नारायणस्य श्रव्य:” is discussed and explained as नारायणातप्रत्येक श्रव्य: in सूत्राः 5, 6, 7 (of पाद 11 अथाय: 1 of भजनसूत्राः as follows:—श्रव्यस्यस्यस्य श्रव्यलुक्तम् ॥ ॥ नारायणस्य श्रव्य: इति श्रव्यस्यस्य एव नारायणात् परिभाषिते श्रव्य: प्रतिपादतां ॥ etc.-etc.

As has been already remarked द्वारिष्टो or द्वारस्यांशो (conscious worship of श्रव्य: seated in the इक्ष्माल) is considered to be of utmost importance for attaining सातुर्यमोहः। This विष्णु has been established by वादेय: in his भजनसूत्राः in द्वारहित: कारण (पृष्ठाधिकत्वं contained in the 3rd of पाद of the 1st अथाय:)
भो न: अभैदयति बुद्धिमत्यन्त्रोऽसः त्वामन्नञ्जगतिरीर्ष्ण संशयायम् ||

वर्णार्थवादविचिनितभूतस्र विनेतो यः: शब्दराशिरोपन्यक्तया प्रमाणम्।

सब्जयं निमत्तसविश्वधपदार्यतति वेदः प्रकाशयति केदरभूतः त्वाम्।

चब्द्वार्यमीश्वर इति श्रुतिगौरवः सत्वानीन्द्रकृत्वयातसितवर्णेश्वरम्।

त्वामेव कौशायति नाथ नीर्जर्षश्चादन्यं पुनः प्रकरणादिनिपिणेन।

पूजा तद्यथिहितमता विहिता मद्यसंगेत मंगण वाह्यवस्त्रकायनिवेशन ते।

सत्वानिपुष्पनिरिक्षत्रहस्तनोक्ता नारायणानिनिद्रा परिभावायम्।

. श्रेयं बद्रादुहरसतुमसान्त ते यद्रा समर्पितां रुपविशेषस्य।

. अंतर्गृहिते तदेछिचकारभिवेधः भ्रमेभिचिनित वाक्यविद्यार्य प्रबाहः।

नारायणाय यजुपात्रताभिस्माय यद्रा फले तदानु नोपश्रेष्ठ कर्ष्येवेत्।

उपलिलिखितमवद्वयमन्नञ्जगतिः श्रेयं मद्यसंगेत न कर्ष्युपासानं ते।

. नारायणसुपासनस्माक्तेव दूरे तसादुपासाकतया परिशेषिताः।

. अंतर्गुर्जरस्सतिधरा परमात्मनाय शब्दाविचारः विहितस्तु तदुपासाकतेः।

. वस्त्र स्नित्तार्थं ह्रद्येष्य परमस्तवमात्रा युक्तं न तस्य परमार्थानिवस्ताहितम्।

. क्षेत्रं श्रेयं समाधि वानिज्जिताळातके तिश्चुपास्य इति ह्रासवद्यं न कस्यः।
These verses fully bear out the discussion contained in the text from the passage...

The first three verses state that the name alone is praised by all Vedas. Verses 4, 5, 6 maintain the internal worship of the name as the object of worship. The third verse substantiates the statement of the previous verse: verses 7, 8, 9 maintain that the name is the worship. The verse 10 says that the words are not the ultimate but the name is the ultimate. The remaining verses elaborate the same and conclude that the experience lays down the ultimate of the name. (see pp. 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12).

Many more extracts of the name in the text may be given; but the following three will be enough:

(a) एस्वम्बन्धपुरे मद्व द्वार यार्डुदं सूने।
    पुंद्ररिक्ते तु तन्मध्ये आकाशे। द्वाराप्रलिततः
    य सिद्धं सचिवन्निहं। सोंपेत्रयं मुः मुः.
    (see न्यंकपापनिषद्—शैवपापनिषद्:)

(b) इत्थीरीकर्मधं रूढःपुणिविबाघितः।
    विशुद्धं पापराहितात् निर्दिशमनिमेर्यम्।
(page 378 सदानंदोपनिषत—Seventy unpublished Upanishads, Adyar, Madras).

Here ends the section on the wearing of Linga internally i.e. अर्थालिंग. And the next section on the wearing of इद्धिक्षिण on the body begins from एवमेश्वरमविनविद etc.

P. 6. बृहस्पतिस्थापयति (पाणिनिपरिन्द्र) — This forms the closing part of the 16th section of नारायणोपनिषत. The section begins with विशेषतः व्यस्तम and addresses salutations to भिंत्र in different forms, which the author explains later as the भिंत्रकलिग्न and concludes that बृहस्पतिस्थापयति lays down placing i.e. wearing of Linga on the body.

इद्धिक्षिण is स्थूलकिंग, the third modification of शिव in the course of the evolution. The wearing of इद्धिक्षिण on the body and its worship is a step to अंतर्धिम्पत्ति and अंतर्धिम्पत्ति, though both बृहस्पतिविद्यमान and बृहस्पतिविद्यमान and अंतर्धिम्पत्ति and अंतर्धिम्पत्ति are mutually helpful and complimentary, as
may be noted from—बहिष्मागविधिवत् अंतरांगो न सिद्धाति इति भागम-विक्रयात्। अंतरसिद्धांस्वभागन खङ्कित न जायेत इति सिद्धातिशिक्षामणिविक्रयात्। इस-लिंग प्राप्तिलिंग एकुक्ल विवेचन इति विवाहस्वाववयात् अंतरंगोपसापनाय पूर्वक बहिष्मां रंगोपासने बहिष्मांगोपासनाय पूर्वक अंतरंगोपासने श्रीदागुःः कल्याणः। (बहिष्मान्यवैश्व-वितामणि page 6). Hence the devotee has to begin with बहिष्मांगवाचारण for बहिष्मांगवाचारण. Hence the author proceeds to establish बहिष्मांग or श्चिल्मधारण.

बदनगेराविषत also says that Linga is to be worn both internally and externally for अपयम as follows:—अधीन सदनं: संबंधें जेबियमन्त्रा नौजोकृत्यं हस्तमुखाच। मगवन्तं किमपवम सत्वनायतं। स एतस्प् भगवान् नौजोकृत्यं: प्रवाच। अंतरहृदयारुषं परम्प्रायिकेऽथ शिक्षा तिंगमुः।

The following will make the matter very clear,

बाघ्रे जापादयाध्यायमुदाव कथा।

अन्तं: सन्याताये हु चैव परिपुरवते।

तथार्थवल्भेन निलं बहिष्मांनुवय्रकमुः।

बहिष्मागविधिवत्सलं बेसंतयांगो न सिद्धति।

तद्वद्याऋषहो चावर्गैह परमभारतपूर्वकमुः।

कल्याणं श्चिल्ममस्य पूर्वतं च मन्नीकयी।

यथं सर्वं: प्रारंभव न करोतामकोषमुः।

निःस्तं कर्मणं बाघ्रे पुनस्ताये हु नेषणमुः।

एवमस्तःशार्यस्यः परायाम परमेश्वरः।

विनार्थमां बहिष्मांवेद्व हिर्तं न कुह्तं चुच्चा।

(बदनगेरावि च चारिका chapter iii)

बहिष्मांग स्थापणि is explained by बधवचित्ताराध्यम as बधवेविंगम स्थाप-वन्ति। He thus differs from the author. बहिष्मांग is a compound. Mr. S. D. Pavate of Hubli dissolves it as बधवेववैष्णवक लिंगम्। But I think it is better dissolved as बधवेवकारं लिंगम्। बधवेवकारं means भाषणवैष्णवदिपकारं, which are further modified into six kinds as बधांगम, भसांगम etc. My explanation agrees with the author's explanation of the passage विचनस्वल्लम्: etc. as the अध्यात्म of these रमविचित्रितम्। (see pp. 14-16).
P. 6. न्यू अन्त्र स्थापयतीति etc.—an objection to the assertion, that "स्वर्णिमं स्थापयति" enjoins the wearing of Linga, begins here and ends with समुद्रयास्मिन्वे परिवर्त्ययोगात् हि त्य खट्टर्. The objection is a very long one, thorough and exhaustive, and says that the sentence "स्वर्णिमं स्थापयति" does not lay down the wearing of Linga (स्वर्णिम) on the body.

P. 6. बवंततत्—because the verb is in the present tense (क्षत्र). The objector says that everything that is enjoined should be expressed by the imperative or the potential mood. But here the verb स्थापयति is in the present tense; hence it lacks the nature of an injunction.

P. 6. त्रितीयं प्रोक्ष्तिति etc.—All Vedic sentences are significant and never unmeaning or superfluous. Vedic sentences, according to मीमांसकाः, express either विधि (injunction), मंत्र (incantation), नामवेय (designation), निषेच (prohibition), or अर्थवाद (missiary assertion or eulogy). Though an injunction is expressed by imperative or potential mood, sometimes it is enjoined by a verb in the present tense, as in त्रितीयं प्रोक्ष्तिति. In the same way the verb स्थापयति might express an injunction. The objector says that the verb स्थापयति cannot do so, as it lacks the nature of an originative injunction (विधिप्रयोज्यक्रमाभावात्). The following discussion maintains why.

P. 6. विषर्क्तमर्पात् etc.—This is a couplet that defines विधि (अपूर्वविधि), नियमविधि, and परिसंप्रक्कविधि, three forms of injunction. The stanza is taken from कुमारिलाः's तंत्रवादिन्; and defines succinctly the outstanding features of these three. Here विधि is defined as (विषयस्य) अर्थतमापात्, which is explained by the author as प्रमाणांतराप्रात्स्य, i.e. a Vedic injunction lays down something, which would otherwise have never occurred by any other means of proof. Such an injunction
is called an अद्वैतविधि, as in यज्ञ स्वर्गकामः। The author
gives त्रिधिः प्रावश्यः as an instance of अद्वैतविधि, in as much as
no where else and by no other means of proof the शोक्यः of
मृत्युः is obtained.

निमानविधि is a restrictive injunction defined by तंत्रवादित्व
as (विषेण) पालिके सति, i. e. where there are more alternative
ways of doing a thing, the निविंम restricts the operation to
one only; for instance त्रिधिःनवहत्ते। Here it is enjoined that
the मृत्युः should be unhusked by thrashing only, and by no
other method of doing it, like नवविद्धर्णः, is to be resorted to.
This निमानविधि is, therefore, त्यसे (अवहनने) प्राजः an 1 त्यसे (नवविद्धर्णे)
अ्रत्त। The difference between निमानविधि and अद्वैतविधि is that
the latter is अवहनमात्र, while the former is त्यसे प्रातः and त्यसे
अवहनः।

परिसंक्षा is an injunction of exclusion, i. e. certain
things are enjoined to be excluded. It is defined as तत्र
चाय्यत्र च प्रसः, explained by the author as समुक्तव्रातः, which is
the same thing as गुप्तवतात्ती (अर्थसंम्वानः)। परिसंक्षा is etymologi-
cally explained as having the notion of exclusion, as परिसंक्षः:
अत्र चर्चनाथिः। संक्षः। दृढः।। This definition is well explained by
विवेत्वलोक in विनात्स्थः, as एकस्य अनेकत्र भानतः अन्यतों निवृत्यभेद एकस्य
पुनर्वचनम्। the stock instance of this परिसंक्षा is पंच चांचनातः सहःः—
only five animals of five nails are to be eaten, (namely, शास्रः, शास्रः,
गोश्यः, खाद्यः, औष्ठः।)। By this all other animals
(अन्यनातिः as well as other पंचनातिः like cats and dogs) are
to be excluded. This is तत्र चाय्यत्र च प्रसः—अनेकत्र or गुप्तवतात्ती, because all पंचनातिः as well as अपननातिः come across people
for satisfying their appetite (रामः प्रातः।)। निविंम, therefore,
restricts the operation to one of the alternatives; while
परिसंक्षा lays down the exclusion of some things. Therefore
it is an injunction of exclusion or excluding injunction.
In निविद्धि the alternatives are such that when one is adopted others are set aside; all are not simultaneously possible. But in परिवर्धन all alternatives are simultaneously possible. Therefore it enjoins exclusion.

P. 7. प्रकृति “सर्वदिग्द स्थायति” इत्यादि:—The objector applies the test of all the three विधि to सर्वदिग्द स्थायति and proves that the sentence cannot be any of the three विधि. He first applies the test of अपूर्वविधि, which is अवंतमाप्ति, and says that सर्वदिग्द स्थायति does not stand the test; because विभ-धारण is already enjoined by शेताथरोपनिषद् in the hymn “सर्वनन्दिग्द अवंतियो:” etc.” and therefore it is otherwise obtained.

In connection with this objection the remarks of शिष्यप्रारंभित are noteworthy:—

साक्ष्याक्षर्व संध्यात्पर्यावर्त्तिष्ठय अनेकादि स्थितां एकस्मातीतर्भर्तरीय अनेकादि शाखां विधि: देखेते तथापि कस्यापि स्थानस्मार्कहान्तरोपितार्थविषयकलेन विधित्तं न व्याख्याते। सर्वपेक्षाय शाखानां तदस्वत्रत्तत्ततच्छाल्कन्ततां तत्रत्ततच्छाल्क्ततां अनुस्मरितोपकलेन विधित्तोपमात्र। एवं शेताथरोपिनिषद्। कयें सर्वदिग्द स्थायतीस्य विधिकल्पात्राय आश्रिते न शक्यते। तथापि सामान्यविषेषमादिशायोपितकलेन परस्परारंभितकलेन व्यवसायितुं विधित्त्र्यात्रात्तसकोषवध्यमिति मंशयम्।

This relation of सामान्यविषेषमादिशायोपितकलेन between सर्वदिग्द स्थायति and सर्वनन्दिग्द अवंतियो: etc. is established later by the author on page 11 and says that the former is the उपजेन्द्र and the latter उपजेयः, and therefore, no objection of अवंतमाप्ति can be advanced against the विधि enjoined by सर्वदिग्द स्थायति.

P. 7. ज्ञिष्ठारिच्छेदरिहरू:—all-prevading and eternal; or unlimited by time, space, and form. This has been well explained by पंडितशिवकुमार as follows:—

परिवर्धन तिथि: विधाः कालपरिच्छेददेशपरिच्छेदकथ्युपरिच्छेदकथी। काल-परिच्छेदो यथा “शातुस्वं पुरुष:” इति। वेशपरिच्छेद: “पदार्थोज्जनविश्वसृष्टिपरिश्रमाब्द:” इति। कथ्युपरिच्छेदो यथा इद्दं विधिभिबं जलशिष्यिति। एवैवरिच्छेदस्—
The hymn सर्वारसिरोऽपि etc.—is taken from ख्रिटङ्कत्रेप-निष्ठा 3-11. But it is to be noted here that the 1st half of the 2nd line is "सबैब्यापी स चनासार"; while in some editions, e.g. निष्ठाव सागर edition and भागवत’s edition, the reading is "सबैब्यापी च मगवार". The difference is in च for च as adopted by the author. The reading च seems to be appropriate, as it well explains the contrast, namely, the limited-ness and omnipresence of the Oversoul, shown by the author later on page 8 in continuation of discussion in this very connection.

P. 7. नूँ सर्वारसिरोऽपि इवस्य etc.—This is the first objection raised against the position of the objecter. Here the objection is that सर्वारसिरोऽपि: and शिव, the qualifier and the qualified, being in grammatical equation must be identical, as the subject and the predicate must be. Hence there can be no relation of आधारवेयसाव between शिव and आनन etc. But the explanation of सर्वारसिरोऽपि: given above shows that आनन etc. are the आधारवेयसाव of सर्वारसिरोऽपि: and शिव. There results from this the inconsistency of identity and आधारवेयसाव. Therefore the position of the objectier being unsound, his objection is to be rejected. The objecter overrules the objection by quoting the authority of नृत्यज्ञानाधिक, who proves that आधारवेयसाव of a thing for another (that is आधारवेयसाव of the two things) was not inconsistent with their identity. It may be noted that on the next page the identity of Linga and मुः is established on account of their being in grammatical equation. Later
also on page 37 the identity of ब्रह्म and भाष्य, that stand in apposition to each other, is established.

P. 7. समानाविमानविकारणि अविकरणात् अविकरणकल्पस् .......नीलकंठाचार्य-चरगैरिणीकृतान्—It is difficult to understand to what नीलकंठाचार्य the author refers, on whose भाष्य he alleges to base this assertion. There is a भाष्य, said to be written by नीलकंठाचार्य, on the बालदुर, printed in Kanarese script and published by उपेक्षित. But the भाष्य does not contain the विवेचन as alleged by the author, as may be noted from the following extract from the भाष्य:—तस्मादानंदनं: परेमेष्वर: | नन्दानंदमाय एव वेदगृहीत चेति सयदे विकारार्थात् विकारार्थाय स्वप्रतिलोपिनिमानाधिकरणविजातीयाय-लसाधिनतः दस्मिन्यि रक्षना परगमवि ज्ञातिवाचियु दस्मिन्यि श्रद्धाण: परेमेष्वरस्व निवाभन्दलेन तद्रस्मव अवलोकितसंबंध्यो वर्णनीय इहृतकायामह।

विकारार्थार्थाति चेच वाच्यारूपाति |

अवलोकितसंबंध्यो चेच वाच्यारूपाति। यथा वृद्धिकारो मृत्युमयो घटायः तथा परेमेष्वरे विकारार्थार्थाति अवलोकितसंबंध्यो चेच स्वप्रतिलोपिनिमानाधिकरणविजातीयाय-लसाधिनतः दस्मिन्यि रक्षना परगमवि ज्ञातिवाचियु दस्मिन्यि श्रद्धाण: परेमेष्वरस्व निवाभन्दलेन तद्रस्मव अवलोकितसंबंध्यो वर्णनीय इहृतकायामह।

विकारार्थार्थाति चेच वाच्यारूपाति |

अवलोकितसंबंध्यो चेच वाच्यारूपाति। यथा वृद्धिकारो मृत्युमयो घटायः तथा परेमेष्वरे विकारार्थार्थाति अवलोकितसंबंध्यो चेच स्वप्रतिलोपिनिमानाधिकरणविजातीयाय-लसाधिनतः दस्मिन्यि रक्षना परगमवि ज्ञातिवाचियु दस्मिन्यि श्रद्धाण: परेमेष्वरस्व निवाभन्दलेन तद्रस्मव अवलोकितसंबंध्यो वर्णनीय इहृतकायामह।

Some think that this available भाष्य is not the genuine नीलकंठाम्य but a spurious one, being a rehash of the real one, which the editor has not been able to trace. In as much as the author refers to and quotes from नीलकंठाम्य in authority, there must have been a different नीलकंठाम्य, which unfortunately is still unavailable to the public.

P. 8. लौकिकतर्पि etc.—This is another reason that अवि-रणश्च does not militate against identity. The compound ब्रह्मविकारणि: is dissolved as ब्रह्म: कपालि: यथै सः। Here कपालि are the अविकरण of घट and are identical with घट। In the same व्यक्त आज्ञाविकारणि: are अविकरणानि: of शिव and are identical with शिव।
This is another objection raised against the position of the objecter, after the first objection was met and after it was concluded that आचार्यशाख क was not inconsistent with identity. Here it is objected that if Linga (अभ्य) was limited to various seats (आचार्यर विज. आनन, शिव, and श्रीवा), it would contradict its स्वभावाभाव (तस्मात.विवेंग: शिव:). This objection is refuted by the following (लोकानुसार etc.) The Linga, though naturally all-pervading, comes to be restricted to artificial limitations as आनन, शिव, and श्रीवा etc., like आचार्य, which, though all-pervading, comes to the spoken of in its limited forms, as प्रतार्क, मण्डळाकाश etc.

P. 8. नवानन्तिरेषिनीव...वात्सल्योपन्नः इति वात्सल्यः। The following extracts from अनादिश्रीकेशवसरसम्बह चाप. I and भुवन सर will make this clear:

(a) तथापि विवेंगः स्वपन्नेव द्विंग: भूतः, भूतानमन्त्रस्मानहः भूतः, स्वाभाविक आचार्यः: आचार्यः: सर: अविन्य: यथावतः वोङशेवृः।

(b) स्वलिल्या स्वपन्नेव द्विंगः: भूतः स्वपन्नेव स्वर्यः पूजाविव: गौरवितः स्वपन्नेव तत्तत्त्वनिवेंगः एव पूजाविविवेंगः गौरवितः स्वर्यः। (pp. 11 and 14)

(c) यथार्थप्रधानः युगस्वेनान्विताः।
शिष्यवेदन: यम: च तत्तत्त् रामोऽपि:।
उपाध्येयः यकु: पूजाज्ञानि स. व्यासाधः।
गुप्तदिशाः शिवालमाम निपटेति श्रीरामसिव:।
यथार्थप्रधानः साधवतस्तरमेः सर:।
साधवतस्तरमें तत्तत्त्त्त्त प्रधानः निदेशति।
(वायुलाभमीलितम् अनादिश्रीकेशवसरसम् page 21)

(d) परमशिवस्य पूजय गुरुक्षेत्राणाम् etc—
(शिवालमामंतर: page 27)
P. 8. चक्रार्थवत्र्य:—Here the significance of त्र, already referred to above, is established. The author maintains that the first half of the hymn gives the limited forms of शिव and the latter half states the all-pervasive forms of शिव; and that both are properly connected by the conjunctive particle त्र.

P. 8. अष्टेद्वसनचरणाचीमृत्यु—Here is stated another (third objection) objection against the position of the objecter. The objection is that Linga may be limited to various भावावा. But its limitation to अन (i.e., its residence in अन) cannot be proved; because इहलोग is never placed in the month, on the authority of विद्वानतितिस्वामणि and शंकरसंहिता, which unmistakably state that Linga is to be worn on the head, round the neck, on the stomach, breast, or on the palm. And as अन is not stated as a seat, it is impossible that it should be a seat of Linga.

P. 8. इलानाकलितिरभणीयम्—Here begins the answer to the objection. It means that the objection looks well for want of real grasp of the truth. The truth, the answer says, is that मंत्र is Linga, both being in grammatical equation, as the expressor and expressed.

P. 8. मन्ननात्मायेते etc.—These verses are taken from स्तंभदुर्गाण—शंकरसंहिता. The first verse gives the meaning of मंत्र to be Linga derivatively. And the second states their identity on account of their being in grammatical equation, as the expressor and expressed. Being in grammatical equation they are one and the same.

P. 9. भवांविन्दस्वय—स्वास is considered to be the author of the 18 Puranas, of which स्तंभदुर्गाण is one. The derivation, therefore, given of मंत्र is his. शिवराह्म also says:—
P. 9. नमः पैठिति प्रोक्त्वि etc.— These verses are taken from सिद्धांतशिखामणि of शिवविवक्षावर्तक. They explain how शिवविवक्षा, that is worshipped either on the altar or on the body, is constituted. The latter is the miniature of शिवविवक्षा, the amorphous representation of शिव. स्वयमानस्वामि explains in his शिवविवक्षा (page 32) that this amorphous representation of शिव contains in it the sixfold forms of the Linga, namely, आत्मांलिंग etc. in the following way:—तत्त्वादत्त्वार्थं, खंडककावर्णं 
एकलिंगं, वर्तलिंगं, नोकुलं वंगमलिंगं, योनिस्थानं प्रसादलिंगं, गोरुके महालिंगं, इस्वं वर्णपतिलिंगस्य प्रकाशामानात्त्वात्

P. 9. अन्त्र वीर्यमयेऽपि etc.— Here two kinds of corn श्रीहि or यव are laid down for preparing the cake (पूरोजात्त्व), which forms वजनवस्तु; while श्रीहि or यव are the material for making it. The two kinds of corn are laid down alternatively for the preparation of the cake. And it does not matter whether it is prepared from either of them, so long as the object, worship, is served. In the same way the purpose of wearing Linga is मोक्ष. And if the end (मोक्ष) is served by wearing Linga, it does not matter whether the Linga is worn on the head, round the neck, or in the mouth. Hence the hymn वर्जनेन etc. lays down alternatives.
P. 9. अबि व शरं प्रथानमृतं etc.—This hymn करं प्रवानं etc. is taken from खेतरङ्गरोपाविष्ट (I—10). In extenso it is,

करं प्रथानमृतां करं हरं करतामनं इति तदनुष्ठानकं।
त्रस्याभिध्यायालाभे भूताभास्ते विश्रमायानिन्ध्वति॥

The objecter maintains that the hymn lays down the wearing of Linga, both internally and externally, as borne out by the verses from सिद्धाश्चिन्थमणिः (quoted by the author), which bases its statements on the Vedas. The internal wearing is laid down by the words तस्याभिध्यायाल, i.e. meditation of Him worn internally. जोर्ज्याल lays down the wearing of Linga externally on the body as इत्यादि। If the wearing of Linga is laid down, says the objector, the place of wearing Linga should need be stated in sequence. This is done by the hymn खर्चनविरोधावः etc., which follows the hymn करं प्रवानं etc. later. The devotee expects to know where it is to be worn. If the places of wearing Linga, as expected by the devotee, are not stated, the devotee would be at a loss to know where to wear it. The hymn खर्चन etc. is significant, as it expressly states the places of wearing Linga on the particular parts of the body.

आधरि = आधारके। हड़ष्ण = अनिलके। भूषषिः = विश्रिष्टके।

P. 9. In corroboration of the verses quoted from सिद्धाश्चिन्थमणिः, the following verses from सदान्देशपंडित, may be noted—

अंताशिधेश्चेत्कं खर्चेश्चेत्कं द्विझेत्तमाः।
संज्ञक्लुणो दत्तं दैवं जिग्नुसस्वदेश्च॥
धार्य द्विणेण मुख्येऽः शिवतसनविदेहं विडु॥
चैवनाठ्रस्तास्यमेव भयोध्य पदातरं पुरुषस्मृति विहनृ॥

(See Unpublished Upanishads, Adyar, Mardas)
P. 9. "going against the context. i.e. failing to fulfill the expectancy raised by the previous context. Such failure would be very undesirable. The hymn: "is significant in that it fulfills the expectancy. Hence there is no apportional in such a manner as asserted by the scholar.

P. 10. "Here the objecter maintains his position finally by saying that the hymn: etc. would be unmeaning, except in the light of the explanation given in the foregoing discussion. If the explanation, the author says, is not accepted, the hymn would either mean "identity" of with आनन्द, शिव; भक्ति, or दर्शन there. But both these alternatives would be untenable, as they would surely conflict with the statements made about शिव, which are given next, viz. Ramesh श्रृंग: and तस्मात्वकऽगतः शिवः.

P. 10. "This is taken from भाषाशा of प्राचीन. This is well explained by पंडित विवेकानन्द as follows:—

P. 10. "This is the fourth and the last objection raised against the position of the objecter. The objection is that if there had been a word expressive of आवाहण (seat of शिविर: viz. आनन्द, शिव:, and भक्ति), the assertion of शिव residing there would be established.
But as there is no such word the assertion is meaningless. This objection is answered by the objecter by saying that the affix expressing possession or having the things (आनन्द etc.) as seats is appended. Except for this the whole thing would be meaningless. But instead of making the whole thing meaningless it is better, says the objecter, to assume the affix by indication, according to the rule (वर्ण वाक्येऽन्न्यायान्तस्मात्स्य व्यक्ता) established in पृष्ठांगा in connection with the पश्चिम, as is discussed next.

P. 10. मत्वोंगार्थप्रस्तावन—The compound सच्चानिक्रियाकित: is dissolved by the author as—सच्चां निग्यायणमांश्च आनन्दिक्रियाकित्व: अधिकरणे यथा स:। this is a बहुनिद्धिमायास। But the author in stead of taking this compound as a बहुनिद्धिमायास says that the word is obtained by the possessive affix अनु पंडित विचित्रकुमार remarks in this connection as follows:—

यथा विशेषता तदेक वाचान्यो निदेश्यति तथापि एकांवाक्यावान्यो कुलसंस्कर्ते उत्तर-पदेक पुनर्वाक्यवस्थाश्चया एव स्वरूपिता तद्वा विद्वानिधिक्रियात्मकानां स्तरोपस्त्रायाश्च। वस्तुतः सहस्त्रायो पुरुष: इति वदित: सर्वा: पाणिपार्श्वे तत: सर्वान्विक्रियारूपे इति न्याय स्वरूपात विनिर्दिष्टी इति इत्यविरुद्धवाक्याभित्र: विनिर्दिष्टोद्वितीय स्वरूपस्त्रोपस्त्राय एव निद्धिमायास।

P. 10. अन्युपगतं जाप ऐतिहय—The rule referred to just above, has been established in पृष्ठांगा (in अ. 10 वाद 7 अक्ष: 20). in सुत्रास—

विचारभित्र इति चेत। चोलसंकल्प।—According to text if you say; it is not so, by reason of there being one injunction.

पार्थवालि विचित्र comments on these सुत्रास as follows:—

परंतु विनिर्दिष्ट विनिर्दिष्ट विनिर्दिष्ट विनिर्दिष्ट विनिर्दिष्ट विनिर्दिष्ट विनिर्दिष्ट
P. 10. प्रकृति क्रिया: कर्त्तव्य—Here it is necessary to understand what is meant by प्रकृति and विकृति. प्रकृति is a fundamental rite or sacrifice. i.e. an Archetype (of a sacrifice) and विकृति is a modification or a derivative. प्रकृति and विकृति are defined by अर्थांश as follows:—चत्र समांक्षुंडे:शा प्रकृति:। चत्र दस्यस्मान्सादिः। प्रकृति न च श्लोगोस्पदेशः। शा विकृति:। शा पीविदिः तत्र कर्तिपानां अंगानां कर्तिपान न प्रस्थाना। In प्रकृति or the Archetype all rules about subsidiary matters are specified. But in derivatives rules regarding the subsidiary matters are not so specified. So it is laid down that all subsidiary matters of a विकृति are performed by the rules prescribed for the Archetype. The rules of a प्रकृति are transferred to the विकृति by the principle प्रकृतिविन्दु विकृति: कर्त्तव्या (a derivative samhita be performed in the same manner as an Archetype). This principle of transferring the rules is called अन्तिदेश (application by protraction or transfer). The meaning of अन्तिदेश is made clear by शास्त्र as follows:—अन्तिदेशो नाम व षेट्र विदिता: तमानील अयष्ट्र तेव्रा देवः। यथा देवस्वस्तास्माबिधि कल्याणा शाश्वे-न्युशासितस्य:। देवस्त:। अन्तिदेशः। विदिता: विषयात् विषयात् अन्तितिदेशं देवस्वस्तान विदिता: भाषितवय:। विदित। श्रेष्ठमन्द्र उदाहरित।
P. 10. चौदरेन—प्रकृतितत्त्व विश्लेषण कर्तव्य हिति चौदरेनकाथातमित्रेश्वर. बलेन. (पाठेश्वरमित्र के अर्पणप्रारंभो.)

P. 10. दिवसवाक्याः... साधितत्त्वम्।—The whole thing has been well explained by पय्यद्वितीय as follows:—पशुक्षे क्षेष्ट्यि धुतिे "एकादशशास्त्रवादानि तानि दिवसवाक्य" हिति पशुक्षे शैरोत्त्र—

P. 10. दिवसवाक्याः...—The whole thing has been well explained by पय्यद्वितीय as follows:—पशुक्षे क्षेष्ट्यि धुतिे "एकादशशास्त्रवादानि तानि दिवसवाक्य" हिति पशुक्षे शैरोत्त्र—

P. 10. दिवसवाक्याः...—The whole thing has been well explained by पय्यद्वितीय as follows:—पशुक्षे क्षेष्ट्यि धुतिे "एकादशशास्त्रवादानि तानि दिवसवाक्य" हिति पशुक्षे शैरोत्त्र—

P. 10. दिवसवाक्याः...—The whole thing has been well explained by पय्यद्वितीय as follows:—पशुक्षे क्षेष्ट्यि धुतिे "एकादशशास्त्रवादानि तानि दिवसवाक्य" हिति पशुक्षे शैरोत्त्र—

P. 10. दिवसवाक्याः...—The whole thing has been well explained by पय्यद्वितीय as follows:—पशुक्षे क्षेष्ट्यि धुतिे "एकादशशास्त्रवादानि तानि दिवसवाक्य" हिति पशुक्षे शैरोत्त्र—

P. 10. दिवसवाक्याः...—The whole thing has been well explained by पय्यद्वितीय as follows:—पशुक्षे क्षेष्ट्यि धुतिे "एकादशशास्त्रवादानि तानि दिवसवाक्य" हिति पशुक्षे शैरोत्त्र—

P. 10. दिवसवाक्याः...—The whole thing has been well explained by पय्यद्वितीय as follows:—पशुक्षे क्षेष्ट्यि धुतिे "एकादशशास्त्रवादानि तानि दिवसवाक्य" हिति पशुक्षे शैरोत्त्र—

P. 10. दिवसवाक्याः...—The whole thing has been well explained by पय्यद्वितीय as follows:—पशुक्षे क्षेष्ट्यि धुतिे "एकादशशास्त्रवादानि तानि दिवसवाक्य" हिति पशुक्षे शैरोत्त्र—

P. 10. दिवसवाक्याः...—The whole thing has been well explained by पय्यद्वितीय as follows:—पशुक्षे क्षेष्ट्यि धुतिे "एकादशशास्त्रवादानि तानि दिवसवाक्य" हिति पशुक्षे शैरोत्त्र—

P. 10. दिवसवाक्याः...—The whole thing has been well explained by पय्यद्वितीय as follows:—पशुक्षे क्षेष्ट्यि धुतिे "एकादशशास्त्रवादानि तानि दिवसवाक्य" हिति पशुक्षे शैरोत्त्र—

P. 10. दिवसवाक्याः...—The whole thing has been well explained by पय्यद्वितीय as follows:—पशुक्षे क्षेष्ट्यि धुतिे "एकादशशास्त्रवादानि तानि दिवसवाक्य" हिति पशुक्षे शैरोत्त्र—

P. 10. दिवसवाक्याः...—The whole thing has been well explained by पय्यद्वितीय as follows:—पशुक्षे क्षेष्ट्यि धुतिे "एकादशशास्त्रवादानि तानि दिवसवाक्य" हिति पशुक्षे शैरोत्त्र—

P. 10. दिवसवाक्याः...—The whole thing has been well explained by पय्यद्वितीय as follows:—पशुक्षे क्षेष्ट्यि धुतिे "एकादशशास्त्रवादानि तानि दिवसवाक्य" हिति पशुक्षे शैरोत्त्र—

P. 10. दिवसवाक्याः...—The whole thing has been well explained by पय्यद्वितीय as follows:—पशुक्षे क्षेष्ट्यि धुतिे "एकादशशास्त्रवादानि तानि दिवसवाक्य" हिति पशुक्षे शैरोत्त्र—
that because पाणिनद्र विविधं contained a विविध, the position of the सिद्धांतिः that सबलिङ्ग स्थापति contained an अयुतविविध विविध was not sound and therefore fell to the ground.

P. 10. वर्षाणारिका—This (पाणिनद्र) has been explained later on page 12 of the text in words पाणिनद्रभिस्थत्व etc.

P. 10. नन्द मर्यादूर्विविधि विविधि वि—Until now the objecter was at pains to prove that there was no अयुतविविध विविध in सबलिङ्ग स्थापति, as the विविध was already laid down in सबलिङ्ग विविधि वि विविधि etc. Now he proceeds to prove that there is neither नियमविविधि nor वि in सबलिङ्ग स्थापति First he proves that there is no नियमविविधि. But the instances of नियमविविधि and परिसंख्यविविधि are given in reverse order, as remarked by परिसंख्यविविधि etc.—

P. 11. This verse is not found in any of the printed editions of शास्त्रस्मृति now available to the
reading public. It is probable that there might be a different redaction of the स्मृति in South India, from which the author took the श्लोक. Our suspicion that there must have been a different edition of this स्मृति in South India is confirmed by the fact that महामार कर quotes this very verse with introductory words इत्यादिकोलः। But this श्लोक appears in स्कंदपुराणः, सदष्टशाखांब as follows:—

र्थेतं कुत्वा गुहदारङ्ग गत्वा।
सुरां पीत्वा ब्रह्मद्वां च कुत्वा।
भमभव्यः भमभव्याधायानि।
सदष्टाध्यायी सुचने सर्बपापः।

P. 11. नन्द तद्भस् etc.—Lastly the objecter proves that there is no परिसंक्ष्यम्, as लिङ्गारण्यक कर्त्तात् and अपरिसंक्ष्यम् cannot, being contradictory, go together so as to be alternatives for positive action. अपरिसंक्ष्यम्: स्वत एव निषेधात् नियमिद्: अपेक्षा नास्तीति भावः। (पंद्रित शिबद्धमार).

P. 11. अत्रेष्यते:—Here begins the refutation of the foregoing long objection, which is met by the विद्वानतिर, saying that स्वास्थं श्याप्यति does contain an अपुरुषविधि, which he ultimately proves. There remains, therefore, no necessity for the विद्वानतिर to refute that there is neither नियमविधि nor परिसंक्ष्यम् in स्वास्थोऽस्मायात्, which go automatically. The विद्वानतिर says that the words सवानिन्यिरोऽशीव: etc., though they contain an injunction to wear Linga only indirectly, lay down specifically the places of wearing Linga on the body. स्वास्थं श्याप्यति, on the other hand, enjoins directly श्यापः (wearing) of Linga. But the main thing being श्यापः, the places of wearing Linga follow श्यापः in expectancy. Hence the sentence स्वास्थं श्याप्यति is the sustainer (उपजीव्र) and the sentence सवानिन्यिरोऽशीव: is the sustained (उपजीव्रम्). On account of this relation between them it cannot be said,
says the सिद्धांतिन्, that the sentence सर्वानन्हिरोऽधिवः should affect in the least the nature of सर्वमिं स्थायति of being an अनूपविविधः.

P. 11. तत्स्वस्वत्वानेद्योजनन्—Here there is the word बोजनः, which lays down the बोजनः (संबंध or wearing) of Linga. This is the prima facie objection to the सिद्धांतिन्'s assertion that सर्वमिं स्थायति is the sustainer and सर्वानन्हिरोऽधिवः is the sustained. सर्वानन्हिरोऽधिवः, therefore, says the objecter, is dependent on कर प्रधान एते, and not on सर्वमिं स्थायति.

P. 11. नवम्याः etc.—This is the refutation of the foregoing objection. Here the सिद्धांतिन् says the sentence सर्वमिं स्थायति has the great advantage of having the words "निं" and "स्थायति", directly expressive of the thing to be worn and the wearing. While बोजनः is not so directly expressive of wearing Linga like स्थायति. Moreover बोजनः is a noun but स्थायति is a verb. The word बोजनः, therefore, expresses the wearing of Linga only remotely (विषेषत्वार्थातिक).

P. 12. रूपेश्वद्विविधस्वरूपप्रयोग—This न्याय is discussed and established in पूर्वमासां in 1-3.30. The न्याय is:—

चेदनामासार्थेऽक्तवषयविभागान्:—By reason of apprehension of the meaning from the utterance of words, there is the unity of sense, because there is no distinction. The न्याय is well explained in a few words by रामेश्वरसूरि in his जैनविश्वासहिति, as follows:—

चेदनेषु: वधारी निषेधे: उत्ताभिचारविति संवेदे वधारी सिद्धे। देवाधि: अवाति कणोभितिरुपमेश्वरूपः। उदाहरः हि देशेवा वधन्तै इति चार्यभेदादिति बहि: पूर्वपेश्व समिद्वात्माइ प्रमोणिति। पूर्वसूत्रे: (चेदनेषुवधाराश्रूपं:) भेद इति पूर्णश्च। प्रथो-गमय वाक्यवः चेदना वचारणविषयविभागान्: तदगात्र अभावसामग्रेः। अथं साध:। वैदिककालाध्यायेऽ: विषमं त्यापुरुपेश्व शक्तिसहासमथवा अधर्नां न स्थायिति। अतः वधाराः अविभागान्त असेद तू अविक्षमिति। देवे गृह्यवशिष्कोशात्वादेवपक्षितापपशः। (वृषादिशिवान्तं तु प्रसिद्धपदसमाभिन्यादाराच्छिन्नकिमिन्ह उपप्रच्छे इति)
वाचनार्थ in his जैमिनिन्यायमाताविस्तर makes the same conclusion in words—तत्त्त्वेऽद्विण्वः पद्यप्रवृत्त: तेऽथ एव वैदिकः। He quotes from वाचनिकः the principle (न्याय) in words “जैमिनिन्याय-सामान्यः शब्दोऽद्विपः बोधः।” It is to be noted that रामेश्वरसुरी interprets नामद्वा as वाचनरञ्जनन्यायप्रवृत्ति: and not as an injunction. While पणिनि Office, Allahabad, translates it as “by reason of direction as to action.”

From the foregoing it is clear that वैदिक words and जैमिनिक words (popular words or words in currency) are one and the same in meaning or import, though they might differ in form. The popular words have, therefore, the power of elucidating the Vedic words and language and helping people to understand the Vedic words rightly. This is made clear by पंडितविश्वकामार who remarks—

वैदिक न्यायार्थाय जैमिनिन्यायत्रिकानां पदानां वैदेविपः सर्वायपमेऽ अर्थबोधकार्यन्यायम्। वैदिकशास्त्रानां जैमिनिकशास्त्राय भौद्भव्यमित्रायं क्षेत्रोपगमे तु शक्तियान्यायायार्थे। वैदिकशालानां जैमिनिकशालां भौद्भव्यमित्रायं क्षेत्रोपगमे तु शक्तियान्यायायार्थे।

The popular words are, hence, mainly dependable for the right understanding of the Vedic words and language. But the popular words derive their power of conveying the right meaning of sentences from grammar in their syntactical connection. The objector, therefore, says that the words, through they have to depend upon grammar for their expressive power, are still capable of laying down something, as the words प्राणा करते जो। In the same way, says the objecter, the words स्वाधीननिरूपणः etc., the sustained, can lay down, even though it has to depend upon स्वाधीनस्थापयति, the sustainer. The position of the objector is finely explained by पंडितविश्वकामार, who comments—
This is refutation of the objection by the विद्वान, who maintains his position by saying that, though the words have to depend upon grammar for their power to lay down something, their dependance ends there; and they have not to depend upon other words for what they lay down, as for instance the words पशुना बजेन दो। But the case of स्वार्तनिषेधीय: etc. is different, in as much as they have to depend upon other words (सर्बलिंग स्थापति) for making the injunction of लिम्बार्यण manifest. The position of the विद्वान is very well expressed by पंडित विवेकानन्द, who says—पशुना बजेति महान शक्तिबास्यपार्थोपगौगौति-भन्नाथजन्तु नपेत्रचिदंतिकारणकालपमंशद्रवः स्व जन्मदवन्ति तात्त्विकतविश्वेषणानि तत्त्वनेत्र नाविशेष नाशित। स्वार्तनिषेधीय: हतोत्त त स्वार्तकाराक-स्वपपविविध दिवदितकारणसहाययतेति अथेवार्यवोधय सर्वलिंगवाक्यम् अथेषा बरित देव।

विवेकानन्द सिद्दे: is another reading for विद्वानसिद्दे: 1. But the latter reading seems to be quite correct, as it forcibly brings about the contrast, as intended by the author, between the two sentences स्वार्तनिषेधीय: etc. and सर्वलिंग स्थाप-यित। पंडित विवेकानन्द विबान त taking the former reading and makes a strained commentary in explanation of the same.

This is the refutation of the objection contained in पूर्ववाच्यकथा etc. on page 10. The objection was that सर्वलिंग स्थापयित did not contain an अपूर्वविशिष्ट, as the विधि to the effect of wearing Linga on the hand was
contained in वािमंते पवित्रे. The सिद्धांतिन now refutes that objection by saying that सवर्णिंग स्थापयति laid down the wearing of Linga in general; while पाणिमंते पवित्रे laid down the wearing of Linga on the hand specifically. The former simply laid down the wearing of Linga. But the latter lays down the place of wearing. Hence पाणिमंते पवित्रे was उपवीक्षक and सवर्णिंग स्थापयति was the उपवीक्ष्य. The objection, therefore, was futile.

P. 12. अन्त अभिहोन्त जुहोतित etc.—अभिहोन्त जुहोति is the sentence to establish the designation of a sacrifice, according to तत्त्वज्ञानयाय, established in पूर्वमीमांसा of अभिमि in I-1-4. (तत्त्वज्ञानयाय चालंश्च). तत्त्वज्ञानयाय मानस अन्यशास्त्र or तद्गुणार्थकशास्त्र, by means of which तत् (गुणदेश्य, आधार or देवता) is determined by the help of other text (शास्त्र). Hence अभिहोन्त जुहोति is only a नामचेताय. The मीमांसकाः argue that, if according to the objecter, अभिहोन्त जुहोति is not नामचेताय, it should a state गुणदेश्य. On the one hand अभि can be taken as the आधार of होम, the गुणदेश्य, by dissolving the compound as अभि होम; or अभि may be taken as the देवता of the होम by dissolving the compound as अभि होम. In the first case it means that we should offer oblation to fire (element) and nothing else. In the second case it means that we should offer the होम to अभि as देवता and not the element. So the विषाण् अभिहोन्त जुहोति, can be a गुणाविषाण satisfying either आधारकांक्षा or देवताकांक्षा. But says the मीमांसक that अभिहोन्त जुहोति cannot do either. Because आधारकांक्षा is satisfied by another विषाण्—यदाहवनीये जुहोति, which gives the आधारेनायामिः as आधार (आधिकरण). And so long as the text आधारेने जुहोति is there, the interpretation of अभिहोन्त जुहोति as गुणाविषाण for आधार becomes superfluous (निराधार). In the same way देवताकांक्षा is served by a different आधार—अभिज्ञानितः वाक्यिनिधि: स्वादः. So अभिहोन्त जुहोति is only a नामचेताय and आधारेनेय expresses
This is discussed in the following:
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The author applies this to the matter under consideration and says that lays down the swāyaṇ of Ling in general but not for which is laid down by Ling remains pure at all times in another section. Similarly Ling remains pure at all times. But is interpreted in the following way:

P. 12. etc.—Here the occurrence of the word is justified; because the word shows that the Linga is always pure and cannot be made impure even when it is worn at impure times like menstruation etc. Later the author vindicates at fuller length the position of Ling remaining pure at all times in another section. is the sacred thread to be worn at all times by after the ceremonial. The thread is always pure and is not defiled even during the times of impurity. Similarly Ling remains pure at all times. But is interpreted in the following way:

P. 13. —This is an objection that the sentence lays down two things, namely, and . It thus commits the fault of
The principle that one sentence must convey only one sense, i.e., there must be no वचनवेदः, has been established by जैमिनि in सूत्र "अर्थविवादित्वबावर" in II-1-14.

P. 13. अभासत्वे विदीयन्ते बद्धेऽप्ययुक्तः—This is the reply to the fault of वचनवेदः. The सिद्धांतः says the fault is removed by taking the sentence as laying down a विदित्वनिधि or a qualified विधि, as पाण्डित्यविवादित्वविवादित्वविवादित्वलिखितनिधि। This principle of laying down a qualified विधि is established in पूर्वोपाया (I-4-9). The सूत्र is—तद्दुपरस्त। विदित्वविवादित्वविवादित्वविवादित्व — (on the other hand the action and the qualities are laid down because they cannot be separated for the purpose of laying down otherwise the qualities will be known by another). The commentary of रामेश्वरसूरि is as follows:—स्याधिकारचार अत्यक्षरीया अपावशयन्या चाच्युतो महत्त्वष वायस्वेदिहिता अमेयादित्वदेविन गुणविधि। कितु कर्मनामेतान बाइं बुद्ध यत्तुविमेव अस्त्रालमार हृदत। तथा कर्मच देवतादियादिकप्राप्तो गुणाध्य विदित्वविवादित्व। विदित्वविवादित्व विदित्वविवादित्व दुर्भं यात्र उक्षत्वेव अविदायात्तु किर्यात्तु विदित्वविवादित्व। अन्तथा अन्यविवादित्व शिष्ट्यादित्व विदित्वविवादित्व न चैत्त सारंप्रयूताः अत्ते निम्नासंस्कृत:। न च वाच्य-वेदः। गुणविवादित्वविवादित्वविवादित्व चाच्युतः।

This principle of विदित्वविवादित्व विवादित्व is finely summarised in the couplet as follows (of which the line under discussion forms the second line):—प्रासे कर्मणि नानेको विवादुः शक्यस्य गुणः। वेदुः अभासत्वे विदीयन्ते बहुस्त्रप्रेक्ष्यात्॥ भणरः।

such a विदित्वविवादित्व is well explained by अर्थसंस्कृत as—

such a विदित्वविवादित्व is well explained by अर्थसंस्कृत as—

यह तृत्यमार्शाल्य तथा विविद्यें। विदित्वमेव "सोमेन चत्रेते" यश्र सोमभागयोगसाधन-लघुसूतविवादित्वविवादित्वसूत्रम। यथा अन्तर्विद्योऽस्मविद्योऽस्माहते यागेते अर्थविवादिति चृत्यान:। न चौमविवादितिर वाच्यवेदः। अस्त्रालमारसा स्वाधितिः। कितु विदित्वविवादिति विदानात।
P. 13. नन्द एवंति efc.—This is the second objection to the assertion that ब्रजिंग व्याप्ति पाणिमं पिकन्त्र enjoins the wearing of Lingas on the body. The objecter says that ब्रजिंग व्याप्ति enjoins the installation of Linga on the ground i.e. an altar in a temple; because the word व्याप्ति prominently and strikingly expresses the व्याप्ति of a Linga on an altar. Moreover the striking and prominent sense is corroborated by the very common custom of the people of installing Lingas in temples. Hence व्याप्ति cannot be taken to mean the placing of Linga on the body.

P. 13. पाणिनि: अन्नम हिंदं घड़मोघनादिना संस्कृतम्—This is the explanation of the word पाणिमं so as to suit the explanation from the objecter's standpoint.

P. 13. पाणिनि: व्याप्तिनादिनि:संस्कृतम्—पाण्डव or the six अधिनि, according to Shiva philosophy are. संदेश, पदाभ्य, बणेच्य, भुताध्य, नवाध्य, and कालव. These are the कार्यं of the कार्यं, शिव and his दात. Being कार्यं and being affected by शक्ति they are अङ्क. Their श्रृद्धिकारण consists in making them free from मलाध्य. श्रृद्धिकारण of these is treated in विस्तारण (see, for instance, कालूम्बीत). But this is treated in विस्तारण (pp. 181-182, 183 briefly as follows—

अन्नम् नम दत्त नाम कार्यकृतव विषये।
वर्णाद्यं नाम कालवं च नदयं भिवेदक्षितम्।
महाख्यं च नवाध्यं च वर्णाद्यं केति शक्तिः।
भुताध्यं च नवाध्यं च शक्तिः विशेषः कालातः।

आणवक्षे मायैवं विस्तारकिल्ले श्रृद्धवें। नाम आणवक्षे नाम सदाशिवस्य श्वस्तायराण—
महायं नाम पुण्यचन्द्रमिति प्रतिष्ठितः। सुविशेषः महाइंकारादि आत्मसुलिं।

उक्तं च वायथेः—

शिवं शक्तिस्तं नादं तत्सामहिंदुं सदाशिवं।
तत्सामहिंदुं जातं शुच्या बिच्या महेश्वराद्र।
This is refutation of the foregoing objection by others. The author's refutation of the objection begins on the next page with भाषा बूझः etc. It is not possible to understand to whom the author refers and whose refutation be reproduces here.

This न्याय or principle is established in पूर्वीमासिकः I-4-19, सूत्र 29. The सूत्र means in doubtful meanings by what follows सम्मोहस्थिति explains this सूत्र in his commentary as follows:

This principle is applied here and the सिद्धांत vindicated. The refutation is that स्थापन might mean installation of Linga on the ground as much as on the body. The doubt, whether the स्थापन means the installation on the body or an altar, is cleared by what follows, namely, मनन (contained in मंत्र). If the word मनन means पूजन, as it always does and as is popularly accepted, and if that मनन or पूजन be restricted to वाणिः (in पाणि मंत्र), स्थापन means the placing of Linga on the hand, i.e., on the body.
extract of Shankar Sanhita already quoted, which extract, namely, "The Gods with Shakra as their leader wear me in the form of Linga on some part or other of their bodies like head", lay down the wearing of Linga in its gross form with a special mention of the place, on which it is to be worn.

Some extracts from Agamas enjoining the wearing and worship of Linga life-long have been already given. Other similar ones may be seen in the Agamas, of which Kamika comes first and Vatula last. They are not given here for fear of swelling the bulk of the treatise (wearisome length of the book).

XII.

An objection:—The Agamas themselves are not an authority (like the Vedas). Hence how can something laid down by them, like the wearing of Linga, be authoritative? In reply we maintain that this is no objection. We ask (the objector) whether the authority of all agamas is denied; or the authority of the well known twenty-eight Shivagamas, that are known to have been written by the great Lord, Shiva, because it is said, "The Shivagamas are an utterance of Shiva; the first in the list comes Kamika and Vatula the last", is denied; or whether the authority of those works written by Buddha, who is taken to be an incarnation of Narayana, and by Jina, is denied; because Buddha and Jina preach against the teaching of the Vedas that the slaughter of an animal in a sacrifice is as sinful (as an ordinary slaughter and, therefore, the sacrifices should not be performed). The first
This is the refutation of the objecter’s justification of पणिः as सापेक्षेऽविष्म समासः। The सिद्धांतिन says that such a justification in a round-about way is no good; because in such a case the word पणि is unnecessary and can be well dispensed with, in as much as पणि as the करण of पुजन is at once implied and requires no special mention. एव पणि thus becomes superfluous.

Here the objecter comes forward again and justifies his position by holding that the mention of पणि is significant in order to restrict the पुजन to पणि only as करण. एव पणि Thus, the objecter says, नियमविविधि. But the सिद्धांतिन says no to this-

This is the refutation of the foregoing explanation of the objecter. The सिद्धांतिन says that the means of worship cannot be so restricted to hand only; because on the authority of सिद्धांतिन शब्दार्थ, भाषा, वाच्य, etc. are all as much the means of worship as the hand.

Herein the सिद्धांतिन points out that according to the objecter’s standpoint “hand” alone would be the means of worship i.e. एक्षेत्राव्याप्ति। Such a restriction would be undesirable in contradiction to the authority contained in शब्दार्थादि etc.
P. 14. नच सामीतापुवालयवेगळि etc.—Here the विद्वानिर्द्व anticipates that the objecter might say that even when the word पाणींग्राण्व was dissolved as पाणी में, the same would be the contingency, namely, that पूजन should be performed on hand only and no where else as in mind etc. But such objection, says the विद्वानिर्द्व, is quite untenable, because the worship of Linga placed on (the left) hand might be done not only by the (right) hand but by मनः, वाक् etc. The worship of Linga, though restricted to the particular अविद्वारण or आधार, can be performed by all means of worship, पाणि, मनः, वाक् etc. Thus Linga, the object of worship, become अविद्वारणजिस्थित्त. But पाणि, मनः, वाक् etc. are all means of worship.

P. 14. वच्छोर्ण etc.—This is the refutation of the meaning given to the word मनन as भविष्यत्तम by the objecter. The विद्वानिर्द्व says that सुख्याध्य कर्तव्य is पूजन and आभिमंत्रण is only its secondary or figurative sense. And whenever सुख्याध्य is possible figurative is unacceptable. गोपार्यः is to be accepted only when सुख्याध्य is inapplicable and गोपार्यः unavoidable. This preferability of सुख्याध्य to गोपार्यः has been established, says the विद्वानिर्द्व, in वज्जगुस्ति in 1-1-5 in सूत्र—गोप-श्रवण आत्माश्रयः. There the objecter maintained that इन्द्रण could be figuratively attributed to the inanimate प्रताप, in as much as इन्द्रण was so attributed to आयः, तेजः, etc. in some passages. This view of the objecter was refuted and it was established that इन्द्रण in its primary sense was better attributed to animate आत्माः and not to प्रताप figuratively.

P. 14. अयः शूभः etc.—Here begins the refutation of the second objection by the author himself. Here the author says that स्थापन means the स्थापन of the Linga on the body. When the दशक्रम and the उपवंश्वार, the beginning and the end of the passage, are to be consistently explained. The
whole passage is—निधनपत्तय नमः। निधनपतांतिकाय नमः। उशीयनमः।
उच्छशिलिगाय नमः। हिरण्याय नमः। हिरण्यशिलिगाय नमः। सुर्याय नमः। सुर्याय
शिलिगाय नमः। हिरण्याय नमः। हिरण्यशिलिगाय नमः। भगवाय नमः। भगविलिगाय नमः।
शामीय नमः। शामीय नमः। शामीय नमः। भगवाय नमः। भगविलिगाय नमः। भगवाय नमः।
त्त्वाय नमः। त्त्वाय नमः। त्त्वाय नमः। भगवाय नमः। भगविलिगाय नमः। भगवाय नमः।
ज्ञानीय नमः। ज्ञानीय नमः। ज्ञानीय नमः। भगवाय नमः। भगविलिगाय नमः। भगवाय नमः।
इन this passage the ten Lingas, namely, अच्छें लिंग or परमस्वरूपेन देव, His first three mod-
difications, महालिंग, प्राणालिंग, हिरण्यलिंग, and the six further modifications, महालिंग, प्राणालिंग,
चर्चिंग, शिवलिंग, गुरुलिंग, and आचारिलिंग, are praised by अप्सरावर; and at last it is enjoined that सर्वलिंगः
(संवृक्कर्कलं लिंगं) स्थापयति—Linga in all its forms should be
installed. In as much as the Lingas praised in the begin-
nning of the passage are those, that occupy the different त्त्वाय of the body and are to be worshipped by the devotee
to attain सुयुज्य with परमस्वरूप, it necessarily follows that स्थापत्य,
refers to the परमस्वरूपलिंगाः and not the स्थापत्यलिंगः. The ten
Lingas praised in the passage are identified with परमस्वरूपलिंगाः
as follows:—

(1) उच्छलिंग is अच्छेलिंग or परमस्वरूप. This is परमस्वरूप.
(2) महालिंग is महालिंग or ideal Linga.
(3) हिरण्यलिंग is प्राणालिंग or vital Linga.
(4) सुर्यलिंग is सुर्यलिंग or gross or physical Linga.
(5) परमलिंग is महालिंग, the first modification of सावलिंगः.
(6) शिवलिंग is प्राणालिंग, the second modification of सावलिंगः.
(7) ज्ञानीय लिंग is ज्ञानीय लिंग, the first modification of प्राणालिंगः.
(8) ज्ञानीय लिंग is शिवलिंग, the second modification of प्राणालिंगः.
(9) आचारिलिंग is गुरुलिंग, the first modification of इद्धलिंगः.
(10) आचारिलिंग is आचारिलिंग, the second modification of इद्धलिंगः.

The author quotes authorities in support of the identi-
fication of the various Lingas, excepting the अच्छेलिंग. But
the following खिंग from योगराजप्रभाविन्द्र may be noted in support of this Linga, namely,

नवम व्योमचक्र स्वादेशः पोषणसंयुतम्।
शविरुद्धाच तन्मध्ये शाक्तिह्वा विष्रता परा॥

The whole passage निचनपत्रे नमः…… विश्लेषण स्थापत्यं पालिमंत्र पवित्रं has been explained in श्रुतिसाराम्यं by शिवशिवाययिगिन् as follows:— अस्वार्थः। निचनपत्रे-निर्गतः धनं जीवितः वस्मात्स्य निवचनस्य मरणस्य पतेः स्वामिने कल्पनयाय नमः। नमस्कारः। निचनपत्रान्तत्रिकाय निवचने वरे दनां पतििनां अंतिकाय समीपमूलय रसालनुप्रय नमः। उच्चाय परूणिव-पतवातमुपरिषुताय नमः। विश्लेषणगताय तपमानादर्मोद्भवेऽणगतमुष्कपय नमः। हिरण्याय नमः। हिरण्यलिंगाय हिमसंयुतिगमं नमः। सुवर्णीय शोभवर्णनां नमः।। सुवर्णलिंगाय शोभवर्णनां अंकं भूताय नमः। दिव्याय दिविक प्रकाशे भरं ज्वलनं तस्मै तेत्रहपय नमः।। विश्लेषणाय देशु प्रकाशवत्मचार्यभूताय नमः। भवाय उम्मते: क्रेमः नमः। शान्तिनिगाय उपलितस्त आण्वयाय नमः। शान्तिनिगाय शुंगाः दिनिर्घरी शर्वः तस्मै हिरंकाय नमः।। शान्तिनिगाय हिमास्तेन्तामभुजादेः नमः।। शिवाय देते सजनानां मनमि अदेते शिवः तस्मै नमः।। शिवशिवाय संगतानां चिन्तुस्य नमः।। ज्ञाय अभित्याय नमः।। ज्ञानशिवाय असंसंगताय नमः।। अमाय जानवतपरमनमांकितस्यस्य स्याय नमः।। अमायशिवाय जातवतंताय नमः।। प्रत्याय परमोपमीयते: इति परमस्तस्मै उक्तक- श्रुपातिताय नमः।। प्रत्यायशिवाय ज्ञानअमायवतौ ज्ञानस्य स्याय नमः।। सोमाय श्रीह- नुःः: सूर्यस्य लीलाभितिरिणक्ष्य स्विश्वस्य सुवर्णियम् विभासकं पालिमंत्र करकमलस्य व्रजनकर्तरः नथा चतुः—

प्रणः न मननानां लोङ्गः सविलोकमयं।
संस्थापेश्वरसदा देहे पवित्रसुपीवदात्॥

पवित्रं पावनस्त्रस्यलिंगं एवं द्वे जागतकः स्थापत्यं प्रतिष्ठाय्य पुजयति। षागतिनितिम्भिति पञ्चायः। कथोऽजूककेस्टर मत्यकेस्तर अन्वेष्टर केष्टर नरकिकेस्तर इत्यादितत्तश्चः पूजनीय विण्वेति। (Every time नमः was followed by नमस्कारः। that has been omitted to avoid tediousness). But it is to be noted that here there is no indication of what खिंग is to be identified with what modified खिंग form of परशिव, as is done by the author. It is to be also noted that the
explanation of पवित्र and पाणिमंत्र, as पवनस्वस्वप्रक्षविन्द and करकमलस्य
पावनकारक respectively, differs from that of the author’s.

This passage has been explained by वसवर्षादिताराम, the commentator of नारायणपारिपत्र, similarly. And the
different लिखान are identified with पद्धति लिखान, as the author
does. But it is unnecessary to reproduce it here.

P. 16. विच्छेदवाद्येरेवत्विधिकारण्यपति:—If it is not admitted
that स्थापन is that of the Linga on the body, then there would
result disagreement between the अर्थवाद and the final विचि of
स्थापन, if this स्थापन were to mean the स्थापन of the Linga
on the ground.

P. 16. किंतु, उपक्रमोपसंहारी etc.—When something is to
be determined as to what it is or when it is to be determined
that a thing refers to a particular thing, it can be so done
by the six textual indications, which are (1) उपक्रम and
उपसंहार (2) अभ्यास (3) अपर्याय (4) फल (5) अर्थवाद (6) उपपत्ति.
These six have been made clear on page 28 of सिद्धांतेदयसङ्ग्रह
as follows:—

उपक्रमोपसंहारी अभ्यासोपपर्याय फलोऽण
अर्थवादोपपर्याय च लिखित तात्त्विकिते॥

तत्—छांदोग्यप्राण सदेव श्रेयम् इस्यद्वितीयं चणेऋक्रमम् एतदालाम्बिदं सर्व इत्यप-
संहारात्ततत्त्वादोपसंहारस्यहीनद्वितीयाङ्कारस्य निर्णयते इति आव्ययुक्त। एवंसंहि रूपं
तात्त्विकिते। सर्वस्त्रावस्य इस्यदेवविक्रमोपसंहारादचसरमात्र अद्वितीयाधिततंग द्वितीयाधि-
स्मासङ्ग्रहम् यद्य वे सोमचैतिसाणिमात्र न निमालक्षे इत्यादिना अद्वितीयाङ्गायी मानोत-
रायोपस्ताधणापूर्वत्त्वक तृतीयाधि । सर्व तात्त्विक चिरं यावत् निमालक्षे अद्वि योगमात्र
माहैन सिद्धो सिद्धेकृतवल्लभूतं फलं चतुर्थं तात्त्विक लिखित। अनेन । जीवनालोकाला मात्रविने
इस्यादिना अद्वितीयालकनायानाथे अर्थवादं च चतुर्थम्। एनेन स्तूतितेन इस्यादिदातिततीनोपविनाश
प्रमिति चतुर्थं च चिनानि मनवति । एभि: चतुर्थ तात्त्विकिते भवति ।
things, having limbs and parts”, and then goes on to describe what the limbs and parts are, in reply to the question that arose about what they are, as follows:—

Omniscience, contentment, eternity, independence indestructibility, and possession of endless powers, these six are the limbs of the great Lord; so say those that know the truth. Knowledge, dispassion, Lordship, meditativeness, might, forgiveness, power of creation, self-consciousness, and government of the universe, these are the endless parts that are ever-abiding in Lord Shiva.”

And this statement is based on the Agamas only. So also Mantras like Tryambaka and Shadakshari, composed by Shankaracharya and included in his works like Prapancharasara and others, are of daily use and are introductory to all devotional rites. But the constituent parts of the Mantras and their veils are described only in the Agamas. And if the Agamas were unauthoritative, these Mantras would also be unauthoritative, contrary to the custom. Never do commentators quote from (and do anything based on) unauthoritative works. Therefore, authoritativeness of the Agamas is as much unimpeachable as that of Smritis, Puranas and historical books written by sages like Vyasa, Manu and others; because these Agamas have been written by Lord Shiva Himself, the greatest sage, as may be known from such texts as “You are the Brahmin of human beings; I am the Brahmin of the Gods”, and “Lord Rudra is greater than the universe; He is the great sage”. It is also known that He is eternal from “Him, the faultless and the spotless etc.”. The last alternative also is no good, because we admit the unauthoritativeness of the works written by (the great) Buddha, an
strengthen his own position, as maintained by him in the foregoing. In the hymn the sentence श्रीदुहरः यूँ भवति contains the विभि, according to सिद्धांतिनि, that the sacrificial post should made of उदुर्वर tree; and the rest is the अर्थावाद or praise of the tree. The objecter comes forward and says that it is not अर्थावाद but the statement of fruit to be attained by the post being made of the tree, because of the word अद्वृत्य in the dative case, which expresses for the sake of (the fruit, यस्य). The सिद्धांतिनि refutes this by saying that unless it is actually laid down that the sacrificial post should be made of उदुर्वर tree, no फल can be expected. But the verb not being in the imperative or potential mood, no विभि can be said to be laid down. The objecter may say, if it was not laid down actually, it might be inferred to be laid down. But the inference can be made, says the सिद्धांतिनि, only from the अर्थावाद of the उदुर्वर tree. Hence श्रीदुहरः यूँ भवति is the विभि and the rest is अर्थावाद. The whole thing is lucidly discussed by माधवाचार्य in his जैमिन्यायमालाविल्लर in I–2–2 as follows:—
P. 17. अश्वमयस्य etc.—This is an objection that लिंगभारण is enjoined on those that seek मोक्ष and not on all, because सिद्धांतशिक्षामणि says clearly—मोक्षार्थकाः शुभिः बायमार्मणेतरं लिंगभारण कर्वल्ल्मप। The author refutes this by saying that such an objection is untenable, in as much as संभोगासाना would also be restricted to those only that seek अमृतेः and not general. But the restriction will go against the general custom of संभव्य being practised by all. This is merely a technical objection and not that all do not or should not seek मोक्ष.

P. 17. अनुरस्य etc.—Here the objector comes forward to prove that संभोगासाना is laid down in the negative form in that the non-performance of संभव्य is productive of degradation. The विद्वानं meets this by saying that his position is similarly sound, because failure to wear Linga also leads to degradation. The verse—सवस्याविविधतः लिंगं etc. is taken from बीरसाइश्वराचारसार वोि. I, page 90.

P. 17. आर्यवादिककल्याणेन—The fruit of संभव्य is not direct but is gathered through आर्यवाद or praise.

P. 17. विवेकलखुलतादेवते etc.—These verses are taken from महाभारत, as noted by विवेकलखुलतादेवते, who remarks—वेदार्थंपुरं ब्रह्म-विवेकलखुलतादेवते तत्त्वात् सर्वं वेदार्थंसंभवं इतिहारपुरणसहायसंभवनिर्देशकरणस्तिंति—क्यालू। It is thought that इतिहासाः and पुराणाः only reiterate what the Vedas say; they, therefore, elucidate the doubts that may arise regarding the meaning of Vedic sentences, which are many times cryptic in their sense. विनेष्वरपुरण agrees with महाभारत and similarly says—

श्रेयं विनेष्वरपुरण वेदार्थं संभोगपिष्टिः दिव्य:।
न वेदार्थं संभवतः नैव व स्थादिशिच्छक्षण:॥
But वायुपुराण and मर्श्युपुराण go to the length of saying that ब्राह्म first cogitated on पुराणas and then the Vedas were delivered by him, in words—प्रथम सच्चारामण पुराणं ब्रह्मण स्वतः। केत्रे । अनंतः च वज्रं भयो वैशालस्य विषयिबुतः॥

The following may also be noted about the importance of पुराण and इतिहास—

(a) नाम वा नूकेने यजुवेंरः सामवेद आयोजितय सत्रद्वार इतिहासपुराणः पंचो वेदानां वेदः मिधेयो राशि: देवी निधिः जीवकं बाक्यं एकायणं द्विविधाः ब्रह्मविधा समविधा नक्षत्रविधा सक्षीवयजनाविधा नामिवेतनामोपास्यावं॥

(छंदं ग्रंथोपनिषतं VII 1-3 )

(b) सेतुत्रं यो मात्मित्वां जाईयेत् वर्ममैौ द्वारामिति। ततो जाियं संयोग संयुक्ते | तमाजीकायितुरै भास्तोरणों निदिक्ष्यम स एनं जाईयांविकार। तपस्त-चछु। कोषस्वते वा शुद्धात्मारिते। तस्य इस्मात्मितिसमाधिते। अन्वितलेके व कामचारि भवति। तस्य इस्मात्मितिहासपुराणीती माणकों ग्रंथीयात्। ग्रंथीत्वं ब्राह्मणः चछुतवेयेत्। भविष्य क्षति। वर्षेषत्व च जीवित।। परमं च वेदस्वापुराण।

(इतिहासिपनिषतं—Unpublished Upanishads, page 10)

It will not be out of place here to note a few instances of how पुराण reiterate the Vedas. The following will be the instances.

(a) The whole of chapter III of केत्रोपनिषतं has been stated in शिवपुराण-बायुसम्भविता as follows—

पुराणः खुर्दः संयो विवेद्तत्: परस्परम्।
ब्रह्मान्द संवरे जित्वा जेटाइहस्मैन्युतु॥
तदा महेश्वरस्तेष्ठों मध्यतोऽविवेष्यः।
स्वस्वावेदः ब्रह्मिनावं: स्वर्य ग्रंथ इवाभवत्॥
। श तानाइ खुर्देन: तुण्मादाय भुस्तेऽ॥
The same has been repeated in छायापत्र 4th अभाव as—अविशाल महावेदवंशवं परिवर्तिता।
बर्व विज्ञायति: अलमुख परालिता:। etc. etc.

The following words of तैतिरियोपनिषत्—दुरुवकी are stated in मानवपुराण; the words are:—

edio वा इमान भूतानि जायन्ति येन जातानि जीवन्ति यत्नयमिनिविशालि

say मानवपुराण—तथा विज्ञायामान च अवभाव महावेदव।

तत्स्तत्स्तु प्राइ अविशालस्य महत्त्वम्।।
वस्मादिभानि भूतानि जायन्ते येन तानि च।

जीवन्ति यस्त्र कृपये तदहेत्याद्रेण च॥

The words of जावलामिनिपत्—य एसौनम्नतोंव्यक्त आत्मा

वक्ष्ये निश्चित इति।।उदमस्य चाय चालं भवति भुजोऽप्राणस्य च मधे यः।।
—are repeated in सूक्तान्बिता as follows:—

वातात्त्वात् महाप्राण भुजोऽप्राणस्य मध्ये।

भुजोऽप्राणस्य या संपरिपार्ध जातात्त्वात् भूति॥
The author, therefore, quotes from पुराणाः in support of his position here as well as elsewhere.

P. 19. नन्द्यश्चिकालेवि etc.—This is an objection raised against the statement made in previous verses that there is no सूतक or अश्लैचः. The objecter says that if लिङ्गपूजा is to be performed during the times of impurity, why not all other religious rites? The author repudiates this objection by saying that लिङ्गधारण and लिङ्गपूजा are not only unobjectionable but imperative even at times of impurity, like मंत्रोपायन, मंत्रपाट and वेदपाट, while संध्यावंदन, वैश्वदेव, and दर्शायणमालेश्वि are performed even during the times of impurity, in as much as they are नित्य and are to be performed daily irrespective of अश्लैचः. The author quotes from मुद्गलः, II-106, in support of his standpoint and stultifies the objecter.
But it is not possible to understand what the author means by कर्मोत्साहन, as, according to the Lingayat Religion, there are no religious rites नैमित्तिक or काम्य, except those prescribed in relation to अष्टावरण and पद्यम. But they being निःस्व are always imperative. From this suspicion arises that the author was an आराध्य, who stands midway between the Lingayata and the Bramhin of Hinduism and who observes some of the Bramhianic rites, in addition to those of Lingayatism. Moreover, when Lingayatas or Veerashaivas have not to observe अश्वमेड्य or पंचसूतकास, so meticulously observed by Hindus, there should arise no question of अश्वसिद्धिकाळ for कर्मोत्साहन, if any.

P. 20. नन्वास्ताम् etc.—This is an objection against the use of the left hand, on which सन्नाम्सिन is performed. The objecter means that the left hand is employed for doing the dirty work of the body and is thus unfit for the holy work of सिंहापुज्य. The author removes the objection by arguing that the left hand is used in conjunction with the right hand for (1) पान or holy drink (2) for holding the full pot to make an offering to the holy fire (3) for सायंग-प्रणाम, (4) and for पुष्पाजिव्यवहार. If the use of the left hand is unexceptionable for these holy rites, says the author, why should it be considered unfit for सिंहापुज्य?

The verse—उरस्स विषया दश्या etc. occurs in सिंहापुज्य with a slight variation as follows:—

उरस्स विषया दश्या मनसा भद्रया मिश।
पद्मणाम् उत्साहृता बाहुल्यं प्रणा-मोहोच्च उच्चते॥

According to बाहुल्यन, therefore, the अष्टांगास are (1) उरस् (2) विषय (3) दश्य (4) मनस् (5) वचम् (6) पद्मी (7) क्रमी and (8) क्रमी. But according to Lingapurana they are (1) उरस्
(2) शीर्ष (3) द्वि (4) मनसू (5) गोर or वचस् (6) पार्श्व (7) राघ्वी (8) और (9) लेफ्ट एंड. The latter seems to be correct, for there can be no use of ears for प्रषाम.

P. 20. नतु महादूरराज्या etc—This is the last objection raised against the position of the सिद्धांतिन्. The objection is that विचारण्य, the great and authoritative commentator of the Vedic literature, has not written his commentary on the passage, which, according to the सिद्धांतिन्, lays down the wearing of Linga. If विचारण्य, says the objecter, had interpreted the text agreeably to the सिद्धांतिन्'s exposition, all he said would have been acceptable. But there being no such interpretation by विचारण्य, the सिद्धांतिन्'s exposition is doubtful and unacceptable. The author argues against this that विचारण्य might have omitted the passage uncommented on two considerations (1) That it was not useful for his purposes (2) That a different interpretation would be sinful. He argues further that (3) If all what is left uncommented by विचारण्य were unauthoritative, many things e.g. इत्वा, given by the author, would be unacceptable. (4) The passage has been interpreted by other equally authoritative exegetes like काय।समिद्रिसिन्, संचारणपेशित्, और बप्तविचितराध्य (5) and lastly that सिद्धावरण has been laid down by बादराध्य in the पुराणाः (already quoted). And there can be no higher authority, विचारण्य included, than बादराध्य. And that शिव, the प्रतिवा, has written the वेदां and the आयमा containing सिद्धावरण, which, therefore, is irrefragable. So also सिद्धावरण is laid down by the very authoritative works like सिद्धातिबिष्कामणि.

The author's line of reasoning as to why विचारण्य left the passage uncommented is very fanciful, as it is impossible to divine the motives why he left the passage uncommented. It is at the same time not possible for any-
body to understand what purposes of विद्वारण्य would not be
served (प्रकरणचैतुस्तिहूः। The second reasoning that a
different interpretation would be productive of sin, is very
strange. Because विद्वारण्य has obviously has not interpreted,
agreeably to the author's exposition, other passages inter-
preted by the author in other sections, e. g. परिवर्तने विनन
व्यासप्तते etc. and as इत्यं भवणावं etc., as will be noted in
the relevant sections. The author's reasoning, therefore,
is unsound in this regard. As for other things, said by
the author, are reasonable.

In contrast with these remarks, it may be noted what
reasonable explanation has been given by वंजनानाय, the
author of वेदान्तसारसंहीनचितामणि, as to why सुत्रहमस like वोधायन
and अ संस्कृत have not said anything about विद्वारण्य as follows:—
ननु लिङ्गवर्ण वोधायन.वस्तंत्रवित्तिसुत्रकररुकुशल इत्यद्यामिनि चेदान्त तृत्व मनुष्ये
चतुर्भुदातरसंस्कृते—

प्रक्ष्येपिद्विदेशं प्रयोगं पुराण वोधायनेन मुनिना बहुवं: प्रणालमु:।
सर्वाध्यदिशानन्दचरिणि गुरुकारणं: यष्ठोपवातित्वविश्वासनियमः॥

इति हर्द्याचार्यंक्यात् गुप्तकरद्वीपवेदग सुप्राणीयसैद्धितसंस्कृतनात्मकान्त यजेन
पवीतेन्द्र विस्तृतं सद्देव लिङ्गावरणणित्त हाविस्तृतात्तिति ज्ञानायुः॥

The editor has not been able to avail himself of the
works of कालहितिशिशित and संबन्धपदिन referred to by the
author. But कस्वफेरितराध्या's exhaustive commentary on
नातार्योपनिषद्व is available. He has been referred to by the
author previously and has written his commentary on
पुरुषसूत्र and other उपनिषद्व like वैदिक and others; and ex-
ttracts from his commentary are quoted in different relations,
Here the author continues the discussion on the creed and principle of wearing Linga on the body. He is not content with establishing the principle of wearing Linga on the strength of the solitary text. He, therefore, proceeds to interpret different texts of the same and other Upanishads and Vedas. The hymn "उँ नमो ब्रह्मेण इति" is taken from the same Upanishad (नारायणोपनिषत). It forms the ninth section of the Upanishad. It, therefore, precedes the hymn, already discussed and proved to lay down the wearing of Linga on the body. This hymn has been explained by श्रीचैतन्यचरितमार्ग, chapter III, as enjoining the wearing of Linga as follows:

"अस्य मंत्रस्यायमथः।—नमः। ब्रह्मेण इति "ब्रह्मणः रात्रिको वै ब्रह्मणः लिंगमुख्ये।" इति संदर्भारणवचनात्, "ब्रह्मणः लिंगमारणवचनात् ब्रह्मणः परिशीर्षः।" इति श्रीचैतन्यचरितमार्गः इति, "आज्ञमेकवचनकृतं लिंगं ब्रह्मणः निविदितम।" इति ईश्वरीयवचनात्, "ब्रह्मेण लिंगमूैः।" इति संदर्भारणवचनात् ब्रह्मणः लिंगमारणवचनात्। ब्रह्मेण लिंगमूैः। नमः। इति वेदुपेत्वें नमस्कारपूर्वः। लिंगार्थं याचितम। भाराण तद् ब्रह्मस्मात्विविधग्यः भाराण मेण्डु। नन्तम तत्त्वस्वविद्व्यावादात् ब्रह्मो भाराणमिति कथ्यं लवभ्यं। नन्तम ब्रह्मस्मात्विविधग्यः व्यतन्त्रलावात् ब्रह्मस्मात्विविधग्यः विष्णुस्मात्विविधग्यः भाराणमिति कथ्यं। इति वाच्यः। ब्रह्मस्मात्विविधग्यः नमः चक्ष्येन सहानवितमतादानाय एवाधिश्चितिष्ठेन नमः चक्ष्येन सहानवितमतादानाय एवाधिश्चितिष्ठेन नमः ब्रह्मस्मात्विविधग्यः वेदो भाराण भाराणस्मात्विविधग्यः वाच्यः। यथं:। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रतियोगिष्ठेन्नाय स्वतदिः। प्रति...
interprets this hymn as laying down the wearing of Ling as follows:—
But it may be noted that the latter is a straightforward discussion, simply to establish the principle without any objection raised and refuted, as former does. The objections raised and refuted in the text of विनिमयार्थम् बौद्धिकम् are more various and exhaustive. The objections, raised in the text, begin from नन्देन अंश्येन and end with द्वैत पूजसः. They are:—
There is an elaborate discussion in वीरभद्रचंद्रिका about the कम of लिंगाधारण and पंचाश्रीमंत्रदेश. But it is not relevant to the matter under consideration. But before we proceed further, it will be proper to note first the interpretations given by वीरभद्रचंद्रिका and वेदांतवारीवैविविचित्तमणि, already quoted above, and लिंगाधारणचंद्रिका.

(a) वीरभद्रचंद्रिका interprets it as—लिंगपूर्वते बहुः नम इति वेदपुरस्वेष नमस्कृतूपवः वाचितत्व ब्रह्मस्वविविचित्तमणि धारण नलकुसऽ। धारणान्तरं अस्त्र शिवविविचित्तमणि कर्तपालिनिरक्षण अवहनं (अभियोग) अस्तु। धारणम् नृपाममिति लिंगाधारणार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थार्...
explains it as सामान्यतः धारणविधान followed by विशेषधारणविधान, namely, of अन्व, (विषविधिः) (3) Lastly both the former explain मा चौद मा चिकारेरिमं: मतः मा व्यवस्था; while the latter does not explain it at all. In one respect only, namely, in respect of अन्व—विषविधिः, वेदान्ताश्रीशैलेश्वरचितामणि and लिंगधारणवंत्रिका agree and differ from बारातिवान्द्वंत्रिका. The author usually starts, strangely enough, with objections and not with the interpretation of the hymn under discussion. But he gives the interpretation somewhere in the course of the discussion.

Basavapanditaradhya, the commentator of नारायणेयप्रियस् comments on this hymn as follows:

Here the explanation is the same as the above three, but differs in respect of अनिर्देश, which is taken to be an adverb of अत्य; while it is explained by बारातिवान्द्वंत्रिका and वेदान्ताश्रीशैलेश्वरचितामणि as अजात्वे or अनिर्देश: अत्य। लिंगधारणवंत्रिका explains it as अनिर्देश, युगुणमित्रमित्रिका सद्यान्तोक्तम्। In another respect also, namely, कण्योः:तः; the commentary differs materially from the three. कण्योः:तः is taken here as अभवसूक्तकिलिंगसाधारणसि. बारातिवान्द्वंत्रिका and वेदान्ताश्रीशैलेश्वरचितामणि take it to mean कण्योः:तः: पंचराहरीसंहः; while लिंगधारणवंत्रिका interprets it as कण्योः:तः अन्व विषविधिः।

The मंत्र has also been explained by अनिर्देश (page 20) as follows:—भो गुह्यमूलायो ब्रह्मवेदाश्च दुम्यस्य नमः अत्य। अनिर्देश बौद्धधारा तिरस्कारस्य नाथं लिंगश्रेयः: ने सम अत्य भवत। बारातिवान्द्वंत्रिका भूपालस्य अवथितं भूसत्तायामिति धातो:। कण्योः: अन्वः: तः अथैत्वेवस्य--
In this interpretation अनिराकरण and मात्योद्धम are differently explained. Particularly the latter's explanation is remarkably different from all others, they are—

अनिराकरण=तिरस्करायथे चारणे. The latter is understood.

मात्या=तन्वा छठयी=वाहनयं

P. 21. विशेषसमर्प्यदामावेन धारणामात्रप्रविष्टि—This is the first objection raised by the objecter. The objecter says there is the word धारण only, but there is mentioned no special thing, for wearing; hence the doubt arises whether Linga is to be worn or some other thing or things.

P. 21. न च देवार्त्यारणे इत्यादि—This is the objection the objecter raises against himself. If it is said, he says, that there is no proof of any other God to be worn, nor is there a custom of any other God being worn on the body, it indirectly proves that विविधिन्न is to be worn.

P. 21. परिशेषन्न or पारिशेष्यत्त—This is an argumentative method of arriving at a conclusion asserted by the सिद्धांतिन्. This method is generally adopted by all; but नैवादिकाः and वैशेषिकाः are specially fond of this. It consists in exhausting all alternatives about an assertion except one, that they are inapplicable, and therefore the last and the only alternative comes to be necessarily accepted, as the सिद्धांतिन् stated. An instance of this will be formed in the discussion given above in अभिवृत्तियोऽहं ज्ञेयति. There the conclusion that अभिवृत्तियोऽहं ज्ञेयति was a नामरूप, is established by this method, after proving the impossibility and unsoundness of other alternatives of the पूर्वपक्षिन्.
P. 21. देवतात्तत्त्वारणामसिद्धांशि etc.—Here the Vaishnavaites contend that the Vaishnavaites may be construed with wearing the marks of conch and disk, the special weapons held by Vishnu in his hands, because the wearing of these has been the creed, established by the followers of Madhwa. Madhwa also wear the marks. But the author chooses to refute the śānt of the Madhwa school in a later section.

P. 21. अनिराकरण—The objecter contends that may be explained etymologically to mean परशुष्ड्य or परिवम, i.e. विधिनाग, as being imperishable or eternal and, therefore, the only thing never to be rejected but aimed at for attainment. But श्वेक and चक can be similarly explained to be objects of wearing.

It is to be noted that अनिराकरण is explained as आह्मन or अविद्यम, by both शास्त्रवैतल्यमटिका and वेदांतसारवैद्यविज्ञामणि. Please see note in the beginning of this section.

P. 21. विभूतिक्षेप्नोभवेत etc.—By means of these verses the objecter establishes his second objection, namely, the wearing of स्तम्भ and स्कराक on the body. He means that the very old custom of non-Lingayat-shaivas might be laid down by the hymn, as corroborated by the verses quoted and not the wearing of Linga, as asserted by the वेदांति.

P. 21. धाराबिला भूसामस—This contains the third objection. The objecter says भूसामस, being in the benedictive mood, has no force either of the imperative mood or the potential mood, which alone can enjoin.

P. 22. न वा विशिष्ठ्ययोजकसर्पस्तम्—This is the last and the fourth objection that the hymn is not an अपूर्विख्य, in as much as it is obtained by वर्तिमांग व्यापारित.
P. 22. अनुस्पर्खते etc.—Here begins the refutation of the various objections in order. The author begins to refute the first objection, that the hymn lays down the wearing of marks of श्रव्ण and चक्र and not the Linga. The author says that all other deities विष्णु, श्रव्ण, and others are perishable and श्रव्ण alone is imperishable and eternal. It naturally follows that विष्णु being perishable, the weapons held by him are more so. Therefore, the hymn cannot be expected to lay down the wearing of perishable objects in preference to the eternal thing, श्रव्ण, for attaining मोक्ष. The sentence “सार्वभ्रमीति etc.” is taken from अयोध्यविद्यमाणी.

आप्यद्विशिष्टः proves that श्रव्ण is the creator of श्रव्ण, विष्णु & श्रव्ण as follows:—अथ भिवस्य भद्राभिभावदितिसृषणश्चर्ववकरुक्तवचारविनिर्भयि तत्र पर-भद्राभिभाविभिष्किमारणरोति——

श्रव्ण: विष्णु: श्रव्ण: श्रव्ण: विदेश: क्षटीरो ये श्रव्णकाल्यानाः।
तपस् चूर्ति संग्राहि च लदिनच्छिन्ननमुच पूर्बतन्त्रेशवतः।।
शु: एव भगवानः श्रव्णवादिनिर्भयः।।
श्रव्णवादिनिर्भयः प्रवाहावस्तव:।।
मैत्रेयसु व्रह्निग्राहामुहापमाणां लोकसरस्वर:।।
वात्मार्हतया विष्णु लोकार्थार्थीस्वर:।।
सुगमते वेघ संभाष्ये सदै असुरासुरृजय:।। इति...एवं भद्राभिभाव
स्नानापि सृषणशिरित्यत्वकं वैविनितिकन्य:येन सर्वस्य यज्ञ: क्षत्ि धिव्ये: ततः बतो।
वा हमानि भूताभि जानन्ते इर्यादिश्चलिनिते भद्र श्रव्ण एवेन्याविस्मय्यति इति
तपोवतनां तदुच्चवाविष्यः।।

( भारतदाससंस्था page 23).

The following verse from महिष्ठोत्तर may also be noted:—

बहुलरजसे विष्णुराति सवहय नमोनाम:।
प्रभुतमसे तत्त्वहरि दशाय नमोनाम:।
जननुभवकं बलेदिको शुक्लय नमोनाम:।
प्रभुहि पदे निलायेष्व शिवाय नमोनाम:।।
P. 22. चक्राण्तिततः etc.—By quoting these verses the author means that the hymn cannot be expected to lay down the wearing of the marks of शंख and चक्र, when the wearing of these has been condemned by पुराणाः and स्मृतिः. The verses are found also in स्मृतिविचित्रक्रः.

P. 22. विवेचचिक्ष्ये etc.—This refers to the discussion contained in section VII infra.

P. 22. संग्राहक्तिलक्षेण etc.—Here the author finally establishes the conclusion that शिवलिंग being eternal is to be worn on the body.

P. 22. न कारणं कारणानां भाता etc.—This sentence is taken from अर्थशास्त्रबोधपनियत. This has been produced here in proof of शिव being eternal.

P. 23. वस्तुतः etc.—This is the explanation of why चारणम् is repeated after the words भारं मेहस्तं अनिराकङ्गः. The author reconciles the repetition by saying चारणम् is only a general injunction of wearing अनिराकङ्ग or पारं व्रजन् being incomprehensible or intangible to all sense organs physical or mental it is impossible for a devotee to wear it. It is, therefore, followed by तः at the end; that तः means लिंग or इलिंग, the author proves on the next page. The author's explanation of the repetition चारणम् after भारण is not satisfactory. The repetition is explained by श्रीश्रीचक्षुविचारचितामि satisfactorily.
P. 23. उक्ता—This is proved on the next page in words न च अक्षरस्य यथा. But व्यवहारानुसार is explicit on this point, which says:—अर्थात् अक्षरो तन्त्राय्याः, उक्तोश्च विश्वासः, मकारः कालकालः, अचरात्रः परमश्चि: अक्षरोऽधिकः। कालकालः is वंचारकर्ता तुः।

P. 23. नन्दा यथा—This is an objection to the author's assertion above that उँ is धिम. i.e. धिमिलिंग. The objector, says that अ, being the prime alphabet, includes in it all other alphabets. उँ, therefore, comes to be included by अ अ at the same time is विष्णु. उँ, therefore, is विष्णु and not Linga as maintained by the सिद्धांतिन. The following verses from प्रसुलिन्याः, part 1st pages 43 44, are to be noted in connection with the importance of the alphabet अ, as being prime the alphabet and as such being the source of all other alphabets:—

अकारः सर्वकाथाः आदिमुखः सहानूसः ।
समस्तकाथाः सार्ववाच्याः।
अस्मि अत्यन्तविश्वास्यात्राय प्रापः।
अकारः प्रेक्ष्यते ज्ञात्मा धुतिधुतुधुतुमूःस्तिति:।
खचन्द्रसंस्कृता पुनःविष्णवभाष्यार्थः।
तदादिर्विष्ण्वालक्रस्ताः सर्वेऽधृति।
अतीतोऽकारःुद्वितीयःसौविद्यात्मकमीजः।
अक्षरः भावेद्धिमाणायां परं विवेद्धः।
अकारः सर्वार्थतः व्यक्ता स्वयोथ्मार्थः परः।
नानाम चहुः भवतीति भृतिजिति।
अकाराणामकारोऽशी विष्णु इत्यादै।
अकारस्त्वात्मकः विवेद्धिः पराः।
प्राप्तः सर्वेऽकारः गीतस्ते कुवः।
सर्वोऽशी भावाकारस्त्वाद्यां जायते ज्ञा।
लोकेति वर्तते तस्मादकारः सर्वकारस्म:।
P. 23. **कारावास्यशब्द्वेष** etc.—Forms the first verse of विक्रमशीत्य, a Sanskrit lexicon. It also occurs in आबंदन-शास्त्रमास. The verse is quoted by all commentators to prove संग्रहल of अय coming at the beginning of a philosophical work or शास्त्र.

P. 23. **अकारोऽसे सवऽि वाक्** etc.—“तत्त अकारोऽसे सवऽि वाक् सैसा स्वप्नोऽभिषि: व्यज्यमानाः बद्धती नानास्त्या सवति” इति अभृतिः सवें बर्णः अद्वार-विकारा हितुका सवति। “अद्वारावास्यकारोऽभिषि” इति स्निततत्व विश्वः सवेन-व्यापकरन्तः अद्वारावाश्चार्तवीणीविविधान्तवये जस्ते सवति इति: (see page 5 of शैवोपनिषद्; published by Adyar Library). “अद्वारावास्यकारोऽभिषि”, taken from संस्कृतमात्रा shows that विश्व is ए।

P. 23. **अकार भावानाम नाभौ** etc.—This extract is taken from विक्रमशीत्य in a sketchy form; the passage in full is—अथ सकलः साधारंजृतमयःचुरावमान महापीठे सपरिवारं तेषिरेत चुरुपरात्मानं \( \ldots \) सापास्य चाचुरावमानमुक्तरं विश्वं हृदये सस्तानं चुरुपात्मानमास अकारं सवें दा कहते सस्तानं चुरुपात्मानं सोकारं दूरीयायंदारात्मानं पोझारतेि दारात्मानां सापास्य चाचुरावमानं अकारं दूरीयायंदारात्मानं सापास्य चाचुरावमानं अकारं सवें दा कहते सस्तानं चुरुपात्मानं \( \ldots \) संस्कृतमा तथा भावाभेदेः विश्वमयस्व भद्रेयव विश्वबाणीविविधान्तवीणी विन्यासानेव च संपूर्णोपाध्ये-\( \ldots \) संस्कृतमा तेजसा। साधारंजृतमयः संस्कृतमा तद्विद्धानमात्मानं संज्ञायते तस्य अस्वैस्तुतमात्मानं बलमंडलयं \( \ldots \) संपायथ महास्पूर्तत्वं महास्पूर्तत्वं महास्पूर्तत्वं महास्पूर्तत्वं महास्पूर्तत्वं महास्पूर्तत्वं महास्पूर्तत्वं महास्पूर्तत्वं महास्पूर्तत्वं महास्पूर्तत्वं महास्पूर्तत्वं महास्पूर्तत्वं च संस्कृतमा मात्राभिः। अतिरुक्तात्मानस्यकालस्य संस्कृतमा तस्य। इति। Here the words स्नितत्व विन्यासानं संस्कृतमा तथा विन्याससंस्कृतमा are noteworthy. Do they refer to the three fold विन्यास, भाषाविन्यास, भाषाविन्यास, and विन्यास?

P. 23. **चन्द्रमन्** This is the refutation of the above objection. Here the author proves that अकार is शिथि, on the authority of the verses quoted from शिबायुरायाः and शिबायुरायाः. The verses एवं तिथुभिः etc. is taken from वायुवहिता, 2nd part page 39. In addition the following 2 verses are to be noted, as explanatory of लिङ्ग (शिवलिङ्ग) being formed by ए, ॐ, ए and of the लिङ्ग being ओ अथवा अर्थमात्रा.
The following verses in proof of शिव being ऋ are to be noted:

तन्त्र देव ख्रि: प्रज्ञा: लोका वेदाद्रोहयोः सः।
तिल: मःत्रः चेमाथा च श्रवण्य विश्वस्य तन्त्र:।
अर्धवेदः गाहिस्याँ च द्रौधो ब्रह्म एव च।
अर्धकारः शरीरं दु: ब्याख्याते ब्रह्मवादिभिः।
इस्सवेदः: सतिर्कश्च दक्षिणागित्त्वैऽः।
बिष्णु: भयवानुः देव: उक्ताः: परिकीर्तितः।
सामवेदःस्तथा वौऽवाहीनवस्तैवैऽः।
ईव:ः परमः देवो सक्ताः: परिकीर्तितः।

(प्रणबोपनिषत्, Unpublished Upanishads page 31).

All श्रवण कृतिपति, ऋ अर्थशिर and ख्रि, पुःपतमख्या etc. say that ऋ is शिव.

P. 23.  न चोक्ताः प्रकृतिकृतिकारस्य etc.—In this paragraph the author proceeds to refute the argument that ख्रि, being the prime letter, includes in it, ऋ and that ऋ being बिष्णु, ऋ is बिष्णु. The author refutes it by saying that अर्धकारः वै सर्वो वाक् is merely an अर्थवाद, like ऋकारिण सर्ववाक्स संज्ञा being an अर्थवाद of ऋ. If अर्धकार, being the prime letter and source of all other alphabets, were alone to have the expressive power of all alphabets, all words made up of others would lose their expressive power, except though ख्रि, and there would be an end to speech except through ख्रि. This is our explanation of the author’s line of argument. But पंडितसिद्धकुमार explains differently as follows:—
P. 23. अन्यथा पूर्वपूर्ववर्णानां etc.—Here the author reduces the position of the objecter to an absurdity. He says, that supposing श्र is the prime alphabet and all others merge into it, श्र उ म, when read from right to left and when म would merge into its source, उ, and उ would merge into its source, श्र, the whole thing, as is well known, will become फ्र and not remain mere श्र, as assumed by the objecter to express विषय. फ्र being proved already to mean शिव, the objecter will indirectly cut under his own feet.

वंदितविवेककार remarks as follows, about the स्तावकत्व of श्र and फ्र:

का ताहि अकारी वे खरी वाकु इसस्य गति: इतयत ब्रह्म स्तावकत्वाविदितं संहतः-कल्प्यन्य व्यासस्यथे। प्रकृतिलेण क्याविधिकलेन च तिसृणां पूर्वोऽस्म मात्राणां अर्थमात्रायो लीलात्तेन अर्थप्रमाणान्तपरमात्मत्ववचकत्वेऽति तसामपि स्थितिरिस्वाभैर परीक्षापेतविति।

The following may also be noted in connection with फ्र:

(a) अकारोकारकोशारु विचारितरुपणगृह्य्व्याख्यातानि व्यासो विचारकस्मकारु अकारोऽप्रबिलायं तं उकारोऽहिरण्यं मूलप्रकृतित्सः अकारोऽप्रविलायवेदः। तस्य च प्रकृत्वोऽलंकार तवः परः च भुतभाषाभौपण नादे भाषत्वम्: उद्युष्ट्र: शिरस्त: खरः श्रम महेश्वरः शिरे: (see शास्त्रशास्त्रीयभाष्यम् भाष्यम् ो ते वेदाङ्गलां स्वरः श्रोऽति: etc.)

(b) अमात्रव्यायोऽलंकारायं: प्रवेंद्रचमः शिववेदेत एवमेकार आलेघ।

(मानवशीलोपनिषत्)

P. 23. अष्ट एव मंगलाध्वक्त्वात् स्थिरतिः—कारकस्य शिवकप्तवा मंगलाध्वक्त्वात् स्थिरतिः: शिव is मंगल or मंगलकर; and फ्र being शिव is also मंगलकर: मंगलकर or मंगलकप्तिः is usually derived from ब्रह्मतिः: शिवः। क्षमावती: इति चातो: पन्चावती पूर्वदिशान्तिः क्षमावतेयो अकारसे-कारावेति च शिव इति रूपः।
The following few extracts may be noted in addition. It may be seen by-the-bye that he quotes the very verses quoted by the author here.

(a) अथवा शिवः स्वयमेव शिवः सोभासल्वात्। सोभासल्वात् हि सर्वजीवव्या-प्रवकारितप्रमाधारार्थियानादिसम्बरानामहत्याक्षरः स्वयमेव शतार्थम्। तथा —

अनातिमलकः स्यामाभावस्याभावः।
अवस्वत्तपरिह्वाद्यतोऽयं शिवः सुच्चते॥ इति

(b) यद्य येति समस्यामिति शिवः। सर्वकारणी-भूलकिच्चेष्टोप्याधारतया परमशिवव्यैव जगदाधारलम्।

(c) अथवा वच्चः लोकस्थितामिति शिवः। सुप्रविद्धः प्रावतः। तथा —

च में धयति शं निर्भ खवीर्षीनामुक्तसम्।
शिवदिव्यव्यथा तेन देवं शिवः स्वृत्॥

(d) यद्य शिवं मंगलं करोतितः शिवः। शिवव्यत्तकरोतीति प्रायंतत्वचा-वचि हृदं। तथा च यूः —

सर्वमन्त्रकरिकज्ञ शिवं एकं भेयं: शिवसंकरः इति, महाभारतेनपि—समासिद्धि में सचं दानवाधारवाच ये।

शिबवेदस्मि शवभूताना शिवले तेन मे सुराः। इति

(e) तथा येति समस्यागदिति शिवः। इति व्यवस्थि प्राविद्ध यत्तद्विव्यस्तवतं

सुद्धिस्वतेऽति असंस्कृत बलते इत्यथाधविकारः। तथा च।

The last is only the rhetorical explanation of (b) above.

P. 24. यथा स्वभीं सोभासल्वात्। वर्णमालयात्। चतुर्वत्। परमे अस्मित। इत्यियतुष्टे॥

(see शिवायवहस्य by नीलकंठदेशिक पाठ 30)

रहस्यमित्र, a staunch श्रवं, devotes over 8 pages to the etymological explanation of शि व अन्तर्गत किवा ता निर्माण किंवा (विहृद)।
the place of द्रव्य as the object of wearing. If the objection meant that मस्त and द्रव्य were to be worn in addition to Linga, it would be agreeable and admitted.

P. 24. केवल तू लगा—Here the author refers to some authors of past times that explained the words of the hymn, viz. that अनिलक नाम meant मस्त and द्रव्य and, द्रव्य meant Linga, and the three were laid down as the objects of equal importance of wearing on the body equally carefully. But we have not been able to find out who the authors are referred to here.

P. 24. यद्यपि तू लगा—Here the author refutes the third objection. He argues that मूर्तास्मू in भार्यिता मूर्तास्मू has the force of the potential mood, as much as मूर्तास्मू in भार्यिता मूर्तास्मू and आसमू in आहामेक: प्रथमासमू have that force. शंकराचार्य explains (in तैतिरियोपनिषद्) मूर्तासमू as भवेयम: मूर्तासमू has thus been proved to have the force of the potential mood. It may be noted that of the two instances, "भार्यिता मूर्तास्मू" and "आहामेक: प्रथमास आसमू," भार्यिता मूर्तास्मू might mean भवेयम मनयम. But it is difficult to understand how आसमू has the force of a विव. पंडिताधिकार्यमार's remarks are to be noted in this connection:—भार्यिता मूर्तासकिति मेघाय।: प्राथमासनाथमूपि दक्षायरथे मूर्तासमालोकन संत्रे आसमान मेघाविनि. कुर्यावंति विचि: कल्या(क) आहामेक मूर्तासमालोकन किंगमर्यात्मेव भवेय चांगुलांग भवेयम भवेयम भवेयम: मथानां तथाविभवजिति तांत्रीम। आहामेक कल्याणकिति विशिष्टवशेखरोपि नामित सर्वां सर्वं नव खनारतलेन चिनतीन इति विशिष्येण कल्याणे तद्वर्तिति भावः।

P. 24. न च विचित्रप्रयोजकलक्षणलेन...न विचित्रंचन्ते इति वाच्यम्—Here is the fourth and the last objection, which is untenable, says the author. The sentence may be enlarged in explanation as—यथा सेविंग स्थाप्यति पारिवर्त्य परिवर्तिताविये विचित्रप्रयोजकलक्षणलेन अनुविचित्रकलेन तत्तत्त्वे सेविंग स्थाप्यतीयेत्र विचित्रंसन्तो वच
The objection means that as there is the अपूर्वविबिधि in स्वर्णिमं स्थायिति, it is प्रमाणान्तराम्. Therefore there cannot be an अपूर्वविबिधि in बाणिज्यम्.

P. 24. अन्वयि etc.—This is the refutation of the foregoing objection. Here the author says that विपर्यायविबि is first laid down by बाणिज्यम् प्रमाणम्. Subsequently the विबि is re-iterated by स्वर्णिमं स्थायिति and the अधिकारण or स्थायि of स्थायिति is laid down पाणिमं पाणि। And in as much the sentence स्वर्णिमं स्थायिति पाणिमं पाणि as a whole lays down अधिकारण, not laid down by the hymn under discussion, the अपूर्वविबिधि of बाणिज्यम् is unaffected. In this connection the refutation of an objection of identical nature on page 27 of the text be noted.

P. 24. आस्त्तं नावर्षस्यवादः—This seems rather abrupt, as there is nothing in the previous discussion about the hymn नमः। श्रद्धा एव. It is, therefore, probable that some portion of the text might be missing, though in all the three editions, no such words being found, there is nothing about अवर्षस्यवादः. पंडितश्रवद्धकमार has failed to note this and comments on this as follows:—आस्त्तं नावर्षस्यवादः तथापि अस्विनकले अनेकारणगत्वथवरङ्गवर्षवरंभवनेन दृशिंहितपशु गुणांश्वलोकमालं अवर्षस्यवादः गुणाविशिष्टं च बोधगम्। तदन्यस्तस्यस्यवादः प्रकृत्यपदाद नमः। श्रद्धा इति नमस्कृतोत्पि विषय-रतनोदेभक्तेषु एव्। Here the author means that नमः श्रद्धा एव. is an अवर्षस्य of विपर्याय and precedes the hymns, दृशिंहितपशु and निधनपत्रेः नमः। श्रद्धा एव. After the अवर्षस्य and the general विबि of wearing विश्रेण is laid down by this hymn, the two latter respectively particularize the अवर्षगत्वथवरं विषयविशिष्टम् and विषयविशिष्टम् in the heart and on the hand for पूजा. Hence the objection advanced by the objecter is untenable.
P. 25. तत्त्वारणगति:मे ब्रज्ये—The author seems to take all these and other hymns about विश्वास्या of the उपास्या as forming one section.

P. 25. अन्यष्ट्र विस्तः—Elaboration or अर्थार्द of भिग in a different hymn, viz. नमो ब्रज्ये etc.

The author quotes in support of explanation the verses from स्कूदपुराण. The following additional verses are given by बीरश्रीवानंदमिन्द्रिका and बेदांतसारवीरचिन्तामणि in support of their own explanation from the same पुराण:—

अच्छोछ मम मे लिंग मा च्यावय विश्वाभ्रमयम् ।
उदैः च द्युःशा कर्मेऽ तद्विद्धवमाध्याः ।
बेदशिस्ते तत्तत्त्वां ज्ञेयलंचारं सदा ॥ (बीरश्रीवानंदमिन्द्रिका P. 80)
ओमिति ग्राह्य परम लिंगाकारं सत्यां ।
वर्तवस्यस्य वर्तेन कालिण्य निमित्तार्थत: ॥
अन्योगेन सुरक्षि च सुविद्मिच्छिन्द्र द्विजोत्तमः ॥
धर्मोंथो तु विमेश्वरस्य स्वान्तेचिन्तामण्यस्य ॥
उदैः च द्युःशा कर्मेऽ तद्विद्धवमाध्याः ।
बेदासिद्ध मन्त्रां पंचाँकां ज्ञेयलं ॥ (बेदांतसारवीरचिन्तामणि page 150).

IV

P. 26. तत्त्वारणसाराध्यपाभो "वष्णूद्वासास्यभव विष्वनम्: etc."—Here the author continues his discussion on विश्वाभ्रमण by taking a hymn from तत्त्वारणसाराध्यपाभो, one of the ten principal Upanishads, and interprets it as laying down the wearing of इद्धिन्य on the body. The hymn forms a part of the fourth section of विश्वाभ्रमण of the उपास्या, which is itself a part of तत्त्वारणसाराध्यपाभो. This hymn has not been commented on or interpreted, like the last one, either by बीरश्रीवानंदमिन्द्रिका or बेदांतसारवीरचिन्तामणि. But it has been explained by बस्थवापस्यार्थ a commentator of the उपास्या. His commentary of the hymn in extenso is:—
यांत्रिकाधिकृतांपेक्षा विचित्रपणे...प्रत्येक में गोपाय। —साधन विना साधना विषय
तत्त्वभेद न्यायरूपः चाकिकाधिकृतांपेक्षा ओपेनराइज़रण विना! तीन ओपेनराइज़रण सम्बन्धित सुमस्त्यां
सुकृमाणांकारणांमन्नृपूर्तीसनेहिंग्यांकारणां। यहां विना: सुकृमाणां कारणांगकारणां
पुरुषां न चिऩ्नतीति मतां। प्रथम बाइबिलगांधिकारणां दृष्टीতि काढ़ेचार्यमिति। अभ्यांगः
ः शिवाः छिंद्रां नरगीरेड़िनां नाममः अः श्रीः श्रविकार्तकर्त्यः। ईशानः
शविविधाना । "यस्य निशिन्न्तिः तेवः अः छिंद्रेऽ वणविशः।" ईशादिइन शविविधाकालोऽयं
परमेश्वरस्य निधित्वात्। ईशानांचालितप्रचन्नमत्यः। "नतः चर्ये परत्र जन रूपं क्रियांगिततः।
कृपार्थेत विचित्राः विचित्रहृयः वेन नमेरीते।" "सार्व्यं च्यूस्तस्य स्त्रे नामः।" ईशादिष्ठूः।
छिंद्रमः। नरेगीरेड़िनाः। तस्मादूर्तादिपिर्वप्रुः प्रादुः। इशादशूः। ये इव: परमेश्वरस्याली शिवः।
सार्व्यंट्यकर्त्यः सार्व्यं च शवनक्रामांशेः। शिव एको श्रेयः सिर्वकर सार्व्यंट्य विलयः।

"ईशादिष्ठूः। मा मा शवन शवविद्यांचेणि छलुक्या सुवर्णू स्रीमद्रुत उज्जवलः। सुपी दश्यांगितिः धातः। तदिश्वानां प्रावेत्रगः हि प्रायमेरिते। अमृत्यु अतित्युः
देवस्य लिप्तविषयः धारणः यथा श्रीणरावर्णनां संज्ञे भविष्यती यथा देववर्ण प्रतिष्ठानीती
पार्येत्यान्त्रायांसंचाराः। " तद्वः कृत्याः। कृत्याः च शविविधाकालोऽयं अथैव
बिमाणिधिपिरणां सुरुमधिमित्यं उत्तमपुरज्ञस्य प्रथमपुरुपरङ्गमवेः अन्तवर्णनायाः
संतोगार्थांत्रायां धारणाकालमृत्यं अन्त्यागोऽसंचाराः। "तदेवताः परमाः च केवले।"
"तस्मादेवः: शिवः स्रुतः।" ईशादिष्ठूः। "देवाय नमः भीमेद्वाय नमः।" ईशादिष्ठूः
आपसतंत्रपुरुषादिरुः देवदान्त सिद्धि सुदिर्मणाशाः।

लिगामिनिःसिद्धिः कस्य पुनर्जनम् न विचित्रे।

भुगुण्यानांचिन्चित्राली शवनक्रामां। शिवति
बंकरबंकरितात्रावनेन तत्पूः कृत्याः प्रावेत्रायांसंचाराः। अन्तवर्णनायांभर्तिवस्य
गिरात्रायांसंचाराः संज्ञे भविष्यती यथा देववर्ण विलयः। भुगुण्याः शंकरयसंचाराःशवनक्रामां
शवनक्रामां गिरात्रायांसंचाराः संज्ञे भविष्यती यथा देववर्ण विलयः। किंव " "अद्वेशः
प्रथमायत्।" "तेवः कृष्णाय प्रावेत्राः।" ईशादिष्ठूः। तस्यः परमेश्वरस्य अतित्युः विद्यमौः। सतः परिवः
लिगामिनिः सुरुमधिमित्यमनः अन्तवर्णनायांभर्तिवस्य लिगामिनिः। बंकरबंकरितात्रावनेन
शवनक्रामां अतो में शारीरिक विचारः आपसतंत्रभाविनिधित्वतः परिषुः सुरुमधिमित्यम्।
शिवाः श्रेयः अतो में समयज्ञकाली शवनक्रामां अतो में शारीरिक विचारः आपसतंत्रभाविनिधित्वतः

The author of लिमिभारणचंद्रिका adopts the explanation of the hymn by श्रीकरंभाग्य (see श्रीकरंभाग्य, page 7.) That the explanation adopted by the author is different from that of वसवंभिताराध्य, will be clear from the following:—

(a) धारणशद्योत्कृत त्युलंतलेन देवं वर्तील्यें तत्ति is not found in the commentary given above.

(b) इति is explained by वसवंभित as परमैश्वर्यशाली चिब; while it is explained in the text as निमिन्ताज्ञुमल्यमः.

(c) स्वयंदु is explained by वसवंभिताराध्य as श्रीशुद्धं उज्जोयता वा; while it is explained in the text as संस्कृता.

However it is undoubted that the explanation of वसवंभिताराध्य has been mentioned, though sketchily, by the author on page 29 in paragraph beginning with अन्येषु.

The hymn under discussion has been commented on श्रीकरंभाग्य as follows:—यस्मादसामिति मेधाकामस्य श्रीकामस्य न दत्मारिष्यवन्व ज्योत्सामालुक्ष्ये। “स केश्रि मेधाकामश्च स्वयंदु” ततो श्रीकरंभाग्य इति न श्रीप्रभुसानातः। यस्मिन्सं बदेशामामृष्ट्रिवर्ष्ये: प्राधान्यतीति विश्रुतह: सवेत्: “तथया शंकना” श्याभिन्दुर्वतराव। अत: एव उनमान्धकारस्य। आवृतो ह्यात्रोपायस्य इति वज्ञमादिये—
The explanation, which is adopted by the author and discussed with pros and cons, is of a portion of the hymn only, though the central and the pithy portion of the text, requisite for proving the principle of wearing Linga on the body.

P. 26. कतरी लुंबलेन—स्तुद stands for अन, a Krit affix denoting the agent or the object or impersonal activity. (कवबखो बहुर्म—पाणिनि III-3-113) Here the affix denotes the agent and imparts the sense of चारक or चारकिया to the word चारण.

P. 26. बेदेव विचारिते—Here starts the objection to the interpretation of the hymn and ends with परमात्मन एवांतवर्गवान प्रतितिथिः. The objection is that the text कः छहसामृतम् etc. is an अनुवाद or restatement, on account of the relative pronoun.
The relative pronoun expects an antecedent, which, in the present case, is found in the hymn of नारायण-निष्ठा, namely,

तत्त्वाः शिखाया मध्ये परमात्मा व्यवस्थित:।
स अभ्यांस व शिवः। स हारेः सोऽहः। परमस्वरः।

But to understand better the chain of reasoning contained in the objection, the following verses from the नारायणीय section of the उपनिषद, are to be noted:—

परमात्मात्रतीकाशं हंदं चाप्योधसुर्मुकम।
अचेनानिष्ठाय वितत्स्याते नामाच्छयमार्थं विद्यति।
वज्रालमलाकुले भावं विश्वस्यापतेन महत।
संवर्तं विलमिष्ठं संवर्त्याशिवायनिभम।
तत्त्वरं जूफँनं सुक्षमं सामस्तिन्यवं प्रतिद्दितम्।
तत्स यथेष महानन्तिर्वाचार्यविन्यासस्वकुश:।
सौप्रभुविविधंनित्यनालारम्बः कथित:।
तियंनूनषवः द्रवः। राजमयः संवेदी।
संवेदी। स देहमापादात्मस्यातं।
तत्स यथेष विविधविश्वा अण्योष्णा व्यवस्थितः।
श्रोतरद्ववमयस्याःप्रियवेदेष्वं मास्तरः।
श्रोतरस्यकुष्ठपत्नी चैवत भास्वलङ्गुः।
तत्त्वाः शिखाया मध्ये परमात्मा व्यवस्थित:।
स अभ्यांस व शिवः। स हारेः सोऽहः। परमः स्वरः।

यथाकर्मसं तथा अनुवाद or reiteration or restatement of the antecedent statement contained by परमात्मात्रतीकाशः etc. The antecedent statement refers to the divine principle residing in the heart cavity. The restatement, accordingly, must mean the same divine principle and श्रावण must mean the संवेदन of that very divine principle. This stand-point, moreover, is supported, says the objecter, by the fact that श्रावण means the Highest soul on account of the adjective.
P. 27. इति चेन्मैवम्.....आप्यवदीक्षिते:—This is the refutation of the objection stated above. The upshot of the refutation is that a Vedic text may restate, but must contain something new or state something special or additional, if it is to be significant and not superfluous. The objecter’s standpoint fails to conform to this test, because, according to him, the hymn गङ्गःप्रसादः etc. is a mere restatement without anything special contained or mentioned in it (पुरोवासासिद्धिं स्याद्). But such mere restatement is superfluous and is, therefore, of no meaning (न शाफल्यं कस्ते).

P. 27. न हि पुरोवासासमनुव......शाफल्यं कस्ते—This sentence states the principle of logic (न्याय), on which the refutation is based.

P. 27. अत एव.....विद्वानितम्.....आप्यवदीक्षिते:—This is quoted here by the author to strengthen his own position. The whole discussion, which is synoptically stated here, will be found in विद्वानितम् on page 28, श्रीरंगे edition.

P. 27. नावस्य....पंि विरोधयते—Herein the objecter makes an attempt to prove that the hymn गङ्गःप्रसादः etc. does contain something new, viz. that the फल of बालस्य is stated, in as much as आमृतवस्य देवताः बूढ़ां अस्मिन वै बूढ़ां अमृतार्थः मोक्षार्थः देववार्णश्च मूर्तांश.

अमृतार्थः = आमृतं अमृतवस्य मोक्षः तद्वक्तं. But शंकरार्क्यः explains it as अमृतवस्य अमृतानुवस्य बूढ़ानान्यं अयं.
P. 27. इति बाच्यं...तद्धातस्त्वाभावानु—This is refutation of the foregoing attempt of the objecter. The author, as a सिद्धांतिक, argues that the antecedent statement also does contain the फल of the उपासना. But it is to be noted here the verses, containing the antecedent statement, do not say anything about the फल to be attained by the उपासना. The question, therefore, arises how it is that the सिद्धांतिक says so. This question can be answered in two ways. (1) Firstly the फल is not expressly stated in so many words but is implied by नारायण’s attainment of at-one-ment with विद्वन्त; the परामर्श, as stated already on page 6 of the text in words “तदार्थस्यनापन्नस्य etc.”. Or secondly, (2) The फल referred to here (श्रवणं गायत्र्यं वंशोकं etc.) is stated a little later at the end of the 15th section, namely, ब्रह्मणं गायत्र्यं वंशोकं तत्तामात्रं समान्तोक्तमात्रेऽवं वेदेतुपनियतं। It is also possible that the फल referred to here, may be connected with the फल, stated at the end of the उपसनेन, in words, “य एवं विद्वन्तं...तस्माद् ब्रह्मणे महत्वम्”; because the फल to be attained by the उपासना, as stated at the end, must be the फल common to the varieties of उपासना laid down in the various sections of the Upanishad. The author, therefore, contends that the objecter’s explanation is untenable.

P. 27. अथ भवन्मेत्रपि...स्थादिति—Here the objecter, after being refuted, opposes the सिद्धांतिक with the difficulty that, if the hymn under discussion were to lay down बाह्यस्वरूप, it would contradict the antecedent statement, which lays down the अंतस्वरूप. There would, therefore, be a conflict between the two hymns instead of agreement.
who meets it by saying that the hymn "पुष्पद्रोण्डः प्रकृतिः इत्यादि" is not the antecedent of "विनय सदा इत्यादि" but नवनिन्था स्थापयिता is so. The present hymn restates the विनय (विनयाधिकारणविनय) of समासित स्थापयिता and makes a special statement of the fruit to be attained by ब्रह्माधिकारण. It is, therefore, not superfluous but contains an अधृतविचि of fruit.

P. 28. नेत्रपति:—The विनय forces the issue upon the objecter by saying that he (the objecter) cannot afford to be content with having the hymn under discussion as superfluous, as no वेदिक sentence can either be superfluous or meaningless.

P. 28. अभ्यासम् च पूर्वत्तेऽति etc.—Here the विनय illustrates his assertion by an example of how attempts are made to make वेदिक sentences significant and not superfluous or meaningless. The example given here is discussed in the 3rd paragraph of the text on page 10, where विनय was preferred to मुख्यार्थ in order to avoid the undesirable contingency of making the sentence दिर्बचि superfluous. The विनय says, therefore, that to avoid such an undesirable contingency in the case of the present hymn, it is right to take समासित स्थापयिता as the antecedent statement and not तत्त्व: शिखाया मथ्या etc.

P. 28. नन्देवसपि...विनयमिति—Here the objecter confronts the विनय with another difficulty that, if मुख्यार्थ were to be attained by विनयाधिकारण, the sentence ज्ञान महाभारतिक्षेत्र etc. would be contradicted. This verse seems to have been taken मातमश्रृंगसुज्ञ—किम्याकांड. But the line in the verse, as printed in the Mysore edition of the book, differs slightly from the line quoted in the text. The verse printed there is:
This difficulty the objecter meets by saying that śrutis is obtained from शिव only and not अष्टवीर्य, as maintained by the objecter. In support of his assertion he quotes various sentences from different Upanishads, like चेतात्मकत, that it is the special privilege of शिव to ग्राह्य śrutis through his अष्टवीर्य. Hence the sentence produced by the objecter is unreliable, particularly because it is from a śrutis, which is weaker in authority than a śrutis and cannot prevail against a śrutis.

The objecter presents another difficulty to the objecter. The difficulty is the sentence contains a prayer for being endowed with रेवा or intellectual capacity (to understand the real ब्रह्म). The intellectual capacity prayed for an ब्रह्म internal thing, can better be secured by internal worship of ब्रह्म. The sentence implies, therefore, the internal wearing for the acquisition of an internal thing and not the wearing of external Linga.

This is the reply to the above objection. The reply is that the devotee, practising intimate association of ब्रह्म with ब्रह्म, has to wear ब्रह्मāलिम to attain gradually the knowledge of ब्रह्म leading to final beatitude. ब्रह्मāलिमालिम, therefore, is a means to that end, as much as the external devotional activities of जनक and others, like the holy bath in the river Ganges etc., have been said to be the means of their attaining the knowledge of ब्रह्म and liberation. The upshot is that it is not that internal things like जंत्राध्याय are alone the means of securing the internal
things like भ्रमण, but external devotional activities are as much the means of gaining an internal thing like knowledge. बाह्लिलिङ्गवारण is similarly the means of securing internal भ्रमण.

कर्मणैव हि संसिद्धिमासिताः जनकायाः is taken from मगवर्तामा canto III.

P. 28. तिमगचारणस्यादि etc.—This is second instance of how बाह्लिलिङ्गवारण, as productive of internal अद्वत (unseen merit), is justifiable, as much as external sacrificial performances are productive of unseen अद्वती.

P. 29. किचास्य...शार्कं भवति—This is further reason of how बाह्लिलिङ्गवारण can be justified by the mention of the particular external things attained by बाह्लिलिङ्गवारण, viz. the sweetness of the tongue and the intake of knowledge by hearing, etc.

P. 29. ख्मो भूता etc —The verse quoted states how the devotee attains at-one-ment with शिव, or how he attains जीवनमुक्ति by practising intimate association with the परमात्मा. जीवनमुक्ति is the extraordinary condition of a person, who moves with his mortal frame in the mortal world but who is at the same at-one with the परमात्मा. This extraordinary condition attained by a devotee is the result of his उपासना starting with बाह्लिलिङ्गवारण. बाह्लिलिङ्गवारण is thus as much the means of external prosperity as of internal spiritual prosperity.

P. 29. इत्यादिप्रकृतिकमशृद्धितस्म...मूरिशवणविश्वदद—Here the सिद्धान्त ति states how गुरुधिल्लिङ्ग, the second modification of इत्यादिप्रकृतिकम, and the deity presiding over the water element, gives to
the devotee the sweetness of tongue, the विशेष्यमण of water; and how प्रथमालिंग, the second modification of भावालिंग and presiding over ether element, imparts to the devotee the capability of attaining भ्रमण by hearing. The चित्तालिति thereby proves that बहूषिक्षयरण is productive of external prosperity to the devotee, only as a means of internal (spiritual) prosperity. The hymn expressly lays down the attainment of external prosperity, and not mere भेष्य, as is asserted by the objecter.

P. 29. यन्त्राण्व etc.—This is the refutation of the last part of the objection advanced by the objecter that the hymn mentions परभ्रमण, as may be known from the adjective विशेष्यमण and from the use of unqualified भ्रमण; the hymn, therefore, cannot be expected to lay down the यहूषिक्षयरण, the modification of भ्रमण in a gross form. To meet this objection the author says that शिव, the unlimited भ्रमण, comes to be limited as उपास्यदेवता, through his उपास्योपासकलिच्च. This He does to favour His devotee that he may be free from the worldly trammels. It may be noted that this very statement is made by the author previously on page 8 of the text. The author quotes sentences from अथवेदितवष पिनित्त to substantiate his statement of शिव being विशेष्यमण.

P. 29. दिनम् तद्भ्रमणसांचितम्—This is to substantiate the दिन in its highest form, भावालिंग, is coextensive or identical with निश्चितम्रमण or परभ्रमण. दिन in that form is merely an appellation (संज्ञा) of परभ्रमण, as it were. Hence दिन in any of its forms, including इद्दिर्मण worn on the body, is भ्रमण. अपपवदीकित proves that शिव is निश्चितम्रमणbh्रमण, as follows:—
This is the refutation of Shankara's interpretation of the hymn by Vasavadatta, as already mentioned above. That it is so will be evident when the commentaries of Shankara and Vasavadatta, already given above, are carefully perused.

The author quotes some verses from Sumburan in support of his conclusion. But they are not quite appropriate, except that they lay down and applaud the wearing of Linga. But the verses quoted by Shankara from Sumburan are very appropriate to the discussion about the explanation of the hymn:

तथा वेदांतवाक्षेनु लिखितारणमिथये ।
वेदोत्तरं यदेवेंदो तैत्रिरै विशेषतः ॥
माघतिर्यं सुमित्तदुलिखितारणांमिथ ये ।
छंदेभ्यं सत्वादेन्यो हस्ततस्य भाषु ह ॥
इंद्रस्तु परमस्वर्यशाली सांपणिक्षेत ।
मां मेष्यां प्रजया च सुपूरणं श्रीमण्यतया ॥
अभितस्य मोक्षपरम सम्बद्धेऽदु सर्वदा ।
देवस्य लिखितारण शिवस्य परमतमः ॥
In this section the author vindicates the principle of wearing Linga on the body by interpreting the 3rd hymn of श्राध्याय, which is—या ते श्र शिवा तनूरशोरा पापकारिणी।

तया नस्तुवां श्रतमया गिरिशेताभिचाकशीह।

The author takes the first line only and interprets it as laying down the wearing of Linga on the body.

श्रीसिवानंदचिक्रिका and बेल्टस्तारवालीशोचितामणि also take this hymn and interpret it as enjoining the wearing of वहिलिंग। Their interpretations are as follows:—

श्रीसिवानंदचिक्रिका—अस्तिमयेः शरद्धीये—

या ते श्र शिवा तनूरशोरापापकारिणी।

तया नस्तुवां श्र शमया गिरिशेताभिचाकशीह। इति।

अस्वाधे—है श्र श्रैङ्खुः दुःखेिहुः तं द्वायाय नः प्रभु।

श्र इत्युप्तेऽश्र श्रिये: परकारणम्। इति सुद्वङ्गनितावचनात्।

रेदर्दशस्त्रलाङ्कुंजितानचत्तकं श्रद्धषय।

अत: प्राक्षुतःिवले श्र इश्वरभिचाकशीह। इति शिवपुरणावचनानां।

श्र भक्ताना तापलबारंक सुः द्वायाय श्र श्यामकति श्र, या ते तव शिवा तनू: 

“श्रै ता एष वद्याः। तस्मिन्ततेन शोरा शिवा अस्या।” इति भुञ्जा—
किंम शिबः तनं: प्रक्षे मूतिचारंतनं: सक्ता।

अथवः मनोऽधु तैवाभिषे लिवः तनं: ॥ इत्युपूर्वः राधाकुर्मणुः लंगभः तनुः श्रेष्ठः निविषमालस्वहः अपाछु पञ्कितकरणुः श्रास्त्रं हृतं अवधारणिः।

हे गिरिवॉट शेषवधः अस्तेशुप्रकः स्वयं तनः अस्मानमिक कशः हि भिगधारणे भिगाज्ञानस्वत्वः परम् सुखः दस्ता प्रक्षथायरथः।

अत्मनेन उपद्रुषनम्—या ते खः शिबः तनुः श्रेष्ठापकाछिनी।

यजुः गीतेन यज्ञसास्मातः देवानां: चवाचितः।

बैद्यसार्बीश्वररतितमाणि—कंडुँदे शतस्वरी शेषताब्धरोपनिषदि च ॥ या ते खः शिबः तनं: ॥ इत्यादिः।

हे खः ते तव शिवः तनः: शिवः निराशयोनि

कल्याणःप्रकरणेन शिवस्थयरसेन च श्रास्त्रा या तनः ॥ "किंम गु शिवः देवेहः।" इत्यामः

वाक्यादिति शैवे वायुवियतिहायाधारत् ॥ "किंम शिवः तनः: प्रक्षे मूतिचारंतनं: सक्ता।" इति पुराणाक्याविकः सा सूतः।

पुनः यदा अग्रापकाछिनी शिवरीश्वराः भिगतःश्रमणा अराया। किंच सनस्तकुमारस्वत्िायाः—

स्वस्त्याविभिः सूक्तः योगः: पुष्पश्वेषविषः सर्वरः।

दानि: सुमोहास्थेश्वरायाः विगति ते तनं: ॥ इति।

शिवगीतायाः—"कोट्तरनमकः पुष्पमेव भक्ति: प्रजायते।" इति सा भक्ति: प्रसाद

द्वारा शास्त्रकार्तिकुरु रुचिते स्यात् ॥ ॥ इति।

कामिकागमे—

प्रसाददत्ता सा भक्ति: प्रसादो माधवः।

यशेवैक्षण्डो बृहो बीजो वा यस्मादः।

अनेकनाथाश्रमानं श्रीशन्तमार्गावारिन्याम्।

प्रदुःश्चानि विरजानि प्रधावदि मस्त्रयाः। इत्यादि

बचनमाणात् शुद्धरसकं: पुष्प: प्रक्षीपपांपंजः वे क्रेन मुनिते ते एव अप्पा

इत्ययः। अथवः मनोऽधु काष्ठी इन्थ्रिमाणात्मविगंभरं दुःखकाष्ठीस्यायाः। गिरिरति

गिरी नंस्फार्थरति बेदे स्त्रापासताय निरतियानांर्दस्वभः शुः तनोत्तरति गिरिरति: तस्य

संजुः: गिरिरति शंस्तमया दुःखो दस्ता शिक्षाया तद्याः। इति ॥ अस्मानमिक संकार

विगत्तमेव पुष्पपांपंनंम प्राणाय अस्मादीयाहंद्वानवदूरेरागो भागिन कशः हि महान

श्वेयः। स्वतंदुपरः—

कामिकागमे—
In his चदुबेंद्रदत्ताश्वंस्मथ summarizes this hymn along with the second hymn of 10th अष्टाघ as follows:—

चेता शिवा च भगवदद्वया तनिस्ते भोरा भशिष्ययति भवाङ्गसुपरजनाना।
अन्य भशिष्ययति रूजीश्वरयाणा दश्या दशति शिवतामशिवाननोद्याने।
वेदां नभो बिद्धत्: शभययति दुराराति हि चोरसुपप्राणिचिक्षितात्याम।
प्रकथित शंकर शिबां चयकादुवकेहैरश्य वतन्व सन्नद्यमाने।

It is to be noted that बेदांतसारवीरसनितायणिक quotes a verse and explains it as follows:—चदुबेंद्रदत्ताश्वंस्मथ—

अपापालीति वुः: श्रुति ते शिष्या: प्रशिद्धा सन्नद्याद्।
अन्तर्भदीयानिता अस्तानानि पश्चितानि निधिनांमि। इति।

स्वामिप्रायाः। स्वा विश्वविनन्दितता ये केचन भक्ता: सन्नि ते शिष्या:
प्रशिद्धा: अपापा: | तनिस्ते अविद्या अपशिद्धा: बपापा स्वयम्। But this verse is not found in तालयंस्मथ, (printed and published by Warad of Sholapur).

It is to be noted that the whole verse has been interpreted and explained by the two; while the author interprets and explains only the 1st line of the hymn. There is no difference between the interpretations of the two and that of the author.

In contrast with all these the commentary of साक्षण and अद्वा, the commentators of रूद्धार्य, may be of interest. The two do not find any injunction therein to wear Linga on the body:—

शाक्षण—हि हि िश्वय तनू। तथा च सरिष्यास्त्राध्यायस्—स्वे वा एव बद्धम: तस्यंिे
ततुवां चोराध्याय बिसान्या।” इति। हिंसिका चोरा, अनुपाधि: शिवा। हि हि ते तव
या तनू: शिवा अस्माकमस्वाहृदकारिणी अत एवाचोरा हिंसिका न भवति। अधारकर्मव
This verse, eulogistic of the Veda, is taken from the Vedic literature, specifically the Taittiriya Samhita. The rite of the Veda is the most important of the Vedic literature. The rite of the Veda in conjunction with certain sacrificial rites are considered to enable the devotee to attain all his desired objects. The rite of the Veda, says, therefore, enables the devotee to attain all his desired objects. The rite of the Veda, says, therefore, enables the devotee to attain all his desired objects.
Here the author explains derivatively the meaning of त्र। His explanation is corroborated by the explanation of the word given by यम्रैवांनांतचंद्रिका, quoted above. भद्याक्षर gives the meaning of त्र as follows:

राणयति सर्वंम्कांके इति त्र। पौराणिकाद्वस्तु बहुधः वदान्ति—स्नौ नादवते 

dharmadhipati वा त्र इति केवलुः।...सखा बेदहाय धर्माद्वस्तुधिवस्काकारि 

प्रायमतिति वा त्र इत्यादि | सखा बेदहाय धर्माद्वस्तुधितं हस्तेय | सखा बेदहाय 

स्वास्तमां प्रायमतितिः। स्नौ रौतीति सत्ये रौक्षमाणो दवति प्रविष्ठानि वास्ता- 

मिनि इति त्र इत्यादि | “यिष्ठा बहुता वृहुता रोक्षाति नहीं! देवों मल्ली उभिः।”

इति। अन्ये दुवों रूपाए नशकावरांषिपारि | स्नौ निगित्यायो ता श्रद्धवयः। 

वर्णिवयाकृतृया स्वदेस्तद्वितिः। त्रद्द——रोक्षिका बंधिका मोहिका वा विष्णिः तदानां 

तथा व्रद्धिता वा महेश्वरे त्र। दर संवारदुःख रावमतिति त्र। इति केवलुः। 

कथा—अङ्गहालोके स्नौ दिवकापुरवस्वम। 

भद्याक्षरसत्तो खस्तद्वायुभिस्मीये। 

हस्तिति शायद राटि दुकारि इति प्राणि त्र इत्यादि। शायद बेराहानां श्राष्ट्रे दुर्वाति 

कलादी ह्यपरे | वया—“ते बेराह श्राष्ट्रीयो तस्वैं” इति। एवं तौफिकारे: 

हस्तस्पर्शस्तायुधा ह्यन्द न्युत्स्थाये।
Vaisk, in his vaccination, derives it as follows:—

Nīrakaṃbodhikīrti's remarks about the Vedic sentence "देहेऽदेहान्, etc." are interesting as follows. — "भगवत् भवति स्यैं गौतेमानवर्षं दद्वर्मम्। वदृशज्ञारुपसर्गम् वदन्तवामिति हारिद्रिविवामिति। हृदिन्वा! नाम मैत्रवर्षेन वाक्ष। सेदः।"

The father asked why he wept. He replied he got no name to take away the evil from him. Prajapati gave him the name Rudra. In as much as he gave him the name, Agni became his...
form, for Rudra is Agni; he was Rudra because he wept. The boy said "I am greater than one who does exist; give me another name". Prajapati said "Thou art sharva".

विष्णु and मार्क्षेय पुराणाः give the story of Rudra's birth as follows:—At the beginning of क्रोध (aeon) Brahma was meditating upon begetting a son similar to himself. At once a boy of blue and red colour was seen sitting on his lap and weeping loudly. Brahma asked him why he was weeping. The boy answered "Give me a name". Brahma conferred upon him the name Rudra. The boy wept again and again for seven times and obtained several more names, Bhava etc. (see "Elements of Hindu Iconography pp. 46, 47").

क्रोध is explained (in श्रीमशामिकेश्वरे page 20) as—स्वाति.

The following verses are to be noted about क्रोध (तालपेरिसंहि pages 6, 7):—

स्वाति यज्ञ वशु बलामेदरवाहुमन्वागतया शृद्धिनिरालिनिति क्रोधमिम।
क्रोधास्वदुकृतस्य महतो गणान्या क्रोधाप्यत च भवत्तमवैति क्रोधम्॥
यज्ञपि क्रोधार्थार्थकेतुकोक्तं तर्चयमिस्यं तद्वितीमिच सर्वामति।
वत्तिदेशन तत्तदेशनादि काश्य चक्रोधां ज्ञात्यम सामगीतम्॥
संताप्य रोदिष्ट्रिति प्रसमं जननामाः क्रोधार्थके विषमेकण चक्रोधम्।
रूपैं च तत्तव्याकृतिम परितित्वेण वा शब्दोत्तें भवति वास्तवार्थस्वकलस्॥

ब्रह्माक्षेत्रियि defines क्रोध as—अय कर्मादुच्यते क्रोधः। यस्मात्यस्मिन्निन्यायेनात्तत्तत्वयं सर्वसुहिलम्बयते तस्मादुच्यते क्रोधः। (Unpublished Upanishads page 316).

P. 30. तन्त्र जापःक्ता etc.—Here the author sounds a note of warning to the devotees that they should be very careful about the injunction laid down by the संत्र, i. e. they should not fail to wear Linga on the body.
The author begins this new section with भ्रष्टचरण, in accordance with what is said "मंगलाचरणः मंगलध्यानि मंगलात्तानि नामान्यं प्रथे " (see सिद्धांतकोशः page 337, सिद्धांतकोशः edition). He also begins sections IX, X, and XI with मंगलचरण. The author seems to think मंगलचरण necessary, not because any new principle is going to be established or any new topic is going to be discussed, but because the same principle is going to be established on different grounds. In the present section the same principle of wearing Linga on the body is going to be established from a text of क्षेत्रेद, another and a distinct part वेदिक literature. क्षेत्रेद is the most important of the four वेदिक संहिताः and is the first and invariably comes to be mentioned first, whenever the different parts composing the वेदिक literature are enumerated. But the author begins, for reasons unknown, the discussion of the principle of wearing Linga by taking यजुर्वेद texts and not रििवेद texts. It is also be noted that the author takes hymns, not from क्षेत्रेद itself but from the उपनिषदेः belonging to that वेद; while in this and the VIII section he takes texts from क्षेत्रेदसंहिता itself.

P. 31, परिच्छन् बिषधते etc.—This hymn is taken from क्षेत्रेदसंहिता (IX-4-83). The author says this hymn lays down लिखियताः साक्षात्, the indefatigable and the illustrious commentator of the वेदिक literature, comments upon this as follows:—हे जवागसते क्षेत्रेद स्वाभिष, शामैं तत्व पवित्र बोधाः अगे सर्वे विस्तुः। य भ्रमः प्रभवित तथा ग्रामः स्वारंगानि परंशिष्ट परिमुखिष्विश्रुतः सर्वे: तत्व तपाविष्ट अननुः। परमे द्वितीय अर्थांगाज: आय: अपरिपकी नाधुः। ष्टानां इत्यतुः एव परिपक्षां एव बहुः नाग्य: निवेदिनः तत्पिष्टि समासोऽथ व्याख्याति। It is clear that here साक्षात् addresses and attributes the prayer to भोग in the भोग sacrifice. But according to the author the hymn lays down लिखियताः.
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This hymn has been taken also by बीरश्रीवांदनचंद्रका and ब्रह्मचार्यरीत्रशैलितामणि and interpreted as laying down लिङ्गाधारण. The interpretation and discussion of this hymn is very elaborate in बीरश्रीवांदनचंद्रका with various objections raised and refuted. But in ब्रह्मचार्यरीत्रशैलितामणि the explanation is simply a straightforward discussion to establish the principle, without any objections raised and refuted, as already noted.

(a) The interpretation of the hymn by the author is—

(b) वीरश्रीवांदनचंद्रका interprets it as—

Later on this explanation is elaborated by the author (of बीरश्रीवांदनचंद्रका) after refuting the objections raised against the brief interpretation stated above. But it would be tedious to reproduce it here.
This explanation differs from that of the author in the following respects.

(1) पवित्र is interpreted by the author as "holy" and as an adjective to तन (शारीर) understood; while it is explained to mean लिंग by वीरश्रैवनंदचंद्रिका, which quotes the following श्लोक in support of its interpretation—

भा प्रजनने कार्त्त पवित्राभिमुख नयः।
प्रस्तरो जनिम आपं देवो लिंग तत्ववचः।
पवित्राभिमुख श्लोके लिङ्गस्य परमात्मनः॥

(2) इत्र is left uninterpreted by the author; while it is explained as इत्तलिंग by वीरश्रैवनंदचंद्रिका.

(3) ब्रजाण्स्तेत is interpreted by the author as लिङ्गहारवारो-रावच्छेदन गारीमायुन अभिविद्यपरमात्मन:; while it is interpreted as वहुदुःखानिषतं by वीरश्रैवनंदचंद्रिका.

(4) खुलासः is also not explained by the author; while it is explained as दीर्घासंस्करण पक्षः मलपाक्रहिता इतयथः by वीरश्रैवनंदचंद्रिका.

(5) वद्ध्नः is another word left unexplained by the author; while it is taken with इत्र (इत्तलिंग) and explained as धार्षन्तः by वीरश्रैवनंदचंद्रिका.

(c) बेददान्तप्रव्रेदश्रवीचितामणि explains the hymn as follows:—
The first thing to be noted here is that the 2nd line of the hymn stands as—

अतन्तन्तोनेतदाचाम। श्रिताइ इत्तलिंगस्ततत्तमासः।

It is strange that this line should differ in three words, viz. that अततन्तोऽि श्रिताइ, and समास्थे are read in place of अत्रस्ततुः, खुलासः, and समासः. The explanation is—समस्थे:। ब्रजाण्स्तेत इति
संबोधनसर्थ प्रथमावधिमतिविभागः।

ईशान: सृविषयानामीयः संभूतानाः।

ब्रह्मचित्तिनिःश्रुणिःरूपितांढ्रा।

शिवोऽमस्तु सदाशिवो ओम। इति मन्त्रात्।

ब्रह्मणस्पतिरौन्यः ब्रह्म तत्किंगमुखेत्।

पवित्र तात्त्विक विषयां तत्सर्वकालः श्रवः।

इति स्त्रकपुराणोपन्यासवाक्यात्, ब्रह्मणस्पतिभिंत्राणो निरूप्यः। परिश्रिव: एततःस्वरं लिङ्गभिन्नत्वं। एतत्चक्रस्वरं पद्यतपथेन ते इति पद्योऽग: पुरःचछार्दः। तत्त्ववेददेशानस्तिः इति पवित्रांमिति वित्तं प्रसिद्धम्। अस्य विनास्य नक्षा-

श्रवानुशीलनः परिनामेन कः संप्रग: इत्वाह विश्वतः अभुरितः। अत तेन विहनमेवेन विश्वात्तितिनः पश्योऽवधे।

ब्रह्मचार: स्यावरात्तायं देवदेवस्य श्रवेणः।

पशव: परिश्रोति संसारचारावतः।

तेषां पतितप्रार्थकः भव: पश्युपति: स्तुतः। इति वचनादेश: तेषां पतितवात्स्य लिङ्गस्य रीतिमास्यसंबंधस्य रसमहास्तिलालाः पञ्चां-परिनामनास्य लिङ्गस्य कुमकमेवत्यः। तत्त्वपरिस्थितिप्रकाश माह ग्रामाणि परंस्थि ति। ग्रामाणि श्र्व-सुभ-कारणारूपिंद्रियाः: करणाः सर्वांगागति स्वसंगोऽन्नःचछार्दःबिनार्यांलिङ्गस्य तेषिविवेदेदेशेऽस्य सर्व शिखवः तात्व श्रवादिविश्वास्तनीणां प्रसादः प्रसादधर्मात्ताविश्वास्तनीणां द्वा पवित्रि

परिनामेण करोति परंस्थि ति क्रियापदायेन मध्यमपुष्पस्य छार्दः। अत एव—

इति विद्यार्थमात्रं किंचिदादुर्बलं तत्त्वावपितम्।

तत्त्वपरस्य भोज्यं तदविद्यमुखेन च॥

इति महं तु ब्रह्मांगो प्राणिमुः तथोऽति ते।

मानिन्दनं सदेवार्थस्ताताऽमः श्रवस्तितितम्॥

हृदयांिचु च यथा कमाहिंगं प्रतिमितम्॥

तथा कमाहिंगंििखु कमाहिंगं प्रतिमितम्॥

इति वादुर्वरोक्तं वाक्यः। "स्त्रेणामथस्य इति श्रेण पीतें पिबर्तिः श्रेणाग्रामं निषिद्धं

ब्रह्म, ब्रह्मचित्तिनिःश्रुणिः रूपितांढ्रा।" इति श्रुतेः। एवं सर्वादिविषयां इतिहास्यस्य च त्वकाल्याचार्यं-

नार्थप्रपातप्रकाशमुपायाः इति श्रवेदवृत्तीमितवर्त्तम्। थिंगांगमयोगाभावः। इति वेदांगमयोगाभावः। 

तथा श्रवेदमितवर्त्तम्। "तपस्या ब्रह्म बिषित्यरास्य, इति तैतिरियमवाक्यः, "आत्माविवा तपवृत्तम्।" इति ब्रह्मप्रलयदा-
After careful perusal of the above, it will be clear how different, tortuous, and long-drawn is the explanation. If the different readings noted above are strange, the explanation is stranger in the following respects:—वहाँसे, ते, पंडित, अतिसारे, are respectively taken for बहांसनिि, पुनः, पंडित, and अतिसारे, as Vedic प्रवृत्ति. This seems very far-fetched and too much assumed. गायकिि पंडितिि is explained as गायत्रिि प्रवृत्ति, हवांसे, पुनः, पंडित, and अतिसारे, as Vedic प्रवृत्ति. This also seems very far-fetched. गायत्रिि is explained as विवेकसारिणिि. This looks reasonable but is different from that of the author and also that of the स्रीवास्तवदात्रिक, which latter takes गायत्रिि to mean both वारीरामिि and इन्द्रियारिि.

बिनििि, is explained as प्रश्निि while both विवेकसारिणिि and वीराश्वात्तवदात्रिकिि explain it is विन्दुन. The explanation on whole is widely different, though it accords, with श्रीवास्तव tenets of छिन्दा and its worship in the proper form and spirit.

P. 31. जीवनसनिि गमयिि—That which tells the inner meaning of the truth, as explained by अनुसवृत्ति, page 10—

लीलिि गमयिि बच्च येन सर्वं चर्चनम्
वहाँसे इन्द्रियारिणिि चिन्तालवधारणिि
अतििसारे इदं भवांसनिि पुनः
इन्द्रियारिणिि सारांस्वबंिि वाक्स विन्दुनिि
P. 31. दिनं तद्वरसतिम्—This has been already quoted on page 29 of the text. But it is not found in the printed copies of विज्ञापर्चक्षमाधिन्यस्तोत्र now available.

P. 31. तदिथाांवाहारः etc.—Here the author finds it necessary that the pronoun तह should be understood for reason stated immediately, namely, (1) पवित्र and विद्वत are both adjectives and neither of them mean Linga. Hence they require a noun to qualify. Otherwise they would hang loosely and meaninglessly in the sentence (विशेषणात्वक्रमपः परन्तः), without their existence being justified in any way. It is to be noted that पवित्र is interpreted as दिनं, as noted above, by श्रीनेत्रायानंदेश्वरका.

P. 31. तथा च है etc.—This is the interpretation of the 1st half of the hymn.

P. 31. ननु.....स्यावरलिंगस्तिपते—This is the first objection raised against the interpretation. The objection is that the hymn lays down the placing of शिरालिंग on an altar and not the wearing of it on the body.

P. 32. व्यासार्य पुरुषुक्तः दिमेदैन नानवितिधिमितर्यः—सवय व्यासार्य दिगानि विश्वेषार्द्धी व्योतािहिमानि । अङ्ग्निस्य अग्निश्वराद्धि । पुरुषकृतानि हरिक्रेश्चराद्धि अस्तेयात्तानि । तद्रूढेन्द्रियः । (पंडिताशिवकुमार ।)

P. 32. केन्द्रामदु...स्यावरलिंगश्यापते:।—This is the refutation of the objection. The refutation is that, if the hymn were to lay down the स्यावरलिंगपद्धापन, the clause प्रभुगीत्वाणि पवित्रि विश्वत: would be meaningless; because स्यावरलिंग cannot in any way occupy the bodies of the devotees.
P. 32. न च संवचालितानि—This is an attempt at meeting the above-mentioned point of refutation. It is said that स्वाभाविकम् by itself may not अस्वरूपम् occupy the bodies of the devotees; but it indirectly means that प्रभु, which the स्वाभाविकम् represents, occupies the bodies.

P. 32. हर्षे etc.—Here the निद्राति argues out the explanation given above. He says that प्रभु is all-pervading; hence there is no meaning in particularly stating the bodies of devotees occupied by the प्रभु.

P. 32. नसु पवित्रमिश्रेिन्द्रनििम् etc.—This is the second objection to the interpretation of the hymn under discussion. The objection is based on the fact that particular अक्षेिन्द्रम् are recited, while particular sacrifices are performed, e.g. अतिशास्त्रम् are recited when a sacrifice in invocation or propitiation of अक्षि is performed. This means that generally those मंत्रम्, that are in invocation of a particular deity, are recited when a sacrifice in honour of that deity is performed. This conversely means that generally, if a particular hymn is recited in accompaniment of a particular sacrifice of a particular deity, the hymn so recited is addressed to that deity. The objecter, therefore, says that the hymn under discussion is used, when the ceremony of consecrating (द्वारशिर) the woolen piece of cloth, used for straining the extract of सोम, is performed. It follows, says the objecter, that the hymn (पवित्रिते विद्वित) is in praise of सोम. It is impossible, accordingly, that the hymn should lay down the wearing of Linga and be in any way connected with निशालिनिम्, as assumed by the निद्राति. The objection is in two parts

(1) द्वारशिर विनियुक्तं तत्क तत्तप्रकृतेव इति निमयाद पवित्रमिश्रेिन्द्रम् सोमद्वारशिरायुक्तम् विनियुक्तलेन न किंगवदारणपरस्तम्।

(2) द्वारशिरायुक्तम् पवित्रितेिन्द्रस्य संवचालितानि संवचालितानि प्रकृताबिश्रोधः।
P. 32. द्वापाविश्वास = तुक्ष्याय अवः: ऋणाभ: सूक्ताङ्काभिः: ओतमातिविषिष्टः
लोभसङ्गेष्ट्वथापात्ताङ्कविवेश्यः |

P. 32. संत्राङ्कं कालीन etc.—Here the objecter illustrates his objection by giving an instance of संत्राङ्क, that are recited during संत्राङ्कन, belong to the particular deities and to none else. From this analogy, says the objecter, it is proved that the hymn (पवित्रं ते वितं etc.) belongs to लिंग only and not to लिंगधारण.

It would be absurd, therefore says the objecter, that hymn (पवित्रं ते etc.) should be interpreted as laying down the wearing of Linga; because such interpretation would be incompatible with the topic, viz. the soma sacrifice. This is the second part of the objection.

P. 32. वस्त्रसारं etc.—This is the refutation of the first part of the objection. The refutation is that the मंत्र may be used for consecrating द्वापाविश्वास, but is not prevented thereby from its belonging to लिंग and from laying down the wearing of Linga.

The सिद्धांतिन illustrates his explanation by the quoting the instance of अधिमंत्र — अधिमुंड्रं दित्र: कहलं etc. (सद्यक्ष वIII-6-44)— is used with reference to the sacrifice in propitiation of the planets मैयम (संग्राहिक) and others. But the मंत्र is not prevented from being an अधिमंत्र. In the same way the मंत्र—पवित्रं ते वितं etc.—may be used during the consecration of द्वापाविश्वास मंत्रण, but is not prevented from belonging to लिंग and लिंगधारण. The सिद्धांतिन also gives another instance, namely, of the शूलसूक्त. This शूल is not meant for the deity, the Lord of wealth; but it is used in connection with the
sacrifice in honour of the Lord of wealth. From this it follows, says the सिद्धांतम्, that the mere use of a मंद्र is not the criterion of the मंद्र belonging to the deity in connection with which it may be used.

पुरुषसूक्त is the well known hymn of Man of स्रवेदः. This सूक्त is interpreted as eulogistic of विष्णु by Vaishnavas and as eulogistic of शाह by Shaivas. For instance बस्थवाक्तराव ः writes a commentary on it and interprets it in accordance with Shaiva tenet of शाहीबिक बोधकृत, i.e. शाह united with His divine power (शाहि). सर्वप्रसादाय, on the contrary, explains it as eulogistic of पशु in accordance with the कृतलाद्रित philosophy of शाकराचार्य.

पंडित विवेकानन्द says that the पुरुषसूक्त is of विष्णु—हहस्ववस्थवादिदिलिग्न विष्णुरस्वापि कुक्षर्याये बिनियोगदर्शनात्. वह गोतम says in his गोतमधामेश्वर page 470—पुरुषसूक्त गायन या बेहदशापचारे: ताह्रोरपि मंदन्नमाति:। प्रणयसुयकनार्थ विरुद्धे वा रेवसुवुद्धे लिपि महुतमचेतेत्।।

In connection with the foregoing discussion the commentary of पंडित विवेकानन्द may be noted as follows:—

सोमे सोमायणे दशापविब्राहुमायणेति। दशाराववने च श्रुत्या श्रवस्वारहिभः सूर्यकाराभिमोदितश्रीतविशिष्टः मशिवनाधारामुतवारास्विशेषः। विनियुक्तवेन कल्पसुन्दरे दशापविब्राहुमायणेता बोधितवेनेतष्ठ:। कथे विनवारवर्तविभिति। आराम्यक्येनान्यपर्यत्या बोधिववान्यपर्यत्र विनिवानहीभिति सोमप्रकरणाविह विनवारवर्त पर्यायगमः कहुँ न शक्ये इति प्रसादायः। तदववारभिति तत्रारायस्ववियस्मुरुपुमः प्रकीर्तियायां वालकवर्त्या प्रतिओत्मानार्गणितवात्स्वविहक्ष्याविभिधिति भवः।। तत्रेव दशरावति अस्मिन्दुप्रवादिद्वैमाधुरिपुजायथिति मंगलादिपूर्व्राजयय:। सलयः।। देत्यात्तत्तति सहस्रवस्थवादिदिलिग्न विष्णुरस्वापि कुक्षर्याये बिनियोगदाहर्षानाः। भैकायचिरहविनयसं मंदनाभिमिति भवः।।

बैराधान्यदशायणका raises the same objection and refutes it. But the discussion is very elaborate. The following in a condensed form may be noted:—
It may be noted here that the interpretation given above agrees wholly with the interpretation of the मंच by साहस्याचार्य except in respect of पत्त, which is explained here as दशाप्रभव, but साहस्याचार्य interprets it as घोषकर्म.

P. 32. बच्च विनियुक्तीमिति निमयः—This is the general rule noted above.

P. 32. प्रक्तार्थवाचक etc.—This is the author’s explanation of the rule given above.

P. 32. नहि पवित्रशुद्धिः...नियमक्षणिः—The author says that पत्त cannot be restricted to mean दशाप्रभव only; because from वैज्ञानिक quoted above पत्त is used in so many senses or has so many meanings. Hence the मंच cannot be restricted exclusively to घोषकर्म.
P. 32. अभिधायकुलविष्टित -(देवताकर्मभ्रक्षणमात्रं मन्त्रासामुपयोग(गात्र) तदाचकपदामात् (विष्णुराम) (द्वारविविक्तमन्त्रत्रमचकमदामात्)

P. 32. प्रकृतप्रकाशानं कर्षं = How is the subject matter, disclosed in the absence of a word expressive of द्वारविविक्तमन्त्र? This is the question asked by the objecter.

P. 32. प्रकृतप्रकाशानं तु कृष्णडाबिना भवति—This is the reply to the above. The author says that द्वारविविक्तमन्त्र is known indirectly by indication in the absence of a word expressive of द्वारविविक्त, as given in what follows:—

P. 32. क्वाचन स्तरीरति...न होयते—The hymn क्वाचन स्तरी- (taken from सामवेद- पू- 4- 1) is directly invocatory of इंद्र, but is used with reference गाहिष्य न अर्पणम्. The question arises how can this be so in the absence of a word expressive of गाहिष्य in the hymn? The reply is that it is understood by क्वाचन (एद्यावतं गाणितय मुद्यत्वा शक्तां मात्रं पि गाणितया शक्तिः). See अविकायायमालाविद्वार page 143. इंद्र contained in the hymn has the principal sense of the deity इंद्र and not गाहिष्यामिः or household fire. But because there is the Vedic sentence "एद्यागाहिष्य न अर्पणम्" इंद्र is taken to mean गाहिष्य by वेश्वर. The application of this मंत्र to गाहिष्य (fire) is discussed in III—3-7 of पूर्णसाराणा त्रां स्थानम् यों त्रां गाहिष्य as गाहिष्य is discussed in III-2-2. The latter is called एद्यावतालविद्वार and the principle established in it is called एद्यावतालविद्वाप्रणय्याय. The author applies the rule here and says that द्वारविविक्त is known by indication or क्वाचन, because the मंत्र "पतित्ते ते वित्त्दे etc." is enjoined for recitation in accompaniment of द्वारविविक्तमन्त्र.
Though the hymn "कद्दाचन स्त्रीरक्षि etc." is used with reference to गाह्नेकल्याण, still it does not lose its principal sense of being invocatory of इद्र. In the same way, the author says, the hymn पंक्ति द्रेते etc. may be used in connection with द्वारापितन or शोभाय, still it does not lose its principal sense of laying down the लिंगोपारण.

The whole of the paragraph has been briefly well explained by पंक्ति निविदित तथा अभिधानक्षणयोग्य देशगानकमेजसंस्कारस्मालेकर्णोऽसुप्रयोगानुवाहे मंत्रवाहः व्यः स्मार्थिता भावः। कद्दाचन… ऐंवागाह्नेकल्याणहितार्थार्थार्थेकर्णोऽसुप्रयोगस्थानांगेलेकर्णि स्वपटकवाटिष्ठवालिष्ठिक्रिविषयकर्णं न बाध्यते। विधिववाह्योषाणादिना गाह्नेकल्याणहितार्थार्थेकर्णि स्वतिष्ठाद्रि पदार्थविना सुमंत्रणागेलेकर्णि स्वतिष्ठापरता न बाध्यते इत्यादः।

P. 33. यहुँकै प्रकरणविशेष… विकाराभावाकर्म—This contains the refutation of the 2nd part of the objection. The author refutes this objection by saying that सोम should be dissolved as उम्मा सहिता and should be interpreted as शिव (He who is in intimate union with उम्मा, his power or शाक्ति. He bases his refutation probably on the interpretation given of the hymn "सोम: पक्ते जनिता मतीनां etc." (जगन्नद लX-5-96) by विश्वाभिक निविदित in his शृद्धिकारमाण्य as follows:—अस्याभः। सोम: उमास्वाहः शिवः मतीनां बुद्धीनां जनिता जनक: सन्। दिव: स्वर्गस्य, पुरुषव्यः भूतकस्य, अमे: वनहे: सुयस्य आदिभावस्य, इद्रस्य दुर्मतः: रिणो: नारायणस्य च ऐतिहासिविषयोऽसुवृद्धी जनकः सन्,पक्ते पावनं करोडः पुष्पम दुर्मतः तथा चेष्टा स्कन्दे—मतीनां दिव: पुरुषमया वनहे: सुयस्य वाक्षिणः।

साक्ष्याद्धि विन्यानेऽसोमो जनितिकिष्ठः।

the word सोम is paronomasia and means both सोम plant and शिव. But here it means शिव, in as much as the plant सोम being inanimate is incapable of producing the things mentioned in the hymn; hence it means शिव alone. On the
whole, therefore, the Soma sacrifice, in connection with which the hymn प्रिंट ते वितंते etc. is used, is the sacrifice performed in honour of शिव. Accordingly there is no प्रकरण वेदये.

P. 33. किंच... प्रकरणविरोधार्थ—The refutation is further elaborated here; the author identifies the deity of सौमन्यम with श्रद or Shiva, from the word कर्पदिने in the hymn—वर्ष श्रद्वमे कर्पदिने दूरंक विष मयू। आचारविश्वास न:। (ब्रह्मद इ.०.३-१७). The author says that this identification is supported by श्रद्व आहुः; and the verse “अइ हि इविशा etc.” from आशिवरण. The latter says श्रद or शिव consumes all oblations in sacrifices in the form of the deities, in whose propitiation the sacrifices are performed and grants all desired objects. This means that शिव of the Universal form appears in the form of all deities in all sacrifices. The सचयग श्रद्व (सहम्यम) is, therefore, शिवया. Hence all conflict, of which the objecter was afraid of, is explained away.

उपासितिविषयकिंचुदर्परिकेरुणिविषयसि।

पृ० ३३ इति बैत्ति परितिबंधक पूर्वत्ति विहू भाग्यम सरीन्यां भाग्यमेद्वीर्मायाधारिताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाइताभाय

P. 33. किंच... This para contains the 3rd and the last objection against the interpretation made of the hymn by the author. It is in two parts (1) लिंगादाराश्य पद्धनेन, (2) लिंगाखश्य मर्यमिं स्वास्तिकादिनं लिंगाद्वित लिंगंय-प्रमयाकृपसंस्थित:।
This contains the refutation of the 1st part of the objection. The दिनांकित्र says that the hymn can well be interpreted as laying down the wearing of Linga, on the basis of the corroborative verses quoted from the Puranas (on pp. 38, 39 of the text); because the पुराणांś only reiterate in different words and in a different form what the Vedas say. Therefore, whenever the meaning of a Vedic text is not quite clear it can be rightly deduced from the evidence of the Puranic verses. On this principle the hymn is rightly interpreted as laying down विनियोग on the evidence of the verse, namely, तत्त्वात विनियोगात अहंकारात्मती एवः etc.

Moreover the right meaning of the hymn can be well guessed from the words प्रमुखाविश्वासः पर्यवेष्टि विश्वः, which contains the import of विनियोग. The meaning of the hymn is well implied, though not expressed.

विनियोग is खान्यासाध्ये. It is a technical term of पूज्यांकृष्ण. It is one of the six means of proof to assist the right disposal of a विनियोगविचि (applicative injunction). They are (1) ध्ीति = direct statement (2) धिन = import (3) वाक्य = sentence (4) नक्षरण = topic (5) स्थान = position or place (6) वस्तुक्य = appellation. धिन is defined as खान्यासाध्ये (अर्थवर्गाः). In the case of the hymn under discussion, the words प्रमुखाविश्वासः पर्यवेष्टि
viśvaḥ: have that śrutasamānyā, i.e. they form the ling (the second means of proof). In as much as they say "Thou occupiest the body", they indirectly mean that thou art in occupation of the body in the forms of इत्यलिपिः, प्राणलिंग etc.

P. 33. वेदप्रच्यंधासिद्वेलच्र etc.—This contains the refutation of the 2nd part of the objection. The विद्वानिति maintains his position by saying that स्वेविंग स्थापयति is a sentence belonging to यवेवेद, a different Veda altogether. And different Vedas may enjoin the same thing, as is generally seen. If it were not so, so many things laid down by different Vedas commonly would be superfluous. One Veda can very well lay down a thing independantly, though it may be laid down by another Veda. Hence there can no वेदाचिन्दल in the present case, as urged by the पूर्वपकित.

P. 34. एवं पवित्रं ते हलालं etc.—This contains the statement of the कल of wearing Linga and the reason why the śruta itself should state the कल. The reason is that dull-headed people may not be able to understand the कल, if it were not stated clearly in so many words.

P. 34. अत्ततनम् तदाम: etc.—This contains both the interpretation of the second line of the hymn already noted and the statement of कल.

P. 34. ब्यतिकन्तकुचेन—In the negative form, in the form that he, who will not wear Linga, will not have वातुत्स्मोक्ष, and not in the positive form that he, who will wear Linga, will attain सातुर्ष्य. But the negative form implies the positive.
This section contains the refutation of the interpretation of the hymn made by the followers of a Vaishnava sect. The hymn is interpreted by them as enjoining the wearing of the mark of heated disk on the body. This interpretation is recorded in the booklet called दुर्देशनकृतम्: by अनंताचार्य. The relevant portion of the explanation of this hymn contained by the booklet is as follows:

इत्य तत्वतः प्रस्थक्षारणमविवेकः ततः व्रह्मारणस्य वर्तन्तं क्योंब्रतां प्रस्थापिते॥

शिष्यपि बेदसु— पवित्र में वितरः व्रह्मणस्य: | नृपार्जुनार्जुन पतंजीवि विश्वतः।

अनंताचार्यस्य तद्भिं वारस्य: | चुरुवास ऐतदेस्तत्त्तलमालोः॥ इति।

श्रुणि कार्यं— वरण पाक्यं वितरः पुराणम्। ब्रह्म पूर्वकरः दुर्देशानि। ततः पवित्रः खुटः पुरा:।

अनुप्राक्षारणविवेकः ततः व्रह्मारणश्च। कोक्ष्य व्रह्मारणश्च।

व्योपितानुप्राक्षारणां व्रह्मारणश्च। अनुप्राक्षारणस्य व्रह्मारणस्य वारस्य व्रह्मारणस्य।

इति।

तत्र पवित्रः ततः इति आत्मार्यम्। ब्रह्म: चुरुवासाः स्तोत्र नियामक हेमकलन्त्रस्य च।

तपोपीति। प्रभु— चुरुवासाः स्तोत्रनियामक:। ब्रह्म: व्रह्मारणस्य:।

विश्वतः विश्वस्य साहिष्ठविवधिस्थितिः। सवेंश। गार्जुन्ति पवित्रः।

व्यापकः तवं पवित्रं वितरं: अमिस्तत्त्त्तसंयोगसन्दर्भविनियम:।

गार्जुनसंयोगसन्दर्भविनियम:। तथा च स्तोत्रनियामक:।

विकस्य व्रह्मारणस्य व्रह्मारणस्य। ब्रह्मारण:।

इति वाराः॥ ततः व्यापकस्य:।

पवित्रः वितरः। अविवेकः अमिस्तत्त्त्तसंयोगसन्दर्भविनियम:।

विकस्य:।

गार्जुन:। व्रह्मारण:।

इति वाराः॥ ततः व्यापकस्य:॥

पवित्रः वितरः। अविवेकः अविवेकः।

विकस्य:।

गार्जुन:। व्रह्मारण:।

इति वाराः॥ ततः व्यापकस्य:॥

पवित्रः वितरः। अविवेकः अविवेकः।

विकस्य:।

गार्जुन:। व्रह्मारण:।

इति वाराः॥ ततः व्यापकस्य:॥

महाभारत: 136
इति निचित्रनवचार्यः
पद्ये ०—पदिण्विर चरणं नेमि रथचक्रं युद्धस्मृतः
सहारां मात्रकर्मे लोकार्धं महीजस्मृतः
न:समा विध्वंसकर्ष्यं पर्यायं निषेधं से। इति
श्रीशब्दसुपि—पदिण्विर चरणं नेमि रथचक्रं युद्धस्मृतः
पर्यायः आः हृते चक्षुः परमाश्च। इति
श्रीगोकुलकाव्यस्वाधेयकर्मितत्वं—श्रीशब्दस्वाधिकारकरमाणविस्मृत्यः। विशे
ष्ठार्थं संबंधायेन तात्तुर्वस्त्र्रत्य अर्थीत वाणिज्यसंस्कृतमकर्तितदेवतासांभवेन युद्ध
स्वर्गस्य हृदयाला विशेषत्वार्धं जीवार्धं गोकुलकाव्यस्य भोध्यम्।
तेनातत्तदो—तजनयमथः पृथ्वीरथ्याजुक्षेत्रः। ततःस्य
करणसाक्ष्मेऽतिर्विवे पर्यायं व्यवस्थानमं तथात्तवादं तथा किमासकृ ताश्च तेनेक्ष्मार्गार्थी
वृद्धात् मुखात्। अर्थं— अद्वर्यपाभो वाणिज्यसंस्कृतमकर्तितदेवतासांभवेन भोध्यम्।
तत्र गुणम नानात् न भवति इति अवतत्तनूर्तिति विभाषिकारायण
तपतायो रूपवर्ष्यकर्ष्यं च प्रमाणपर्यं कार्यवर्ष्यं। अभ्यासर्वतः तत्र भूतस्य स्वामिनिः
महीजस्य नाम भवति, ओमु तस्यदिर्य निदेशं। श्रीणिश्रीदिववः स्तूः। इति
प्रमाणविहीर्यात्। मोक्ष्येद्वृत्तोपत्रायुद्धस्वाधिकार्यम् पर्यायश्रीमातिपर्यायस्यसंबंधवेन नामं अभि
यव यथावत्यपरमायुद्धस्य कवितवादात्तमकर्ष्यं युद्धस्मृत्य स्बेतुत्या तस्यस्य वायु
किलं किलमात्रादिकेकर्ष्यं अविद्यादेहरावर्ष्यं मोक्षसमारोपकर्ष्यं पृथ्वीमात्रार्थायुद्धस्य
विश्रीलिंगमा भोध्यम्। श्रीमातिपर्यायकर्ष्यं भोध्यम्। भोध्यम्।
इति—हृदेन तपस्या वस्त्रयाः उक्तस्य गृहसनायास्वर्णं। शूनयाः— दृष्टान्तः
तत्रभूमिः श्रीनामातुस्तवादात् उक्तवेद्यां श्रीप्रस्तावस्य अल्पाकालं श्रीनामादिकेकर्ष्यं
श्रीविद्यादेहस्वाधिकारः विश्रीलिंगविश्रीलिंगमा भोध्यम्।
श्रीमातिपर्यायकर्ष्यं भोध्यम्। भोध्यम्।
हृद—हृदेन नानात् न भवति तथा तत्रस्येऽति विभाषिकारः।
तत्रस्य अवतारं जगद्वृत्तम्। भोध्यम्।
श्रीमातिपर्यायकर्ष्यं भोध्यम्। भोध्यम्।
हृद—हृदेन नानात् न भवति तथा तत्रस्येऽति विभाषिकारः।
तत्रस्य अवतारं जगद्वृत्तम्। भोध्यम्।
श्रीमातिपर्यायकर्ष्यं भोध्यम्। भोध्यम्।
The booklet further contains the refutation of the interpretation of the hymn by the Veerashaivas, as laying down the wearing of लिंगमुद्रा as follows:—

यथोक्त पाण्डुरूपं हंसाबाणं शैवपुरुषोपवृत्त्वकाव्यात् पवित्रचरणः ह्योत्साहि लिंगमुद्राः परस्परमुखः।।

ए तथा हि—

अद्वैतः लिंगमाध्यमः तत्त्वस्पर्शतः रीत:।

पवित्र तत्त्व लिंगमाध्यमः तत्त्वस्पर्शतः: श्रवणः।।

कल्पिताः पवित्र तत्त्व लिंगमाध्यमः तत्त्वस्पर्शतः।

तत्त्वस्पर्शतः लिंगाक्षयं ध्यायम् शैवमनन्दनम्।।

तेनात्मासतनुलज इत्यादिना—

हीर्ष्या सद्विषेदित: साहात्मयालिवेश्मुद्रानम्। इत्यादिनेन अपवस्य प्रति येनेन पवित्रस्वरुपः

लिंगमाध्यमः तत्त्वस्पर्शतः श्यायायात्त्वतः।।

तत्त्वस्पर्शतः शैवपुरुषः तमसवृतम् पान्च पुराणां बल चारिवक्तव्य तथा विविधोऽपि पान्चचरणः स्वायत्वः।।

गगच्छादेष लिंगाक्षयं ध्यायम् तत्त्वस्पर्शतः।।

शैवानीलासाधिनेन तद्भवतु॥ गगच्छादेष मुद्रास्तुपस्तितिविशेषे प्रस्तुतस्तराणार्थे मनादिर्भूषयता॥

मन्यथेश्वरीति तु या स्वर्णः सा न भवते सा न भवते॥ इत्यादिसंदेहेन साहात्मयालिवेश्मुद्रानम्।।
ननु श्रेष्ठपुराणस्य तामसले पादपुराणस्य च साबितकरे कि मानं किद्वा मानं
तामसानांस्त्राविभूते इति उच्यते—

१३

कैरवं नार्दिवं च तथा भागवं परस्।
गाहं च तथा पाटे मनः श्रीमनः स्वमस्।
धर्मकामि पुरुषार्थम् श्रीमानि हुहानेन।
हस्त्राखं जड्डाकाव्यमेव भावेन तयत्।
अधिवधारार्णं ब्राह्मणं राज्यानि विशेषे च।
श्रेष्ठानेऽस्त्ये वैढ़े धैर्यं स्त्रान्ते तयत्।
कौमे वैढ़े च तथा मात्स्यं तामसानि अनशते।
इति पादपुराणवचने:

धार्मिकराजवतामसविभागस्—

नाद्रितं पुराणादिनं राजश्वास्त्रायांश्चतय।
अनंतानि प्रतश्च वृधा नौकरवर्णित।

इति भारदाञ्जनेन तामसानांमुपादेयत्वसः च सिद्धे। कि चालनयंश्चिद्वामेवार्थंबुधं
शुल्केरिण्याय प्रभवति। 'श्रीशिबं खिल्मान्त्वतां' इह्रुषु-बुधं च तपतिक्रमयमुः
धारणायं नानाय सिद्धम्। तथोइह्रुषुस्य दुर्धारावतेनाय पर्वते।
तथा हि श्रीशिबं खिल्मान्त्वा विश्वास्यामर्थं—ब्रह्मतिशाङ्केन विज्ञम्
मुनार्थिः दुर्धारा तपतिक्रमयमुः।
एवं मुनस्य दुर्धारास्य स्वत्रो नारायणं परित्यज्यनापि।'पति विश्ववस्तेश्वरं शाश्त्रं,
'निरुपाध्याक्षरं उच्छ वास्येव प्रितिष्ठितम्' इह्रादि श्रुतिस्तृतस्तीविक्रमश् दुर्धारयं
नारायणम् अनयोदशीणाम्। तत् प्रसिद्धे दुर्धारामणे सत्त्वं तत्त्वमपकार्तकाः ख्याति
पवित्रेऽ ते विततातिति ख्यातिदीति योजना।
तत्माध्याश्च विनाद्यां शिववस्य नारायणेयाक्षर्मि शिवम्।
'शाश्त्रानि शिवम्युः' इह्रादि नारायणेऽक्षिप्तः श्रीवास्तवार्थस्य नारायणानात्। यद्य शिबेन
क्षेत्र धार्यामानस्कैलेकैसि, वैष्णवायमह्यं यथेति भागवाद्विरो शिववस्य वैष्णवोपायलोकस्य-
स्यायं च चक्षारायाधिकैः। तत् विश्वकाेकायमस्तुम्। तपति नृषुष्टेश्वर इह्रादीष्ठया
तापासद्दिनकरायिप्तत्स्वाय लक्ष्मीकाराय उत्स कं मगावलंदिनिन्य सतसारायामिति \!
वानुः। आपायावाच्यति। यद्य किरणादि: शिवसिद्धपरो: स्माय तत्त्वमपुष्टिमुः श्रीवास्तवार्थस्य
महमादीयतितः तत्सिद्धं शिवकारायाय त्वच्छता। न दि किरणजेतु केनाधि तद्बयादित। न
स पादपुराणात् शिबं धिपतिमहादितकैलाशसिद्धान्तात्मकाराकस्यतत्वस्य नृषुष्टेश्वरविश्वार्थ
सिद्धिः जयमुहल्लक्षिप्तम् न तु विश्वविश्वमुन्नचकोपायर्वं प्रकरणविश्वार्थविकसी
दिति क्षम्योः। शिवसिद्धपरो: साधारणपुराणिविवेकं उपविवृत्तिगृहीतमामायापात्।
शिवस्य चक्षुविकारायेन वैष्णवोपायस्वरमस्विकारः श्रीतिवादाचार्य।
The refutation contained by उपनिषदेकुस्रुषुम्य and that by उद्वृत्तिलिखितम्: exhibit the high and irreconcilable sectarian spirit of both the Vaishnavas and Veershaivas. It is noteworthy that here अनेन्ताचार्य takes लिङ्ग to mean लिङ्गमुद्रा of heated लिङ्ग and not द्विलिङ्ग or द्वालिङ्ग. Hence it is clear that अनेन्ताचार्य does not in the least understand द्विलिङ्गसाधारण, which he means to refute in the above.

To this उद्वृत्तिलिखितम्: may be added another pamphlet called "तत्तन्त्रमूलण " written by राजचेतार्थचार्य, a Madhwaite or a follower of the Madhwa sect of Vaishnavas. But this latter is more extensive and exhaustive, when compared with उद्वृत्तिलिखितम्. Still it does not contain the refutation of Veerashaivaite interpretation of the मंत्र "पवित्र तै बितंतं etc."; though it refers incidentally to Veerashaivaite tenets of उपनिषद्याण etc. and says these are to be rejected, being condemned by दुरावण etc.

There is also an उपनिषद of name उद्वृत्तिलिखितम्, included in Unpublished Upanishads, Adyar, Madras. This Upanishad also purports to the injunction of wearing the disk-mark on the body. It contains this मंत्र (पवित्र तै बितंतं etc.) and other Vedic मंत्रस quoted in authority by the two pamphlets. But the treatment of the subject matter in the Upanishad is quite in keeping with the tone of Upanishadic discourse.

There are various objects held by Hindu Gods and Goddesses in their hands, such as weapons, musical instruments etc. The weapons held by them are ten, namely—

कदनो शापिष्ठ रेण्ध न स्तं च व्यास तथाकृष्णम् ।
गदा शिण्डालं पद्म न च वर्क चेति दशाशुधुसम् ॥
वन्धे शापिष्ठ श्रीमाय चक्रपद्य ननुस्के ।
शेषा: पुराङ्गो विषेयास्वल्पज्ञानिनिमिता: ॥
Of these, the most prominent of Vishnu's weapons is called 

It is also carried by the sister of Vishnu and as such the female form of Vishnu. It is of two forms. In the first variety, it is shaped like the wheel of a cart with spokes, nave and all, and is meant to be grasped by the rim. In its second variety it is highly ornamented; the spokes are made to resemble the petals of a lotus so that the internal parts appear like a full-blown lotus. In the Vaishnavas' interpretation, the wheel is praised as—

Vaishnavanandavrita (page 64) also records the Vaishnavaite interpretation of the wheel and refutes it. The refutation there is very elaborate. The relevant portions of which are:

The refutation there is very elaborate. The relevant portions of which are:

Vadēva (page 64) also records the Vaishnavaite interpretation of the wheel and refutes it. The refutation there is very elaborate. The relevant portions of which are:
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Vadēva (page 64) also records the Vaishnavaite interpretation of the wheel and refutes it. The refutation there is very elaborate. The relevant portions of which are:

Vadēva (page 64) also records the Vaishnavaite interpretation of the wheel and refutes it. The refutation there is very elaborate. The relevant portions of which are:

Vadēva (page 64) also records the Vaishnavaite interpretation of the wheel and refutes it. The refutation there is very elaborate. The relevant portions of which are:

Vadēva (page 64) also records the Vaishnavaite interpretation of the wheel and refutes it. The refutation there is very elaborate. The relevant portions of which are:
The discussion is still continued. But it is unnecessary to reproduce it here in full. But it is evident that the line of refutation is so different from that of the Vaishnavas. The refutation consists in taking three alternatives and proving them to be inapplicable; it is thereby shown that the interpretation falls to the ground.

P. 34. अथापि...... क्रियाविषय एव विवादः।—The verse quoted in the commentary of वैश्वनार्यविवेचनिका and also in युद्धौनन्दनम् has been taken as the authority by the Vaishnavas. But the reliability of that is questioned here. पंडित शिवकुमार remarks here—अर्थ कोशः हंस्निवितकोशपुस्तकेः अनुपलव्यमानतया कहित इत्य आयाति। धृष्ट्येवायानितितली उपलब्धस्मानकोशपुस्तकेः अनुपलम्भ एव तत्कलिणि-तत्त्वचिन्हितिभावः।
P. 34. बिष्णूभेदा भक्तांमणिधिलताः—Because भक्तांमणि is addressed to विष्णุ, as admitted by the Vaishnavaite interpreter, the विद्वान्तित् says that प्रभुमणियो वेषि should be interpreted as connected with विष्णु and not as laying down the wearing of चक्ष, which becomes inconsistent to do.

P. 35. नञु……चक्षस्वते विद्वान्तित्वेतः—This is the attempt of the Vaishnavaite interpreter to explain away the foregoing objection.

P. 35. मेवम् विभक्तासहलाः—Here the विद्वान्तित् refutes the explanation of the Vaishnavaite interpreter by taking three alternatives, which he says the explanation cannot stand. The three alternatives are—(1) किं चक्षस्वते विष्णुमणिन्तन्तन घायतस्य (2) विष्णुमणिन्तन्तन घायतस्य (3) विष्णुमणिन्तन्तन वा.

P. 35. नाथः……विनिगमकामामातः—In this para the विद्वान्तित् proves that the first alternative fails to the ground; because there is no cogent reason why चक्ष alone should be laid down by the मंत्र for being worn on the body in preference to other things like गद्य, खंड etc. all of which are borne by विष्णु in his hands.

Vishnu's गद्य is called कीमोडकी. It is described in विष्णु-धर्मालाः as—गद्य पीतम्भा कन्या कुर्विन्धरमणस्तहला। It is the ordinary Indian club and is held by Vishnu with all his five fingers. It has a top and a stout bottom. It is a weapon to strike the enemy at close quarters and therefore never leaves the hands of the owner. कीमोडकी is derived as की: पृथिया: पाल्लकालम्, मोदक: कुमोदक: विष्णु:। तत्त्वेयम् कीमोडकी।।

खंड is a sword, long or short, and is used along with खंडक or shield made of wood or hide. Vishnu's खंड is called नंदक. It is described in विष्णुमणिन्तन्तन as—खंडक्षुध: घुष्क: स्वामशरः: कुलोचनः।
Kośṭum is the sapphire worn by Vishnu on his breast and is his most characteristic ornament. It was obtained from the milky ocean, when churned by Gods for Amrit. It is, therefore, derived as—कौस्तुभ स्त्राभाति कौस्तुभ: जलति: तन्व सवः कौस्तुभः। It is one of the fourteen jewels (invaluable things) obtained, when the ocean was churned, which are enumerated in the ऋक—वद्यम: कौस्तुभ पारिजातक श्रुता धनवतृतिवांदम्। etc. The appearance of कौस्तुभ is described as follows:—

Kośṭumवर्णितिव्रय उत्तमो घृतसंवर्णः।
मार्शिशिविक्ष: श्रीमान् नारायण उदागतः।
(see तारानाथज्ञावच्छसित्परं बुधस्त्रस्तकारभाषण page 2281).

P. 35. न द्वितीयः etc.—In this para the सिद्धान्तिन् shows that 2nd alternative is inapplicable; because in that case (विष्णुस्वरूपे) there will disappear the distinction between the mark (the लोंगं of विष्णु) and the bearer of the mark viz. विष्णु; but without such a distinction it cannot be said such and such is the mark worn.

P. 35. तृतीयः वर्णः etc.—Here the third alternative, which is further made twofold, is also shown to be inapplicable. It is twofold as (1) विष्णुश्चकरणप्रविष्णु (2) चक्षु विष्णुश्चकरणविष्णु वा.

P. 35. नायः पशः etc.—The first alternative is proved to be untenable, because विष्णु being मर्यम्बिन्न, he is in all things and not in चक alone. Then why is the mark of चक only to be borne on the body and not others?

P. 35. चेतरः पशः etc.—Here the सिद्धान्तिन् says that in as much as चक, like शाल्प्राम, is the शरीर of the शरीरिन्य (विष्णु), it will have to be worshipped as शाल्प्राम is done. But it is not so done; hence it is absurd and unsound to think that चक to be शरीर of विष्णु.
A शालग्राम is generally a flintified ammonite shell, which is river-worn and thus rounded and beautifully polished. The river, Gandaki, which is one of the well-known tributaries of the Ganges, is famous in India for its deposits of शालग्राम. Each of these has a hole, through which are visible several interior spiral grooves resembling the चक्र or discus of विष्णु; and these are in fact considered by the people to be naturally produced representations of the discus of विष्णु. Remarkable virtues are attributed to it...The वराहपुराण states that the river-goddess Gandaki requested विष्णु to be born in her womb, to which विष्णु acceded and came to be born in the river as शालग्राम.

A good or auspicious Sālagrāma is one which has a Chakra, which resembles a नाग (cobra) reposing in a spiral; the spirals of the Chakra in the Sālagrāma should have in them delicate traceries running across them. Those Sālagrāmas which are of the size of an āmalaka fruit or smaller are very efficacious. Sālagrāmas may be of the following colours: brownish black, green, white, red, blue, dark brown, jet-black, yellow or multicoloured. They are said to belong respectively to Narasimha, Vāmana, Vasudeva, Samkarshana, Dāmodara and Aniruddha, Nārāyana, Kshetravaishnava and Shridhara. A Sālagrāma with three Chakras is said to belong to Lakshmi-Nārāyana

Fine spiralled ones grant all the desires of the worshipper; whereas black ones would give fame (Kirti). White Sālagrāmas destroy sin and yellow ones confer sons. Sālagrāmas of blue, etc., colours grant peace and wealth, while a red one bestows enjoyment, (bhoga). Even pieces of the auspicious Sālagrāmas, might be worshipped; the following specimens must be avoided. Badly mutilated, and rough surfaced ones. those having a large number of holes or pits or scarred with many lines, porous, unusually large-sized, those having too many spirals, or having only one loop in the spiral (?), big-mouthed or large-spiralled, down-looking and burnt ones, very red ones, ill looking ones and those with a number of Chakras in a line; worshipping these brings only misery to the worshipper.
P. 35. यदुकं etc.—Here the सिद्धांतिक quotes verses condemnatory of चक्राकर्षण and shows that the interpretation of the second line becomes not only untenable but drifts into something else, that goes against the Vaishnavaita theory of wearing the disk-mark. This is stated on the next page. But in connection with the condemnatory verses the remarks of तत्संरक्षण are note-worthy. There the verses not in favour of तत्संरक्षण are first quoted and then it is remarked—परोक्षितितान समीतिशम्योपेय इति। वासुदेव तेषां समीतिशम्यान सातित । तथापि। एतत्तथा च चन्द्रानि रल्लावलः तद्विभिन्नता रचित। न चायंततत्तकुछकुचसंबंधः प्रच्छंदेवेन ब्राह्मणकुंक्र विवेद्य वेदात्मत्तित शाश्वानि च शुद्धं पश्चात्तितळ पुरानोऽपि विश्वासान्वितासिद्धिकारित: कोपाश्ची निदानम् कलितानि हि उत्तरदेवः असिद। एतिन—दीर्घच च शंखचक्राकशिकान्तं च पदा। संभाव्य रौष्ट्र वाति राविविद्यान्तुदं || इति यदुकं ताविताः। The author of the pamphlet explains the lines,

तत्संरक्षितं दश्या पश्चेत्तुर्थं च यो नरः।
जपेच पौर्णं सूर्यं अन्यथा नरकं ब्रह्मेत्, || as—

तथापरं काकं पदस्यर्थं अन्यायां अस्थबां नस्थे।
एतत्सर्वादं सुव्याहृतम् इति प्राच्ये श्रव्ये। अनन्यवाहिनस्यप्रज्ञिस्ते।

It is clear that how tortured, farfetched, and distorted the explanation is. This is all due to intense sectarian spirit, on account of which Shaiva, Vaishnava, and Veerashaiva interpreters explain any text in any far-fetched way they like, only to make the text suit the tenets of their particular school.
P. 36. किंवतस्मय......विरोधः पते।। This has been clearly expressed by वीरेश्वरानन्दचंद्रिकाः as stated above.

P. 36. नृत्तिमन्त्रे etc.—This refers to the 1st objection advanced by the (Vaishnavaite) यूक्तिः against the author’s interpretation of the संदृ and has been refuted by the author above.

P. 36. यायुस्वाभवसतानुरूप्या etc—Here the author states how different would be the meaning, when interpreted strictly in accordance with texts produced by him. He takes his stand on अं in sense of बिन्दु and reduces the explanation to an absurd thing. But it cannot be understood why he should take अं (in श्लासः) in the sense of “अंसु पाक हि धरः”。 वीरेश्वरानन्दचंद्रिका also does the same as follows:—

परिग्रहःयद्यूष्माय कर्तहेतुला च अस्थतान्तरसम्बन्धित। तथाहि मन्त्रविनियोग–
प्रद्वन्तनां कलात्रुकारणां भास्ताग्रंहितिरार्थवद्यादिनां विनिमयं विना, प्रसिद्धोक्षयवचनक्र–
पदोऽपूर्व्यं विना, यदिं स्तवस्वरूपसरोऽस्तरं स्वस्तवस्तवित्तिसूचनेन अर्थान्तरक्तप्यं तदावशः
परिग्रहाध्योक्तयोऽध्ययः। स्यातु तथाहि–हे ब्राह्मणस्ते ब्राह्मणेशु, ‘हक्तेव निम्नान्तम्य’
रिति कोषान्। ते तं प्रमाणम् पत्ती। विशेषः सर्वभ, पञ्चः सर्वभौस्तिः, तत्तित्रञ्जने
में न अनुवेदनकाः। किंतु पत्त्रं यथा वाक्यति तत्र, वितते विस्तुतानि, वचनवल्लक–
च्छान्दः, गाजः पदवे, गाजः परिग्रहस्तु “यातार्यं देवतास्ते: सर्वेन शयश्यिस्ति
इस्कन्धः वस्त्रिः” ति अश्लिष्यवचनं। अतर्ततदिस्सि अकारः विनियोगः, ‘अकारः
प्रयज्ञाचारिः, कमठश्यर्कर्ण्यं रो’ इति कोषान्। अय विनेते, तस्मनं वाहुल्ये दुर्गः–
वदीरः, अत एव आमोऽसमाश्वरः, तदाप्लुण्यम्, तस्मन्न पदं नावते न अप्राधि।
श्लासः–तत्तपक्रमक नकः, त्रे पकः इस्ते धरः पं: अं बुहुर्यमस्यक्तपदः, इत्यादिन्त्यं
किंतु वहन्तः, तत्सम्बुकार्यं पकः कुम्भिपक्षसाधनः। नाविकः नाममायुः, शस्य
मृत्युः भानेन्द्रेवाद्। सामायः–प्रामुख्यं, तत्तशुचकर्तारी पुमांकुम्भिप्रकां अपनो
तीति विनिजोऽध्यः। तत्तपतु शुचिन्तस्तकनुकर्तवन श्लासकृत्याः पदं बुहुर्यमल्लवम–
दुस्कलित्वार्यां परत्वक्तप्यं भावः:।।
Pandit explains this para lucidly as follows:

"The author says that it is impossible to interpret the hymn as laying down the wearing of the disk-mark. takes up the challenge of the Veerashaivaites and explains away the objection as stated in some details above. It is note-worthy that Vaishnava Puranas generally praise and uphold and condemn , while Shaiva Puranas and some others condemn and uphold and establish . Puranas are, therefore, not only mutually contradictory but are many times self-contradictory. The whole thing is thus made a mess of, and the Puranas become quite unreliable. All these contradictory statements contained by the Puranas are due, no doubt, to irreconcilable sectarian spirit; and it seems they are all subsequent interpolations."
In this para the author points out that if पवित्र were to mean चक, explained etymologically as दुनाति श्रायते च श्ल्यतः पवित्रे (see the extract of सुदर्शनशुद्रम् given above), it cannot have the sense of पवित्र or holiness, which it means very commonly and is accepted as such universally. All lexicons give the same meaning of the word. The पूज्वशिनि, therefore, cannot but reject this sense of the word universally accepted, if he were to establish his view in the hymn and his interpretation of the hymn.

When there is something militating against the particular sense of the word, the word loses its power of expressing that sense. Here शक्ति means अभिभा or the power of expressing the primary sense of the word, as distinguished from लक्षणा and शिब्जना. The author says, accordingly, that the word पवित्र cannot have that power of expressing the sense of चक for because there are so many Pauranic verses that contradict चकङ्गा, which directly or indirectly militate against the sense of the word पवित्र as चक.

Here the शिब्जाति illustrates his statement by giving an instance of how लक्षणा has been resorted to instead of अभिभा by अमरकोश in connection with the use of adjectives as qualifying adjuncts to nouns. The sentence quoted here is "गुणो श्रुत्य दयः पुनः गुणि बिगास्तु तद्यति" (see अमरकोश-ग्रामदिवर्गेः). The commentary of क्षीरस्वामिव on this line is—गुणमात्रे वर्तमाना: गुणा पुनः ऊपरस्य श्रुत्यः.
That the adjectives, when used with nouns, mean not merely the quality but the thing qualified as characterized by the quality is the opinion of the शक्तिविशिष्टेऽतित्न, may be known from the नीलिकप्प न केवल स्वरूप बाचक अपि श्वविशिष्ठेऽतस्यापि। तथा चराचरप्रधानवचक्षस्वस्वविशिष्टेऽतित्न, न केवल चराचरप्रधानवचक्षस्वस्वविशिष्टेऽतित्न अपि तत्वविशिष्टेऽतित्न तत्वस्यापि। see शिबाल्रैक्षण pp. 28-32. In a note below it is said by the editor of the books—तथापि गुणमा च नेवण्ण तद्विशिष्टेऽतित्न द्रव्येऽतित्न लक्षणया समानाविकारणव्यवहारः संभवति। तत्तुवण च न नेवण्ण वस्तुयंतरं कल्पनायं गौरवति।
Another objection:—The pronoun "This" (इं) coming before "विवाभियन" speaks about the hand. It, therefore, means that the hand which touches Shiva while applying sandal paste etc. Hence the words "This Lord, my hand", praise the right hand that is so valuable, being very useful in applying sandal paste and offering food to Linga made of Baṇa wood or emerald, when that Linga placed on a wooden altar is worshipped; and it is, therefore, praised as being mother, father, etc. The text, accordingly, does not lay down the wearing of Linga on the hand. This objection is wrong; because the hand being inanimate, it is impossible that it should be attributed with being mother, father, etc. It is improper to accept non-intimate attributes (attributes falsely ascribed to a thing where they are not existing) in preference to those that exist in a thing inherently and therefore, are intimate to it. This is why the Vedic passage "Soma, the creator of intellect, purifies" is explained as containing the praise of Shiva, the consort of Uma, and not the Soma plant, in as much as the Soma plant cannot be said to possess the attributes mentioned in the passage. The word Soma is interpreted paronomastically as Lord Shiva who is united with Uma (उमा सहित), in order to vindicate the intimate possession of attributes. This interpretation agrees with that of other writers. And if the right hand, that is occaisionally in contact with Shivalinga, sportively expert in the creation, protection and destruction of the universe, is so venerable as to be praised like this, how much more should be the left hand that is in perpetual contact in the way explained.
the word *पंकज* is used by an author in the sense of लहृ, the conventional meaning कलं is to be set aside; and the word can neither mean a *पद्म* (a day lotus) or a *कुंद* (a night lotus). The word is actually used in its बौद्धिक sense. In the same way here the word पवित्र means holy, as its conventional sense is contradicted by the verses anti the चक्रवर्तादायक.

**P. 36.** एतेन “तसं चक्रं हिमुखे धार्यं”—Is another text that might be adduced by the Vaishnavaite पुरवपाक्ष्य. The author presumes it and says that that also is refuted by the foregoing discussion.

**P. 37.** अनुवादनेन......श्रुतिले एव विवादाद्—The विद्वान् says that the text तसं चक्रं etc. is a fib, being not found in any Vedic literature, as no Vedic student (अनुवाद) has come across it.

अनुवादनेन = साङ्गवेदाण्याखिना.

**P. 37.** यदि च विग्रीणिन्दर्शा etc.—Here the विद्वान् anticipates the पुरवपाक्ष्य might produce other texts in favour of चक्रवर्तादायक from other Vedas and says that such texts are also refuted by the discussion above. The author probably refers to the texts of यद्धवेद and बालवेद given by the खदर्शन खदुःन above.

**P. 37.** चक्रवर्तादायक सावधारणे etc.—Here the author finally disposes of the Vaishnavaite interpretation by saying that if the hymn must lay down the wearing of चक्रुद्र, it must do so that thing alone and not the marks of शेखर and others,
in accordance with what is said by संव्रातिकं स्वाभारणे. (In connection with संव्रातिकं सावभारणे please see note on page 57 of the notes). But there are texts, says the विद्वान, that enjoin the wearing of the marks of शंक्र and others. The universal custom of wearing these other marks endorses the texts. The position of the पूज्यप्रिय, therefore, becomes awkward, as to why the hymn should lay down the चक्रंकथारण and not other marks. There is no reason why चक्रंकथारण should be specially laid down by the Vedic text in preference to other marks.

P. 37. गुरुरणास्तु……व्यासौविद्वारयेः प्राहुः।—Here the author gives the interpretation of the hymn made by his गुरु, महिलार, whom he praises in the third verse of मंगलावरण. The interpretation is—हे ब्रह्मणस्ते परमविश्वे ततं पवित्रं चिंगं विदतं इवादिष्टेन अनेकविश्वनाथैन्वितस्तं प्रस्तुः: अवकंडा गद्यविस्मृति मानविनि संकल्परीताणि शिखतः सर्वंतात्र पवित्रि व्यास्तिक शृङ्खले:। This is the interpretation of the first half of the line only. It is, therefore, to be taken for granted that the interpretation of the second line in no way differs from that of the author. The interpretation given by the preceptor differs in respect of the meaning of पवित्र established as चिंग. This is done by means of the grammatical equation of पवित्र and मंत्र, which equation proves the identity of पवित्र and मंत्र. This grammatical equation, proving the identity of things in apposition or things equated, has been already noted (see note on page 51 of notes supra). That मंत्र means Linga has been already derivatively explained by the author on page 8 of the text in श्रीमान्ते "मनस्तवत्तधाय ब्रह्मवाच् इत्यादि”, and on page 13 of the text. Here the preceptor produces the authority of महिलारस्ती, who says that वाच्य is व्रत on account of their being in apposition or grammatical equation. 20
P. 38. अश्वत्तशणीपीयान्—This refers to the wonderful power of परमशिव, who is, by means of his power, capable of working wonders of creating, maintaining, and reabsorbing the universe. In short it is the inconceivably great power of परमशिव that is at the bottom of the universe and its working. This is अश्वत्तशणीपीयानि शक्ति; that makes the शक्तिविशिष्टदैत philosophy and differentiates and distinguishes it from other aspects or schools of अद्वैत philosophy.

P. 38. अजेय हु इति—This contains the interpretation of the first half of the hymn by others. The difference is in the meaning of the word बिंतत, which is explained as शरीर—श्रवणरीर or परिशिवसरीर in the form of शिन्ना. This interpretation of the word बिंतत as शरीर differs from all other interpretations already noted of this hymn. प्रशु also is explained to mean तात्त्वशारीरकं भूमिकापि क्रिया. (Page 39).

P. 39. गुरुभते इति इयामनिषेष्यः| Here the author points out the difference between this interpretation and that of his preceptor. The difference lies in the meaning of the words बिंतत and प्रशंस, which are respectively interpreted by the preceptor as meaning शिन्ना and विस्तृत; but अजेय take them to mean भूमिकापि क्रिया वर्णनयनाय and बिंतत as श्रवण: परिशिवसरीर शिन्ना. The author further indirectly points out skillfully how the interpretation of his preceptor is superior to that of others on account of the occurrence in due order of the words प्रशंस, the subject; and बिंतत, the predicate, which are उद्देश्य and विशेष respectively. While in the other interpretation they stand in reverse order and do not conform to the dictum “उद्देश्यवचन पूर्वः” etc. This dictum is laid down by मंडलसिन्धन as noted by पंडितशिवरुकार—पर्वतो वानिज्यतित्रेव मंडलसिध्यकारि—
काळाराघिनेलयः।
In this section the author proceeds to prove that वास्तविकतारण is laid down by another त्वरितमत्, namely, अन्य में हस्तो मन्त्रान्त्र etc. This contains two मंत्रान्त्र (X-4-60 and X-6-61) placed in reverse order of occurrence. The hymn अर्थ माता अर्थ पिता etc. comes first in the वेदा and then अर्थ में हस्तो मन्त्रान्त्र etc. comes after the fourth hymn. The commentary of सामान्यावर्त, in order of the occurrence of the hymns here, is as follows:

अन्या बन्धुवाद्यी सर्वजीविं षुब्धं पाणिभिरस्याधार अर्थ में हस्तो मन्त्रान्त्र सामान्यावर्त निर्माण सम्पूर्ण स्वरुपाति अर्थादयत तत्समात तथापर्यं में हस्तो मन्त्रान्त्र अतिभेद अस्तित्वानु तथापर्यं में हस्तो बिन्दुनष्ठानं सीविचिलित्यास्पदान्तरोप्यधार, तत्त्वार्थान्त्रीयो वा अर्थ शिवामिनित्वानं संशोधनशील श्रृण्णि जीवान्तं स्वरुपाति अर्थ इव।

अन्य सुक्षवेश्य शास्त्रावर्तक-अपराधि सूक्ष्णासुन्त्रान्त्र अभिः स्वयं धार्माग्राम आश्रय चाड विकाशियागमर्गायते षुब्धोयोरेत्वां पुनःवद्धिमिहुष्ववान् एवेन्ति परिष्ठब्धव-वीत तमादधर्मान्ति तं निर्माणवर्धय माता अर्थ पिते तिः। शौकक्षं —

स्वतः स राजा षुहरीश्वरण गृहपावनाभिः। र्मारी सुकेन ते स्वमहाम ःप्रदेः यथा नियुक्ता || 1 इ। अप्यामिरिश्वरीपरत्यायमंतः परिष्ठथं। । स्वरुपस्य शेषश्वरकारणां युगो द्वितीयायमा || 2 इ। स्वथायं जनायकां जनायक्यां च पाणक:।। स्वाती सापाधिमें: प्रेमो जनायक स्वरुपाति प्रति || 3 इ। अर्थ भावते तेत्र षुहरीश्वरुष्णाब्याय ।

शाष्ट्रमायनिदिश्य स्वरुपाः परितं सुधि || 4 इ। सुक्षमेश्य जूतस्य प्रवस्य भार्यानय ते || 5 इ। इति

अन्यमस्माताः अभिनव पिता अर्थ जीवादुवर्षाविष्टा आमद्वाजाग्राम अतो हे षुहरीश्वरी जीवन परिभ्रमो विद्वान्त्याश्रमाधिदं चारीं तस्मान्त्र तस्मान्त्र महाश्वेत प्रतिसाधनं अत इवः प्रेमाधि आश्रय स्वरुपर्षिष्ठिते स्वरूपार्षिष्ठिते स्वाकाशोः। अर्थे प्रेम व्याख्याते—हे निर्माणार्थ स्वरुपाः संवैधानिक अर्थ विद्वानिक्षेत अर्थ जीवान्तं अवन्तं नेत्रां: षुहरीश्वरां प्रवस्य त्वामागान दुःखिताः सत्ता:। सिद्ध समारं || 7 इ।
These hymns have been also taken and interpreted as laying down the ब्रह्मचारिणी by (1) ब्रह्मचारिणी (2) ब्राह्मचारी (3) श्रृंगारकथा and (4) श्रीकङ्काश्य. They are reproduced below in order. But it is to be noted that ब्रह्मचारिणी takes only the first three lines and interprets them; but the fourth line is omitted by it. It is also to be noted that all these place the two hymns in reserve order as the author does.

(1) श्रीगङ्गादेवरामाणी interprets it as—

एवं चार्यं भगवानं श्रीगङ्गादेवरामाणिः शिवः मे हस्तं इत्यतं: मे मत्तर्त्वाति अर्थं विषयं
मप्तदातां। अर्थं माता अर्थं पिता इरीतं दुखितकर्ममिति यावते। अर्थं विषयेष्ठं: इससे बिक्रम। 
सत्यं भेषजं: संवारोगनाशकं: इस्यकेन संहारकर्मेण अज्ञापायते। शिवमभिन्नतेतः अविभाज्यमेचं च 
सदा स्पृशातिति शिवामभिमाणः। वेन कारणं शिवामभिमाणः अतं एवं जीवाश्राद्वावानोपधमूः मे हस्तं:। 
छुन्ने प्रसर्ष्य तवं वै प्रक्ष्यं अयुसपन्नममहामतं अस्तं:। तेन मे हस्तं पूर्णं सत्तं निरंदित सबैंद्रो तिष्ठ।

(2) ब्रह्मचारिणी interprets it as—

बस्यं पुरुषस्य:—अर्थं मे हस्तं: भगवानं भगवानं स्तीति भगवानं माहात्म्यमवानित्यः। 
मप्तदातां: अख्तमाहात्म्यवानित्यः। विषयेष्ठं: बिक्रम्य: मायामप्पडः। 
भेषजं: भेषजवानं वैयः। अर्थं आदिवाद्वः। शिवामभिमाणः। असम् ररमर्त्वादृ: न केवलं 
सन्तास्यमण्डली, किंतु अभिलं: परितं स्पृशातितः। अर्थं माता अर्थं पिता अर्थं 
जीवाश्राद्वावानोपधमूः: अस्मृतिर्घण्यं—

अर्थं मे हस्तं महावानं भगवानं भर्तरः। 
शिवामभिमाणिः शिवामभिमाणां भारानात।। इतिं।

(3) ब्राह्मचारीश्रीगङ्गादेवरामाणिः interprets as—

अस्वायं: अर्थं मे हस्तं: मे अर्थं हस्तं: भगवानं स्तीति भगवानं 
ततां भगवानं हस्तं महावार्षीकः: शृंगारकथा:। अर्थं मे भगवानं: अर्थं मे हस्तं: 
भगवानं: तथाखंड्नु महाशास्त्रविध् वाद्विधं तथामार्छं विविधं हस्तं: अर्थं मे 
विषयेष्ठं: मे अर्थं हस्तं: विषयेष्ठं: बिक्रम्य: मायामप्पडः सम्प्रदायः
(4) अक्षरात्मक interprets it as—

अस्याः: । खड़न्धो—दोममधातीविच्छुच सुवधः: तस्य समवेदनां है जगति भिन्नप्राप्ते, तथे — आगाण्च हुः; गतावितविप्राः: हदद——युद्ध यूजित—
अव तस्मि संविधिः, तव — ततु, परस्पर:—उपवेशनाति भिन्नान, निरंलि: निरःमाः:निः: हुः; गता—
वित्ताभासीः: अतएव, अर्थ——एव:- मे मम, हस्तः——पाणि: मगस्तः: पुष्कराःपुष्कराः—समस्तः—
स्यादृ अर्थ — अस्वी, मे— मम, हस्तः, ममस्तः: मगस्तः: पुष्कराःपुष्कराः–
समस्तः: तथा चोर्जः—पृथ्विश्च समवेद्यो चीर्त्यथा वशद: भिन्नः दानमधा वयः:ैः हुः; गता—
ितिरः: मगोः:पाणी: मगस्तः: मगस्तः: मगस्तः: मगस्तः: पुष्करः—पुष्करः—
समस्तः: भगवस्तः: अर्थ—एव:- मे मम, हस्तः: विरोधं: मवेशैं: भवेतः—पुष्कराः—
समस्तः; सबलार्गाः वैच्छुर्वः: अर्थ—एव हस्तः: विशंविशंविशंविशंविशंविशंविशंविशंविशंविशं
समस्तः: मातामातुरः: अर्थ—एव हस्तः: विता:—जननवशः: अर्थ—एव हस्तः—
जीवकः:—आत्मवशः: अगमम समवालमवादृ पाणि: नार्ताभासः: तथा:चोर्जः: नभ:—

(5) भैरभरामाओऽ takes these hymns in support of इलिंगम्भारण but does not record its interpretation and simply says that they lay down the wearing of बाल्यालिंग in words — “इलिनले बेदुरुक्ष्य पाणिएष्ठालिंग निर्हित्स and then quotes some corroborative verses from आगमांस and पुराणाः.”
does not find in the hymns any injunction to wear Linga on the body, as the Veerashaiva interpreters find.

The interpretations recorded above do not differ except in respect of which is taken to mean or by while takes it as . The author of interprets it differently from both above; as Veerashaiva interpreters find.

The interpretations recorded above do not differ except in respect of which is taken to mean or by while takes it as .

In the author establishes the identity of (and) on account of their being in apposition in sentences quoted by him. Later, on pages 42 and 43, the author discusses why should mean specifically and not other deities, though it may be used in apposition to them.

The author identifies as follows:

The identifies with as follows:
P. 40. नेह इस्त्रिगति भगवानिनि वचनं इति—Here is the first objection to the author's interpretation, which the author refutes in what follows immediately, by saying that इस्त्र and इस्त्रिगति are identical on account of their intimate and inseparable connection. The author illustrates the identity of इस्त्र and इस्त्रिगति by sentences, quoted which state the identity of अनिष्ठित and श्वेत on account of the latter's living in अनिष्ठित or अनिष्ठितेन. The author quotes various verses in support of how Linga is not to be separated or kept apart from the body. This is the inseparable connection of इस्त्रिगति and the wearer. That is why all Lingayatas so carefully wear Linga on the body and are never without it. It, thus, forms the visible and distinguishing mark of Lingayatas or Veerashaivas.

शिवालिखित or इस्त्रिगति is always worn on the body. But its worship is performed on the hand (left hand by means of the right hand). Hence the inseparable connection of Linga with the hand. This is why इस्त्र, being so connected with the Linga, is identical with Linga.

शिवयोगप्रदीपिका says that शिव is in all the three मंडल of सूर्य-इंद्र-वैष्णव, as follows:

यहं शिवं केवलत्वद्वायस्म्।
धूर्याध्यात्मानमद्वस्म्॥
शुद्धसार्थस्त्रिवस्तवः।
श्यात्व यजेन्मोक्षितं घ वाति॥

The three मंडल have been explained by the दीपाकार there. The शाक्ति is in Kanarese but may be stated in Sanskrit as—चक्रोदयसूर्यचंद्रामिनिमंडलेः वर्तमानम्। इद्रमिनिगलासुखार्थ-मंडलान्वेः वा वर्तमानम्। अकारोकारकारसुर्यचंद्रामिनिमंडलान्वेः वा वर्तमानम्।

(see शिवयोगप्रदीपिका प्रथमपरख).
P. 42. ध्नं बै दिमं—Here it is established that ध्न means Linga on account of their being in grammatical equation. But we have been not able to find it in कौशिकस्मुतसाक्षण.

P. 42. स्वमुक्तान्त्विण्यवने इत्या—The strict rule that one must lose one's life, when one loses the Linga given by the गुह as soon as one is born. That very Linga should be one's उपास्वेदता to the end of one's life. But one must not lose it. This strict rule was a little relaxed later, and permission was given to wear a new Linga ceremonially, when one came to lose one's first Linga; the verses quoted in the text bear this strict rule out.

In support of these the following verses from श्रीरहस्य (II-9) are to be noted:

यङ्गामादिते लख्च वाजजीवं तदेव हि।
नान्याङ्गिः भच्चनमत्थे बद्द म्याल्लिः तु पातस्ति।
याबजीवं तदेव स्थायु अन्यथा रौद्वें ब्रजेत्।
यङ्गिः सुचान दत्तं प्राणादितं तदेव हि।
सधेऽदं प्रमादेन देहं स्थाना शिरं ब्रजेत्।

Later on permission was given to wear another Linga in place of the one lost. The following verses from the same book in the same place are to be noted:

यदि नदेयत्रादित स्विगामयस्यार्थाविषि।
दीष्यपूवं प्रकतिन्य यदि स्विजय ताहं।

स्वमुक्तान्त्विण्यवने means अवांतरस्वाचारिणविण i.e. secondary दीष्य requisite for replacing the lost Linga. There is no restriction about the time (हुषुषु) for such an अवांतरस्वाचारिण, as is
necessary for the primary दीर्घ, which every one must have at a particular stage of life. This is also laid down in that very book in verses—

येव किष्णसंचालन दिनेष अखेलीयाव वः।
देवपालर्थ गुणाविवर्धन वेदम् दीर्घा प्रस्तुते। ॥
अयूर्वेदीवेदवर्धिने विशिष्टिश्च वै उदाहरणः।
बद्ववांतरदीर्घा वैत्तर्वैवर्त्त्वत्ते न संशयः।

This removal of restriction of इष्ठिति for अवांतरदीर्घा was necessary, as no body was allowed to taste food without the worship of Linga and before the food was first addressed to one's इष्ठिलिंग.

P. 42. नृव नारायणोऽरि भगवान्ति etc.—This contains the 2nd objection that भगवान्ति is also found used in apposition to नारायण, श्रेया and others. There is, thus, no special reason why भगवान्ति is to be identified with श्रविं औरि. The objection is a pertinent one. But the इष्ठिलिंग refutes the objection maintains his own standpoint in the next paragraph.

P. 43. इष्ठोत्त्वावति etc.—This is the refutation of the foregoing objection. Here the author proves in refutation of the objection stated above, that भगवान्ति must go with Shiva only and none else, for the simple reason that श्रविं (इष्ठिलिंग) alone is worshipped on the hand and no other deity, as borne out universally in custom. इष्ठि meant for पूजा of इष्ठिलिंग is the indication (the 2nd of six means of proof of विनियोगविवि, अयुति, लिङ्ग etc. as noted above) that भगवान्ति must mean श्रविं alone and no other deity. This is illustrated by the instance that इष्ठि alone becomes the instrument for अवांति of अवतारदास, तृत्व for that of आवज्य, and स्विचिति for that of नािति;
and no one of them can take the place of any other; because the 
abundance of 
abundance of either by hand or 
abundance is prima 
face ridiculous, but the 
abundance is best and most appropriate 
instrument for that purpose. In the case of the matter 
under consideration the 
churning of Linga on hand, is a clear indica-
tion that 
churning must go with 
churning or 
churning, because there 
is no custom of any other deity being worshipped on hand. 
This principle or 
principle, of particular instruments are meant 
for particular things, is established in 
principle "अर्थां द्वारा 
कल्पनाकल्पना" (पूर्वीमाइंसा I–4–30) in 20th 
अर्थां द्वारा 
कल्पनाकल्पना. This is lucidly 
explained by माधवाचार्य in his 
जैनमीयमाधवाचित्र as follows:— 
अर्थां द्वारा 
कल्पनाकल्पना.
P. 43. In this the author states another reason why भगवान must go with शिव only, namely, the word शिव in शिवामिर्द्वन्त: at the end of the second line proves beyond any doubt that भगवान must go with शिव (शिवप्रेमस्वाभावः). The author applies another पूर्वानुपासनायां viz श्रीश्रीकरणस्वाय, which is established in पूर्वमानवं (I-3-5 in सूत्रास 8-9-) as follows:

तेष्वदशान्त्रितस्य समा विशिष्टति: स्वाय। श्रीमस्य का तस्मिनस्वायः।
}

यथार्थमहाद्विक्षां श्रीयो ने वार्षेऽस्मायम्यतः।
}

दैर्घ्यधर्मस्वायाः हृदथावंशी विकलिताः।
}

यथार्थमहान्ति श्रीमत्त्वा प्रसिद्धदस्तु वचनयसी।
}

श्रीमयदमें तेनाधिविवेचनादि न ज्ञाते।
}

"यथवमाहस्वथवति " "बाराहि उपानहायुपयंचति " इति श्रूयते। तत्व यथवमाहं
}

मायों दैर्घ्योऽहुँ प्रसिद्धा वराहशर्त च सुके। स्मृतस्य यथवमाहं विशालयुः वराहशर्त
}

च कृष्णशस्त्रेन। तथा इति लेखनवहौँ निबित्तबेकें हृदार्शेपु यथवमेल्च्छरसमिद्वः।
}

समाननस्माहुदयविवचाराम्यते अवयथां विकलितेन हृदाबाथों इति श्राहं। श्रीमयदमावेषाय
}

श्रीश्रीकरणश्री: बलायसी प्रसादान्तवादविशिष्टपारंपर्यमात्ताच। शाके यथवमाहस्वथवादः
}

एवं श्रूयते—"यथार्थमहारूपयोऽपि ते अपिें इत्यादिति" इति। इत्योपस्य
}

विवाचलको अभिश्रीधर्मस्वायेकु सुधेरु कृपया न्य निश्चयण्यु: तेषां इत्यादिपरिवर्दपूर्व फद्यमात्ताच।
}

वराहोपाल्मध्यवाचदशेवमुर्वान्यति—"वराइ गावेष्टुवावति " इति।
}

ग्राममुदावाय दूसरे संभवै नतु कृष्णशस्त्रेन। तत्साधारणाम्यतिविवेचनादश्यायः। अन्तः
}

वार्तिकायः पीछाद्वारसाधाराः। तत्ते मेल्च्छा हस्तिनि प्रसिद्धते। आयौस्तु इति।
}

तत्साधारणाम्यतिविवेचनादश्यायः। मेल्च्छा हस्तिनि प्रसिद्धते। आयौस्तु इति।
}

The upshot of the discussion is that in the case of words of different senses that sense of a word is to be taken as authoritative, in which sense the word is used in the literature; and other senses of the word, in which it may be used by different sections or tribes should be rejected. The author applies this test or न्याय to the matter
under consideration and says शिव is used most generally in the sense of the deity of शिव-शंकर (and very rarely in another sense of मंगल). But चायणचार्य takes शिव in sense of मंगल (see his commentary quoted above).

P. 43. एवं हस्ताद्वैतिकाः etc.—Here the author says that अर्थावाद of शिव and that the अर्थावाद must ensure the विधि, (as the अर्थावाद must be in agreement with विधि). The एक्स्तत of अर्थावाद and विधि has been taken advantage of at the end of the second section. That there should be agreement or unity between अर्थावाद and विधि has been already established in a note on page 77 of notes.

P. 43. नन्दर्थि मितिवर्माशीतन्त्र हस्ताद्वैतिकाः शंक्त्वत् इत्यदि etc.—Here is another objection, which says that though the identity of hand with शिवलिंग is established, the hand here referred to is the right hand, that worships शिवलिंग installed on an altar and not the left hand, on which the इश्वरलिंग is placed for worship. The right hand is मितिवर्माशीतन्त्र; because it comes to be associated with शिव, while applying sandal paste etc., while that शिवलिंग is worshipped on the altar. The अर्थावाद, therefore, is the अर्थावाद of the right hand used for the worship शिव on an altar. Hence the conclusion of the मितिवर्माशीतन्त्र that the hymn enjoins the placing of Linga on the hand, the left hand, falls to the ground.

P. 43. बाणमर्कतलिंग etc. Here the author refers to the materials, of which the शिवलिंगas placed on altars are made. बाणमर्कलिंग mostly consists of quartz and are egg-shaped pebbles. They are described in the मितिवर्माशीतन्त्र of चित्रेचनचायणचार्य as—"the बाणमर्कलिंगas are liked by ईश्वर and may be in sizes ranging from
the 8th of an angula (inch) to one cubit. They may be of the colour of a ripe Jambu fruit, or honey, of a black beetle, or of the black torch-stone, or may be blue, deep-red, or green etc." (see Gopinathrao's *Hindu Iconography* Vol. 1 page 12). The other varieties of materials used for making Lingas are also stated there further (page 43, ibid) as—

"The materials recommended in the āgamas for the making of images are wood, stone, precious gems, metals, earth and also a combination of two or more of the aforesaid materials. The precious stones enumerated in the āgamas for the purpose of making images are sphatika (crystal), padmarāga, vajra (diamonds), vaidurya (cat’s eye), vidruma (coral), pushya, and ratna (ruby). Of these, sphatika is said to be of two kinds, the surya-kañta and the chandarakānta. Another authority adds brick, kadi-śarkara (a preparation, the chief ingredient of which is the lime-stone) and danta (ivory) to the materials noted above. Almost all the Dhruvaberas, that is, the images set up permanently in the central shrines of Indian temples, (Hindu, Baudha or Jaina), happen to be generally made of stone. There are a few instances of such principal images being made of wood."

But मरक्त, which is emaradd or a green precious stone (हिर्दियणे मरक्ते-अमरकोश), is not mentioned there, though other precious stones used for making Lingas like पद्मरण, वट्र, वेदूर्व, and र्नर are mentioned.

P. 43. चेच etc.—This contains the refutation of the objection above stated. In refutation the भिभासित्व says that इस्त cannot mean the right hand; because the right hand is
only occasionally associated with शिव as the means of worship. But the left hand, being in invariable and inseparable association with शिव, can be identified with शिव. The right hand, accordingly, remains a mortal hand; and things, as set forth by the अर्थवाद, cannot be attributed to it. शिव alone possesses that power or the left hand, identified with शिव, can be said to have been endowed with that power.

P. 43. सम्बन्धग्रंथविद्वादिकते etc.—The special qualities or attributes in intimate association with the possessor. The attributes, as set forth in the अर्थवाद, reside in शिवलिंग (or the left hand identified with शिवलिंग) in intimate connection; the attributes will only be असंबन्ध or आरोपित on the right hand being not identified with शिव. It would, therefore, be in the fitness of matters to say that the हस्त means the left hand and not the right hand.

P. 43. अत एव etc.—This is an illustration of how सौम (in the hymn सौम: जिन्ता जीतीना etc.) is to be interpreted as शिव (उमगः सहितः); because the plant सौम being inanimate cannot be said to have the power of being the producer of things mentioned in the hymn. Similarly here the right hand (unidentified with शिव) cannot have that power. It is, therefore, unavoidable that हस्त should mean the left hand. It is to be noted that this very hymn is quoted in illustration in similar connection on page 32 of the text. (Please see note in that connection).

It might be said that the Linga is worship on the left hand only twice or thrice a day, and as such it is in association with it only occasionally like the right hand. But the Linga having been worn on the body always
without a moment's separation, it is in intimate association with the left hand. Hence the logic of the Linga being identified with the left hand. This very thing has been stated in the para “पूजनार्योत्तु etc.” on the next page.

P. 44. किंच etc.—Here the author points out that if the right hand deserves the अर्थवाद, even though it is in occasional association with लिंग, the left hand being in invariable association with the Linga has superior claims for the praise contained in the अर्थवाद. This is by कैमुतिकन्त्रय (also made use of twice in this section later). The कैमुतिकन्त्रय is a maxim of “how much more,” an argument a fortiori (derived from किंच—how much more). This न्याय is identified with दंडापूर्ण्याय by पंडितालिबुद्धमार, who remarks about it as follows:

कैमुतिकन्त्रयेवेति दंडापूर्ण्यायेति। ततसार्थः हृत्युष्ण दृष्टि भक्षितः
तेनाऽपि किंचत मक्षयां न एक्षेत्। दंडकर्त्त्रेन अर्थवान्धे न भक्ष्यत: इति भवान।
एवमिदापि इस्तव सिवलिंगपूज्याः द्रवणलोकान्त्रय सन्नविधान्त्राः। स्वेता सिवा
लिंगासंविधारी शिवलिंगप्रार्थिविभव्येवेति भवः। बुत् दंडापूर्ण्याय इस्प्रायत
किंचत योज्याः। इति साहित्यमुद्र्मण X as, मृणकोषेण दृष्टि भक्षित इक्ष्येन
तस्मात् रितिमुद्र्मणस्वर्णस्वर्णदुःखायां भवती नियमा कमान्यायां अर्थार्थान्तप्रतीति
न्यायः दंडापूर्ण्यायः। बुत् योज्याः। इति साहित्यमुद्र्मण X as, मृणकोषेण दृष्टि भक्षित
इक्ष्येन

P. 44. न चासनमेत्योत्तु etc.—Here the objecter objects that that the right hand is preferable to the left hand, which being used for the dirty work of the body comes to be dirty and therefore vile. The right hand should, therefore preferred. But the विस्मित्त्र rules it out on account of the left hand being already proved to be as good for holy worship as the right hand. This has been discussed well
about the end of the second section (see page 83 of notes). The author produces here an authority of शंकरसंहिता that the शिवलिंग should be worshipped on the left hand, which proves, the author means, that the पुराण cannot be expected to lay down the use of the left hand for worship, unless it were worthy of it.

P. 44. नतु शाबासेदन etc.—Here is the objection that the injunction has been already obtained by the hymn—पवित्रं ते वितंतं etc., belonging to यज्ञवेद, though the injunction by the Yajurvedic texts may be ruled out as is done already. This objection is beyond being ruled out (इष्ठाः), says the objecter. But it is refuted by what follows next.

P. 44. पवित्रभिति मंत्रेण etc.—This contains the refutation of the last objection. Herein the शिवलिंग, says that the hymn—पवित्रं ते वितं etc.—lays down the wearing of Linga in general. But the present one specifies the place where it is to be worn, namely, हस्त that becomes the अधिकरण of the Linga. Hence the two मंत्रास are related to each other as उपजीवक and the उपजीवन. The objection, therefore, of अन्यथासिद्धत्व of the injunction by this मंत्र falls to the ground.

P. 44. पूजाराबीद्व तथा etc.—This contains the justification of how the left hand as an altar for the worship of Linga is so intimately associated with शिवलिंग. This has been noted above already. The use of the right hand for the worship of शिवलिंग installed on an altar cannot be said to be so associated.
P. 45. अहं सिंगाधारणमार्गायत्मग्नि etc.—Here the author proves that not only the two hands (left hand used as the पीठ of इश्वरिङ्ग and the right hand used to perform the worship of the इश्वरिङ्ग) but the whole of the body is devoted to the worship of the Linga, i.e. the whole of the body is dedicated to शिव and his worship. The author here refers to the nine चक्र स or nerve-centres being the seats of the nine Lingas (the main three divisions or modifications, शाचार्लिङ्ग, श्राणालिङ्ग, and इश्वरिङ्ग, and their further six sub-divisions or modifications, namely, शाचार्लिङ्ग, गुड़लिङ्ग, शिवलिङ्ग, वरलिङ्ग, प्रसादलिङ्ग, and महालिङ्ग). The शिवपूजा and the शिवधान in the Yogic way makes the whole body subservient to God शिव. It is thus that the whole body is dedicated to शिव through his पूजा.

P. 44. नवचारित इत्यस्य etc.—Here is the last objection advanced by the objecter against the सिद्धांतितिर. The objecter interprets अभित्र as सर्वभागायवच्छेदेन, i.e. all-round contact of the hand with the Linga. This is as much possible for the right hand as for the left. Hence the hymn, says the objecter, refers to or lays down the worship of शिवलिङ्ग by the right hand, शिव placed on an altar and not on the left hand. But this objection the सिद्धांतितितिर refutes by interpreting अभित्र as सर्वागामित्वच्छेदेन and सर्वदेवेशेन (सर्वभागायवच्छेदेन). The objecter's interpretation, says the सिद्धांतितितितिर, falls short of सर्वागामित्व. Hence it is to be rejected in preference to the placing of Linga on the left hand, i.e. the wearing of Linga on the body.

This paragraph further contains the explanation of the last line in continuation of the explanation of other lines given elsewhere previously.
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P. 45. तथा च दक्षिणाहस्तय...स्तुतिश्रमपञ्चते—This contains the explanation of how the लिंगपूजा worn on the body is सार्वभाविक. And the left hand as the पीठ for लिंगपूजा can be so highly praised.

P. 45. शर्वदा...कैमुकितन्यायसिद्धम्—Here the सिद्धान्त states that लिंगधारण to the end of one’s life brings about अतिमंगल of the devotee with शिव, because शर्वाधिकार संबंध leads to शिवस्वरूप or लिंगंगसामस्य or complete अतिमंगल of अंग (the individual) with लिंग (the पशुपति or पशुपन्त). But it is to be understood that mere लिंगधारण will not be able to accomplish this. लिंगधारण and लिंगपूजा in the proper from and spirit all through life will do this for the devotee.

The following verses from पंडिताराध्यचरित (Sanskrit) by युज्याज are to be noted in support of the author’s interpretation of the hymn:

अर्थम् में हस्तोऽभगवान्य ं में भगवतारः |
अर्थ में विश्रामेष्यो अर्थं विश्रामिकानानं: || 1 ||
इति न्यायविन्यासानि सन्ति ह्यतानि यानि हि ।
अर्थ माता अर्थं पिता अर्थं जीवाङ्गकामकान || 2 ||
इद्यं तत्र प्रसर्वं सुन्सन्याति निरहित ।
इत्यानि तद्यथानि सन्ति वाक्यानि यानिः हि ॥ 3 ॥
तेस्सुम्ब यीयाहियाय: कथ्यते विज्ञधारणम् ।
कल्याणिकोनिपिन्यं मुखिकामिरिति स्फुटम् || 4 ||
दाक्ष्यानामध्य एतयं कथ्यते दाक्ष्यकामम् |
अर्थम् में हस्तो भगवानं सम कराहुमः: || 5 ||
भगवानुपुस्य ऐश्वर्यर्वादिपपुपपुपपपः ।
ऐश्वर्यं समाभ्यं वीर्यस्य बलसाधितं: || 6 ||
शालभरणोद्वैतेषं भण्यं भग हस्तरितता।
इस्युक्तम् भगवानं श्रीयाचर्यांशविविधां: || 7 ||
उद्धवते सन्ति। ते यस्य भगवाणंसदि कथ्यते।
ततो वि सभवानु श्रीकृष्णा भगवत्तर इवपि || 8 ||
After giving the corroborative verses in support of the discussion and conclusion, the author proceeds to prove in this remaining portion of the section the वाचासिंगवारण on the ground, namely, the comparison of निम्नवारण of मस्त with लिङ्गवारण. He first states that it is as sinful to revile मस्त as it is to revile शिव. The verse quoted in the beginning is taken from बुद्धावालोपिशिब्र (page 113 of Shaivopanishads), where it is plainly stated that it is as sinful to revile at मस्तवारण
as it is to do so शिव. It is established by means of this that भस्मधारण is important religiously, as a religious practice. In the second line of the verse it is also plainly stated that शिवलिंगधारण of भस्म is as great and important as लिंगधारण is as a religious practice. शिवलिंगधारण thus becomes the उपमान and लिंगधारण the उपमान. The word धारणि does not exactly lay down the लिंगधारण, but merely states that शिवलिंगधारण is tantamount to लिंगधारण. The author means that there is an implication of शिवलिंगधारण as the उपमान of शिवलिंगधारण. In other words the author says that शिवलिंगधारण as the उपमान must be an established fact. The implication may well be taken as an injunction to wear Linga on body (in combination with other statements of शिवलिंगधारण). Hence he says “इति जावलेपनिषद्धाक्यमपि तद्विषयं सवति—तद्भवालिङ्गधारणाविषयं सवति.”

P. 46. तत् हि—These words state that the verses that follow next are in that उपनिषद्. There must be some mistake here; because these verses are not found in that उपनिषद्, but in शिवपुराण.

P. 46. लिंगधारणकं नाम अतं etc.—This verse, plainly laying down the wearing Linga on the body, is given here to strengthen the assertion that लिंगधारण is the उपमान, as an established fact to strengthen the statement contained in the verse quoted after अपि च, and also to show that लिंगधारण is productive of मुक्ति, which मुक्ति becomes the ground of comparison or common quality of लिंगधारण and भस्मधारण.

P. 46. दशोचिना गौतमेन etc.—This verse is found in बस्मपुराण, chap. II. The दशोचिनाप and गौतमशाप have been described in चौवेणक्षावधृपिश्याधिक्षिष्कारण as follows:—भो चेष्ट महामायेनस्यचित्तविरोधिताया आद्राणानो द्वाराच्छवसंयो दशोचित्वम्: चापविष्य: शृवताम्। आदिमधुपरणेः—
एक एवेति यो रक्षा सर्वसंबेद गच्छते |
तस्य प्रसषादेष्यन भविष्यति सावधी।
सर्वांसातकालाभिभाति भवाद्यानोपयोगः।
हृ इत्युच्यते मयैः सर्वैपरं प्रसूच्यते॥
तस्मात् एव देवानामाधिकंश्नेयः।
इत्यते सर्वयेषु कथं दक्ष न दुस्यते॥
गद्य सार्वको विश्वसति अधिष्ठितं च तथा।
भवायनमया तथा पदायं निर्भयं॥
एतेऽव भाषणः सर्वं च विधितं सदेश्यरम्।
भवति येद्वार्तेः प्राप्तप्रहचेतयः॥
पार्षदानाधिनं च निर्गणाधिनं॥
कलै युगे तु संवासस दुश्मनः व्रद्धयाचकः॥
इति शाप्तव च यथो विश्रान्दधीचुनितुनिपुलः॥

कृत्वान् येद्वेद व्याक्षे शास्त्रो द्वीपचेष्य हितोऽपि।
भविष्यति कलौ सत्या: परिधानः: प्रयत्नः॥

गीतमाशापविष्ठिः।—विश्वादिदेहतः। सर्वं विविधः। तन्नोऽविष्ठः।
आत्मानाशनसंप्त्याः सर्वे ग्रंथः ग्रंथाः॥
वच्छलद द्विधवाच कः तत्त्वारे इच्छतु।
भवेत् विसुला युवं च संवासं ग्राह्याणामः॥
वत्तस्वात्मप्राध्यवेदीश्वरविशिष्ठिनः।
भवेत् अद्रव्यः साधं वल्लट्ट ग्राह्याणामः॥
पांचारां न कायः तथा कायः अनुवेदिपभिः।
शाणि च दीर्घिता युवं भवेत् ग्राह्याणामः॥
वेदवाहकः तत्त्वेदु पांचाराग्राहितु द्विजः।
भवेत् दीर्घिता युवं युम्भारं वंशजालस्य॥
वहुन्त्वेदशि किम् सार्वाविचे संवासमोचेत्।
तस्याविविष्ठु सर्वं श्रुतिस्मृतिरुद्धे च्॥
युम्भारं वंशजालानं युम्भारं च तथेऽव च॥
अद्रव्यावासस्यवाणु सापस्त्रीत्र: कतोऽस्य॥
This maintains the similarity of भस्माघारण with लिहियागारण, in as much भस्माघारण like लिहियागारण is productive of मीत्व, as stated in ब्रह्मावलाभमिनिष्टत and भस्मजाभावेप-निष्ठन. The former says—ेव चैत्तनिष्ठ भस्म सद्वापां निक्षतेदद्। मीत्व द्वातिते हित कालानिर्रुद। This भोक्तावादक्तव is the common quality of both भस्माघारण and लिहियागारण. The author thus proves there is उपमांशकार here.

तत्र साहस्य नाम etc.—This is the definition of साहस्य, which is so defined by विश्वनाथ in सिद्धांतमुकाबलि (page 59, निम्नवसागर edition), where he says—साहस्यमपि न पदार्थांवर किंतू तस्मानां तस्मान तदन्तमृतोत्तमवत्वमिः। यथा चैंद्रिकावले सति चैंद्रिकातलाह्दाविवेचव नुवे चैंद्रिकाभ्यासमृ। the author applies this test of साहस्य and says that भस्माघारण answers this test, in words—लिहियागारणमित्रले सति तदन्तमृतोत्तमविवेचवच्यमृ।

P. 46. साहस्यां प्रतियोगाधिकारणांमयं अभावो हि निलयते—अभाव (negation) is known from the knowledge of the प्रतियोगि (भाव, the counterpart or opposite of अभाव) and अधिकारण or the place, where the thing (negated) is said to be non-existing. "The simplest definition of अभाव is साहसक, what is distinct from existing things, but other definitions are more elaborate. सिद्धांतचर्चादय, a commentary on तंत्रदीपिका, defines अभावम् as प्रतिभौगिन्यानाचार्यविषयत्, that is, a पदार्थ, the knowledge of which is dependant on the knowledge of its contradictory. The नैयायिकाः hold that अभाव is an object of direct perception and is connected with its अधिकारण by the relation called विश्वेषणता; that is when we say चटाभाववदूतलम् we regard चटाभाव as an attribute of सूतक, just as we call देव the attribute of देवी।" (see Athalye’s तत्कृतसंग्रह page 101). Thus both प्रतियोगि and अधिकारण come to be the elements for the knowledge of अभाव. Both of these must be well known
to make the knowledge of अभाव clear. In the same way उपमान or the standard of comparison is the प्रतियोगिता of उपमेय, the object of comparison. The उपमान, in अश्लेष्याख्य, must be well known; then and then alone it becomes the standard of comparison. The author here says that because भस्मधारण is compared with लिङ्गधारण, the latter must be well known and must be an established fact as the means of सुचि. This established fact leads to the conclusion that there must as injunction of वाहिनिधोधरण.

P. 46. न च etc. This contains an objection to the conclusion that उपमानत्व of लिङ्गधारण led to an injunction of लिङ्गधारण. But, says the objecter, that there must be इव for expressing comparison. And as there is no इव in the verse containing the comparison of भस्मधारण and लिङ्गधारण, the conclusion is faulty and, therefore, wrong. The निदेशनि मेष this objection by saying that इव is implied or understood here, as it is in the sentence वाक्पद्वते वृहस्पति, which means वाक्पद्वते वृहस्पतिरिव. In the same way इव is to be understood in the verse which contains the comparison of भस्मधारण with लिङ्गधारण.

P. 46. बहि द्वारा द्वारा अलंकारोंवात्र स्वतः etc.—After establishing the लिङ्गधारण by means of उपमानत्वकार, the author now proceeds to do the same by means of द्वारा अलंकार, contained in the second line of the verse quoted already, namely, (भस्म) धार्यनित्त इव वे सकल्या धार्यनित तत्वेव ते। द्वारा अलंकार is defined in कृद्दश्चायंद्र of अपस्यवेयित्तित as—चेष्टीश्च्चतेष्ठिविभवित्वद्वारा द्वारानस्तद्वेष्ठिति। The same has been given here by the author. An instance of द्वारा अलंकार has been given there (in कृद्दश्चायंद्र) viz. तत्वेव कार्तिमान् राजान् विदेहश्च इव—कार्तिमान्। the explanation of the अलंकार has been given there as follows:—यद्नामाननोपेयकालक्योरितिचायेच धम्भिं विनियादितिविचमावेच 'नित्यिष्ठी
In the same way, the author means, that in the two sentences of the second line, namely, (1) ये (सर्व) मथा धार्यन्ति ते तमेव (शिवलिङ्ग-स्थलिविभव) धार्यन्ति, there is विवधातिविभवमाव्. शिराधाराणवाक्य is the उपमानववाक्य and मस्तधाराणवाक्य is the उपमेयववाक्य. The former is the विव, of which मस्तधाराणवाक्य is the प्रतिविव. It does not matter, according to the author, that the two sentences are not put exactly in the form required of द्वातालंकार. The author, therefore, concludes by saying—तस्यापि भेदगतिलेष्वन प्रतियोगिनिविधया शिराधाराणप्रसिद्धिरात्रक्षमः and proves that शिराधारण as the विव must be an established fact and there must be an injunction behind it to wear लिंग on the body; for attaining मोह.

P. 47. नमेतावतापि etc.—Here is the very last objection against बायालिविभव. The objecter says even though the शिराधारण is granted on the ground of उपमा and द्वातंत as already proved in the foregoing, it is the अन्तरिशिलवारण and not विविशिलवारण. The author as शिवलिङ्ग रिवतु it by saying that if मस्तधारण is the उपमेय or प्रतिविव and शिराधारण is the उपमान or विव, it follows that there must another element of similarity in both, namely, बायालिवणतम्, in as much as मस्तधारण is obviously a thing worn or applied externally on the body and can never be so done internally. मस्तधारण, the उपमेय, being an external thing, शिराधारण, the उपमान, must be an external thing obviously and unavoidably. The author applies the dictum or test, यत्रदेव शून्यते बायक् ततादानवत्तिः, which, when expanded in explanation of the matter under consideration, will be as follows:—यदि वद मस्तधारणम् आय: बायक् शिराधारणाभिव शून्यते तत् मस्तधारणम् बायालिवणणविशभूति हस्त ताग्नक् शिराधारणाभिव बायालिवणणाभिव अवगम्यते। पंडितिविवकुमार puts this briefly as—अन्तरिशिलवारणमानाय प्रतियोगिनिविध्यं संजोशे नेत्र कदं शकयते इत्यादि सर्वाय इति।
The author expresses the same thing in his own words as—सर्वोत्तमाः वहः परराधार्याश्रेष्ठोपाधारणां भूताः तत्सत्त्वगिताकाशादृश्यवदिर सम्मते।

P. 47. एतत्समार्थक...तत्सिद्धः।—Here the author proves the समन्वयः बाह्यगच्छति on the authority of the extract of कालासिरस्वादिन्द्रपनिषतिः as follows—

सन्तुलकुमारः प्रायमस्य प्रत्रेक स्त्रियुद्धारणस्यः। शिष्य रेखा आचार्यात्—

P. 47. इत्यादिनि...कैमुनितकेःयायसिद्धम्। Here the author maintains that if the three stripes of भस्म applied on the forehead represent the three fires, the three constituent letters of the syllable त्रिते, the three गुणाः of भावा, the three वेदस (exclusive of अथवंदेः), the threefold manifest deity aspects of परमशिव, the threefold power of शिष्य’s activity, the three सत्त्वस (purificatory ablutions), and if the wearing of the three-striped भस्म leads to शिवसायुज्य, how much more is लिङ्गचारण to be preferred and how much more will लिङ्गचारण be conducive to शिवसायुज्य? The importance of लिङ्गचारण as a means of बोधि is, therefore, beyond description. It is no wonder then that लिङ्गचारण (बाह्यलिङ्गचारण) should be laid down by the वेदस.
In this section the author proceeds to establish the principle of wearing Linga on the body from its being a means of श्रवण or at-one-ment of वेद, जीव or the individual soul, with लिङ्ग, the प्रत्यक्ष or परिष्व. This at-one-ment is called विष्णुविवेक्य or लिङ्गाग्रामस्थ, which the author calls लिङ्गाग्रामस्थं. सामर्थ्य is a particular kind of संबंध or union, and may be called तात्त्वसंबंध; but there is difference between तात्त्वसंबंध and सामर्थ्य, which will be noted hereafter shortly. The two sentences establishing such a संबंध are लिङ्गाग्रामस्थं वोधक-वाक्यद्वय. The sentences that declare such oneness of the individual soul with the Highest soul or परमेश्वर are “तत्वबलि” and “काले ज्ञानसि”. These are Upanishadic sentences, and all schools of Vedanta philosophy base their doctrine of सुक्ति on these two sentences and interpret them in accordance with their idea of सुक्ति or सोह्र, the final beatitude. The Veerashaiva philosophers do the same in accordance with their doctrine or idea of सुक्ति or सोह्र. The doctrine of सुक्ति of Veerashaivism is peculiar to itself and forms a distinctive and distinguishing feature of the religion. This doctrine लिङ्गाग्रामस्थं or विष्णुविवेक्य. सामर्थ्य is derived from समस्थ, the mixture of two separate quantities of the same liquid. For instance a quantity of milk is divided into two separate quantities; and when the two separated quantities of milk are mixed there is सामर्थ्य of the two quantities. From the instance given it will be clear that for सामर्थ्य the mixture or union of two separate quantities of the same liquid or the same thing is necessary; but two quantities of two different liquids or things will not do. A quantity of milk may be mixed with a quantity of water and the mixture or union of milk and water may be seemingly indistinguisha-
ble but not really indistinguishable, i.e. there will be no complete at-one-ment of the two liquids. In such a mixture the quantity of water will lose itself into the quantity of milk and becomes one with milk. Here the nature of milk prevails and that of water is lost or destroyed. So also if a lump of salt is dissolved in water salt disappears and becomes one with water. Here is तात्त्विक but not सामरस्य. In the mixture of two different liquids or of some soluble salt with a liquid, there may be तात्त्विक but not सामरस्य, which is complete and indistinguishable at-one-ment. In the case of two different liquids, the nature of the liquid stronger and greater in quantity will prevail over the weaker and lesser in quantity. In the case of two different liquids of equal strength, the nature of that greater in quantity will prevail over that of the lesser in quantity. Hence in the mixture of two different liquids, one of the liquids has to lose its individuality and the mixture will be heterogeneous one. For really through and indistinguishable mixture or at-one-ment of liquids or things two separate quantities of the same liquid or thing are necessary. It is on this account that the author says on the next page नीरनीरसत्योगानुतः अविभाज्यस्यसौयोगः”. So also the commentator of शिवयोगप्रदीपिका says क्षीरश्वरसत्योगानुतः सामरस्यम् (see 3rd पदल).

From this analogy it will be clear that there will be सामरस्य of जीव or अंग, the individual soul with शिव or अंग, the परश्रमान, on account of their being innately one. It is the शक्ति of परश्रमान, the wonderful capability or inscrutable activity, that causes the परश्रमान to appear in the forms of of Lingas, the higher modifications of परश्रिव, and अंगास, the lower modifications of परश्रिव or परश्रमान. परश्रमान or परश्रिव could not remain tranquill or content in His unmodified from
and desired out of sportiveness or लिंग to assume the manifest form of the Universe. It is from this sportive desire of परशिव, His tranquilly is disturbed and His शक्ति begins to work and causes all higher and lower modifications of परब्रह्म and the Universe to arises out of him. The higher modification is लिंग or His उपास्य form and the lower modification is शंग or His उपासक form. So it is said in विवाहितमंजरी “एवं न विमर्शपरिब्रुंहितं श्रोचव स्वकीर्णार्थं लिंगव शिवशक्तिसदाशिव.........भौम इति पद्मिनिशतचार्थमा भिवते” and “एवंविश्वपरिपूर्णंश्रींतात्मकपरमशिवस्वय पुज्ञ-पुजकलिङ्गायां...इश्चविन्मुत्त्वयते....न्यूणायिकभवंस द द्विथा भिवते...तत्र...प्रविष्ट सुप्रागणकपशिचैतत्वनेव शंगसवर्णम सवर्णाय भवति...तत्विच न्यायभूतप्रकाश्यायां प्रविष्टिविव- चैतत्नेव अंगात्वम सवर्णाय भवति.”

His शक्ति also concurrently modifies herself along with परशिव correspondingly into कला and भक्ति. कला, the creative activity of परशिव goes or is associated with लिंग and भक्ति, the reunifying activity, goes with or is associated with शंग. The six modifications of Linga and the six corresponding modifications of Anga, associated with the corresponding modifications of शक्ति (as कला and भक्ति) form the basis of परशिव philosophy, on which are built the spiritual or religious practices for the sake of the (Veerashaiva) devotee that he may seek reunion or at-one-ment with परब्रह्म. The at-one-ment of the individual soul with परब्रह्म is यामार्थय.

भक्ति, which is only a form of शक्ति, enables the devotee to rise higher and higher gradually by stages by graded spiritual practices into ultimate at-one-ment with परशिव. शक्ति, the creative activity of परशिव, is अधोसूक्ती, in as much as it tends to the creation of the universe associated with the vale of miseries; and भक्ति is उच्चसूक्ती in as much it tends to the upliftment of the individual soul into thorough union.
or at-one-ment with परशिव by making him (जीव) free from मत्त्रय. Thus the doctrine of शुक्ल, as already remarked, is the distinctive and outstanding feature of the Lingayata religion. शास्त्र is also sometimes called साधुमुक्ति in the sense described heretofore. This short explanation and description of the doctrine of मोक्ष is all that is treated briefly in this section by the author; and it will be pretty clear when it is carefully read through.

The following भोक्तः from अजुभवतम may be read to understand well what is said above about धिन, अंग, शक्ति, and मुक्ति.

एकमेव परं जन्म सविदानंदवक्षणम् |
शिवतत्वं शिवाचारीं: स्थलमिक्षारुपादारात् II 1 ||
संवेषं स्थानमंतवापथमूत्तरततत्तत्: |
तत्त्वात् महदावीं मिला। लिखिष्यितत् II 2 ||
यज्ञावी लिखिष्यिते विलय प्राक्तं पैरेषं यतः: |
कौयं पुनर्स्थतेः च स्थलं तत्प्रच्छिते ततः: II 3 ||
स्थाकारं स्थानवाच्य लिखिष्यितेऽववाचः: |
तैयं: कारणमूत्त्वं यज्ञदेव स्थलमुव्यते II 4 ||
अभिष्ट्यानं समस्तस्य स्थानवर्ष्य च | |
जगतीं यज्ञरूपातत्वं तदैं वै स्थलमुव्यते II 5 ||
आऽधारं सर्वा वाचीं ज्योतिषामिलातमाः |
यत्तत्वं भवति यज्ञं: स्थलं तत्परिगमयते II 6 ||
आऽधारं सर्वं भूतानं भोक्तानं सर्वंपरां: |
यज्ञवेयत्वाम् जगा स्थलं तत्पाहुर्भि इति II 7 ||
परिनिर्णयिश्वानं यज्ञवेयत्वाम पदमु: |
तदहु: स्थलमित्तं शिवाचारावेयत्वाम्: II 8 ||
स्वरूपक्षामक्षारिणं स्थलं तद्वितिधं भवेतु: |
एकं धिनाध्वल्लो प्राकमन्यदशस्थः स्मृतमु: II 9 ||
स्मृतावेयथं शिवाचारावेयत्वाम् II 10 ||
महानं घटमेंद्रेऽवशुक्लां: प्रक्तितं: ||
भौतिकता यथा बैच स्थलें लिङ्गांगणितसः।
स्थलें नाम परं तत्त्वं शिवशब्दिसंबंधः॥ ११॥
उपास्योपासकतेन स्थायेव दिशाभवेत॥
लिङ्गमृगुपायं स्यांग्रंग्मुस्पाशसः॥ १२॥
उपास्यतं तथोपासकतं च परमशिवः।
अःच्युतत्मेण वित्तस्वचारात्मिनः॥ १३॥
स्वशालयं युगपत्त्वां भ्रात एव स्वर्यः कमात्।
नाधिवस्य शिवोपासतिष्ठते जनसंगोवितः॥ १४॥
शिवस्यैव शिवोपासिताः नामाभ्रुतस्वतः।
चिन्मात्रं परं विश्वास्यप्रृंखं स्वादिश्चक्रणं॥ १५॥
लिङ्गांगतत्वशिवात्मेनेनेव स्वर्यः स्थितः।
शिवलेनार्थगतः परं च चिन्मात्रमुद्यते॥ १६॥
लिङ्गलेनार्थगतः स्थालमात्रं तंत्वेत्।
स्थायं चिन्मात्रमेव स्वातिमं स्वाचित्वं एव इतः॥ १७॥
तथां गौरं एव स्वादित्वं शैवी परं स्थितः।
यथा स्यां दिशा मूर्तं तथा शक्तियिं महेत॥ १८॥
शक्ति प्रतिमा वाक्षाचित्वेऽन सहविभणी।
सद्धिन्द्र स्वसंपूर्णता निर्विभक्ता मेंधुरी॥ १९॥
सा शक्तियिं भूता स्वस्वतंत्रत्ववेदन हु।
समाने अर्धेण्निश्च विभण कार्यस्वलः॥ २०॥
लिङ्गमः काचित्ताचित्विंग्मस्वलोकसः।
लिङ्गमः काचित्ताचित्तथायं शक्तिः कार्यसः प्रकीर्तितः॥ २१॥
अःच्युताचित्तथायं शक्तिकेन्निद्रा भवापदः।
यथा वायुभासता विभण दीपिकाकारः॥ २२॥
तथा मेंधुरी शक्तिरिंब्रित्ता महक्षरिणी।
ज्ञाला तमस्विनी वस्मादीविरुक्ता इत्यक्षणी॥ २३॥
तमस्वेवास्याते शक्तिमिन्निर्विनवासना।
सविभिंशतः स्याः स्वस्विन्निद्रा भवसः॥ २४॥
सविभावन्द्रयुपा स्याः स्वस्विन्निद्रा।
शक्तिरिं श्वता शक्तिकेन्निद्रा हि सा सदा॥ २५॥
In order to understand how distinct is this doctrine of Brahma of the Veerashaiva religion is, it will be proper here to note the idea of Brahma of the different schools of philosophy as follows:

\[\text{अथ कादिर्योऽक्ष्यवतं ततोऽमरेण ढूढ़ेते—व्याक्तिकर्म सुध्यां भोग इति वार्षिकः। आत्मध्येऽवै भोग इति ब्रह्मवादिनोऽ मायामिकः। नित्यावालोक्यां भोग इति हते त्रेयः। कर्मक्रमस्य देवस्वरस्वार्थारण्यासावे ज्योति सत्तोष्यगमनं भोग इति जैनः। सर्वकृत्यविष्कार्तिरिक्षानां सर्वस्वाति अन्तः परमात्मायानां अस्तित्वार्थाते नागकृत्यवृद्धिषु परमात्माया भोग इति रामायाजीयः। अगन्तकृत्यवृद्धिषु परमात्मायाया भोग इति माधवः। परमेष्ठिप्रतिमोक्षं हते कुलीपालपुत्रः। विनिवासर्वतिरिति कैवः। पूर्णसामालकां हति व्यासरासमालवः। परदसेन देवस्वर्ये जीवनस्मृतिकेरेरे भोग इति रामेश्वरावः। अर्वेष्युतःके भोग इति नवेष्ठितः। आविकर्मेऽ पुनासनीविर्तिति नैयायिकः। नैयायिककेवलिनिन्त्व न तत्र केवल दु:खानिव:। कल्पितमेऽ भोग इति मोक्षलक्षणः। मुख्यतःक्षेत्राया परातुष्मकाया भाग्यपावाया वाचे दृश्यं भोग इति पाणिनियः। विद्याज्ञानः पुन: वृद्धस्य स्वरूपेण अवस्थानं भोग इति साहिबः। छत्रकरिक्षरत्वा भुजार्यादिनां स्वल्पलक्षमसः।
From this extract it will be clear how different are the ideas of मोक्ष of different schools of philosophy. Of these in the case of the Kashmere School of Shaiva philosophy, namely, श्रीशिवाशास्त्र, and the शांकर school of अद्वैत philosophy, there is the idea of सामरस्य। But these schools of philosophy do not term it सामरस्य, which is, therefore, a special term for मोक्ष according to the शांकर philosophy of the Veerashaiva or Lingayata religion. This religion and the school of philosophy is, therefore, the fourth aspect or school of Shaivism and Shaktivishistadwaitism.

सामरस्य is possible in the case of केवलद्वैत of Shankar school of philosophy. But except for this possibility there is a world of difference, as noted by शास्त्रीय मंत्रिय as follows:—

शास्त्रीय मंत्रिय also states the idea of सामरस्यमोक्ष in contrast with the idea of मोक्ष of other schools of philosophy as follows:—

ननु पद्मयेंतलज्ञानपरेक्ष्यस्वत्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधिकरणपरमेश्वरस्वाधि
From the two extracts given above in the idea of मेघ there is an element common to all Vedic schools of Indian philosophy, i.e. all schools exclusive of नायिक, बौद्ध, and जैन schools; it is either निरतिशय्युत or हुन्साभ. In the case of माध्य school मेघ consists in बालाक्ष्य and सामवथ in addition to
It will be in the fitness of matters here to say briefly how जीव or the individual soul will attain at-one-ment with शिव or परशुराम. The devotee has to undergo in the first instance the दीया ceremony of the three kinds. He is then taught by his गुरु the principles and practices of the religion. Thereafter he has got to perform the उपासना or worship of विष्णु दिन daily, which उपासना is अष्टहोपासना and not the अष्टकोपासना. He has to begin with the उपासना of श्रीवलिंग or the लिंग in its gross form, and then to advance step by step to the worship of आणालिंग, the vital Linga, and आचारलिंग the ideal Linga. अक्ष also rises into the higher forms, from श्रद्धा to नैष्ठिक form etc., corresponding to the higher forms of Linga and अंग in a particular stage. He has to offer to the Linga everything that he takes, not only the food but all things that he enjoys for personal comfort. This is विग्रहसमर्पण; and the things offered thus become the प्रसाद of the लिंग. When it is said that the devotee should begin with the उपासना of इल्लिंग and advance to the उपासना of other Lingas by stages, it does not mean that in the initial stage the devotee is to be concerned with इल्लिंग only, but it means that the devotee has to worship इल्लिंग or gross Linga, as the visible outward Linga, connected with Lingas located in the चक्रास internally in the body. इल्लिंग and its two modifications, आचारलिंग and गुस्तिंग, are themselves located in the चक्रास of the body, namely, आचारलिंग in the आचारचक्र and गुस्तिंग in स्बाधिलिंगचक्र. इल्लिंग is, therefore, only the visible
symbol of the inner corresponding Linga and its further twofold divisions or modifications. Even during the उपासना of इस्लिंग in the initial stage the devotee has to be conscious of other Lingas, प्राणिक्ष्य and साबलिंग and their further twofold modifications. During the advanced stages as well the devotee is not to lose sight of इस्लिंग but has to begin with इस्लिंग and proceed to the higher, which, during that higher stage, is a short affair. The devotee has to practise अन्ताभरण्यास or the eightfold protective fences all along. In the advanced stages some of the अन्ताभरण्यास, that are also symbolic, assume an ideal form. The devotee then has not to be very keen on outward symbols during the advanced stages. The devotee has also to observe all through life the पंचाचार्यास or fivefold code of conduct, namely, शिवाचार, लिंगाचार, छूटाचार, वणाचार, and वद्वाचार. All these are necessary for the devotee to reach at-one-ment with परमशिव. It is, therefore, said in शिवाद्वित्तदर्षण, page 3—अत्र अथ शास्त्रवेद्यश्चाभाष्यशिष्यसुप्रचाररुतिधर्मवामुनत्येवचनः। So also it is said in कियाचार, page 18—अस्मान्यक्ष्य वीर्येवास्तु पंचाचाराः वापरार्थश्च नैयतं संपादा “श्रीनेव विन्द्या वर्धु वाष्पेयेद्” श्रवण कर्षणानेक्ष्यसाधारणाय भोज इत्यादिकायं युग्मभोजविचार्य वास्तवसुपरमय इति तादं फलं च शास्त्रिकसिद्धश्चोपायः।

शिवाचार is the Veerashaiva’s attitude towards the deity that शिव, is the परमदेह; and he has not to worship any other deity. शिव, being the परमदेह, he has not to take any other deity, as परमदेह. He should maintain all through his life the idea of शिव as the only Godhead and deity to the exclusion of others. Whatever devotional acts he does, whatever devotional prayers he offers, and whatever devotional thoughts he thinks, they must be all about Shiva and none else. This is शिवाचार. लिंगाचार is the devotee’s
daily religious practices, prayers, and thoughts about Linga, as शिव’s appearance in all the forms of Linga, which are the basis of his religious and spiritual life. शिव is the highest deity and is निर्माण; but लिंग is his समृद्ध form and is the उपास्यदेवता of the devotee, to enable the devotee to offer his devotions to the निर्माणवत्ता, शिव, through this समृद्धदेवता, लिंग. This is विगाचार. सुखाचार is the devotee’s attitude of complete humility towards शिव and his forms of लिंग. So also he has to maintain the attitude of humility towards his गुण, who gives him all guidance in the spiritual life and practices, the जीव, who is शिव being a जीवसुख person, and the विवाहारास, the great and renowned devotees of शिव. He has to adopt the attitude of service towards all Veerashaivas, all human beings and the animal world. गणाचार is the devotee’s code of conduct towards the society and the community. He has to live well as a member of the community, strive for the upliftment, increase and service of the community. Lastly सदाचार is the code of devotee’s ethical or moral life in his behaviour as an honest and straightforward being. All these forms of पंचाचार or the code of conduct, religious and moral, are meant for the Veerashaivas all through their lives with the ultimate goal of attaining at-one-ment with परशिव, which at-one-ment in the technical language of the Veerashaiva religion is लिंगांगासांभरस्य or शिवजीविक्य. It may be noted that the author does not say anything about the अदानवारणास and पंचाचारास in the devotee’s religious life. But the brief description of these पंचाचारास has been given above, in order that the reader may understand how they are helpful to the devotee for his uniformly religious and moral life to attain the ultimate goal of शिवब्रह्म. Readers may be referred to the introduction for information about अदानवारणास,
P. 47. लिगांगसंवैचर्य...लिगाघारणसिद्धिनि:प्रलूबितूतू—This is the assertion of the र्मार्दितनि that लिगाघारण is beyond cavil on account of the लिगांगसंवैचर्य. By लिगांगसंवैचर्य the author means लिगांगसामरस्व or लिगाघारणविद्य, though he does not say so in so many words. But that he means so is clear from the words coming later, namely, “जीवितमेंद्रस्वपनालब्धि ..अविभाव्यसंयोगः” “तयोरिवभाव्ययोगः” on pages 48 and 49.

P. 47. नसू तत्त्वमसि...न लिगांगसंवैचर्यः।—Here is the objection advanced against the assertion of the र्मार्दितनि contained in the foregoing. The objection seems to come from a केवलार्दितनि of शंकर School, as may be gathered from the words “आविभाव्यप्रद्युनं तथा जीवः.” But शंकराचार्य never speaks of परमात्मा as परशिव, particularized as “नीक्रकंठचधेरश्रेष्ठतालाभावायुषयमाल्पकसंबितातिदिषयं गभिविषिः परमात्मिः.” He always speaks of परमात्मा as having only three positive attributes सत्त, चित्त, आनंद, and none else. The पृढंगास, in addition to सत्त, चित्त and आनंद, are always said to have been possessed by परशिव by all schools of Shaivas. The पृढंगास are mentioned in—

सम्बन्धतः तृतीयादिविधायः श्वतंततः मिथ्यम्हताः प्रति।
अनेतराभित्रत्वं विभाव्यविधिः प्रवाहुर्गानि महेश्वरस्व॥

Here it seems that the author refers to the doctrine of the school of महेश्वरस. The doctrine of मेघ, given last in the extract from विशोधवासदेवदिनि above, may be seen in this connection. There it is said “नीक्रकंठचधेरश्रेष्ठतानवल्लिहिः ” i.e. महेश्वरस.

P. 47. व्यक्तिकव्रेमणीत्—All schools of Vedanta philosophy resort to व्यक्तिकव्रेमणीत् of the two sentences (३यमाक्ष्य and अहि यमान्त्रिस्तम) on account of the व्यक्तिकव्रेमणीत्व being inapplicable to the statement contained in them. The following extract from वेदांतसार of चदान्त, a follower of शंकराचार्य's केवलार्दित यलिसोफ्रेय, may be noted.
“संस्कृतों वा शिशिरों वा बालकार्यों नात्र समन्वयं।
अस्त्रकालस्तेन वृक्षस्य बिद्या मतं” हृत।

अथ ग्रन्थां कोः प्रत्यभिन्नतिवाक्यं ज्ञात्वा अपि न ज्ञाते। तत्र हु
ग्रंथाप्रस्तुती। धारावेश्वर्मणकल्पः वाक्यस्यआदेशेन विद्यःविज्ञानकल्पः रूपपति:। पारे
विर्या तत्कथ्यं तिरुमल्लितीर्क्षणं युक्तं ज्ञात्वा अपि न ज्ञाते। अथ हु परीक्षणः विद्यः
वैत्तिककल्पं वाक्यायत्स्य भागमात्रं विचारार्थान्तरं परिज्ञानाल्क्षणं अनुकालोज्ञात्वा ज्ञातः न ज्ञाते।
न च ग्राम्ये स्वरूपशास्त्रमित्रमात्रज्ञातः स्वरूपस्य न ज्ञातः। तथा तद्वा वाक्यस्य परिज्ञानभावं बतादृश्यते
तथा तद्धार्क लघुमुख प्रत्येकस्य तथापि ज्ञातः कृतः ज्ञानम् न ज्ञातः दृष्टे वाचायम्। ततो तीर्थान्तरिक्षाशास्त्रमात्र तत्कथ्यं। श्रीमणोले
तद्यथा मतीतीती ज्ञातति ज्ञातति पुनर्वहनस्तपदान्तरं परिज्ञानाल्क्षणतीती लक्षणामात्राः।

अथ भोजक वार्तालालकाव्यद्वारं ज्ञात्वा अपि न सम्भवति। तत्र भोजपुणामनल
क्षणस्य वाक्यायत्स्य निद्धार्यारुपितथापितमात्रज्ञातः। तद्विग्रहार्थसङ्कल्पः सम्भवारुपक्षणस्य अथ हु न
परशुरामपरशुरामकीर्तिश्रीकैलकस्य वाक्यायत्स्य लक्षणितत्वां परिवर्त्यारुपितमात्रज्ञातः। न च तद्वा वाक्यमयः
वाक्यायत्स्य निद्धार्यारुपितमात्रज्ञातः। तथा तद्वा वाक्यस्य निद्धार्यारुपितमात्रज्ञातः।

तस्मात् भोजक संवर्णं देशनं हति वाचे तद्यथा तद्यथा तत्कालतकार्यविशेषद्वस्तु
क्षणस्य वाक्यायत्स्यां विनिवेश्यितकल्पितनिपुंसकार्यविशेषद्वस्तु
क्षणस्य वाक्यायत्स्यां विनिवेश्यितकल्पितनिपुंसकार्यविशेषद्वस्तु

अथ हु नादो श्रीस्वामीलखनवाचार्यां च वत्सं। एवमाचार्यायां श्रीस्वामीलखनवाचार्यां च
तत्कालतकार्यां साधारणविश्वासां बहुविचारितप्रतिकल्पितप्रति निवृत्तुपद्धतिकल्पितप्रति
मात्र सवर्णमात्र ज्ञातयति भायथविशेषद्वस्तुप्रति तद्यथा तद्यथा तत्कालतकार्यविशेषद्वस्तु
क्षणस्य वाक्यायत्स्यां विनिवेश्यितकल्पितकार्यविशेषद्वस्तुक्षणस्य
क्षणस्य वाक्यायत्स्यां विनिवेश्यितकल्पितकार्यविशेषद्वस्तु
P. 47. अभिन्नाभिमनगतवान्ति et c.—Here the author says that the non-Veerashaivas have not been able to understand the meaning of संगमांगासारस्य or विवेकचक्र. He, therefore, proceeds to explain what is meant by it.

P. 48. इस्तमस्तकसंयोगस्प्लवधादिक्षया etc.—Here the author refers briefly to the three kinds of दीक्षा, वेशा, मन्त्र, and क्रिया. The three दीक्षा ceremonies are connected with the three primary modifications of ज्ञान, समाजांग, भोगांग and लाबांग.

The three primary ज्ञान have been explained by अनुभव-कृत पढ़िः—

शिव्योगसुखान्त्रि औरांगमिति कथयते ।
शिवेन तद्भोगि भोगांगमिति गोयते ।
संसारात्मितिंहरांगाः चाणांगमिति पढ़िते ॥

The three kinds of दीक्षा ceremony are meant for introducing the novice into the principles of ज्ञान by the explanation being given of the three primary ज्ञान. The meaning of दीक्षा, as given by अनुभवस्वादूत, is—

दीयते शिमान्तरः क्रीयते च मल्व्रम्र ।
दीयते क्रीयते वस्मान्त्रा वंद्यति निम्नातिष्ठते ॥
पाशानब्रह्मन्तरः च्छित्वा शिमां समाविष्ठते ।
कवरी शिवदीक्षा स्थायिया पाशानुमित्तचतुष्को ॥
The three दीक्षा ceremonies are explained in the same book as follows:

सा दीक्षा परम शैवी लिङ्ग भवति लिङ्गस्य
एका वैधानिका साक्षादन्या भमासितस्य मन्त्रासितस्य महता।
किञ्चित् भवति पशु क्रान्तिते एवं च लिङ्गभवते॥
इस्तम्भात्तस्यत्याचार्यते गायते॥
युक्तोदतिरिक्त च या सांस्कृतिक कथ्यते॥
शिष्यप्राणिते द्वादश या दीक्षा या किम्यथे॥

All these ceremonies are well treated in शिष्यप्राणिते द्वादश (pp. 86-88), particularly the last one, which readers may see for information.

The three दीक्षा are meant for the three primary अंगांस, (योगांग, ऋगांग and लामांग) that the devotee may worship the three corresponding लिङ्गस्य, beginning with his devotion to इत्यविंदि and advance by steps to higher लिङ्गस्य.

P. 48. लोकं गच्छति etc.—These contain the explanation of what is meant by लिङ्गस्य. The explanation given by अनुभवसूत्र of लिङ्गस्य will be elucidating as—

शिष्य एवं स्वर्य लिङ्गमिति लिङ्गस्य बैभवम्।
नान्यचिन्तार्थिर्क लिङ्ग तत्स्य हुजारिते च बैभवम्॥
क्षोभेऽ गम्यते गल्येन सब्रेन चरार्थम्।
तदेतांसिद्धानिकिः लिङ्गतत्वपरमेष्ठि॥
लघुस्तव्यग्नोहेतुर्मूलसाधवस्तवदेहिनाः॥
लिङ्गमित्युप्तस्य साक्षात्तिथृः सकलनित्क्षेत॥

P. 48. मायापशीवकलिङ्गस्य परमेवेदांशिखराहैव—Here माया means शिष्यs शक्ति in all her manifold and multifarious forms and not the माया of केवलमेवेद school. माया is called ब्रह्मामा, the शक्ति of परम्परावर्ग. शैविकमाया is well explained in मृणेश्वरम्, which readers may read for full information.
P. 48. अभिवित्ति etc.—These lines contain the explanation of अंग or the individual soul. The following धोक from अनुभवसूत्र may be read for understanding अंग better:—

अं भेदत्त्वमं शंका्तत् तत्तवायनम्।
अंगस्वलमिति श्राहुहस्तमतीविशाखः॥

P. 48. विद्वृहं देशदेवस्य etc.—This verse gives briefly some idea of पंञ्च and पशस्य, which imply पति. The three are invariably associated with one another and form the very essence of पंञ्चपप्त तत्व. These three are given very great prominence in प्रश्नविज्ञा system of Kashmere Shaivism, which is also called the शिख system or the system of the three, पति, पंञ्च and पशस्य. In other Shaiva systems the idea of the three is there; but they are not given as much prominence as in the Kashmere system. In corroboration of what is said above the following may be noted:—

श्रेष्णिकमेघु मुख्यं पतिपप्तपशस्य इति कमांतियम्।
तत्र पति: शिख उक्तः पशवो गणवो श्राहुहस्तमतीविशाखः पाशः॥

(महेश्वरद्वीप in सर्वदर्शनसंग्रह page 187, Oriental Sans. series)

विद्वृहु मतिमदमिन्द्रश्वेतवा बिशिष्टाः॥
पप्तपितामहोऽपि पंडिताध्यायिः॥

(सिद्धांतसिद्धांतमणि—part I, page 10).

P. 49. इतिकृष्णा...विज्ञानाति—This contains the explanation of how by पशस्य the innate oneness of अंग and शिख or जीवन and शिख is easily explained. But जीवन or individual souls come to be entangled with पशस्य and look so different from शिख. Hence the primary sense of तत्त and तत्त् being identical is impossible. And, therefore, the sentences तत्त्वमसि and
The author's explanation is very brief. The following extract from शिबाहेदमयमें will be found very elucidating.

(see शिबाहेदमयमें: pp. 51–57)
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This explanation may be compared with the explanation given above in the extract from बेदांवत्सार.

P. 49. यो क्रीबं पंक्तिसंहितायथैत्तत् et al.—The verses quoted from बंकरविहित treat of लिंग and अंग, their innate oneness, their at-one-ment, of how वाच्यार्थ is inapplicable and how क्रमयां is, therefore, to be resorted to to explain away the two sentences
declaring the oneness of जीव and शिव, and how जीव attains at-one-ment with शिव. In short the verses quoted support the standpoint of and the assertion made by the author.

P. 49. आशित्रेष्ठसदानन्दस्ततो नैव विलोकनेन—This is a difficult line. We have translated it as “If जीव, that is really शिव, is not शिव, then he will not look up for (i.e. never attain) at-one-ment. The construction is as—यदि जीवमा परमार्थत: सदानन्द: सत्य अविव: न शिव: चेत, ततो मौर्य नैव विलोकनेतः मौर्य न श्रावायत। दंडित्विशिवकृमां comments upon this as follows:—जीवात्मा चांगालपकः अविव: नैव सदानन्दस्ततो नैव विलोकनेत। अत: विलोकनेणिस्यन्तः कर्तृतर्विद्वक्ष्य चोदव्या। अधिगच्छति शाक्षर्थः स्मरति (it ought to be शाल्कर्थः) अहंचाति चेतिवत। अर्थ भाव: नक्षांगहह्यो जीव: अविविक्षेत्र विविधम: चेत, तदा जीवायम: आनंदरुपत्वा-भावात् मा न मूच द्वै (not quite clear) भुशातोरियांविविधाच्छेदमस्यसुचिव-तादेन: आनंदरुपत्तान: न द्वेषत्। द्वेषते तच्छायुत। यद्य नैव विलोकनेत न चेतिवेत्। ब्रजाभिच्छय जहत्वायतिर्ति तात्त्विकू। इदं न म परमानन्दस्मानं सामायमहणेन भवतितत् तात्त्वात् सर्वथा विवाक्षणो जीवात्मा। सौवारिकविविधाच्छेदपुश्तिपुस्थितः।

अभानेन वर्ष अभाने विषयं स्पृहा।
तस्मादभानेन अनापि प्रतिज्ञेन हुज्जाते॥
अधिनेनरथेनेच्छेदसुनाग्राध्यन्यात्वुदयुः॥ इत्यादि।

P. 50. सोऽविषयोपाधिको भूता भवन्यान्यात्वस्य—Here अविवा means माया (ignorance), the sixth of the thirty six तत्त्वाः (principles) of Shaiva philosophy. The fifth is विवा or छुइविवा; from this proceeds माया. This has been explained in चिन्नेतमंत्री as—अथैवविषयहुद्विवात्तत्वमेव अंदरसन्यायेन स्वातवानिषु मव-नक्षियान्यमुखु भविषु अन्नोत्तामविचिन्तनद्वैद्विद्वायां सत: मायातत्त्व भवति। From this माया proceed क्षा, विवा or छुइविवा, राग, काल, and विवाति, which are called पंचरुक्तां and which envelope the जीव and make him entangled with सवमाव (सवमावन्याचितः). The in-
dividual soul is, therefore, called the केघुकिन. The जीव is required to have recourse to मन्त्र as the उपासक of लिंग and attain a-ône-ment with शिव by उपासना.

P. 50. इवानी...तथावत्र प्रदर्शन—Here ought to begin the next section for proving the बाळ्डालिंगारण on the authority of स्मृतिः. But by some mistake, it seems, भंगालिंगारण of this section comes later. We have not interfered with the arrangement of the text, which is, therefore, printed as found in the three copies of the text consulted.

This section is intended to refute the second objection advanced against विंगारण, as stated in विषयावटार in words "न वा वेदसूत्रस्मृतिः राधाम्यतमम्। मन्त्रिकिल्लूर तंत्रापक्तत्वादतनात्। The author here vindicates the principle and creed of बाळ्डालिंगारण on the authority of स्मृतिः. It is however to be noted that many of the verses produced in authority from different स्मृतिः are not found in the available texts of those printed स्मृतिः, e.g. The verses शिवचानतो मूलं शिवालिंगांगान्युतः etc. (quoted on page 52) cannot be traced in the मद्वस्मृति in the three or four different printed editions of the स्मृति. It, therefore, seems that there must have been different editions or recensions of स्मृतिः in southern India. It has been already noted on page 62 of the notes that a verse from शातातपस्मृति “भस्मच्छन्न मस्तवायायायानीति तथा।” has been quoted by लिंगारणचंद्रिका on page 11 of the text; but the verse is not found in any printed text of the स्मृति. However महमास्कर quotes this very verse from शातातपस्मृति in the introductory portion of his commentary on श्रीमायाय. Similarly two verses produced by विंगारणचंद्रिका, (pp. 51, 52) one from वीरायणस्मृति, viz. कवीसुगमितृत्वं तथा etc. and the other from शातातपस्मृति, viz. वातास्त्र धोगिनं च etc. cannot be traced in these स्मृतिः. But these very verses from the same sources
have been quoted in स्मृतिचंद्रिका by देवनार (see आशोचलं page 187). Hence our remark that there must have been different recensions of स्मृतिः in south India.

It is not strange that there should be such different recensions or editions, when we find that two खोंककास found in मद्दृष्टि printed by निवंदनङ्गर, should not be found in the copy of मद्दृष्टि printed by वेंकेश्वर press, Bombay. The खोंककास are—

जन्मना जाते श्रृः: संस्कारिणी उच्चते।
विषया याति विशिष्टेऽनिष्ठे: खोंककास उच्चते॥
शास्त्र दलेन तीतेन स्वात्मायेन श्रृःतेन च।
एविभेदं दि वासिदेविलं स द्वित उच्चते॥

p. s. ब्रह्मजानाति श्राष्ट्र: is a variant of निष्ठे: खोंककास उच्चते।

P. 50. ततः तथात्वेऽवदन्ते—ततः विन्धितारणस्य (वेंकेश्वरमिति दक्षिणगौतम मनवादिस्मृतिचंद्रिकासनेन) तथात्वेऽऽनुनित्तलयं वदन्ते तद्रष्टे।

P.51. नात्र्य तथात्वेऽवदन्ते—This contains an objection to the statement made in the verse given above. The verse mentions six special characteristics of being a Brahmin. But, says the objecter, that there are many persons that are Brahmins but are not having these characteristics (क्रष्ण) e.g. माघ्यास and रामायास. The author refutes this objection by saying that the verse makes a statement about a particular section of आश्चर्यां and not all (varieties of) आश्चर्यां. By-the-bye it is to be noted that the opinion of the author विन्धितारिनिः आश्चर्याः i.e. विन्धितालिङ्गाः। This ambition of a section of Veerashaivas or Lingayatās, particularly the आश्चर्याः, to prove that Veerashaivas or Lingayatās are a kind or variety of आश्चर्याः, has given rise to a great deal of controversy and controversial literature about the nomenclature and has made confusion worst confounded, regarding the status of Lingayatās and their religion among the हिंदुस and their religion or religions.
Two instances have been given by the author of the restrictive nature of some injunctions, namely, 1(1) the injunction to perform the अश्रवण ceremony as being inapplicable to माध्यव्र Matthew, if it fell on an एकादशी day (2) the injunction to observe the महाशिवरात्र vigils as being inapplicable to रामांजनवास. Though the two injunctions are general still they are limited in operation. In the same way says the author, the भ्रामण्यस्वाग्न given by the verse is limited in its operation.

P. 51. नन्दवरमणि विगंगिवाध्माप्रेषेत्...तारंवीत्रद्यायां—Here the objecter rightly points out in objection that any person of any वर्ण (caste or community) can be a ब्राह्मण, if he possess the sixfold ब्राह्मण or characteristic of Brahmanism, as set forth in the verse (सुत्र संत्राथि इत्यादि). But the author refutes this objection by maintaining that word restricts the sixfold ब्राह्मण to ब्राह्मणs only. The author thus indirectly means that those, that are born as ब्राह्मणs or pass as such in the public, can be विगंगिवाध्माप्रेषेत. His attitude, thus, betrays itself as being very narrow and against the very broad-minded and broadbased spirit of the religion, which actuated the founder of the religion (the Lingayata religion) to level up all classes and give them equal opportunities to practise spiritual self-culture and attain realization of the Highest Self, i. e. विगंगिवाध्माप्रेषेतस्य. It may, therefore, be safely concluded that the author must have been an आश्रयव्राह्मण or some other ब्राह्मण, converted to Lingayatism, and that he lacked the real spirit of Lingayatism—विगंगिवाध्माप्रेषेत—prevailing the religion. Moreover the author's construction—ज्ञानवद्वेषते सति वेदविवर्णक्षचस्य—seems ultravires, as there is nothing in the verse to warrant such construction.
P. 52. तत्त्वेत्—तत्त्वेत् गौतमसूत्ती. This verse is better suited to refute the third objection stated in the विष्णुवतार, namely, याकलाजनाचरितावेत् etc., because it says that अक्ष्यवद्व और others wore Linga on their heads, i. e. there was the custom of wearing Linga on the body. And अक्ष्यवद्व और others being great persons, the wearing of Linga was a शिष्याचार.

P. 52. मनुसूत्ती तथा इत्यादि—In the passage (from मनुसूत्ती तथा इत्यादि the author proceeds to prove the wearing of Linga on the body on the ground that burial was prescribed for wearers of Linga, as known from the verses occurring in the very authoritative स्वात्तिं (मनुसूत्ती, वैधानसूत्ती and the शालात्तीमृती). The universal custom among the Veerasaivas of burying the dead bears this out, says the author. The whole of the 2nd part of शिष्याचारितमृत्तिं is devoted to establish this custom as being a Vedic injunction. The words शिष्याचारितमृत्तिं and शिष्याचारितमृत्तिं in the verses, taken from मनुसूत्ती and शालात्तीमृत्तिं, show that there must have been wearers of Linga in conformity with Vedic injunctions to wear it.

P. 53. नन्देवेत्—नन्देवेत् इत्यादि—Here there are two objections raised against the conclusion arrived at heretofore. (1) The first is that the wearing and worship of Linga on the body being an all time duty, it is to be worn and worshipped even by women in menses, when they are temporarily in a state of untonchability and when they are not even to be seen and talked with. That women should wear and worship Linga in such a state is quite an improper thing. (2) the second is that Linga, handled for worship in such a state of impurity, comes to be defiled, even after bath is taken by such women (women in menses).
P. 53. किंच…क्रमबित्र योजयम्—This contains the third objection against the principle and creed of wearing Linga established heretofore. The objection is based on the statements contained in the verses given. The words घूमिन, लिंगपारिणम्, घूमिनकित्, and लिंगिन, occurring in the verses show that the wearers of Linga are altogether an undesirable set and imply unmistakably that Linga is not to be worn at all. The author proceeds to refute these objections in order upto the end of this section.

P. 53. मैवं etc.—Before proceeding to refute the three objections noted above, the author first establishes the propriety and necessity of performing rites, which, he says, are imperative in spite of all actions and rites being condemned by some Vedic sentences like “न कर्मणा न प्रज्ञा रथेन etc.” (taken from नारायणपनिषत्); because there are other Vedic sentences like “सोमेन रथेत्” etc. that enjoin the performance of rites. In the same way, says the author, the wearing and worship of Linga is an imperative religious duty for the attainment of final beatitude on the authority of Vedic injunction discussed heretofore.

In connection with the ban put on all क्रम or rites and ritualism, the following from चक्षुपुरण, page 41 may be noted:—

उत्प्रयाप्तिमादिकमौऽः प्रज्ञा च रथेन च।
न कर्मेते ब्रह्मविवा लिंगिन शुनिसताम॥
वक्तव्य समस्तकर्मणि मयं ते ब्रह्मवादिनः ॥
प्रासा पुरुषेषुमुनलं तु विवधानपरश्यणः॥
These verses declare and establish that Linga-wearing women are not untouchable, as non-Linga-wearing women are. Here begins the refutation of the 1st objection. The Linga-wearing women being free from रज्ञसूक्तक, the wearing and worship of Linga during menses is beyond cavil and is unexceptionable. It is to be noted that the Veerashaivas or Lingayatatas, being अतिवर्णाभिमान्स, have not got to observe the पंचसूक्तकs or five kinds of impurity, namely, (1) जातिसूक्तक (2) जननसूक्तक (3) मरण-सूक्तक (4) रज्ञसूक्तक and (5) उचितसूक्तक. Moreover रज्ञसूक्तक is not to be observed by those that follow वर्णाश्रमम् (1) during the पैंडवसूक्तक, which lasts for a long time and also (2) during the marriage ceremony of a grown up girl, if the girl is in menses in the middle of the marriage ceremony; (3) so also no मरणसूक्तक is to be observed by Brahmins, when they are busy with performing a पैंडवसूक्तक. If the impurities are not to be observed by those that follow the वर्णाश्रमम्, it is no wonder, the author means, that the Veerashaivas being अतिवर्णाभिमान्स have not got to observe the impurities or सूक्तकs.

Regarding the inapplicability of रज्ञसूक्तक to a grown up girl during her marriage ceremony the author quotes in authority verses from चुलवैपर्यितांतम (on page 201) by हेमाद्रिभु (there is a manuscript copy of the work in the Oriental Library, Mysore). The following authorities may be noted in addition—

सृजितचैत्रिका—Vol. I, page 233—अन्न यज्ञपत्रं:—

विचाहि विताते तंत्रे होमकारे उपस्थिते।
क्रन्याया श्रद्धुरासख्चित्व कुःति तातिका:॥
स्नाययित्रा तु तां कथां अर्चणेत्रत्वा यथाबिष्टे।
झुंझान बाहुविरि हुवा तत्सत्सं अवत्ते॥
So also आपस्लवस्मृति says (आनंदाध्यम edition, page 40):—

classical language

In addition to these the following from स्त्रितचब्रिका (आसीनवंद, pages 66-67) regarding the avoidance of आशोच on all these occasions are to be noted:—

classical language

P. 55. तत्तत्त्वगतानादि etc.—Here the author states that विनायक and the दीप्ता ceremony being a life long तत्, the avoidance of सुतकास (including रजासूतक) becomes an exception all through life, i.e. the सुतकास are not to be observed by the Lingayatats (see words तत्तत्त्वावावथ etc. on page 56).

P. 56. अत एवाशृंचनिग्रहयादि etc.—The verses "सुतकासानन्द समारथ " etc. occur in श्रुतलिपितस्वति (a manuscript copy of which is in the Oriental Library, Mysore.) But in the colophon of the book it is said to have been written by श्रुतवर्द्धनमाधिन. It seems that the श्रुति must have written the book in the name of कीर्तिकारित्व.
P. 56. अन्नारंभे वर्णे युङे etc.—This verse occurs in अवनान-पुराण (as noted by विभासकौमुदी). This is also quoted in संस्कारमूख by नारायणनाथ.

P. 56. राजस्वादान्त धारणां यंत्रेजः etc.—Here the author states the difference of opinion about how far women in menses are to be considered pure and in regard to what duties. One set of thinkers hold that such women are pure and free to do all duties. While another set hold that they are to be considered pure and free to perform तित्तपूजा only.

P. 57. अन्यशासीरनिश्चितावनाये etc.—This is rather obscure. I have taken it as अन्नेन वर्णे निश्चितावनाये etc. and interpret it as—when some body spits on the body of another, the person so spat on is free to mutter मंत्रास only after gurgling water etc., but is not free to do any other holy rite without taking another bath.

P. 57. युङे etc.—In this paragraph the author refutes the 2nd objection that Linga worn on the body is made impure by its contact with a person in an impure condition. He says (in the sentence पूर्णादाहत...तथात्वं द्वापास्मः) that when the body itself is never polluted or made impure, there is no possibility of Linga being made impure.

P. 57. तथायथपुप्पेयं बदेन निश्चिताते—After stating in the way aforesaid the impossibility of Linga becoming impure, he takes up the objection for the sake of argument only, that Linga becomes impure and refutes it. He reduces the objection to twofold alternatives and asks (1) whether परिविच or परिवद्वाच, residing in the Linga, is made impure or (2) whether तित्त itself, the residence of परिविच, becomes impure: Both these possible alternatives are not tenable,
says the शिष्यांति. The first is untenable because परशव or परमाज्य is maintained by the Upanishads as being निष्कल, निरंजन etc. and is, therefore, above pollution. The second also is untenable, because Linga, the residence of परशव, is in intimate association with the परशव (the Being above pollution) and is, therefore, above pollution.

It is to be noted that all schools of philosophy hold that परमाज्य is निष्कल, निरंजन, etc. and above being affected in any way.

P. 57. यदि मन्ये किवादीशासये इत्या—Here is anticipated another possible objection, that might be raised, that Linga is consecrated by the गुरु at the time of the किवादीशा ceremony of a शिष्य. But the effects of consecration are destroyed by when the wearer enters a state of impurity.

In propriety such a question should not arise at all, when Linga is proved to be beyond pollution, i. e. above संस्कार of any kind or above being affected in any way. Still, it seems, this also is taken up for the sake of argument only.

P. 57. कृपारमणीशुष्पानमेंवालकुरोति—As impossible as the drinking of milk obtained from a female tortoise. कृपारमणी- दुर्ग is as much a myth as शास्त्रविश्लेषण or वैद्यापुर्ज. The objection, says the शिष्यांति, is as good as this.

P. 57. तथाहि इत्या—Here the शिष्यांति refutes the objection by saying that the consecration or संस्कार of Linga is as permanent as the अपूर्व arising from गुरु is performed. अपूर्व, according to मीमांसक, is the unseen merit produced by the sacrifices performed and attaches to the वज्रमान and his wife.
The अपूर्व of a person accumulates and takes the यज्ञमान and his wife to heaven after their death. If the अपूर्व says the विद्वान, remains in tact, in spite of any kind of impurity or सूतक, that might beset either the यज्ञमान or his wife, there is no reason why the consecration, which is similar to the अपूर्व, should be destroyed by any kind of impurity besetting the person wearing Linga.

P. 57. शचिरहस्यायिसंस्कारजनन—The permanent संस्कार, full of potentiality and arising (out of दीप्ता ceremony).

P. 57. यथे नापि नाशः कल्प्यते etc.—If the संस्कार from the दीप्ता ceremony is considered liable to be destroyed, अपूर्व should be similarly liable.

P. 57. गंगास्नान etc.—गंगास्नान or a bath in the holy river Ganges is considered to be productive of merit attaching to the person taking the bath. The merit is similar to the शिवसंस्कार. If the latter is considered liable to be destroyed, the merit arising from गंगास्नान is also liable to be destroyed. In such a case the injunctions to have a bath in a holy river would be meaningless; and the position of the followers of the Vedas would be similar to that of the followers of Buddha, who are heretics and have discarded all Vedic rites. The following श्रीका from स्मृतिवाच्यें are to be noted regarding the bath in the river Ganges, or a holy river or in any holy pond of water:

वैशालिने श्रीरक्षेत्र दुः तत्तत्त्वायं तत्पूजः
गंगातोत्तुतः स्नातवं सुचलतेः सर्वं किन्तुः
शिवलिम्ब भीते दुः वस्त्रश्रित्वेन
शिवशर्मस्तिति ततः तत्र स्नातवं दिवं श्रेष्ठत
जामहीस्नानमाणिः चोष्टहर्विलं अन्नेत

(see vol. II, page 321).
P. 58. किंच etc.—This is an instance of how food addressed to शिवलिंग becomes प्रवाह and is distributed among the devotees as the grace of God. Such प्रवाह is above impurity. If it is so, says the शिवालिंग, the शिवलिंग itself should be much more so, and there should be no dispute about it.

P. 58. न च स्थायरसः etc.—In this para the author shows the difference between the संस्कार of स्थायरसः and that of इश्लिंग. The former is temporary and liable to be destroyed at any time by any kind of impurity; while the latter is permanent, in as much as the इश्लिंग is to be worn on the body all the life and is to be worshipped at all times. In the case of स्थायरसः the संस्कार is not so. And that is why re-consecration of स्थायरसः is enjoined, when it comes to be defiled by the touch of an impure person, or animal etc.

पंक्ति शिवकुमार explains this finely as—

'वैष्णवविद्वानि' स्थायरसःक्रिणानििक्षणाविश्वासार्थः। स्थायरसः क्रिन्तिनि पूज्यताप्रथमो-ज्ञानसंस्कारेण प्रयुक्तार्थां कर्मयात्राविद्वादस्यांस्रूपैकै। दृश्यविद्वारितया न सभोते । वैष्णवविद्वानि तु एकपुष्पस्य व्याप्तिर्विद्वादस्यां धीरा काले पुरुषां किंतु दृश्यविद्वारितया विद्वादस्यां तदर्थसम्बन्धैः न तथा। शायरसःक्रिणां बाचाध्या अशक्तेनमंगिता न तादात्मसंस्कारस्य तेनित्यथेति मात्रयत्वकल्पनाविद्वानि

P. 58. यथार्थसः etc.—From यथार्थसः up to the end of this section the author goes on refuting the third objection based on the verses quoted on page 53 of the text. The objection becomes threefold, when analysed as—

(1) शैवाः and पाल्पताः are an undesirable religious set or sect and, therefore, they are to be avoided. (2) the food of लिंगिनस or लिंगपारिनस is not to be taken; their very sight
should be avoided. (3) The लिङ्गिन्, being पार्श्वास or heretics, are a fallen set of people and as such their association should be altogether avoided. This threefold objection goes to prove, says the objector, that Linga is not to be worn. The विन्मातिन् refutes this objection in all its three parts in order. But it is to be noted first that the author's refutation is based on the interpretation of the word लिङ्ग (in लिङ्गिन्, लिङ्गालारिन् etc.) as a portable image or प्रतिमा of a deity, made of metal, stone, or some other material and not as इड्लिंग worn on the body by Veerashaivas. He interprets लिङ्ग as लीलीने अर्थ गमयात्ित व्युरस्तः तस्येवतामिवलोक्यक्तानिविवानारामदिप्रतिमा (see page 59 of the text). That लिङ्ग means चिन्ह is evident from the following words of वंदनाविनय—

अमात्माधिन्य: केलिचिंगाक्तितस्मात्तमः |
केळित्तकः विश्वलं च देशम् च मुखद्वये ||
केळित्तकः विगतिक्षे हुदि शुरू तथापरे ||
केळित्तकः मुन महेशा हुदि नामी च लिङ्गः ||
एवं शेषाचिन्हानि भारविन्य समागातः || (page 17)

Similarly on page 62 it is said—प्रवर्: केष लिङ्गमूर्ति तस्य व्यासावस्थिते रचितय:। कौशिक: केन चिन्दिनकालिता तस्यः समुद्गामने विहारवस्ता भूर। अते व्यासावस सूढुद्वृद्धि परित्यय विन्यमिं लिङ्गेऽ लिङ्गः etc. So also लिङ्ग is used in the sense of चिन्ह in the book in various places. लिङ्गिन् or लिङ्गालारिन्, therefore, means any person that wears such a mark or चिन्ह or प्रतिमा of a deity and exhibits it for earning livelihood.

P. 58. तथा: शैवसंवेदिनः शैवः etc.—In refutation of the first part of the objection the author says that the verses refer to the शैवास and पार्श्वास, that wear भस्म and स्वर्णक्ष and are a kind of devotees of शिव. Here the वेलुक्षणपार्श्वास और
कालसुकृष्णशेवास seem to be referred to, who by there immoral practices and life had become a disgrace themselves and brought disgrace on the community. They have been well described in the शंकरविज्ञ and शंकरदिविज्ञ. Their devotional practices have been briefly given by the author in words—प्रदौष्टकाण्यििधिवंदनभमांदरणबायथायुः.

P. 58. आनंदसीप्यानां न यदू भविष्यति—The author brings भाष्यवैष्णवास in line with शैवास and पाठ्यपतास as an undesirable set on the authority of the word चक्रिन्द्र (a wearer of a disk-mark), occurring in the verses. But it is not possible to understand why he should all at once bring in भाष्यास leaving रामायजेन्द्रास, specially when we see that he refutes in a previous section the रामायजेन्द्रवैष्णवास only without referring to the भाष्यास, though both of these wear a disk-mark.

In connection with the शैवास and पाठ्यपतास, spoken of here, the brief discussion about such undesirable set of Shaivas as वाष्ठ, लाकुस, पाठ्यपत and भ्रातव is to be noted on pages 74 and 75. The religion of such people is considered to be मोहियाबाय्य.

P. 58. न चावयवशच्यया...इति वाच्यम—Here is the objection against the interpretation of शैवास as merely wearers of सम and स्त्राक्ष or some such kind of शैवास and not भीरेचैवास. The objector says that शैवास: means all Shaivas in general including the भीरेचैवास.

P. 58. विविष्ययाध्वाटकलिगिपदस्ततादद—The author refutes the preceding objection by saying that the words लिगिन्द्र and लिगिपदारित् etc. are mentioned in the verses specially and are intended to signify a different set of people. And if Veerashaivas are to be expressed they are to be expressed
by these special words and not by the word शैवास. Except for this there is no meaning in using the special words लिंगिन् etc. But the author immediately explains the word लिंगिन् to mean "a bearer of a mark or आतेमा of a deity" and thus proves that Veerashaivas are excluded from amongst the undesirable sets or sects of people to be avoided.

P. 58. न च...चकारबिरोधादि—The author further says that the word लिंगिन् is not a qualifying word of an individual शैव, belonging to a शैव sect; because there is the conjunctive particle च, that adds पाश्यपतास to शैवास. So also the word तथा at the end of the line brings together लिंगिन् and प्रतिन् with शैवास and पाश्यपतास. The conjunctions च and तथा add one set of people to another and none of them can be a qualifier of another.

P. 58. पाषांद्यमिदि etc.—The author defines and explains the word पाषां as meaning a लिंगिन्, on the authority of lexicons that state these words to be synonyms. लिंगिन् means, as explained immediately, a चिन्द्रादिरि or प्रतिमादिरिन् and not an इहलिंगादिरिन् or a Veerashaiva.

P. 59. आदियम् etc.—The verse, आदिमांबिरिकाविषेण गणनायं बहेश्वरम्।

is found in शंकरविजयम्, page 14 in तुलिय प्रकरण and enjoins the worship of the five deities in their प्रतिमास, as may be unmistakably known from the context.

P. 59. न च पाषांलिंगिनिदिः etc.—Here is the refutation of the argument that लिंगिन् means an इहलिंगादिरिन्, i.e. a Veerashaiva; because the author says that लिंग means a चिन्द्र and
not an इश्लिंग and लिंगिन् means a चिन्द्वाल्. Therefore, there
can be no relation of a qualifier and the qualified between
पाषंड and Linga. The author is at great pains to explain
away the word लिंगिन् or लिंगमधााङिन् as the bearer of लिंग or चिन्ह.
His explanation might find support in the information
and discussion contained in शंकरविज्ञ. It is undoubted that
during the times of शंकराचार्य all people bore marks (चिन्हाः)
of their Godhead to an excessive and revolting degree
without the spirit of real religion; and the great philosopher
had to carry on a campaign against the practice and dissuade
people from wearing the marks. But it is also undoubted
that later the Vaishnavas condemned the wearing of लिंग
(इश्लिंग), as the Veerashaivas did the wearing of a disk-mark.
There was thus mutual condemnation and vilification by
Vaishnavas and Veerashaivas, after the latter developed
into powerful rival religious community. Hence it is also
clear that लिंग might mean an इश्लिंग and a mark also. But the
author says no and strives his best to prove that लिंग means
a चिन्ह and not an इश्लिंग in all condemnatory sentences.

P. 59. पाषंड पतितं बालेः स्मातेरप्रेव—The author here fixes
up the meaning of पाषंड as the bearer of a mark (चिन्द्वधारी)
and says that it means a स्माते. By-the-bye he refutes the
2nd objection.

P. 59. “मुनेरक्षं न भोजनम्” इत्यादि etc.—Hereafter the
author refutes the 3rd objection that food from लिंगिन् (लिंगिना, i. e. इश्लिंगधारीं) should not be taken. He says in refutation
that it does not mean an इश्लिंगधारीं but a चिन्द्वधारीं; because
the list of persons, food offered by whom is banned as
unacceptable by मऊ, does not contain the person wearing
इश्लिंग on his body. It is, therefore, evident, he says, that
a लिंगि does not mean a Veerashaiva.
P. 59. कृत्यम् etc.—After refuting the objections the author maintains the soundness of the position of इद्दिन्द्राधारिन्द on the ground of the Vedic injunction to wear Linga on the body. Hence, he says, even if there be any सम्भवितिः and पुराणाः condemning Veerashaivas and इद्दिन्द्राधारिन्द, they are not an authority against the Vedas and they are to be disregarded. The सम्भवितिः and पुराणाः cannot stand opposition to Vedas, and much less establish any doctrine in contradiction to the Vedas. When the Vedas contradict a statement of a स्मृतिः or a पुराण, that statement is to be discarded as unauthoritative. If a statement of a स्मृतिः (or a पुराण) is not contradicted by a Vedic sentence, a Vedic statement to that effect may be presumed. स्मृतिः (or पुराणाः), therefore, are authoritative when they do not contradict Vedas. If they contradict, they are not only unauthoritative but are to be discarded wholly and solely. The शुद्धिताकल्प्यम् is established in पूर्वोद्दासौ, I-3-3, in सूत्रः—विरोधितनापेक्षाः स्मादिनिर्दुर्गमामः। The commentary of रमस्यबरदृशिः on the सूत्र well explains the सूत्र ब्रिन्तब्रिन्तप्रायं अनुप्रयोगव्यूहाय अनादात्रायेव कल्प्यशुद्धिप्रक्षेपया स्मादिनिर्दुर्गमाय° प्रवृत्तं वाधवार्तसमवादितं मथ:। विरोधितनापेक्षात् शुद्धितं कल्पकमुद्यामानं प्रवृत्तं।

It is said in जैतमस्मृतिः (quoted by स्मृतिचंद्रिका vol. I, page 16)—

श्लूतिमुखोपेक्षात् तु श्लूतिरं गरीयसि।
विरोधादिः सत्तम् कार्यं समाहं वैदिककर्मवः।
तथेऽव लोकनग्रं वाक्यं स्मृतिवाचात्परिशिष्टेऽि।

The author seems to be conscious that विनिमित् could well be construed as इद्दिन्द्राधारिन्द on the authority of various sentences condemning विनिमित्. Hence he seeks the shelter of श्लूतिः to silence the objector. On the whole the author does not
seem to have succeeded in establishing the creed of wearing Linga on the body on the authority of स्थूलतिस and पुरुणस, on account of numerous contradictory statements therein.

P. 59. भ्रातार्थि etc.—Here the author establishes the creed of wearing Linga on the authority of the statements contained in भ्रातार्थि. In the verses quoted there are words "किंगान भ्रातार्थि" "किंगाना," which, the author says, establish the wearing of Linga. But it is not known if किंग here means इत्यदियत्व exactly. Some explain किंग as आध्यात्मिदिल्लु, as कुष्टकांत does in his commentary on मनुस्मृति. He explains "अत्याध्यात्मिदिल्लु यो कथितपण्योकासि" as—यो भ्रातार्थि ज्ञातिः श्रुतिः श्रुतिः श्रुतिः श्रुतिः (see page 167 of मनुस्मृति, वेंकटेश्वर प्रेस, Bombay). However many Veerashaiva authors set store by these verses of भ्रातार्थि and say there were इत्यदियत्वाधिकारिन्स in the times of भ्रातार्थि. They thus try to date back किंगायार्थि to long past. It is no wonder that they should do so, when they trace the injunction to wear Linga in the Vedic and Upanishadic sentences, which have been so elaborately discussed in previous sections.

P. 60. परंतु...इत्यदि पूर्ववाच्यव्यथम्—In this passage the author attempts to prove that the undesirability attached to those persons that were fickle and deserted one deity for another for the sake of livelihood and exchanged विन्यास accordingly. Such deserters were किंग, because there was no sincerity and fixity of devotion in them for want of principles. Such people alone are meant to be excommunicated and avoided. On the whole that author takes किंग to mean विन्यास and not the इत्यदियत्व worn by the Veerashaivas and says that whenever a किंग is condemned as an undesirable person and to be altogether avoided, it means विन्यासार्थि.
P. 61. कुम्भकरत्नगद्य: etc.—The first five verses quoted are the well known verses from वीरशाव. These also occur in other आगमां also and are always quoted in authority by Veerashaiva writers. They give the gradation in the scale of living creatures on the criterion of intelligence and sense or understanding. The gradation from the lowest to the highest is as follows:—(1) कुमिष्ठ, कुम्भकरत्नसंग, the insects or small living beings, little gnats, moths etc., other various similar creatures and birds. This class includes all स्वीदीस्त and अंडीस्त, out of the four classes of creatures, according to Hindu philosophy. The four classes of beings are (a) वक्षिः, or sprouts springing from the earth, that is, plant life or vegetation in general. The list omits plant life in general from living creatures. Vegetation, therefore, seems to have been excluded from living intelligent creatures. (b) स्वीदिः or those spring from atmosphere (warm vapour or sweat). (c) अंडिः or the creatures coming of out eggs or oviparous. (d) जनायक or born of foetus alive i. e. viviparous animals.

(II) All viviparous animals excluding human beings.

(III) Human beings.

(IV) द्विजाः or twice-born. The persons that, after physical birth, enter spiritual life along with the life of intellectual culture after the उपन्यास ceremony, which ceremony is considered to give them second birth, called spiritual birth, in the case of those that follow वृज्ञानमच्छम् of Hindus. But in the case of those that do not follow वृज्ञानमच्छम्, the same ceremony gives them the second birth. In the case of the
latter intellectual life (called education) might begin previously to दीक्षा ceremony; but it continues some time after the ceremony.

(V) विश्व is one that receives education and attains intellectual culture.

महामहीति defines विश्व as follows:—(see :निष्णयसागर edition).

(VI) कृताजनिः—he that becomes a man of principles after receiving education.

(VII) कर्ती—he that acts on those principles.

(VIII) संस्मातिः—he that rises above वर्णाश्रममें, i.e. he that discards these and leads a life on broad principles of humanity and religion, and not a person in the fourth stage of life according to वर्णाश्रममें.

IX) विश्वानिः—a man of profound learning or one that attains intellectual and spiritual height.

(X) शंकरपुजत—a विश्वानी shiva.

(XI) लिम्बांसिणिः—A shaiva that wears शिवसिंधु on the body; a Veerashaiva.

(XII) प्रद्ध्य ज्ञानान्वान—A Veerashaiva that understands the शिष्य—philosophy and practises शिष्यवाच or शिष्य principles to attain गोक. This means that mere wearing of Linga will not do for a Veerashaiva; he must grasp the principles of शिष्य philosophy and practise them.
...Vairasukya or Paramesvara contains these verses, but in addition gives the gradation in a different form:—

भूतान्त्र प्राणिन: भेष्जा बुद्धिमंत्रस्तते स्वामिका:।
tatstllo.पि च बुद्धिमंत्रस्ततयो चना:।
समवेत्तमा हि मनुजास्तन्त्र बिश्रा महात्मा:।
वेदन: कर्मकातीस्तद्वर्षा विशेषः।
ततो वेदांगसारस्तत: संस्कार:।
तत: पाशुपता: अश्वा संभिनिन्द्व ततोऽधिका:।
तताधिकान्त्र महाभेष्जा बीरमहेश्वर:।
न तेष्यो धार्मिकः कस्मिदु बीराधिश्चायत:।
तावान्मादिमन्यथिः बीरश्रवः परः शिवः।
साक्षान्मादिपतामेव बीरस्वप्नतः महेत॥

In comparison with the above and in explanation of the four classes of creatures, the following श्लोकाः from मनुस्मृतिः may be noted:—

पश्वाक मुगाप्रावे व्यालाश्रोपयोद्यादत:।
राजसिः च पिशाचाश मनुप्याच जरानुजा:॥
अंड्छाः पलिण: सपृः नक्षा मल्याषां कच्छिः।
धारति चैव प्रकाराणि स्वयंजन्यायद्भानि च॥
स्वदेजं ब्रजस्वागन्तं युक्ताम्विनक्तंगममु॥
उपाषना ज्ञातवन्ति रुषात्मश्चिनिद्वश्रमम॥
उद्धुर्यं स्वारां स्त्रेष्व ब्रजान्विदसविद्याण:।
शोष्यम् फलमात्रं बेंद्रुश्च-फलोन्याण:॥
सुमार्गां श्राणिः भेष्जा प्राणिनां बुद्धिजीविन:।
बुद्धिमस्तु नराः: शेषा: नरेणु प्राणाः स्पृवतः॥
शाधणेषु च विमासो विमस्तु कृतवुद्भ:।
काठुद्भिः कलोर: कल्पु जागवेदिन:॥
The *Vīraṇān* adds to the gradation given by *नृ (1) शंकर-पूजक or a वै (2) लिंगांग-रंगिन (3) यद्यायानवान*, even though there is some difference between the gradation previous to this addition. The upshot of the verses is that the followers of Veerashaivism stand at the top of all human beings, particularly in respect of religion. The author concludes on the authority of these that the wearers of श्यालिङ्ग, being so highly praised, cannot be included among the undesirable and condemned class of beings. Therefore, whenever a लिंगिन is condemned, it means that a अतिमार्गार or विध्यार is condemned. It is to be noted all Veerashaiva writers base all their discussion on these verses regarding the religious and communal status of Lingayatas among the Hindus in India.

Verses 6-9 say that non-Linga-wearers as well as *कुड, गोलक, and देवलक* are a condemned class of persons. Verses 10-13 state that those that do not worship शिव, that is, those that are not Shaivas, can never expect to attain शेख. They remain fallen until and unless they become shaivas and especially Veerashaivas. All the statements contained in the last four verses are, it seems, due to high sectarian spirit and fervour.

P. 62. नृ...पाषंपदं तत्तत्रमेवेति बेज—This contains an objection to the interpretation by the author of the word पाषंपद, as a heretic, a bearer of a विन्द्र, one that changes one religion for another and the mark of that religion for that of the other. But the objector quotes verses from विष्णुपुराण descriptive of पाषंपद and says that the interpretation of the word पाषंपद as made by the विद्वार्तिन, the author, was wrong. But the word पाषंपद has been explained by नारसिष्वीयार्यंद्रशीरिपिका as—
P. 62. — Here the सिद्धांतिक refutes the above objection by saying that the word पार्षद has a variety of meanings and is very elastic. The meaning of the word is not fixed but very wide so as to include in it any kind of heretic or an undesirable person. Different पुराणas treat the word पार्षद in different senses. Hence it is no use, says the author, taking stand on the authority of one पुराण and reject the sense of the word as given in others. Hence any person degraded morally or religiously is a पार्षद and as such is an undesirable and unsociable person.

P. 63. — एवंपदार्थस्वरूपवचनानि etc.—Upto the end of the section now the author makes a general statement that, the sentences of condemnation found in different पुराणas of the things mentioned in condemnation, are not really intended to condemn but are meant as an indirect praise of the subject-matter under treatment. Hence not much importance is to be attached to the condemnatory verses and they are to be taken as a foil to set off the importance of the matter treated in a particular section of the पुराण. This practice of the पुराणas of eulogising a particular thing is peculiar and conforms to the न्याय, viz. नहि निंदा निंदितवाचिः परं स्तुत्वं स्तैति (in the words of the author). This is taken from चबरभाष्य on एवंपदार्थस्वरूपवचनानि (II-4-20). The exact wording of the न्याय there is—नहि निंदा निंदितवाचिः प्रश्योऽसि | किं ताहिः-निंदिताविद्वश्च प्रश्योऽसि | (Blame is not employed in order dispraise something that is blame-
worthy, but rather to praise something other than that, i.e. the topic under consideration. शर्मसूची illustrates this न्याय so well in his आराममार्ग (page 49) as follows:—

नन्दौ एवं वेदन्दृश्यं. 7थालात्त्वाग्नार्थेन वेदन्दृश्याभासात। उक्तं हि चतुष्कं वेदेऽणे रुक्मिण्यमार्थसं शारीरस्य इति शालाशीर्षवानित। अनेकात्त्वज्ञानयन्येवर्ष पर्यन्त्योगं। न हि निन्दा निन्द्य निन्दितु प्रकटित अभ्यु निन्दितान्तिश्चनिश्चतुमु वचनार्थकामानं, 'प्रातःप्रत्येकम् ते वद्वन्त!' इत्यितेत्तोष्मनिन्दा वदिन्द्रोठमार्थानिन्दे सभ्यिते। यथा मांने (iv 124).

'डेबदेबेदेबेदेबेदेबेदेवं शष्येदस्तु मानं।
सार्वेश्वरस्तु प्रथ्यं स्ततास्रित्स्तयाविवृत्तिः।'

इति सार्वेश्वरनिन्दा इतर्वेदप्रज्ञायाः। यथा वा मांकि।

चलार एकलो वेदा भारत चैंकेखत:।
समापति। हृ ऋषिसिस्तुत्वारापिन्ते पुरा।

महत्वे र गुरुस्ते ज प्रियामाण्य विषाण्य।
महत्त्वः महत्त्वाच महाभारतस्वच्छते॥

इति महाभारतस्वंस्वंस्वं श्रुत्ते न वेदरन्देशित। एवं पुष्पालवायुः।

समाक्सरसूरि also puts it briefly as—नहि निन्दा निन्द्यं तताः। किंतु पक्षांतरविचारः।

Except for this there would be no end to a controversy based on Pauranic sentences, which are mutually condemnatory and contradictory. In illustration of what the author says, he quotes verses condemnatory of the वजितिं or सन्धातिंवित, which if followed closely there would be an end to the religious life of both श्राव्य and रामाज्ञ वैश्वनास. The author adopts a very sensible course, indeed. He, thereby, shows himself to be conscious of irreconcilable statements made by the पुराणाः.

The verses quoted here are aptly descriptive of the pseudo-ascetics or pseudo-anchorites and they are fully borne out by the conditions seen generally at present. But they are applicable to all ascetics Vaishnava as well as Shaiva; though they have been taken from Shaiva पुराणाः, they are, I think, descriptive of false ascetics of all sects and sections of the public and not merely Vaishnava यति.
This is a miscellaneous section containing the treatment of different topics as follows. (1) An objection to विष्णुवारण, that is, इश्वरवारण, based on the interpretation of इश्वरवारण by इश्वरभाद्रि's commentary on अमरकोश.
(2) Establishment of विष्णुवारण on the authority of पुराणाः.
(3) Establishing the custom of wearing Linga by great and distinguished persons and Gods and Goddesses, that is, proving that विष्णुवारण was a निश्चयार.
(4) Lastly the refutation यद्यपि some objections raised against the conclusions arrived at on the authority of Pauranic sentences in support of the custom or निश्चयार of wearing इश्वरिन.

P. 64. नन्द...मा भूषिति वेद-—Here the objection based upon the interpretation of इश्वरवारण is stated. The word इश्वरवारण occurs in अमरकोश (ब्रह्मवर्ग, stanza 54). The interpretation of the word इश्वरवारण quoted by the author for discussion, is by इश्वरभाद्रि, a commentator of अमरकोश (see अमरकोश with the commentary called इश्वरभाद्रि by इश्वरभाद्रि, page 466, Andhra edition). In contrast with the interpretation of the word by इश्वरभाद्रि, the interpretation of the word by कृष्णभाद्रि and मातुजीदिशिक (commentators of अमरकोश) should be noted as follows:—

कृष्णभाद्रि:—चरमः भजनान् चिन्हे इश्वरवारणं जन्तुभार्तर्कः। इश्वरभाद्रि: इश्वरवारणं जन्तुभार्तर्कः। भवानुवारणं तथा जन्तुभार्तर्कः।

मातुजीदिशिकः:—अधिष्ठणं ध्वजः चिन्हे चरमः ध्वजः इश्वरवारणं अधिष्ठणं ध्वजः। इश्वरभाद्रि: इश्वरवारणं जन्तुभार्तर्कः।
A third different commentator also interprets लिंगश्चति as—आधमादिविन्दुधारण व्रस्तिः जीविकादिः यस। विश्वासगये जटापारी। etc. etc’ From all this it is clear that लिंग has been interpreted as a चिन्द्र and not लिंगधारण (इहलंगधारण) for the sake of livelihood. Even the interpretation of लिंगअत्र does not exactly mean an इहलिंगधारिन and might be taken as a चिन्द्रारक. But it seems that it must have been taken as इहलिंगधारिन by rival religious sections in the times of the author. Hence the author’s attempts at refuting it.

P. 65. ब्रस्व मलस्यति etc.—Here the author refutes the objection and he bases his refutation on the verses taken from ब्रस्वयति (see pages 166 and 167 of the स्मृति,-वेंकटेश्वर edition). There the words अलिंगश्च, लिंगधेण, and लिंगिनाम have been interpreted by उक्तस्वत, a commentator of the स्मृति, as pseudo- ब्रह्मचारिन्द or pseudo यतिः and not इहलिंगधारिनिः. Hence, says the author, लिंगश्चति means a person that deceitfully moves about in the disguise of a ब्रह्मचारिन or a यतिः and not an इहलिंगधारिनिः.

By-the-bye it may be noted that अवकृष्णिः has been explained differently. In वसाबुरुण (pp. 52, 53) अवकृष्णिः has been explained as—

याब्जोशिहिं कर्म करोमीति वभाति ।
संक्रमण कर्मस्यति यः सवेय सवयं जीवने ।
प्रवेशस्वति संरथ्यांगदशवृत्तिः संबंध सः
अंगीक्षु पुरा कर्म तत्समवृत्ति मष्ठतः ।
अवकृष्णिः च विशेषः सवेशिचित्रभृतिः ॥
एनांवार्तक सुनयो व्यासस्त्रायुष महाराजः ।
शैवस्वतं परिस्थित्य सुनिष्टं प्रतिपित्रे ॥
finds it necessary to find support to शिखरस्यम् from general custom (कुष्ठाचार) and proceeds to prove the custom of शिखरस्यम्. He maintains with the verses from पुराणोऽि that not only great distinguished persons like अक्षयादेश the author of अयायबाल्य, but also Gods, Goddesses, अश्रुस, राक्षस् etc. wore इश्लिंग on thier bodies made of different materials suited to their position and station. He thus proves that there was a universal custom. The author quotes also from विद्यातिशिखरस्यम्, which seems, to have been considered by the author as important and authoritative, as a पुराण. But we have already noted previously that he author places विद्यातिशिखरस्यम् on par with आगमाः, which in turn have been taken by Shaivas as much an utterance of the Almighty God and as much authoritative as the Vedas. The verses quoted here in proof of the custom of wearing Linga have been quoted in religious treatises by almost all Veerashaiva writers of name and fame.

P. 69. नवनयं...श्रव्यानामाविधितिवत्—Here is an, objection raised against the custom of wearing Linga, as shown by the verses from पुराणोऽि given by the author. The objector says that sages, Gods, and demons and others might have worshipped लिङ्ग, because the verses from महाभागाः and पराशरमुराश do not say any thing about इश्लिंग and they better seem to express लिङ्ग.

P. 69. वेम्बत्र् etc.—Herein the author meets the objection and proves that sages etc. all wore Linga on the body, as may be unmistakably known from the mention of places on the body of wearing Linga, in the verses, namely,
The author thereby means that, because some Puranas mention the places of wearing Linga on the body in so many words, it is not possible that others should contradict them. Even though some fail to mention clearly the places of wearing Linga, as some others do, it is to be understood that they mean so and the places of wearing Linga are to be understood. This line of reasoning is not quite sound and seems very strange, when it is seen that Puranas are mutually contradictory. Pandit Sivakumēr aptly remarks here as—

P. 69. etc. —This is the second argument made by the author in refutation of the objection, and this seems sounder and better than the previous one. Here the author proceeds to prove that Gods and Goddesses wore Linga on their bodies; because the root युगः (in the verse “इश्वर तमाइं बरे” on page 70) to worship or to be in
union with, according to शंकरितिवे द्रव्य (quoted by author). And the Gods and Goddesses and others cannot be in union with शिवलिंग, unless they wear it on their bodies.

P. 70. तदु...कथे सिद्धाति—Here is another objection raised to meet the foregoing refutation. The objector says that it may be admitted that the root वज्र means संगमिकरण. But that does not mean all time union but occasional union with the स्थावरलिंग, when the devotee comes in contact with it at the time of worshipping the Linga. The verse quoted above proves, therefore, स्थावरलिंगपूजा and not the इश्वरलिंगपूजा.

P. 70. तदु...तलितः!—This is the refutation of the objection just raised. The विद्यातियं removes the objection by pointing out that there is the adverb जाह्निसमुद्र modifying the verb वज्रते. This shows that the devotees of शिवलिंग worshipped it day and night. But it was not possible for them to do so the स्थावरलिंग. It, therefore, compells admission that they must have worshipped the Linga worn on the body. The worship of the Linga worn on the body is tantamount to all time worship, as already shown in section viii (see pp. 43 and 44 of the text).

P. 70. न च यज्ञातो:...अंतर्भत्तेन्त्व प्रेयाः: संक्रियते—Here is the last objection raised against the सिद्धातियं against his interpretation. The objection is that the root वज्र may mean संगमिकरण or धारण of लिंग and may also mean all time-धारण. But all this means अंतर्भहितधारण and not बाह्यलिंगधारण. The विद्यातिर्य’s attempts, say the objector, at proving the custom of wearing बाह्यलिंग fall to the ground.
P. 70. अंतःप्रदेशः—etc.—Here the author refutes the objection by saying that there is no word to indicate the अंतःप्रदेशः of लिंगायारणः. And to understand such a word in its absence will be open to a fault. But बद्विस्मिषारणः or वाक्यदेशायारणः will not open to such a fault, as वाक्य means that prominently and does not stand in need of any specification, as अंतःप्रदेशः does stand in such a need.

The author further adduces in support of वाक्यदेशायारणः the verse already quoted in connection with the custom of wearing Linga, where मस्तकार्त्तः proves beyond doubt that वाक्य means वाक्यदेशायारणः.

P. 70. आगमवंचनानित्यः etc.—Here the author refers to various verses quoted from आगमाः in all previous sections. He, therefore, simply refers to them. But the mention of आगमाः raises an important question of the आगमाः being authoritative or otherwise. This question touches the discussion contained in the book vitally. This question, therefore, forms the topic of discussion in the next and the last section of the book, and the section begins forthwith.

Before going to the next section we might state here that the discussion heretofore covers all points of proof mentioned in the श्रीकः in विषयात्तारः, namely,

वेदशास्त्रपुरशेषु कामिकायायामेतु च।
लिंगायारणायायां चिरत्वेदश्च निर्द्वयात्॥

By way of recapitulation it may be said here that in sections I–IX the वेदविद्विषत्व of लिंगायारणः is established. In section X the वाक्यविद्विषत्वः, (स्वयविद्विषत्वः) of लिंगायारणः is established. In section XI पुराणविद्विषत्वः and आगमविद्विषत्वः is established. The author therefore, vindicates the statement of the verse in all its parts, as he asserted in the beginning.
In this last section the author proves the authority of आगमाः, on which are primarily based the doctrines of Shaiva, Shaska, Vaishnava, and Veerashaiva religions, though Vedas also form the basis of all these. आगमाः form an important and voluminous part of Sanskrit Literature and treat of philosophy and religion and other kindred topics. It is unfortunate that they have been neglected completely and not studied by scholars, European and Indian, who have all devoted their energies and time to the study of Vedas and all other branches of Sanskrit learning. There are three distinct branches of Agamic literature, namely, Shaiva, Vaishnava, and Shaka. The शिवागमाः and शावषागमाः are believed to have delivered by शिव to His consort, पार्वती, or His son, पुण्यख. Even in past times आगमाः do not seem to have been of much importance but seem to have sprung into prominence, after Shaiva and Vaishnava religions and their philosophy came to be very prominent side by side with the religion and philosophy of the Vedas, though the development and growth of Agamic literature was concurrent with that of the Upanishads.

After the आगमाः and the religions based on them came into limelight as powerful rivals of Vedic cults and religion, the question naturally arose about their authoritative nature, in comparison with that Vedas, the authority and revelation of which were and have been beyond question. The followers of particular Agamic religions thus found it necessary to vindicate the authority and authoritative nature of Agamic literature. Thus शासुन्तरि, a Vaishnava, wrote a book called आगमस्धामाख्याय. But the book is only about the
vindication of the authority of Vaishnavagamas. The Veerashaivas also naturally found it necessary to do so, when charges were levelled against them that their religion had no unquestionable authority behind them or at the basis. The writers of Veerashaiva religious tracts and treatises became busy with vindicating the honour and unquestionable authority of the बिष्णुगम. And the author does the same in this last section, which forms the closing section and topic of the book.

The author concerns himself with the vindication of the authority of Shaivagamas but does not say anything about other Agamas, Shaktâ or Vaishnava. This forms a prominent characteristic of the treatment, altogether different from that of चातुर्यानुक्षेत्रे भागाभास्फल, in which the author, while vindicating the authority of Vaishnavagamas, tries to disprove the authority of the Shaivagamas. It seems to us natural, because there is no place in the Vaishnava religion (of the रामावम school) for विन. Whereas, in contrast, Shaiva religions give a place for Vishnu among their pantheon, though a subordinate place, subordinate to that of शिव, the परमेश्वर. But वेदात्माग्रे वेदात्मक बिवासमिष्ठ is an exception, as may be noted in the extract given below. The आगमाभास्फल has also been vindicated by other authors, like the present author, both Veerashaiva and non-Veerashaiva. The following few extracts from some of the authoritative treatises will be of interest to readers.

The first point to be noted here is that in the opinions of all writers Agamas do not teach anything that is either anti-Vedic or non-Vedic. Hence only
those Agamas, that conform to Vedas and their teachings, are authoritative; but those that do not do so, are unauthoritative and, therefore, unacceptable. In विवेकत्वं, आगम has been defined as—

आयातः शिवश्रीण्यं गतेऽपि प्रतिचित्त विदेिक सर्वत्र भवति ।

समस्तस्या ह्रत्वेजे तत्समाजगम उच्च्यते ॥ …

(I) The opinions of non-Veerashaiva authors.

(a) उर्दूतालार्थन्यां धीमहिः (verses 108, 109)—

वेदः स्तवं भवति वा विदेि वा प्रणीतिः

सर्वेः प्रमाणमविवाहं गृहार्थविषये चेष्टा: ।

तत्तत्त्वकृत्यदेविततात्त्वकृत्य—

मन्यत्त्रतमाणमविवाहिन प्रवश्या कथा: ॥ १ ॥ क्रमे वेदः प्रमाणमविवाहं संगिर्षाम् एव

डिक्ष्यं तत्त्वमस्वैतिः जन: प्रमाणम ।

लक्ष्यान्वायन्यायायेपिके: पदाभिः—

रामूपालिन्तिविषयान्वाच मूलात: ॥ २ ॥

(II) श्रीकेत्त in his ब्रह्मसूत्रायणम says—

इवागमविवाहश्रमाण्याच परमेश्वरस्य जगद्भक्षकारणतः विवाहितिः अनवहस्यपि शिवश्रीण्यमे: शिवश्रीण्यमेव परमेश्वरस्य जगद्भक्षकारणतः विवाहितिः। तत्तत्त्वकृत्यदेविततात्त्वकृत्य—

पुर्वित्तप्तिः क्योः । वर्त्तमान तु वेदशिवायेपिके: न परस्यां:। वेदोहित्य वेदशिवायेपिके: तत्त्वमस्य जयम्। अतः वेदशिवायेपिके: विविधां: श्रीवर्णिकविषय: सर्वविद्विद्विदेषी:। वेदः श्रीवर्णिकविषय:। सर्वविद्विद्विदेषी:। अतः श्रीवर्णिकविषया। उद्योगे: क्षिप्य: कर्म:। “इश्वान: शर्विशाति माहतो भूतस्य निःशक्तिम्” इश्वादिशेन।

आद्यवेदान्तैव द्विवेदान्तं बिवाहं शिवश्रीण्यमां।

आदिकेत्त शिव: सकलात शुद्धापाणिरितिशुद्धिः। ॥

इति समुद्राच वेदेऽवत्सः तत्त्वमस्य कर्मवादत्तम:। अन्यायायां तत्त्वमस्य कर्मवादत्तम:। अतः कर्मसामायादिभिः सकलात शुद्धापाणिरितिशुद्धिः। इत्यत: तत्त्वमस्य कर्मवादत्तम:। अन्यायायां तत्त्वमस्य कर्मवादत्तम:। अतः कर्मसामायादिभिः सकलात शुद्धापाणिरितिशुद्धिः।

कर्मसामायादिभिः कर्मवादत्तम च बिवाहश्रीण्यमान।
(c) राष्ट्रवाद in his commentary on शारदातिप्रकाश says—

"सवा अपि श्रुति: भवपाशववाना जेवृणां स्नायु मुख्ये न समुपदिष्टा
है। अन्यथा स्वतिशालावैदनो तम्मत्कलनेन तद्धे शिष्याधिकारेन न प्रामाण्यशिक्षित सुधा-
सिद्धम्। अस्यस्य आगमस्यः: कथो तम्मत्कस्मम्। अन्यथा तरः (स्वतिशालाके:) विशेषण पर्यायावरूपः क्षणों सुक्तिरापि सविधायतीत किमनया (आगमस्य)ः हति
प्रति मूमः। स ऐतत्व बहुत्स्या प्रजायत्। "इति तथा "ततो वा इमानि भुतानि जायन्ते
हेन जातानि जो शरीरभिन्नभिसंविशालानि तद्विज्ञाशः। इति प्रक्रमः "अनन्दा-
प्रेमें खलिमानि भृतानि जायन्ते आनन्देन जातानि जीवितः आनन्दं प्रमन्यमिष्व-
विशालित्।" इवादि। "इं तर वदयमाराठै! "इवानेनोपरि कार्तिका। इति प्रक्रमेऽप्रसहास्यः
स्वलीलापनाधानविष्यमा चिः बिशालास्यस्य परमानंदस्तुप्ति निलधार्दुस्त्रभावं पर-
ज्ञायव प्रशालविशिष्टः रकम जगात् सर्वोऽभि हति श्लोकनीतिपादित्याः।। "इन्द्रो मायाभि:
पुरुषम् इत्येते। "सिवेस हि शाक्ति (हितः शक्तः केघः न किचन्।"इवादिना शक्तिः प्रति-
पादिता। तस्मात् सर्वसु श्लोकु मोप पापस्याभेदेन काण्डमायू। तत्र कर्मकाण्डेः जीविनिः-
प्रभृतिनां सम्भावना विवृत्तम्। उपासनाकाण्डाः नारादिविः। ब्रह्मकाण्डेः भगवद्वावास्ति-
मितिः। स्वरूपन्तकलस्य श्रवणं प्रख्यातं। श्रुतिमुखकता च रामपुतौरतापायी
नृसिंहेन सौजन्यतापायसीरामायतुधिवर्लकालावनक्षे पापविशालानक्षे व साजाच्छितुत्रपुषपमत्य एव।
तन कर्मकाण्डे सवायोपविकारी। सुपुरुषार्थः तदस्मानार्थं सचित्त्वमेत्य प्रख्यातापरि-
दाराः च कर्मविकारस्य समवाहः। तदस्मानाकाण्डस्य यतः साकरोपावामात:
स्वरुपाद्वुकते भवति कम्रतो मुनिक्षा। कर्मकाण्डायु स्वरुपाद्वुकतो भवत्त्वात्वाधाश्च भवति।
ब्रह्माणानुसरितपि आवनन्देनस्विरेण कालाधास्याद्वेकु पजनसु ताहेके:
वेदि गतिदु भवति। "अनंकनमयेश्वर्यः ततो गाति परसं गतिम्।" इति वचनादृष्ट।
अत् एतदुपासकाण्डेऽभ आगमानकालः। गरीयि इति सिद्धम्।"

(II) Veerashaiva writers

(d) ब्राह्मणे वर्तमान in his किमारी says—

आगमा द्वीपिता श्रेष्ठे ब्राह्मणे वर्तमानं:।
विशेषिन्ता तैतत्त स्वरूपार्थनुस्थित:।
कर्मणार्थान्ति तैतत्ताग्निमालिगोति यथा।।।।।।।।।।
तैतत्त्व तैतत्ताग्निमानां तैतत्ताग्निमालिगोति:।
ब्रह्माणानुसरित: आवनन्देनस्विरेण कालाधास्याद्वेकु पजनसु ताहेके:
एकाद्वैतान्तिकां शुचिनिर्दिष्टकम्यायू।।।।।।।।
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अंबेदिकवासवेंशामन्युक्तता भवेत्।
वेदाविलोकनदुःसातः पातिकं वापुतकादः॥ ४॥
वयात्मुखेव वा द्रविकादस्याविकं बुधः।
शैवागमस्तदाचारा वैदिकं नेति का प्रधा॥ ५॥
स्मृतिशिर्मु हुराणेष्व विद्विता एव वैदिकः।
शैवागमेऽहु विद्विता नैव स्मुद्विक सर्वे॥ ६॥
स्मृत्युष्का वैदिकः नेति कुटस्य नैव साहेषे।
वैदिकाते भवेदुखशामोखा वैदिकः॥ ७॥
अत एवाचरित्रं वैदिकःः सकल धुषः।
आलोकस्वस्ववत्रविविन्युक्ते शाल्विवित्तमः॥ ८॥
कामशुद्वमातायाहु शैवान्वयात्त मानिच च।
अंबेदिकाति सर्वाणि नाबरेतानि वैदिकः॥ ९॥
शैवान्वयात्तविवे भजेवान्वयमण्डनस्तथा।
किळिमो वाचार्येन पारासात्तारिवर्ज्येन॥ १ो॥
इङ्के निष्ठानि कामशुद्वनि वे पुनः।
वीरैचाक्रप्रमणता न निंदा इति तत्कथाम्॥ ११॥
न हिस्याविदी सबस्येन हिस्यात्रि निषेषिते।
वाणिसपुष्माधाबो न निषेषियो भवेत्तथा॥ १२॥
सङ्कोचे धर्मो वस्तुमण्डन्यः तुक्तिभाव।
यज्ञेति विष्नुस्त्रव नियामकं उदाहृतः॥ १३॥
प्रेमशावेदिरे दैनि वैष्णवनिवािविविदायम्।
शैवशास्त्रसंह शंकचचं सहाचादिधे तथा॥ १४॥
नियामिका शृवित्ततं शूर्यते बहुः पुनः।
वेदावतासुखुष्यायु चास्तासुखादिधे तथा॥ १५॥
अर्या विभवनिवास्तुक्तियाय प्रिय्वामना।
अधिकाः सिद्धकेमभ् साष्ट्रिकं विनिर्ता॥ १६॥
परस्परविविदायः विभोजता नियामामाः।
आभ्युद्विद्यासर्वादधिवारं परिक्लपे॥ १७॥
निममात्मासाम्यानां अमाप्राप्तीप्रियः।
आछाणमिवशेषाः श्रास्त्रं तत्सादविविषे॥ १८॥
त्वहुत्सिन्दुविन्यः सप्तविशेष: परिहाराणे।
दैवभविस्तरमीत्याः प्रविक्तसाहुपमकम्॥ १९॥
(e) "in his वीरशैवकथ्यसहायिका says—
नन्मेत्यां स्मृतिपुणानां वेदसूक्तविदेशवार्तामय्यानसंधनेत्र्यागमन-बचनानां तथा प्रामाण्यं न संमतवति चेष्टा। वेदोगम्योक्तों वृद्धविद्वार्तर्थस्यति-पादकरणा निःश्रवितहृ: वेदपेशया तालोष्टुपट्टास्यएवर्चितान्तकामायमायमायमुवेदः-
ञजुवेदवश्यामविद्याकार्यक्रमाणि वस्तुनिष्ठानां सिद्धेन्तित वेदांवगतवाचर्चितविन्यासं कर्मेन सिद्धाचर्चणियमिति च वर्ण समवदमू।

(f) "in his वेदांवतारिकृतीविवाचितामणि says (pp. 58-64)—
नन्मेत्यां वीरसूक्तमहोर्त्तकामिकाविशिष्टवामतत्रामुवेदनेत्र्यागमन-वचनानां तथा प्रामाण्यं न संमतवति चेष्टा। किंतु वेदसूक्तव्रयज्ञानां तत्त्रगच्छन निभेन स्त्रा एव तन्मुखस्य वीरवृद्धस्यवैदिकसिद्धित चेष्टा। || सिद्धान्तविशिष्टामणि—अवतस्य प्रतिरेखकणेषणात्मकम् ||
इति शिवभ्रणित्योगीयित्वेपीद्यांम्योऽकारपुरुषेऽमेवं दश्यिति। तत्स्य —

ब्राह्मणम्योऽकारपुरुषेऽमेवं दश्यिति।

शिवभ्रणित्योगीयित्वेपीद्यांम्योऽकारपुरुषेऽमेवं दश्यिति।

रामायणेऽकारपुरुषेऽमेवं दश्यिति।

कौमुदीपरिपरिशोधित्वेपीद्यांम्योऽकारपुरुषेऽमेवं दश्यिति।
(g) "In his chapter 20—"

[(g)]
Some of the आगमास themselves vindicate the authority of the आगमास; thus—

(h) प्रौढ़करागम says (quoted in तत्तव्यमें संबंधप्रेक्षिकाएँ pages 24 and 25)-

Another passage...
On the whole all authors take Vedas as the primary authority and then say that शिवागमास, being in conformity with the Vedas, are equally an authority like the Vedas; and, therefore, acceptable and not to be rejected.

P. 70. आगमाप्रमाण्य वदर वादी प्रभावः।—Here the author raises a question about the authority of the आगमास and asks the disbeliever of the authority of आगमास what he means by आगमास, and whether by आगमास are meant (1) all आगमास (2) or the शिवागमास only (3) or the आगमास or scriptures of Buddhistic or Jain religions. The शिवागमास refutes the first two alternatives of the objection and admits the third.

P. 71. नष्ठ: etc.—From this upto पुरुषविदशिष्ठि (page 72) the शिवागमास refutes the first part of the objection. The शिवागमास says if the आगमास were to be unauthoritative, there would be an end to the procedure and practice of the meditation of मंत्रास or mystic prayers like गायत्री and others, in as much as the procedure and practice of मंत्रास have been
elaborated in the अगमाः only. स्मृतिः and other non-अगमि Hindu religious books treat of वर्णिधमेर्मि and do not say anything about the practice of मंत्राः, though in some of them the meditation or ध्यान of a few मंत्राः like गायत्री and others, is laid down. शारदातिलक, कालीप्रेम, and ज्ञानश्रवणि and ईशाननिर्वेशदृष्टि are prominent instances, which treat, inter alia, all about मंत्राः and their practices. The practice of मंत्रध्यान consists in (1) पुरुंक्षरण or the preliminary procedure of a मंत्र before its meditation begins (2) मंत्रांक्षियम or purification of a मंत्र (or making it free from all crudities) (3) the putting of मंत्र in a proper form or the making of मंत्रवेदना by arranging the parts in due order or form (4) making a मंत्र free from faults i.e. the avoidance of faults. All these have been briefly stated in order except the first one, which is described in सपुरुंक्षरणगायत्रीपंचाङ्ग as follows:—

The ten मंत्रसंस्काराः, but not the methods thereof, are stated in the first three lines of the first two verses. These ten संस्काराः and the methods of imparting the संस्काराः to the मंत्राः are stated in शारदातिलक as follows:—

मन्त्राणां दश संस्कारां: कथयते सिद्धिरायिनः।
अनन्त श्रवणं पञ्चालांकारं श्रवणं तथा। ॥ १ ॥
तथातिलकोऽविमलोकांणिप्रायोऽि पुनः। ॥ प्रयाः
तपैणं द्विपनं श्रुति: दशौति मंत्रसंस्कारः। ॥ २ ॥
मन्त्राणां मातृकामाध्यादवरो अनन्त स्वस्तम्।
अण्वन्तरितां वर्धा मन्त्रवर्णानू जापस्वच्छोः। ॥ ३ ॥
The 2nd line of the second verse (of the first two verses) states the parts of the संग्रहकोश and the next two verses state the arrangement of the parts to set up the संग्रहकोश. The verses 3-6 state the faults of मंत्रास. But शास्त्रविद्वान is more elaborate and exhaustive about the faults of मंत्रास and it also describes the conditions of मंत्रास and संग्रहकोश being young etc. and their mental attitudes as follows:—

**The 2nd line of the second verse (of the first two verses) states the parts of the संग्रहकोश and the next two verses state the arrangement of the parts to set up the संग्रहकोश. The verses 3-6 state the faults of मंत्रास. But शास्त्रविद्वान is more elaborate and exhaustive about the faults of मंत्रास and it also describes the conditions of मंत्रास and संग्रहकोश being young etc. and their mental attitudes as follows:**

**The 2nd line of the second verse (of the first two verses) states the parts of the संग्रहकोश and the next two verses state the arrangement of the parts to set up the संग्रहकोश. The verses 3-6 state the faults of मंत्रास. But शास्त्रविद्वान is more elaborate and exhaustive about the faults of मंत्रास and it also describes the conditions of मंत्रास and संग्रहकोश being young etc. and their mental attitudes as follows:**

**The 2nd line of the second verse (of the first two verses) states the parts of the संग्रहकोश and the next two verses state the arrangement of the parts to set up the संग्रहकोश. The verses 3-6 state the faults of मंत्रास. But शास्त्रविद्वान is more elaborate and exhaustive about the faults of मंत्रास and it also describes the conditions of मंत्रास and संग्रहकोश being young etc. and their mental attitudes as follows:**

**The 2nd line of the second verse (of the first two verses) states the parts of the संग्रहकोश and the next two verses state the arrangement of the parts to set up the संग्रहकोश. The verses 3-6 state the faults of मंत्रास. But शास्त्रविद्वान is more elaborate and exhaustive about the faults of मंत्रास and it also describes the conditions of मंत्रास and संग्रहकोश being young etc. and their mental attitudes as follows:**

**The 2nd line of the second verse (of the first two verses) states the parts of the संग्रहकोश and the next two verses state the arrangement of the parts to set up the संग्रहकोश. The verses 3-6 state the faults of मंत्रास. But शास्त्रविद्वान is more elaborate and exhaustive about the faults of मंत्रास and it also describes the conditions of मंत्रास and संग्रहकोश being young etc. and their mental attitudes as follows:**

The 2nd line of the second verse (of the first two verses) states the parts of the संग्रहकोश and the next two verses state the arrangement of the parts to set up the संग्रहकोश. The verses 3-6 state the faults of मंत्रास. But शास्त्रविद्वान is more elaborate and exhaustive about the faults of मंत्रास and it also describes the conditions of मंत्रास and संग्रहकोश being young etc. and their mental attitudes as follows:—
The author's refutation of the objection contains threefold arguments. (i) If the आदेशas were to be un-authoritative, the statements of आदेश prescribed for various moral lapses, based on the आदेशas and contained by various पुराणas, would be unauthoritative. But the पुराणas have been written by व्यास and cannot be said to be un-authoritative in any way and to any extent. However पुराणas, like स्कंदपुराण and लिङ्गपुराण, declare that those, that are anti-shaiva and anti-shaivite, are accursed beings. Thus the पुराणas support the आदेशas directly or indirectly and also their religious teachings. Hence the विवादमास cannot be held to be unauthoritative.

P. 73. नष्टि आदेशिकाधिनिदनां देवोद्वारां पुराण—This is the summing up of the first argument of refutation. But this rather is obscure. I have construed it as—सिंहस्य सिंहवंषय ॐ प्रतिपादकां आदेशां हेक्य: आदेशमाणिक्षवन निधित्वश चति तुष्किस्फूरिन्दिधारणां उद्दार्नं पुराणं श्रुयचं तथा आदेशायायम् हस्यं तावधार्मिकयान्यम् बुधं भवेदिवद्यः। And I have translated it as—It is no use declaring the moral lapses based on the works taken to be unauthoritative. (ii) The second argument of refutation is contained in "विवादतिथिं प्रतिद्वादिकाः स्त्रयाः सोहदिस्य...स्त्रयाः प्रतिद्वादिकाः..." (page 73). Herein the विवादतिथि refutes the objection by saying that if all विवादमास were unauthoritative, then all details, minor or great, regarding the construction of देव, मंदिर, स्तंभार of लिङ्ग, construction of temples, their opening ceremonies, the ceremonial exhibition of the images of the deities at festival times of the year, etc. etc. would be un-authoritative, and all such ceremonies would be at an end for want of scriptural authority. Nor can any such basic authority be found in any other non-Agamic Hindu religious works. Hence the author says the विवादमास must be an authority, unless all such ceremonies are to be repudiated and discontinued, which is an impossibility.
P. 73. अविच...वचनानुदानिग्रहितेः—This is the third argument of refutation. Here she विद्वान्तितः says that great authoritative philosophers and authors, like श्रिविनाश तथा शंकराचार्यः, quote in authority sentences from आयनस, which they could not have done, if the आयनस were unauthoritative. In connection with these lines of argument the following from वेदांतसारार्थिविचित्तांमिर्मयि may be noted:—

नन्त नूमेपुराणे—वामा पश्चातपाठाय: पांचराश्रयायः परे। इशारितः वैदिकानां तान्त्रिकाभारतानिष्ठाद्वाद्रप्रतिपोष धमये वैदिकाभारताविकाराय न तत्त्वो इति बैच। वेदविशिष्टांतांश्चकतः वैदिक इत्यादिकमधर्म तं प्रतिविद्धानःपौर्णम तथा वेदविशिष्टात्तवाचार्यि-निर्देशतत्त्वाचार्यः। वेदविशिष्टात्तत्त्वाचार्यः। इति तं प्रतिविद्धानः। प्रबुद्धम्: विद्वानार्थिविचित्तां तथा तत्त्वते। इति वेदविशिष्टात्तत्त्वाचार्यः। इति पधुः नमास्ते। दोषः: किं वैदिकानां वैदिकानां तन्त्राचार्यानिवाचार्यार्थ: प्रबुद्धानां श्रीरुप्तमपानार्थाचार्यानां निर्देशकत्रतबैधानिर्देशात्तदाचार्यं अन्यानां। वैदिकानां जगताभारतमविशिष्टीत्वेति। इति यज्ञानानां। दोषः: किं वैदिकानां तन्त्राचार्यानिवाचार्यार्थ: प्रबुद्धानां श्रीरुप्तमपानार्थाचार्यानां निर्देशकत्रतबैधानिर्देशात्तदाचार्यं अन्यानां। वैदिकानां जगताभारतमविशिष्टीत्वेति। इति यज्ञानां।

P. 74. न चर्मः परः—Here the refutation is further continued. The विद्वान्तितः says that if the works written by व्यास and सदृ, the great ब्राह्मण sages, are authoritative, the आयनस delivered by the great गौड़, श्रीविनाश तथा शंकराचार्यः, the highest deity and ब्राह्मण among deities, must be more authoritative and there can be no dispute about it.
and not amenable to be guided by truth. is also similarly said to have been written to mislead perverse people that they might sink into ignorance and go to rack and ruin. The condemnation of Buddhist and Jain doctrines by all followers of Vedic religion or religions is due to their extreme bigotry and their refusal and inability to understand the truth underlying the doctrines. The one strong ground of Vedic people to condemn the Buddhist and Jain doctrines was that Buddha and Mahavira, the founders of the two religions, repudiated the authority of the Vedas; because, they said, the Vedas preached the slaughter of animals in yajnas and excluded sustris from the benefit of the study of the Vedas and they were denied spiritual culture.

P.74. After Buddha preached the religion, named after him later, it became very popular for some centuries on account of its broad humanitarian principles, so much so that Vedic religion seemed to totter. Vedic religion came to be discredited and deserted by many people. The leaders of the Vedic religion naturally became anxious and began to think of the ways and means of saving the Vedic religion from the great danger. They then skilfully passed on the public that Buddha was an incarnation of Vishnu and as such was to be respected, in order to gain the sympathy of the followers of Buddhism and win them over. Except for this there can be reason why Buddha should be considered an incarnation of Vishnu. This trick of the followers of seems to have the effect intended; and gradually as Buddhism spent much of its force in its conflict with Hinduism, the exponents of Vedic religion began to say that Vishnu had the incarnation only to deceive the perverse public and wrote Buddhist scriptures. The author, a follower of Vedas, naturally condemns Buddhist scriptures as meant for deluding the public.
P. 74. नृः कृमिपुरण etc.—Upto the end of the book from here the very last objection is discussed and disposed of. The objection is based on what is said in the कृमिपुरण and says that the scriptures of various Shaiva and Vaishnava sects are said to be deluding like the Buddhistic scriptures, namely, the scriptures of कापलिकाः, बकुलीवास, शाक्तः, भौरवः, पाण्डुपतः, पांचरास्त्रबैश्वास. The words अन्यानि सहस्वः: means that the literature of many other sects also is deluding and is therefore, to be discarded, like the foregoing ones (mentioned in the श्रोक्ताः quoted). The words अन्यानि सहस्वः includes the Veerashaiva literature, which, therefore, is unacceptable.

P. 74. चेत्त etc.—This contains the refutation of the past objection. In refutation the बिज्ञातितः points out that the Agamic literature of those Shaiva and Vaishnava sects is to be rejected, as do not conform to the Vedas. There are some sects, says the author, that do not conform to Vedic principles. The literature or scriptures of such sects only are to be discarded. And the literature or scriptures of those Shaivas and Vaishnavas that conform to the Vedas are to be accepted and followed. This standpoint of the present author and others has been already pointed in the notes at the beginning of this section. The word पाण्डुपतः, mentioned in the verses from कृमिपुरण, is a general name of all Shaiva Schools and hence the objection.

The refutation is based on the statements contained in that very गुरण, which say that some particular Shaiva religions were acceptable; while others were preached with a view to delude the perverse public. It seems that Shaiva and Vaishnava religions were very crude in the beginning:
but later they must have come to be refined by being purged of the crudities and repulsive practices. The unrefined sects naturally came to be regarded as deluding and mischievous and hence to be rejected. शंकराविजय contains vivid description of such various discredited Shaiva and Vaishnava sects. In the last four chapters of शंकराविजय it is stated that शंकाराचाय gave permission to some of his disciples to preach and establish Shaiva and Vaishnava religious Schools on a refined and reformed basis, which give an idea about what those refined and reformed schools were. The following from वेदांतसाराविकवितामणि may be noted in this connection:—

तत्त्व—एवं संबोधितो श्री माधवेन मुरारिणा |
चकार मोहसामानिणि माधवोत्पि शिष्येति:।

इति कृम्भवचनस्य तत्त्रदृष्णस्य पप्यारांखर्षितवादिति सूतस्य च का गतिरिति
बेलिहुयोति। वस्तुतस्तु तद्वचनम शालामाथपाखलतंदिविश्चर्थं न वैदिकसाहित्यान्तस्वागमाविषयम।
तदुःख तथेऽव कृम्भपुराणे—

निमिति हि मया पूर्वे जति पाखलतं ज्ञेयम।
युक्तप्रवतम सुखेम वेदधार मिलकये॥ इत्याभयम।
एव माखलतो योगस्वेतनायो मुख्यमि।
भस्महैवैहि सत्त्वतत्त्वोपदेशित हि श्रुतिः।

इत्यन्ते सेभाम्बुतं वेदिकपाखलतपुर्वकाः। तत्रवेश।
नात्म माखलतं चौम्मा लघुते दैव भस्मवे।
न वैद्यमेतत्तकृतं वेदवांशं तदेदत्तत। इति

तद्वेद्विष्ठय सतीपदितम्।

सिद्धान्तशिल्पामणि discusses the Vedic and non-Vedic Shaiva schools in the following verses:—
The school is a Shakta sect, as may be noted from the following verses of 

P. 75.

Here in the refutation the author means that and some schools of Shaivism were preached by to delude the perverse public, as much as Buddhism was preached by Vishnu. So the author holds both and equally responsible for some degraded mischievous forms of religion in India.

P. 73. etc.—Here the author summarizes up to the end of the book how preach doctrines in consonance with the Vedic doctrines. He thus finally puts at rest the objections raised by the sceptics of .
P. 76. तबचू उच्चादिवा etc.—In this passage the author discusses the objection advanced against the practice (आचार) of लिंगाधारण on account of its being a तांत्रिकाचार. This means that तांत्रिकाचार is questionable. The author disposes of the objection very much in the same way as he does the objection against आयामसायण्य. He finally establishes the आयाम्य of those तत्त्वां that lay down आचार in conformity with Vedic principles and says that those तत्त्वां that do not conform to the Vedas are to be rejected, such as those of वामस, ककुंलस, etc.

आयामसायण्य and तत्त्वां are almost synonymous and there is not much difference between them. तत्त्व has been defined as:-

तत्त्वोति विदुर्ज्ञानьяपरथमकर्मसम्बन्धचायकान्।
ग्राम्य च क्रस्ते पुस्त तत्त्वायुद्भिधायते॥
शिवज्ञानयथे साधुदस्मिनन्मविराधकम्॥

(आयामसायण्य, which is not yet printed).

"Strictly speaking an आयाम differs but slightly from a तत्त्व. The former is said to deal with twenty five subjects, such as the nature of the Brahma, Brahmavidya, the names of different तत्त्वां, creation and destruction of the world etc. The latter treats of only seven out of twenty five subjects dealt with in the आयामास. Sometimes the word “यामल” is used as synonymous with आयाम and तत्त्व; and a यामल deals with only five out of the twenty five subjects dealt in the आयामास". (Elements of Hindu Iconography Vol. I, part I). On the whole तत्त्वां are a literature of Shakta sects and Shaiva sects and their religion and practices—
APPENDICES.

The following appendices are intended to give readers in a collected form the explanation of शिव and शक्ति and Their समवाय-संबंध that makes शक्तिशिवद्वात्रिक. Appendix I gives the nature of शिव, शक्ति and Their समवाय or शक्तिशिव-संबंध. Appendix II (a) gives and describes the creation both शुद्ध and अशुद्ध and criticizes and pulls down the भावायाम of केन्द्रकेति School; and it further gives शरीर-राम-विवेक. It also pulls down the theory of अण्यकेति of Buddhistic schools. II (b) demolishes the अन्योन्यायामात्. II (c) gives the evolution of 36 principles or तत्त्वान.

Appendix I

सिद्धांतदिक्षामणि—Chap. I, 1-12.

चैत्यशम्पर्कसमितिशिवसुलभावासंस्कृतम्।
सचिदांनुदस्त्राय शिवाय ऋषां नमः ॥ १ ॥

जगन्नायिकसंप्रदायशास्त्रसुलभनाथारीतिसन्ताय सचिदांसुखस्वरूपाय जड़-जीव-विलक्षणाय ऋषां विद्वान्तप्रियाय शिवाय शिवचिदांतप्रियस्वरूपसार्वाय नम हृदयः ॥ २ ॥

श्रीरत्न व्यपदेरास्य विषयं यं प्रचर्चिते ॥
चेतान्तिनो जनान्युक्त तद्भधं म परं शिवं ॥ २ ॥

श्रीरत्न व्यपदेरास्य परश्रमक्ति शार्क्षेय वेदान्तिनो यं परमात्मानं विषयमेव प्रचर्चिते तं जगत्कारणं परशिवं शिवचिदांतप्रियस्वरूपसार्वाय नमामित्यः ॥ २ ॥

यस्योपमिन्दुदादाभासः पद्मिनिशत्वसंगच्छाः।
निमित्तं शिवनामानं तं वेंदेच्च चिन्महा-स्रीधि ॥ ३ ॥

शिवदिक्षान्तपद परिवर्तनध्वस्तसमूहः यस्य परिन्यायविविधसुलभः अमिथ-डामाः।
हृदकोपन्यायानेत्रवृक्षं तरंग-गिरिवमाति।
निमित्तं महत्यारथं सिद्ध-नामां तं चिन्महो-स्रीधि वेंदेच्च नमस्करभीमायः ॥ ३ ॥

यम्भास्या भाष्ये शिरं वलुक्षेनायुन्देने ॥
नमस्तसः गुणातितिविभचाय परामने ॥ ४ ॥
“तस्य भास्यं सर्वं मिदं बिभाति” हि तत्ते: विष्णु सत्यं परव्रत्यं: प्रकरणेन प्रकाशते” “अस्वैवान्द्रस्तथायति भूतानि सामात्रायुप्तायति” हि तत्ते: चतुरात्मक्युक्तेनानुमोदते तस्मै मायिकस्तवरजस्तमोगुणावतिविभवाय परमाङ्गने शिवाय नम इल्व्यथ: || ४ ||

सदासिद्धमुक्तेषतःतेषोऽपि विशिष्टावर्दिनी ||

हिबन्धस्तम्भावय नमं: सांत्यं सङ्ख्या || ५ ||

महुराण्डरस्याचेन सर्वविद्वाचिलास्यापन्नसर्वद्विप्रतिभूतं तत्वशिवकालार्थेण विष्णुर्धरितस्वरूपाय सुकभाक्षे सुखव्रते सङ्ख्या नम इल्व्यथ: || ५ ||

स्वेच्छाविविधतुकाय स्वेच्छावशिष्यवाचनिने ||

स्वेच्छाविन्दतित्वात्रेकाय नमं: सांवायं सङ्ख्या || ६ ||

“स्थिरोत्तपरुषुः उद्गमः” हि तत्ते: भक्तानुप्रवेषः स्वेच्छाकारप्रदिब्यं मंगलञ्चिन्द्रुकाय स्वाभद्दलार्थेण स्वेच्छासारोदिनिमित्तहोकाय पार्वतीपते परस्याय नम इल्व्यथ: || ६ ||

तत्र विश्रामश्चिविश्लेषकमुदयं ||

नस्तःस्मै महाशयं महादेवाय शुद्धिने || ७ ||

तत्र वेदागमस्विन्दुपरमहाव्यायारिवेत्रेत्रेत्रेत्रेत्रेत्रभृंगे अनुज्ञम विश्वतः श्रेष्ठं स्वाभाविकं ममाशीमीलस्मामाहेश्वरेऽवज्जतं विश्रामिति || “षुकात्तयथादिव्याहति: सचिदानंदः: कः || सिवायन्मूलति सचिदानंदः कः || सिवायन्मूलति सचिदानंदः कः || सिवायन्मूलति सचिदानंदः कः” हि सूतगौतेश्वराल्यं भजते तस्मै महेश्वरायं “तत्वसिद्धार्थं परग्नं महेश्वरं” हि तत्ते: भाविकारगे-श्रायं महादेवाय अपरिमितकाश्रयाय शुद्धिने इच्छालोकित्वयात्मिनिरूढीयोऽपराश्रयाय नम इल्व्यथे: || अनेनायं सिद्धान्तो निर्विशेषश्राथैत्तिकम्त्व इल्व्यथं सः ||

एवं धितिष्ठानन्तरे मत्तु तत्परं भ्राह “स एक: स एको रहः स इल्वानः स मृगाचार्य सहेश्वरः स महादेवः” इल्वाधिविशेषार्थ्युक्तप्रकरणेत्रे-कमेवेति शिवावैदैतसाध्वास्योपमद्रव्यं || ७ ||

थामाहुः: सवेच्छोकानां प्रकृति शाश्वपरार्थाः ||

तो धर्माचारिणी शंभोः: प्रणामाशि परं पितं शिवाः || ८ ||

वेदागमा विद्वस्तार्थार्थात: शिवाज्ञानिनः यो परस्तिवसस्वनेत्राशायिनां सवेच्छोकानां प्रकृति सुचाकारणीमूर्त्तिनिर्मित्यासामस्तायामिकामाहुः: तो शंभोर्थेण धर्माचारिणी धर्मस्वरूपाद्यं परं सवेच्छोकानं सिवाय अवगती प्रणामाशि लयथ: ||
3

यथा महेशर: शंभुनार्मद्यादिप्रसंयुतः।
तस्मै मायास्वरूपायेः नमः परमशक्ते ॥ ९ ॥

यथा स्वसम्बोद्वारात्मका महेशरः। ब्रह्मधिवेकरणेऽर्थः। शंसु: शिवं शको यथा स शंसु: “शुचि कृष्णस च पञ्चलिन्यास्य” तत्वप्रकाशाचार्याःकुलायेः नामस्य-चिन्ताविकिष्टः। जीवान्तं भूस्मृत्तिभ्रमेण स्वात्स्य मायास्वरूपायेः। “माया तु प्रकटिः ब्रीकार्मणां हुः महेशरः” हृत्त शुक्ले प्रतिस्फुरणलया जनवपदानकारणी-मृतसत्वरजतमोगुणालमकं मायायत्तमृतक्स्ये तत्परत्र शक्ते परमशिवस्वसम्बोद्वारात्मके नम इत्यतः ॥ ९ ॥

शिवाध्यायसुप्रस्नप्राणांतिप्ररोचाः॥
मार्गः तां समस्ताः बने शिवकर्कं शिवार्थः ॥ १० ॥

शिवाध्यायादया। आदिपतगतवृक्षवतः सुमा मोनिवृत्तिमात्रिविष्णुविषाद-शालिनिरादत्तितकारुण्डकिनिदशाक्यपेश्वया उपरि शंक्रां समस्तां मात्र शिवकर्करं संग्रहते तं शि शिवतः सर्वसंगतं नमान्याः ॥ १० ॥

इच्छायानादिरुपेण या शंभोविविहारिनी ॥
बने तां परमानंदऽमोघहरिनी विवाहं ॥ ११ ॥

. . . शंभोः। परमेश्वरस्य या समवेतवस्य:। इच्छायानादिरुपेण “परा-स्वचकिति-विमल। वितक्री स्वाभाविती खुदसाक्षाभिसिद्धिः। शान्तिक्रन्य्यादिरुपेण समयस्य। तस्य मनः। सिवरक्षक्तस्तु” हृत्त शुक्ले इच्छायानादिरुपेण बिन्धनेव मिनोविनी। शिवस्वरकारणी तां परमानंदऽमोघहरिनी विवाहं बने इत्यतः ॥ ११ ॥

अमृतार्थ प्रपणां या सुविवाहदायिनी ॥
बहरिकर्कहरिनी बने तामीतामनमर्मां ॥ १२ ॥

अमृतार्थ मुक्तवर्ष प्रपणां शारणागातानां या शिवसंवेतत्वस्य:। सुविवाह-प्रद्राचिनी। “वेदान्तसाक्षात्विचया” हृत्त सृजतंशितः। तत्वस्मिन्वेदमेव अन्त: महावाक्यप्रकाशितत्विीचविवाहदायिनी। तां सिवप्रकाशां बहरिकर्कं बने नमस्तस्य मृत्युः इत्यतः। “अनन्या स्थानिक्ता सेव वस्तुस्य सूक्तिनिबिर्धी” हृत्त पौष्प-वचनस्य पुत्रंचुलुक्तार्तिपादितः सांक शिवायेवेन परमेश्वरदिति ॥ १२ ॥

Chap. II.—1–13.

सविवाहान्तर्रुप ददादिरुपिततव ॥
नमः। शिवाय संवाय सुभाष स्वरूपे ॥ १ ॥

सदादिरुपितवते शारवाभक्षकफ़ाण्डातिक्ष्वानाष्ट्रणेऽव मायापद्वे अस्मृतगायिनी श्वस्त्रहे योगिनाय बहरिकर्कं मुक्तसुस्त्रुपमार्थ शिवाय नमः। इत्यतः ॥
सद्दाशिवसुखाशोषत्वमोक्षारंभिकताकां॥
बज्जरे मातुशीर्षा शाक्ति महामायादिरुपिणिः॥ २ ॥
सद्दाशिवाविभृम्यमन्तप्रिवियत्वमोक्षिकोपतितसुकुमारिः शुक्लविचारसत्तमायाप्रसुखारंभिकताकां शिवसमवेदशाक्ति भवानीं वन्दे नौदीपायः॥ २ ॥
अविपि सख्सुलाकारमलक्षणपदास्तपूर्व॥
निर्विकल्प निराकार निरसारोषिन्धुवं॥ ३ ॥
सख्सुलाकारमलक्षणपदास्तपूर्व भेदरहित अकारण्य निर्विकत- सख्सुपुरुषपुरुष॥ ३ ॥
परिच्छेदकशास्त्रवृत्तं प्रणचाति तैवामभं॥
प्रबस्रासमनामानामासमीतियमद्वे स्थितं॥ ४ ॥
विभिन्नशिम्मज्ञानन्थरहितत भ्रात्रक्षतवेशमं हस्तविष्णुतः अर्नमनाय सफार्थमण्डलमा गंगाशरवेशम् प्रक्षणमणागम्यं अति एवातुरामानाय सम्प्रयोगातिप्राप्त शिरिन्दुरा ज्ञानात्तथा स्वमणलाविराजनतसमानमायनाम्॥
स्ववेजं स्वेजं शान्तं स्वेजशक्ति निर्मलां॥ ५ ॥
स्वप्रकाशनेत्र धर्मकामानं जनननमयानिधिधोपरहितं उपमातितं सर्वं स्वायु-स्वयं रागद्वैरहितं सर्वसामंद्रं अनगीं निरोधरहिततमिति यावत॥ ५ ॥
तत्र लीं अभुपूवं चेतनावेतनं जगात॥
स्वामलां जगतायं स्वप्रकाशं तदर्थुं॥ ६ ॥
तत्र तस्मिनक्षुत्तक्षणनं परसद्यनं "चराचरमविश्रं" पूवं चतुःप्राक्तं लीं अनुमानवेदितियागोचरलेवा तावास्येन स्थितं तदर्थुमात्रलं अनंतरसमिति शेषः। स्वामलां स्वामसुक्कितिलां जगात् योग्यपुपदानांतिरस्वरहितलेवा स्वप्रकाश्यं त्रितीयस्या-भ्रावास्ने निन्द्याचरलेवा कतन्त् योगसम्मुदितर्॥ ७ ॥
शिवमंगं परं वहं जगस्मीमातुमित्ये॥
स्वरूपमात्रे बिभिन्नशिरुक्षरूणिनिविचारिः॥ ८ ॥
शिवायं परं वहं विभिन्नक्षुत्तक्षणं स्वेधं सुसखावलोक्षणं किचिदस्वरूपं
बंगोकारेश्वरे॥ ८ ॥
विभिन्नक्षुत्तक्षणं विश्रं स्वं विश्रं सुसखावलोक्षणं
कीचिदस्वरूपं चारं बंगोकारेश्वरं॥ ९ ॥
ब्राह्मणाधारसमसमं तदर्थुं॥ ३ ॥
दिनें स्तुत्यं निरंभज्ञानांस्मथ्यचछद्युरादिकरणप्रणं योगिनां प्रव्य्क्तः कौटिष्ठयः
प्रकारं चन्द्रकोटिसमभाषं. अभायेनात्मकक्याणुगुणार्थं अतिदुर्गऩ्यकरिताधनेनकम-
हिीमाधारं किंचित्स्वरूपसाधृष्ठ इति पूर्ण संबंधः।। 11।।

तद्वीया परस्मा सन्तक्षणः साधुमानुःस्वरूपणीं।। 12।।

तद्वीया परस्मासंबंधीन परस्मा सन्तक्षणः परारूपः विद्विचारः साधुमानुः-
स्वरूपण अस्तित्वी श्रेष्ठः।। 12।।

तद्विच्यप्रकारः साधारणस्वरूपातुकारिणी।
स शंखुभेदावन्देवः सविणण्यस्मानाः।। 13।।

अहम्मिन्द्र हिि श्रुते: “आसिः, प्रकाशी, नवंशी।” स्नाप्यमयोऽहुसानम्-
काकमोितमस्मृतीर्थपायि समस्तेऽकर्मिन्मणु पूर्वाककरणेः।” नाससो विधाते माहं
इति भगवदुके: स्त्राम्यप्रस्यमयेनाधिदित्यिवाभाग्यमर्त्यान्हानाहुभयंत्रीव्योचरीं
त्वेन खितत्व विखितस्येवाधुलक्षणानिवाभाग्यमर्त्यान्हानाहुभयंत्रीव्योचरीं।
स्त्राम्यप्रकरणेः मैदानें प्रतिपादः ब्रह्मात्मकस्थुपष्पदियायां विकाराहिशेऽ समवायस्वरूपीणि
उपाध्यायकारशीष्ट inland। भवचति। युन: स्त्रांतारक्षण्यालसृजसहारामिनीयां तद्विच्चाया
कृमिम्बसन्न्यायेः स्वकिरणायानसंभाळक्यायाकिएः।।
तव मैदानें साधारं-
परोक्षियाप्रिशति तत्त्वस्वरूपातुकारिणी शिवाधिष्ठंस्वरूपः।।
नव मैदानें मैदानें विश्वास इति वाचि तत्त्वस्य भावेनयास्यारिष्टव्यास भावीकी-
मैदानें मैदानें विश्वास इति वाचि तत्त्वस्य भावेनयास्यारिष्टव्यास भावीकी-
भेदायेऽविश्वास इति वाचि तत्त्वस्य भावेनयास्यारिष्टव्यास भावीकी-
भेदायेऽविश्वास इति वाचि तत्त्वस्य भावेनयास्यारिष्टव्यास भावीकी-
भेदायेऽविश्वास इति वाचि तत्त्वस्य भावेनयास्यारिष्टव्यास भावीकी-
भेदायेऽविश्वास इति वाचि तत्त्वस्य भावेनयास्यारिष्टव्यास भावीकी-
भेदायेऽविश्वास इति वाचि तत्त्वस्य भावेनयास्यारिष्टव्यास भावीकी-
भेदायेऽविश्वास इति वाचि तत्त्वस्य भावेनयास्यारिष्टव्यास भावीकी-

V—38.

नन्दु झाँड़रूपे परमाधिवे साध्वकादिगुणायथासंबंधेः नास्ति युक्तत्वात् कथे
युक्तार्थ्यसंजीवित्याहाः—

गुणायत्वमें निर्दले विद्वात्मिः।।
भूलवले वै भूज्यवले प्रेक्षकं च कालित्तम्।। 38।।

साध्वकादिगुणायथामें निर्दले विद्वात्मिः झुड़े चैत्यवे भूज्यवले
प्रेक्षकं च कालित्तमिः।। 38।।

गुणायत्वा साध्वकादिगुणायथामें निर्दले विद्वात्मिः।।
तद्वैभुवस्था साध्वकादिगुणायथामें।। 39।।
ब्वबमनियांसयोगसन क्रियापूर्वक अन्तरोधकमेजब संयोगस्वतांिज्ञबद्धे-स्थित्यांरोघोपनधति हि ब्वबांदायेदसता। शनिवर ब्वबसिंधुसंपन्नका बिकायपूर्वसंयोग-स्थापितसिंधुस्यालिगियोगिकित्सरस्तिने विचित्रित्सूत्रत्वां। सर्वभर्त्सनांवकाशः।

“सिषोहस्तयुति कौतिय इत्बअहिम शाहसुर्यं:।। हि भवनं तुकः।।
“शोकर्ण हुतात्या हुव वित्तिनामानि भीतृ शर। गाणु मार्दव्यमिववसक मुखणवलमः।।
बाहेशु नोहु द्वं योगितु च प्रबोध: प्रस्तावमः व्याख्यायः हि नियमनित्तमहः।”

इत्यबनियोक्तेषा भस्म्या महेद्वदंक्षणात्मासंस्थं चेति नातो। नेद्रामें-ब्वबोधिरोध: सार्वंत्रिकः नसनांति निभा शाखोः ज्ञानकियासामर्यांतिकश्च शर्माधकः विरिजियाः। अन्यथा प्रताषांपूर्वेऽपि हिवण: प्रतिश्चिवनजातमा-विश्वस्तरमार्यािन्त्यवाति स्पष्टिकमणित्वुरातिविक्रातान्तिकसिंधुसंस्यग-परामर्शोज्ञज्ञचेति जन्ततिपतिनविचविवेदः।

सर पराश्चर्याककिविचवेत। शृवते शर्माधिकारियाःशृवते:—
िर्रुनांदेख्यात्क्याकिविधिपिणी चक्षुश्चाकार्योभाकारकवादः।। तत् धिद्वानं-वर्षोवर्षद्रवें विशेषोभावाति इष्ठादिशितियां सार्वादनीयां विशेषसंबंधायां नेद्रामेंवर्धेष्ठरुमणी सभूर्तसंरचापादप्रक्षस्तन्विविबन्धेयाने स्वातांमण्डली-कृत्थाणावपुष्यमियां पुराणिपिणी विमालककिविभागपरमेवद्वायाः। स्वता विसय-परामर्शद्वायाः गुण्यनिविकायान्ति क्यमोभिचेतु। उच्यते।

वद्वित्मस्तिक्षरसमात्रे दृश्याकियिनियम्यानेन क्रियायाश्च ज्ञातुतात्वियोगात् ज्ञान-शस्त्र कुरुटात्वियोगाव उच्चमन्दात्विनियुक्तथा अनाधिकारियाः बियायसाधनां र्यति। प्रतिति। तवाबहुतात्वियितुकियिनमालाति अक्षिलस्तत्वतमोभिराण्युक्तलिङ्गी-कृत्कारियानिम्न। ज्ञानमीती न्यवहरे ज्ञातुत् क्रियाभिषववकरोमीक्षण कर्तृत्वाय अपि उपुद्धुस्तवात्यज्ञानककियोपैवर्तुत ऐक्येपि विभागपरमार्यामहिमनाः। ज्ञानं क्रिया न भवति किष्ट् ज्ञानं न भवित्य-योगेभावानुसङ्क्षेपेत्तमोण्यात्सिद्धिवेपमेव गुण्यनिविकायके सही सत्यस्मात् गुणस्त्रत्यत्वत्तमात्तरस्तुष्टमेव वरस्त्राधिकारिके परस्परस्ये बस्तुध्वनिष्ठाना भौगोलिकेश्यकसाधनां नास्तिकायाधिकारिणी ततो समुपवा प्रतिस्करणगाला मावाध्यक्ष्याभिभूतेयुक्तसाधनसिद्धिष्ठति भावः।

अनेन सर्व विश्वसंस्यायनविभागपराक्षणमहिमाति दृष्टचित्तिः न परिमािनवादुक्तसाधकाः।। ““विधिमैत्रेयि वेषोस्त: स्थितिमाणिवशावद्विहि-चौपीड़ि निमुद्यादनस्मयेजाति प्रकाययेद।“ हि श्रीमद्वीरक्ष्यमिबिनोक्तेय। अस्वाम-संभरस्थितसंस्यात्।।।। “ “नास्ति वच्चते भावः।” हि गौतमराज। नम्बरे चोद्युथः
उत्तरायण वंशविद्यालयें स्मार, "नामातो विचारेत सेर" हृति करत्वार्द्धिति बेद्र॥
आर्यतकौश्योजितेरुपवेनासनपर्वकारिवर्तिप्रत्याममिवमिवतहाविदिवदुत्। सुधापि न
गुहर्वविन इक्षुरेष्यायास्त्र नियमकिन्तुिति॥

नन्दनायचिवाससंवादीभि: पूर्वपुरुषांतःवेत्तानंतीतिकंदमें भ्रमणिणा
सनातनी राज्यमानसत्तका गुणमयापद्यि शक्ति: अध्यात्मिष्वनात्यविधायासाक्षरिति।
तद्वेश्यात्तुदुःस्वात्त्वायात्तास्ते बाध्यं वस्तुर्व्यवसित्वा वस्तुन्त्रसाहित्याभिष्मा समुप्येति
व्याख्यायुं शाक्यवादृं किम्भेतातान्ध्रायां हृति बेद्र॥

"तद्धिति परमा शक्ति: संचितांकबन्धुणा।
समस्तकोक्तिकरितारणांस्वयमविकरिति।
तदिष्ठायायकसंवादस्तथा पुनः कारिति॥
हृति तत्ततः पूर्वपुजारवेत्तानिधिरोऽवात॥

"श्रायांबियकतक्रोणा संगीतित्वां प्रति।
स्थानभूतों विमानों चर्मक्षाद्वेशमुच्यते॥
पराइत्तासमावेशविपुरूविनिभवताः।
सर्वः सर्वः सहस्र, सर्वकारता सहस्र:।
भिवशाहारामहाविविविवर्तिपुर्विवतमू।
परार्थकमोऽहुँविविवः प्रसांगकृते:।
यथा चंद्रे स्थिरा ज्योतिः विश्रवस्त्राकारिणी।
तथा शक्तिविविवालिमा प्रकारे बाध्यं स्विताः।"

हृति वस्तुमाणसंवादमाज्यनमस्तव पिरोऽवात॥

अथ शक्ते: दिवसमिष्ठेवन निरवचनार्थ कर्म सांसाध्यापादानकारण्व।
सम्भवतीति नासकेनियम्॥ यथा परमार्णां निरवचनार्थकर्म गुरुकर्माध्यक्षकःऽनिमोवतांत्वामीजित्वते तथा तत्त्वज्ञात्मिष्वनिक्षिपिताया मायापादःऽनिमोमित्वस्तवाव।
अथ भगवद्गुरुपालिविवालिभृति तिनेन सम्बन्धति। तस्य द्विपुरुसेन श्रायादस्तुद्वत्ये दृष्टिप्रसंगमात॥

नन्दु श्रीकिरकाःजातशामानसमुदार्य्य यथा तद्यथप्रक्रो न विचारेत तथा श्रायां
भास्तमा पिवार्थिपि तस्यपर्यप्रावरोद्यकर्मफलकिष्यते तथा तत्त्वान्तिपरिकल्पिताया मायापादः: तस्य द्विपुरुसेन श्रायादस्तुद्वत्ये दृष्टिप्रसंगमात॥

मथु निवासिकाः ज्ञातशामानसमुदार्य्य यथा तद्यथप्रक्रो न विचारेत तथा श्रायां
शत्त्वेः सत्यवेषंः अनन्तिभावेनांगीकृतत्वात्। नचायमसंप्रयोजनरेतुः
यदि सत्यवें न श्याताभिन्निभाववेषं न श्यात् घटाविरिति भ्यतिरेकिरूपवात्
स्वयम्र प्रियापमानत्वात्। उक्ष्यमहतिरियतीनां गृहसंगवेषामसक्तप्रभारितापतिष्ठिती।
तन्निः तथाकार्यत्व नियमनात्तिस्वत्त्व मानान्यत्वात्। सकलमार्यादाभिमुखाभिज्ञानत्वात्।
नच घटकसंगवेषाय दुर्मितरूपायाय थहः। नारी घटकार्याय। “शालमया
शाकाश: संभूत” इत्यादि शुरूः पवायादी नास्याल्यरंपर्य। तथाकार्यत्व नदिःशरिगत
त्वादसब्दात् नेख तथा द्रुयोर्य पवायादसवात्। नारी नारीसार्यायः बाधात्कोट्टयाः
परस्परवायाय: भेष्याकोटी प्रमाणा शंग्रोजितवेन श्रीस्वत्त नीरान्यात्वात्। नेख
तच चैत्यवेषामसब्दात्। वदिःसार्याजातीयतावादात्।

यथा कथंचितुंगीकारेशीपि तथा: प्रमेयतवात् प्रमेयोस्य प्रमादारा प्रमादानिः
रूपाय भेष्याकोटीरूपाय भेष्याकोटीविचित्रेति विचार महेतूः भविष्यति वाच्यतः न स्थानुः। नात्त्वा
नपुष्पददिविषाधिनण स्वृति नाशात्। नच संस्काराय नं संस्कारद्वीप वाच्यम्। तस्यापि
सविष्याकवेदवायम्-सविष्याकवेदवायम्। पुर्व वशवंशिताविवायम् मानान्यतात्
शंग्रोजितवेन शंग्रोजितवेन शंग्रोजितवेन शंग्रोजितवेन शंग्रोजितवेन शंग्रोजितवेन शंग्रोजितवेन शंग्रोजितवेन
गार्विकबिविषिष्ठत्रैत्रं भोज्यसादिदृश्यं। परतवमयोपाधि: आयमायुपकृतित्वेन परतव- 
हृपसत्वगुणोपाधिबिविषिष्ठत्रैत्यायरंभ्रोकरूपमेवेक हृक्ष्यं। \ll ४० \ll

यथोक्तमेव ऋषियांत—

भोज्यं प्रेमविता वसुद्रवमिंद्र समुस्मु।
अखंडे बहाचेलनः कल्पितं गुणमद्धुः। \ll ४१ \ll

समवृष्टिः \ll ४१ \ll

अत्र प्रेमविता श्रुद्धुद्रापूर्विकमेवेकः।
संभोगाधिकः सवं माहीतः पश्चातः सृष्टः। \ll ४२ \ll

अन्तत्व गृहकैलमुख्ये। \ll ४३ \ll

अतिकसऽपाधिकवातः महीयः सवं: सुखमोक्ष: श्रस्मु: किंचितमो- 
सिद्धवातः संहारसम्भविणः कायुक्तः। जाऊक्त: किंचितसचिकारंगेऽपि- 
कवातः किंचित्वा: जाणात्मकसंगीत:। अतः कुऽक्त: शुऽक्त:। किंचित्वा: ह्रास्यमायु- 
सिद्धवातः भोज्यमंवः प्रकृत्तिरिश्यं: किंचित्वमायुक्तमेवेक:। अन्तसात: श्रुद्धादानान्तरं —
ह्रास्यमायुक्तमेवेक:। तथा ज्ञाते गृहकैलमुख्ये। \ll ४३ \ll

एवं मायच्यमेवेक:रोपाधिवृष्टीः श्रुद्धायान्तरं। लिंगरंगव्यासिनवज्वस्वरूपं 
सनुरक्षयितं पूर्वोक्तमयोपाधिः द्विप्र विभाव वृक्षवित्त—

उपाधि: पुनरावृत्ता। श्चुऽक्तव्रृद्धिवेदनः।
श्चुऽक्तव्रृद्धिवेदनः: परा माया स्वाग्रायमोहिकारिणः। \ll ४४ \ll

"पिण्डस्वरूपं" उपाधि: पूर्वोक्तमयोपाधि: पुनः: गुद्दुश्रवमेदनं द्विप्र भवितः,
तत्र श्चुऽक्तव्रृद्धिवेदनः: परा माया स्वाग्रायमोहिकारिणोऽस्मिन्यायस्यविस्मययः। \ll ४४ \ll

श्रुद्धापौर्विकाः प्रतिप्रश्नमविचारायमोहिनी।
अविधाध्यात्मकमेदनं जीवं बहुविचा: स्मृता:। \ll ४५ \ll

श्रुद्धापौर्विकाः: बाविन्धा अःध्रुमोक्षिनी। अनेकोऽस्मिन्यायः। अविधाध्यात्मकमेदनं 
अंशमेदनेयः। जीवं बहुविचा: स्मृता:।
मायावाक्षिकवादीसो नानासृत्तिकाः प्रसुः।
सर्वकाः सर्वकार्त्वं च निलसुको महेश्वरः॥ ७६॥

इन्द्र: शुद्धिपाठिधेश्वरः मायावाक्षिकवादी सदायकाः:
वानिकाः जीवाण्यं कृपणकृमण्याकर्मणुः सर्वकाः:
वास्तवकाः सर्ववास्तविकाः सर्वात्मसम्पन्नवासः॥ ७७॥

तथा जीवः नामाः, किंचित्तेति, किंचित्काः किंचित्तः बहः: आयामाः:
नादिरासिरवादम् इमोरितस्य जीवः नादिरासिरवादम् नादिरः 
प्राकृतिरासिरास्मात् ॥ जातृत्वाद्भविष्यस्य साधुः कृत्यमत्युक्ते 
अभ्यासात्मपन्नवासः कृत्यम् भवते असदायकाः जातृत्वाद्भविष्यस्य 
"इति इति इति इति किरणामोक्षयः पुरुषसिद्धिभिः जीवः:
आहारोक्तिः संसारं सदायकाः होमः सदायकाः होमः सदायकाः होमः ॥ ७८॥

परिप्रेमिति संसारे निजनार्कासोऽकरः
देवतिष्यमुनायानन्यायोनियितेऽकरः ॥ ७९॥

संसारे निजनार्कासोऽकरः: देवतिष्यमुनायानन्यायोनियितेऽकरसंसारे
परिप्रेमिति संसारे ॥ ७५॥

अथ च: गायकमृत्वाद्भविष्यस्य साधुः कृत्याविरासिरास्मात् ॥
सहाराकाः सुविशेषस्तायस्य संविशेषस्तायस्य संविशेषस्य संविशेषस्य ॥

सिद्धांशुशास्त्राणि, I—७८, ७४.

अवतारणिका—नन्दु शारीराववीको: किंचित्येश्वरः इल्लात्राय—
शारीराववीकोऽसंधार्यग्नि स कृप्ते इल्लात्राय
शारीरैव शारीरैव शारीरैव शारीरैव परिलिङ्ग इल्लात्राय ॥ १॥

व्यायामयः—सर्वायमन्यायोनियितेऽकरसंसारे
बहः सहारात्मपन्नवासः कृप्ते इल्लात्राय—
परिप्रेमिति संसारे निजनार्कासोऽकरः ॥ परिप्रेमिति संसारे ॥

अवतारणिका—नन्दु शारीराववीको: इल्लात्राय—
च्याय्यां—अर्थ भाव: युक्ततिरिक्तमेव युक्त-वद्वत्तबिधृत, पारिवाहिनियमेव युक्त-वद्वत्तबिधृत, पारिवाहिनियमेव युक्त-वद्वत्तबिधृत। 

व्याख्यानं—अर्थ भाव: युक्ततिरिक्तमेव युक्त-पारिवाहिनियमेव युक्त-वद्वत्तबिधृत, पारिवाहिनियमेव युक्त-वद्वत्तबिधृत, पारिवाहिनियमेव युक्त-वद्वत्तबिधृत, पारिवाहिनियमेव युक्त-वद्वत्तबिधृत, पारिवाहिनियमेव युक्त-वद्वत्तबिधृत।
स्वराज सुप्रवक्ता श्रीमान्य भारत रत्न \n
स्वराज सुप्रवक्ता श्रीमान्य भारत रत्न
प्राकृतिक रूप में प्रस्तुत विवेचनात्मक स्थान के लिए हिन्दी भाषा का इस पृष्ठ का प्रतिनिधित्व करता है।
शिवाधीतमंजरी-34 to 37. प्रतिशतचौद्वारासनम्

एक च बिरासितप्रमिहैं ब्राह्मण स्कंदिकार बहुता शिवाधीकितवाशस्वर-हुद्रविषांकलाविषारकालारामकालारामरितपुंसकालकालयुतिम: प्रशुकुमहृज्ञ-श्रानावावावापरापियस्तुपलमसंपाद्रपरसंपाद्रायावायुविन्हितलिक्ष्वाधारम्

इति पृथ्विषा तत्त्वानाँ भिन्नते तत्वादि:—

“अनाद्रितिनवनायनायांविषालिवायावपारमकारणात।

हुद्रविषांकल्लितवारं ततो जांत तत: किया।

तथोपबानि भुवाति भुवनानि चलुद्धारा॥”

इत्यागमोकः:

“अर्थ किया स्वतः दुःखासेंष्वां。

जांत समालोकारी मध्यसिद्धा।

हुद्रविषां मुघुवांविदशंतवरभाष्यति।

जांत किया च जाल मुघुवांहुसश्चरय॥”

इति मातुकाचचरविन्दकिनितेशः

सृष्टि-समुद्धरस्त्र स्वेच्छास्तंतरंगभूतजनानानायामित्वमध्यमः यथाव भविष्यवाच्छर्वांचनित्तकारणः

सर्वज्ञाक्षरुकण्यानोऽक्षरमत्रा तिश्ववत्सिद्विति।

अथ स्वेच्छायकः: वहिरंगरुवकित्तियोगादिहींयोगः यथा, भविष्यवाच्छर्वांचनित्तकारणः

शक्तितवर्म भवित।

अथवैविष्णसिद्वित्वमेव स्वेच्छास्तंतरंगभूतजनानानायामित्वमध्यमः सतः

जालविवाहसिद्ठरचाविवाहविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तुतिवारविस्तु
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Works:</th>
<th>English Works:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altekar—Village communities of Western India.</td>
<td>Hopkins—Religions of India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabindo Ghosh—All his Works.</td>
<td>James—Introduction to Anthropology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barth—Religions of India.</td>
<td>Jayaswal K. P.—History of India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown—Sex Worship and Symbolism of Primitive Races.</td>
<td>MacDonnel—Sanskrit Literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatterjee J. C.—Kashmir Shaivism</td>
<td>Max Muller—Vedic India; Six Systems of Indian Philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Das S. K.—Shakti or Divine Power</td>
<td>Anantakrishna Iyer L. K.—The Mysore Tribes and castes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furneaux—Human Physiology</td>
<td>Perry—Growth of Civilisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghate—Vedanta.</td>
<td>Purnalingam Pillai M. S.—Ravana the Great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayavadana Rao C.—Introduction to Srikar Bhashya.</td>
<td>Râdhâkrishnan Sir—History of Indian Philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heras Fr.—Mohenjo Daro and other articles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors and Titles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranade R. D. — A Constructive Survey of Upanishadic Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranade &amp; Belavarkar — Philosophy. Vol. II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rele V. G. — The Mysterious Kundalini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoff — Periplus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seshu Iyengar T. R. — Dravidian India.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaktas of Bengal, Heritage of India Series.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shivapadasundaram — Shaiva School of Hinduism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slater — Dravidian Element in Indian culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith V. A. — History of India.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srinivasa Iyengar P. T. — History of the Tamils; Outlines of Indian Philosophy; Stone Age in India.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Aryan Tamil Culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suryanarayana Sastri S. S. — Shivadwaita of Srikanta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston — Castes &amp; Tribes of South India.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyllor — Primitive Culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivekananda Swami — The Four Yogas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadia — Geology of India.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall — Sex and Sex Worship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney A. V. — Sanskrit Grammar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodroffe Sir John — Serpent Power; Shakti &amp; Shakta; Studies in Mantrashastra &amp; other works.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Journals etc.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Department, Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay University Journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclopaedia of India by Balfour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopaedia of Religion &amp; Ethics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Gazetteer Vols. I, II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Antiquity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Historical Quarterly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Indian History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnataka Historical Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madras Christian College Magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabuddha Karnatak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddhanta Dipika (different Vols.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triveni Vol. IX.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sanskrit Works.

- वीरमाहेश्वराचारसंग्रह-नीलकेत \*  
  नागानाथाचार्य
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Agamas, Vedas, Puranas, Upanishads, Smritis, and many other relevant works have also been consulted. They have all been referred to in the body of the book; but being too many to be mentioned they are omitted from the list. Books marked (*) are to be taken as printed at Sholapur by late Mallappanna Varad.
Dr. S. N. Dasgupta, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., F.R.S.E.,
O. I. E., King George V Professor of Mental Science,
Calcutta University.

I have read with great interest your learned performance on the History and Philosophy of the Lingayat Religion. In going through the pages of your great work I feel that I have learned much. It appears to me that, so far as I know, this is the best work on Virasaivism that I have ever read. I must congratulate you on your great success and I can assure you that I shall have to draw copious materials from your work for Vol. V of my Cambridge History of Indian Philosophy. I must thank you most sincerely for the kindness you have shown to me in presenting the work to me.

Sri A. V. Gopalachariar, B. A. M. L.

Mimamsacharya, Vedantaratna etc., Trichinopoly.

The Lingadhāraṇachandrikā of Śrī Nandikeshvarā is a learned, well-reasoned and lucidly written Sanskrit book in defence of the wearing of the Lingam with profuse quotations from the Vedas, Puranas, and Agamas. The author’s arguments are often based on the Mimamsa Nyayas. We were favoured with the Sanskrit original with its excellent English translation and very copious and learned annotations in English by Professor M. R. Sakhare about two years ago and we read the book with great interest and sent a short appreciation. Professor Sakhare, who has with untiring industry studied all the literature of the East and the West which throws light on the great religions of the world and particularly on the Vedic-Agamic systems prevailing in India, has now added a very elaborate and edifying English Introduction extending over 682 pages. We have read carefully through the entire introduction and we feel bound to say that we cannot sufficiently praise the thoroughness of the author’s research, the remarkable lucidity of the exposition, the critical acumen displayed in the shifting of all the materials gathered from various sources, and more than all, the deeply sincere God-passion which almost every sentence of the work breathes. We have always thought and felt that the Lingam is a symbol of the Universe and the form is a miniature representation of the Universe, etc. etc.

Swami Sāswarananda,
Shri Ramakrishnamath, Mylapore, Madras.

The book has considerably added to my knowledge of this form of the Hindu Dharma little known outside the regions where-
it is professed. Your distinguished service to Religious of India, especially to Veerasaivism, in the form of this volume is bound to receive grateful recognition from all who take interest in religious truths. I am of sincere opinion that it will be a valuable addition to any library worth the name.

I have been going through the book with a great amount of interest and am much pleased to note that the whole treatment is thoroughly historic and explanation given convincing and authoritative. The book has dispelled several misunderstandings regarding the origin and nature of Linga worship and other Saivite practices, born of pure ignorance or blind prejudice.

You maintain a very healthy and equally true thesis in your historical outline when you set forth the view that the spiritual culture of India is a confluence of two streams, the Aryan and Dravidian forms of thought and practices that have commingled and enriched mutually from long past. Any attempt to divide the cultural unity of India by attempting the impossible task of separating and claiming exclusiveness is childishly ridiculous. The vast literature you have consulted and the splendid array of facts you have presented in the pages of this book will surely evoke the admiration of all scholars. The book will stand as a very valuable document for the future, guiding and helping all who study the Lingayat faith either for its spiritual content or for its historic interest. The non-technical treatment and informal language of the book make it valuable for the laymen. This however does not hinder the scholarly interest. ..........even as it is, the book is a very distinct contribution.

Dr. C. Kanhan Raja,

Department of Sanskrit, University of Madras.

I read through your very well-written book with great interest. The 11th Chapter is quite admirable and no one can fail to admire your courage in dealing with a religious institution with a full historical sense of uprightness and love of truth. Your exposition of the religion is also very thorough and lucid. We want such full descriptions of the various religions in India undertaken by scholars of your type, who have a good grasp of the subject along with a training in historical investigation.

I am not quite sure whether you have been quite just to the presentation of what you call Hinduism. There is no religion called Hinduism. Historically, Hinduism can mean only what
was in Hind, or India. It is more a civilization than a religion
and there were all sorts of religion in the country. .................

As regards Phallus worship, I am not convinced that Sisna-
devah means phallus worship in the Veda and to that extent we
are agreed. But why should a man be ashamed if there had been
phallus worship? .........................................................
your arguments on the point are quite cogent and convincing.

As historical study and as a full presentation of a religion,
the book is admirable. Since you asked me to give my frank
opinion, I have spoken out my mind on two important topics,
which you have dealt with in the book. It is only a difference
in outlook and has nothing to do with your opinion or your book.

Dr. S. K. De,
Department of Sanskrit, University of Dacca.

The immense labour, wide reading and enthusiastic but con-
scientious treatment displayed in your elaborate work on the
History and Philosophy of Lingāyat Religion greatly impressed
me as I went through its interesting pages. The subject, on which
literature is so scanty and not easily available, is not as widely
known to scholars as it should have been; and even where known,
it is perhaps imperfectly understood, and sometimes misrepresented.
your complaint on this score is fully justified, and your attempt
to remedy the deficiency is praiseworthy. Although I am myself
interested in Indian Religious faiths and movements, I must
confess I had little knowledge of the Lingayat system, which had
been a sealed book to me. I can say without hesitation, therefore,
that I have read your book with great pleasure and profit. Please
accept my congratulations and thanks for the gift.

The first few preliminary chapters bring in admittedly
controversial matters, but your treatment of the question of origins
and early religious movements is suggestive, and cannot be entirely
ignored even by those who honestly differ. There can be no doubt,
however, that when you come to the treatment of the Lingayat
system in particular, you supply a great deal of valuable informa-
tion on a little studied subject with painstaking lucidity. In this
respect I do not feel entitled to express an authoritative opinion;
but I find that the most interesting and informative chapters are
those which deal fairly elaborately with the meaning of Sivalinga
as a fundamental concept (viii, ix) the rise of the Lingayat
religion and its early history (xi) its philosophy and religious
practice (xii) and its literature and scriptures (xv). Your labours
have succeeded in throwing great light on the subject; and you;
have thereby rendered a real service not only to the understanding
of the religious faith but also to the cause of scholarship in general.

M. S. Basavalingayya, Esq. M. A. B. L., Curator,
Govt. Oriental Library, Mysore.

"Lingadharana Chandrika" by Nandikeswara is one of the monumental and most authoritative works, which establishes the practice of wearing Lingam on human body, as being enjoined by the Vedic and Upanishadic texts and supported by Agamas, Itihasas etc. The work by itself is a small one, but the editor, while writing an Introduction to the work, has elaborated his writing to a voluminous size comprising about 700 pages, wherein he has traced the origin and development of Savisim and its schools, from the pre-Vedic times up to the 12th century A.D. and expressed his views regarding the rise of Lingayat Religion and its Founder. The chapter on "The Philosophy and Practice of Lingayat Religion" faithfully represents the fundamental tenets of the Lingayat Religion and Philosophy. ..................................

But some of the views and conclusions held and arrived at by the editor cannot be taken as conclusive and as warranted by authoritative texts bearing on those points.

Apart from what I have said above, the editor has expended a lot of energy in making an assiduous study of all the important points raised in his introduction to the work and the pains he has taken in bringing out such a useful edition of the work are unquestionable.

This is almost the first work written in English, explaining so vividly the Philosophy and Religion of the Lingayats. His copious and useful introduction would be an eye-opener to other ambitious scholars to proceed further in their path of research and study of the Lingayat Religion. The editor of the work richly deserves patronage and all possible encouragement.
Dr. S. K. Belvalkar,
M. A., Ph. D., I. E. S., (Retd.) Poona.

I read Professor M. R. Sakhare's "Lingadhārana-chandrikā" with English Translation and full Notes, and a long, valuable Introduction, designed to familiarise the layman as well as the scholar with the 'History and Philosophy of the Lingayat Religion,' with considerable pleasure and profit. It has helped to clear many of my own hazier notions about the Lingayat Cult, and I feel sure that the experience of other readers—be they Lingāyats or Non-Lingāyats—will not be much different from mine.

Being himself a cultured and critical follower of the Lingāyat Religion it was natural that Professor Sakhare should have looked upon the task accomplished by him so meritoriously in a volume of more than a thousand pages as a sacred mission; and I can vouch from personal knowledge that he had been formulating plans about such a work some years ago. The present publication is evidently a product of wide reading and mature thinking, which are discernible on almost every page of it. Alike in the Introduction as in the Annotations the author has quoted extensively the original authorities used by him; and this feature is likely to appeal to the average reader, who rarely feels the inclination, even when he has the means, to refer to the original sources when they are cited merely by chapter and page.

Nandikeshwara, the author of the Lingadhārana-chandrikā, is a Seventeenth century author, Lingayat by profession, who has endeavoured to establish in the Sanskrit work before us that the beginnings of the Lingayat Religion
and Philosophy are traceable even in the Vedas and the Upanisads. In his lengthy Introduction Professor Sakhare has availed himself of the Indus Valley finds, particularly of their interpretation by Professor Herns, to render the antiquity of Siva worship, as not improbable in view of the data already known, which Professor Sakhare has with considerable pains collected together. Not every reader of the Volume will of course find it possible to see eye to eye with the learned author in every detail but there is a wealth of information to be derived from the book and occasional hints for workers in kindred fields of research. All this taken into consideration, I sincerely congratulate Professor Sakhare upon his performance.

Unhappily the work is disfigured by too many misprints of which the Author himself is painfully conscious, and which will have to be removed in the next edition before the work can secure an assured place of respect in the world of Oriental Scholarship.