



# Vedāntic Analogies Expressing Oneness and Multiplicity and Their Bearing on the History of the Śaiva Corpus.

## Part II: *Vivartavāda*

Andrea Acri<sup>1</sup>

Published online: 22 July 2021

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature B.V. 2021

**Abstract** This article, divided into two parts, traces and discusses two pairs of analogies invoked in Sanskrit(ic) literature to articulate the paradox of God's oneness and multiplicity vis-à-vis the souls and the manifest world, reflecting the philosophical positions of *pariṇāmavāda* (and *bhedābheda/dvaitādvaita* or, in some cases, *viśiṣṭādvaita*) and *vivartavāda* (and *abheda/advaita*). These are, respectively, the analogies of fire in wood and dairy products in milk, and moon/sun in pools of water and space in pots. Having introduced prevalent ideas about the status of the supreme principle(s) vis-à-vis the souls and creation in Śaivism, Sāṅkhya, and Vedānta, and having investigated instances of the first pair of analogies in multiple textual genres in Part I, here I turn to the discussion of the second set of analogies. Having proposed that the first set reflects the influence of *pariṇāma*-Vedānta on an early strand of the Śaiva textual corpus, I argue that the second set, attested prevalently in relatively late sources, betrays a (post-)Śāṅkarian origin (even if it was used in a *pariṇāma*-sense), thereby suggesting a *vivartavāda*-Advaita Vedānta influence on the Śaiva corpus after the 9th or 10th century.

**Keywords** Analogies · *bhedābheda* · *bhedavāda* · *pariṇāmavāda* · *vivartavāda* · *satkāryavāda* · Śaivism · Vedānta · Sāṅkhya

## Introduction

In Part I of this article, I have mapped and discussed a pair of analogies—i.e., fire in wood and dairy products in milk—invoked to express the concepts of *pariṇāmavāda*

---

✉ Andrea Acri  
andrea.acri@ephe.psl.eu

<sup>1</sup> EPHE, PSL University, Paris, France

(and *bhedābheda*) with respect to the theologico-philosophical issue of God's oneness and multiplicity, his transcendence and immanence, and his identity and difference with creation and the individual souls. My analysis has taken into account selected sources spanning multiple literary genres, viz. Upaniṣads, the *Mahābhārata*, philosophical treatises and commentaries, Śaiva revealed scriptures and post-scriptural sources, Vaiṣṇava-Pāñcarātra and Hāthayogic texts, and (Sanskrit-)Old Javanese Śaiva texts from Java and Bali. In Part II, I shall take into account the same corpus of sources, with the addition of Sanskrit inscriptions from the Khmer domains, to discuss a second set of analogies, which in the course of the medieval period came to be regarded as expressing *vivartavāda*, namely the reflection of moon or sun in pools of water and the limitation of space inside pots. In the Conclusion, I will advance a hypothesis, based on my analysis of both sets of analogies, on their bearing on the history of the Śaiva textual corpus—in particular, the relationship between different strands of Saiddhāntika scriptures, and the influence of Vedānta (both in its *pariṇāma*- and *vivarta*-varieties) thereon.

## Reflection of Moon or Sun in Water and Space Delimited by Pots

The reflection analogy constitutes a group, different variations of which are possible. Its basic (and, perhaps, earlier) configuration is that of the reflection of a celestial body in multiple pools of water, like for example many pots filled with water acting like mirrors. Variations of the theme may include the comparandum (i.e., moon or sun), the medium (i.e., a flowing river, the ocean, or multiple receptacles of water), and its characteristics (i.e., calm or rippling water). As the analogy of space (fictitiously) delimited by pots is presented in some sources alongside the reflection analogy—a fact that may be historically significant—it seems pertinent to discuss both of them here.

Kamaleswar Bhattacharya (1961, p. 60), in his study on Brahmanical religions in the ancient Khmer domains, noted that the image of the reflection of sun or moon on water is frequently employed in Sanskrit literature from the Indian Subcontinent from the mid-9th century onwards, especially in Vedāntic milieus. Indeed, both analogies are nearly always encountered in Vedānta or Vedānta-influenced sources, including Śaiva sources, or in passages of sources of rival systems (such as post-6th-century Sāṅkhya commentaries) describing the views of a Vedāntin *pūrvapakṣin*.<sup>1</sup> Those images are usually resorted to in order to express the paradoxical relationship

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the ca. 6th-century *Sāṅkhyasaptatīrti* ad SK 18: The Vedavādins say that one consciousness is apprehended in all bodies like one thread running through the jewels of a necklace, or rather that are consciousnesses like the moon in the water—i.e., numerous moons seen in the river, well, pond, sea, etc.; *Mātharavṛtti*: the view of a *pūrvapakṣin* is referred to with the example of the moon being one and yet appearing as manifold on the water's surface: *āhosvij jalacandravat puruṣa iti eka eva bahuṣu nadikūpataḍgādiṣv ivopalabhyate iti | atah saṁśayaḥ kim ekaḥ puruṣo guṇasūtranyāyena āhosvid bahavaḥ puruṣāḥ | atrocyate—bahavaḥ puruṣāḥ katham iti cet tad ucyate* (this is contrasted to the view of another *vedavādin* who holds that the relationship between the *ātman/puruṣa* and the single bodies is like that between one string and many gems pierced by it, which is likely to correspond to a distinction between *pariṇāma*- and *vivartavāda*-Vedānta. The Sāṅkhyas subscribe to the view that consciousness is plural).

between the Absolute (either Brahman, in Vedānta, or the Lord, in Śaiva systems) and the manifest reality and/or the individual Souls in terms of oneness vs. multiplicity, union vs. separation, and identity vs. difference.

The reflection analogy bears an illusionistic and monistic flavour, and constitutes a far cry from the realist and evolutionistic force of the analogies of fire in wood and butter in milk, which convey the idea of an actual and irreversible transformation of a substance. And yet, this analogy—as it is evoked, e.g., in the BS, and even in some passages of Śaṅkara's BSB, e.g. *ad* 2.3.43—has been regarded by some scholars as being susceptible of a more nuanced interpretation, which stands closer to, or even coincides with, *bhedābheda* and *pariṇāma* positions—for the reflection is an actual image of the ultimate reality, sharing with it some common characteristics.<sup>2</sup> Seen in this light, the analogy and its philosophical premises would, therefore, seem to share with *bhedābheda*-Vedānta the same emanationist model for the transformation of the cosmos, but differ from it with respect to the nature of this transformation in that it is only illusory: nothing really changes and the Brahman remains the only cause of the world. This would seem to put Śaṅkara closer to a *bhedābheda* (and “qualified” *vivarta*) rather than *abhedaladvaita* view.<sup>3</sup> As noted by Nicholson (n.d.), not only *vivartavāda* “emerged gradually out of the earlier Vedāntic theory of *pariṇāmavāda*, rather than one that sprang fully formed out of the head of Śaṅkara”, but also “the lines between the doctrines of *pariṇāmavāda* and *vivartavāda* are considerably blurrier than usually depicted in histories of Indian philosophy” (ibid., 2007, p. 395).

Be this as it may, it is hard to deny that, from the 9th century onwards, both the reflection and limitation analogies became the signature-mark of a form of Vedānta that reflects not much the *bhedābheda* of the Aupaniṣadas/Vedavādins but rather the *vivartavāda* of the Advaitavādins associated with Gauḍapāda, Śaṅkara, and Maṇḍanamiśra. As such, they are attested mainly in non-dualistic sources influenced by monistic, *vivartavāda* Vedānta; and the former is also invoked in the critiques of Vedānta by both Saiddhāntika authors and non-dualists, such as Somānanda. These

<sup>2</sup> The analogy conveys the idea that the sun or moon are fundamentally different and separate from their reflections, and yet the latter share some similarities with their original realities—that is, they are not totally non-existent, but possess a certain order of reality and are dependent on the higher reality of their prototypes (Hiriyanna, 1949, pp. 155–156). Reflections are at the same time different and the same as their prototypes—an idea that conforms to *bhedābheda*. To Nakamura (1989, pp. 450–451), the reflection of the image of the sun denotes a *bhedābheda* view, for it is found in the BS (cf. infra). According to Thrasher (1993, pp. 45, 48, 50), the *vivarta* interpretation is traceable to Maṇḍanamiśra, a contemporary of Śaṅkara.

<sup>3</sup> Several scholars (among whom Hacker, 1953, pp. 24ff.; Rao, 1996, p. 265ff.; Andrijanic, 2017) have noted *pariṇāma* passages in some works of Śaṅkara, which suggests that he, at least in the early period of his activity, might have held an intermediary position between the realism of the BSB and the uncompromising *vivarta* of the later Vedānta. Some *bhedābheda* arguments may be detected in BSB 2.3.43 (*jīva* is an *aṁśa* of Brahman, as it were [*iva*], like the scintillae and fire, which might have been taken from an unknown older *bhedābheda* commentary). Thus, the *vivartavāda* probably emerged gradually out of the earlier Vedāntic theory of *pariṇāmavāda*, and evolved toward a more marked illusionism in the course of the mediaeval period (Nicholson, n.d.). A more controversial position is that of Rao (1996, pp. 266, 272ff.), who regards Śaṅkara as a *pariṇāmavādin*, having been the victim of subtle misunderstandings throughout the history of Vedānta from classical to modern times. Potter (1963, p. 165) argues that Śaṅkara made a “deliberate decision to avoid the causal conundrums with which his successors occupied themselves.”

facts may reflect the fortune enjoyed by that system, as well as its reception and development, in medieval India and beyond.

### **Śruti, Smṛti, and Philosophical Śāstras**

The analogy of the reflection of the sun or moon in water is frequently used by Śaṅkara in many of the writings attributed to him (whether genuinely or spuriously) to express the relationship between Brahman (or Īśvara) and the individual souls. His BSB probably came to be regarded as the locus classicus for it. But the analogy goes back to a much earlier period, as it is attested in the BS itself, in the *Vākyapadīya* of Bhartṛhari,<sup>4</sup> in the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti* (4th to 5th century CE),<sup>5</sup> and in other sources that are quoted as *śruti* by Śaṅkara in the BSB and other works, namely:

*eka eva tu*<sup>6</sup> *bhūtātmā bhūte bhūte vyavasthitaḥ* |  
*ekadhā bahudhā caiva dṛśyate jalacandravat* || (= *Brahmabindu Upaniṣad* 12)<sup>7</sup>

The Self of all beings, one as it is, residing in different beings, is seen as if it is one and many [at the same time], like [the reflections of] the moon in water.

*yathā hy ajaṃ*<sup>8</sup> *jyotirātmā vivasvān apo bhinnā vahudhaiko 'nugacchan* |  
*upādhiṇā kriyate bhedarūpo devaḥ kṣetreṣu evaṃ ajño*<sup>9</sup> *'yam ātmā* ||<sup>10</sup>

Just as the unborn Sun, whose essence is light, being one, [becomes] many, reflected in diverse waters, even so this god, the Self, who is ignorant, through limiting adjuncts is made to [appear to] have diverse forms in [different] bodies.

In the *Brahmabindu Upaniṣad*, the two verses following thereupon (13–14) illustrate the analogy of the space delimited by pots.<sup>11</sup> The latter analogy is found,

<sup>4</sup> Cf. 1.49, on the relation between *sphoṭa* and *nāda*: “Just as a reflection existing in other place [than where the real thing stays], as it were, follows the motion of water because of the action of water, so *sphoṭa* and sound are related” (trans. Nakamura, 2004, p. 592), *pratibimbaṃ yathānyatra sthitaṃ toyakriyāvaśāt | tatpravṛttim ivānveti sa dharmāḥ sphoṭanādayoḥ* (compare 1.70, on the word as one or many; 1.99; 2.298). On the various reflection analogies (*pratibimbaka*) in Bhartṛhari, cf. Nakamura, 2004, p. 488 n. 12. Bhartṛhari seems to critique the reflection analogy in 2.296—although not of moon or sun in water but of mountains in (probably) a body of water, as in the Buddhist *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (*ibid.*, pp. 485, 488 n. 13).

<sup>5</sup> 3.144: “For just as the ether is one, (but appears) as plural (when reflected) in pots etc., so the one Self (appears as) many, like the moon (or sun) (reflected) in pools of water”, *ākāśam ekaṃ hi yathā ghaṭādiṣu prthak prthak | tathātmaiko hy anekāś ca jalādihāreṣv ivāṃśumān*. The first line is also found in Bhaṭṭa Vāmadeva’s *Janmamarāṇvicāra* (p. 14), with the variant *prthak bhavet*: cf. *infra*, fn. 40.

<sup>6</sup> *Brahmabindu*: *hi*.

<sup>7</sup> Compare also *Parākhyantra* 1.42 cd, and *Devyamata* 6.2.4.86 cd.

<sup>8</sup> *Mṛgendravṛtti*: *ayam*.

<sup>9</sup> *Mṛgendravṛtti*: *aja*.

<sup>10</sup> Also quoted in Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha’s *Vṛtti* on *Mṛgendra* VP 2.12ab.

<sup>11</sup> *ghaṭasambhṛtam ākāśaṃ līyamāne ghaṭe yathā | ghaṭo līyeta nākāśam tadvaj jīvo ghaṭopamaḥ || ghaṭavad vividhākāraṃ bhidyamānaṃ punaḥ punaḥ | tadbhagnaṃ na ca jānāti sa jānāti ca nityaśah*.

by itself, in pre-Śāṅkara Vedāntic works, including the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* *Āgamaśāstra* (or *Gauḍapādakārikā*) 3.3–7, where it is said that the universal Self is like the great space (*mahākāśa*), while the individual self is like the ether within a jar (*ghaṭākāśa*);<sup>12</sup> and in the *Vākyapadīya* (3.1.15–16).<sup>13</sup>

Potter (1981, p. 84) describes the reflection analogies as “probably the most complex and sophisticated of the models offered by Śāṅkara and his contemporaries [...] to explain the relation between God and the *jīvas*.” According to Śāṅkara, the individual souls are mere reflections (*ābhāsa*) of the Supreme Self, just like the sun is reflected multiple times in rippling water, each reflection being independent from another. Śāṅkara also invokes this analogy to explain the fictitious multiplication and appearance as object of experience of the single Brahman, which is without characteristics and whose essence is consciousness only. While Śāṅkara does not clearly and unequivocally explain what the medium in human experience represents —e.g. undifferentiated *prakṛti*, *buddhi*, *prajña*, *prāṇa*, or *citta*, among others—, his ultimate view is that it is not different from Brahman (ibid., pp. 85, 87).

Śāṅkara invokes the reflection analogy in many of the works attributed to him, viz. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad Bhāṣya* 1.4.7, 2.1.20, 3.5.1; *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad Bhāṣya* 1.6, 3.2.7; *Chāṇḍogya Upaniṣad Bhāṣya* 6.3.2; *Praśna Upaniṣad Bhāṣya* 4.5, 4.9; and *Bhagavadgītā Bhāṣya* (13.2, 15.3). In an oft-quoted passage of the BSB (2.3.46), he couples it with that of space limited by jars.<sup>14</sup> The two together represented “the most influential analogies for theorizing the complete unity and partlessness of Brahman” (Nicholson, 2007, pp. 386–387). The sun (=Brahman), being one and the same, inactive, assumes different characteristics (just like the souls) when it is reflected by a mass of water that moves, shrinks, dilates, etc. The difference between the original (*bimba*) and its reflection (*pratibimba*) is only apparent: division and difference is only because the intervention of ignorance and

<sup>12</sup> *ātmā hy ākāśavaj jīvair ghaṭākāśair ivoditaḥ | ghaṭādivac ca saṃghātair jātāv etan nidarśanam || ghaṭādiṣu pralīneṣu ghaṭākāśādayo yathā | ākāśe saṃpralīyante tadvaj jīvā ihātmani || yathaikasmin ghaṭākāśe rajodhūmadibhir yute | na sarve saṃprayujyante tadvaj jīvāḥ sukhādibhiḥ || rūpakāryasamā-khyāś ca bhidyante tatra tatra vai | ākāśasya na bhedo’sti tadvaj jīveṣu nirṇayah || nākāśasya ghaṭākāśo vikārāvayavau yathā | naivātmanaḥ sadā jīvo vikārāvayavau tathā.*

<sup>13</sup> “Once parts are postulated on the basis of the properties of the different objects (with which space is) in contact, the universal space also is found in these parts. Just as the connected (potsherds etc.) are parts of the jar and the like which (as such) are without divisions, in the same way, the connected objects are the parts of *ākāśa* which is really without any division” (trans. Iyer, 1971, p. 18), *saṃyogidharmabhedena deśe ca parikalpite | teṣu deśeṣu sāmānyam ākāśasyāpi vidyate || deśānām ghaṭādinām deśāḥ saṃbandhino yathā | ākāśasyāpy adeśasya deśāḥ saṃbandhinas tathā.*

<sup>14</sup> “Just as the light of the sun or the moon which pervades the entire space apparently becomes straight or bent when the limiting adjuncts with which it is in contact, such as a finger, for instance, are straight or bent, but does not really become so; and just as the ether, although it apparently moves when jars are being moved, does not really move; and just as the sun does not tremble, although its image trembles when you shake a cup filled with water in which the sun’s light is reflected; just so the Lord is not affected by pain, although pain be felt by that part of him which is conjured up by ignorance, and limited by the intellect and other adjuncts, and called the individual soul” (trans. Shima, 2000, p. 38), *yathā prakāśaḥ saurāś cāndramaso vā vīyadyāpyavatiṣṭhamāno ’ṅgulyādyupādhisambandhāt teṣu jjuvakraḍibhāvaṃ pratipadyamāneṣu tattadbhāvaṃ iva pratipadyamāno ’pi na paramārthatas tadbhāvaṃ pratipadyate | yathā cākāśo ghaṭādiṣu gacchatsu gacchann iva vibhāvyamāno ’pi na paramārthatas gacchati, yathā codaśārāvādikampanāt tadgate sūryapratibimbe kampamāne ’pi na tadvān sūryaḥ kampate, evam avidyā pratyupasthāpīte buddhyādyupahite jīvākhye ’mśe duḥkhāyamāne ’pi na tadvān īśvaro duḥkhāyate.*

intellect. Once these are removed, only the original remains. Similarly, the space is one, invisible, omnipervasive, and inactive, although it appears as if separate and limited inside different jars. Once the jar is broken, the unity of the space is revealed. In post-Śāṅkara Advaita Vedānta, the two analogies became essentialized as technical explanations of *avacchedavāda* and *pratibimbavāda*, respectively, but by using both of them in the same context, Śāṅkara does not seem to regard the two views as conflicting (Shima, 2000, p. 38). This suggests that a scholastic distinction between the two positions and their proponents had not yet developed during his time.

The former analogy occurs again in the commentary to the sūtra *ābhāsa eva ca*, “And it is just a reflection” (BS 2.3.50), to make the point that the soul is only a semblance of the supreme Self.<sup>15</sup> The individual soul stands to the supreme Self as the little image of the sun reflected in water stands to the real sun. It is not identical yet not a totally separate reality either, and not something absolutely unreal (in the way of an *advaita* understanding), which corresponds to the *bhedābheda* position propounded by the Upaniṣads and, indeed, by the BS itself, which attests and expands on the analogy in sūtras 2.3.43 and 3.2.18–20. Having introduced the analogy in 18, *ata eva copamā sūryakādivat* “And so there is the example of the image of the sun, etc.”, the BS advances an objection in 19, and defends the aptness of the analogy in 20, saying that Brahman is within the limiting adjuncts (body etc.), so it participates in their modifications, however illusory. In his commentary, Śāṅkara elaborates on all those points along the lines of the passage quoted above, and contends that Brahman is at the same time similar and dissimilar to the (insentient) medium of the reflection—rippling water, and that its modifications affect the Brahman only in appearance and not in reality (Potter, 1981, p. 85; BSB 3.2.11).<sup>16</sup> Further, since Brahman is beyond human perception, it (or, rather, its limiting adjuncts, *upādhi*) can only be described apophatically or through analogies. He notes that the entity and its illustration are not completely alike.

From the above it emerges that the reflection analogy, although may have been originally understood in early Vedāntic milieus as conveying a *pariṇāmavāda* and *bhedābheda* position, and was employed by Śāṅkara in a rather ambiguous manner, was reused by Maṇḍanamiśra to represent a *vivartavāda* position (Thrasher, 1993,

<sup>15</sup> “And this Soul is just a reflection, which has to be conceived as different from the Self like the image of the sun in the water, etc. Clearly, it is not the same. Still, it is not a different substance either. And further, when one image of the sun moves in the water, another does not move: likewise, when a soul is connected with the fruits of karma, another soul is not connected with those [fruits]”, *ābhāsa eva caiṣa jīvaḥ parasyātmano jalasūryakādivat pratipattavyaḥ | na sa eva sāksāt | nāpi vastvantaram | ataś ca yathā naikasmīn jalasūryake kampamāne jalasūryakāntaram kampate, evaṁ naikasmīn jīve karmaphalasaṁbandhini jīvāntarasya tatsambandhaḥ*.

<sup>16</sup> BSB 3.2.20: “The reflection of the sun in water expands and contracts with the motion of the water, moves when the water moves, multiplies when the water is divided. Thus, it conforms to the condition of the water, but not in the true sense of the word”, *jalagataṁ hi sūryapratibimbaṁ jalavṛddhau vardhate jalahrāse hrasati jalacalane calati jalabhede bhidyata ity evaṁ jaladharmānuyāyi bhavati na tu paramārthataḥ [...]*. The image of rippling water is also invoked by Maṇḍanamiśra in his *Brahmasiddhi* (cf. the following fn.).

p. 48),<sup>17</sup> and eventually became one of the signature analogies of the illusionistic medieval Advaita Vedānta. Insofar that it illustrates an example of absolute absence of modification, the space-pots analogy aligns even more clearly with the *vivartavāda* position, and indeed it is not found in the BS, which understood the individual Self to be a portion (*amśa*) of the supreme Self (cf. 2.3.43; Nakamura, 1989, pp. 450–451).

### Śaiva Literature: Indian Subcontinent

Among the early Tantras of the Śaiva Siddhānta, only the *Parākhya*—one of the latest among the demonstrably early scripture of the corpus, probably composed in the 8th or 9th century (Goodall, 2004, p. lviii)—attests the analogy of the reflection of moon in water to epitomize the *vivartavāda*-Vedānta position.<sup>18</sup> Having defended the idea of a discrete connection (*viśiṣṭas ... sambandho*) of the Soul with a body and its karma in VP 1.41, a Vedānta opponent replies:

*eka eva sthito vettā dehe dehe svakarmataḥ |*  
*ekadhā bahudhā caiva dṛśyate jalacandravat || 1.42<sup>19</sup>*

[But perhaps] there exists only one knower, [situated] in various bodies, in accordance with his past actions. He appears both as one and many, like the moon [reflected] in [rippling] water. (Trans. Goodall, 2004, p. 151)

The (somewhat naïve) answer, from the Saiddhāntika perspective, is that in as much as the bodies are of the form of consciousness (*cidrūpatva*) they are one (*ekatva*), and yet they are divided (*bheda*) because of their various experiences (*bhinnabhoga*), determined by karma and delusion (*avidyā*). In this manner, the non-dualist position is undermined. An even earlier attestation of the reflection analogy may be Sadyojyotis' *Bhogakārikā* 75cd: *bhogye bhogaḥ prabhoś chāyā yathā candramaso jale*, "Experience is the reflection of the self in the experienced, like [the reflection] of the moon in water"; the context, however, seems to be that of Sāṅkhya rather than Vedānta.<sup>20</sup>

An instance of the analogy invoked to illustrate the view of a Vedānta *pūrvapakṣin* is found in the *Vṛtti* on the *Mrgendra* by Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, VP 2.12a. According to the Vedāntins, there exists only one Self that can be known through its sentient and insentient manifestations; the moon illusorily appears as double due to a defect in eyesight, while the sun appears in multiple reflections due

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *Brahmasiddhi* pp. 19, 60, 72 (mentioning rippling water, *jalataraṅga*; connected with *vivarta*, as opposed to *vikāra*, illustrated by the analogy of the clay and the pot).

<sup>18</sup> According to Goodall (2015, p. 272), the whole passage 1.42–50 constitutes an attack to non-dualism as formulated by *vivartavāda* Vedānta, which bears important implications for the relative dating of the *Parākhya*.

<sup>19</sup> 1.42 cd corresponds to *Brahmabindu Upaniṣad* 12 cd and, with variations, *Devīāmata* 6.2.4.86cd.

<sup>20</sup> Watson et al., 2013, p. 225, fn. 98. However, stanza 75 could refer to the same view of the consciousness attributed to the Vedavādins in *Sāṅkhyasaptatīvṛtti* on SK, which uses the same analogy (cf. supra, fn. 1).



to the *upādhis*.<sup>21</sup> Interestingly, Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha too, like Śāṅkara, quotes *Brahmabindu Upaniṣad* 12 (as well as *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 5.12=Śvetāśvātara 6.12ab).

The non-dualist, non-Saiddhāntika *Śivadṛṣṭi* by Somānanda (ca. 875–925 CE), in a series of polemical verses illustrating the views of different schools of Vedānta (6.6–15, on which cf. Dyczkowski, 1989, p. 232, n. 96), employs the analogy to epitomize the views of one of them on the separation between Brahman and the bodies (6.13):

*dehe dehe prthaktve na<sup>22</sup> tathā bhedo bhavātmakaḥ  
jaladhārāmśumannyāyo yeṣāṃ vā samavasthitaḥ*

Or those among whom the analogy of the sun [reflected] in streams of water is established: being separated in each body, [Brahman] does not have a real (*bhavātmaka*) division in like manner.

Nemec argues that Somānanda betrays no knowledge of Śāṅkara's philosophy in his summary critique of Vedānta found in verses 6.6–15.<sup>23</sup> This may very well be the case; indeed, echoes of this verse are already found in a pre-Śāṅkara source, i.e. *Yājñavalkyaśmṛti* 3.144 (cf. fn. 5, supra), in a passage that contains other *pariṇāma*-Vedānta analogies, and the analogy of reflection is also found in Maṇḍanamiśra's work, which was known to post-9th-century Kashmirian Śaiva authors. And yet, it seems to me that this verse is not incompatible with Śāṅkara's use of the analogy.

Let us now turn to Śaiva texts that resort to the analogy to represent their own doctrinal position. A series of verses in the *Niśvāsakārikā* present that analogy along with other typically non-dualistic similes in verses 29–37 of Paṭala 31:

*jaladarpaṇamadhye tu chayārūpaṃ yathā viśet |  
notsaren na ca bhidyeta tadvad devo virocate || 29  
[...]  
tatas toyē yathā candro dṛśyaty ākāśasaṃsthitāḥ |*

<sup>21</sup> *vedānteṣv eka evātmā cidacidvyaktilakṣitaḥ || 12a [...] tasyaiva tathā tathā vaicitryeṇāvasthiter asatyatvāt dvaitapratibhāsasya dvicandrādijñānavat bhrāntatvāt [...] paramātmā tu sūrya ivāmbhaḥpratiḥbimbabhedair upādhibhiḥ abhinno 'pi bhinna iva pratibhāti*. The former analogy is already found in Bhartṛhari, as well as in *Pañcārthabhāṣya ad Pāśupatasūtra* 5.8.

<sup>22</sup> Nemec (whom I thank for having allowed me to refer to his unpublished handout [Nemec, 2017\*], and for having shared with me his more recent views on this verse) considers the reading *na* of mss. T and C (on which, cf. Nemec, 2011, p. 79) to be superior to the reading *tu* of the other manuscripts as well as the printed edition, while at the same time not discarding the possibility of reading *prthaktvena*.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Nemec (2011, p. 255, fn. 316; cf. also p. 106, fn. 43), who follows Sanderson's (1985, p. 210, fn. 41) remarks on *Śivadṛṣṭi* 6.4–24b: "When Vedānta is expounded by its opponents in Kashmirian sources of our period it is the doctrine of Maṇḍanamiśra which is generally in mind [...]. To my knowledge no source betrays familiarity with the doctrines of Śāṅkara," as well as Ratié (2011, p. 257, fn. 5), who in her turn quotes Sanderson in making the same point: "si Utpaladeva et Abhinavagupta s'attaquent explicitement à des représentants de l'Advaita Vedānta ailleurs dans le traité, les *vedāntin* qu'ils combattent défendent une doctrine qui rappelle bien davantage celle de Maṇḍanamiśra que celle de Śāṅkara [...], tandis qu'à ma connaissance, aucun indice solide ne permet d'affirmer que les philosophes de la Pratyabhijñā connaissaient les oeuvres de Śāṅkara"; the same author, having noted a parallel between Śāṅkara's BSB and works by Utpaladeva and Abhinavagupta, suggests the influence of a common Mīmāṃsā source. Cf. infra, Conclusion, for Sanderson's and Goodall's remarks that early Siddhāntatantras as well as commentators like Sadyojyotiṣ ignored *vivartavāda*-Vedānta.



*tadvat sarvagato devas sūkṣmatvān nopalabhyate || 32*  
*sa ca yogena dṛśyeta pratyakṣaṃ jalacandravat |*  
*kṣīyate vardhate candra asthiro viśamaś calaḥ || 33*  
*vikāritvam upāyāti utpannaś śaśalakṣaṇaḥ |*  
*amāyī nirvikārī ca bahirante ca saṁsthitaḥ || 34*  
*samāyī bimbasaṁkrānto khe sthito na tu tadjale |*  
*maline 'pi svadehe tu dṛśyate parameśvaraḥ || 35*  
*upadeśena deveśi pratyakṣaṃ jalacandravat |*  
*yathā śarīramadhye 'pi pratyakṣaḥ parameśvaraḥ |*  
*vidyamāno na dṛśyeta tathā patraphalādiṣu || 36*  
*svabhāvena hi tatrastho khe tu dṛśyati candramāḥ |*  
*upadeśena deveśi pratyakṣaṃ sarvataḥ sthitaḥ || 37*

**29c** na ca bhidyeta] T17; naiva vidyeta T127 • **32b** °saṁsthitaḥ] T127; °saṁsthitam T17 • **32c** sūkṣmatvān nopalabhyate] T17 (sukṣma°); sūkṣmatvopalakṣyate T127 • **34b** śaśalakṣaṇaḥ] em.; śaśalāñchanaḥ T17 • **33cd–36ab**] T17; om. T127 • **37a** tatrastho] T127; tatrasthā T17 • **37b** dṛśyati] T17; dṛśyatu T127 • upadeśena] T17; upadevena T127 • sarvataḥ sthitaḥ] T127; sarvatasthitaḥ T17

As [the Supreme Principle] entered in the water-mirror in the form of a reflection, it would not flow, it would not be split: God appears in the same manner. [...] Just as the moon, existing in the sky, appears in the water, likewise God, omnipervasive, is not perceived because of His subtlety. He can be directly perceived through yoga, like the moon [reflected] in water. The moon diminishes and increases, [appears as if] trembling, irregular [in shape], moving. Having arisen, the moon undergoes modifications. Without illusory forms, without modifications, it exists inside and outside. Having an illusory form, transferred to a reflected image, it [still] exists in the sky, not in that water. The Supreme Lord is seen in one's own body, even if it is stained. O Goddess, He is visible according to the teaching, like the moon in the water. Parameśvara is visible in the body: while existing [there], it cannot be seen, like [the seed still existing] in the leaves and fruits.<sup>24</sup> Residing naturally there, the Moon is seen in the sky. By way of the teaching, o Goddess, [it is shown how the Lord] resides everywhere, in visible form.

The context of the passage is the definition of the supreme reality (*param tattvaṃ*) and the pervasive, manifest/unmanifest state of the Lord. It refers to a form of yoga through which the adept can perceive the form of the Lord in the manifest world, as when one realizes that the moon appearing in the water contained in different pots is but a reflection of the one moon in the sky. In this respect, it echoes Sanskrit and Old Javanese Śaiva sources analyzed in Part I with respect to the manifestation of

<sup>24</sup> I wonder whether here a portion of text has gone missing, presumably a half-verse mentioning the seed (*bīja*), for the fourth *pāda* seems to refer to the Vedāntic analogy of the tree, with its branches, leaves and fruits (=the souls and the visible universe), existing in a latent form in the seed (=Brahman), and vice-versa.

the Lord through yoga as fire in wood and butter in milk;<sup>25</sup> further, the analogy of the reflection of the moon recurs in the Old Javanese *Arjunavivāha* in the same yogic context (cf. infra). Also noteworthy is the fact that verses 33cd–36ab, where the analogy is elaborated upon and expanded with respect to the various appearances of the moon, are omitted in ms. T127.<sup>26</sup> As the description echoes Śaṅkara's discussion in BSB 2.3.46, could those verses be interpolations? Paṭala 31 of the *Niśvāsakārikā* betrays Vedāntic influences, as it employs other typically non-dualistic analogies like the brilliant nature of gold (*hematvam*) hidden beneath the rusted copper (*tāmra*; this image is also found in the interpolated passage of the *Sarvajñānottara*),<sup>27</sup> the seeds evolving into fruits and leaves (apparently *pariṇāma*), etc. The analogy of the space in pots, too, features in Paṭala 32.62–63ab:

*gamāgamananirmukto ghaṭākāśeva tiṣṭhati |*  
*ghaṭasaṃvṛtam ākāśaṃ nīyamānam itas tataḥ ||*  
*ghaṭo niriyāti nākāśaṃ śivo hy evaṃ nabhopamaḥ |*

**62b** ghaṭākāśeva tiṣṭhati] T17 (double *sandhi*); ghaṭākāśe 'vatiṣṭhati T127 • **63a** niriyāti] T17; nayati T127 • **63b** hy] T17; pi T127

Free from going and coming, it exists like the space in pots. The space is enveloped by the pots, carried along here and there. It is the pot that moves, not the space. In the same way, Śiva is like the sky.

Goodall (2004, p. lvi, fn. 93) has noted that 62ab–63cd finds a parallel in *Sarvajñānottara* 111(–112)<sup>28</sup> and *Tripurātāpanī Upaniṣad*, and that both Śaiva sources could have been inspired by *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā/Āgamaśāstra* 3.3–4,<sup>29</sup> or by an even earlier source, the Buddhist *Āryasatyadvaya-vatārasūtra*.<sup>30</sup> It seems to me equally possible that the analogy might have been drawn from a later (*vivartavāda*)

<sup>25</sup> *Pādas* 32cd–33a echo *Bhuvanakośa* 2.18 and *Vṛhaspatitattva* 49 (cf. *Jñānasiddhānta* 25.5), where the analogy of fire in wood and butter in milk is invoked to justify the non-perceptibility of the Lord on account of its subtleness.

<sup>26</sup> The half-line 33cd *kṣīyate* (variant: *kriyate*) *vardhate candra asthiro viśamaś calaḥ* appears in a different context in T127, p. 271, and T17A, p. 237. (Note that all the *Niśvāsakārikā* portions presented here are missing from the other paper transcript of this text, T150).

<sup>27</sup> T17, Paṭala 31.6–8 (pp. 204–205): cf. *Sarvajñānottara*, Goodall (2006, Appendix, esp. vv. 5–6, 16, 19–20).

<sup>28</sup> *ghaṭasaṃvṛtam ākāśaṃ nīyamāne yathā ghaṭe | ghaṭo nīyati nākāśaṃ tadvaj jīvo nabhopamaḥ || bhinne kumbhe yathākāśam ākāśatvam prapadyate | vibhinne prākṛte dehe tathātmā paramātmāni*. Note the shift from *jīvo* to *śivo* in *Niśvāsakārikā* 30.63b.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. supra, fn. 12.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. also Candrakīrti's (ca. 600–650 CE) *Madhyamakāvatāra* and the (pre-421 CE) *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra* (which, strikingly enough, presents the reflection analogy along with the comparison with space in verse 21.10): *ākāśatulyā gagaṇasvabhāva māyāmarīcyudakacandrakalpā | sarve ca sattvāḥ supina svabhāva mahānta śūnyāḥ svaya nāyakasya*.

Vedāntic source, even though its origin could ultimately be traced to a Buddhist milieu.<sup>31</sup>

Other instances of the reflection analogy occur in post-9th-centuries texts that betray an influence of illusionistic Advaita Vedānta, like the *Devyāmata*;<sup>32</sup> Haṭhayoga texts;<sup>33</sup> Purāṇic passages, such as *Śivapurāṇa* 4.43.6–7 and 20–21<sup>34</sup> and the *Śivādvaitakathana* of the *Liṅgapurāṇa*, where it is coupled with the analogy of space in jars;<sup>35</sup> and several texts of the later Saiddhāntika tradition of South India, influenced by non-dualist Vedānta from the 12th century onwards.<sup>36</sup> The analogy of space in jars occurs also in the Vaiṣṇava *Jayākhyasamhitā*,<sup>37</sup> along with other well-known Vedāntic analogies of the reflection in a mirror and the redness in a lump of iron;<sup>38</sup> and in Śivāgrayogin's *Śaivaparibhāṣā* 41 (*ghaṭākāśamahākāśaḍṣṭānta*), alongside the analogy of the river and the ocean (*nāḍīsamudradṛṣṭānta*, a *pariṇāma*-Vedānta image), in the context of the identity (*tādātmya*) between the Soul and Śiva.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, both analogies are attested in some non-dualist, non-Saiddhāntika Śaiva works. See, for instance, the *Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta,

<sup>31</sup> Gauḍapāda is notorious for using Buddhist ideas and terminology, as well as for invoking Buddhist analogies, like for example that of the wheel of fire (*ālātacakra*; cf. Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* 1.130, 291), cf. Potter, 1981, p. 83. Wallis (2016) notes that “the Vedānta of Gauḍapāda and Bhartṛhari [...] may be seen as a bridge (or in-road) between the doctrines of Vijñānavāda Buddhism and those of the so-called ‘Hindu’ sphere.”

<sup>32</sup> *eko 'pi bahudhā devas tiṣṭhate jalacandravat* (6.2.4.86cd, in Ślāczka, 2016, p. 196). The *Devyāmata* is a Pratiṣṭhānta whose core dates to the 7th century, but which contains material added much later, i.e. not before the 9th–10th century.

<sup>33</sup> Cf., e.g., *Gorakṣaśataka* 87 (≈ *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* 153): *nirmalaṃ gaganākāraṃ marīcijalasannibham | ātmānaṃ sarvagaṃ dhyātvā yogī yogam avāpnuyāt*.

<sup>34</sup> *racayivā svayaṃ tac ca paviṣya dūrataḥ sthitaḥ | na tatra ca praviṣṭo 'sau nirliptaś ca citśvarūpavān || yathā ca jyotiśaś caiva jalādaḥ pratibimbatā | vastuto na praveśo vai tathaiva ca śivaḥ svayaṃ || sarvaṃ śivaḥ śivas sarvo nāsti bhedaś ca kaś cana | kathaṃ ca vividhaṃ paśyaty ekaṃ ca kathaṃ punaḥ || yathaikaṃ ca sūryākhyam jyotiḥ nānāvidhaṃ janaiḥ | jalādaḥ ca viśeṣeṇa dṛśyate tat tathaiva saḥ*.

<sup>35</sup> *Liṅgapurāṇa* 1.75.24–25: “Others say that, even though the space is one, it is perceived [separately] in regard to [separate] pot[s], o virtuous ascetics; [similarly,] Śāṅkara possesses the state of separation and non-separation. [Here is another example] for the understanding of the people: the sun, albeit unique and fixed in the same place, is perceived as multiple [reflections] in water-streams, o virtuous ascetics,” *vyomaikam api dṛṣṭam hi śarāvaṃ prati suvratāḥ | pṛthaktvaṃ cāpṛthaktvaṃ ca śāṅkarasyeti cāpare || pratyayārthaṃ hi jagatām ekastho 'pi divākaraḥ | eko 'pi bahudhā dṛṣṭo jaladhāreṣu suvratāḥ*.

<sup>36</sup> These instances will not be dealt with here. On the analogy in the *Suprabhedha*, cf. Brunner, 1967, pp. 51–54.

<sup>37</sup> *Jayākhyasamhitā* 88–89: *tathā sarvasya jagato vahirantarvyavasthitaḥ | ghaṭasamsthāṃ yathākāśaṃ nīyamānaṃ vibhāvayate || nākāśaṃ kutracid yāti nayanāt tu ghaṭasya ca | calācalatvaṃ evaṃ hi vibhoś caivānumīyate*. It seems to me that another Pāñcarātra text, the *Lakṣmītantra*, while not attesting the analogy of space in jars, alludes to *avacchedavāda* in the following verse (2.4): *anavacchinnarūpo 'haṃ paramāmeti śabdyate | kroḍikṛtaṃ idaṃ sarvaṃ cetanācetanātmakam* (cf. fn. 61 infra on *pāda* cd).

<sup>38</sup> *Jayākhyasamhitā* 83–84: *ayaḥpiṇḍe yathā vahnir bhinnas tiṣṭhaty abhinnavat | tadvat sarvaṃ idaṃ devo vyāvṛtya paritiṣṭhati || nirmale darpaṇe yadvat kiñcid vastv abhitiṣṭhati | na ca tad darpaṇasyāsti asti tasya ca tad (d)vija*. On the conjunction of fire and iron concealing their difference, cf. *Brahmasiddhi* (p. 61).

16.80,<sup>39</sup> and an unattributed quotation in the *Janmamaraṇavicāra* by Bhaṭṭa Vāmadeva (disciple of Yogarāja, himself disciple of Kṣemarāja).<sup>40</sup> For the non-dualist Śaivas the Soul is identical to Śiva: he is the only existing subject, and everything is but a direct emanation of him—a real rather than illusory one, contrary to what the *vivartavāda*-Vedāntins maintain. Furthermore, he is active and not passive. It is conceivable that the Trika and Krama schools used the analogy in the manner of *bhedābheda*-Vedānta to illustrate their theory of *ābhāsa* (reflection) without impacting their transformationist theology.

### Sanskrit Inscriptions from the Khmer Domains

The analogy of reflection occurs in a number of dedicatory opening stanzas of Sanskrit inscriptions from the Khmer domains in Mainland Southeast Asia from the 10th century onwards.<sup>41</sup> Being all of Śaiva theological persuasion except one, which is Buddhist, these inscriptions can be considered Śaiva literature of the hymnological genre; as such, they are likely to reflect doctrinal themes that were prevalent in the transmitted sources of their time, which must have been ultimately based on South Asian prototypes.<sup>42</sup> Below are the relevant stanzas of inscriptions containing the analogy of moon reflected in water (chronologically ordered):

- (1) Inscription of Udāḍityavarman on Phnom Khna, K. 355, 944–968 CE (Cœdès, 1911, pp. 405–406):

----- ś cale jala ivāṅśumān |  
bhedābhedātmane tasmai parameśāya no na[maḥ ||] 1

[... Who is] like the moon [reflected] in moving water—to that Supreme Lord, who is [thus both] multiple and undivided, obeisance!

- (2) Inscription on Banteai Srei, K. 570, 969 CE (IC I, pp. 144–147; Finot et al., 1928, p. 72):

dr̥ṣṭādr̥ṣṭārthavidyānām ya ekaḥ prabhavaḥ paraḥ |  
vikalpabhedād<sup>43</sup> bhinnānām sarvvāpām iva candramāḥ || 9

The One who, supreme origin of the sciences (or: spells?) whose aim is what is seen and unseen, because of the division [introduced by] dichotomizing

<sup>39</sup> “Thereafter one should meditate on the Self, unique and divided into six kinds by virtue of the operations that are superimpositions, like the moon on the water; in reality, it is not divided,” *ātmanam bhāvayet paścād ekakaṃ jalacandravat | kṛtyopādhivaśād bhinnam śodhābhinnam tu vastutaḥ*. Another reflection analogy employed by Abhinavagupta is that of the city reflected in a mirror (cf. Rastogi, 1984, pp. 28–34).

<sup>40</sup> P. 14: *ākāśam ekaṃ hi yathā ghaṭādiṣu prthag bhavet | tathātmaiko 'py anekaś ca jalādhāreṣv ivāṅśumān*.

<sup>41</sup> A discussion of the reflection analogy in these inscriptions may be found in Bhattacharya, 1961, pp. 60–61 and Goodall, 2017, pp. 139–140, fn. 11.

<sup>42</sup> No Śaiva text transmitted in manuscripts from the region has survived to us, but several Śaiva scriptures of the Mantramārga are mentioned in inscriptions, viz. the *Niśvāsa*, *Pārameśvara*, *Śiraścheda*, *Vīṇāśikha*, etc. (Sanderson, 2014, p. 37).

<sup>43</sup> Based on the reading by Goodall (2017, p. 140, fn. 11), correcting Finot’s *vikalpa[n n]o dād*.

thought, [appears as the origin] of the distinctions, like the moon in the waters of the universe.

(3) Inscription of Thma Puok, K. 225, 989 CE (IC III, p. 66):

*yo 'pi eko vahudhā bhinno v[i]neyāśānurodhataḥ |*  
*śaśīva naikanīrasthavamvo<sup>44</sup> vuddhas sa pātu vaḥ || 1*

May the Buddha protect you—He who, albeit unique, [becomes] divided into multiple [forms] to fulfill the wishes of the disciples, like the moon is reflected in multiple receptacles of water!

(4) Stele of Tuol Prasat, K. 158A, 1003 CE (IC II, p. 99):

*oṃ namaś śivāyāstu śivāya yasmād |*  
*vrahmādir aṅśaḥ pratibhūḥ prabhūtaḥ |*  
*bhinnopadhānād vahudheva bhinno |*  
*nānyas svabhāvād iva vāribhānuḥ || 1*

Oṃ. Let homage be to Śiva the benevolent, from whom the portions consisting of Brahmā etc. have appeared, [as] substitutes (*pratibhūḥ*), as if they were manifoldly distinct [from Himself] due to the superimposed particularity of being distinct, [yet] not different from its natural state, like the sun [reflected] in the water.

(5) Piedroit N at Phnom Sanke Kon, K. 232, 1009 CE (IC VI, p. 229):

*śivo jayaty unmanayaikadhāmā*  
*tadekavad yaś śikhayeva vahniḥ*  
*manāsthito 'neka ivormmimāli-*  
*kallolacancadvidhuvimvatulyaḥ || 1*

Victory to Śiva, who shares his abode with Unmanā<sup>45</sup> and is like one with her, like the fire with the flame, and who resides in the minds, as if multiple, like the reflection of the moon shaking on the billow (*kallola*) of the garlanded of waves.

(6) Stele of Trapan Don On, K. 254, 1129 CE (IC III, p. 182):

*namaś śivāya yacchaktir ādyā puruṣasaṃgatā |*  
*prakṛtisthā dvitīyā vā yābhyāṃ vyāptam idaṅ jagat || 1*  
*abhivyākto yayāpy eko dṛṣyate 'neka dhā śivaḥ |*  
*candraḥ pratimayevāvyāt sā śaktiś śāmbhavī jagat || 2*

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Goodall (2017, p. 140, fn. 11), who understands *naikanīra*° in place of *naikanira*°.

<sup>45</sup> *Unmanā* may stand for the homonymous form of the Śakti, along with Vyāpinī and Samanā (represented by *manāsthito*?).

Homage to Śiva, whose first Energy is united with the Spirit, whose second Energy resides in the Nature, and by both of whom this universe is pervaded. This Energy, [called] Śāmbhavī, refreshes the Universe, [she] through which Śiva is manifested and, even though unique, is seen as manifold, just like the moon [is seen] through [its] image [reflected in water].

(7) Inscription of Angkor Wat, K. 300, > 12th century (Bergaigne, 1893, p. 388, LXV A2):

†...† *eko 'nekadeheṣu dehinām |*  
*bhidyate vahudhevendur vvahukoṭighaṭāmbhasi || 2*

[... while] unique, He is split in the multiple bodies of the embodied beings, like the [reflection of the] moon [is] manifoldly [split] in the water of an innumerable multitude of jars.

All inscriptions describe the paradoxical concept of unicity and multiplicity of Śiva; six of them articulate its self-manifestations through the analogy of reflection. Goodall (2017, p. 140, fn. 11) notes that

The moon divided when reflected upon ripples is an oft-repeated image for the paradoxical nature of God found in such Śaiva works as the *Parākhyatantra* (1.42) and the *Devyāmata* [...]. In Cambodian sources, it is rather more common to find the moon reflected on the surfaces of multiple bodies of water rather than on moving water.

K. 355 (1) and K. 232 (5), invoking the analogy of the moon reflected on ripples rather than multiple bodies of water, are remindful of the elaborations by Bhartṛhari and Śaṅkara (compare *Niśvāsakārikā* 31.33cd–36ab) mentioned supra. And yet (1) explicitly mentions *bhedābheda*, identity in difference, rather than *advaita*,<sup>46</sup> whereas (5) employs a distinctly tantric terminology and imagery.<sup>47</sup> K. 570 (2), attributing the seeming multiplicity to *vikalpabheda*, would seem to stand closer to a *vivarta* perspective. This is also the case of K. 158 (4), remarking that creation is not distinct from its natural state (*nānyas svabhāvāt*): difference is only due to external conditionings (*upadhāna*, corresponding to *upādhi*—a Vedāntic technical term). K. 254 (6) presents the analogy along Śaiva theological lines, multiplicity being the result of the manifestation of Śakti. K. 300 (7) multiplies the reflections of the moon

<sup>46</sup> Along with the typically *bhedābheda* analogy of identity between fire and heat, standing for Śiva and Śakti, in st. 1 (cf. infra, fn. 49).

<sup>47</sup> Besides the reference to the Śāktis, the image of the moon reflecting on the waves of the sea echoes the analogy of the “rising of the moon on the ocean of consciousness”, and the Śiva-Śakti dichotomy expressed though the image of sea and waves, found in non-dualist Krama and Spanda works, such as the *Mahārthamañjarī* (which is later than this inscription, yet often contains earlier motifs), several hymns to Kālī (Silburn, 1975), *Tantrāloka* 4.184b, *Spandakārikā* 11, etc., as well as in *Lakṣmītantra* 2.21.

to an uncountable number, so as to represent the individual souls.<sup>48</sup> K. 225 (3), a Buddhist inscription, presumably borrowed the analogy from a Śaiva source.

The above attestations of the reflection analogy in Sanskrit inscriptions dating from the mid-10th-century onwards suggest an influence of Vedānta—arguably of the variety that was popularized by Śaṅkara, Maṇḍanamiśra, and their epigones—on the Śaiva religion in the Khmer lands from the turn of the first millennium CE. However, many of those instances seem to reflect the use of the analogy in the context of a transformationist, qualified monism (*bhedābhedavāda*) rather than illusionistic, utter monism (*abhedavāda* or *advaitavāda*), in which Śakti plays a central role, just like in some non-Saiddhāntika Śaiva sources from India.<sup>49</sup> Thus, one may assume that even though the widespread attestation of that analogy in prototypical Sanskrit texts was due to the successful reception of *vivartavāda*-Advaita Vedānta in Brahmanical circles, its adoption by the Khmers did not displace the locally predominant philosophical and theological paradigm.

### (Sanskrit-)Old Javanese Śaiva Texts from Java and Bali

The analogy of reflection is attested in some Śaiva-influenced Old Javanese belletristic texts as well as (Sanskrit-)Old Javanese Śaiva scriptures of the *tutur* genre—but not in *tattvas* (i.e., *Dharma Pātañjala*, *Vṛhaspatitattva*, and *Tattvajñāna*), which, as we have seen in Part I, only attest the analogies of fire in wood and butter in milk. The *Bhuvanakośa*, a text containing early material which may have achieved its current form in Bali during the Majapahit or even post-Majapahit period (> 14th century), betrays Vedāntic-influenced doctrinal strands.<sup>50</sup> Cf., for instance, dyad 2.15 on the Lord's pervasion of the beings:

*tathā jñātvā mahādevaḥ vyāpī sarvaśarīṣu*  
*ākāśam iva kumbheṣu vrajen mokṣam anāśrayam*

**15a** *tathā jñātvā*] conj.; *tathāpītvā* ms. **15b** *sarvaśarīṣu*] em.;  
*sarvvagarīṣu* ms. **15d** *vrajen*] em.; *vrajan* ms.

<sup>48</sup> Compare *Jñānasiddhānta* Ch. 5, quoted *infra*. Note that in stanza 30d, the inscription refers to the *Pārameśvara* as a scriptural source (*yathoktaṃ pārameśvare*); this is likely to be the *Pārameśvaratantra*, an early Siddhāntatantra that has survived to us in fragmentary form, and which is regarded as non-dualist by Goodall (cf. *infra*, fn. 61). Another non-dualist Siddhāntatantra, the *Sarvajñānottara*, is mentioned in K. 1002 and K. 532.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Bhattacharya, 1961, p. 61. Note that other *bhedābhedā* images, like the association between fire and flame/heat, are featured in K. 232 (IC VI, p. 229); compare heat (*auṣṇya*) and fire (*agni*) in K. 355 (cf. *supra*), as well as *Śivadṛṣṭi* 3.7 (*nāgner auṣṇyaṃ pṛthag bhavet*), *Vijñānabhairava* 19ab (*na vahner dāhikā śaktir vyatirikṭā vibhāvayate*), and *Jayākhyasamhitā* 97ab (*jñānam tad eva jñeyaṃ ca vahner jvālā yathaiva hi*). Another inscription propounding a *bhedābhedā* position through the use of a Vedāntic terminology (i.e., *paramātmā*) is K. 713A, vv. 1–2 (IC I, p. 19, 879 CE): “Hail to Śiva, the Supreme Lord, the Supreme Self who, by his own nature without parts, takes [separate] forms out of his own will. Hail to the one who holds the javelin, who, albeit unique, constantly creates a self, by residing separately and at the same time in multiple [beings],” *niṣkalāya svabhāvena svecchayā dhṛtamūrttaye | śivāya paramēśāya namo stu paramātmāne || yenaikenāpy aneṣu tiṣṭhatā yugapat pṛthag | ātmāpi kriyate nityaṃ tasmai śulabhṛte namaḥ*.

<sup>50</sup> Several Vedāntic analogies feature in this text, viz. that of the seed plant, the river joining the ocean, etc. One also notes a Vedāntic terminology that owes to the discourse of Brahman-Ātman refashioned along theistic lines.



*sira sañ yogīśvara vruḥ riñ bhaṭāra mahādeva | vyāpaka ri sarva māvak |  
mañkana riñ kumbha makveḥ inandālan iñ vulan tuṅgal | mañkana simpṇiñ  
nora | ulihniñ kabeh | tañkəs viśeṣa irikañ ṣaḍvarga | sira ta mantuk riñ  
kamokṣapadan | tar paḥiñan ləpasnira ||*

Having known that Mahādeva is pervasive within all embodied beings like ether within pots, [one] reaches supportless liberation.

The leader among yogins knows that the Lord Mahādeva pervades all the embodied beings like the space pervades all the embodied beings. In the same way, the multiple pots are the place where the single moon resides. Thus is how non-existence, the final destination of everything, is brought together in a limited space.<sup>51</sup> [Being] the epitome of superiority over the group of six [inner stains], he reaches the stage of release. His release is without boundaries.

Intriguingly, the Old Javanese commentary mentions the analogy of reflection of the moon in the water of multiple pots, which is not found in the śloka, while passing over in silence the analogy of space in pots—i.e., rendering it instead as the image of space pervading, just like Śiva, the bodies of all beings.<sup>52</sup> This could reflect either a misunderstanding by the Javanese/Balinese author, or an attempt to add on the śloka by integrating the latter analogy with the former. Indeed, as we have seen, the coupling of the two analogies of reflection and delimitation is not uncommon in Sanskrit sources.

The space-pot analogy is echoed in other Old Javanese sources, in passages characterizing the Lord as pervading everything as the invisible space or a clear sky.<sup>53</sup> Some of those passages bear a somewhat illusionistic flavour, like for example in an Old Javanese prose passage of *Jñānasiddhānta* 8.5 (p. 120), describing the Lord as bodiless, inaccessible through direct perception in the world (*tan dadi sira katona sakala pratyakṣa riñ rāt*), having a just dimly visible form or

<sup>51</sup> The root *simpṇ\** is unattested as such in the *Old Javanese-English Dictionary* (Zoetmulder, 1982), which glosses *asimpṇ* as “brought together in a limited space, grouped together, compressed, in a limited number, containing the basic essentials; put away, hidden.” I am not sure about whether here the term is to be understood in a concrete sense, namely to illustrate one or both images, or rather figuratively, so as to mean “the [doctrinal] essentials of”.

<sup>52</sup> But it is possible that *nora* in the Old Javanese commentary is to be interpreted as a synonym of space, in the sense of “unmanifest” (this reflects a Vedic usage applied to *asat* in the sense of “invisible to the eye”, as a synonym of *antarikṣa*: Acri, 2017<sup>2</sup>, p. 588), which could be an oblique reference to the image in the śloka.

<sup>53</sup> This image recurs in various Old Javanese sources, viz. *Jñānasiddhānta* (15.6, 25.2–3), *Bhuvanakośa* (1.11, 2.17), *Saṅ Hyāñ Kamahāyānikan* (p. 19 line 28) and in Balinese Sanskrit Stutis. In the Sanskrit-Old Javanese version of the *Bhagavadgītā* (Old Javanese *Bhīṣmaparvan*, p. 64, corresponding to *Bhagavadgītā* 13.32), the image of the Self being ubiquitous in the body yet invisible as space is related: *yathā sarvagatam sauḥmyād ākāśaṃ nopalabhyate | sarvatrāvasthito dehe tathātmā nopalabhyate ||* [OJ:] *prasiddha sarvagata kṛta ikañ ākāśa, ndatan kopālābhi gatinya, makanimitta sūkṣmanya, yathā, kadyaṅganika, mañkana ta sañ hyaṅ ātma vyāpaka riñ śārīra, tan katon sira pan aḍamit*, “Just as the ubiquitous space is not perceived due to its subtlety, so the Self, which is contained everywhere in the body, is not perceived. [OJ:] As is well known, space is ubiquitous, yet its state is not perceived because of its subtlety. *Yathā*—just like that. In like manner, the holy Soul pervades the body; it is not seen, for it is subtle”.

merely having the appearance of illusion/Māyā/creative power (*māyākāramātra*),<sup>54</sup> and like the sky (*ākāśavat*).<sup>55</sup> The same text unpacks the analogy, along lines similar to those found in Khmer Sanskrit inscription K. 300 (i.e., moon reflected in an innumerable quantity of pots), in a lengthy prose passage of Chapter 5 (p. 90), as follows:

*upamaniñ sarva tumuvuh sahananya kabeh kadya dyun mesi bañu | bhaṭṭāra kadi sūrya haneñ ākāśa | dālən sira sañke sor | tuñgal juga sira | tathāpinyan ikañ dyun sevu sənvakəna riñ sira | yadyastun salakṣa koṭi niyuta kvehanikañ dyun | niyata kasənvān denira | tonən ikañ toyen ghaṭa | an muñgu in natar | niyata pada mesi sūryabimba ikañ toyen dyun | mañkāna ta bhaṭṭāra haneñ hatiniñ rāt kabeh ||*

The analogy of every living creatures, all of them, is that they are like vessels filled with water. The Lord is like the sun that is in the sky. Look at Him from below: He is one only. Yet, if a thousand vessels were to be irradiated by Him, [and if] the number of the vessels would be even ten thousand, a hundred thousand, or a million, no doubt [they] would be irradiated by Him [one by one]. Look at the water in the vessels, which are on the ground: clearly, all the [distinct bodies of] water within the vessels contain the image of the sun. In this manner is the Lord as He exists in the hearts of all beings.

In a prose passage of the same chapter (p. 88), the text describes a “yoga of the sky” (*devāmbarayoga*) using an image that may be regarded as a (local?) “variant” of the analogy of ether in pots, where those elements are substituted with the cavity of the heart/the interior of a bamboo and the sky, respectively:

*apan in kuvuniñ hati tuñgal kalavan lañit kañ katon deniñ vvañ kabeh | ya kuvuniñ hati | ya ākāśa ikā<sup>56</sup> tan patəpi | tan pāntara | aparān ta deniñ anuñgalakən pikəkəsira | vyaktinya | kadyaṅganiñ tvas in vuluh sinivak | kuvunyañ hūni ikañ vuñvañ ri jəro | mulih anuñgal mareñ ākāśa paranya |*

For in the cavity of the heart it (i.e., the *om*/vital breath) is one with the sky, which is seen by all men. What is the cavity of the heart is [also] the sky, without borders and without intermediate space. What is the way to unite their [separate] arrangement? Its explanation [is as follows:] like the interior of a

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Zoetmulder, 1982, p. 1130: *māyākāra*, “(Skt) illusory or unreal form, vague or dimly visible form.” The same word occurs in the early 13th-century *kakavin Sumanasāntaka* 12.7 to articulate a variant of the reflection analogy: “Existence is like an illusory form (i.e., reflection) in a mirror; everything that exists does not last” (*māyākāra haneñ cramin paḍanikañ dadi sahanahananya tan sthiti*).

<sup>55</sup> Compare *Bhuvanakośa* 3.79: [Skt] “This universe, the mobile and the immobile, is an entirely illusionary appearance. Śiva’s essence resides in everything; [everything] is dissolved into the ontic level of Śiva. [OJ:] The nature of the whole universe is illusion (or: [the Lord’s] creative power). Everything that exists in it is the form of the Lord Śiva. The whole universe, in the end, dissolves into Him”, *māyāmātram idam rūpañ jagat sthāvarajaṅgamam | śivātmā bhavate sarve śivatattve praliyate* [em.; *śivatatva vvaliyate* mss.] || *ikañ jagat kabeh | sthāvarajaṅgamāvaknya | māyā svabhāvanya | rūpa bhaṭāra śiva sahananya | ikañ rāt kabeh | i vakasan lina mare sira*. The use of *praliyate* and *lina* are indicative of *pariṇāma*-Vedānta: cf. infra, fn. 60.

<sup>56</sup> Em.; *ikañ* ed. (all mss.).

split bamboo; the cavity [mentioned] above is the bamboo, in the inside, which returns to become one with [the space in] the sky, its destination.

Another instance of the analogy of reflection is found in the second part of the Stuti of the *Arjunavivāha* (11.1; cf. 10.1–2, quoted in Part I, in the context of the first set of analogies), which uses it to characterize the ineffable presence of the absolute—in His Sadāśiva form, i.e. *sakalanīṣkala*—within all beings:

*śaśivimba haneṇ ghaṭa meṣi baṇu  
ndan asiṇ śuci nirmala meṣi vulan  
iva maṅkana rakva kiteṇ kadadin  
riṇ aṇambāki yoga kiteṇ sakala*

The image of the moon is [present] in pots containing water.

And anything that is pure and spotless contains the moon.

In such a manner you are said to dwell in creation.

For one who devotes himself to yoga you are in the manifest world.

This echoes *Niśvāsakārikā* 32–33ab, quoted above, which also declares that the Lord can be directly perceived through yoga like the moon reflected in water. Analogous non-dualistic propositions of seemingly Vedāntic origin are found in the *tutur Kumāratattva* (II), where the oneness of the Lord is compared to the oneness of the sun: both only appear to be manifold when contained in the eyes of each person (f. 22v); further, because Māyā makes Him endowed with a body,

*bhaṭāra prabheda vākasan, ya ta inupamākṇ āditya mvaṇ ghaṭa, ikaṇ māyā  
akṇ magave ghaṭa, satus, siyu, sayuta, ikaṇ bhaṭāra kaḍi āditya haneṇ jaro,  
ikaṇ pradhāna [em.; paḍāna ms.] veniṇ ghaṭa, ikaṇ puruṣa chāyāniṇ āditya.*

The Lord at last [becomes] differentiated; that can be compared to the sun and the pots. Māyā is like that which makes the pots, hundreds, thousands, millions; the Lord is like the sun that exists inside [the body (?)]; the Nature is the water of the pot; the Spirit is the reflected image of the sun.

Here the analogy has to be understood within a local Śaiva framework that unpacks and reconfigures it so as to define each element in terms of Lord, Māyā, Prakṛti, and Puruṣa.

The absence of both the analogies of reflection and of limitation of space in *tattvas*, as opposed to their attestation in *tuturs*, as well as in the early 11th century *Arjunavivāha*, seems significant. It suggests that, although both *tattvas* and *tuturs* reflect a (*pariṇāma*/bhedābheda-Vedānta-influenced) non-dualistic form of Śaivism that predates the strictly dualistic Siddhāntatantras, some *tuturs* might have been influenced by *vivartavāda*-Vedānta views, or in any event borrowed the analogies from Advaita Vedānta-influenced prototypical Sanskrit Śaiva sources. This state of affairs supports the hypothesis that the *tattva* corpus represents a distinct genre, which is earlier than the latter, and also derives from an earlier South Asian prototypical canon (Acri, 2017<sup>2</sup>, p. 9).

## Conclusion: Some Reflections on Śaivism and Vedānta

The investigation of Sanskrit and vernacular literatures of South and Southeast Asia carried out in Parts I and II of this article has revealed a widespread presence of the four analogies of fire in wood, dairy products in milk, sun/moon in water, and space in pots. To recapitulate, and for the readers' convenience, I summarize the salient features of the four analogies below:

- (1) **Fire in wood/kindling sticks:** this is an old analogy, probably originating from Vedic ritualism. In the earlier Upaniṣads and the *Mahābhārata*, it is invoked to justify the immanence of the universal Self in the beings (or the existence of any invisible things, or the cause in the effect). But already in the *Śvetāśvatara*, it seems to have assumed a more “applied” connotation, to metaphorize the manifestation of the supreme reality in the human body by means of a focused/strenuous activity—a form of yoga (since fire is not produced from wood spontaneously, it requires a *nimittakāraṇa* to be manifested). This usage has been appropriated, along theistic lines, by Śaiva sources, where it sometimes occurs together with analogy (2). The image of generation of fire from kindling-sticks through rubbing might have implied a sexual metaphor, at least in the earlier stratum of the literature, and perhaps it came to represent a specific mode of *pariṇāma* implying indirect generation, like when a child is born from parents; this might explain its virtual absence from Sāṅkhya treatises, which rather employ analogy (2).<sup>57</sup> It is referred to only once (succinctly) in Śaṅkara's BSB, in the *Vākyapadīya*, and it is attested neither in the BS nor in the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā/Āgamaśāstra*.
- (2) **Dairy products in milk:** this equally old analogy epitomizes not only the concept of latent existence, and pervasion, of an effect in/by its cause, but also exemplifies an evolutionary, realist, and complete transformation of a substance (*dravya*) into another. As such, it features in Sāṅkhya commentaries, often to illustrate the production of evolutes from *prakṛti*. It may also have been associated with *pariṇāma*-Vedānta, for in BS 2.1.2, the Brahman is defined as being “like milk”. This is interpreted by both Śaṅkara and Bhāskara (e.g., *ad* 2.1.24) as the analogy of milk turning spontaneously into coagulated milk or curd (the process is merely accelerated by heat). Just like in the case of analogy (1), and often in the same context or alongside it, it occurs in passages of Śaiva texts mentioning a yogic procedure to manifest the Lord in the body. In a strictly dualistic Siddhāntatantra, the *Kiraṇa*, it is invoked to negate the transformation of Māyā—Māyā being only nominally differentiated from Śiva, while in commentaries by Saiddhāntika authors it refutes the Sāṅkhya position on *prakṛti*. In some *viśiṣṭādvaita* South Indian Śaiva works, it

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Part I, fn. 21. The silence of the Sāṅkhya sources (apart from one oblique mention in *Yuktidīpikā ad* SK 9c) may reflect a disagreement: cf. *Sāṅkhyavṛtti ad* SK 16, where the production of a multiple world through the modification of *guṇas* is regarded as being like milk produced from curds, not like parents producing a child.

epitomizes the special transformation of the Supreme into its effects by way of its power (thus, God is conceived of as being both *upādāna*- and *nimitta-kāraṇa*).

- (3) **Reflection of sun or moon in (multiple bodies of) water:** probably deriving from Buddhist sources, it is attested in a handful of pre-Śaṅkara/Maṇḍanamiśra Brahmanical sources, where it epitomizes the mode through which the One Self/Brahman resides in many beings. In Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*, it is used in the context of the definition of the two kinds of words. It occurs in the *Sāṅkhyasaptatīrti* (ca. 6th century) as representing the view of Vedavādins on multiple consciousnesses (cf. Sadyojyotis' *Bhogakārikā*), and in BS 3.2.18 (and perhaps BS 2.3.50 too) to articulate the status of the individual self as being not an identical and yet not totally separate reality. Originally, it probably conveyed a *bhedābhedavāda* stance, but it was reused along *vivartavāda* lines in the milieu of Śaṅkara and Maṇḍanamiśra, as well as their epigones. It often goes together with analogy (4), such as in Śaṅkara's BSB. His (as well as Maṇḍana's) elaboration in terms of linking the various shapes assumed by the reflection depending on the medium (i.e., still or perturbed water, etc.) could have influenced subsequent texts. It commonly features in Vedānta-influenced Śaiva texts, and also occurs in Sanskrit inscriptions from the Khmer domains from the 10th century onwards, and prob. post-10th-century Old Javanese texts. In the *Niśvāsakārikā* and the Old Javanese *kakavin Arjunavivāha*, it illustrates a form of yoga through which the adept directly perceives the immanent form of the Lord in the world.
- (4) **Space delimited by pots:** attested in the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā/Āgamaśāstra* and the *Vākyapadīya*, this analogy too may have been inspired by earlier Buddhist literature. But, again, it may have been Śaṅkara who popularized it, employing it along with analogy (3). It usually illustrates the point that the Supreme Self/Soul has no parts, and its illusory delimitation by bodies is just on account of *upādhis*. As such, it bears a *vivartavāda* signature: indeed, *pariṇāma*-Vedānta did subscribe to the doctrine that individual selves are portions of the universal Self. It occurs in post-9th-century Śaiva sources, both in India and Java/Bali, which reveal either knowledge of, or influence from, *vivartavāda*-Vedānta.

In what follows I advance the hypothesis that the distribution of the analogies in Śaiva literature (presented in tabular form in the Appendix) could cast some light on the relationship between Vedānta and Śaivism in the medieval period on the one hand, and the relationship between different strands of Saiddhāntika texts on the other.

Various scholars of Śaivism have noted that the early Saiddhāntika exegete Sadyojyotis may not have been aware of the illusionistic doctrine introduced by Śaṅkara and Maṇḍanamiśra, which became established—to the point of relegating transformationism to a minoritarian and eventually forgotten position—more than a century later than the period in which Sadyojyotis flourished (prob. 675–725 CE, cf.

Sanderson, 2006, p. 73).<sup>58</sup> Sanderson has argued that the *pariṇā mavāda* refuted by Sadyojyotis corresponds to the doctrine of Bhartṛprapañca in his lost commentary on the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (ca. mid-6th century),<sup>59</sup> and that by Rāmakaṇṭha's time, the leading Vedāntins no longer considered *pariṇāma* to be the principal teaching of the Upaniṣads. Goodall (2015) has argued that most early Siddhāntatantras ignore *vivartavāda*-Vedānta, with the exception of the latest among the demonstrably early scriptures, the *Parākhya* and the *Mrgendra*, which contain critiques of that school (cf. supra). Furthermore, in their lists linking the followers of a particular system to a cosmic level, the early Saiddhāntika sources place the Vedāntins (Aupaniṣadas) in *prakṛti*, which indicates that they must have been *pariṇā mavādins*; at a much later date, the placement of Vedāntic *pariṇā mavādins* in *prakṛti* and *vivartavādins* in *puruṣa* is made explicit by Rāmakaṇṭha. This shows that “Vedāntic *vivartavāda* was either unknown or of little importance in the places and at the times in which the earliest thinkers of the Śaiva Siddhānta wrote” (ibid., p. 277).

The material presented in this article seems to be in harmony with the abovementioned findings. Even though analogies (3) and (4) do occur in such early sources as the *Yājñavalkyasmṛiti* (3), the *Vākyapadīya* (both 3 and 4), the *Brahmasūtra* (3), and the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā/Āgamaśāstra* (4), and may be traced back to even earlier Buddhist texts; and in spite of the fact that analogy (3) may originally have been understood in a *pariṇāma/bhedābheda* manner, the adoption of either one or both analogies in Śaiva literature from the 9th–10th century onwards suggest that they only became widespread around that period, possibly because of their association with *vivartavāda* milieus stemming from the traditions of Śaṅkara and Maṇḍanamiśra. Therefore, their presence or absence from Śaiva sources may be tentatively proposed as a criterion to detect certain doctrinal strands or influences, and the relative dating of (parts of) scriptures, especially within the notoriously difficult-to-date Saiddhāntika canon. The presence of those two analogies (especially when they occur as a pair, and irrespective of whether they are invoked to reflect a *pariṇāma* or *vivarta* position), along with a more widespread awareness of *vivartavāda*, in the sources may reflect some sort of “canonization” process triggered by the increasing success enjoyed by the orientation of Vedānta formulated by Śaṅkara and Maṇḍanamiśra. This proposition is consistent with (a) the demonstrated progressive influence of *vivartavāda* non-dualist Vedānta on medieval Śaiva sources, especially those redacted in South India; (b) the occurrence of the reflection analogy from the 10th century in Sanskrit inscriptions from the Khmer domains; and (c) the occurrence of the same analogy in Sanskrit-Old

<sup>58</sup> Rāmakaṇṭha's account of Vedānta in *Paramokṣanirāsakārikāvṛtti* 2.3 draws on Maṇḍanamiśra (Watson et al., 2013, p. 25) and, although he may not have known Śaṅkara, subsequent exegetes show an awareness of *vivartavāda*. Rāmakaṇṭha labels the two (unspecified) types of Vedānta expounded and refuted by Sadyojyotis in his *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā* (2b) *pariṇā mavāda* or *pariṇativedānta* and *vivartavāda* or *māyāvāda*, respectively (ibid., pp. 23–25; 236, fn. 41).

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Sanderson (2006, pp. 70–71, fn. 42; 68–73). Some fragments of Bhartṛprapañca's work have been collected by Hiriyanna (1924).

Javanese Śaiva *tuturs* and a Śaiva-inspired Old Javanese *kakavin* from the early 11th century, which can be contrasted with the occurrence of only the first set of analogies (along with other early *pariṇāma*-Vedānta and Sāṅkhya analogies, like that of the string of pearls) in the (probably earlier) corpus of Śaiva *tattvas*.

More tentatively, I also propose that the origin of the first set of analogies could be sought in Sāṅkhya and early Vedāntic *pariṇāma*-*bhedābheda* (*à la* Bhartṛprapañca/Aupaniṣadas)<sup>60</sup> milieus—or, rather, in a common Sāṅkhyaic-Vedāntic “fund” that characterized some Upaniṣads and such texts as the *Mokṣaparvan*, documenting a historical stage at which the two schools had not yet acquired distinct identities. There may, thus, exist a thread connecting the early phase of (theistic) Upaniṣadic and post-Upaniṣadic speculation of the *Mokṣadharma* and the *Śvetāśvatara* to the relatively early Siddhāntatantras that display an unusual doctrinal allegiance to non-dualism or a “compromised dualism”, like the *Sarvajñānottara*,<sup>61</sup> or that are characterized by an eclectic or somewhat blurred doctrinal formulations, like the *Kālottara* (i.e. Vāthula/Āgneya) corpus and the *Niśvāsakārikā*, or again to some equally eclectic Hāthayogic texts. These scriptures may tell us a different history of Śaiva non-dualism (or qualified non-dualism), i.e. one that is associated with an older textual background and doctrinal filiation from the Upaniṣads, which appears to have also shaped some seminal Pāñcarātriśa scriptures. This strand may have been important also in forming the doctrinal norm in Southeast Asia: some of the Sanskrit inscriptions from the Khmer domains presented here seem to use the *vivartavāda* analogies in a *bhedābheda* sense, thus reflecting the BS and other early *pariṇāma*-Vedānta sources rather than the *māyāvādin* interpretation, although their post-9th-century dating, and their use of such technical terms as *upādhi*, suggest an awareness of, and perhaps even influence from, Advaita Vedānta. Similarly, while early Old Javanese sources of the *tattva*

<sup>60</sup> Bhartṛprapañca’s doctrine of liberation consisted in dissolution (*laya*) into the Supreme Self (Sanderson, 2006, pp. 70–71), and his philosophical views—that reflected an unambiguously *dvaitādvaita* or *bhedābheda* position—closely resembled Sāṅkhya (Hiriyanna, 1949, p. 92). For this reason, his positions were repeatedly criticized by Śāṅkara.

<sup>61</sup> Goodall (1998, p. lxxiii) notes that the *Niśvāsa*, the Cambridge *Pārameśvara* fragment, and the *Sarvajñānottara* have a non-dualist position (or a compromised dualism), which “may or may not be an indication of relative antiquity.” Duquette (2015, fn. 15) presents an often-quoted verse attributed by Śivāgrayogin to the *Skānda* (this might be a scripture of the Vāthula/Āgneya corpus, or the *Sūtasamhitā*, where Skānda figures among Śiva’s main interlocutors?) regarding Śiva as material cause of the universe—a typically Vedāntic position: “From Śiva, whose nature is only truth, supreme bliss and light, all this [world], both sentient and non-sentient, became manifest” (trans. *ibid.*), *śivāt satyaparānan-daprakāśaikaśvalakṣaṇāt | āvirbhūtam idaṃ sarvaṃ cetanācetanātmakam* (compare *Lakṣmītantra* 2.4cd: *kroḍhīkṛtam idaṃ sarvaṃ cetanācetanātmakam*). In his commentary to Śrīkaṇṭha’s *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* ad 2.2.38, 16th-century Appaya Dīkṣita refers to a passage of the *Vāyavyāsaṃhitā* (corresponding to the 7th chapter of the *Śivapurāṇa*) quoted by Śrīkaṇṭha, which supports just the same view, as being rooted in the *Sarvajñānottara* (which is, indeed, part of the Vāthula/Āgneya corpus). Sivaraman (1973, p. 33) argued that *śivādvaita* has “a long and continuous history [...] traceable to *Vāyavya-Samhitā* [...] and also to *Sūtasamhitā* of Skānda-Purāṇa.”



class only attest the first two sets of analogies, post-11th century sources display an eclectic stance mixing both sets—just like Śaṅkara does—in spite of the fact that in the medieval Indian tradition they gradually became associated with distinct philosophical positions. Indeed, it is still very much open to question whether those analogies already represented well-fixed and unambiguous philosophical stances when they entered Śaiva literature, or were woven into theories at a later time by authors with specific agendas, and who were writing from specific cultural and religious contexts. Those analogies could have acquired different meanings in different texts, milieus, and regions of the Indic world; and yet, it seems reasonable to assume that they reflect theological and philosophical signatures deriving from prototypical traditions that became crystallized in later historical periods.

Finally, I should like to point out that the two sets of analogies seem to reflect a different emphasis on gnosis and action: the former, more “realist” and “concrete”, admits both gnosis and action—as epitomized, for instance, by the yogic procedure metaphorized by the activity of rubbing wood to produce fire and churning milk to produce butter—,<sup>62</sup> while the latter upholds gnosis or cognitive shift (i.e. the mere recognition that the moon reflected in water is not the actual moon and that space is not separate) as the sole means to remove the *upādhis* and ignorance, and realize unity with the supreme principle. Interestingly, this dichotomy reflects an analogous debate within Vedānta: while the *jñānakarmasamuccaya*, the combination of action and knowledge to achieve liberation, was subscribed to by some pre-Śaṅkara *pariṇāmalbhedābheda* Vedāntins, including Bhartṛprapañca, as well as Bhāskara (Potter, 1981, p. 40), knowledge alone was admitted by Śaṅkara. This dichotomy was also present in the Śaiva movement: dualist texts and traditions were (or progressively became) associated with ritual (especially initiation, as well as observances), whereas non-dualistic traditions were preponderantly gnostic. Yoga-oriented traditions, such as the one that formed the mainstream view in the Śaiva literature from Java and Bali, seem to hold an intermediate position between the two polarities. Statements found in the *Kālottara*, the *Niśvāsakārikā* etc., as well as some Old Javanese texts (e.g., the *Dharma Pātañjala*) as to the necessity not to just know the means but also to apply them would seem to reflect the *jñānakarmasamuccaya* position. Whether this means that they betray an influence from this early strand of transformationist Vedānta, or that they reflect views elaborated in a postulated “yogic milieu” of the Gupta period (cf. Wallis, 2016), it is impossible to determine with certainty, but either scenario does not seem to be outside the realm of possibility. Some doctrinal vestiges of this posited early trend may be found in Old Javanese texts, whose central tenets—such as the status of the Lord as material and

<sup>62</sup> This emphasis might have been introduced in yogic/theistic milieus, for according to the philosophical formulations of *pariṇāma* in Sāṅkhya and Vedānta, milk transforms into curds spontaneously, without the intervention of an external instrument.

not instrumental cause of the universe,<sup>63</sup> the disagreement with the view of the dualist Śaiva Siddhānta as to the nature of the relationship between the liberated Soul and Śiva,<sup>64</sup> as well as the concept of liberation as merging (*laya*) into Śiva—seem to have preserved a paradigm that is more archaic than the systematized Siddhānta of Sadyojyotis and the dualist Siddhāntatantras.<sup>65</sup>

In the light of the above, it seems not impossible that the beginning of the Vedāntization (both in terms of *pariṇāma*- and *vivarta-vāda*) of Śaivism could be traced to an earlier period than it has been hitherto assumed,<sup>66</sup> and that after the 9th or 10th century, this influence seems to bear an *advaita* mark.<sup>67</sup> For instance, the development of the concept of *śakti*—inherent to Śiva—as Māyā in Śaiva texts could be indebted to early Vedānta's need to justify the “transformation”, as it were, of the supreme principle as material cause without involving a separate efficient cause, and articulate the relation between oneness and multiplicity, as well as the idea of a static/changeless Brahman versus a changing/dynamic universe.<sup>68</sup> It is therefore not impossible that some theistic scriptures, such as the *Jayākhyasaṃhitā*,

<sup>63</sup> A perspective that is compatible with that of the transformationist Vedānta with respect to Brahman (who is intrinsically changeless and inactive) as the material cause of the universe is related in śloka 12 of the *Vṛhaspatitattva*, characterizing the Lord in his Sadāśiva aspect as “creator” or “generator” (*utpādaka*, i.e. material cause) and not as “realizer” or “accomplisher” (*sādhaka*, i.e. instrumental cause) of the universe. This view was shared by Pāśupata Śaivism, for the ontology of that system did not yet feature Māyā: the *Pañcārthabhāṣya* on sūtra 5.47 indeed identifies in the Lord the cause and impeller of the Universe, criticizing the views that attribute that role to unevolved matter or Spirit. The position that Śiva is both material and instrumental cause of the universe was also upheld by Śrīkaṇṭha, and Appaya Dīkṣita in the *Śivakarnāmrta* also attributes it to some “Vedic” (*śrāuta*) Pāśupatas, as opposed to *aśrāuta* Pāśupatas, who claim that the Lord is uniquely the instrumental cause (Duquette, 2021, p. 67).

<sup>64</sup> This relationship is described not in terms of similarity, intimate union, or qualitative identity (*śivatulyatva* or *śivasāmya*), but numerical identity (*sāmya*, i.e. oneness or identity of nature). This view may coincide with the *tādātmya* upheld by non-dualists such as Umāpati Śivācārya, and also found in the (interpolated) monistic passage in the *Sarvajñānottara* (cf. Goodall, 2006, p. 101; Watson et al., 2013, p. 78 fn. 6).

<sup>65</sup> Elsewhere I have suggested that Old Javanese Śaiva texts are characterized by doctrinal archaism (Acri, 2017<sup>2</sup>, pp. 12–15), and some bear traces of the doctrines of early Saiddhāntika exegete Bṛhaspati (Acri, 2011).

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Padoux, 1990, p. 35: “perhaps as early as the ninth century A.D., a twofold movement of tantricization of the Brahmanic milieu, and of ‘brahmanization’ or ‘vedantization’ of Tantrism, is apparent in Kashmir as well as in South India, with the Śrīvidyā”; contrast Goodall, 2004, p. xxvi: “Early non-dualist works of the school could have gone missing, but it appears likely that the old Śaiva Siddhānta was a broadly dualist school which only after the twelfth century felt the influence by non-dualist Vedānta.”

<sup>67</sup> On the other hand, Isayeva (1995, pp. 5–6) suggested that early Śaiva strands might have influenced Vedānta philosophical constructions by the 5th–6th century, and that tantric developments within the scope of Vedānta already characterized the works of Gauḍapāda and Bhartṛhari (*ibid.*). This view (which boldly assumes that these tantric influences occurred at a remarkably early period, when Tantra as we know it was still in its formative phase) does not necessarily contradict my own position, which assumes that new Vedānta influences on Śaivism intervened on the top of this pre-existing dialectical relationship between the two systems.

<sup>68</sup> The development of the concept of *śakti* may have been in part informed by Bhartṛhari's ideas on the relation between language and meaning, and his use of *śakti* as a principle between the signifying power of language and metaphysics, which had an influence on Kashmirian Śaiva non-dualistic thinkers like Utpaladeva and Abhinavagupta (Timalsina, 2013; MacCracken, 2017).

some early Siddhāntatantras, (Sanskrit-)Old Javanese Śaiva scriptures, and Sanskrit inscriptions from the Khmer domains, document the “survival” of a *bhedābhedal pariṇāmavāda* metaphysic elaborated in early Vedānta contexts—where Brahman is described as the material cause of the world and immanent in it, almost along theistic lines. In a similar way, it is possible that the source of the analogy of milk transforming into curd that is refashioned along theistic lines in non-Saiddhāntika Śaiva sources, like the non-dualist *Dakṣiṇamūrtivārttika/Mānasollāsa* and the *Brahmamamīmāṃsābhāṣya* by *viśiṣṭaśivādvaitavādin* Śrīkaṇṭha, may not have been its Sāṅkhyaic but rather its Vedāntic formulation, as found, e.g., in the BS, Bhāskara’s works, etc. This state of affairs may reflect a tension, as it were, in Śaivism between the strict dualism of Sāṅkhya and the qualified dualism or non-dualism (whether along *pariṇāma* or *vivarta* lines) of Vedānta. Be this as it may, these open questions should prompt us to read the early Saiddhāntika corpus without applying the distorting lenses of later dualist commentators, for it seems increasingly clear that it reflects a less systematized, unitary, and coherent theology than it has been hitherto assumed.

### Declarations

**Conflict of interest** On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

### Appendix

The table below displays the occurrences of the four analogies discussed in the article (Part I and Part II) in a selected body of texts, viz. Upaniṣads, the *Mahābhārata*, Sāṅkhyaśāstras and Vedāntaśāstras, Śaiva literature, Vaiṣṇava-Pāñcarātra texts, (Sanskrit-)Old Javanese Śaiva texts, and Sanskrit inscriptions from the Khmer domains. Since my scanning of this body of sources—mainly through the use of e-texts—is far from systematic and comprehensive, this table should be read as a preliminary tool to visualize some general patterns and trends in the distribution of analogies in the corpus of texts I have taken into account—especially the increase in occurrence of the second pair of analogies in chronologically younger non-Vedāntic sources, as well as the occurrence of both pairs of analogies in non-dualistic Saiddhāntika texts. Xs indicate the attestation of an analogy, while Ps indicate its attestation as a *pūrvapakṣa* position. Question marks indicate a source that has been scanned only partially or unsystematically.

	Fire in wood	Butter/ curd in milk	Sun or moon reflected in water	Space inside pots
Upaniṣads				
<i>Bṛhadāraṇyaka</i>	X			
<i>Kaṭha</i>	X			
<i>Kauṣītaki</i>	X			
<i>Śvetāśvatara</i>	X	X		
<i>Aṃṛtabindu</i>		X		
<i>Dhyānabindu</i>		X		
<i>Brahmabindu</i>		X	X	X
<i>Tripurātāpanī</i>				X
<i>Mahābhārata</i>				
<i>Mokṣadharmā</i>	X	X		
<i>Āraṇyakaparvan</i>	X	X		
Sāṅkhyaśāstras				
<i>Suvarṇasaptati</i>		X		
<i>Sāṅkhyakārikābhāṣya</i>		X		
<i>Sāṅkhyavṛtti</i>		X		
<i>Sāṅkhyasaptativṛtti</i>		X	P	
<i>Mātharavṛtti</i>		X	P	
<i>Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī</i>		X		
Vedāntaśāstras				
<i>Vākyapadīya</i>	X		X	X
<i>Māṇḍūkya-kārikā/Āgamaśāstra</i>				X
<i>Brahmasūtra</i>		X	X	
<i>Brahmasūtrabhāṣya</i> (Ś.)	X	X	X	X
<i>Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya</i> (Ś.)			X	X
<i>Muṇḍakopaniṣadbhāṣya</i> (Ś.)	?	?	X	?
<i>Chāṇḍogyaopaniṣadbhāṣya</i> (Ś.)	?	?	X	?
<i>Praśnopaniṣadbhāṣya</i> (Ś.)	?	?	X	?
<i>Brahmasiddhi</i>			X	
<i>Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya</i>		X		
<i>Upadeśasahasrī</i>		X		
<i>Ātmabodha</i>		X		
Śaiva literature (Indian Subcontinent): Saiddhāntika				
<i>Trayodaśaśatikakālottara</i>		X		
<i>Niśvāsakārikā</i> ( <i>Dikṣottara</i> )	X	X	X	X
<i>Sarvajñānottara</i>		X		X
<i>Kiraṇatantra</i>		P	P	
<i>Parākhya</i>			P	

	Fire in wood	Butter/ curd in milk	Sun on moon reflected in water	Space inside pots
<i>Devyāmata</i>			X	
<i>Paramokṣanirāsakārikāvṛtti</i>		P		
<i>Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa</i>		P		
<i>Mataṅgavṛtti</i>		P		
<i>Mṛgendravṛtti</i>		P	P	
<i>Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā</i>		P		
<i>Bhogakārikāvṛtti</i>		P		
Śaiva literature (Indian Subcontinent): non-Saiddhāntika				
<i>Svacchandatantra</i>	X			
<i>Brahmayāmala</i> (Southern)		X		
<i>Śivadyṣṭi</i>			P	
<i>Akulavīratāntra</i>	X	X		
<i>Dakṣiṇamūrtivārttika/Mānasollāsa</i>		X		
<i>Brahmamīmāṃsābhāṣya</i>		X		
<i>Janmamaraṇavicāra</i>	?	?	X	?
<i>Tantrāloka</i>			X	
Vaiṣṇava Pāñcarātra texts				
<i>Jayākhyasaṃhitā</i>	X	X		X
<i>Lakṣmītantra</i>	X	X		
Hāṭhayoga texts				
<i>Gorakṣasāta</i>			X	
Śaiva (or Śaiva-influenced) literature (Java and Bali)				
<i>Vṛhaspatitattva</i>	X	X		
<i>Tattvajñāna</i>	X			
<i>Dharma Pātañjala</i>	X	X		
<i>Arjunavivāha</i>	X	X	X	
<i>Dharma Śūnya</i>	X			
<i>Bhuvanakośa</i>	X		X	X
<i>Jñānasiddhānta</i>	X	X	X	X (variant)
<i>Kumāratattva II</i>	X	X	X	
Sanskrit inscriptions from the Khmer domains				
K. 355, K. 570, K. 225, K. 158, K. 232, K 254, K. 300			X	

## Primary Sources in Sanskrit and Old Javanese

- Arjunavivāha: *Arjunawiwāha: The marriage of Arjuna of Mpu Kanwa*, ed. Stuart Robson. Leiden: KITLV, 2008.
- Bhagavadgītā (Sanskrit-Old Javanese): *Het Oudjavaansche Bhīṣmaparwa*, ed. Jan Gonda. Bandoeng: A. C. Nix & Co., 1936.
- Bhāgavadgītābhāṣya of Śāṅkara: *Śrīmadbhagavadgītā Ānandagīriviracitaṭīkāsaṃvalitāśāṅkarabhāṣya sametā* [...], ed. K. Āgāṣe. Poona: Ānandāśrama Press, 1897.
- Bhogakārikā: *Aṣṭaprakaraṇam: Tattvapraśāsa, Tattvasaṅgraha, Tattvatrayanirṇaya, Ratnatraya, Bhogakārikā, Nāḍakārikā, Mokṣakārikā, Paramokṣanirāsakārikā*, ed. Brajavallabha Dvivedi. Varanasi: Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, 1988.
- Bhuvanakośa: [1] *Lontar* ms. Leiden Cod. Or. 5022, 1878 CE; [2] *Lontar* ms. from the collection of Ida Dewa Gede Catra [bearing a colophon dated 1625 CE/Śaka 1547, but probably last copied in the 19th or 20th century].
- Brahmabindu Upaniṣad: *The Atharvana-Upanishads*, ed. Ramamaya Tarkaratna. Calcutta: Ganesha Press, 1872.
- Brahmasiddhi: *Brahmasiddhi by Ācārya Maṇḍanamiśra, with commentary by Śaṅkhaṇḍī*, ed. S. Kuppuswami Sastri. Madras: Government Press, 1937.
- BS—Brahmasūtra: Cf. *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*.
- BSB—Brahmasūtrabhāṣya of Śāṅkara: *Brahmasūtra-Śāṅkarabhāṣya with the Commentaries: Bhāṣyaratnaprabhā of Govindānanda, Bhāmatī of Vācaspatiśiśra, Nyāyanirṇaya of Ānandagiri*, ed. J. L. Shastri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980. [Revised and reprinted from the edition of M. S. Bakre, Nirṇayasāgar Press, Bombay, 1934]
- Brahmasūtrabhāṣya of Śrīkaṇṭha (Brahmamīmāṃsābhāṣya): *The Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya of Śrīkaṇṭhācārya with the Commentary Śivārkamaṇi Dīpikā by the Famous Appaya Dīkṣita*, ed. R. Halasyanatha Sastri, 2 Vols. New Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1986 [reprint of 1908 edition].
- Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad Bhāṣya: in *Ten Principal Upaniṣads with Śāṅkarabhāṣya*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1964.
- Chāṇḍogya Upaniṣad Bhāṣya: in *Ten Principal Upaniṣads with Śāṅkarabhāṣya*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1964.
- Dharma Pātañjala: Cf. Acri 2017<sup>2</sup>.
- Gorakṣaśataka: *Gorakṣaśatakam*, ed. Swāmī Kuvalayānanda & S. A. Shukla, in *Yoga-Mīmāṃsā*, 7, 4. Kaivalyadhāma: S.M.Y.M. Samiti, 1958.
- Janmamaranavīcāra: *Janma-Marana Vichāra of Bhaṭṭa Vāmadeva*, ed. Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍit Mukund RāmShāstrī. Bombay: Nirmaya Sagar Press, 1918.
- Jayākhyasamhitā: *Jayākhyasamhitā of Pāñcarātra Āgama*, ed. Embar Krishnamacharya. Baroda: Oriental Institute Baroda, 1967.
- Jñānasiddhānta, Cf. Soebadio 1971.
- Kāṭha Upaniṣad: Cf. Oliveile 1998.
- Kumārātattva (II): Romanized transcript K.IIc 2256 by I Gusti Nyoman Agung (1941), of a *lontar* from Singaraja.
- Lakṣmītantra: *Lakṣmī-tantra: A Pāñcarātra Āgama*, ed. Pandit V. Krishnamacharya, Adyar: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1959.
- Liṅgapurāṇa: *Liṅgapurāṇa*. Bombay: Śrī Venkateśvara Steam Press, 1906.
- Māṇḍukyakārikā/Āgamaśāstra: *The Āgamaśāstra of Gauḍapāda*, ed. Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya. Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1943.
- Māṭharavṛtti: *Sāṃkhyakārikā of Śrīmad Īśvarakṛṣṇa; With the Māṭharavṛtti of Māṭharācārya*, ed. Vishnu Prasada Sharma. Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1970. [1st ed. 1922]
- Mṛgendravṛtti: *Śrī Mṛgendra Tantram (Vidyāpāda and Yogapāda) with the Commentary of Nārāyaṇa-kaṇṭha*, ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shāstrī. Srinagar, 1930.
- Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad Bhāṣya: in *Ten Principal Upaniṣads with Śāṅkarabhāṣya*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1964.
- Nisvāsakārikā: [1] Paper transcript, Devanāgarī, IFP MS T17, from a MS belonging to M.K.S. Bhattar Madurai; 188 leaves/635 pp. [2] Devanāgarī transcript, IFP MS T127, from MS GOML R. No. 16804; 506 pp. [3] Devanāgarī transcript, IFP MS T150, from MS GOML R. No. 14403; 353 pp. [4] e-texts of the above transcripts, typed principally by S.A. Sarma and Nibedita Rout (T17), R.

- Sathyaranayanan (T127), Nibedita Rout (T150). [The verse and chapter numeration used here is that of the e-text of T17]
- Pañcārthabhāṣya of Kauṇḍinya: *Pasupata Sūtras with Pancarthabhāṣya of Kaundinya*, ed. R. Anantakrishna Sastri. Trivandrum: The Oriental Manuscript Library of the University of Travancore, 1940. Parākhyatantra: Cf. Goodall 2004.
- Paramokṣanirāsakārikāvṛtti: Cf. Watson et al. 2013.
- Praśna Upaniṣad Bhāṣya: in *Ten Principal Upaniṣads with Śaṅkarabhāṣya*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1964.
- Śaivaparibhāṣā: *The Śaivaprabhāṣā of Śivāgrayogin*. Ed. R. Balasubramanian and V. K. S. N. Raghavan, trans. S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri. Madras: The Dr. S. Radhakrishnan Institute of Advanced Study in Philosophy, 1982.
- San Hyang Kamahāyānikan: *Sang Hyang Kamahāyānikan; Oud-Javaansche Tekst met Inleiding, Vertaling en Aanteekeningen*, ed. J. Kats. 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff, 1910.
- Sāṅkhyavṛtti: *Sāṅkhyavṛtti; A commentary on the Sāṅkhya Kārikā*, ed. E. A. Solomon. Ahmedabad: Gujarat University, 1973.
- Sāṅkhyasaptatvṛtti: *Sāṅkhyasaptatvṛtti (VI)*, ed. E.A. Solomon. Ahmedabad: Gujarat University, 1973.
- Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya: *The First Two Chapters of Bhāskara's Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya—Critically Edited with an Introduction, Notes and an Appendix*, ed. Takahiro Kato. PhD Dissertation, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 2011.
- Sarvajñānottara (VP): *Sarvajñānottarāgamaḥ vidyāpāda and yogapāda*, ed. K. Ramachandra Sarma, *Adyar Library Bulletin* 62, 1998, pp. 181–232.
- Śivadr̥ṣṭi: *The Śivadr̥ṣṭi of Srisomānandanātha with the Vṛtti by Utpaladeva*, ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shastri. Srinagar, 1934.
- Spandakārikā: *Spandakārikā with the commentary (-vivṛti) of Rāmakaṇṭha*, ed. J. C. Chatterji. Srinagar, 1913.
- Sumanasāntaka: *Mpu Monaguṇa's Sumanasāntaka: An Old Javanese Epic Poem, Its Indian Source and Balinese Illustrations*, ed. and trans. P. Worsley, Suryo Supomo, T. M. Hunter, and M. Fletcher. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Suvarṇaprabhāṣasūtra: *Suvarṇaprabhāṣasūtram*, ed. S. Bagchi. Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute, 1967.
- Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad: Cf. Olivelle 1998.
- Tantrāloka: *The Tantrāloka of Abhinava Gupta; With Commentary by Rājānaka Jayaratha*, ed. Madhusudan Kaul Sāstrī (12 vols.). Allahabad/Bombay/Srinagar, 1918–38.
- Vākyapadīya: *Bhartr̥haris Vākyapadīya. Die Mūlakārikās nach den Handschriften herausgegeben und mit einem Pāda-index versehen*. Wiesbaden: Kommissionsverlag Frans Steiner, 1977.
- Vijñānabhairava: *Vijñānabhairava with the commentary partly by Kṣemarāja and partly by Śivopādhyāya*, ed. M. R. Shastri. Bombay, 1918.
- Vivekamārtaṇḍa: e-text by James Mallinson 2009, based on ms. Central Library, Baroda Acc. No. 4110.
- Vṛhaspatitattva: *Vṛhaspati-tattva; An Old Javanese philosophical text*, ed. Sudarshana Devi. Nagpur: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1957.
- Yājñavalkyasmṛti: *Yājñavalkyasmṛti with the Commentary Mitākṣarā of Vijñāneśvara: Notes, Variant Readings, etc.*, ed. Narayan Ram Acharya. Bombay: Nirayāsagara Press, 1949.
- Yuktidīpikā: *Yuktidīpikā; The Most Significant Commentary on the Sāṅkhyakārikā*, ed. Albrecht Wezler and Shujun Motegi. Hamburg: Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets, 1998.

## Secondary Sources

- Acri, A. (2011). Glimpses of Early Śaiva Siddhānta; Echoes of doctrines ascribed to Bṛhaspati in the Sanskrit-Old Javanese *Vṛhaspatitattva*. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 54, 209–229.
- Acri, A. (2017<sup>2</sup>). *Dharma Pātañjala: A Śaiva scripture from Ancient Java studied in the light of related old Javanese and Sanskrit texts*. New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan [1st Edition: Egbert Forsten Publishing/Brill, 2011].
- Andrić, I. (2017). Traces of reuse in Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Brahmasūtra*. In E. Freschi & P. A. Maas (eds.), *Adaptive Reuse: Aspects of creativity in South Asian Cultural History* (pp. 109–134). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Bergaigne, A. (1893). *Inscriptions sanscrites du Campā et du Cambodge*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.



- Bhattacharya, K. (1961). *Les religions brahmaniques dans l'ancien Cambodge, d'après l'épigraphie et l'iconographie*. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Brunner, H. (1967). Analyse du Suprabhedāgama. *Journal Asiatique*, 255, 31–60.
- Cœdès, G. (1911). Études cambodgiennes. VI. Des édicules appelés «bibliothèques». *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient*, 11, 405–406.
- Duquette, J. (2015). Is Śivādvaita Vedānta a Saiddhāntika School? Pariṇāmavāda in the *Brahma-matīmāṃsābhāṣya*. *The Journal of Hindu Studies*, 8(1), 16–43.
- Duquette, J. (2021). *Defending God in Sixteenth-Century India: The Śaiva Oeuvre of Appaya Dīkṣita*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dyczkowski, M. (1989). *The Doctrine of Vibration: An Analysis of the Doctrines and Practices of Kashmir Shaivism*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Finot, L., Parmentier, H., & Goloubew, V. (1928). *Le temple d'Iṣvarapura (Bantāy Srēi, Cambodge)*. Mémoires archéologiques I. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Goodall, D. (1998). *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the Kīraṇatantra. Vol. I: Chapters 1–6. Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*. Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Goodall, D. (2004). *The Parākhyantra: A Scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*. Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Goodall, D. (2006). Initiation et délivrance selon le Śaiva Siddhānta. In G. Tarabout & G. Colas (eds.), *Rites hindous: Transferts et transformations* (pp. 93–116). Paris: Éditions de l'École des hautes études en sciences sociales.
- Goodall, D. (2015). The Śaiva Siddhānta and the Vivartavāda of the Aupaniśadas. In G. Mishra (Ed.), *Vedānta without Māyā? A debate on Saptavidha-Anupapatti* (pp. 269–285). Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research & Motilal Banarsidass.
- Goodall, D. (2017). What information can be gleaned from Cambodian inscriptions about practices relating to the transmission of Sanskrit literature? In V. Vergiani, D. Cuneo, & C. A. Formigatti (eds.), *Indic manuscript cultures through the ages: Material, textual, and historical investigations* (pp. 132–160). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Gupta, S. (2000). *Lakṣmī Tantra: A Pāñcarātra Text*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Hacker, P. (1953). *Vivarta: Studien zur Geschichte der illusionistischen Kosmologie und Erkenntnistheorie der Inder*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.
- Hiriyanna, M. (1924). Fragments of Bhartṛprapañca. In *Proceedings of the Third All-India Oriental Conference* (pp. 439–450). Madras: Law Printing House.
- Hiriyanna, M. (1949). *The essentials of Indian philosophy*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- (IC) Cœdès, G. (1937–1966). *Inscriptions du Cambodge, éditées et traduites* (8 Vols.). Paris/Hanoi: Imprimerie d'Extrême-Orient/EFEF.
- Isayeva, N. (1995). *From Early Vedānta to Kashmir Shaivism: Gauḍapāda, Bhartṛhari and Abhinavagupta*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Iyer, K.A.S. (1971). *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari* (Chapter III, Pt. I, English Translation). Poona: Deccan College.
- MacCracken, S. (2017). Recognizing recognition: Utpaladeva's defense of Śakti in his 'proof of relation' (Sambandhasiddhi)". *Religions*, 8(11), 243. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel8110243>.
- Nakamura, H. (1989). *A history of early Vedānta philosophy, Part I*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Nakamura, H. (2004). *A history of early Vedānta philosophy, Part II*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Nemec, J. (2011). *The ubiquitous Śiva: Somānanda's Śivadr̥ṣṭi and his tantric interlocutors*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nemec, J. (2017\*). *Somānanda's argument against the Vedāntins*. Handout of a lecture presented at the Manipal Centre for Philosophy and Humanities, Centre for Religious Studies, Manipal University (India), 23 January 2017.
- Nicholson, A. J. (2007). Reconciling dualism and non-dualism: Three arguments in Vijñānabhikṣu's Bhedābheda Vedānta. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 35, 371–403.
- Nicholson, A. J. (n.d.). Bhedābheda Vedānta. In *The Internet encyclopedia of philosophy*. Retrieved March 2021, from, <https://iep.utm.edu/bhed-ved/>.
- Padoux, A. (1990). *Vāc: The concept of the word in selected Hindu Tantras*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Potter, K. H. (1963). *Presuppositions of India's philosophies*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

- Potter, K. H. (1981). *Encyclopedia of the Indian philosophies, Vol. III: Advaita Vedānta up to Śaṅkara and his pupils*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Rao, S. (1996). Two 'myths' in Advaita. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 24, 265–279.
- Rastogi, N. (1984). Some more Nyāyas as employed by Abhinavagupta. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, 65(1/4), 27–42.
- Ratié, I. (2011). *Le Soi et l'Autre: Identité, différence et altérité dans la philosophie de la Pratyabhijñā*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Sanderson, A. (1985). Purity and power among the Brāhmins of Kashmir. In M. Carrithers, S. Collins, & S. Lukes (eds.), *The category of the person: Anthropology, philosophy, history* (pp. 190–216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sanderson, A. (2006). The date of Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati. *Cracow Indological Studies*, 8, 39–91.
- Sanderson, A. (2014). The Śaiva literature. *Journal of Indological Studies (Kyoto)*, 24–25(2012–2013), 1–113.
- Shima, I. (2000). On Pratibimbavada and Avacchedavada in Advaitavedānta. *Journal of the Japanese Association for South Asian Studies*, 12, 29–49.
- Silburn, L. (1975). *Hymnes aux Kālī: La roue des énergies divines, traduction et introduction*. Institut de civilisation indienne.
- Sivaraman, K. (1973). *Śaivism in philosophical perspective: A study of the formative concepts, problems and methods of Śaiva Siddhānta*. Motilal Banarsidass.
- Ślāczka, A. (2016). Two iconographic chapters from the *Devyāmata* and the art of Bengal. In D. Goodall & H. Isaacson (eds.), *Tantric studies. Fruits of a Franco-German collaboration on early Tantra* (pp. 181–246). Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Soebadio, H. (1971). *Jñānasiddhānta; Secret Lore of the Balinese Śaiva Priest*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Thrasher, A. W. (1993). *The Advaita Vedānta of Brahma-siddhi*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Timalsina, S. (2013). Linguistic and cosmic powers: The concept of Śakti in the philosophies of Bhartṛhari and Abhinavagupta. In P. P. Kumar & J. Duquette (eds.), *Classical and contemporary issues in Indian studies: Essays in honour of Trichur S. Rukmani* (pp. 211–232). Delhi: D.K. Printworld.
- Wallis, C. (2016). The Śaiva religion and its philosophy in context, Part Two: Shaivism's sources and influences. *Sutra Journal*. <http://www.sutrajournal.com/the-śaiva-religion-and-its-philosophy-in-context-part-two-by-christopher-wallis>.
- Watson, A., Goodall, D., & Anjaneya Sarma, S. L. P. (2013). *An enquiry into the nature of liberation: Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Paramokṣanirāsakārikāvṛtti, a commentary on Sadyojyotiḥ's refutation of twenty conceptions of the liberated state (mokṣa), for the first time critically edited, translated into English and annotated*. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Zoetmulder, P. J. (1982). *Old Javanese-English dictionary*. (With the collaboration of S. O. Robson; 2 Vols.). 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff.