

A4

**INSTITUT FÜR KULTUR- UND GEISTESGESCHICHTE ASIENS
DER ÖSTERREICHISCHEN AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN**

INSTITUT FÜR INDOLOGIE DER UNIVERSITÄT WIEN

**WIENER ZEITSCHRIFT
FÜR DIE
KUNDE SÜDASIENS
UND
ARCHIV FÜR INDISCHE PHILOSOPHIE**

Herausgegeben von

GERHARD OBERHAMMER

Band XLII
1998

Sonderdruck
ANZEIGEN



VERLAG
DER ÖSTERREICHISCHEN AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN
WIEN 1998

ŚAIVA TANTRIC MATERIAL IN THE YOGAVĀSISŪTHA

*By Jürgen Haneder, München**

Introduction

The *Yogavāsīṣṭha*¹ (YV) has for a long time been overlooked by historians of Indian literature, and despite a monograph by GLASENAPP published in 1951² that drew some attention to it and the work of THOM³ it is only through the 'discovery' of its Kashmirian version (*Mokṣopāya*) and an analysis of the various recensions made by WALTER SLAJE that this fascinating work can now be made the subject of closer investigation. SLAJE⁴ has succeeded in demonstrating that earlier conclusions by DIVANI were correct in that they assumed an influence of the shorter recension, the *Laghuyogavāsīṣṭha*, on the *Yogavāsīṣṭha*, but that they were wrong in assuming that the longer version was produced from the shorter by enlargement. The *Yogavāsīṣṭha* is a redaction produced from the *Mokṣopāya* as well as from the shorter recension in a process that cannot yet be fully reconstructed, since none of the versions is as yet accessible in a critical edition. SLAJE has also shown that the YV has undergone redaction by adherents of the Advaita-Vedānta, who forced their own religious agenda upon it. Only in this process the work became a 'Mahārāṅgāyana' and was fit to be

* I am very grateful to Prof. Walter Slaje for his valuable suggestions and for providing me with the variants of manuscript S3 as well as to Prof. Chlodwig H. Werba for his corrections and notes.

¹ The *Yogavāsīṣṭha* of Vālmiki with the Commentary *Vāsīṣṭhamahārā-māyanatātparyāprakāśha*, ed. WĀSUDEVA LAXMANA ŚASTRI PANSKAR. Part I-II. Bombay 1918 (repr. New Delhi 1981).

² HELMUTH VON GLASENAPP, *Zwei philosophische Rāmāyanas*. Mainz - Wiesbaden 1951 (repr. in: *Kleine Schriften*, ed. H. BECHERT - V. MOELLER. Wiesbaden 1980, p. 256-360).

³ PETER THOM, *Chāḍāla*. Eine Episode aus dem *Yogavāsīṣṭha*. Nach der längeren und kürzeren Rezension unter Berücksichtigung von Handschriften aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt. Wiesbaden 1980.

⁴ WALTER SLAJE, *Vom Mokṣopāya-Śāstra zum Yogavāsīṣṭha-Mahārāmāyana*. Philologische Untersuchungen zur Entwicklungs- und Überlieferungsgeschichte eines indischen Lehrwerks mit Anspruch auf Heilsrelevanz. [SbOAW 609 = Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens 27]. Wien 1994.

quoted as the main source for the idea of *jñanamukti* by Vidyāranya in his *Jīvanmuktivivēka*.⁵

In the following pages I shall analyse the textual history of a short passage by comparing the three versions. Because the religious background of this passage is specifically Śaiva, the unknown, but presumably non-Śaiva redactors of the YV were apparently at a loss to understand the structure of the two versions of the story that were their sources, namely that of the Mokṣopāya (MU) and that of the Laghuyogavāsīṣṭha⁶ (LYV), and produced an odd mixture.

The passage occurs in the YV in the Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa,⁷ in which the crow Bhruṣuṇḍa relates the story of its conception by the crow Caṇḍa, the vehicle of Alambusā,⁸ and one of the *hamsas* of Brāhmi. The vehicles of these two goddesses meet at a gathering of the eight 'mothers', ferocious deities that form the retinue of Śiva.⁹ At these Tantric feasts the intoxication caused by the drinking of blood seems to spread to the vehicles of the goddesses who engage in sexual acts. Bhruṣuṇḍa, it is told, was conceived at such a gathering.

The text that is analysed here is in the introduction of the story in which Alambusā and the eight mothers are described.

The Text (YV 6.18.18–26 ≈ MU 18–31)

In the left-hand column I give the text of the YV as edited¹⁰, on the right-hand side the parallel in the Mokṣopāya according to Ś1, Ś3 and Ś5.¹¹

kharośtrākāraavadanā
raṭāmedovāsāśavāḥ /
digambaravivāharīnyajā

kharośtrākāraavadanā
raṭāmedovāsāśavāḥ /
*digambaravivāharīnyajā*¹²

⁵ Cf. WALTER SLAUB, Zur Traditionsgeschichte der Vorstellung von einer 'Erlösung noch im Leben' (*jñanamukti*). BEI 13–14 (1995–1996/97) 387–413. Laghuyogavāsīṣṭha, ed. VASUDEVA ŚAMMAN PANAŚIKARA. Bombay 1937 (repr. New Delhi 1985), p. 545.

⁷ Pūrvarāḍha, Sarga 18–19.

⁸ The variant *alambusā* occurs in LYV.

⁹ See J. N. TIWARI, Goddess Cults in Ancient India (with special reference to the first seven centuries A.D.). Delhi 1985, Chapter 3. Mātrīs (p. 95–181).
¹⁰ Vol. II/808f.

¹¹ Ś1 is the facsimile of a Śāradā manuscript, published by LOKESH CHANDRA in the 9th volume of his Sanskrit Texts from Kashmir (New Delhi 1984); the text is to be found there on p. 574. Ś5 is in the Bodleian Library, Oxford: Ms. Sanskrit C 89; the passage is on fols. 19v–20r. Detailed descriptions of the manuscripts (for Ś3 cf. n. *) can be found in SLAUB, op. cit. (n. 4), p. 36ff.
¹² *digambarā* Ś3; *digambarā* Ś1/5.

śarīrānyogavāsurajāḥ // 18//
*vasanāgriṭkūṭeṣu*¹⁴
vyomnī lokānāreṣu ca /
atāreṣu śmaśāneṣu
śarīreṣu ca dehīnām // 19//
jayā ca vijayā caiva
jayantī cāparājītā /

śiddhā rakṭāmbusā ca
utpalā ceti devatāḥ // 20//

sarvāṣām eva mātrīnām
aśṭau etās tu nāyikāḥ /
āśām anugatās to anyās

*śarīrānyogavāsurajāḥ*¹³ // 18//
vasanāḥ gṛīṭkūṭeṣu
vyomnī lokānāreṣu ca /
*atāreṣu*¹⁵ *śmaśāneṣu*
śarīreṣu ca dehīnām // 19//
jayā ca vijayā caiva
jayantī cāparājītā /
vāmasrotogatā etās
tumburīm rudrām āśrītāḥ // 20//
*śiddhā śuškā ca rakṭā*¹⁶ *ca*
*utpalā*¹⁷ *ceti devatāḥ* /
śroto dakṣiṇam āśrītā
bharavaṇṇaṃ rudram āśrītāḥ // 21//
sarvāṣām eva mātrīnām
aśṭau etās tu nāyikāḥ /
*āśām anugatās*¹⁸ *to anyā*
devyāḥ śatasahasraśāḥ // 22//
raudrī ca vaśīṃsvatī brāhmi
vārāḥ vāṅsvatī tatāḥ /
kāmanārī vāśavotī saurī
celyādhyās tāḥ sahasraśāḥ // 23//¹⁹
āśām anugatās to anyā
devyāḥ lhecaryā uttamāḥ /
devakīnaraṅganādhārova-
purusāsurasambhavaḥ // 24//
*tāśām*²⁰ *anugatās*²¹ *to anyā*²²
bhūacaryāḥ koṭīśāḥ śītītāḥ /
*rājīkā nāmadhārīnyā*²³
bhāmanu puruṣabhogantāḥ // 25//
*hayaḥ gajāḥ kharrāḥ*²⁴ *kākā*
uśtrāḍyāgaramarikatāḥ /

tāśām anugatāḥ parāḥ // 21//

¹³ *śrajāḥ*; *śrajāḥ* corrected to *prajāḥ* Ś1.

¹⁴ See below, p. 71n. 34.

¹⁵ *atāreṣu* Ś5; *atāreṣu* Ś3, *atāreṣu* corrected to *atāreṣu* Ś1.

¹⁶ *śuškā ca rakṭā* Ś1/5; *śuškāmbusā* Ś3.

¹⁷ Ś1 reads *hyutpalā* in order to avoid the hiatus.

¹⁸ *anugatās* Ś5; *anugatās* Ś1.

¹⁹ This stanza is missing in Ś1, but the identity of 22c and 24a may explain the oversight.

²⁰ *tāśām* by emendation; *tāśām* Ś1/3/5.

²¹ *anugatās* Ś1; *anugatās* Ś3/5.

²² *anya* Ś3/5; *arjā* Ś1.

²³ *nāma* Ś5/1; *kāma* Ś3; see below, p. 71n. 40, on the *crux* of this verse.

²⁴ *gajāḥ kharrāḥ* Ś3; *gajā kharrā* Ś1/5.

<i>tāsām madhye mahārthānām</i>	<i>igādivāhanānāṃ²⁵ āstām</i>
<i>māfirātām munināyaka </i>	<i>caranīnām jagatraye 26 </i>
<i>alambuseṭi vikhyātā</i>	<i>tāḥ kaś cī paśūharmayāḥ</i>
<i>mā mānada vidyate 22 </i>	<i>keśudakarmaso avasthitāḥ </i>
<i>vajrāsthānūndas caṇḍālekhyā</i>	<i>kāś cid vidīavedyatōḥ²⁶</i>
<i>indranīlācalopamah </i>	<i>jīvanmuktapade sbitiāḥ 27 </i>
<i>tasgās tu vāhanam kāko</i>	<i>tāsām madhye mahārthānām</i>
<i>vaiśṇavyā garuḍo yathā 23 </i>	<i>māfirātām munināyaka </i>
<i>iḡ aśṭaiśvarayuguktās tū</i>	<i>alambuseṭi vikhyātā</i>
<i>mālaro raudraceṣṭiāḥ </i>	<i>mā mānada²⁷ vidyate 28 </i>
<i>kadā cin militā vyomni</i>	<i>vajrāsthānūnda²⁸ caṇḍālekhyā</i>
<i>sarvāḥ kenāpi hetunā 24 </i>	<i>indranīlācalopamah </i>
<i>utsavām paraman cakruḥ</i>	<i>tasgās tu vāhanam²⁹ kāko</i>
<i>paramārthoprakāśakam </i>	<i>vaiśṇavyā garuḍo yathā 29 </i>
<i>vānasarvogatā etās</i>	<i>iḡ aśṭaiśvarayuguktās tū</i>
<i>tumburam rudram āśritāḥ 25 ³²</i>	<i>mataro³⁰ raudraceṣṭiāḥ </i>
<i>prājyotiḥ jagatpūṅgavā</i>	<i>vyomni melāpakan cakruḥ</i>
<i>devau tumburbhāvavau </i>	<i>ekadā samurāḡatāḥ³¹ 30 </i>
<i>vicitrāṭhāḥ kahāś cakruḥ</i>	<i>prājyotiḥ jagatpūṅgavā</i>
<i>mādirāmādatosiāḥ 26 </i>	<i>devau tumburbhāvavau </i>
	<i>vicitrāṭhāḥ kahāś cakrū</i>
	<i>rudhivāsavatosiāḥ 31 </i>

Translation of the Mokṣopāya Version

18. They (i.e. the mothers) have the face of a donkey, a camel or a crow; their drink is blood, fat and marrow; they roam about nakedly; they wear garlands of parts of (human) bodies.

²⁵ *vāhanāṅg* S3/5: *vāsanāṅg* S1.

²⁶ *vāḥā* S3/5: *vidyātā* S1.

²⁷ *mānada* S1/5: *mānada* S3.

²⁸ *vajrāsthi* S5: *vajrāstī* S1/3. (²⁹ *ṛ* hardly legible in S1).

²⁹ *vāhanam* S3: *vāhanah* S1/3.

³⁰ *mālaro* S3: *mālaro* S1/5.

³¹ *samurāḡatāḥ* S1: *saman āḡatāḥ* S3, *samamagatāḥ* S5. After this line S3 inserts verse 25 of the YV.

³² = MU 20cd; see below, p. 75.

³³ The reading of the YV *digamītaravāhīrīṅgāḥ* (18c) taken as an equivalent to *khecaraḥ* would make sense in itself, but would unnecessarily complicate the description, since the next verse describes the dwelling places including *vyomni*.

19. They dwell³⁴ on mountain peaks, in space and in other worlds³⁵, in forests, on burning grounds and in human bodies³⁶.

20. (Of those) Jayā, Vijayā, Jayantī and Aparājītā belong to the left stream (of Śaiva revelation); they are dependent on the Rudra (called) Tumburu.

21. The deities Siddhā, Śuṣkā, Raktā and Uṭpalā have resorted to the right-hand stream and depend on the Rudra (called) Bharava.

22. These eight³⁷ are the leaders of all mothers, but they are followed by other goddesses in thousands of hundreds.

23. Raudrī, Vaiṣṇavī, Brāhmī, Vārāḥī, Vāyavī, Kāmāntī, Vāsavī, Saurī and others in thousands.

24. But they³⁸ are followed by other goddesses, the supreme Khecariś, ³⁹ who stem from gods, Kinnaras, Gandharvas, humans and demons.

25. But these are followed by others, the Bhūcarīś, that exist in ten millions; these are ...⁴⁰ and eat humans on earth.

³⁴ The text in the YV edition is meaningless, since the variant *vasantā* leaves us without a verb. Since the commentator Anandabodhendra does not comment on the verse, it could be a misprint.

³⁵ That is, in other parts of the *brahmāṇḍa*.

³⁶ This might mean either that they inhabit corpses on burning grounds, or that humans, especially children below sixteen to whom they are thought to be particularly harmful (Mahābhārata [MBh] 3.219.41–42), are possessed by them. For trees, burning grounds and mountains as their dwelling places, cf. MBh 9.45.38.

³⁷ The particle *tu* in 22b as in 29c is restrictive (*tu nirāhāraṇe*).

³⁸ It remains unclear how the group mentioned in the present verse relates to the previous, i.e. whether the Khecariś 'follow' the eight mothers, or the large group mentioned in 23.

³⁹ It should be emphasized that *khecariś* and *bhūcarīś* (in the next verse) occur as names of two of the four groups of powers in the Kashmirian system of the Krama, for which see Ksemarāja's description in his *Spandasamdhā* (ed. MUKUNDA RAMA ŚĀSTRĪ. Bombay 1917 [KSTS 16], p. 19–22): *kīṃ ca śaktīkṛtem khecariśocariścaṭṭhācarīyāḥ* ... Although we cannot be sure that these deities are meant here, *khecariś* and *bhūcarīś* is more likely a name for two groups of deities than a description of goddesses as 'moving in the atmosphere' and 'moving on earth'. According to Ksemarāja (p. 19) the *khecariś* etc. are groups of *yoginīs*.

⁴⁰ None of the readings available for Pada c seems to make good sense. *ṛṅgikā* could be a corruption of *ṛṅgīṅgāḥ* ('beautiful'), which does occur in Svachandantantṛa (ed. by MADHUSUDAN KĀUL. Bombay 1921–1935) 10.1017c (*mātarāḥ sopka ṛṅgīṅgo*). Prof. Werba has suggested *ṛṅgīṅgām kamāhāriṅgāḥ*, which is a plausible emendation, since the mothers, according to MBh 9.45.31, take forms at will. Finally Bṛhatsamhitā (ed. RAMAKRISHNA BHAT. Delhi 1981–1982) 58.56ab, according to which the mothers should bear the characteristics of the male deities with the corresponding names (*mātrīṅgāḥ kartavyāḥ sammadendvīrāpaktacāṭṭhāḥ* /), could lead to further emendations, but at present none appears to be absolutely convincing.

26. Horses, elephants, donkeys, crows, camels, boars, apes etc. are the vehicles of those (deities) who move in the three worlds.
27. Some (of) those (Bhūcarīs) have the characteristics of bound souls and are engaged in vile acts; others are, since they know what is to be known, established in the state of being liberated in life.
28. Among the (latter) highly estimated mothers,⁴¹ a leader of sages, there is a mother renowned as Alambusā, o giver of honour.
29. Her vehicle – like Garuda is for Vaiṣṇavī – is a crow called Caṇḍa, whose beak is made of diamond(-hard) bone, and who resembles a sapphire mountain (through his dark colour).
30. All these⁴² mothers of cruel behaviour, who were equipped with the eight powers,⁴³ once convened in space and performed the (ritual of) unification.
31. Having performed the worship of (their deities), the gods Tumburu and Bhairava, who are to be worshipped in the world, they, delighted by their drink of blood,⁴⁴ made disputations on various topics.

Analysis

At first sight the passage under discussion is not too different from other descriptions of Tantric deities or practitioners in Sanskrit poetry which aim at evoking an eerie atmosphere. But unlike in poetry, where Siddhas or Kāpālikas are archetypal figures, rather than adepts belonging to a specific sect, the information given in our passage is very detailed.

The Mokṣopāya version, after describing the iconography of the 'mothers' (18–19), proceeds to describe how these eight deities fit into the Śaiva pantheon, namely how they relate to two of the five faces of Śiva.

The five faces⁴⁵ are adduced by exegetes of the Śaiva Tantras to explain the diversity of their scriptural sources. According to them

⁴¹ The implication seems to be that only those liberated ones are benevolent, whereas the man-eating ones are feared.

⁴² *śi* ... *śi*(s) presumably is referring to all the mothers described above.

⁴³ This presumably included the power to fly and therefore explains the following.

⁴⁴ The YV reads 'liquor' (*madirā* [26d]) for 'blood' (*raudhrā*). The reason might be that 'liquor' seemed to fit better with the concept of the *vāmanāyoga* as understood by the redactor (see below, p. 75). Cf. MBh 3.215.22ab: *karṇā kṛvā lohitaśhoṇā*!

⁴⁵ For the following, see my Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Revelation. An Edition and Annotated Translation of Māhīśloka-vārttika I, 1–399, Groningen 1008 (<http://www.forth.com/nri>)

each face, although part of a single deity, namely the five-faced Sadāśiva, teaches scriptural texts that contain doctrines appropriate to its nature. As a result the Tantras taught by the five faces, also called 'five streams' (*pañcāsrotas*), are supposed to have the following characteristics:

Direction	Face	Tantra	Description of the Tantra
Zenith	<i>īśāna</i>	<i>siddhānta</i>	granting liberation
East	<i>tatpuruṣa</i>	<i>gāruḍa</i>	destroying all kinds of poison
North	<i>vāmadeva</i>	<i>vāma</i>	acquiring magical control
West	<i>sadyojāta</i>	<i>bhūta</i>	warding off spirits and planetary influences
South	<i>aghora/bhairava</i>	<i>bhairava</i>	destroying enemies

This model of the five-fold Śaiva canon was adhered to by all Śaivas, and for that very reason prone to reinterpretation. Adherents of scriptures that were not associated with the highest face (*īśāna*) had to demonstrate that their own practice was not limited by the strict hierarchy expressed in the dichotomy of one highest face and four lower faces. They did so, for instance, by assuming a sixth face, either above the 'highest', or a lower face.

We know of one very elaborate attempt to contest the obvious hierarchy expressed by the model of the five streams from the hand of the 10th century Śaiva theologian Abhinavagupta in his *Māhīśloka-vārttika* I.1–399. Since his school adheres to scriptures associated with Bhairava, he has to go to great length to demonstrate that what others think to be lower is in fact higher. We need not go into details here; it will suffice to note that in his re-interpretation of the *pañcāsrotas* the 'left' and 'right' form a closely fused group, a concept that goes back to scriptural sources that belong to the heterodox Śaiva cults of his time (Trika, Krama, Kula). The point of this digression is to show that whereas the model of the five faces of Śiva is pan-Śaiva and even pan-Hindu, the fusion of the right and left streams makes sense only within a very specific doctrinal context, that is within the Kashmirian non-dualist cults.

The Mokṣopāya mentions these two streams with their corresponding deities Tumburu and Bhairava, here both called Rudras, and the eight mothers are divided into two groups associated to Tumburu and

Bhairava, respectively (20–21). This is exactly what we find in an important, but still unpublished Kashmirian Tantra, the Jayadrathayāmala⁴⁶:

<i>dakṣiṇa</i>	<i>śuśkta – siddhā – utpala – rakta/candikā</i>
<i>vāma</i>	<i>jayā – vijayā – jayantī – aparājitā</i>

The two sets of deities are in this context combined to form a single group in worship. For further occurrences of these deities SANDERSON refers to Jayaratha's *Vireka* on Tantrāloka 29.51, where he explains *cakṣkam* as 'Siddhā etc., or Jayā etc.' (*cakṣkam ite siddhāḥ jayāḥ vā*)⁴⁷ and a passage in YV/MU⁴⁸ which contains *niracamas* of a list of deities that includes Caṇḍikā, Utpalā, Jayā, Siddhā, Jayantī, Vijayā and Aparājitā.

The text then continues by proclaiming these eight as the leaders of the many other mothers (22) and adds another list of eight mothers in 23 as an example.⁴⁹ Then two groups of goddesses are introduced, the *kleccarīs* (24) and the *bhūccarīs* (25).⁵⁰ Of the latter some are unliberated beings (*paśū*), others are liberated in life; Alambusā belongs to the last-mentioned group.

If we turn to the YV version of the passage we can see that there Alambusā has risen to the status of one of the eight mothers.⁵¹ The rest of the description, which in the Mokṣopāya served to explain her position relative to these mothers, becomes superfluous and is abbreviated. Verse 22 (21 in YV) makes sense in MU, but is slightly awkward in YV, and there is no need to introduce Alambusā in YV 22, since she is, unlike in MU, part of the main list. The following passage (28ff. in MU) is adopted without substantial changes, but the YV version

⁴⁶ See A. SANDERSON, *Mandala and Āgamic Identity in the Trika of Kashmir*. In: *Mantras et diagrammes rituels dans l'hindouisme*. Paris 1986, p. (169–207) 186n. 84.

⁴⁷ The Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta with the commentary of Jayaratha, ed. R. C. DWIVEDI – NAVJIVAN RASTOGI. Delhi 1987, vol. 7, p. 3326.

⁴⁸ YV 7.84.9cd–11a. ≈ p. 852 in S1.

⁴⁹ For partly overlapping lists in Tantric sources, see Tantrāloka 8.241 (Brahmi, Mahēśvarī, Kaumārī, Vaiṣṇavī, Vārāhī, Indrāṅgī and Cāmūṅḍā), which goes back to Svachandatantra 10.1017ff.; furthermore Māhivijayot-tanāntra (ed. MADHUSUDAN KAVU. Bombay 1922 [KSTS 37]) 3.14.

⁵⁰ Cf. above, p. 71n. 39.

⁵¹ I do not know of external evidence to clarify the status of this deity. The name Alambusā is met with in the Epics, but more specifically for Kashmir in the Kathāsariśāgara (9.24bc [*apsarāḥ / agatā alambusā nāma*]) and the Bṛhatsaḥasrāmañjarī (2.1.28ab [*svaryogīd ... alambusā*]), but as a name of an *apsarās*, not as our deity, who is, as the text shows, a *bhūccarī*.

inserts what is 20cd in MU as 25cd for no apparent reason, and so does §3. Perhaps the redactor of YV saw that the two deities were going to be mentioned soon, but that he had omitted the passage that connected them to the mothers. It is obvious that the details of the *pañcā-srotas* were unclear to the redactor, and we can only speculate about his motives for including the verse on the *vāmasrotas*. I would assume that he – like the commentator⁵² – did not understand *vāmasrotas* at all and took it as a reference to the 'left-hand' practice of Tantrism, which involves consumption of impure substances like alcohol etc. (cf. *mā-dira* in YV 26d). In any case the result is a story that distorts the intended religious background, since now all the eight mothers are wrongly associated with Tumburu.⁵³

The above analysis, however, does not fully explain the history of this redaction. Why did the redactor, if he had no idea of the religious background, not leave it untouched or completely remove the obscure passages? Why did he include Alambusā in the list of eight mothers? The answer is that he did not. The history of the text as reconstructed by SLARJ must draw our attention to the abbreviated version in the LYV, which here indeed forms the missing link.⁵⁴ For there is the source of verse 20 in the YV, in which Alambusā is among the eight mothers. The difference is that there the story, although it does not portray the religious background properly, makes more sense, since the references to left and right streams are altogether omitted (see n. 54) so as to produce no ambiguity.

To sum up, the most plausible explanation of the redactory process that led to the YV version is the following: The redactor, who was not familiar with the Śaiva background of the tale, wanted to retain the simplified description of the mothers that he knew from the LYV, which seemed to give more weight to Alambusā and dispensed with details of deities not directly related to the story. But since he could not follow the internal logic of this description, he failed to edit out all references to the deities of the 'left' and 'right' and thus rendered the description incoherent.

⁵² In his commentary on YV 6.18.25 Ānandabodhendra writes: *vāmasrotas vāmanārgena parvasaktyātvānānaprakārah*.

⁵³ The only problem that remains is that of §3, which like the YV version reads the verse *vāsam parvamañ cakruḥ* after 30d (see above, n. 31). Here, as in the case of the variant *śuśkatalambusā* in 21a (see n. 16), we cannot but assume contamination of §3 with the YV; see SLARJ, op. cit. (n. 4), p. 73 with n. 10.

⁵⁴ The observations on the LYV are of course of limited value, since they are as yet based only on the printed edition (see above, n. 6). In this the crucial passage is identical with YV 19–25b, i.e. the verses 18, 25cd and 26 are missing. That means that there are no references to *vāma* and *dakṣiṇa* in the LYV-Version.

These findings demonstrate again the importance of the Mokṣopāya version, but raise many more questions. What is the source of this part of the narrative of Bhṛṅgunda? Are the contents of the *ābhāyanas* indicators for influences on the philosophy of the work? In the present case, is there a corresponding influence of Śaiva philosophy? Or does the author consciously employ the *ābhāyanas* to attract the attention to his *sarvasiddhāntasiddhānta*? Can we then still trace a subliminal influence of his Kashmirian background? In any case, be it in order to make some progress in describing its philosophy, or merely for enquiring into the context of the Yogavāsīṣṭha/Mokṣopāya,⁵⁵ an edition of the earliest version of this text has to be our primary concern.

⁵⁵ See also Ph. GRANOFF, *The Yogavāsīṣṭha: The Continuing Search for a Context*. In: *New Horizons of Research in Indology* (Silver Jubilee Volume), ed. V. N. Jha. Poona 1989, p. 181–205. GRANOFF is no doubt correct in saying that the philosophical context of the work cannot be deduced merely by terminological similarities, that is to say the presence of key words of the Pratyabhijñā philosophy does not make the text a Trika story. But her attempt to explain the YV from a Pāñcarātrika background is also problematic, since her sources, especially the Lakṣmītantra, are themselves heavily influenced by the soteriology of the Trika; see A. SANDERSON, *History through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism: The Pāñcarātra and the Buddhist Yogintantras* (forthcoming [n. 42f. on the indebtedness of the Lakṣmītantra as well as the *Ahīndhvaśambhīṣṭha* to K. COMAROFF, *Das Indische*]).