# ŚAIVA TANTRIC MATERIAL IN THE YOGAVĀSIṢṬHA

*By Jürgen Hanneder, München*[*]

Introduction

The Yogavāsiṣṭha[1] (YV) has for a long time been overlooked by historians of Indian literature, and despite a monograph by GLASENAPP published in 1951[2] that drew some attention to it and the work of THOMI[3] 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. SLAJE[4] has succeeded in demonstrating that earlier conclusions by DIVANJI were correct in that they assumed an influence of the shorter recension, the Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha, on the Yogavāsiṣṭha, but that they were wrong in assuming that the longer version was produced from the shorter by enlargement. The Yogavāsiṣṭha 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 'Mahārāmāyaṇa' and was fit to be

---

[1] The Yogavāsiṣṭha of Vālmīki with the Commentary Vāsiṣṭhamahārāmāyaṇatātparyaprakāsha, ed. WĀSUDEVA LAXMAṆA ŚĀSTRI PAṆSIKAR. Part I–II. Bombay 1918 (repr. New Delhi 1981).

[2] HELMUTH VON GLASENAPP, Zwei philosophische Rāmāyaṇas. Mainz – Wiesbaden 1951 (repr. in: Kleine Schriften, ed. H. BECHERT – V. MOELLER. Wiesbaden 1980, p. 256–360).

[3] PETER THOMI, Cūḍālā. Eine Episode aus dem Yogavāsiṣṭha. Nach der längeren und kürzeren Rezension unter Berücksichtigung von Handschriften aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt. Wichtrach 1980.

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

quoted as the main source for the idea of *jīvanmukti* by Vidyāraṇya in his Jīvanmuktiviveka[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 Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha[6] (LYV), and produced an odd mixture.

The passage occurs in the YV in the Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa[7], in which the crow Bhuśuṇḍa relates the story of its conception by the crow Caṇḍa, the vehicle of Alambusā,[8] and one of the *haṃsas* of Brāhmī. 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. Bhuśuṇḍa, 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 edited[10], on the right-hand side the parallel in the Mokṣopāya according to Ś1, Ś3 and Ś5[11].


| | |
|---|---|
| *kharoṣṭrākāravadanā* | *kharoṣṭrakākavadanā* |
| *raktamedovasāsavāḥ /* | *raktamedovasāsavāḥ /* |
| *digantaravihāriṇyaḥ* | *digambaravihāriṇyaḥ*[12] |

---

[5] Cf. WALTER SLAJE, Zur Traditionsgeschichte der Vorstellung von einer 'Erlösung noch im Leben' (*jīvanmukti*). BEI 13–14 (1995–1996[97]) 387–413.

[6] Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha, ed. VĀSUDEVA ŚARMAN PAṆAŚĪKARA. Bombay 1937 (repr. New Delhi 1985), p. 545.

[7] Pūrvārdha, Sarga 18–19.

[8] The variant *alambuṣā* 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: Mātṛs (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 SLAJE, op. cit. (n. 4), p. 38ff.

[12] *digambara* Ś3: *digambarā* Ś1/5.

śarīrāvayavasrajaḥ ∥18∥
vasantagirikūṭeṣu[14]
vyomni lokāntareṣu ca |
avaṭeṣu śmaśāneṣu
śarīreṣu ca dehinām ∥19∥
jayā ca vijayā caiva
jayantī cāparājitā |


siddhā raktālambusā ca
utpalā ceti devatāḥ ∥20∥


sarvāsām eva mātṝṇām
aṣṭāv etās tu nāyikāḥ |
āsām anugatās tv anyas




tāsām anugatāḥ parāḥ ∥21∥

śarīrāvayavasrajaḥ[13] ∥18∥
vasanti girikūṭeṣu
vyomni lokāntareṣu ca |
aṭavīṣu[15] śmaśāneṣu
śarīreṣu ca dehinām ∥19∥
jayā ca vijayā caiva
jayantī cāparājitā |
vāmasrotogatā etās
tumburuṃ rudram āśritāḥ ∥20∥
siddhā śuṣkā ca raktā[16] ca
utpalā[17] ceti devatāḥ |
sroto dakṣiṇam āśritya
bhairavaṃ rudram āśritāḥ ∥21∥
sarvāsām eva mātṝṇām
aṣṭāv etās tu nāyikāḥ |
āsām anugatās[18] tv anyā
devyaḥ śatasahasraśaḥ ∥22∥
raudrī ca vaiṣṇavī brāhmī
vārāhī vāyavī tathā |
kaumārī vāsavī saurī
cetyādyās tāḥ sahasraśaḥ ∥23∥[19]
āsām anugatās tv anyā
devyaḥ khecarya uttamāḥ |
devakinnaragandharva-
puruṣāsurasambhavāḥ ∥24∥
tāsām[20] anugatās[21] tv anyā[22]
bhūcaryaḥ koṭiśaḥ sthitāḥ |
rūpikā nāmadhāriṇyo[23]
bhūmau puruṣabhojanāḥ ∥25∥
hayā gajāḥ kharāḥ[24] kākā
uṣṭrājagaramarkaṭāḥ |

---

[13] srajaḥ: srajaḥ corrected to prajaḥ Ś1.
[14] See below, p. 71n. 34.
[15] aṭavīṣu Ś5: avaṭeṣu Ś3, aṭaveṣu corrected to aṭavīṣu Ś1.
[16] śuṣkā ca raktā Ś1/5: śuṣkālambusā Ś3.
[17] Ś1 reads hyutpalā in order to avoid the hiatus.
[18] anugatās Ś5: anugatas Ś1.
[19] This stanza is missing in Ś1, but the identity of 22c and 24a may explain the oversight.
[20] tāsām by emendation: tasām Ś1/3/5.
[21] anugatās Ś1: anugatas Ś3/5.
[22] anyā Ś3/5: aryā Ś1.
[23] nāma Ś5/1: kāma Ś3; see below, p. 71n. 40, on the crux of this verse.
[24] gajāḥ kharāḥ Ś3: gajā kharā Ś1/5.

*ityādivāhanāny*²⁵ *āsāṃ*
*carantīnāṃ jagattraye* // 26//
*tāḥ kāś cit paśudharminyaḥ*
*kṣudrakarmasv avasthitāḥ* /
*kāś cid viditavedyatvāj*²⁶
*jīvanmuktapade sthitāḥ* // 27//

*tāsāṃ madhye mahārhānāṃ*          *tāsāṃ madhye mahārhānāṃ*
*mātṝṇāṃ munināyaka* /             *mātṝṇāṃ munināyaka* /
*alambuseti vikhyātā*             *alambuseti vikhyātā*
*mātā mānada vidyate* // 22//     *mātā mānada*²⁷ *vidyate* // 28//
*vajrāsthituṇḍaś caṇḍākhya*       *vajrāsthituṇḍaś*²⁸ *caṇḍākhya*
*indranīlācalopamaḥ* /            *indranīlācalopamaḥ* /
*tasyās tu vāhanaṃ kāko*          *tasyās tu vāhanaṃ*²⁹ *kāko*
*vaiṣṇavyā garuḍo yathā* // 23//  *vaiṣṇavyā garuḍo yathā* // 29//
*ity aṣṭaiśvaryayuktās tā*        *ity aṣṭaiśvaryayuktās tā*
*mātaro raudraceṣṭitāḥ* /         *mātaro*³⁰ *raudraceṣṭitāḥ* /
*kadā cin militā vyomni*          *vyomni melāpakaṃ cakrur*
*sarvāḥ kenāpi hetunā* // 24//    *ekadā samupāgatāḥ*³¹ // 30//
*utsavaṃ paramaṃ cakruḥ*
*paramārthaprakāśakam* /
*vāmasrotogatā etās*
*tumburuṃ rudram āśritāḥ* // 25//³²
*pūjayitvā jagatpūjyau*           *pūjayitvā jagatpūjyau*
*devau tumburubhairavau* /        *devau tumburubhairavau* /
*vicitrārthāḥ kathāś cakrur*      *vicitrārthāḥ kathāś cakrū*
*madirāmadatoṣitāḥ* // 26//       *rudhirāsavatoṣitāḥ* // 31//

### 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;³³
they wear garlands of parts of (human) bodies.

²⁵ *vāhanāny* Ś3/5: *vāsanāny* Ś1.
²⁶ *vidita* Ś3/5: *vidyata* Ś1.
²⁷ *mānada* Ś1/5: *mānadā* Ś3.
²⁸ *vajrāsthi* Ś5: *vajrāśri* Ś1/3 (°*jrā*° hardly legible in Ś1).
²⁹ *vāhanaṃ* Ś3: *vāhanaḥ* Ś1/3.
³⁰ *mātaro* Ś3: *mātaryo* Ś1/5.
³¹ *samupāgatāḥ* Ś1: *samam āgataḥ* Ś3, *samumagataḥ* Ś5. After this line Ś3
inserts verse 25 of the YV.
³² = MU 20cd; see below, p. 75.
³³ The reading of the YV *digantaravihāriṇyaḥ* (18c) taken as an equiva-
lent to *khecarāḥ* would make sense in itself, but would unnecessarily compli-
cate the description, since the next verse describes the dwelling places includ-
ing *vyomni*.

19. They dwell[34] on mountain peaks, in space and in other worlds[35], in forests, on burning grounds and in human bodies[36].
20. (Of those) Jayā, Vijayā, Jayantī and Aparājitā belong to the left stream (of Śaiva revelation); they are dependent on the Rudra (called) Tumburu.
21. The deities Siddhā, Śuṣkā, Raktā and Utpalā have resorted to the right-hand stream and depend on the Rudra (called) Bhairava.
22. These eight[37] are the leaders of all mothers, but they are followed by other goddesses in thousands of hundreds.
23. Raudrī, Vaiṣṇavī, Brāhmī, Vārāhī, Vāyavī, Kaumārī, Vāsavī, Saurī and others in thousands.
24. But they[38] are followed by other goddesses, the supreme Khecarīs,[39] who stem from gods, Kinnaras, Gandharvas, humans and demons.
25. But these are followed by others, the Bhūcarīs, 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 vasanta° leaves us without a verb. Since the commentator Ānandabodhendra 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 nirdhāraṇe).

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

[39] It should be emphasized that khecarī and bhūcarī (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 Kṣemarāja's description in his Spandasaṃdoha (ed. MUKUNDA RĀMA ŚĀSTRI. Bombay 1917 [KSTS 16], p. 19–22): kiṃ ca śakticakraṃ khecarīgocarīdikcarībhūcaryādih ... Although we cannot be sure that these deities are meant here, khecarī and bhūcarī 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 Kṣemarāja (p. 19) the khecarīs etc. are groups of yoginīs.

[40] None of the readings available for Pāda c seems to make good sense. rūpikā could be a corruption of rūpinyaḥ ('beautiful'), which does occur in Svacchandatantra (ed. by MADHUSUDAN KAUL. Bombay 1921–1935) 10.1017c (mātaraḥ sapta rūpiṇyo). Prof. Werba has suggested rūpāṇāṃ kāmadhārinyaḥ, which is a plausible emendation, since the mothers, according to MBh 9.45.31, take forms at will. Finally Bṛhatsaṃhitā (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 (mātṛgaṇaḥ kartavyaḥ svanāmadevānurūpakṛtacihnaḥ /), could lead to further emendations, but at present none appears to be absolutely convincing.

26. Horses, elephants, donkeys, crows, camels, boas, 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] o leader of sages, there is a mother renowned as Alambusā, o giver of honour.
29. Her vehicle – like Garuḍa 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 these[42] 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 faces[45] 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] *iti ... tā(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' (*rudhirā°*). The reason might be that 'liquor' seemed to fit better with the concept of the *vāmamārga* as understood by the redactor (see below, p. 75). Cf. MBh 3.215.22ab: *kanyā krūrā lohitabhojanā* /.
[45] For the following, see my Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Revelation. An Edition and Annotated Translation of Mālinīślokavārttika I, 1–399, Groningen 1998 (forthcoming).

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

| Direction | Face | Tantra | Description of the Tantra |
|-----------|------|--------|---------------------------|
| Zenith | *īśāna* | *siddhānta* | granting liberation |
| East | *tatpuruṣa* | *gāruḍa* | destroying all kinds of poison |
| North | *vāmadeva* | *vāma* | acquiring magical control |
| West | *sadyojāta* | *bhūta* | warding off spirits and planetary influences |
| South | *aghora/bhairava* | *bhairava* | 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 Mālinīvijaya-vārttika 1.1–399. 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 *pañcasrotas* 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 Jayadra-thayāmala[46]:

| dakṣiṇa | śuṣkā – siddhā – utpalā – raktā/caṇḍikā |
|---------|------------------------------------------|
| vāma    | jayā – vijayā – jayantī – aparājitā      |

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 Viveka on Tantrāloka 29.51, where he explains catuṣkam as 'Siddhā etc., or Jayā etc.' (catuṣkam iti siddhādi jayādi vā)[47], and a passage in YV/MU[48] which contains nirvacanas 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 khecarīs (24) and the bhūcarīs (25).[50] Of the latter some are unliberated beings (paśu), 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, Maṇḍala 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 Śl.

[49]  For partly overlapping lists in Tantric sources, see Tantrāloka 8.241 (Brāhmī, Māheśvarī, Kaumārī, Vaiṣṇavī, Vārāhī, Indrāṇī and Cāmuṇḍā), which goes back to Svacchandatantra 10.1017ff.; furthermore Mālinīvijayottaratantra (ed. MADHUSŪDAN KAUL. 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 Kathāsaritsāgara (9.24bc [apsarāḥ / āgād alambuṣā nāma]) and the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī (2.1.28ab [svaryoṣid ... alambuṣā /]), but as a name of an apsaras, not our deity, who is, as the text shows, a bhūcarī.

inserts what is 20cd in MU as 25cd for no apparent reason, and so does Ś3. Perhaps the redactor of YV saw that the two deites 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 *pañca-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 commentator[52] – 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. *madira* 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 SLAJE 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: *vāmasroto vāmamārgeṇa paraśaktyārādhanaprakāraḥ.*

[53] The only problem that remains is that of Ś3, which like the YV version reads the verse *utsavaṃ paramaṃ cakruḥ* after 30d (see above, n. 31). Here, as in the case of the variant *śuṣkālambusā* in 21a (see n. 16), we cannot but assume contamination of Ś3 with the YV; see SLAJE, 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 Mokṣo-pāya version, but raise many more questions. What is the source of this part of the narrative of Bhuśuṇḍa? Are the contents of the *ākhyānas* 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 *ākhyānas* 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 Yogavāsiṣṭha/Mokṣopāya,[55] an edition of the earliest version of this text has to be our primary concern.

---

[55] See also PH. GRANOFF, The Yogavāsiṣṭha: 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 Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras (forthcoming [n. 42f. on the indebtedness of the Lakṣmītantra as well as the Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā to Kṣemarāja's Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya]).