Article

Śaivism after the Śaiva Age: Continuities in the Scriptural Corpus of the Vīramāheśvaras

Elaine M. Fisher

Religious Studies, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA; emf@stanford.edu

Abstract: This article makes the case that Vīraśaivism emerged in direct textual continuity with the tantric traditions of the Śaiva Age. In academic practice up through the present day, the study of Śaivism, through Sanskrit sources, and *bhakti* Hinduism, through the vernacular, are generally treated as distinct disciplines and objects of study. As a result, Vīraśaivism has yet to be systematically approached through a philological analysis of its precursors from earlier Śaiva traditions. With this aim in mind, I begin by documenting for the first time that a thirteenth-century Sanskrit work of what I have called the Vīramāheśvara textual corpus, the *Somanāthabhāṣya* or *Vīramāheśvarācārasāroddhārabhāṣya*, was most likely authored by Pālkurikĕ Somanātha, best known for his vernacular Telugu Vīraśaiva literature. Second, I outline the indebtedness of the early Sanskrit and Telugu Vīramāheśvara corpus to a popular work of early lay Śaivism, the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, with particular attention to the concepts of the *jaṅgama* and the *iṣṭaliṅga*. That the Vīramāheśvaras borrowed many of their formative concepts and practices directly from the *Śivadharmaśāstra* and other works of the Śaiva Age, I argue, belies the common assumption that Vīraśaivism originated as a social and religious revolution.

Keywords: Vīraśaiva; Liṅgāyat; Hinduism; Sanskrit; Telugu; Śaivism; South Asia; multilingualism

1. Vīraśaivism, Tantra, and the Śaiva Age

By the mid-thirteenth century, Śaivism in the Deccan had already been irrevocably transformed by the decline of the Śaiva Age, as Alexis Sanderson has called it, the golden age of what we colloquially describe as "tantric Śaivism" (Sanderson 2009). Perhaps most remarkably, the Śaiva institutions that had previously dominated the region's religious ecology were rapidly disappearing, particularly those of the Kālamukhas. Descending from the Lākula traditions, or what Alexis Sanderson has termed Atimārga II, the Kālamukhas left behind precious few of the scriptures that must have originally distinguished their practice from competitors within the Atimārga and Mantramārga, and none in full recensions. Nevertheless, even before Alexis Sanderson and his students had revolutionized our narrative of medieval Śaivism over the past two to three decades, the Kālamukhas were already known to have vanished abruptly, as their landholdings were systematically replaced by another Śaiva tradition rising to prominence in the region, the Vīraśaivas. As a field, we owe our original awareness of this phenomenon to the pathbreaking work of David Lorenzen, who in his monograph, *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas: Two Lost Śaivite Sects*, compiled a voluminous array of inscriptional evidence to document how Kālamukha *maṭha*s (monasteries) ceased to be patronized precisely as inscriptions increasingly attested to the presence of Vīraśaiva devotional figures at the same sites.[1] Reflecting further on this state of affairs, however, Lorenzen later added an appendix to his work, claiming that Kālamukha *maṭha*s were not merely displaced, but rather were overthrown by a veritable religious revolution. As Lorenzen writes:

---

[1] (Lorenzen 1991; see also Shanthamurthy (2015). Although inscriptions in the Karnataka region often refer to the tradition with the spelling Kālāmukha, because the name is shown in textual citations to be originally synonymous with the Sanskrit *asitavaktra* ("black face"), I use the spelling Kālamukha here throughout.

> It can even be said the two [Kālamukha and Vīraśaiva] movements represent antipodes of Indian intellectual and religious tradition[:] the Brahmanic and the anti-Brahmanic, the scholastic and the devotional, Sanskrit learning and vernacular poetic inspiration, pan-Indian culture and regional culture, social and spiritual hierarchy and social and spiritual equality . . . . Vīraśaivism represented not "a reformist schism of the Kālāmukha church" but rather its overthrow. (Lorenzen 1991, p. 242)

For Lorenzen, in essence, Vīraśaivism is the quintessential representative of the Bhakti Movement: a fundamentally anti-brahmin, anti-caste "movement", a radical rupture of social protest, and a purely vernacular religion of the people.[2] Lorenzen is not alone, of course, in attributing these features to Vīraśaivism. To the contrary, in the wake of A. K. Ramanujan's celebrated *Speaking of Śiva* (Ramanujan 1973), the field of South Asian religions has naturalized his portrayal of Vīraśaivism as a social and religious revolution. Ramanujan, in turn, imported the perspectives of earlier intellectuals writing in Kannada who emplotted Vīraśaivism quite explicitly as an Indian foil for the Protestant Reformation.[3] But does this narrative accurately capture the influences that precipitated the emergence of Vīraśaivism? If we depict Vīraśaivism as essentially a devotional (*bhakti*) revolution, for instance, we might be inclined to delineate the Śaivism *after* the Śaiva Age as something radically different from its predecessors, those traditions that fall under the category of "Śaiva *tantra*". Indeed, most scholarly monographs and articles on Vīraśaivism scarcely mention the word "*tantra*", and historicize Vīraśaivism *only* in relation to other communities traditionally categorized as "*bhakti*", as if an unbridgeable chasm separated the two.[4] Likewise, even leading scholars of Śaiva philology flag the "movement of the non-brahmin Vīraśaivas" (Sanderson 2012–2013, p. 83) as of interest to what we might call Tantric Studies only for its occasional borrowings from the Śaiva Siddhānta and the Trika of Kashmir.

Yet, if we read this antagonism back into the origins of Vīraśaivism as a moment of rupture, we risk putting forward a thesis that—as I would like to argue as explicitly as possible—is completely in contradiction with our textual evidence. To put matters even more plainly, based on philological evidence, Vīraśaivism did not originate as a revolution or reformation of tantric Śaivism, nor of Kālāmukha traditions in particular. Indeed, a large part of the problem facing earlier generations of scholars was that adequate textual evidence had not yet come to our attention. Only a fraction of early Vīraśaiva literature has been studied to date, in part because we have restricted the source languages of our archive to the vernacular, exclusive of Sanskrit, and in part because we lacked sufficient knowledge of what had come before. Of course, print editions of such Vīraśaiva works in Sanskrit did exist, as Vīraśaiva monasteries published a substantial quantity of the tradition's literary history in the late-nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For institutional reasons, however, scholars trained in early Kannada and Telugu literature have rarely consulted Sanskrit texts, and when they did so, they previously lacked sufficient knowledge of the pre-Vīraśaiva traditions of the Śaiva Age from the region to draw clear connections between the two.[5] Likewise, and perhaps more crucially for the present audience, when Śaivism is studied from a philological perspective, vernacular literature is rarely consulted, and in this case,

---

[2]　On the historical construction of the concept of the Bhakti Movement, however, see (Hawley 2015), who distinguishes the modern conception from the early modern origins of the Vaiṣṇava model of the "four *sampradāya*s".

[3]　I have discussed at greater length in (Fisher 2019) the problems with emplotting non-Western history based on the metanarrative of the Protestant Reformation.

[4]　In fact, modern scholars were not the first to bifurcate Indian religion into *tantra* and *bhakti* as polar opposites; even early modern Vaiṣṇavas had begun to develop an antipathy toward traditions they perceived as tantric in nature (Burchett 2019).

[5]　See, for instance, (Nandimath 1942), for an example of a now classic work on Vīraśaivism that aimed to integrate data from Sanskrit texts, even if quite preliminarily. Other works of scholarship from past decades, such as Michael (1983), acknowledge Sanskrit data while reifying the Liṅgāyat/Pañcācārya binary and reading it into the earlier centuries of the tradition.

as I will argue, the contemporary Telugu textual context is indispensable for historicizing the early Vīraśaiva works in question.[6]

In this article, I will make the case that Vīraśaivism emerged in direct textual continuity with the "tantric" traditions of the Śaiva Age, especially the Atimārga II of the Kālamukhas, although in a number of cases early Vīraśaivism was influenced by Mantramārga traditions as well. As an embryonic version of this article was originally presented at the Society for Tantric Studies Conference in 2019, I present evidence that specifically sheds new light on how we define and periodize what we call *tantra*, but a similar corrective must be taken in our broader narratives of Hindu and South Asian religious traditions as well. In an earlier article in the journal *History of Religions* (Fisher 2019), I introduced elements of my claim by delineating the canon of what I have called the Vīramāheśvara textual culture of Srisailam. As I demonstrated in that publication, we have access to a rich body of early Vīraśaiva didactic literature that I date to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, contemporary with our earliest vernacular evidence for Vīraśaivism and heavily indebted to the textual canons of the Śaiva Age, most notably (but by no means limited to) the *Śivadharmaśāstra*. Whereas in that context I dealt with issues of historiography facing Religious Studies and South Asian Studies, my project here is primarily philological. Naturally, much work remains to be done in critically editing this textual corpus, and tracing parallels in the citations of many of the otherwise rarely attested early recensions of prior Śaiva scriptures. As a result, the evidence presented here will be extended in subsequent publications on the ritual practice and textual canons of the Vīramāheśvaras.

With such an aim in mind, I will reiterate in greater philological detail the case for dating the Vīramāheśvara corpus to around the thirteenth to early-fourteenth centuries, a significantly earlier date than that of the Sanskrit Vīraśaiva works of Vijayanagara. The principle Sanskrit works in question are the *Vīramāheśvarācārasāroddhārabhāṣya*, otherwise traditionally known as the *Somanāthabhāṣya*, the authorship of which I will discuss below; the *Śaivaratnākara* of Jyotirnātha; and the *Vīramāheśvarācārasaṅgraha* of Nīlakaṇṭha Nāganātha. Each of these Vīramāheśvara texts, in turn, contains citations from earlier (some likely Kālamukha) Śaiva scriptures, which in many cases match quite closely, barring the usual accretion of textual variants. The contemporary Telugu corpus consists primarily of the Telugu works attributed to Pālkuriǩe Somanātha: namely, the *Basava-purāṇamu*, *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu*, and *Caturvēdasāramu*.[7] The *Śivatattvasāramu* attributed to Mallikārjuna Paṇḍitārādhya merits consideration here as well, although most likely dates to a slightly earlier period (a twelfth century dating would be plausible).

First, by bringing these two bodies of textuality into dialogue, I present the evidence that the Sanskrit *Somanāthabhāṣya* has been correctly attributed to the same Pālkuriǩe Somanātha who is responsible for the three Telugu works mentioned above. As a result, as both text–internal citational evidence and the attribution of authorship to Pālkuriǩe Somanātha are consistent with each other, we can assert with relatively strong confidence that the *Somanāthabhāṣya* was composed in the thirteenth century at Srisailam. The fact that the Sanskrit and Telugu works in question overlap so pervasively in tone and content, moreover, further allows us to reject the hypothesis, entrenched as it is, that early vernacular Vīraśaivism arose in strict opposition to Sanskritic Śaivism. Second, I will conclude by outlining the principle points of continuity between the Vīramāheśvara corpus and the Śaivism of the Śaiva Age, demonstrating that on textual grounds early Vīraśaivism was directly indebted to its predecessors in the Deccan, and did not constitute an "overthrow" of its legacy, nor a revolution of any kind. While the Vīramāheśvaras drew on a number of

---

[6] In addition, political controversies concerning the Liṅgāyat and Pañcācārya or Pañcapīṭha communities has obscured matters further, but that state of affairs cannot be adequately addressed in the present article. In a forthcoming article to be published in the new journal NESAR (*New Explorations in South Asia Research*), I will further disambiguate the Vīramāheśvara corpus of texts from the origins of the Pañcācārya or Pañcapīṭha *paramparā* some centuries later by tracing the roots of the latter to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

[7] To clarify, what I refer to here as the *Caturvēdasāramu* is the first portion of the work printed under this title, up through the subheading in the printed edition, "Śivānubhavasūtravivaramu". As I will discuss, I suspect that the second portion of this work, given its seeming indebtedness to the *Anubhavasūtra* of Māyīdeva or similar material, along with the *Anubhavasāramu*, are more likely later accretions to Somanātha's oeuvre.

distinct textual currents from the Śaiva Age, I focus here on their substantial inheritance from the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, with particular attention to the concept of the *jaṅgama*, the human devotee as moving *śivaliṅga*.

2. Dating the Vīramāheśvara Corpus: Pālkuriḱĕ Somanātha and the Authorship of the *Somanāthabhāṣya*

As I have argued at greater length in other venues (Fisher 2019), the tradition we now define as Vīraśaivism, or Liṅgāyatism, was not a new religious movement founded by the poet-saint Basava in the twelfth century.[8] Our earliest texts that mention Basava and his exploits—the Telugu (and Sanskrit) works of Pālkuriḱĕ Somanātha, and the Kannada *Ragalĕgaḷu* of Harihara—can only be dated as early as the thirteenth century, and moreover speak to a wider discursive world that pre-existed Basava himself, in which he merely participated as one historical agent among many.[9] Indeed, both Harihara and Somanātha, from opposite sides of the Deccan, speak to a remarkably similar religious worldview, both depicting, for example, the historical *śaraṇa*s or Vīraśaiva saints as incarnations of Śiva's celestial attendants, the Pramathagaṇas.[10] Inscriptional evidence confirms, moreover, that Vīramāheśvara terminology was used prior to and far afield from the city of Kalyāṇa where Basava served as *daṇḍanāyaka* to Bijjala of the Kalachuris. In other words, we have no plausible historical grounds for situating a singular religious revolution in twelfth-century Kalyāṇa. Rather, the Vīraśaivas in residence there during Basava's day were already part of a greater trans-Deccan network spanning from southern Maharashtra through coastal Andhra and, if we trust inscriptional evidence, likely penetrating further south into Tamil Nadu as well.[11]

Nevertheless, although the Vīramāheśvaras may well have traversed an extensive geographical network by the thirteenth century, our surviving Sanskrit textual evidence from the period stems from one single location: the extended domain of the Śaiva pilgrimage site at Srisailam. While we might hypothesize that these texts circulated beyond their locale of composition, whether or not similar texts were composed elsewhere, we can assert with confidence that Srisailam was something of a discursive epicenter, so to speak, in which the thirteenth-century Vīramāheśvaras codified their doctrine and ritual practice. How, then, do we know that the texts I have identified above are Vīramāheśvara works composed at Srisailam at a relatively early date? First of all, as I have discussed in greater length in (Fisher 2019), the texts generally declare their location of composition and religious affiliation fairly explicitly. In the *Śaivaratnākara*, Jyotirnātha traces his family lineage's origin to Saurashtra, apparently prior to the demolition of the Somanātha temple by Mahmud of Ghazni. He continues, in the same context, to describe the temple that he and his family had maintained after relocating to Srisailam. In the *Vīramāheśvarācāra-saṅgraha*, Nīlakaṇṭha Nāganātha pays homage to Mallikārjuna, the form of Śiva at the temple at Srisailam, and proceeds to venerate a number of early Vīraśaiva figures writing in Sanskrit or south Indian vernaculars, none of whom can be dated, based on our evidence, after the thirteenth century. In both of these works, as well as in the *Somanāthabhāṣya*, the words Vīramāheśvara and Vīraśaiva appear as terms of self-reference to the community in

---

8 In fact, by no means did all premodern Kannada Vīraśaiva texts view Basava as the central figure of the tradition. One key example is the *Śūnyasampādanĕ*, which granted pride of place to Allama Prabhu. Likewise, the figures now known as the Pañcācāryas did appear in early modern Kannada texts as well. Nevertheless, the idea of Basava as the leader of an Indian Protestant Reformation—indeed, the Indian Martin Luther—had gained traction by the mid-twentieth century not only as a scholarly fashion but as itself a point of theological doctrine. This emergent tradition, which I have called Protestant Liṅgāyatism (Fisher 2019), needs to be understood within scholarship as itself a religious phenomenon. It is also crucial to note that the *vacana*s or poetic utterances attributed to Basava and other early poet saints cannot be taken as reliable documentary evidence concerning the origins of Vīraśaivism. See Chandra Shobhi (2005) for a discussion of the later canonization of the *vacana* corpus during the Vijayanagara period, connected with the rise of what the author terms "Virakta" Vīraśaiva identity, as well as of the twentieth-century editorial history of the *vacana*s.

9 On the *Ragalĕgaḷu* of Harihara, see Ben-Herut (2018).

10 Gil Ben-Herut, personal communication.

11 See also Ben-Herut (2015) on the transregional dimensions of Śaiva *bhakti*. In my forthcoming monograph, I examine the category of translation as a vehicle for understanding how regional Vīraśaivisms took root across the southern half of the subcontinent, as, for example, was the case in Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra.

question. All three are structured primarily as *nibandha*s (compendiums, or anthologies) of Sanskrit scriptural citations, while the *Somanāthabhāṣya* also elaborates on the verses cited with extended prose commentary. Incidentally, the Telugu works of Pālkurikĕ Somanātha also contain all of these features, incorporating the self-referential term "Vīramāheśvara", extended descriptions of the Śaiva institutions of thirteenth-century Srisailam, and, as we will see, lengthy anthologized passages of Sanskrit citations.

Who, then, is Pālkurikĕ Somanātha, and why would his dual authorship of works in Telugu and Sanskrit be so significant for our scholarly portrait of Vīraśaivism? Scholars of *bhakti* traditions of Hinduism will be intimately acquainted with Pālkurikĕ Somanātha for the hagiographies of the early Vīraśaiva saints or *śaraṇa*s he crafts in his vernacular Telugu works. From the perspective of Telugu literary historians, Somanātha's verse style stands in stark contrast to the school of high Telugu literature that more strictly emulated the idiom of Sanskrit *kāvya*.[12] In short, his writings are marshaled in support of a view that the vernacular in South Asia emerged from the popular religious sentiment of devotion, rather than from the elite courtly world of Sanskrit literature. Based on the portrait of Somanātha's writings as vernacular hagiography, his works—like those of his near contemporary writing in Kannada, Harihara—have been read almost exclusively in dialogue with the lives of the Nāyaṉārs as recounted in the Tamil *Pĕriyapurāṇam*. Indeed, such parallels do exist. But, as we will see, by reducing Pālkurikĕ Somanātha's discursive context exclusively to the *Pĕriyapurāṇam*, scholars to date have lost sight of the data that allows us to contextualize more precisely the Śaiva worldview from which he wrote.

Among works attributed to him, Somanātha is best known for the *Basavapurāṇamu*, which narrates not only the life story of Basava, as the name would suggest, but also numerous of his purported contemporaries. The *Basavapurāṇamu* has been adopted as a principle source for classroom teaching and scholarship on the Vīraśaiva tradition because it can be accessed easily by English speakers through the translation of Velcheru Narayana Rao and Gene Roghair. This Telugu epic in *dvipada* meter has often been upheld in scholarship as an example of purely vernacular, devotional narrative—disconnected, in other words, from anything remotely Sanskritic and from *tantra* as a category.[13] Pālkurikĕ Somanātha is also generally accepted as having composed the *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu*, a second Telugu *prabandha* on the life of Mallikārjuna Paṇḍitārādhya, to whom authorship of the Telugu-language *Śivatattvasāramu* is attributed.[14] Indeed, we can be fairly confident that the same author crafted both of these two Telugu works, and in fact, a third as well: Somanātha tells us explicitly at the outset of his *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu* that he had previously completed two Telugu works entitled the *Basavapurāṇamu* and the *Caturvēdasāramu*, or "Essence of the Four Vedas". Speaking about himself in the second person, Pālkurikĕ Somanātha declares the following:

> You admirably composed the *Basavapurāṇa*;
>
> In the *Basavapurāṇa* narrative, you recounted as history (*itihāsa*)
>
> The stories of the Gaṇas, those celebrated ancient devotees.
>
> You composed the *Caturvēdasāramu* with the

---

[12] According to the canonical portrait of Telugu literary history, early Telugu literature was divided into a more elite and Sanskritized (*mārga*) register on one hand, and a more popular and accessible (*dēśi*) current on the other. See for instance (Rao and Roghair 1990, p. 5) for further detail. Pālkurikĕ Somanātha's works, and Śaiva *bhakti* literature more broadly, are generally associated with the *dēśi* current, and are thus viewed as intrinsically anti-Sanskritic and as intended for popular audiences. Nevertheless, an important corrective has recently been raised by Jones (2018), who complicates this division by showing that Pālkurikĕ Somanātha was deeply acquainted with formal Telugu literary conventions and makes use of such literary devices in his Telugu works. As this article also hopes to make clear, Somanātha's Telugu works, as well as other Telugu Śaiva works such as the *Śivatattvasāramu*, are anything but anti-Sanskritic.

[13] See Rao and Roghair (1990). For instance, "Somanātha's rejection of Sanskritic, brahminic, literary conventions was complete" (p. 6); "Somanātha emphasized his opposition to the brahminic tradition by explicitly stating that he never associated with bhavis, non-Vīraśaivas" (p. 7). On the second point, based on our combined intertextual evidence, such statements are *not* evidence of "opposition to the brahminic tradition". Rather, Vīramāheśvaras strictly avoided contact with non-Śaivas, considering them to be virtually untouchable. Caste, Sanskrit, and the Vedas are not at all under contention in such a statement.

[14] Although Paṇḍitārādhya is also accepted by the Pañcācārya or Pañcapīṭha *paramparā* as one of the original five teachers (*ācārya*s), that later hagiographical portrait of Paṇḍitārādhya is beyond the scope of this article.

best of heroic devotion (*vīrabhakti*) in accordance with the Vedas.[15]

Although Somanātha has professed his own authorship here of the *Caturvēdasāramu*, its title might give some readers pause: the "Essence of the Four Vedas", some might suspect, is the polar opposite, at least according to conventional wisdom, of what motivated Vīraśaivism as a religious "movement". Yet, not only can we infer, pending further examination, that Pālkuriкĕ Somanātha did author the *Caturvēdasāramu*, but we must acknowledge his self-professed motive in doing so: Somanātha authored this vernacular work of Śaiva doctrine, he tells us, to establish the orthodox Vaidika status of what he understands as *vīrabhakti*. Indeed, this sentiment accords precisely with the view articulated in the *Basavapurāṇamu*, where we read that devotion to Śiva is inculcated in the Vedas themselves: "O Basava, proclaim the devotion that has been derived from the essence of the Vedas and *śāstras*".[16] Moreover, we have little reason to suspect that Somanātha's genuflection to the Vedas was intended disingenuously, or as a means of coopting a textual authority he viewed as foreign to Śaivism. To the contrary, by the thirteenth century in the Andhra country, it would have been quite normative among Śaivas to interpret the Vedas as a quintessentially Śaiva scriptural corpus, in no way contradictory with the Āgamic and Atimārgic literature of the Śaiva Age. For instance, the name of Somanātha's "*Caturvēdasāramu*" was by no means unprecedented. Rather, it was likely intended to evoke the earlier *Caturvedatātparyasaṅgraha* of Haradatta, a garland of Sanskrit verses in the *vasantatilaka* meter intended to illustrate that Śiva is the essential meaning (*tātparya*) of the four Vedas, cited frequently in the *Somanāthabhāṣya*.[17] Evidently, we cannot casually presume that the Vīraśaivism of Pālkuriкĕ Somanātha intends in any manner to upend the authority of the Vedas as scripture.

Further, we would be remiss in presuming that for Somanātha the vernacular Telugu was in any way divorced from Sanskrit. Contrary to popular perception, his linguistic register is highly Sanskritized, even preserving the sort of lengthy Sanskrit compounds generally taken to be the purview of courtly Telugu literature. For example, to indicate his distaste for interacting with non-Śaivas, Somanātha describes himself in the *Basava-purāṇamu* with extended Sanskrit compounding as "avoiding contact such as dialogue with and respect for non-Śaivas" (*bhavijanasamādaraṇasambhāṣaṇādisaṃsargadūraguṃḍa*), and encapsulates his reverence for Vedic canons of textuality in phrases such as "in accordance with all the Vedas and Purāṇas, and the established doctrine of the secret of the stainless *liṅga*" (*akalaṃkaliṃgarahasyasiddhāṃtasakalavēdapurāṇasammataṃbaina*) (*Basava-purāṇamu* p. 7). Moreover, all of Somanātha's vernacular works are interlaced with direct Sanskrit quotations from Vedic and Śaiva source material. Both the *Paṇḍitārādhaycaritramu* and *Caturvēdasāramu* are heavily inflected with long doctrinal digests of Sanskrit source material, as will be discussed below, but Sanskrit citations appear in the *Basavapurāṇamu* as well. Unfortunately, these quotations are not necessarily apparent to those reading Rao and Roghair's translation, as the English rendering and footnotes may obscure the shift in language.[18]

---

[15] Pālkuriкĕ Somanātha, *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu*, p. 3: basavapurāṇa mŏppaṃga raciṃcitivi, basavapurāṇa prabaṃdhaṃbunaṃdu prathita purātana bhaktagaṇānukathanaṃbul itihāsaghaṭanaṃ gūrcitivi, vara vīrabhakti savaidikaṃbuganu viraciṃcitivi saturvēdasāramana.

[16] (Rao and Roghair 1990, p. 62). Similar examples are abundant, and do not need to be cited here.

[17] Haradatta's work has often been (either erroneously or synonymously) titled by its editor and as a result, by subsequent scholarship, as the *Śrutisūktimālā*, with the title *Catuvedatātparyacandrikā* attributed to a later commentary by *Śivaliṅgabhūpāla*. Somanātha, however, is consistent in referring to this text by the shorthand *Tātparyasaṅgraha*. The print edition of this work by P. A. Ramasamy with commentary is incomplete. See also IFP transcript no. 1059 for the root text. Somanātha's lack of antipathy toward the Vedas also raises the question, of course, of his caste status prior to Śaiva initiation and his attitude toward non-Śaiva brahmin communities. While I will discuss this matter further in my forthcoming monograph, it is worth remarking for the moment that throughout the *Somanāthabhāṣya*, Somanātha refers to matters of ritual practice that he believes to be current in various *śākhās*.

[18] See, for example, *Basavapurāṇamu* p. 10: mṛdumahattvamuṃ gānamini bŏṃku lanaṃgaṃ baḍuṃ "kavayaḥ kiṃ na paśyanti" yanuṭa yanucuṃ gukavula gītunaṃ bucci pērci vinutiṃtuṃ datkathāvidha mĕṭṭu lanina. Rao and Roghair (1990) translate, p. 45, without indicating the direct quotation in the footnotes: "It is said that a poet can see everything. But that does not hold true if one is ignorant of Mṛda's greatness. Thus I ignore all the bad poets and praise Basava with vigor. This is how the story goes". The Sanskrit quotation *kavayaḥ kiṃ na paśyanti* is found in the *Mahāsubhāṣitasaṅgraha*. On p. 57, although indicating the quotation in a footnote, they translate: "Śruti has commended it as all seeing", leaving the casual reader unaware of the Sanskrit citation *viśvataś cakṣur uta*.

Stylistically, in other words, all of Pālkurikĕ Somanātha's works give every indication of an authorial imagination well versed in the Sanskrit language. Yet, we can find even more conclusive evidence of shared authorship by directly comparing key passages from the *Caturvēdasāramu*, *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu*, and the Sanskrit *Somanāthabhāṣya* that contain direct and unmistakable parallels. In fact, despite linguistic differences, the texts harmonize to a remarkable degree, such that the overlap in content is far too significant to be explained by coincidence. To begin with a particularly striking example, let us examine the *maṅgala* verse of the *Somanāthabhāṣya*, which invokes Basava simultaneously as a human incarnation of Śiva's bull, and leader of the Pramathagaṇas, Vṛṣabha or Nandikeśvara:

> May Lord (*rājaḥ*) Basava surpass all, venerable (*pūjaḥ*) for his fortitude and
>> stainlessness,
>
> The seed (*bījaḥ*) of shining devotion, keeping the company (*samājaḥ*) of the
>> Pramathagaṇas
>
> Abiding (*vartī*) within an expansive lineage that removes the affliction (*ārti*) of the
>> humble,
>
> His limitless fame (*kīrti*) established across the directions, incarnation (*mūrti*) of the
>> Lord of Bulls.[19]

In both halves of this benedictory verse, Somanātha employs a four-part rhyme scheme of a sort that is rarely encountered in Sanskrit literature but is not at all unexpected in Telugu *dvipada* verse. In fact, not only do Pālkurikĕ Somanātha's Telugu works make ample use of this device throughout, but Somanātha is particularly fond of the second rhyming pattern, often making use of the very same rhyming words. To name a single example, the *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu* also opens with an invocation of Basava, incarnation of Vṛṣabha, as the one "who had accumulated fame (*kīrti*) and merit through the form (*mūrti*) of the auspicious guru, dwelling (*varti*) in bliss, pulsating (*sphūrti*) with the end of scripture". The content of the verses may differ, but the rhymes are unambiguous parallels. Moreover, the precise same rhyming words appear on multiple occasions in the *Basavapurāṇamu* as well.[20]

With the evidence presented thus far, it may remain plausible to suggest that the *Somanāthabhāṣya* was simply invoking the literary fashions of the day, imitating either Pālkurikĕ Somanātha directly or the broader conventions of early Telugu prosody. Nevertheless, the overlapping content is far more pervasive, including some particularly striking doctrinal passages reproduced in both the Sanskrit *Somanāthabhāṣya* and the Telugu *Caturvēdasāramu*. For instance, both texts include an enumeration of a closely matched set of Upaniṣadic scriptures, which both texts refer to as "Śākhā Upaniṣads", the property of distinct lineages (*śākhā*) of Vedic transmission.[21] It is worth noting that the term *śākhopaniṣad*

19 *Somanāthabhāṣya*: jayatu basavarājaḥ sthaulyanairmalyapūjaḥ pramathagaṇasamājaḥ prollasadbhaktibījaḥ | prahṛtavinamadārti-sphāyadāmnā-yavartī sthiradigamitakīrtiḥ śrīvṛṣādhīśamūrtiḥ | |

20 *Paṇḍitārādhaycaritramu*, p. 1: śrīgurumūrti mārjitapuṇyakīrti | nāgamāṃtasphūrti nānandavarti | Note that the *Caturvēdasāramu*, p. 1, also begins with a (Sanskrit) invocation of that incarnated Pramathagaṇa who is a portion of Vṛṣabha and a Vīramāheśvara (*vṛṣabhāṃśavīramāheśvarāya*). For the same rhyme scheme, see also *Basavapurāṇamu* p. 1: baramakṛpāmūrti bhaktajanārti, haruṃ drijagatsphūrti nānaṃdavarti; *Basavapurāṇamu* p. 5: bhuvanapāvanamūrti budhacakravarti, pravimalakīrti sadbhaktiprapūrti. *Caturvēdasāramu*, p. 14: vēdamayuṃḍu vēdavinutakīrti, divyaliṃgamūrti bhavyatējassphūrti. Further similar examples can be found.

21 The list in the *Caturvēdasāramu* is intentionally incomplete (as indicated by the word *ādi*). Note that the two passages are clearly parallel but not identical, either suggesting the two were composed without the intention of fidelity to a canonical list, or that some textual drift has occured. As the *Somanāthabhāṣya* reads: tat tac chrutibhedam āha—śrīrudra-bāṣkala-śvetāśvatara-bṛhadāraṇyamādhyandināṃgīrasa-kaṭha-brahmabindu-pañcabrahmātmagarbha-kātyāyana-śukla-kālāgnirudra-kāpāla-śoṣīya-gālava-vājasaneya-jābāla-vaiśeṣa-haṃsa-pavamāna-kaivalya-bodhāyana-śivasaṃkalpa-nārāyaṇa-kāṇḍava-atharvaṇaśikha-paippalāya-vārtāntareya-pauṇḍarīka-dundubha-daṇḍilāṅguli-maṇḍūka-pādakrama-śūkalāvadika-śaṭha-paramāvadhikaraṇa-vidyāvārāha-caraka-hiraṇyakeśīya-śukleya-mānaveya-mārkaṇḍeya-mārdaveya-kaideya-carcaka-śravaṇa-sūtārdhiṇāya-bilva-prācyaka-mudgala-brahmadāśvalāyana-devarṣi-saṅkhyāyanīya-maitrāyaṇīya-śāma-tvarita-dānta-nārāyaṇīya-satya-satyāṣādi-śaunaki-śāmya-bārhaspatya-mauṇḍikāhvā itiśākhopaniṣadādiṣu prakalpyate | Note that the manuscript tradition preserves numerous variants in this list. *Caturvēdasāramu*, p. 10: śrīrudra-jābāla-śvētāśvatara-bṛhadāraṇya-taitrīyamādigāṃga brahmabiṃduvu paṃcabrahmātmagarbha-kātyāyanī-śukla-kālāgnirudra-kāpāla-śōṣīya-gāla-vājasanēya-śāṃḍilya-praśna-suśaṃkha-haṃsa-pavamāna-kaivalya-bāṣkala sa-śivasaṃkalpa-nārāyaṇa-kāṃḍavādi śākhalaṃdupaniṣaccayamaṃḍ' …

itself is not especially common. By employing this term, Somanātha might be taken as revealing that for him, Vedic scripture was not an abstract canon but was embedded within a living sociology of distinct Vedic brahminical communities. Furthermore, both works supply identical proof texts for the incarnation of Vṛṣabha as Basava: "I will become your son, by the name of Nandin, not born from a human womb".[22]

Perhaps the most remarkable of these convergences is that the *Somanāthabhāṣya* and *Caturvēdasāramu* provide a precisely identical Prakrit etymology of the name of Basava, which makes use of identical grammatical rules and examples from vernacular Telugu usage. Drawing on the Prakrit grammar of Vararuci,[23] Somanātha makes the case that the name Basava can be derived systematically from the Sanskrit Vṛṣabha ("bull"), as rules of substitution render the letters b and v interchangeable (*vṛkārasya bakārādeśo bhavati, vabayor abheda iti; pavargatṛtīyākṣaramu bakāramu pakāraṃbuvalanaṃ*), and the sibilants of various classes are notoriously collapsed into "sa" in Prakrit and several vernaculars (*śaṣoḥ sa iti sūtrāt ṣakārasya sakārādeśo bhavati; śaṣoḥ sa yanu vyākaraṇasūtramunaṃ*). Hence, "vṛ" can become "ba", "ṣa" can become "sa", and "bha" can become "va", transforming the Sanskrit Vṛṣabha into Basava. Similarly, one may demonstrate Basava's ontological connection with Śiva, by deriving in a similar manner the name Basava from the first three syllables of Śiva's name as Paśupati, "lord of beasts" (*paśupa*). Both texts proceed, then, to illustrate this phonetic transformation with identical examples, such as the Sanskrit word *kuṭhāra*, meaning an axe, and the Telugu equivalent, *guddali*, (*kuṭhārakuddālatāmarasādipadeṣu . . . ; guddālatāmarasakuṭhāramul' varusa guddaliyuṃ dāmarayu gŏḍali*).[24]

It is undeniable, at this point, that the *Somanāthabhāṣya* and *Caturvēdasāramu* share some direct relation of dependence, but could one text have been written in direct imitation of the other? For multiple reasons, forgery seems implausible. For instance, the *Somanāthabhāṣya* makes no effort to stake out a reputation for itself through attribution to Pālkurikĕ Somanātha. In fact, the author's name is mentioned nowhere in the text. Despite their substantial intertextuality, moreover, the two texts are not precise matches: that is, neither the *Somanāthabhāṣya* nor the *Caturvēdasāramu* seems intended as a translation of the other. While concerned with several identical themes—for example, both deal with the obligatory Vīramāheśvara topics of sacred ash (*vibhūti*), *rudrākṣa* beads, and the bearing of the personal *liṅga*—the structure of the texts is not identical. Moreover, while a substantial number of the Sanskrit citations in the *Caturvēdasāramu* also appear in the *Somanāthabhāṣya*, an equally substantial number do not, and vice versa. As a result, neither text would have been sufficient to provide the source material for the other.

If anything, Somanātha's *Paṇḍitārādhaycaritramu* overlaps even more pervasively with the contents of the *Somanāthabhāṣya*, even if the overlapping content is not so readily memorable. Structured as a garland of narratives of the lives of Mallikārjuna Paṇḍitārādhya and other saints, the *Paṇḍitārādhycaritramu* has, like the *Basavapurāṇamu*, been represented as a strictly vernacular and prototypically devotional *bhakti* literary work. While very little work has been done on the text within the Western academy, it is best known for its occasional polyglossic use of multiple vernaculars (Kannada, Marathi, and Tamil), and

---

22 The *Somanāthabhāṣya* reads: tava putro bhaviṣyāmi nandināmā tv ayonijaḥ. *Caturvēdasāramu*, p. 4: tava putrō bhaviṣyāmi. Both texts further contextualize the name Vṛṣabha in relation to the practice of touching the testicles (*vṛṣa*) of the bull (*vṛṣabha*) outside of a Śaiva temple.

23 On the Prakrit grammar of Vararuci, see Ollett (2017)

24 Further, we learn, something similar takes place when the Sanskrit words *kuddāla* (spade) and *tāmarasa* (lotus) are transformed into the Telugu *gŏḍali* and *dāmarayu*, respectively. *Somanāthabhāṣya*: ko basava iti idānīṃ kaliyuge śivabhaktim uddhartuṃ basavābhidheyena vṛṣabha eva jātaḥ | vṛṣabhasya basavanāmakatvaṃ kasmāt kāraṇād āsīt | vṛkārasya bakārādeśo bhavati, vabayor abheda iti | śaṣoḥ sa iti sūtrāt ṣakārasya sakārādeśo bhavati | vaḥ pavargasyeti vārarucyasūtrād bakārasya vakārādeśo bhavati | etadvṛṣabhākṣaratadbhavād basava iti nāma vakṣyate | paśūn pātīti paśupaḥ vṛṣabhaḥ, tat paśupatyakṣaratrayaṃ ca sambhavati | kuṭhārakuddālatāmarasādipadeṣu tattadādyakṣarāṇāṃ tattadvargatṛtīyākṣarādeśo bhavati | yathā kuṭhārasyāndhrabhāṣāyāṃ gakārādir bhavati | kuddālasyāsyāndhrabhāṣāyāṃ gakārādir bhavati | tāmarasasyāndhrabhāṣāyāṃ dakārādir bhavati | tathaiva paśupatināmādyakṣarapakārasya bakārādeśo bhavati śaṣoḥ sa iti sūtrāt | śakārasya sakārādeśo bhavati | pakārasya bakārādeśo bhavati vaḥ pavargasyeti vararucisūtrāt | vakārasya bakārādeśo bhavati | ata eva paśupetyakṣaratrayasya basavetyakṣaratrayaṃ siddhaṃ bhavati | *Caturvēdasāramu*, p. 5: paśupati vṛṣabhaṃbu paśupati paramuṃḍu yanaṃganu jĕllu śubhākṣaramulu | basavavākyaṃbu pavargatṛtīyākṣaramu bakāramu pakāraṃbuvalanaṃ baragaṃ guddālatāmarasakuṭhāramul varusa guddaliyuṃ dāmarayu gŏḍali yanukriyanu śaṣōḥ sa yanu vyākaraṇasūtramunaṃ kŏppaḍu sakāramunu śakāramuna nahō vāyu tatsūtramuna vakāramunu pakāraṃbunanu dōṃcuṃ bŏlupuhīra basavanāmaṃcidiyu liṃgabhāvyamaguṭa basavaliṃgāhvayaṃ bŏppu basavaliṃga.

secondarily for the chapter in which Paṇḍitārādhya journeys to meet Basava, only to find that the latter has fled Kalyāṇa after the assassination of Bijjala. Anything more than a surface level perusal of the text, however, makes clear that the author aimed to convey Vīraśaiva doctrine as much as narrative, and was as thoroughly acquainted with Sanskrit as with Telugu. For instance, in the first *prakaraṇa*, we find several extended doctrinal discussions, structured as garlands of Sanskrit citations within a Telugu grammatical medium.

Many of these discussions, moreover, are structurally parallel to sections of the *Somanāthabhāṣya*, and the verse quotations often run in almost the same sequence in both texts. It is the "almost" here, again, that is key: in most cases, we find just enough variation between the two—a verse missing or an extra citation supplied here or there in either text, or different attributions of sources for the same citation—to be confident that one text could not have been simply copied from the other. The doctrinal digests in the *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu* concern the "greatness" (Telugu: *mahima*, Sanskrit: *māhātmya*) of sacred ash (*vibhūti*), *rudrākṣa* beads, *pādodaka*, the worship of the *liṅga* (*liṅgārcana*), the bearing of the *liṅga*, and *prasāda*, all of which are discussed in the *Somanāthabhāṣya* as well. The sum total of the evidence is abundant, and only a fraction can be published here for want of space. I have, however, exemplified this citational pattern below in Appendix A, with the original Telugu and Sanskrit of a parallel section from the *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu* and the *Somanāthabhāṣya*.

What, then, do we make of these pervasive textual parallels in multiple languages? By far the most parsimonious solution—which I believe to be the strongest argument, based on the evidence—is quite simply that all of these works were composed by the same author. In order to confirm the plausibility of dating the *Somanāthabhāṣya* to the thirteenth century, however, we must further clarify that no textual material contained within the work precludes such a dating. The same, incidentally, must be ascertained for the *Śaivaratnākara* of Jyotirnātha and the *Vīramāheśvarācārasaṅgraha* of Nīlakaṇṭha Nāganātha, the other two works I associate with the early Vīramāheśvara corpus. In short, none of the Sanskrit Vīramāheśvara works cite any source texts that would prohibit dating the *Somanāthabhāṣya* and *Śaivaratnākara* to the thirteenth century, and the *Vīramāheśvarācārasaṅgraha* to the early fourteenth century.[25] Among readily datable Sanskrit sources in the *Somanāthabhāṣya*, we find citations from the *Somaśambhupaddhati* of 1048/9 CE, the ca. eleventh-century *Vāyavīyasaṃhitā*, and the mid twelfth-century *Sūtasaṃhitā*.[26] In the *Śaivaratnākara*, we further find an intriguing mention of the fourfold typology of yoga, which Jason Birch has recently historicized to this time period.[27] It is worth noting that none of the Vīramāheśvara authors cite the Sanskrit *Śrīśailakhaṇḍa*, which Reddy (2014) has proposed to date to the thirteenth century on stylistic grounds.[28] Also worthy of note is that while these works are intimately familiar with the Śaiva religious landscape at Srisailam, none makes mention of Mallikārjuna's consort as Bhramarāmbā, who seems to make her debut on the stage of Telugu literature around the turn of the fifteenth century.[29]

---

[25] We can state conclusively that the *Śaivaratnākara* postdates the *Somanāthabhāṣya*, because it incorporates its commentarial prose along with shared verse citations.

[26] On the *Somaśambhupaddhati* or *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī*, authored by Somaśambhu, pontiff of the Golagī Maṭha, of present day Gurgi, located in Rewa District in Madhya Pradesh, see for instance Sanderson (2012–2013), p. 21. On the *Vāyavīyasaṃhitā*, see Barois (2013). On the dating of the *Sūtasaṃhitā*, see Cox (2016).

[27] (*Śaivaratnākara* 1.39: tanmantrayogahaṭhayogalayākhyayogaśrīrājayogavidhitaḥ paramārthavedī | bhūlokapāvanasamāgataśambhumūrtiḥ satkīrtipūraśaśipūrṇajagatkaraṇḍaḥ || Jason Birch (2019) has argued that the *Amaraughaprabodha*, which was a foundational source text for the fifteenth-century *Haṭhapradīpikā*, should be understood as one of the earliest texts to teach a fourfold system of yoga. Drawing on the eleventh- to twelfth-century exchange of yogic ideas between Śaivism and Buddhism, exemplified by the *Amṛtasiddhi*, the short recension of the *Amaraugaprabodha* likely predates the thirteenth-century *Dattātreyayogaśāstra*. Other texts that mention the fourfold typology of yoga include the Marathi *Vivekadarpaṇa* (Birch 2020) and *Vivekasindhu*, which are generally dated to the thirteenth century, and the fourteenth-century *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* (Jason Birch, personal communication).

[28] See Reddy (2014), p. 103. Somanātha does however cite a certain *Śrīparvatamāhātmya*.

[29] One excellent example is Gaurana, author of the *Navanāthacaritramu*, whose floruit Jamal Jones dates to the late-fourteenth and early-fifteenth centuries (Jones 2018). Gaurana's mention of Bhramarāmbā (Jones 2020) is quite in keeping with the rise to power of the Bhikṣāvṛtti Maṭha, whose lineage never receives mention during the earlier Vīramāheśvara period but is famously invoked by Srīnātha (Rao and Shulman 2012, p. 15).

Some confusion may be generated by the fact that the *Śaivaratnākara* and *Vīramāheśvarā-cārasaṅgraha* cite a text by the name of *Kriyāsāra* ("Essence of Rituals"), a title that is most famously associated with a Vijayanagara-period (perhaps fifteenth- or sixteenth-century) ritual compendium hybridized with a Śaktiviśiṣṭādvaita commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*.[30] Not only does the *Kriyāsāra* as cited by the Vīramāheśvaras, in contrast, contain no discernibly Vīraśaiva or Vedāntic content, but citations attributed to that name fail to match the Vijayanagara text.[31] Succinctly, the *Kriyāsāra* in question is an entirely different work. In fact, none of the Vīramāheśvara texts in question contain Śaktiviśiṣṭādvaita content, and generally invoke the term Vedānta exclusively as a reference to the Upaniṣads. That these three works—the *Somanāthabhāṣya*, *Śaivaratnākara*, and *Vīramāheśvarācārasaṅgraha*—are an interconnected corpus of textuality, moreover, is underscored by the fact that they share a common repertoire of citational texts, a number of which are rarely cited under the same names in other domains of Sanskrit intellectual history, some to my knowledge never otherwise identified in any source to date.

Among the shared scriptural canon of the Vīramāheśvaras, the most foundational and frequently cited source texts include the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, *Vātulatantra*, *Śivarahasya*, *Liṅga Purāṇa*, and, in the *Śaivaratnākara* and *Vīramāheśvarācārasaṅgraha*, the *Vīratantra*. It must be noted carefully that the recensions of the *Vātula* and *Vīratantra* cited are distinct from Āgamic works commonly cited in the Vijayanagara period. Text names that are never mentioned within the Vīramāheśvara corpus, but that are ubiquitous in Vijayanagar period compositions, include the *Vātulottara*, *Vātulaśuddhākhya*, and *Vīrāgamottara*.[32] In addition to these theologically significant works, Vīramāheśvara authors share a pattern of citing a number of less widely circulating works, including: the *Īśānasaṃhitā*; the non-Vijayanagara *Kriyāsāra*; the *Kriyātilaka*; the *Kālikākhaṇḍa* (presumably of the *Skanda Purāṇa*); the *Brahmagītā*; the *Bhīmāgama*; the *Mānava Purāṇa*; and the *Liṅgasāra*.[33] Outside of the Vīramāheśvara corpus, one of the texts' closest discursive neighbors seems to be the *Śāradātilaka*, sharing a number of these sources.[34] Although I cannot possibly document all of the voluminous points of textual overlap in this article, including numerous shared citations, suffice it to say that the intertextuality between the Sanskrit Vīramāheśvara works is so strong as to be patently obvious when the works are subjected to a close comparative analysis.

I would caution, however, that there are a number of works attributed to Pālkuriকĕ Somanātha that I have not included in this study, and in some cases, I currently harbor significant doubts that Somanātha could have composed them.[35] Two of the latter are worth discussing more explicitly, because their content deviates significantly from the discursive norms across languages of the "Vīramāheśvara moment". Most notable among

---

[30]　The term Śaktiviśiṣṭādvaita, or "nondualism of Śiva as qualified by Śakti", contrasts conceptually with the Śrīvaiṣṇava use of the term Viśiṣṭādvaita as the former intends a non-monistic brand of nondualism influenced by the Trika Śaivism of Kashmir.

[31]　As of yet, I have only identified one citation attributed to a *Kriyāsāra* in the *Śaivaratnākara* that corresponds to what we understand as the Vijayanagara period text by that name: vibhūtir bhasitaṃ bhasma kṣāraṃ rakṣeti bhasmanaḥ | bhavanti pañca nāmāni hetubhiḥ pañcabhir bhṛśam || aiśvaryakāraṇād bhūtiḥ bhasma sarvāghabhartsanāt | bhāsanād bhasitaṃ bhasma kṣāraṇāt paramāpadam | (*Kriyāsāra*, vol. 2, p. 14; *Śaivaratnākara* 7. 79–80). As *bhasma* is a ubiquitous topic across Śaiva lineages, this parallel is not especially surprising. And in fact, this is a rather common citation, also appearing in the *Bṛhajjābalopaniṣad* and the *Siddhāntaśikhāmaṇi*. Both the *Somanāthabhāṣya* and the *Kriyāsāra* attribute it to the *Jābalopaniṣad* or *Bṛhajjābalopaniṣad*, which thus appears to be the source through which it entered Vīramāheśvara discourse. While several other citations are attributed by the *Śaivaratnākara* to a *Kriyāsāra*, these do not appear in the published edition.

[32]　Further textual work on the available manuscripts of these texts will be needed to determine if the early recensions survive in any form outside of the quotations in the Vīramāheśvara corpus. While these works have been redacted significantly over the centuries, we know little as of yet about how and when these transformations took place.

[33]　The *Bhīmāgama* may potentially be related to the *Bhīmasaṃhitā*, although I know of no other citations under the name *Bhīmāgama* itself. The *Somanāthabhāṣya* does not cite the *Liṅgasāra*. The *Somanāthabhāṣya* is also distinctive in its citation of a *Bāṣkalasaṃhitā* and *Bhṛgusaṃhitā*. I have been able to confirm so far that the *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu* also shares citations of the *Bhīmāgama*, *Mānava Purāṇa*, and the *Vātulatantra*. References to what ought to be the *Kālikākhaṇḍa* also appear, but the Telugu editor or manuscript tradition has emended this to *Kāśikākhaṇḍa*, due to the similarity of the letters śa and ḷa in Telugu script

[34]　The *Śāradātilaka* is likely fairly close to the Vīramāheśvara corpus in date and region, as Alexis Sanderson has suggested that it was likely composed in Orissa (Sanderson 2007) around the twelfth century (Sanderson 2009).

[35]　Other works attributed to Pālkuriকĕ Somanātha that are not examined here include: *Pañcaprakāragadya*, *Namaskāragadya*, *Akṣarāṅkagadya*, *Aṣṭottaraśatanāmagadya*, *Basavapañcaka*, *Basavāṣṭaka*, *Trividhaliṅgāṣṭaka*, *Basavodāharaṇa*, *Vṛṣādhipaśataka*, and a *Rudrabhāṣya* (apparently not surviving). The *Somanāthabhāṣya* does, interestingly, cite a certain *Rudrabhāṣya*, but authorship is not mentioned.

these is the *Anubhavasāramu*, a fourth major Telugu work often attributed to Pālkurikĕ Somanātha. The category of *anubhava* (experience) is already heavily thematized in Vīraśaiva circles by this time in the western Deccan, but is more typically invoked in early Marathi literature than in Telugu. *Anubhava* does not appear as a technical doctrinal term in the *Somanāthabhāṣya*, *Śaivaratnākara*, or *Vīramāheśvarācārasaṅgraha*. The work currently printed as the *Caturvēdasāramu*, likewise, requires further explication. While I believe the beginning of this print edition to be the work by that name of Pālkurikĕ Somanātha, as I have argued above, the second half of this publication consists of a Telugu work structured as an elaboration of Māyīdeva's *Anubhavasūtra*.[36] We find numerous instances of terminology here, as in the *Anubhavasūtra*, that is highly atypical of Vīramāheśvara thought: for example, *caitanya*, *unmeṣa*, terminology from Māyīdeva's ontology, such as *paramātmaliṅga*, *bhāvaliṅga*, and so forth. Both works rely heavily on the *ṣaṭsthala* system, which only begins to make a brief appearance by the time of the *Vīramāheśvarācārasaṅgraha*.

　　　　This conclusion, then—that Pālkurikĕ Somanātha is the author of the Sanskrit *Somanāthabhāṣya*—bears significant ramifications for how we as scholars ought to historicize the genres of South Asian religious discourse and practice that we call *bhakti* and *tantra*. Indeed, beyond the scope of what can be covered in the present article, the Vīramāheśvaras shared with the Śaiva Age distinctive elements of its ritual culture, which are generally not comprised within our academic definitions of *bhakti* traditions. Such is the case, for instance, with formal tantric rituals of initiation; while this evidence will be discussed elsewhere, it is worth noting for the moment that in both the *Basavapurāṇamu* and *Caturvēdasāramu*, Somanātha refers to Vīramāheśvara initiation as *śāmbhavadīkṣā*.[37] In this light, to accept the *Somanāthabhāṣya* as composed by the very same Pālkurikĕ Somanātha who authored the Telugu *Basavapurāṇamu* is to cast fundamental doubt on whether the vernacular of Telugu devotional literature ever existed in isolation from contemporary Sanskrit discourse. In turn, we need to acknowledge that, in the eastern Deccan especially, the tantric Śaivism of the Śaiva Age was not overthrown by Śaiva devotional movements. Rather, it exerted a formative influence on the emergence of the Śaiva communities we classify as *bhakti* traditions. While these points of continuity are too abundant to enumerate in the present article, I would like to continue by looking closely at one key element that the Vīramāheśvaras had inherited from their predecessors of the Śaiva Age: the role of the *liṅga*, both the personal *iṣṭaliṅga* and the *jaṅgama*, the moving *liṅga*, as living Śaiva devotee.

3. Before the Vīramāheśvaras: Antecedents from the *Śivadharmaśāstra*

　　　　Centuries before the coalescence of the Vīramāheśvara tradition around the thirteenth century, numerous Śaiva lineages had already carved out an institutional domain at Srisailam. These religious networks spanned not only the central mountain peak, on which the Mallikārjuna Temple is located, but also the wilderness terrain in which it is embedded. Indeed, well before the rise of the Vīramāheśvaras, numerous religious communities, Śaiva and otherwise, had established monasteries throughout the extended sacred geography of the "auspicious mountain". In the thirteenth century, for instance, Srisailam was home to the regional branch of the Golaki Maṭha of the Śaiva Siddhāntins,[38] who held a dominant share in the transregional pilgrimage site, negotiating periodic alliances with the Kalachuri, Cōḷa, and Kākatīya kingdoms (Inden et al. 2000). The eastern Deccan, especially around Srisailam, was also well known for housing Kālamukha lineages of the Simha Pariṣad, who

---

36　Although insufficient work has as of yet been done on Māyīdeva, he appears to be the author both of the *Anubhavasūtra* and *Viśeṣārthaprakāśikā*, based on similar identificatory information at the outset of both works. While he may indeed have lived fairly early in Vīraśaiva history (ca. thirteenth/fourteenth century?), his writings are highly characteristic of a western Deccani Vīraśaiva context rather than of the Srisailam Vīramāheśvaras.

37　See Rao and Roghair (1990), p. 271, and *Caturvēdasāramu*, p. 3. What precisely Somanātha might mean by *śāmbhavadīkṣā* is not entirely clear. In the *Caturvēdasāramu*, Somanātha glosses the practice with the citation "vratam etac chāmbhavam". This passage, drawn from the *Kālāgnirudropaniṣad*, is also cited by the *Somanāthabhāṣya*, and is usually interpreted as referring to the practice of bearing the *tripuṇḍra*.

38　For more information about the earlier transregional Golaki Maṭhas of the Śaiva Siddhānta, see Sanderson (2012–2013) and Sears (2014). On the Golaki Maṭha in Andhra, see Talbot (1987).

appear often in the inscriptional record. Śākta transmissions of the Kālī Krama and the Paścimāmnāya were also in evidence.[39] Beyond the Śaiva and Śākta-Śaiva fold, Srisailam also fostered a shared Buddhist-Śaiva transmission of yogic practices; indeed, some of our richest understudied textual resources for the early development of Haṭha Yoga are in the vernacular languages of the Deccan, especially Marathi and Telugu.[40] Given the intense interest it generated across Śaiva communities, it is no surprise that Srisailam was the site at which the surviving Sanskrit Vīramāheśvara canon was first articulated. To the contrary, it is precisely the legacy of the Śaiva Age that made Vīraśaivism as we know it possible.

In the preceding discussion, space has only permitted us to scratch the surface of the textual canons that Pālkurikĕ Somanātha adapted in composing his Sanskrit and Telugu oeuvre. For example, he evidently felt no qualms about supplying material from the Śaiva Siddhānta where convenient.[41] Other texts cited by Somanātha, as we have seen, seem to have circulated within a more limited domain, possibly only within the extended coastal region of Andhra and through Orissa. Yet, Somanātha also inherits a far deeper legacy than his more temporally proximate Śaiva sources, such as the *Somaśambhupaddhati* or *Sūtasaṃhitā*. Most notably, we find a number of citations in the *Somanāthabhāṣya* from the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, perhaps the single most authoritative source for lay Śaiva *samaya* conduct dating back to the sixth or early seventh century (see for example Bisschop (2018) on the dating of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*). Indeed, many of those features of Vīraśaivism that scholars have viewed as "revolutionary" and "vernacular", including caste blindness among initiates, emotional or affective *bhakti*, reciting the stories of Śaiva saints, and the worship of the *jaṅgama*, or Vīraśaiva saint, as a moving *liṅga*, were not at all new to the twelfth or thirteenth centuries, but can be directly traced back to the *Śivadharmaśāstra* itself.[42] Other features of the *Śivadharma*, although less well known within the academic study of *bhakti* traditions, were equally foundational to the Vīramāheśvaras, including the belief that Śaiva saints were not at all natural or material (*prākṛta*) human beings but were rather incarnations of Śiva's *gaṇa*s on earth.[43] The original *Śivadharma* was couched in the form of a conversation between the sage Sanatkumāra and Nandikeśvara, the latter of whom, equated with the bull *gaṇa* Vṛṣabha, was later understood to be incarnated as Basava himself. We also find, throughout the *Śivadharma*, frequent usage of the term *śivayogin* (Kan. *śivayogi*) as a religious identity marker, which as Gil Ben-Herut has shown was employed abundantly within early Vīraśaiva literature in Kannada.

Succinctly, the *Śivadharma* was no minor influence on the Vīramāheśvaras. By now, that *Śivadharmaśāstra* citations appear within the Vīramāheśvara corpus is somewhat of an established fact rather than a new finding; I have already discussed this myself, for example, in Fisher (2019). Concerning the history of the *Śivadharma*, research has been well underway for some years aimed at producing a critical edition of the text itself and tracing the outsized influence of the scripture on the history of popular Śaivism. One particularly noteworthy example, in the present context, is the ongoing work of Florinda De Simini on the transmission of the *Śivadharma* and *Śivadharmottara* within vernacular currents of south Indian discourse. It may well be the case that the abundant *Śivadharma* citations preserved in the *Somanāthabhāṣya* can be of use in reconstructing the earlier history of what has often proved to be an unruly and heterogenous textual transmission. As this work is being conducted elsewhere, my project is not primarily to address the textual history of the *Śivadharma* itself. My project is, however, both in the present article and within my

---

[39]　See, for instance, Dyczkowski (2009), p. 108.

[40]　See, for instance, Jones (2018) on Gaurana's Telugu *Navanāthacaritramu*, and Mallinson (2019) on early vernacular texts that dialogue with Sanskrit sources on Haṭha Yoga.

[41]　While this matter will have to be discussed in future publications, a crucial example is the fact that Vīramāheśvaras drew on initiation rituals outside of the Śaiva Siddhānta tradition, despite the fact that a Saiddhāntika model was available to them in the *Somaśambhupaddhati*.

[42]　See below for some further discussion. These issues are also discussed in greater detail in my forthcoming book manuscript.

[43]　The goal of becoming a *gaṇa* in early Śaivism, specifically in the Nepalese recension of the *Skanda Purāṇa*, was discussed, for instance, by Yuko Yokochi (Yokochi 2018) in her talk at the 17th World Sanskrit Conference (7/11/18), "Mahaganapatir bhavet: Gana-hood as a religious goal in early Shaivism". Aside from the features mentioned in this paragraph, we also find some evidence that the practice of the ritual worship (*pūjā*) of scriptural texts (*śāsana*), explicitly discussed within the *Śivadharma*, may have continued under the Vīramāheśvaras (see De Simini (2016) for further discussion)

larger book project, to clarify something that has to date escaped scholarship on the history of Vīraśaivism. Specifically, on historical and philological grounds, we can demonstrate conclusively that early Vīraśaivism—including the *Somanāthabhāṣya* in particular—was constituted directly from the scriptural and cultural heritage of the Śaiva Age, not least among which is the *Śivadharma*. To make this case requires that I document, as I have begun to do in this article and in Fisher (2019), the distinctive religious sensibilities that early Vīraśaivas directly inherited from the *Śivadharma* and other earlier Śaiva sources.

In all likelihood, the Vīramāheśvara exegetes, and their predecessors, possessed far more than a casual acquaintance with the text of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*. Indeed, the *Somanāthabhāṣya* incorporates textual extracts from the *Śivadharma* significantly in excess of the verses attributed by name to that text in our available manuscripts. For instance, in one passage variously described as "Vīramāheśvaramāhātmya" or "Vīraśaivācāra", a significant portion of the *anuṣṭubh* passage consists of silent borrowings from the *Śivadharma*. This was not, then, simply a matter of searching for an authoritative proof-text readily at hand. Moreover, the fact that the Vīramāheśvaras were thinking systematically with the *Śivadharma* is illustrated by the fact that we can observe what seems to be textual drift, possibly deliberate, in the verses of the *Śivadharma* themselves. While further manuscript work is needed to confirm this point, we meet with some intriguing *Śivadharma* citations in both the *Somanāthabhāṣya* and the *Śaivaratnākara* that speak either to deliberate redaction of the text or spurious attributions. These verses, moreover, do not appear in the most widely attested recensions of the *Śivadharma*.[44]

> One should always bear the *nirmālya* out of devotion; one should not bear it out of greed.
> It is called *nirmālya* because it is stainless (*nirmala*). One with an impure body should not bear it.
> One should bear the *nirmālya* on the head, and one should also consume the *naivedya*.
> Having drunk the *prasāda* water, one obtains *gaṇa*-hood.[45]

Both of these two verses concern the subject of *nirmālya*, the leftover offerings of food, flower garlands, etc. from the worship of Śiva. By the thirteenth century, *nirmālya* had become a topic of contention within Śaiva discourse across lineages, with the Śaiva Siddhānta even taking deliberate pains to declare Śiva's *nirmālya* as impure, requiring the ritual intervention of shrines to Caṇḍeśvara to purify its contamination.[46] Nevertheless, following in the spirit of the earlier precedent set by the Pāśupatas, the Vīramāheśvaras took a strong stance on the matter by not only declaring *nirmālya* as inherently pure, but requiring that initiates offer all food to their personal *śivaliṅga*s before consumption such that it would become *nirmālya*. In contrast, the text we now associate with the most common recension of the *Śivadharma* does not provide any scriptural support for this practice. It is perhaps no surprise, then, that the redactors of the Vīramāheśvara canon would wish the *Śivadharma* to speak more forcefully in support of their position on the matter—and this is precisely what we find in the texts. In a similar vein, it is worth noting one additional verse attributed to the *Śivadharma* by both the *Somanāthabhāṣya* and the *Śaivaratnākara*, but this time with one crucial variant. The *Somanāthabhāṣya* reads: "One must not go to a place in which Śiva is not, where there are none of Śiva's people (*nāsti māheśvaro janaḥ*)".[47] The

---

44 Further manuscript work on the *Śaivaratnākara* will be necessary here, as well as on the *Śivadharma* itself. While I do not have access to all of the variants compiled by The Śivadharma Project, these verses do not appear in the published recension, *Paśupatimatam* of Naranarinatha, or in IFP transcript no. 72, copied from Adyar ms. no. 75425. I have not located these first two verses cited in any texts besides the *Somanāthabhāṣya* and the *Śaivaratnākara*.

45 The *Somanāthabhāṣya* preserves these two verses, not contiguously, which I have translated above: nirmālyaṃ dhārayen nityaṃ bhaktyā lobhān na dhārayet | nirmalatvāc ca nirmālyaṃ maladehī na dhārayet || nirmālyaṃ dhārayen mūrdhni naivedyaṃ cāpi bhakṣayet | tatprasādodakaṃ pītvā gāṇapatyam avāpnuyāt || The *Śaivaratnākara* also preserves both of these verses, the first as vs. 16.91 with the following variations: nirmalatvāc ca nirmālyaṃ maladehī na dhārayet | dhārayec chivanirmālyaṃ bhaktyā lobhān na dhārayet || and the second as vs. 16.124, with the following variations: nirmalatvāc ca nirmālyaṃ maladehī na dhārayet | dhārayec chivanirmālyaṃ bhaktyā lobhān na dhārayet ||

46 For further detail, see for example Goodall (2009).

47 The *Somanāthabhāṣya* reads: yasmin kṣetre śivo nāsti nāsti māheśvaro janaḥ | tac ca sthānaṃ na gaṃtavyam.

Śaivaratnākara, on the other hand, preserves this variant: "One must not go to a place in which Śiva is not, where there are no Vīramāheśvaras" (vīramāheśvaro janaḥ).[48] The fact that the phrase "nāsti māheśvaraḥ" appears to have been replaced in the *Śaivaratnākara* by "vīramāheśvaraḥ", a less desirable reading, suggests that the verse was modified either intentionally, or through textual drift within the community, to employ the community's term of self-reference, Vīramāheśvara. We do not, to clarify, have any evidence that the term Vīramāheśvara was employed in the original *Śivadharma*.[49]

It is abundantly clear, then, that the *Somanāthabhāṣya* and the Vīramāheśvara corpus were substantially indebted to the *Śivadharma*, and that they invoked—and possibly redacted—the *Śivadharma* to underpin the authority of their fledgling Śaiva community. What may be less well established, by this point, is the fact that Somanātha was no pioneer in his invocation of the *Śivadharmaśāstra* within the thirteenth-century Vīramāheśvara community. Rather, the *Śivadharmaśāstra* was already foundational to the incipient ethos of the Vīraśaivas, or Vīramāheśvaras, even before the community was known by either of those names. Rather, we can illustrate the continuous influence of the *Śivadharmaśāstra* on the emergent Vīraśaiva community by looking more closely at a predecessor to Pālkuriĕ Somanātha's works, namely, the Telugu *Śivatattvasāramu* of Mallikārjuna Paṇḍitārādhya. As of yet remarkably understudied for its contributions to Vīraśaiva thought, the *Śivatattvasāramu* is, like Somanātha's Telugu works, internally bilingual, even preserving direct citations from the *Śivadharmaśāstra* embedded in its Telugu verses. These citations, as well as paraphrased content, allow us to isolate certain elements of the *Śivadharma*'s worldview that were already prominent in the proto-Vīramāheśvara community before the time of Pālkuriĕ Somanātha.

The *Śivatattvasāramu* is a Telugu Śaiva verse work of which only 489 verses are currently thought to survive. What do we know, first of all, about Paṇḍitārādhya, purported author of the *Śivatattvasāramu*? Aside from being the subject about whom Pālkuriĕ Somanātha wrote the *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu*, the name Paṇḍitārādhya appears rather prolifically in the inscriptional record from the twelfth century onward. All things considered, Paṇḍitārādhya can be presumed, to the best of our evidence, to have been a historical personage and perhaps a late contemporary of Basava. Remembered as a native of Draksharama near Guntur in East Godavari District, Paṇḍitārādhya appears based on inscriptions to have been active in the Srisailam region in the late twelfth century.[50] We know little for sure about what Paṇḍitārādhya's doctrinal affiliation may have been, although Somanātha describes him as having studied under a certain Kōṭipalli Ārādhyadēva. As for his authorship of the *Śivatattvasāramu*, although we have no other substantial works attributed to him to compare, the author of the *Śivatattvasāramu* names himself as "Mallikārjuna Paṇḍita" within the text itself.[51] As scholars of Telugu literature have noted for some time, we also find a few direct citations of the *Śivatattvasāramu* within the *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu*, making it plausible to believe that the person Somanātha revered in this text was indeed the author of the *Śivatattvasāramu* (Lalitamba 1975, p. 40, ftn. 25).

A fair amount of ink has been spilled by scholars of Telugu literature questioning whether Paṇḍitārādhya was in fact a "Vīraśaiva", as the *Śivatattvasāramu* nowhere mentions

---

48　The *Śaivaratnākara* (17.40) reads: yatra kṣetre śivo nāsti vīramāheśvaro janaḥ | | tatra sthānaṃ na kartavyaṃ.

49　The following verse, however, does appear in the *Śivadharma*: sudūram api gantavyaṃ yatra māheśvaro janaḥ | prayatnenāpi draṣṭavyas tatra sannihito haraḥ | | (IFP Transcript 72, vs. 11.28). This same verse also appears later in the *Śaivaratnākara*, without a clear attribution of source (vs. 21.31).

50　For instance, an inscription on a stone slab found in Sangamesvaram, ten miles from Alampur, records a gift of land to Mallikārjuna Paṇḍita by Karṇāṭa Gōkarṇadeva, dated to 1187–1188 CE. *Hyderabad Archaeological Series* (HAS) vol. 19, p. 71 (Mn. 34). Another intriguing series of inscriptions speaks in the voice of a certain Vibhūti Gauraya, self-described as servant in the household of Paṇḍitārādhya of Srisailam: *śrīgiri-śṛṅgavāsi-śrīpaṇḍitārādhya-gṛhasthadāso*. SII XX No. 357, written in Kannada, Telugu, Tamil, and Nāgarī scripts; HAS vol. 19, p. 92 (Mn. 44); cited as ARE (Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy) 25 of 1993–1994. ARE 4 and 6 of 1993–1994; written in Telugu and Sanskrit (Nāgarī), with characters dated to the thirteenth century. See also HAS vol. 3, p. 12. We also find mention of a land grant to two of Paṇḍitārādhya's sons by the Kākatīya king Gaṇapati (r. 1199–1262); HAS vol. 13, pt. II, p. 4 (No. 1).

51　For other short works attributed to Paṇḍitārādhya, see Venkata Ravu, ed., *Śivatattvasāramu*, p. 33. The author of the *Śivatattvasāramu* names himself in vs. 387: ŏṃḍĕmi mallikārjuna, paṃḍituṃ ḍana numḍukaṃṭĕṃ pramathulalō ne, nnamḍŏkŏ nīyājñŏnnati, numḍaṃgaṃ gāṃtu nanikōrucuṃḍudu rudrā.

the names Vīraśaiva, Vīramāheśvara, or Liṅgāyat. Unfortunately, most of these debates have fixated on the question of whether or not the *Śivatattvasāramu* prescribes the bearing of the *iṣṭaliṅga*, as the term itself, and the related *prāṇaliṅga*, are also nowhere mentioned.[52] Although these two later concerns did become integral to Pālkurikĕ Somanātha's theology, the fixation on these two points within Telugu language scholarship has obscured the substantial doctrinal homologies between the *Śivatattvasāramu* and Pālkurikĕ Somanātha's works. The *Śivatattvasāramu* contains, for instance, a lengthy section in praise of Śiva's Pramathagaṇas, associating them as later Vīramāheśvara authors do with the narrative of the destruction of Dakṣa's sacrifice.[53] *Bhakti* as a religious value is celebrated at great length; indeed, we even find references to a number of the Śaiva saints whose stories Somanātha would later narrate in the *Basavapurāṇamu* and *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu*. The *Śivatattvasāramu* is equally insistent that caste distinctions must be totally prohibited among Śaiva initiates. Moreover, we even find noticeably proto-Vīraśaiva language, such as an invocation of the term *jaṅgama*. In short, the substantial points of overlap all have roots in the popular lay theology of the *Śivadharma*.

In the surviving portion of the *Śivatattvasāramu*, there are seven verses with direct—although deliberately fragmentary—quotations from the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, making it the most frequently cited Sanskrit work within the Telugu text. I have reproduced below in Appendix B all seven of these citations. Indeed, in some cases, knowledge of the original Sanskrit from the *Śivadharma* allows us to emend textual corruptions in the Telugu that the editors appear not to have noted. One *Śivadharma* verse, for instance, that appears to loom particularly large in Mallikārjuna Paṇḍitārādhya's imagination is the famous comparison between a dog cooker (*śvapacaḥ*) and a *caturvedī* brahmin, which asserts that commensality must be respected between Śaiva devotees, regardless of their caste origin: "Neither a Caturvedī nor a dog cooker who is my devotee is more dear to me. He may be given to, and taken from, and is to be worshipped as I am myself".[54] This *Śivadharma* verse apparently warrants enough attention that Paṇḍitārādhya weaves portions of this Sanskrit citation through a series of three verses in Telugu. In the process, Paṇḍitārādhya reveals that he is well aware of the lengthy history of anti-caste rhetoric within the Śaiva corpus; the necessity of erasing caste distinction among Śaiva initiates, for him, is clearly no "revolution", but rather an established point of doctrine.

To the best of our knowledge, then, it appears that *Śivadharma* vs. 1.36 conveys a fairly unambiguous literal meaning that was greeted favorably, and not undermined, by its interpretive communities. In other cases, what certain terms may have meant to an ideal reader of the *Śivadharma* in the sixth century is far less clear, and we would be wise to pause before reading back their Vīraśaiva meaning, iconic as it may be today, into the original scripture itself. For instance, Paṇḍitārādhya dwells over an extended series of Telugu verses on the concept of the *jaṅgama*, or "moving" *śivaliṅga*, which by the time of the nascent Vīraśaiva traditions unambiguously refers to a human devotee of Śiva, or Śaiva saint. One such Telugu verse in this passage, however, cites directly from the *Śivadharma*, while simultaneously paraphrasing the textual context of the citation. As Paṇḍitārādhya writes:

> The sentence "*liṅga*s are said to be twofold"
> States that if one does not worship the *jaṅgama liṅga*
> As prescribed, having undertaken ritual,
> *Pūjā*s and good deeds become fruitless.[55]

The *Śivadharma* verse cited reads as follows:

52 For a review of the Telugu literature discussing Paṇḍitārādhya's religious identity, see Lalitamba (1975), Chp. 4.
53 The discussion of the Pramathagaṇas and the destruction of Dakṣa's sacrifice by Vīrabhadra spans the verses of the *Śivatattvasāramu* between vs. 300 and 388.
54 IFP Transcript 72, vs. 1.36: na me priyaś caturvedī madbhaktaḥ śvapaco 'pi vā | tasmai deyaṁ tato grāhyaṁ sa saṁpūjyo yathā hy aham | |
55 *Śivatattvasāramu* vs. 156: kriyagŏna jaṁgamaliṁgamu | niyatiṁ būjiṁpaṁḍēni niṣphalamulu sa | tkriyalunuṁ būjalu "liṁga | dvayaṁ samākhyātam" anina vākyamu mrōyun. I have emended "samakhyātam" in the Telugu to "samākhyātam" as is expected by Sanskrit grammar and metrics.

*Liṅga*s are said to be twofold (*liṅgadvayaṃ samākhyātam*): the moving and
  non-moving.
The moving is known as "conviction" (*pratīti*). The non-moving is in the case
  of [*liṅga*s] made of earth and so forth.[56]

In this Telugu verse, Paṇḍitārādhya's point seems to revolve not much around the
verse that is actually cited as much as around another slightly subsequent Śivadharma verse,
which states that the fixed (*sthāvara*) *liṅga* is useless without the moving (*jaṅgama*) *liṅga*:
"Through disrespect of the *jaṅgama*, the *sthāvara* becomes fruitless. Therefore, the wise one
should never disrespect the pair of *liṅga*s".[57] We may assume, then, that Paṇḍitārādhya
intends to invoke for his readers not simply the verse cited, but the wider discursive
context of the twofold typology of *liṅga*s as discussed in the *Śivadharma*. As with all of his
partial citations, the meaning of the *Śivadharma* verses cannot be coherently read without
background knowledge simply from the elliptical Sanskrit provided. In this respect,
Paṇḍitārādhya's multilingual idiom appears to have been a foundational influence on
Somanātha's Telugu works, which also weave partial Sanskrit quotations directly into the
Telugu grammar of his *dvipada*s. Thus, succinctly, the *Śivatattvasāramu* reveals a discursive
world in which the *Śivadharma* was quite well known to his intended audience. He intends,
evidently, not to teach something his audience has never encountered before, but to evoke
a scriptural canon they can instantly recall even from the mention of a few key words. If
the *Śivadharma* was, then, not new for Pālkurikĕ Somanātha's audience, it was likely not a
novel source of inspiration in Paṇḍitārādhya's generation either.

Now, the fact that the term *jaṅgama* predates the advent of Vīraśaivism proper is, in
and of itself, not a new finding. In fact, David Lorenzen has already discussed this in
his landmark study of the Kālamukhas, noting where the term *jaṅgama* appears in our
inscriptional record as associated with Kālamukha institutions. The *Śivadharma* verses
that mention this term, however, are ambiguous: is a "moving" *liṅga* a human saint,
or a portable miniature *śivaliṅga*? Within the Vīramāheśvara context, for instance, the
related word, *caraliṅga* ("moving *liṅga*") retained the separate meaning of a portable
śivaliṅga, since we are provided with detailed measurements of its allowable dimensions
(Fisher 2019, pp. 32–33.). As of yet, we know relatively little about which interpretation of
the term *jaṅgama* or *jaṅgamaliṅga* would have been most current in distinct pre-Vīraśaiva
historical and discursive contexts. Indeed, the original Śivadharma verse itself does
not precisely inspire confidence that *jaṅgama* was originally, in all cases, intended to
mean a moving saint, as "*pratīti*", the term used in the definition of the "moving *liṅga*"
(*caraṃ pratītivikhyātam*), does not conventionally have that meaning. Nevertheless, in the
spirit of Lorenzen's inscriptional evidence, the testimony of the *Śivadharmavivaraṇa*, a rare
commentarial voice from the tradition, also suggests that the concept of the *jaṅgama* was a
decidedly pre-Vīraśaiva development: "Intending to articulate that the Māheśvaras also
are to be respected like Śiva himself, [the text] points out that they, also, are considered
*liṅga*s".[58]

But what, then, does the term *jaṅgama* mean for Paṇḍitārādhya? While he does not
definitively state his position in the *Śivatattvasāramu*, the nearby context of the Telugu verse
cited above suggests that the term *jaṅgama* did refer to a Śaiva devotee, as the verse appears
immediately after a discussion of the *pūjā* of the Śivabhaktas themselves:

Without having worshipped the Śivabhaktas,

Having performed many crores of *pūjā*s to Śiva

Is useless. To worship the Śivabhaktas

---

56 IFP Transcript 72, vs. 3.56–57: liṅgadvayaṃ samākhyātaṃ caraṃ cācaram eva ca | | caraṃ pratītivikhyātam acaraṃ pārthivādiṣu |
57 IFP Transcript 72, vs. 3.59: jaṅgamasyāvamānena sthāvaraṃ niṣphalaṃ bhavet | tasmāl liṅgadvayaṃ prājño nāvamanyeta paṇḍitaḥ | | Narahari-
  natha, *Paśupatimatam* vs. 3.58: jaṅgamasyāpamānena sthāvaro niṣphalo bhavet | tasmāl liṅgadvayaṃ prājño nāvamanyeta jātucit | |
58 *Śivadharmavivaraṇa* on vs. 3.56: śivavan māheśvarānām api sammānyatvaṃ vivakṣaṃs, teṣāṃ liṅgatvam iti diśati | On how one ought to interpret
  the potentially obscure term *pratīti*, the *Śivadharmavivaraṇa* writes as a commentary on vs. 3.57: pratītivikhyātaṃ pratyakṣasiddhidaṃ śivapratīnāṃ
  laukikavṛṣṭigocaratayā vartamānatvāt | For more on the *Śivadharmavivaraṇa*, see for instance Schwartz (2021), chp. 3.

Is to perform crores of *pūjā*s to Śiva, O Rudra.[59]

Thus, the *Śivatattvasāramu* provides us with evidence that the *jaṅgama* had already acquired its conventional meaning as a human saint, and moreover, the text understood this meaning to be associated with the interpretive traditions of the *Śivadharma*. A further intriguing example occurs in a citation preserved in Jyotirnātha's *Śaivaratnākara*, where we meet with a variant reading for this very same *Śivadharma* verse. As Jyotirnātha cites: "There are said to be two types of *liṅga*s: the moving and non-moving. The non-moving is made of earth and so forth. The moving is known as the *guest* (*atithi*)". Although we cannot as of yet be certain if the verse was already modified in Jyotirnātha's text at the time of composition, this seemingly minor variant is doing significant interpretive work: while the original verse may also refer to a portable *śivaliṅga*, the *Śaivaratnākara* restricts possible interpretations with the word "guest" (*atithi*) to provide an impeccable scriptural precedent for the worship of the human *jaṅgama*.[60] Whether further manuscript research locates this shift at the text's inception or in later textual drift, this *Śivadharma* verse provides an intriguing snapshot of textual redaction in process. It does suggest, in either case, that early Vīraśaiva exegetes were uncomfortable with the ambiguity in the original *Śivadharma*, and saw that text as the ideal authenticator of Vīraśaivism's new approaches to Śaiva praxis.

According to our textual evidence, then, the *jaṅgama* as moving *liṅga* was one of many concepts the Vīramāheśvara tradition shares with the Śaiva Age interpretive tradition of the *Śivadharma*. Should we conclude, then, that the *Śivadharma* was the sole proximate source for the entrée of these doctrinal elements into Vīraśaivism? As it turns out, textual evidence from further south in the Tamil country complicates matters a bit further. An epigraph preserved from the reign of Kulōttuṅga Cōḻa explicitly mentions the patronage of a group known as Vīramāheśvaras.[61] This reference, however, contains little contextual information as to what sort of religious practice these "Vīramāheśvas" may have advocated. We do, however, possess an external source for this evidence, brief as it is, from a Śaiva doxography that seems likely to date back to the Cōḻa period in question. A circa seventeenth-century Tamil work, a commentary on the *Ñāṉāvaraṇaviḷakkam* by Vĕḷḷiyampalavāṇar, preserves an extensive Sanskrit citation from a work entitled the *Sarvasiddhāntaviveka*,[62] in which we meet with a description of a group of Mahāvratins who espouse a form of practice reminiscent of early Vīraśaivism. According to the *Sarvasiddhāntaviveka*, these Mahāvratins appear to advocate the bearing of the personal *liṅga* (*liṅgadhāraṇā*) as a central religious practice, and insist that the *liṅga* must be borne on the body only above the navel.[63] The Srisailam Vīramāheśvaras attribute just such a restriction to the *Vātulatantra*, a text that the Tamil commentator Vĕḷḷiyampalavāṇar describes as a "Mahāvratatantra".[64] But moreover, and crucially for the present instance, the *Sarvasiddhāntaviveka* also links the practice of *liṅgadhāraṇā* explicitly with devotion to *jaṅgama*s. As the verses in question pair the term

---

[59] *Śivatattvasāramu* vs. 155: śivabhaktulaṁ būjiṁpaka | śivapūjalu gōṭividhulaṁ jēsina vr̥tha yā | śivabhaktulaṁ būjiṁpuṭa | śivapūjalaṁ gōṭividhulaṁ jēyuṭa rudrā | |

[60] Jyotirnātha cites from the *Śivadharma* (19.4): liṅgadvayaṁ samākhyātaṁ caraṁ cācaram eva ca | caraṁ cātithivikhyātam acaraṁ pārthivādikam | | IFP Transcript no. 72, vs. 3.56–57: liṅgadvayaṁ samākhyātaṁ caraṁ cācarameva ca | caraṁ pratītivikhyātam acaraṁ pārthivātmakam | | Naraharinatha, *Paśupatimatam*, *Śivadharmaśāstra* vs. 3.56: liṅgadvayaṁ samākhyātaṁ sacarācaram eva ca | caraṁ prāṇeti vikhyātam acaraṁ pārthivādiṣu | | Although I have no further information about the prevalence of this variant, the appearance of the term "*prāṇa*" in Naraharinatha's text is quite interesting, as Vīramāheśvaras commonly referred to the *iṣṭaliṅga* granted upon initiation with the term "*prāṇaliṅga*."

[61] See ARE 111 of 1893, published in Epigraphia Indica vol. 6, p. 276.

[62] The text of the *Sarvasiddhāntaviveka*, as preserved by Vĕḷḷiyampalavāṇar, is reconstructed in Nagaswamy (2006), *Art and Religion of the Bhairavas*. Nagaswamy dates the *Sarvasiddhāntaviveka* to the eleventh century, as the author of the text describes himself as a disciple of the author of the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*. See Nagaswamy (2006) p. 42. The *Ñāṉāvaraṇaviḷakkam* is a text of the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta lineage, authored by Ñāṉacampantamūrtikaḷ of the Tarumapuram Ātīṉam. Other elements of Vĕḷḷiyampalavāṇar's knowledge of Vīraśaivism prove quite informative as to what textual knowledge had been imported into Tamil discourse by the seventeenth century. For instance, he cites a Tamil work entitled the *Navaliṅkalīlai*, which, based on the summary of Nagaswamy (p. 30), is clearly highly indebted to the *Anubhavasūtra* of Māyīdeva. Further research is needed on this matter.

[63] On the bearing of the *liṅga* above the waist, the *Somanāthabhāṣya* preserves the following verse attributed to the *Vātulatantra*: nābher adho liṅgadhārī pāpmanā 'pi sa ucyate | nābhyūrdhvaṁ liṅgadhārī ca saubhāgyajñānavardhanaḥ | | The *Śaivaratnākara* (14.27) also preserves this verse, attributed to "another text" (*granthāntare*). I have discussed similar textual passages from the Vīramāheśvara corpus in Fisher (2019) to underscore the centrality of *liṅgadhāraṇā* to Vīramāheśvara praxis.

[64] See Nagaswamy, *Art and Religion of the Bhairavas*, p. 29, as well as ftn. 66 p. 38.

jaṅgama directly with the term *guru*, clearly a human figure, it appears that the "moving *liṅga*" quite clearly depicted the human Śaiva devotee for this audience:

> He always bears the *liṅga* on his own head, or his shoulders,
>
> Or on other places above the navel, such as the heart, etc., according to the *śāstra*.
>
> Liberation [derives] from bearing the *liṅga*; how much more so from the worship of men?
>
> As with devotion to Śiva, so with devotion to the guru and the *jaṅgama*s.
>
> Even so, devotion to the *jaṅgama* is called the "particular" (*viśeṣa*).
>
> Those who are intent on the daily rituals and so forth stated in the *śāstra* known as the Great Vow (*mahāvrata*)
>
> Set forth for liberation in a single lifetime. Thus, here [on earth], they are "those of the Great Vow".[65]

In other words, given this contextualizing information, it would appear overly facile simply to conclude that the theology of the *jaṅgama* was inherited by early Vīraśaivas directly from the raw text of the *Śivadharmaśāstra* without any textual or institutional intermediaries. As we have seen, the early interpretive context for these *Śivadharma* verses does attest to the fact that the *jaṅgama* was previously understood in the Vīraśaiva sense as a human saint. Moreover, while at this time the evidence available to us is fragmentary, the Vīraśaiva understanding of the term *jaṅgama* can also be traced through at least one intermediary discursive context in circa twelfth-century Tamil region, in which other practices favored by the Srisailam Vīramāheśvaras, such as *liṅgadhāraṇā*, seem to already be associated with each other. Yet the term *liṅgadhāraṇā*, central as it had become even to early Vīraśaivism, is *not* attested in the *Śivadharma* itself as a component of lay Śaiva practice, nor are the names later attributed to the miniature *liṅga* borne on the body.

The *iṣṭaliṅga*, or personal aniconic image of Śiva, is today quite renowned as a definitive marker of Vīraśaiva religiosity: initiates are generally obligated to wear around their necks a miniature *śivaliṅga* imparted to them upon initiation, and for which they traditionally perform daily *pūjā*, enshrined in the base that is the palm of the hand (*karābjapīṭha*). The Srisailam Vīramāheśvaras frequently invoke the concept of the *iṣṭaliṅga*, most frequently referred to as the *prāṇaliṅga* or *sveṣṭaliṅga*. While the Vīramāheśvara terms for such a personal *liṅga* do not appear in the *Śivadharma* nor its successors, they do appear in other sources that were directly known to the *Somanāthabhāṣya*, including the *Somaśambhupaddhati*. Likewise, preserved within Vīramāheśvara texts, these terms appear in non-Saiddhāntika ritual procedures, such as initiation (*dīkṣā*), which may originally derive from a Kālamukha, or perhaps a similar Mahāvratin lineage of transmission. This discrepancy underscores the fact that other foundational Vīraśaiva ritual elements cannot be traced to the *Śivadharma*, and must be excavated elsewhere within the sources cited by Somanātha and his successors.

These and other related issues will be discussed at greater length in other contexts, but suffice it to say for the present moment, an excavation of the Śaiva Age precurrents of Vīraśaivism cannot be limited to the *Śivadharma*. While I hope to expand upon these findings in future publications, the following points should, I hope, be clear from the present article: (1) early Vīramāheśvara texts such as the *Somanāthabhāṣya* drew substantially upon the textual resources of the Śaiva Age and their religious systems of value, including, but not limited to, the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, and (2) the recovery of the history of this inheritance is best approached by bringing both Sanskrit and vernacular textual evidence into dialogue.

---

[65] As cited from the *Sarvasiddhāntaviveka*, reconstructed in Nagaswamy, *Art and Religion of the Bhairavas*, p. s-12, vs. 116–119: liṅgadhārī sadā svasya mastake kandhare 'thavā || nābher ūrdhvaṃ yathāśāstraṃ sthāneṣu hṛdayādiṣu | liṅgasya dhāraṇān muktiḥ kiṃ punaḥ pujayā nṛṇām || yathā śive tathā bhaktir gurau vai jaṅgameṣu ca | tathāpi jaṅgame bhaktir viśeṣa iti kathyate || mahāvratākhyaśāstroktanityakarmāditatparāḥ | ekena janmanā muktiṃ prayāntīha mahāvratāḥ | By the word "particular" (*viśeṣaḥ*), the *Sarvasiddhāntaviveka* would appear to suggest that the worship of the *jaṅgama* is a higher or more exclusive form of practice reserved for a particular tier of initiates.

In the thirteenth century, after all, Śaivism was not exclusively entextualized in Sanskrit, and *bhakti* was not exclusively expressed in the vernacular.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Appendix A

Example of Parallels in the *Somanāthabhāṣya* and *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu*
Matching citations will be indicated in bold below.

Citations of a series of visualization verses. Note that these extracts appear in distinct sections in the two texts: specifically, in the "Vibhūtimāhātmya" of the *Somanāthabhāṣya*, and in the "Rudrākṣamahima" (Skt. Rudrākṣamahimā) section of the *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu*.

Somanāthabhāṣya:[66]

rudrākṣavalayaḥ śubhro **jaṭājūṭavirājitaḥ** ‖
bhasmāvaliptasarvāṅgaḥ kamaṇḍalukarānvitaḥ ।
kṛṣṇājinopavitāṅgaḥ adoṣī puṇyakīrtanaḥ ‖
āsevate mahādevaḥ yogināṃ hṛdayālayam ‖
    iti tatraiva **praṇavavyāvarṇanam** ‖
rudrākṣabhūṣaṇā sarva**jaṭāmaṇḍaladhāriṇī** ।
akṣamālārpitakarā kamaṇḍalukarānvitā ‖
tripuṇḍrāvaliyuktāṅgī āṣāḍhena virājitā ।
ṛgyajuḥsāmarūpeṇa sevate sma maheśvaraṃ ‖
    tathaiva **gāyatrīvyāvarṇanaṃ** tatraiva ‖
śubhratripuṇḍrāni śubhāni tiryag**rakṣābhir uddhūlita**sarvagātraḥ ।
rudrākṣamālāvimalaś ca bibhran tādṛgvidhaiḥ śiṣyagaṇair munīndraḥ ‖
    iti tatraiva **vedavyāsamunivyāvarṇanam** ‖
saṃstūyamāno dīptāṅgair devair munigaṇais tathā ।
dhṛta**tripuṇḍrako divyai rudrākṣaiś** ca vibhūṣitaḥ ‖
śuśubhe satataṃ viṣṇur bhasmadigdhatanūruhaḥ ।
tripuṇḍrāṅkitasarvāṅgo jaṭāmaṇḍalamaṇḍitaḥ ‖
    iti **tatraiva viṣṇuvyāvarṇanam** ‖
ityādiśrutismṛtītihāsāgamapurāṇavacanodīritasitabhasitatripuṇḍrahīnāś ca ye
santi te na darśanīyā na saṃbhāṣyāḥ ‖
iti śrīvīramāheśvarācārasāroddhāre basavarājīye somanāthabhāṣye vibhūtimāhā-
tmyaṃ nāma dvitīyaprakaraṇaṃ sampūrṇam ‖

Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu:[67]

... yiṭlu

mariyuṁ burāṇāgama śruti smṛtulu-

nara lēka cĕppu rudrākṣa kalpamula-

n adigāka bhūti rudrākṣamul dālci

vadalaka śivuṁ gŏlpuvārala vinuṁḍu

acalitaprīti brahmāṁḍapurāṇa

vacanambu "**rudrākṣavalayā**" yanaṁgaṁ

brati "**jaṭājūṭavirājita**" yana, vi-

ratiṁ "dripuṁḍrēna virājita" yana, ma-

lina mēdi "**bhasmāvaliptasarvāṁga**"

yanaṁganŏppuṁ **braṇavavyāvarṇanaṁbu**

vŏgaḍaṁga "**rudrākṣabhūṣaṇā**" yanaṁgaṁ

daga "**jaṭāmaṁḍaladhāriṇī**" yanaṁgaṁ

darin "**akṣamālārpitakarā**" yanaṅga

neri "**gamaṇḍalu karānvitā**" yanaṅga

nuruṁ "**dripuṁḍrāvaḷiyuktāṁgi**" yanaṁga

guri "**ṛgyajussāmaghōṣēṇa**" yanaṁga

nila "**sēvatē sma mahēśvaram**" anaṁga

nalaruṁ dā **gāyatrivyāvarṇanaṁbu**

ratiṁ "dripuṁḍrēna virājita" yanaṁga

vratayukti "rudrākṣavalayā" yanaṁga

sŏgasi "**śubhrō jaṭājūṭa**" yanaṁga[68]

vagavaṁga nadi gratuvyāvarṇanaṁbu

sariṁ "dripuṁḍrōdbhāsi sarvāṁga" yana na

mari yaṁda "rudrākṣamaṁḍanair" anaṁga

vaḍi vāyavīyasāvarṇisaṁhitala

saḍisana nidiyuṁ dā samidabhidhāna

dēvatāvyāvarṇanāvṛtti yanaṁgaṁ

dā vĕṁḍiyuṁ burāṇatatulalōṁ dĕlpu

sariṁ "dripuṇḍrāṁkitasarvāṁgi" yana na

mari yaṁda "rudrākṣamaṁḍanair" anaṁga

nadigāka mŏdala "śuddhātmā" yanaṁga

nadĕ vaṣaḍḍēvatāvyāvarṇanaṁbu

diviri "**tripuṁḍrakō divyair**" anaṁga

naviraḷaprīti "**rudrākṣaiś ca**" anaṁga

dudi "**śuśubhē satatō viṣṇur**" anaṁga

nadiyu "**bhasmasnigdham**" anaṁga nav **viṣṇu**

vyāvarṇanamu yajurvyāvarṇanaṁbu

śaivādulaṁdiṭlu sāṁgamai mariyuṁ

pōlaṁga "**śubhratripuṁḍrāṇi**" yanaṁga

līla "**rakṣābhir uddhūḷita**" yanaṁga

---

67 *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu*, pp. 11–12.
68 This citation appears identical to the one above, but I have only noted the parallel once.

manasiḍi "**rudrākṣamālā**" yanu va-
canamu "rudrāṃś ca pañcabrahma" yanaṁ da-
gili "yatharvaśiraśśikhē" yanunivi mŏ-
dalaṁ dudaṁ bĕnaṁga raudramula maṃtramula
velayuṁ "baṃcākṣarīm vidyām" anaṃga
nŏlaya ṣaḍakṣariyunu japiṃcucunu
niṭaṁ "būjayēt paramēśvaram" anaṃga
sphuṭabhakti nīśvarapūjābhiniratuṁ
ḍanaṁga nā**vyāsuni vyāvarṇanaṃbu**
munu gāśikākhaṃḍamunaṁ jĕppu maṟiyu
bhuvinŏppa "rudrākṣabhūṣaṇā" yanaṁga
navuṁ "dripuṃḍrālaṃkṛtāṃgāś ca" yanaṁgaṁ
bŏrin "akṣamālāvibhūṣitā" yanaṁga
narudugā svāyambhuvādi manuvula
vyāvarṇanamu sĕppuṁ gāvuna niṭṭu
lāvidhi viśṣṇu . . .

Appendix B

Citations from the *Śivadharmaśāstra* in the *Śivatattvasāramu* of Mallikārjuna Paṇḍitārā-
dhya:

Vs. 114, parallel to *Śivadharma* 1.36
bhaktiya mukti tĕruvu vi
dhyuktamuga "na mē ya priya caturvēdā" "ma
dbhaktaś ca śucī" yanu nā
sūkti pradhānammugāṁ baśūttamula kajā[69]

Vs. 115, parallel to *Śivadharma* 1.36
kŏnunadi bhaktuni cētana
dhana matanika yiccunadiyu "tasmai dēyaṃ"
baniyunu "tasmād grāhyaṃ"
baniyunu gala daniri vēdabhaktividhijñul'

vs. 116, parallel to *Śivadharma* 1.36
katha lēṭiki "sa ca pūjyō
yathā hyāham" manina vidhiyathārthamugā ma-
nmathamardana, nī bhaktulaṁ
brathitaṃbuga nīva kāṁga bhāviṃtu śivā

Vs. 156, parallel to *Śivadharma* 3.56
kriyagŏna jaṃgamaliṃgamu
niyatiṃ būjiṃpaṃḍēni niṣphalamulu sa-

---

[69] As noted above, the Sanskrit citation preserved in the printed editions has been corrupted from the following: na me priyaś caturvedī madbhaktaḥ śvapaco 'pi vā.

tkriyalunuṁ būjalu "liṁga-

dvayaṃ samākhyātam" anina vākyamu mrōyun

Vs. 181, parallel to *Śivadharma* 1.28

praṇutiṃpa "na mē bhaktāḥ

praṇaśyaṃti" yanaṃgaṁ daginapalukunakuṁ dagan

gaṇanātha bhaktaciṃtā

maṇi rakṣiṃpavĕ yapāramahimādhārā[70]

Vs. 203, parallel to *Śivadharma* 11.28

anaghulaṁ gēvalabhaktulaṁ

nanuṣaktiṃ gani "sudūram api gantavyam"

mana darśiṃcinaṁ jāladĕ

gŏnakŏni śivuṁ jūḍa vēṟa kōraṁga nēlā

Vs. 210, parallel to *Śivadharma* 3.55

sphuṭaśivatāṃtrikuṁ ḍapagata

kuṭilātmakuṁḍu dhariyiṃcu gōtramun ĕllaṃ

baṭugati "rajjuḥ kūpād

ghaṭaṃ yathā" yanina sūkti gāraṇa maguṭan

References
Primary Sources

Barnett, Lionel D. *Inscriptions at Palampet and Uparpalli. Hyderabad Archaeological Series*, vol. 3. Hyderabad: Nizam's Government, 1919.
Haradatta, *Caturvedatātparyasaṅgraha*.
    Ed. P. A. Ramasamy Sastri, with the *Caturvedatātparyacandrikā* of Śivaliṅgabhūpāla. Kumbakonam: Sri Vidya Press, ND.
    Institut français de Pondichéry, Transcript no. 1059.
Hultzsch, E., ed. 1899. *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. 6. New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India, 1899.
Jyotirnātha, *Śaivaratnākara*.
    Ed. Mallikarjuna Sastri. Solapur: Virasaivalingibrahmanagranthamala, 1910.
    Ed. C. N. Basavaraju. Mysore: University of Mysore Oriental Research Institute, 1992.
    Institut français de Pondichéry, Transcript no. 0497.
    Institut français de Pondichéry, Transcript no. 0923.
Katti, Madhav N. *Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy for 1993–1994*. New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India, 1999.
Mallikārjuna Paṇḍitārādhya, *Śivatattvasāramu*.
    Ed. Nidudavolu Venkataravu. Krsnapatika Karyalayamu, 1968.
    Chennai: Andhra Sahitya Parisattu, 1922.
Nīlakaṇṭha Nāganātha, *Vīramāheśvarācārasaṅgraha*. Ed. Mallikarjuna Sastri. 3 vols. Solapur: Virasaivalingibrahmanagranthamala, 1906.
Pālkurikĕ Somanātha, *Basavapurāṇamu*. Ed. Guda Venkata Subrahamanyam. Hyderabad: Kalabhavanamu, 1969.
Pālkurikĕ Somanātha, *Caturvēdasāramu*. Ed. Bandaru Tammayyagaru. Vijayawada: Calavadiracayya, 1962.
Pālkurikĕ Somanātha, *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritra*. Ed. Cilukuri Narayanaravu. Hyderabad: Telugu Visvavidyalaya, 1990.
Pālkurikĕ Somanātha, *Somanāthabhāṣya*.
    Ed. Mallampalli Bhairavamurtyaradhya. *Śrī Somanāthabhāṣya*. Masulipatam: Sribhairavamudraksarasala, 1914.
    Adyar Library and Research Centre, Ms. No. DX 864.
    Baroda Oriental Research Institute, Ms. No. II 7116.
    Bibliothèque nationale de France, Sanscrit no. 1043.
    Government Oriental Manuscripts Library in Madras, Ms. No. D 5493.
    Institut français de Pondichéry, Transcript no. T0330.

---

[70] The edition of Venkataravu preserves a singular reading in the Sanskrit (na me bhaktaḥ pranaśyati) while the 1922 Chennai edition preserves the plural (na me bhaktāḥ pranaśyanti).

Mysore Oriental Research Institute ND XII, Ms. No. 41084, 41085, 40186.

Śivadharmaśāstra.

Institut français de Pondichéry, Transcript no. 72b, copied from GOML Madras No. 75429.

In Naraharinatha, Yogi, ed. *Paśupatimatam Śivadharmamahāśāstram Paśupatināthadarśanam.* Kathmandu: Brhadadhyatmikaparishadah, 1998.

Śivadharmavivaraṇa. Trivandrum Oriental Research Institute, Ms. No. 12766B.

Sreenivasachar, P. *A Corpus of Inscriptions in the Telingana Districts of H.E.H. the Nizam's Dominions*, pts. 1–3. *Hyderabad Archaeological Series*, vol. 13 and 19. Hyderabad: Nizam's Government, 1942, 1956.

Bibliography

Barois, Christèlle. 2013. La Vāyavīyasaṃhitā: Doctrine et Rituels Shivaïtes en Contexte Puranique. Ph.D. dissertation, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris, France.

Ben-Herut, Gil. 2015. Figuring the South-Indian Śivabhakti Movement: The Broad Narrative Gaze of Early Kannada Hagiographical Literature. *The Journal of Hindu Studies* 8: 274–95. [CrossRef]

Ben-Herut, Gil. 2018. *Śiva's Saints: The Origins of Devotion in Kannada according to Harihara's Ragaḷegaḷu.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Birch, Jason. 2019. The Amaraughaprabodha: New Evidence on the Manuscript Transmission of an Early Work on Haṭha- and Rājayoga. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 47: 947–77. [CrossRef]

Birch, Jason. 2020. The Quest for Liberation-in-Life: A Survey of Early Works on Haṭha- and Rājayoga. In *The Oxford History of Hinduism in Practice.* Edited by Gavin Flood. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bisschop, Peter. 2018. *Universal Śaivism: The Appeasement of All Gods and Powers in the Śāntyadhyāya of the Śivadharmaśāstra.* Leiden: Brill.

Burchett, Patton. 2019. *A Genealogy of Devotion: Bhakti, Tantra, Yoga, and Sufism in North India.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Chandra Shobhi, Prithvi Datta. 2005. Pre-Modern Communities and Modern Histories: Narrating Vīraśaiva and Lingayat Selves. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA.

Cox, Whitney. 2016. *Modes of Philology in Medieval South India.* Leiden: Brill.

De Simini, Florinda. 2016. *Of Gods and Books: Ritual and Knowledge Transmission in the Manuscript Cultures of Premodern India.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Dyczkowski, Mark. 2009. *Manthānabhairavatantram, Kumārikākhaṇḍaḥ: The Section Concerning the Virgin Goddess of the Tantra of the Churning Bhairava*; New Delhi: IGNCA, vol. 1.

Fisher, Elaine. 2019. The Tangled Roots of Vīraśaivism: On the Vīramāheśvara Textual Culture of Srisailam. *History of Religions* 59: 1–37. [CrossRef]

Goodall, Dominic. 2009. Who is Caṇḍeśa? In *Genesis and Development of Tantrism.* Edited by Shingo Einoo. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture.

Hawley, John Stratton. 2015. *A Storm of Songs: India and the Idea of the Bhakti Movement.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Inden, Ronald, Jonathan Walters, and Daud Ali. 2000. *Querying the Medieval: Texts and the History of Practices in South Asia.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Jones, Jamal. 2018. A Poetics of Power in Andhra, 1323-1450 CE. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA.

Jones, Jamal. 2020. Yogis Empowered and Imperiled in the Telugu Account of the Nine Naths. Paper presented at the School of Oriental and African Studies, London, UK, April 11.

Lalitamba, K. 1975. Virasaivism in Andhra. Ph.D. dissertation, Karnatak University, Dharwar, India.

Lorenzen, David. 1991. *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas: Two Lost Śaivite Sects*, 2nd ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, First published in 1972.

Mallinson, James. 2019. Kālavañcana in the Konkan: How a Vajrayāna *Haṭhayoga* Tradition Cheated Buddhism's Death in India. *Religions* 10: 273. [CrossRef]

Michael, R. Blake. 1983. Foundational Myths of Two Denominations of Vīraśaivism: Viraktas and Gurusthalins. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 42: 309–22. [CrossRef]

Nagaswamy, R. 2006. *Art and Religion of the Bhairavas Illuminated by Two Rare Sanskrit Texts, Sarva-Siddhānta-Viveka and Jñānasiddhi.* Mayiladuturai: Dharmapuram Adheenam.

Nandimath, S. C. 1942. *A Handbook of Vīraśaivism.* Dharwad: L. E. Association.

Ollett, Andrew. 2017. *Language of the Snakes: Prakrit, Sanskrit, and the Language Order of Premodern India.* Oakland: University of California Press.

Ramanujan, A. K. 1973. Introduction. In *Speaking of Śiva.* New York: Penguin Books.

Velcheru Narayana Rao, and Gene Roghair, trans. 1990, *Śiva's Warriors: The Basavapurāṇamu of Pālkuriki Somanātha.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rao, Velcheru Narayana, and David Shulman. 2012. *Śrīnātha: The Poet Who Made Gods and Kings.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Reddy, Prabhavati C. 2014. *Hindu Pilgrimage: Shifting Patterns of Worldview of Srisailam in South India.* New York: Routledge.

Sanderson, A. 2007. Atharvavedins in Tantric Territory: The Āṅgirasakalpa texts of the Oriya Paippalādins and their Connection with the Trika and the Kālīkula, with critical editions of the Parājapavidhi, the Parāmantravidhi, and the *Bhadrakālīmantravidhiprakaraṇa. In *Atharvaveda and its Paippalada Sakha: Historical and Philological Papers on the Vedic Tradition.* Edited by A. Griffiths and A. Schmiedchen. Aachen: Shaker Verlag, pp. 195–311.

Sanderson, Alexis. 2009. The Śaiva Age: The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism During the Early Medieval Period. In *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Edited by Shingo Einoo. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Institute of Oriental Culture.

Sanderson, Alexis. 2012–2013. The Śaiva Literature. *Journal of Indological Studies* 24–25: 1–113.

Schwartz, Jason. 2021. Ending the Śaiva Age: The Universalization of Hindu Dharma and Its Impact on the Medieval Social Imaginary. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA, USA.

Sears, Tamara. 2014. *Worldly Gurus and Spiritual Kings: Architecture and Asceticism in Medieval India*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Shanthamurthy, Shubha. 2015. An epigraphical account of the Śaiva institutions in and around Baḷḷigāve (11cAD–12cAD). Master's thesis, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

Talbot, Cynthia. 1987. Golaki Matha Inscriptions from Andhra: A Study of a Saiva Monastic Lineage. In *Vajapeya: Essays on the Evolution of Indian Art and Culture*. Edited by A.M. Shastri and R.K. Sharma. Delhi: Agam, pp. 130–46.

Yokochi, Yuko. 2018. Mahaganapatir bhavet: Gana-hood as a religious goal in early Shaivism. Paper presented at the 17th World Sanskrit Conference, Vancouver, BC, Canada, July 9–13.