ALEXIS SANDERSON

REMARKS ON THE TEXT OF THE KUBJIKĀMATATANTRA*

The *Kubjikāmatatantra* of 3500 verses that is edited in this publication[1] is the principal scripture of the branch of Kaula Śaivism that calls itself the Paścimāmnāya or Paścimānvaya.[2] Closely related to it are two other redactions, the longer *Ṣaṭsāhasrasaṃhitā*, which is probably later, and the shorter *Laghvikāmnāya* of 1800 verses, which is probably earlier. The text has drawn extensively on the *Tantrasadbhāva, Siddhayogeśvarīmata, Kularatnamālā* and *Triśirobhairava*, scriptures of the tradition known as the Trika whose systematization is the subject in the late tenth century of Abhinavagupta's principal work of Śaiva exegesis, the *Tantrāloka*. In brief, the text has worked materials pertaining to the Kaula cult of a new deity, the goddess Kubjikā, into a matrix of materials belonging to the early literature of the Vidyāpīṭha division of the Bhairavatantras.

The oldest dated manuscript noted by the editors is that of the *Laghvikāmnāya* redaction (siglum Z), which is dated in the year 158 of an era that is not named but is evidently the Nepālīya, corresponding to A.D. 1037/8. The earliest manuscript of the middle-length redaction used by the editors (siglum D) was completed in Nepal in the reign of the Pāla monarch Rāmapāla, who ruled *ca*. A.D. 1072–1126.[3] The year is lost through damage. How much further the tradition goes back is, as usual, unclear. It is earlier than the first Ṣaṭka of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, which lists the *Kubjikāmata* in its account of the Śaiva canon.[4] That Ṣaṭka is also referred to in its colophons and in the text itself as the *Śiraścheda*.[5] One might argue, therefore, that it predates the ninth century, since a work of that name is listed with three others in a Cambodian inscription as having been the basis of a royal ritual performed at the beginning of that century to consolidate the newly founded kingdom of Angkor.[6] The *Kubjikāmata*, then, would be even earlier. However, it is very improbable that this is that work. The four texts of the Cambodian inscription are Tantras of the Vāma current (*vāmasrotaḥ*) of the Śaiva revelation. The first Ṣaṭka does refer to itself as a Vāma text, and it does contain Vāma elements.[7] But those are subordinated within a Dakṣiṇasrotas framework;[8] and this hybrid character is confirmed in the text's account of the scriptures, in which it speaks of itself as embodying both the Vāma and the Dakṣiṇa currents.[9] Furthermore, that same account strongly suggests that the two works are

Indo-Iranian Journal **45:** 1–24, 2002.
© 2002 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands.*

distinct, since it says that the archetypal *Śirascheda* has come down to main in two forms through separate lineages.[10] Even if the *Śirascheda* of the inscription were this work, the evidence that it was in existence at the beginning of the ninth century would be weak, since the inscription was written in A.D. 1052, about a quarter of a millennium after the events it claims to report. In fact the earliest firm evidence for the existence of the *Jayadrathayāmala* is a citation by Kṣemarāja, who flourished *ca*. A.D. 1000–1050.[11] The *Mādhavakula*, which is part of the fourth Ṣaṭka of the work, is cited by his immediate predecessor Abhinavagupta;[12] and that Ṣaṭka, with the second and the third, is later than the first, which originally stood on its own.[13] However, though Abhinavagupta's commentator Jayadratha, working around the middle of the 13th century, notes that the *Mādhavakula* is part of this text in his comments on that citation,[14] it is presented in the *Jayadrathayāmala* itself as a text in its own right, and since its style is also distinct from that of the chapters around it, we cannot be sure that it was part of the larger work in Abhinavagupta's time. A line is cited by Abhinavagupta in his *Parātrīśikāvivaraṇa* with attribution to the *khaṇḍacakravicāraḥ* of the *Kubjikāmata*.[15] But the reference is not trustworthy. The line is not found in the transmission of our text. More significantly the *khaṇḍacakra*, from whose treatment in that text the line is said to come, is a feature of the Krama rather than the Paścimāmnāya.[16]

All but one of the 66 manuscripts registered by the editors are Nepalese and those that have dates extend from the eleventh to the eighteenth centuries. The existence of more recent copies, the abundance of practical manuals for the performance of the initiation ceremonies into the cult of Kubjikā, and her conspicuous presence as one of the principal deities in manuals in Sanskrit and Newari that set out the rituals associated with the Malla kings and the private temples of their palaces show the prevalence of the cult in Nepal. But it was by no means purely Nepalese. Among the manuscripts collated by the editors is one in the early Maithilī or Gauḍī script (siglum T). The cult is also well attested in Kashmir, if not in the earliest evidence, that of the tenth century. It is quoted by Rājānaka Takṣakavarta in his *Nityādisaṃgrahapaddhati*;[17] Rājānaka Jayaratha quotes a verse which mentions Kubjikā among the major manifestations of the goddess in his *Vāmakeśvarīmatavivaraṇa*;[18] Kubjikā is included as the Paścimānāyeśvarī among the other early Tantric goddesses that receive oblations in the *ājyahomaḥ* of the *agnikāryapaddhatiḥ* of the *kalādīkṣāpaddhati* and other practical manuals used by the Kashmirian Tantric priests;[19] and a rock (a *svayambhuśilā*) is worshipped as Kubjikādevi in Kāṭhom village, where she once had a temple.[20] It also flourished in southern India, where it appears as the Ṣaḍanvayaśāmbhava

system, also called Śāmbhavānanda, in association with the better known cult of Tripurasundarī. Śivānanda, the South Indian author of the published *Ṛjuvimarśinī* commentary on the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* and other works in the tradition of the Kaula worship of Tripurasundari, also wrote on this system: an incomplete manuscript of his *Śambhunirṇayadīpikā* survives.[21] Maheśvarānanda of Coḷadeśa reports in his auto-commentary (*-parimala*) on the *Mahārthamañjarī* that he was initiated into this system.[22] When the Saiddhāntika Jñānaśivācārya, a South Indian settled in Vārāṇasī probably during the twelfth century but not earlier, thinks of the Kaulas it is mostly texts of the cult of Kubjikā that he cites.[23] That it was by no means a marginal phenomenon in the Śaivism of South India is suggested by its assimilation into the tradition of the Smārtas' Śaṅkarācāryas, where it is the basis of the first half of the famous hymn *Saundaryalaharī* attributed to Śaṅkara.[24]

This, then, is a text of considerable interest to the student of Śaivism and we owe a great debt of gratitude to the editors for providing us with the *editio princeps*, especially since it is one of the first editions of a Śaiva Tantric text that has been prepared on critical principles. In the light of the value of this work the early death of Jan Schoterman, the junior of its two editors, seems all the more tragic.

Of the 66 manuscripts registered many were discovered towards the end of the project or were rejected because they were recent, very incorrect or fragmentary. Modernity is no reason for not examining a witness, and the fact that a manuscript is fragmentary has no bearing at all on the value of its readings. But the edition is unlikely to have suffered greatly. It is based throughout on ten good manuscripts (A–K), with a few others collated for certain chapters. Of these ten six (A–D, H and J) are palm-leaf manuscripts, of which none is later than the thirteenth century.

After describing the manuscripts, testimonia and citations (pp. 3–14), the editors consider the mutual relation of the manuscripts (pp. 24–43), their orthography and sandhi (pp. 44–66), the morphology, syntax, style, lexicon and metre of the anomalous Sanskrit of the text (pp. 67–109), and provide a brief outline of the contents of its twenty-five chapters (pp. 110–130), including convenient tables of the more complex of its systematic correspondences. Four appendixes after the edition (pp. 481–488) show the distribution in the manuscripts of intentionally divergent versions of certain technical data such as the fifty Mantras of the Parāparā arrangement of the letters of the alphabet; and a fifth (pp. 488–496) enables the reader to judge for himself the relationship between the *Kubjikāmata* and NAK 1–362 (=NGMPP A 44/1) of the *Tantrasadbhāva* by setting out in tabular form a selection of the significant readings of each where they diverge in

the long shared passage that is chapters 4 to 6 of the former and chapters 3, 6 and 8 of the latter. The work ends (pp. 497–571) with an index of proper names, a list of the epithets applied to Kubjikā and Bhairava in the text, and an alphabetical index of its half-Ślokas.

The treatment of the language of the text is of value to all who wish to deal critically with the early Tantric Śaiva literature. The many deviations from Paṇinean norms that characterize this literature present a severe problem to editors, who must consider in every case whether such deviations are original or scribal. Having this extensive collection of anomalies to hand will assist their judgement, though some may wish that there were more analysis of the material in relation to the later Indo-Aryan linguistic substrate and the 'hybrid' Sanskrit of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

In their treatment of the mutual relation of the manuscripts the editors conclude, as one might expect with so vigorous a transmission, that a strictly stemmatic reconstruction is impossible. They have therefore not attempted to establish an archetype of all the witnesses they have collated, but only to "reconstruct a text which represents old tradition in one of its most consistent and influential recensions (to wit, the recension offered by B and A" (p. 35). They admit that they have been only partially successful. The reason for this, they say, is that they found that in many cases they had to deviate from the evidence of their preferred recension. This openness to the evidence of manuscripts other than those they have chosen to prefer is certainly a virtue of their edition. If anything one would wish they had been more open than they were, less partial, that is, to A and B; but if one is in doubt about the wisdom of their choice of any reading one has their complete collation of all ten or more manuscripts throughout, the result of herculean labour, which provides a solid basis for all future critical work on this text.

A and B are certainly closer to each other than to any other of the witnesses collated. But it is very doubtful that they constitute evidence of a recension, that is to say a version of the text resulting from conscious revision, requiring as such to be edited in its own right.[25] And if they do constitute a recension one must ask why the editors have sometimes chosen to reject A and B when they share a reading that can be recognized as the result of conscious revision of the received text, one, for example, that sanctions a variant in ritual or meditational practice. Thus 11 verses after 1.70ef in ABEFG but not in HJK have been excluded; and the Vīrāvalīmantra after 22.16 is that of DHJKT, the version of ABCE having been consigned to Appendix I, even though this version is that which has been followed, with some elaboration and a little confusion, in the 33rd Paṭala of the *Ṣaṭsāhasra* redaction. Similarly they have relegated

to Appendix II ABC's Anugraha variant after 23.148 of the six goddesses beginning with Ḍākinī; and rejected ABFG's line after 3.24, ABG's extra verse between pādas c and d of 11.7, AB's line after 14.61b, although this makes 14.61 a verse with only two pādas, AB's verse after 17.7, though this looks like a studied attempt to account for the six-faced and twelve-armed form of Mahāntārī taught in 19.25 ff., AB's line after 17.60, though this completes the sense by making up the full list of the five Vimalas, and AB's extra line after 24.154d, which accommodates instructions for the offering of Pavitraka cords to the Kṣetradevīs and the Pīṭhas as in the *Ṣaṭsāhasra*.[26]

This, then, is not exactly an edition of a distinct recension but an edition of the shared portion of the text which favours AB where the manuscripts are not unanimous, provided that AB's readings do not seem unacceptable to the editors. Their method has been to abandon AB where their readings are impossible but to stand by them where they are not. This is partially reprehensible, since it is not enough that a reading be possible. But they are to be congratulated for the many occasions on which they have suspended their preference and exercised their independent judgement to good effect.

When a text has come down to us, as the *Kubjikāmata* has, though lines of transmission whose relations are so promiscuous that no agreement within them can guarantee their archetype, it is inevitable that the critic will find more or less frequently according to the state of the transmission and the degree of his perspicacity that there are conflicts between readings that his judgement is unable to resolve. In such cases only is he justified in adopting the reading of the 'best' manuscript(s) against the rest. If he has found that one part of the transmission is more trustworthy where he can test it he is entitled to infer that it will be more trustworthy where he cannot. This does not mean that it will be right, but only that it is likely to be more often right than the rest of the transmission. Evidently this method must be adopted only as a last resort. It can never be a substitute for criticism, since its success depends entirely on the acumen of the judgements which lead the critic to rely on it when all else fails.

So how have the editors reached their preference for AB? They seem to have done so on the grounds that these two manuscripts have some readings that are preferable in terms of their meaning and because they find them to be in general more conservative linguistically, assuming that the language of the text has been progressively polished. One may concede that unpolished readings are more likely than not to be original, though this is by no means certain, and that AB have more such readings than other manuscripts. But this does not put one in a position to prefer them to other witnesses without further tests. AB may have been greatly corrupted

without being subjected to a vendetta against anomalous forms, and other manuscripts may have been cleaned up rather more while better preserving the text in its essentials. Indeed one can well imagine that in the case of a text like this which has a technical subject matter the scribes most careful to preserve it might also be those who would be most prompt to make the minor adjustments in question. Because of this there is no point in counting up the occurrences of Aiśa readings in order to weigh one group of manuscripts against the others.[27]

A more decisive means of testing AB's readings is to collate them with their sources outside the transmission of the text. Where manuscripts of a source text and those of the *Kubjikāmata* diverge either or neither may have the original reading, since independent error is possible in both. But where part of the *Kubjikāmata* transmission is identical with the source then that part must be sound, preserving the text of the source in the form in which it was first incorporated, except in cases where they agree in the sort of errors that are commonplace and might therefore have arisen in the source and the receiver independently.

Sources can be identified for a substantial part of the text. In the section on testimonia and citations (pp. 14–24) several correspondences between the *Kubjikāmata* and texts of other systems of Tantric ritual, above all the *Tantrasadbhāva*, are mentioned and discussed. The major among them were communicated to the editors by this reviewer in 1984, and notice of them published with the thesis that the *Kubjikāmata* was the borrower.[28] To the correspondences noted at that time may be added another: Adhikāra 15 of the *Tantrasadbhāva* has been incorporated into the *Kubjikāmata* as 25.29–171.[29]

By the time the editors became aware that there were such extensive correspondences their work on the edition was almost complete. Nonetheless they collated Paṭalas 4–6 of the *Kubjikāmata* with the corresponding portions of the *Tantrasadbhāva*, tabulating the significant divergences in Appendix V and confirming in the introduction (pp. 15–17) my opinion of the relationship between the two texts. However, they were not able to apply this conclusion to revise their evaluations of their text's readings and thereby to test their commitment to AB. They do observe that at 5.24b the reading *dhyānāc ca kramaśo* given by most of the manuscripts of the *Kubjikāmata* "probably obscured a correct originally *dhyānāc cakrasamo*", which is the reading of the *Tantrasadbhāva*. But they do not emend to that reading. It appears rather that they consider the error to be part of the original redaction of the text. There certainly are places in which it would be rash to correct the *Kubjikāmata* by substituting a better reading from its source, but this is not one of them. 5.42d can and should

be corrected, because the reading of the *Tantrasadbhāva* also appears in FG of the *Kubjikāmata*. It is unlikely that it could have got there except through survival.

An inspection of the list of significant discrepancies in Appendix V soon shows the hazardousness of the editors' preference for AB. Agreements between the *Tantrasadbhāva* manuscript and those of the *Kubjikāmata* tell against AB too often to allow much confidence in the readings of these two witnesses when they are merely possible. The same inspection also sheds light on the criteria of impossibility that caused the editors to abandon their preference from time to time. For AB are not infrequently confirmed by the *Tantrasadbhāva* against the rest of the tradition where the editors have spurned their evidence.

Thus at *Kubjikāmata* 4.32b the editors prefer D(E)FGHJK's *prabhedataḥ* to ABC's and *Tantrasadbhāva*'s *prakārataḥ*; but at 4.30d they prefer (AB)CD's *coditāḥ* to EFGHJK's and *Tantrasadbhāva'*s *coddhṛtāḥ*.[30] This seems to mean that AB do not outweigh the rest of the transmission unless they are joined by more than one other manuscript: the weight of C is not sufficient to tip the balance in favour of *prakārataḥ*; but that of CD tips it against *coddhṛtāḥ*. Naturally by such a criterion AB's reading *upāyāḥ saṃprakīrtitāḥ* at 4.33b, though supported by the *Tantrasadbhāva*, could not stand against the reading *saṃpradāyāḥ prakīrtitāḥ* of all eight other witnesses. At 25.29a (=*Tantrasadbhāva*), in the new parallel, confirmation by only one manuscript suffices: ABG's *anujñāto 'bhiṣiktas tu* is preferred to CDE(F)HJKT's *anujñāto 'bhiṣiktaś ca*. But perhaps another factor has influenced this decision, namely the editors' being "especially inclined to accept the readings of AB where the evidence of the other sources proved to be not unanimous" (p. 39). For F reads not *abhiṣiktaś ca* but *abhiṣiktasya*.[31]

If by following such principles an editor hits upon the right variant it will be largely a matter of chance. Here our editors have been unlucky, as the reading of the *Tantrasadbhāva* shows. But in this and other cases that merely confirms what the critic can see without its help. The same is true elsewhere.

At 4.30c–31b the *kubjikāmata* is defining what it has just called the *akṣarārtha-* form of Mantras. Mantras, it says, are *akṣarārtha-* in the form in which they are taught by Śiva in his scriptures (*śivoditāḥ*). They are the Mantras 'dismembered' (*khaṇḍamantrāḥ*), being 'enjoined' if we read *coditāḥ* or 'extracted' if we read *coddhṛtāḥ* by means of devices such as Prastāras: *prastārādi-r-anekaiś ca ye mantrāḥ coditāḥ/coddhṛtāḥ priye/akṣarārthena te jñeyāḥ khaṇḍamantrāḥ śivoditāḥ*. Now Prastāras are diagrams segmented to contain the letters of the alphabet in a certain order.

Their purpose is to enable the Mantras to be taught cryptically by identifying their constituent sounds one by one through their relation to other letters in the arrangement. The term for the process of teaching a Mantra in this way is *uddhāraḥ* 'extraction', the idea being that one puts it together by extracting it letter by letter from the diagram. Mantras, then, are extracted (*uddhṛtāh*) by means of these devices, not enjoined (*coditāḥ*). Evidently, then, it is the reading rejected by the editors that is sound.[32]

At 25.29a CDE(F)HJKT's *anujñāto 'bhiṣiktaś ca*, confirmed by *Tantrasadbhāva* against the reading *anujñāto 'bhiṣiktas tu* of ABG preferred by the editors, is not so obviously superior, especially since *ca* and *tu* are frequently used in this and similar texts as mere verse-fillers (*pādapūraṇārtham*). But we should assume no meaning in such cases only where we have looked for it unsuccessfully. Here *ca* has the edge, because one may practise the *vidyāvratam* only when one has been *both* authorized (*anujñātaḥ*) and consecrated (*abhiṣiktaḥ*). Authorization here means initiation (*dīkṣā*), more specifically the 'penetration-initiation' (*vedhadīkṣā*) in which Śiva penetrates an individual with the bliss of his authority (*ājñānandaḥ*). This *vedhadīkṣā* or *ājñāvedhaḥ* must then be followed by the ritual of consecration (*abhiṣekaḥ*). See 10.67–133 on these two, especially 10.111–112b: *anuṣṭhānatapopāyair yadānandabhṛtas tanuḥ/tadādhikāraḥ kartavyo yasyājñā tasya tatpade/anujñāto 'bhiṣiktaś ca nāmamālāṃ prakāśayet*. The editors read *'bhiṣiktasya* in 10.112a following ABG against (C)DE(F)HJK. That would mean: "Once he has been authorized he should show the name-garland *to* the person consecrated (*abhiṣiktasya*)." But one receives the name garland as the first stage of the initiation, well before one comes to that of consecration.

In favour of AB's and *Tantrasadbhāva*'s *upāyāḥ saṃprakīrtitāḥ* against the reading *saṃpradāyāḥ prakīrtitāḥ* preferred by the editors on the evidence of all eight other witnesses at 4.33b there is the argument that the former is the *lectio difficilior*: it is more probable that the latter was corrupted into the former than vice versa. The context is the definition of the Saṃpradāya type of Mantra. If we follow AB and *Tantrasadbhāva* against the editors we have: "As for the Saṃpradāya (type), this, O Goddess, is of six kinds; Pallava, Yoga, Rodha, Saṃpuṭa, Grathana and Vidarbha. These are called the six devices (*upāyāḥ*)": *saṃpradāyo bhaved devi so 'pi ṣaṭsu prakārataḥ/pallavo yoga rodhaś ca saṃpuṭo grathanas tathā/vidarbhaś ca ṣaḍ etāni upāyāḥ saṃprakīrtitāḥ*.[33] The 'devices' are methods of writing the syllables of the Mantra and those of the name of the victim or beneficiary (*sādhya*) in various orders according to the goal sought. Since, then, Pallava and the rest are indeed devices, the reading *upāyāḥ* gives a good, specific sense. The reading *saṃpradāyāḥ* is just

possible. The text might refer to these arrangements as Sampradāya both collectively *and* individually. But this would add nothing to the meaning of the verse. The redundancy points also to the origin of the corruption: a copyist has carelessly substituted for the *upāyāḥsam* of *upāyāḥ saṃprakīrtitāḥ* what was in the forefront of his mind as the first word and the subject of the verse. The result is unmetrical.

The list of significant discrepancies between *Kubjikāmata* 4–6 and *Tantrasadbhāva*, 3, 6 and 8 given in Appendix V can cause us to *doubt* the advisability of placing so much trust in AB. But it cannot be used to attempt a more precise evaluation of the relative weights of the editors' manuscript groups. This is because it collates the readings of the *Tantrasadbhāva* manuscript with the already edited text of the *Kubjikāmata*. This, of course, is heavily weighted towards AB and therefore most of the discrepancies are with the readings of those manuscripts. We cannot see without collating the *Tantrasadbhāva* manuscripts with all those of the *Kubjikāmata* whether AB are less reliable witnesses than others. In an exploratory collation of the *Tantrasadbhāva* with all points in the text of *Kujikāmata* 25.29–171 and 4.1–66 where the manuscript diverge significantly it seemed clear to me that AB transmit the truth less often than any other manuscript. However, they do not so much less often. In fact no part of the transmission is markedly more or less correct than any other by this test. I conclude that in this highly contaminated manuscript transmission truth and error have permeated everywhere in approximately equal measure. Only in their sincerity do the manuscripts differ significantly. HJK (the editors' third recension) and CD (their second) have very little in the way of interpolation compared to AB and EFG.

It seems, therefore, that the critic has only one support of judgement available to him, namely the collation of some parts of the text with their sources. Where all, some or one of the manuscripts of the *Kubjikāmata* agree with the source text, that reading should be adopted as original, except where there may be independent error. For the rest the editor has no recourse but to exercise judgement in the light of the knowledge of the habits of the copyists, and of the language, style and, above all, the subject matter of this text and the corpus to which it belongs.

I shall now propose on such grounds some emendations to the text as edited.

1.11.d. *sakuṭumbaḥ stutiṃ divyāṃ himavān vākyam abravīt* (BHJK). This sentence, with its bizarre double object *stutiṃ . . . vākyam* is evidently an attempt to avoid the unpaninean thematicization of the stem of

himavant- seen in A's *himavantam uvāca ha* or, without the hiatus-bridger, C's *himavanta uvāca ha*. For the stem *himavanta-* see 1.16c, 17c and 18c.

2.2(4). In place of the editors' *raudrī manākhyāmbikā* read *raudrī-m anākhyāmbikā*. Raudrī here is given after Jyeṣṭhā and Vāmā. Ambikā is the fourth goddess, who transcends this common triad. Equally commonplace are the hiatus bridger *-m* and the name 'Nameless' (*anākhyā, anāmā*) for a fourth power in relation to a triad.[34]

2.2(15). *mātṛkāsiddham icchā kriyā*. A neuter noun has no place in this list of the goddess's names. Nor does it yield sense in the context. DF's *mātṛkāsi tvam icchā kriyā* is entirely appropriate. The error may have been encouraged by the occurrence of *siddhamātā*, meaning Siddhāmātṛkā the alphabet-goddess (see, e.g., *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* 1.1) at the beginning of the preceding line.

2.2(18). *tvaṃ navātmānadevasya cotsaṅgayānāśritā*. Kubjikā (the 32-syllabled Samayavidyā) is certainly to be visualized in the lap (*utsaṅga*) of her consort Navātman.[35] But what could be the meaning of the editors' *utsaṅgayānāśritā*, literally 'occupying the vehicle of his lap'? I propose that this is a corruption of *tvaṃ navātmānadevasya cotsaṅgagā anāśritā* or perhaps, avoiding the hiatus, *tvaṃ navātmānadevasya cotsaṅgagā* hy *anāśritā* "You are in the lap of Navātma (yet) unsupported (being the support of all things)".

2.2(35). *vimuñcanti* and 2.2 (38) *muñcanti*. Read *vimucyanti* with CE(HJK) in the first case and *mucyanti* with CEFHJK in the second. Passive forms are required for sense in both. Passives with parasmaipada endings are commonplace in this literature, as they are in the Epic.

2.40cd. *oḍḍitā yena aṅghribhyāṃ tenedam oḍḍiyānakam*. The evident purpose of this line is the semantic analysis of the name of the pīṭha Oḍḍiyāna/Uḍḍiyāna. The reading accepted by the editors gives no sense. I propose *uḍḍito yena uḍḍīśa tenedam uḍḍiyānakam* "This is (called) Uḍḍiyāna because the (Siddha) Uḍḍīśa ascended (here) into the sky" following the direction of AF's *utthitā* and E's *uḍītā* for the first word, F's *uḍḍīśā* for *aṅghribhyām*, and F's *uḍḍiyānakam*. The *Ṣatsāhasraṭippana*, which has this line at 5.16cd of its Mūla, has the same beneath superficial corruptions: *uḍḍitā* (*uḍḍita* BC) *yena uḍḍīśe tenedam uḍḍiyānakam*. The word *uḍḍito* is intended as the ppp. of *ud-* √*ḍī* 'to fly up' in place of the chaste form *uḍḍīno*. E's *uḍīnā* hints perhaps at the correct form; and the *Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippaṇa* either understands it or has it in its comment: **uḍḍīśam uḍīnaṃ* (em: *uḍyīśam uḍyānaṃ* Cod) *karoti yadā tadā uḍḍiyānakam*. However, the reading *uḍḍito* is backed by MIA *uḍḍiya-*. A version of the same etymology from *uḍḍīyate* is given in the Old Kashmiri *Mahānayaprakāśa* 4.1a: *so oḍḍiyānu śaccī ullasane* "That

is (called) Oḍḍiyāna because Śakti is effulgent (there).” The Sanskrit commentary explains: *prācuryeṇānavarataṃ pīṭhavāsināṃ śaktir uḍḍīnā ullasantī dṛśyate iti . . . oḍḍiyānaṃ nirucyate* “The (name) Oḍḍiyāna is appropriately applied, because the Śakti of the residents of this Pīṭha is seen to be very, i.e. permanently, ‘in ascent’ (*-uḍḍīnā*, i.e. vibrant.)”

2.42b. For *ṣaḍguṇāḥ* read *ṣaḍ gaṇāḥ* (AB). The text refers to the six attendents (*praticārakāḥ, pālakāḥ*) of Oḍḍiyāna.

2.45c. For *vināyakṣaḥ* read *vināyakyaḥ*, as at *Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippaṇa*, cod. cit., f. 8v6. I propose that this is *vināyakaḥ* modified for the sake of the metre. Cf. *kauśaṭya-* for *kauśaṭa*-in 5.65. The conjuncts *ky-* and *kṣ-* are easily confused in the Newari script.

2.50c. For *karālaṃ ca samāgatā* read *karālambaṃ samāgatā*. This is supported by A (*karālamba samāgatā*) and the version in *Ṣaṭsāhasrasaṃhitā*, ed. Schoterman, 5.40. This site is located by our text in the Pīṭha Jālandhara (2.51d, 54c). Cf. the parallel verses stating the Goddess’s progress to sites in the other three great Pīṭhas, to Olambikā in Oḍḍiyāna (2.36c–37b), to Ucchuṣmavana in Kāmarūpa (2.82c–83a) and to Sahyavana in Pūrṇagiri (2.63cd). See also Maheśvarānanda, *Mahārthamañjarīparimala*, ed. V. Dviveda, p. 99, giving esoteric meanings to these sites: *śṛṇoti śabdam olambe prekṣate puṣkaradvaye/ karālambe ‘bhidhatte ca sahye jighrati gandhavat*.

2.57b. For *anugocare* read *atra gocare* (EFHGK).

2.65b. For *nayopādair* I conjecture *nayopāyair*.

2.85b. For *tattvāṅgī* read *tanvaṅgīṃ*. Cf. *tanvaṅgī* EGHJ and *tatvaṅgī* FK.

2.112a. For *mātaṅgānāṃ kulotpanne* read *mātaṅgānāṃ kulotpanno*. See 2.113a; *yo ’nyavarṇas tu*.

2.115b. For *devīkoṭam kṛtakṣaṇāt* read *devīkoṭaṃ kṛtaṃ kṣaṇāt* (CDFGHJK). The context is the miraculous creation of the Pīṭhas and Kṣetras.

2.118ab. For *kṛtaṃ tu bhārate varṣe ātmakīrtikumārikā* read *kṛtaṃ tu bhārate varṣe ātmakīrtiṃ kumārikā*. The meaning intended here is “The Kumārī made herself famous in the continent of Bhārata.” J has *kṛtvā* HK) and EFG have the corresponding nominative *ātmakīrtiḥ*. In that case *kumārikā* could be for the instrumental singular of the agent. The more economical emendation, which leaves *kṛtaṃ* and reads the accusative *ātmakīrtiṃ*, is far from chaste Sanskrit, but such a construction occurs elsewhere in the Kaula corpus. See *Yonigahvara*, cod. cit., 493b–494a: *prāptaṃ mahānayaṃ . . . devī*; ibid. 517b: *devī tad vākyaṃ kathitam*; 522b: *cakraṃ . . . dṛṣṭaṃ devī*. It also occurs in late Mahāyānist texts, e.g., *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, ed. Vaidya, 53.472, 53.732.

2.121. For *devo 'pi pūrvasantāne śiṣyaḥ suravarārcite/śrīmadoḍramaheśānaṃ kṛtvā cājñāṃ punar dadet* read *devo 'pi pūrvasantāne śiṣyaṃ suravarārcite/śrīmadoḍḍamaheśānaṃ kṛtvā cājñāṃ punar dadet*. The reading *śiṣyaṃ* proposed in place of the editors' *śiṣyaḥ* is that of CDEFG. I have emended to *oḍḍa* against the manuscripts, which read *oḍra, oḍraṃ, oddra, odra* or *orga*. The meaning here is that after the Goddess's return from her circuit of Bhāratavarṣa Śiva makes Uḍḍīśa his disciple (*śiṣyaṃ . . . kṛtvā*) and commands *him* to go to Bhāratavarṣa to install himself in Uḍḍapīṭha and promulgate the teaching there. The summary of the contents of this Paḇala in the editors' introduction (p. 113) misinterprets passage: "After Devī has joined Bhairava, she receives yet another order; she should go again to Bhāratavarṣa, especially to Oḍḍiyāna, to start the creation." Perhaps they have understood *śrīmadoḍramaheśānaṃ* at 121c as a nominative and an epithet of the subject. A similar understanding is evident at 20.44d, where they accept the majority's reading *japamānaṃ puraṃ viśet* against FG's *japamānaḥ puraṃ viśet* where the meaning can only be "he should enter the town while repeating the mantra." A greater influence may be their interpretation of 122d: *kuru sṛṣṭim anekadhā*. They take this as a command to start creation, and evidently such a command could be addressed to none but the Goddess herself. However, one might ask how she could be commanded to initiate creation in a place which could exist only after creation. The expression *kuru sṛṣṭim anekadhā* refers here not to creation but to reproduction. Uḍḍīśa is being instructed to produce many son-disciples in order to spread the teaching through their lineages (*oli*).

3.21. For *etad antaram āsādya* read *etad anantarāsādya*. The narrative context shows that we need *anantaram* here. My conjecture gives this and avoids hypermetricality by supposing an irregular Sandhi such as is seen in 2.38d (*yogimayākhilam*) and *Yonigahvara*, cod. cit. 563a (*kathayāmi upāyāsya*).

3.30ab. For *bhairave madanāsakte jagadyoniḥ sadoditā* read *bhairavo madanāsakto jagadyoniḥ sadoditaḥ*. CEG have *bhairavo*. FGHK have *mathanāsakto*. FGJ have *sadoditaḥ*. These masculine nominatives are demanded by the context.

3.47a. For *āgataṃ na tyajed vastuṃ* read *āgataṃ na tyajed yas tu* following G. The text is describing the ideal Guru.

3.68ab. For *ājñāsphurantam ānandaṃ guruṃ tyaktvānyam āśrayet* read *ājñāsphurantam-ānandaṃ guruṃ tyaktvānyam āśrayet* "If one leaves a Guru who has the vibrant bliss of (Śiva's) command and resorts to another . . ."

3.71. *guroḥ samo naiva hi martyaloke tathā viśeṣeṇa tu cāntarikṣe/yas tārayed duḥkhamahārṇavaughāt kiṃ tasya kartuṃ sa karoti śiṣyaḥ*. The

meaning of the last pāda is lost in corruption. CEFGHJK have attempted to rewrite it in various ways with *śaknoti* as the verb. There remains the problem of the genitive *tasya*; but no doubt they were settling for the meaning "What can the pupil do *for* him who can rescue us from the vast surging ocean of suffering." This, however, is surely not what the text intended. The context is the incomparable greatness of the Guru and the inability of the disciple to act *for himself*. I conjecture *kartuḥ* in place of *kartuṃ*, understanding the following: "What is the autonomy (*kiṃ karoti*, i.e. *kiyat kartṛtvam*) of one who is (merely) the pupil of him who is the (true) agent, in as much as it is he that can save souls from the surging ocean of suffering." This must be read in the context of the pan-Śaiva doctrine of the divine agency in the Guru's performance of the liberating ritual of initiation. The corruption of *kartuḥ* into *kartuṃ* – ABD have *kartu* – is adequate cause for the corruption of *karoti* into *śaknoti*. The corruption of *śaknoti* to *karoti* if *kartuṃ śaknoti* is original would be less easily explained.

3.81ab. *yāvan mūrdhnopari pādā ājñāyuktaḥ subhāvitaḥ*. This bristles with problems. (1) A negative particle is missing. G alone provides it: *nājñā°*. (2) Plurals are expected where we have singulars in *°yuktaḥ* and *subhāvitaḥ*. Traces of these plurals are seen in D (*ājñāmuktā*), FHJK (*svājñāmuktāt*) and G (*svabhāvinaḥ*). (3) The first pāda is unmetrical and A's *mūrdhnopariḥ*, C's *pūrvopariḥ*, G's *mūrdhni padaiḥ*, and HJK's *mūrdhni dadet* try unconvincingly to get around this. (4) We are not told to whom the feet belong: we need either a noun or a pronoun in the genitive. G sees this, reading *mūrdhni padaiḥ devyāḥ*. (5) *pādāḥ* is plural: only E has the dual required by anatomy. Finally (6) *subhāvita-* is insipid, where we look for a verb to bear the weight of the clause. I propose as a mere diagnostic conjecture *yāvan mūrdhni guroḥ pādā ājñāyuktā na bhāvitāḥ*. "Until one has meditated on the feet of the Guru resting imbued with authority upon one's head . . ." For this meditation, much developed in the Ṣaḍanvayaśāmbhava tradition see, e.g., *Mahārthamañjarīparimala*, ed. cit., p. 4, quoting the *Kubjikāmata*, a work which shares the title of the text edited here and is much quoted in the literature of this subsystem; also *Saundaryalaharī* 14 and *Ṣaḍanvayaśāmbhavakrama*, cod. cit., ff. 10v–11v. This literature translates the Guru's feet into metaphysical categories and with this license teaches the contemplation of a third and a fourth. Because of this I have refrained from the duals otherwise required.

3.118d. For *yady eṣām 'nukramo na hi* read *yady eṣāṃ tu kramo na hi* (EG). The context is as follows. There are two degrees of empowerment: *adhikārājñā* and *prasādājñā* (3.108; 3.120; 13.56). The first is given to the beginner (109a: *prāthamikasya*). It merely purifies and grants

formal qualification as an initiate (109c: *adhikāranimittārtham*). It does not bestow enlightenment, at least not before death, when all Śaivas are guaranteed liberation if they desire it (13.56c: *na mokṣo vidyate teṣām*). The second *ājñā, prasādājñā*, gives liberation-in-life, by producing Śiva's knowledge (*śāmbhavaṃ jñanam*) and omniscience (13.57). Now this enlightening 'favour' (*prasāda*) is also termed *krama* (13.57ab: *prasādaṃ kramam ity uktaṃ kramāj jñānaṃ tu śāmbhavam*). 3.117d–118c has just spoken of the higher empowerment in this cryptic manner as *krameṇa vihitā ājñā* "empowerment accomplished by the *krama*" and said that those who have it are the elect of the tradition (3.118c: *te jyeṣṭhāḥ kramasantāne*). In the pāda that we are considering the text goes on to consider the rest. If we follow the editors we have "If they do not have the *anukramaḥ*." To make sense of this we have to assume implausibly that the author intended *anukramaḥ* to be synonymous with *kramaḥ* in this special sense. Following EG we remove this difficulty and the need to assume *nukramaḥ* for *anukramaḥ*.

3.131ab. For *prāyaścittī salakṣeṇa śuddhyate* read *prāyaścittī sa lakṣeṇa śuddhyate* "If he is in a state requiring expiation he is purified by 100,000 (repetitions of the Mantra)."

7.24b. For *catvāriṃśad dhi mālini* read *catvāriṃśaddvimālinī* (G) "engarlanding 42 (syllables)." The number 42 is required by the context, being the sum of the syllables of the Samayā together with the five Praṇavas added to its beginning and end. The reading proposed is that of G alone. But E has the same in a more natural word order: *dvicatvāriṃśamālinī*, and C rewrites as *catvāriṃśadvayādhikā*. Such reversed number compounds, odd though they seem, are seen elsewhere in this text. See *pañcāśaikona* in 6.91a, *daśatritayam* in 5.7d and *viṃśacatvāri* in 5.8d and 5.27b.

7.86ab. For *lagne granthitrayaṃ devi khagatir nātra saṃśayaḥ* read *lagne granthitraye devi khagatir nātra saṃśayaḥ* "O Goddess, when the three knots have been connected one ascends into the void. Of this there is no doubt." This passage describes a variant of the Khecarīmudrā taught in *Mālinīvijayottara* 7.15c–17b and in other scriptures of the Trika; see *Tantrāloka* 22.10c–64. According to the *Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippaṇa* the three knots here are the navel, the point between the brows and the genitals (cod. cit., f. 50v4–5): *lagne granthitraye devi. granthitrayaṃ nābhir bhrūmadhyaṃ janmādhāra iti. traye lagne saṃlagne ekībhūte . . .*

8.18b. *padmaṃ tasyopari sthitam*. The context is the worship of Śikhāsvacchanda, the deity of the Śikhā of Kubjikā, that being one of the auxiliaries (*aṅgam*) of any principal Mantra (*mūlamantraḥ*) in Tantric worship. 8.17–19a describe the throne of the deity to be worshipped.

If 18.18b, the pāda in question, is sound, then one is to visualize the *pretaḥ*, i.e. the deity Sadāśiva as a prostrate body, then visualize a lotus above it and Ananta on its pericarp as the throne of the deity to be worshipped (8.17–19: *dhyātvā pretaṃ purā devi . . . padmaṃ tasyopari sthitam/karṇikopari dīpyantaṃ prajvalantaṃ mahaujasam/anantaṃ tad vijānīyāt tasyordhve tacchikhāśivam*). But this is very improbable. For the order in such sequences of worship is first the lotus, then the *preta* on its centre and then the deity to be worshipped above it. The lotus is hardly likely to be located, as the editors' text requires, above the *preta*. The reading *padmaṃ tasyopari*, I infer, conceals the meaning 'on the lotus'. The sense of the passage would then be: "Having first visualized, O Goddess, the *preta* . . . radiant, burning and mighty on the lotus – know that that is Ananta – he should visualize Śikhāśiva above him." The text the preceeds to describe the Ananta lotus in 8.19cd. B avoids the problem with the reading *padmāntasyopari*, but the expression "above the limit of the lotus" is crude and pleonastic. This translation also assumes corruption in the following:

8.17cd. *mahāyogī mahāsiddhaḥ sarvalokadharaḥ prabhuḥ*. All these must, of course, be accusative to agree with *pretaṃ* in 8.17a, a fact to which not all the manuscripts are blind: *mahāyogaṃ* F, *mahāsiddhaṃ* F, *sarvalokadharaṃ* AF.

8.25a. *tasyopari tam aikāram*. According to the *Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippaṇa* the true text here is *tasyopari tam oṃkāram*. One is to install Śikhāvacchanda on to that (visualized deity) in the form of the syllable OṂ (cod. cit., f. 53r6–v1: *madhye pretaṃ pretopari devaṃ guhyakubjikāsahitaṃ . . . tasyopari tam oṃkāraṃ . . . śikhāsvacchandadeveśaṃ saṃsthāpyopari pūjayet*). That *oṃkāraṃ* here is not a copyist's error is apparent from f. 53v3, where the syllable is described as *akāra-ukāra-makāramayam*" comprised of A, U, and M." The reading *aikāraṃ*, found in all but G (*aṅkāraṃ*) and J (*aukāraṃ*) is very probably a corruption of *aiṃkāram* "the syllable AIṂ". AIṂ has some claim to be preferred to OṂ, since it is the Śākta Praṇava, the cult's esoteric substitute for the exoteric Praṇava OṂ.

8.28d. For *vighnarāṭ kule* read *vighnarāṭ cale*. After installing Śikhāsvacchanda one is to install that deity's auxiliary mantras in the directions around him and then worship the deity in their centre (8.28b: *bhūyo madhye prapūjayet*). But before he does so he must make offerings to the Site Guardian (Kṣetrapāla) Juṣṭacaṇḍeśvara, Gaṇeśa (*vighnarāṭ*) and the line of Gurus (*gurupaṅktiḥ*). The emendation I propose informs us that Gaṇeśa (and Juṣṭacaṇḍeśvara) should be worshipped in the direction of the Wind (*calaḥ*), i.e. in the NW. It rests upon the evidence

of *Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippaṇa*, cod. cit., f. 54r1–2: *juṣṭacaṇḍeśvaraṃ kṣetraṃ juṣṭacaṇḍeśvarākhyaṃ kṣetrapālaṃ taṃ pūjākāle prathamataḥ pūjayet. tathā vighnarāṭ. gaṇapatiḥ. cale vāyavye*. It has the advantage of sense where *kule* conveys no relevant meaning. *Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippaṇa* also reads *kṣetraṃ* (in my emendation) where our editors have *kṣetre* (8.28c: *juṣṭacaṇḍeśvaraṃ kṣetre*), understanding it as a contraction of the *bhīmaḥ* type (Bhīma for Bhīmasena). The locative *kṣetre* certainly conveys no easy meaning here. Why should one worship Juṣṭacaṇḍeśvara "in the site" (*kṣetre*)? The reading *kṣetram* is also that of our F.

8.29ab. *calādīnām adhiṣṭhānaṃ jānīyād gurupaṅktivat*. After worshipping the Kṣetrapālā and Gaṇeśa one must worship the line of Gurus. According to the *Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippaṇa* one should position the line from the NW to the NE (cod. cit. f. 54v2–3: *tato gurupaṅktiḥ. kutra. calād īśānasaṃsthānaṃ jānīyād gurupaṅktiṣu iti. vāyavyadiśāyām ārābhya īśānāntaṃ yāvat svagurukramaṃ pūjayet*.) The version of our line that it quotes here is an improvement on that of the edition in as much as it gives not only the line's point of departure but also its terminus. Four of the manuscripts of the *Kubjikāmata* too have readings that refer to the terminus: *calād īśam adhiṣṭhānaṃ* EF, *calādigādīsānaṃ* A and *calādisupadīśānaṃ* B.

A suggests corruption of a reading *caladigādi-m īśāntam*. B may be a corruption of another somewhat more plausible original: *calādi yāvad īśānam*. The last word, *gurupaṅktivat*, is also corrupt, at least in its final syllable. The reading *gurupaṅktiṣu* in the *Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippaṇa*, ABEG's *gurupaṇkti ca* and C's *gurupaṅktibhiḥ* are equally unsatisfactory, though *paṅkti ca* might be accepted as an instance of the use of the stem-form in place of the accusative, a usage not without parallels in this literature.

8.91cd. For *dīkṣānirvāṇakārī syāt trisaptaparivartanāt* read *dīkṣā nirvāṇakārī syāt trisaptaparivartanāt*. The editors take *dīkṣānirvāṇakārī syāt* to mean "he will perform the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*", saying (p. 85) that it is a "fine instance" of an inverted compound. For them, then, *dīkṣānirvāṇa-* is for *nirvāṇadīkṣā*. However, there is an alternative interpretation of the transmission that does not convict the author of writing nonsense, for nonsense it would be. The context is the enumeration of the rewards of reciting the Śikhāśivamantra a given number of times. If one repeats it seven times one will achieve all the benefits by inundation with all sacred waters (90c: *sarvatīrthābhiṣekaś ca*). The benefit of the same number (reading *saptajaptena*) or a hundred (reading *śatajaptena*) is equal to that of all the Vedic sacrifices (91ab). The line in question then states the reward of 21. This can hardly be that of *performing* the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*. For that is a duty, not a benefit. The reward intended is obviously that one

receives the benefit of *nirvāṇadīkṣā*, the highest Tantric initiation, which bestows liberation at death. The text will make this sense if the proposed reading, which requires no emendation, is accepted. The idea expressed is not unusual. One may compare *Parātrīśikā* 18: *adṛṣtamaṇḍalo 'py evaṃ yaḥ kaścid vetti tattvataḥ/sa siddhibhāṅ bhaven nityaṃ sa yogī sa ca dīkṣitaḥ*; and 25: *evaṃ yo vetti tattvena tasya nirvāṇagāminī/dīkṣā bhavaty asaṃdigdhā tilājyāhutivivarjitā*); also *Ūrmikaulārṇava*, NAK 5.5207, f.31v8: *saptāvartena subhage dīkṣitaḥ sarvamaṇḍale* "By repeating (the mantra) seven times he becomes initiated in every Maṇḍala."

17.22. For *pañca pañca ca vidyāstraṃ mahāntārī sa eva hi* read *daśa pañca ca vidyāstraṃ mahāntārī sa eva hi* with AB. The editors' preferred reading cannot be correct, because the Vidyā of Mahāntārī referred to here consists not of ten but of fifteen syllables (RIṄGAṬĪ PIṄGAṬĪ KUḌU KUḌU KAṆḌĀYAI SVĀHĀ; see 19.28) as the text confirms at 19.29 ab: *pañca pañca tathā pañca svarūpākṣaramālikā*.

17.27c. For *vidyāṅgābharaṇopetām* read *vidyāṅgāvaraṇopetām* "with her Vidyā auxiliaries and circuits" following the guidance of the Śāstra against all the manuscripts.

18.58. *vāmaraudrāntadakṣasthaṃ dakṣaraudrāntavāmagam/raudrā-raudrasamāyuktaṃ triraudraṃ tadgraho 'py ayam*. The Tadgrahamantra referred to here is formed by combining the 50 letters of the Śabdarāśi alphabet (*a* to *kṣa*), the 50 letters of the Mālinī alphabet (*na* to *pha*), and the 50 syllables of the Trividyā into 50 units, each of which comprises a serially corresponding element of each. The first unit consists of the first letter of Śabdarāśi, the first letter of Mālinī and the first syllable of the Trividyā (thus A NA AIṂ), and so on. Evidently 18.58abc serve to state the order in which the three elements of each unit are to be combined; but as they stand the pādas are corrupt: *dakṣastham* and *vāmagam* need to be predicates of what has been corrupted into *vāmaraudrānta* and *dakṣaraudrānta*. I propose that we emend to *vāmaraudraṃ tu dakṣasthaṃ dakṣaraudraṃ tu vāmagam*, understanding this to mean "The left Raudra is on the right and the right Raudra is on the left." This, barring the gender, is the reading of F (*vāmaraudras tu vamastho dakṣaraudras tu vāmagaḥ*). It is also supported by *Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippaṇa*, which reads *vāmaraudraṃ ca* and *dakṣaraudraṃ ca* (cod. cit., f. 44r5 and 44r8–v1). The left Raudra (*vāmaraudram*) and right Raudra (*dakṣaraudram*) to be placed on the right and left respectively must be the two alphabets. The first is Mālinī because that embodies Śakti; the second is Śabdarāśi because that embodies Śiva. Thus the order prescribed is not NA A AIṂ, Ā THA HRĪṂ etc. up to KṢA PHA AIṂ). The Tadgraha is described here as *triraudram* '(that which comprises) the three Raudras'.

The third Raudra, namely the Trividyā, is called *raudrāraudra* in 18.58c in the reading of ABCD(FG) followed by the editors. But this appears contradictory. Even in this text one wonders whether it could be said that there is an X that is both X and not-X. H(JK) have *raudra-raudra*, E has *rudraraudra*, and *Ṣaṭsahasraṭippaṇa* agrees with the former. I propose that we follow it.

In their introduction (p. 122) the editors describe the Tadgraha as "a combination of the Śabdarāśi, the Mālinī and the Parāparā in an extended form". But the third element is not the Parāparā in any form. That is part of it, and the largest part – hence the error – but it is actually the combination of all three of the Vidyās that define the antecedent system known as the Trika ('Triad'): Parā, Parāparā and Aparā, in the order Aparā, Parāparā and Parā. This is why it is called the Trividyā "the triple Vidyā" in the Paścimāmnāya, or, as at 24.35, "the three Śaktis" (*śaktitrayam*). The editors repeat their mistake in their summing up of the contents of Paṭala 24 (p. 127): "The stanzas 36–37, announced as 'the threefold Śakti' (i.e. Parā, Aparā and Parāparā), give an application of the Mālinī system: the extraction of the "eightfold Aghori" (the Parāparā)."

20.32–33b. For *pañca pañca tathā pañca pañcamāntaṃ kulāntikam/ calasaumye caytuṣkaṃ tu īśvaraikaṃ diśāditaḥ/pīṭhavyūhavaraṃ madhye dvīpavyūhaṃ bahisthitam* read *pañca pañca tathā pañca pañca māntaṃ jalāntikam/cale saumye catuṣkaṃ tu īśvaraikaṃ diśāditḥ/ pīṭhavyūhavaraṃ madhye dvīpavyūhaṃ bahiḥ sthitam*. The editors' summary of this Paṭala (p. 123) shows that they have not understood that it is concerned with the system of 'continents' (*dvīpa*) principally as the letters of the alphabet arranged in a certain order (an *akṣaraprastāraḥ*) as a means of determining from the initial letter of sites of various categories which directions or divisions of such sites are more or less suitable for mantra rites, image installation and the like (*digvicāra*). The passage in question prescribes this arrangement of the letters; but the text of the editors yields no coherent or applicable sense. With the preferred variants (supported by the *Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippaṇa*) we have the following: "Five, five, five, five and that (five) of which the last is MA (should be placed in the directions) ending with that of water (i.e. the W). Four (should be) in both the NW and the N. One should be in the NE. (All this should be done beginning) from the first of the directions (i.e. the E). The illustrious array of the Pīṭhas (i.e. the 16 vowels) (should be) in the centre (of the diagram) and the array of the Dvīpas (i.e. the 34 consonants) outside it." The fives are the velars, palatals, retroflexes, dentals and labials, each with its homorganic nasal. The fours are the semi-vowels and the sibilants with the voiced aspirate HA. The one is KṢA. The rule that one must begin from

the E applies to the internal arrangement of each of the groups of five or four. That the Pīṭhas are the vowels and the Dvīpas the consonants is stated at 20.22.

25.217–218b: *pūjā cāsya prakartavyā viśeṣeṇa varānane/śuklapakṣe tṛtīyāyāṃ vaiśākhasya tathā punaḥ/kṛṣṇapakṣe trayodaśyāṃ nabhasyanavamī punaḥ/āśvine śuklapakṣasya pūrṇimā phālgune matā/āṣāḍhe śrāvaṇe caiva bhādrapadyāṃ tathaiva ca*. This passage lists those specific lunar 'days' (*tithi*), called *parva*, on which initiates must offer special, more lavish worship (*viśeṣapūjā*). Cf. 28.10–59. As the next stands we have a problem. If the reading *nabhasyanavamī* is sound then the text fails to tell us whether this ninth day of Bhādra is that of the bright (waxing) or dark (waning) semi-lunation. It also requires us to accept that our author has written of the full-moon day of the waxing half of Āśvina (*āśvine śuklapakṣasya pūrṇimā*), as though there could be a full moon in the waning half. I therefore propose that we emend *nabhasyanavamī* to *nabhasye navamī*. This gives the following Parva days: (1) the 3rd of the bright half of Vaiśākha; (2) the 13th of the dark half of Bhādra (*kṛṣṇapakṣe trayodaśyāṃ nabhasye*); (3) the 9th of the bright half of Āśvina (*navamī/punaḥ āśvine śuklapakṣasye*); and (4 to 6) the full moon Tithis of Phālguṇa, Āṣāḍha, Śrāvaṇa and Bhādra. The emendation is supported by the result that the 9th of the bright half of Āśvina revealed by it is the Mahānavamī, the ninth and last day of the annual Durgāpūjā (Navarātra).

Not every edition of a Sanskrit text need be published with a translation; but no sentence in any such edition should be published that the editor has not subjected to the close examination of meaning in context that translation demands. In no other way can he hope to discover and remove the greater part, if not the whole, of the defects of the transmission. If in spite of his best efforts he finds that he is left with suspect passages for which he can propose no plausible emendation, he should reveal his defeat by enclosing them between obeli, or marking them out in some other way, in order to draw them more directly to the attention of scholars, who may well succeed where he has failed. Unfortunately, our editors have not followed this convention, leaving us to guess whether or not they would have agreed with us where we find unintelligible what they have printed as their text.

One's ability to test a text's transmission in terms of its meaning will depend upon the depth of one's knowledge of the subject it covers. This ability to solve the problems presented by a transmission will increase with the range and quantity of relevant textual materials with which one is familiar. The worst situation is one in which the only source of such

knowledge is the text to be edited itself. The best is one in which one has at one's fingertips a substantial part if not all of the sources that informed one's author. In the case of the *Kubjikāmata* these sources are numerous indeed. It is desirable to be familiar not only with the other redactions of the *Kubjikāmata* and the commentary on the *Ṣaṭsāhasra* but also with the related literature of other Kaula systems and the voluminous corpus of the antecedent Śaiva traditions, from the Siddhānta through the *Svacchanda* to the Vidyāpīṭha and the Trika in particular. A scholar thoroughly versed in the whole range of the Śaiva Śāstra that these layers and branches of the tradition comprise may well be able to produce a better edition of such a text from a single manuscript than the most determined collator of witnesses who lacks that knowledge.

Our editors would have been better equipped if they had acquired a deeper knowledge of this textual hinterland. But the task would have been formidable. For much of the literature awaits thorough study and it is to a great extent available only in manuscripts. One may ask then whether they were wise to take up this text rather than another. According to their preface (p. xi) the project began shortly after 1970 in pursuance of a decision of a working committee of the Instituut voor Oosterse Talen of the State University of Utrecht to conduct further study of microfilms of two manuscripts of the *Kubjikāmata* that had been acquired with others from Calcuttan libraries in that year. If there were more substantial reasons for their choice of this text over others they do not state them.

In a new field such as this the would-be editor would be well advised to direct his first work to those parts of the unedited literature that are the most fundamental, that is to say to those that underly the rest, both in time and in content. In this respect the *Kubjikāmata* is far from ideal being later than most of the scriptual literature and supposing an understanding of it. The editors would have had an easier task if they had chosen to work on a primary scripture of the Saiddhāntika Śaivas, such as the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, or, if they wished to work on one of the goddess-oriented traditions, a text such as the *Tantrasadbhāva*. The first is more fundamental than the second, since the Śaiva Siddhānta is the general or common tradition (*sāmānyaśāstra*), while the Trika is specialized (*viśeṣaśāstra*); but in either case an editor would have the advantage of access to an extensive body of Sanskrit exegetical literature that can act as a base from which to launch into the study of related unpublished materials. The learned works of a Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, an Abhinavagupta or a Kṣemarāja do not, of course, exactly mirror the meaning of the scriptures of the Siddhānta, Trika or Bhairavatantras, as they pretend to do. Nonetheless, they provide a firm base of technical knowledge from which one can

begin to perceive the specific differences between them and the texts whose meaning they have tended to assimilate to their own understanding of what is correct in practice and doctrine. When by this means knowledge has encompassed the scriptual literature in the immediate background of the learned Śaiva schools it will be much easier to proceed with confidence to a text such as the *Kubjikāmata* that is late and without sophisticated and systematic exegesis.

NOTES

* Review article on: Goudriaan, Teun and Schoterman, Jan A. (Eds.), The Kubjikāmatatantra. Kulālikāmnāya version. Critical Edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill 1988, pp. XII, 517.

1 The following abbreviations appear in the text and footnote: BEFEO = Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient; cod. cit. = in the manuscript cited (*codice citato*); *conj* = my conjecture; *em* = my emendation; JaRaYām = *Jayadrathayāmala*. K_{ED} = edition in the Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies; NAK = National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu; NGMPP = Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project; $PaTriViv_K$ = K_{ED} of *Parātrīśikāvivaraṇa*; = K_{ED} of *Svacchandatantroddyota*; $TaAL_K$ = K_{ED} of *Tantrāloka*; $TaĀlViv_K$ = K_{ED} of *Tantrālokavivka*.

2 E.g. 2.22: *paścimāmnāyamārgo 'yaṃ*; 2.47cd: *aṣṭau putrāḥ kariṣyanti adhikāraṃ paścimānvaye*.

3 Thus in the chronology of D.C. Sircar (*Journal of Ancient Indian History* IX, 1975–1976, pp. 209–210). The editors (p. 6) give Rāmapāla's regnal years as A.D. 1077–1120. This is in accordance with the chronology proposed by R.C. Majumdar in his *History of Ancient Bengal* (Calcutta, 1971), pp. 161–162.

4 JaRaYām 1.36.27–29 (NAK 5–4650, = NGMPP reel no. B 122/7, f. 169v6–7): *vidyāpīṭhaṃ smṛtaṃ devi mudrāpīṭham ataḥ param / mudrāpīṭhaṃ tridhā bhinnaṃ sahasrāṣṭādaśānvitam / mantrāṇāṃ saṃkhyayā devi śatāṣṭottarakalpagam / hṛdbhedo mātṛbhedaś ca tathānyaṃ kubjikāmatam / mudrā*pīṭhe* (em: *piṭhan* Cod) *tu sūtrāṇi triṇi bhinnāny anekadhā*. It is also mentioned, more prominently, in the third Ṣaṭka, Yoginīsaṃcāraprakaraṇa, 1.27c–29b (NAK 5–1975, = NGMPP reel no. A 152/9, f. 170v1–2): *tantrāṇi devadeveśi tāni samyak purā mayā / kīrtitāni sureśāni pūrvaṣaṭke suvistaram / iha saṃkṣepato khyāsye śṛṇu vīrendravandite / mūlatantraṃ kubjikā ca yoginījālaśamvaram / . . .*

5 JaRaYām Ṣaṭka 4, Pustakādhikārapaṭala, vv. 68–69b (NAK 1–1468, = NGMPP reel no. B 122/4): *śrīpūrvaṃ nāma vai grāhyaṃ śiraśchedeti noccaret / jayadrathendro vaktavyaṃ tantrarājānam ambike / yāgakāle śiraśchedam iti vaktavyam eva hi*.

6 Sdok Kak Thoṃ inscription, v. 28; *śāstraṃ śiraśchedavināśikhākhyaṃ saṃmohanāmāpi nayottarākhyaṃ / tat tumburor vaktracatuṣkam asya siddhyeva vipras samadarśayat saḥ*. See Cœdès and P. Dupont, 'Les stèles de Sdok Kak Thoṃ, Phnoṃ Sandak et Prāḥ Vihar', BEFEO XLIII, p. 79.

7 See, e.g., JaRaYām Ṣaṭka 1, cod. cit., f. 101v1–2, 15.54c–55: *praviśyejyā*gṛhāntaḥstho* (em: *gṛhāṃtasthaṃ* Cod) *vīkṣya vijñānacakṣuṣā / *punaḥ padottareṇaiva* (em: *punaryaduttareṇaiva* Cod) *praveśo vāmaśāsane / vāmapāṇipramokṣaś ca *srajo* (em: *sraje* Cod) *nārācamudrayā*; cod. cit., f. 212v6–8, 40.85–87: *proktam ca kulajāgarbhe tava janma bhaviṣyati / tasmiṃś ca śāṅkaraṃjñānaṃ vāmācāraparāyaṇam / vāmāyāḥ*

*saṃprasādena vāmeśvaramukhodgatam / *vāmeśa* (em: *vāmetha* Cod) *pūjitaṃ vāmaṃ vāmeśīnāṃ gṛhe śubham / vāmavīryacarāṇāṃ ca supratiṣṭhaṃ bhaviṣyati / kalau yuge mahāghore duṣṭaprāṇigaṇākule*; ibid., f. 213v6, 50.102: *nānātantramaṇīndrakaustubham imaṃ vāmāgamārthodayam*.

[8] In the sixth Paṭala (cod. cit., ff. 22r–27v) the text works a uniquely detailed pantheon of Vāmasrotas text-deities into its account of the Bhuvanādhvan, the hierarchy of worlds, inserting this material, which is not to be found in any other Āgama Saiddhāntika or Dakṣiṇa, as the content of Īśvaratattva. There are close connections between this pantheon and the outer retinues in the Maṇḍala of Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī, the central deity of this Tantra, set out in 15.84–112 (cod. cit., ff. 102v2–103v4).

[9] JaRaYām Ṣaṭka 1, cod. cit., f. 174r, 50.3–4: *etāni śaktitantrāṃi santi śūlālayāni tu / savyasrotasi siddhāni śiracchid ubhayātmakam / nayottaraṃ mahāraudraṃ mahāsaṃmohanaṃ tathā / trikam etan mahādevi vāmasrotasi nirgatam*.

[10] JaRaYām Ṣaṭka 1, cod. cit., f. 322v5, 40.75c–86: *vāmadakṣiṇabhedasthaṃ śiracchedaṃ suvistaram*.

[11] SvaTaUdd$_K$ vol. 1, Paṭala 2, p. 107, lines 10–13; **tadvac ca* (em: following JaRaYām: *taducca* K$_{ED}$) *mekhalāsaṃsthaiḥ prāgagrair *udagagrakair* (conj: *udagagrair* K$_{ED}$: *udagagrabhair* JaRaYām) *hutabhugveśmano darbhair akṣavāṭaṃ *prakalpayed iti śrītantrarāje* (em: *prakalpayet śrītantrarāje* variant reported by K$_{ED}$: *prakalpayet. śrīmantrarāje* K$_{ED}$). Cf. JaRaYām 1.17.52–53b (cod. cit., f. 109v5): *tadvac ca mekhalāsaṃsthaiḥ prāguktair udagagrabhaiḥ / hutabhugveśmano darbhair akṣavāṭaṃ kalpayet*. The honorific title *Tantrarāja*, used in this instance by Kṣemarāja, is the only one under which, with the further honorific *bhaṭṭāraka*, the text is cited by Jayaratha in his *Tantrālokaviveka*.

[12] TaĀl$_K$ 29.56–77.

[13] This is apparent from its very different character as a non-Kaula work, but also from the fact that it refers to itself at its end as a complete work comprising 6000 verses. See 1.50.78–79b (cod. cit., f. 212v1–2): *sahasrayugalenātra vidyāpādaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ / kriyāpādas tathaivaṃ hi yogākhyaḥ pañcabhiḥ śataiḥ / caryāpādaḥ sahasreṇa sārdhena gaditaḥ sphuṭaḥ*; 1.50.93c–94b (cod. cit., f. 213r2–4): *kiṃ tasya bahubhiḥ kalpaiḥ pratikalpakriyekṣakaiḥ / yasyāyaṃ sarvavidyādhṛt ṣaṭsahasre pratiṣṭhitaḥ*.

[14] TaĀ1Viv$_K$ ad 29.56: *śrīmādhavakule iti śrītantrarājabhaṭṭārakagranthaikadeśe ity arthaḥ*.

[15] PaTriViv$_K$ p. 184 (Gnoli's edition, p. 249): *tathā ca śrikubjikāmate khaṇḍacakravicāre amum evārthaṃ pradhānatayādhikṛtyādiṣṭaṃ "māyopari mahāmāyā trkoṇānandarūpiṇi."*

[16] See, e.g., *Kālīkulakramasadbhāva* (NAK MS 1–76, = NGMPP reel no. a203/23) 2.36c–37b: khaṇḍakhaṇḍakamadhyasthā khaṇḍakākārabhakṣakī / khaṇḍajñānena *sā devi khaṇḍacakraikatāṃ gatā; Yonigahvara*, Calcutta, Asiatic Society of Bengal, MS 10000 (G), vv. 81c–82: *yaṃ yaṃ bhāvaṃ jhaṭity antaḥsthitaṃ bāhye 'thavā sakṛt / taṃ taṃ grastaṃ bhavet sadyo yoginām api yoginām / (saṃhā)raṃ tad viduḥ prājāb̃āḥ khaṇḍacakrapathānugam*; and *Mahānayaprakāśa* of Arṇasiṃha, NAK 5.358, = NGMPP Reel No. B 30/26, v. 201: *niyatagrahasaṃsthānavarjito 'kramamūrtimān / sarvasaṃhāraniratah khaṇḍacakrakramaḥ paraḥ*.

[17] Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Stein Or. d. 43, ff. 124r2–125r3. Takṣakavarta's date is uncertain. He quotes Somaśambhu's Paddhati, *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī*, which was completed in A.D. 1095/6.

[18] K$_{ED}$ p. 28, lines 19–20.

[19] See, e.g., *Agnikāryapaddhati*, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Sanscrit 166, f. 71v16–73r6, giving her *dhyānam*, Gāyatrī, *mūlamantra, aṅgamantra, dhyāna* at the

time of her *pūrṇāhuti*, and *tarpaṇaśloka*, ending as follows: *anena mantrahomena śrīkubjikā paścimāmnāyadevatā sāṅgā saparivārā savaktrā prīyatāṃ prītāstu*. The order of the goddesses is typically Durgā and Gaurī; the local Kashmirian goddesses Śārikā, Śāradā and Jvālāmukhī; Bhuvanamālinī, also called Dikṣādevī and Pāpāntakāriṇī (both <JaRaYām 4), four Traipura goddesses (Kulavāgīśvarī, Kāmeśvarī, Vajreśvarī, Mahātripurasundarī), the Sarasvatīs, namely Mātṛkāsarasvatī, Vidyāvidyeśvarī (<JaRaYām 2), Vāgbhaveśvarī (<JaRaYām 3), Vāgīśvarī (<JaRaYām 3), Vāgīśvarī (<JaRa Yām 4), and Vaikharī; **Kubjikā**, the Pratyaṅgirās, namely Siddhalakṣmī (<JaRaYām 2), Mantramātṛkā (<JaRaYām 3), Mantraḍāmarikā (<JaRaYām 3) and Saptakoṭeśvari (<JaRaYām 4); Caṇḍā Kāpālinī (<*Picumata*); Vittalakṣmi and Lakṣmī; Pūrvāmnāyeśvarī Mālinī (Trika); Lakṣmī; Bhāgyādhirohiṇī (<JaRaYām 4); and Nityākālī (<JaRaYām 4).

[20] See Sāhib Rāma, *Tīrthasaṃgraha*, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Stein Or. d. 2, f. 127r–v.

[21] Madras, Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, R. No. 3203 (d).

[22] Maṅgala verse 5, stating that he was the recipient of two Kaula lineages (*ovalliyugmam*), the first being that of the Krama (Anuttara), which is the subject of the *Mahārthamañjarī*, the other being that of the Saubhāgya, namely the cult of Subhagā (Tripurasundarī), and the Śāmbhavānanda: *yasmād anuttaramahāhradamajjanaṃ me saubhāgyaśāmbhavasukhānubhavaś ca yasmāt / tat svātmacitkramavimarśamayaṃ gurūṇām ovalliyugman uditoditavīryam īḍe*. A complete surviving work in this tradition is the unpublished *Ṣaḍanvayaśāmbhavakrama* of Umākānta, London, Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine. MS Sansk. B 353.

[23] Jñānaśivācārya, *Jñānaratnāvalī*, Institut Français de Pondichéry, Transcript 231, pp. 160–162. The author cittes the *Nigūḍhajñānasadbhāva*, which praises the Paścimāmnāya and denigrates the Śaivism of the five streams, and a 24000-verse redaction of the *Kulālikāmnāya* of the same tradition.

[24] This is the section of the *Saundaryalaharī*, vv.1–62, known as the *Ānandalaharī*. Its many late South and East Indian commentators, such as Kaivalyāśrama, Ānandagiri, Gaurīkānta Sārvabhauma, Narasiṃha and Lakṣmīdhara, are fully conversant with the technicalities of this originally Kaula system.

[25] A text produced from witnesses belonging to different recensions may be stripped of whatever has been added in all identifiable stages after the common text; but what remains will itself be problematic, since it will tend to be a hotchpotch of the versions presented by the different recensions for the common sections of the text. Where they disagree the critic will find it hard to the perceive their common source if the differences are of meaning.

[26] *Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippaṇa*, NAK 5–428, = NGMPP reel no. B 32/6, f. 270r8–vl: *kṣetradevīnāṃ dviradākhyaṃ . . . pīṭhānāṃ caturadhikam*.

[27] The terms used by the Śaiva authors for non-paninean scriptual forms are *ārṣa* 'proper to the (ancient) Ṛṣis', *chāndasa* 'proper to scripture', as in non-Śaiva scholarship, and *aiśvara-* or *aiśa-* 'proper to God'. For the last see, e.g., SvaTaUdd$_K$ ad 5.64, 7.30.7.275 and 9.68.

[28] Sanderson in *Mantras et Diagrammes rituelles dans l'Hindouisme* (Paris: Éditions du CNRS, 1986), pp. 163–164.

[29] The manuscript of the *Tantrasadbhāva* (NAK 1–362, = NGMPP reel no. A 44/1) in which I noted the parallels communicated to the editors lacks much of the latter part of the text. The additional correspondence came to light at a later date when I had access to the remaining Adhikāras in NAK 5–445, a complete manuscript dated Saṃvat 217 (= A.D. 1097/8). I take this opportunity to record a further parallel between the scriptural corpus of the Trika and that of the Kubjikā cult, though it does not concern the *Kubjikāmata* redaction

edited here. **Devyāyāmalādi* quoted or paraphrased in TaĀl$_K$ 15.521c–531, on 64 rules for initiates, is found with few divergence in the 17th Paṭala of the *Ṣaṭsāhasra* redaction; see *Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippaṇa*, cod. cit., f. 80r6–v7.

30 A parenthesized siglum indicates that the reading of that witness differs from those with which it is listed but in an insignificant manner.

31 That reading, incidentally, is also that of the *Tantrasadbhāva*; but in this case I consider the reading to have risen independently in both. The same error has occurred at 10.112a. AB have *anujñāto 'bhiṣiktasya*, which the editors have accepted, wrongly in my opinion, against the reading *anujñāto 'bhiṣiktaś ca* in DEHJK(CF). Compare also 3.13cd, where the majority of the witnesses, followed by our editors, give *vasantasya kāmasya*, which is nonsense in the context, against the sense *vasantaś ca kāmaś ca* of GH(J)K.

32 For *mantroddhāraḥ* and *prastāraḥ* see André Padoux, 'Contribution à l'étude du mantraśāstra', BEFEO LXV (1978), pp. 65–85; and Jan Schoterman, *The Ṣaṭsāhasra Saṃhitā. Chapters 1–5 Edited, Translated and Annotated* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), pp. 181–209 (with diagrams). See also *Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippaṇa*, cod. cit., f. 14v6: *akṣarārtho uddhāramantram*.

33 The editors read *ṣad ete hi* with FGHJK against AB's *ṣaḍ ete ca*, E's *ṣaḍ evaite*, and CD's *ṣaḍ evaitāni*. The last is also the reading of the *Tantrasadbhāva*. This too might have been preferred without the evidence of the *Tantrasadbhāva*, since the use of *etāni* as the nominative and accusative plural in all genders is likely to be an original form, reflecting the Middle Indo-Aryan tendency of pronouns and numerals to reduction and fixation. Cf., e.g., *anyāni* in 5.123c.

34 For such hiatus bridgers in this text see Introduction, pp. 64–66. For Ambikā as the 'nameless' fourth see. e.g. Amṛtānanda, *Saubhāgyasudhodaya*, ed. V. Dviveda, 2.7–19.

35 See, e.g., *Nityāhnikatilaka* (NAK 3–384, = NGMPP reel no. A 41/11) f. 29rl: *ity olitraye nāyakī kathitā navātmotsaṅgagatā āvāhanīyā*.

All Souls College
Oxford OX1 4AL
England