

RĀJA RĀJA - THE GREAT

(Seminar Proceedings)

R E P R I N T S

**Ananthacharya Indological Research Institute
G. D. Somani Memorial Building,
Cuffe Parade, Bombay-400 005.**

1987

was in answer to Śaṅkara's denial of the authority of the Āgamas. On this basis Yāmuna justified the temple worship and rituals (Cf *Āgamaprāmāṇya*).

2. Rejection of Śaṅkara's doctrine of Advaita (monism) and expounding the doctrine of qualified monism (Viśiṣṭādvaita)

3. Rejection of Śaṅkara's concept of *Nirguṇa-Brahman* and description of the Lord as the embodiment of all auspicious qualities (*Sarvakalyāṇa-guṇa Sampannaḥ*).

4. Glorification Śrī or Lakṣmī as the embodiment of mercy and grace (*Chatusloki*) and as complementary to the Lord.

5. Preaching of the *Bhakti* and *prapatti-mārga* as the only effective means of salvation (*Stōtraratna*).

6. Glorification of the Tamil saints Āḷvārs and their sacred hymns as revelations worthy of equal veneration. In one of the verses in the *Stōtraratna*, he describes Nammāḷvār as his father, mother, consort, child, wealth and in short, everything.

Thus, Yāmuna, following his preceptor Nāthamuni was profoundly influenced by the inspired Tamil hymns of Nammāḷvār and other Āḷvārs and his works are replete with their teachings and ideas. Actually, some of the stanzas seem to be Sanskrit renderings of the Tamil hymns. All these ideas and precepts mentioned above inspired Rāmānuja and helped in the crystallisation of his philosophy. The galaxy of āchāryas who followed Rāmānuja continued this tradition and expanded the *Divyaprabandhas* in the light of Rāmānuja's tenets. Thus, we can say that Rājarāja's period witnessed a very important and formative period in the history of Sri-Vaishnavism thanks to Yāmuna-chārya's exposition. This was a prelude to a period which witnessed a new form of religion centering round the temple and the idol (*arcā* form) within it, reticent to the vedic orthodoxy and accepting the Āgama as also valid and authoritative, venerating Tamil saints Āḷvārs and their inspired hymns as divine revelations preaching the path of devotionism (*Bhakti*) and surrender which could be practised irrespective of caste status.

Aghoraśivācārya and the Dvaita School of Śaivism in Chola Period

PIERRE - SYLVAIN FILLIOZAT

The importance of Śaivism, i.e. not only monuments, cult and bhakti but also the philosophical doctrine of Śaivasiddhānta, in Tamilnadu in Cōḷa period, is well-established through inscriptions. Inscriptions are indeed the best documentary source and they allow us to approach the most authentic reality in the past. But there are other documents which can be taken into consideration. Our purpose here is to present two documents of a different nature and to examine their validity and interest.

They are two short Sanskrit texts. One is already known and published. It is an account which Aghoraśivācārya has himself given of religious, intellectual and even familial lineage. It is a chapter of his magnum opus, *Kriyākramadyotikā*, and is entitled "gotrasaṃtatih" (55 verses). It comes at the end of the section on *mahotsavavidhi*. The second document is less known because to our knowledge it is available in only one unpublished manuscript preserved in Tiruvadudurai Math, a transcript of which is in the collection of the French Institute of Pondicherry. It contains a story about the same Aghoraśivācārya and establishment of a śaiva maṭha in Cidambaram : it is entitled "Aghoraśivācāryacaritam".

The first text contains in the beginning an exposition of the theoretical organization of Śaiva lineages, what is common to all lineages in the first 23 verses and then the particular lineage of the author, Aghoraśiva, as an example of an application of the theory. To summarize briefly the theory there are four *gotras* and 16 *gocaras* or *kula*, 4 *gotra munis* and 36 *bhrātṛs*, 4 *śihānas*, 15 (?) *maṭhas* and four *vrkṣas*. There is a regular correspondence between one gotra, 4 *kulas*, 1 *muni*, 9 *bhrātṛs* etc.

Then Aghoraśiva gives his own lineage. The first part is mythical. It starts from supreme Śiva. From Śiva residing in non-agitated *kuṇḍali-śakti* comes the Śiva-kula which is supported by Gāyatri-śakti and which descends in Durvāsas. The dwelling

of ṛṣis who received the grace of this sage, is Āmardaka embellished by a *kadamba* tree. The mythical origin is thus: Śiva-gotra, Bharadvāja-muni, his ninth brother (*bhrāṭṛ*) Durvāsas, Prājāpatya-gocara, Āmardakamaṭha, kadamba tree. Āmardaka is non-mythical. Aghoraśiva says himself: “sthānam atrābhavad bhūmau bhārate mokṣasāadhanam (it was a place on this earth, in Bhārata (khaṇḍa), a means to achieve liberation)”. Then he gives his own *guru-saṃtati* on the human and historical level. It starts with Vyāpakaśiva, chief of Āmardaka, and hailing from Lāṭa. For all gurus in the line Aghoraśiva gives indications on their origin and place of residence, occasionally a few historical facts. We will see that the line covers all parts of India. The line is:

Vyāpakaśiva, residing in Āmardaka.

Disciple, Sarveśapaṇḍita from Gauḍa, residing in Nilalāṭa (?).

Disciple, Uttuṅgaśiva from Lāṭa; resided in kalyāṇa; author of a *paddhati*; his younger brother was guru of King Bhoja “who determined the meaning of all *āgamas*”, and who is probably the author of *Tattvapraśāṅgika* and earlier than King Bhoja of Dhārā, as he is very early in the long lineage coming before Aghoraśiva in the middle of 12th century and this line may have covered more than a century which is the distance between Aghoraśiva and King Bhoja of Dhārā.

Disciple, Somaśiva, of Lāṭa (?)

Disciple Pūrṇaśivācārya, honoured by a King of Vārāṇasī.

Disciple, Āryottuṅgaśiva of Āryadeśa.

Disciple, Vidyēśānasa of Āryadeśa.

Disciple, Vidyāntaśiva of Coḷadeśa, guru of the King of Vārāṇasī.

Disciple, Brahmaśiva of Lāṭa.

Disciple, Mūrtiśiva residing in Vijayapura.

Son, Sarvātmadeśika residing in Māyāpuri.

Disciple, Śrikanthaśivadeśika from Gauḍa. By his desire to see the Lord of *ciṭṣabā* in Cidambaram he came to Coḷadeśa

and Cōḷa Kings, Vikrama and others, appointed him as their guru. If Vikrama Cōḷa is referred to here, Śrīkaṇṭhaśiva came to Tamilnadu in the beginning of 12th century.

Disciple, Dhyānaśiva from Gauḍa, 'skilled in commenting the 28 *tantras* ; honoured by a Cōḷa King.

Disciple or son, Hṛdayaśaṃkara; the relation between this guru and the previous one is expressed by the imprecise words "tasmād babbhūva"; therefore we have no certainty about his origin; it appears that he was settled in Tamilnadu; he is the elder son of the paternal uncle of Aghoraśiva's grandfather.

The next guru which is mentioned is Parameśvara, His relation with the previous one is problematic. It is expressed by the verse : "mātulo 'smatpituh tasya kaniṣṭhaḥ parameśvaraḥ" If "tasya" refers to Hṛdayaśaṃkara mentioned in the previous verse, Parameśvara appears to be a younger brother of Hṛdayaśaṃkara and the maternal uncle of Aghoraśiva's father. It implies that Aghoraśiva's grandfather had married a sister of Parameśvara, i.e. a cousin in the same gotra, If "tasya" qualifies only "asmatpituh", Parameśvara has no connection with Hṛdayaśaṃkara, has another gotra, and is the younger brother of the mother of Aghoraśiva's father. Parameśvara is told to have received *ācāryābhiṣeka* from Dhyānaśiva and to have resided in Kañcī. Aghoraśiva has a special reverence for him and for Hṛdayaśaṃkara. He eulogizes them in longer verses, *vasantatilkā* and *śārdūlavikrīḍita*. He probably received *dikṣā* from Parameśvara as he qualifies him as *madbandhavicchedaka*. He had himself the name Parameśvara, Aghoraśiva being his *dikṣā* name.

At the end Aghoraśiva introduces his own *Kriyākramadyotikā* by saying that he has composed it after the model of his spiritual ancestors, of *Uttuṅgapaddhati*, *Siddhāntasārāvalī* and the teachings of Sarvātmaśiva. The final verses give the date of composition in *śaka* era, 1080/1158 A.D. and describes the *paddhati* as composed in 3500 *granthis* at the order of his guru.

The second document to be presented here is entitled "śrīmad aghoraśivācāryacaritam" but it also claims to be an extract of a larger text of puranic nature "cidambarasāre brahmānandaśaṃkarayatiśvarasaṃvāde". Therefore no composer is acknow-

ledged for it. It is not found in the different *māhātmyas* and legendary accounts of Cidambaram. Nor is a *Cidmbarasāra* known to us. And we may suspect that it is in fact an independent text asserting its subordination to the literature devoted to the glorification of the holy place. It is very short. What we have consists in 31 *anuṣṭubh* verses. We suspect that there is a lacuna in the unique manuscript, as we shall see below.

It narrates the following story. A teacher explains to his disciples the story of a *matha* situated outside the temple of Cidambaram, to the South-East of it. There were in Cidambaram Trisahasra brahmins who followed the cult of Naṭesa and won fame for their generosity in giving food to all. Durvāsas, the irascible sage, wants to test it. He goes to Tilvaraṇya when everybody is asleep. He approaches the liṅga worshipped by Śeṣa and asks three times for *bhikṣā*. No woman comes to give him food, because of sleep. He gets angry and begins to say some derogatory sentences about Tilvaraṇya. At that moment Nṛttagaṇapati thinks of his mother...

Here there must be a lacuna in the manuscript, because without continuity, we come to a scene in which Durvāsas receives the desired *bhikṣā*, recognizes Gaurī and worships her. It implies that in the gap Gaurī had appeared for some reason determined by Gaṇapati. Then it is told that Gaurī addresses Durvāsas, asking him to instal in this place his disciple, as a *naiṣṭhikābrahmacārin*, with the name Aghoraśiva, so that he will give *dīkṣā* to śūdra devotees. At the behest of Gaurī Durvāsas builds a residence and with the necessary preparations performs the *paññābhīṣeka* of Aghoraśiva. Then he brings his disciple in the *citsabha*, accomplishes different worships of the god in front of Trisahasra brahmins. Then he returns to the house, instals a liṅga and asks Aghoraśiva to worship it and, after studying the *āgamas*, to establish the rule of liṅga mūrtis and śakti worship, the rules of different *dīkṣās* for twice-borns and for *śūdras*. Aghoraśiva obeys the order of his guru and composes the *Kriyākramadyotikā*.

An important detail is the mention of the date of the *abhīṣeka*. The details of the date are given is : *śrīmukha* year, *śuklapakṣa*, *puṣyanakṣatra*, 5th *tithi*, *vaiśākha* month, Thursday. In Swami-

kannu Pillai's Ephemeris we find all these details, with the exception of the *nakṣatra*, occurring on Thursday 10th April 1153. We have seen that the date of composition of the *paddhati* is 1158.

Now we may examine the historical validity of these two documents. It is clear that they contain a large part of myth. But when Aghoraśiva gives himself the history of his family and his religious lineage at a not-too-far-away distance in the past, we have no reasons to doubt the historicity of the tradition he records. There is no impossibility or inadequacy in his account. The other text has certainly taken more distance from reality. But still we find in it some interesting historical information, by interpreting the myth as a mythical transposition of some reality. There is in Cidambaram still now, a *maṭha* which claims to have been established by Aghoraśiva. This text has certainly been composed there. When we compare its contents with the *gotrasaṃtati* of Aghoraśiva, we see that the guru of *ācāryābhiseka* who is actually Parameśvara, has been transposed into the mythical sage Durvāsas. And Durvāsas has been selected, because he is the original sage of the mythical lineage. The installation of the *maṭha* may be accepted as a historical fact. Its date fits well with the date of composition of the *paddhati*. The present *maṭha* which claims to have been established by Aghoraśiva is connected with a temple of Ananteśvara. This reminds us of the "Liṅga worshipped by Śeṣa" near which the story of Durvāsas and the establishment of the *maṭha* are located in the text.

We have thus enough corroborations to accept these two texts as documents for history. And we may infer some historical value of the line of gurus given by Aghoraśiva, a few of these names such as King Bhoja being known by their works or by other sources. An interesting point which can be drawn from Aghoraśiva's *gotrasaṃtati* is that the Śaivasiddhānta movement spread all over India. The Āmardaka-*maṭha* was not the only one. The Golakī-*maṭha* has had in the same and later periods a great number of ramifications from Central India upto the South. The presence and activities of these *maṭhas* in Tamilnadu is one of the great contributions of this land to the overall Śaiva movement.

The name of Śaivasiddhānta is primarily attached to the group of 28 *āgamas* beginning with *Kāmika*. The basic *āgamas* are mainly manuals of religious practice. Their main purpose is to describe the activities of devotees, i. e. their private rituals or temple rituals. The doctrine contained in *vidyāpādas* is the formulation of the basic principles, the theory of creation, the six *adhyans* etc. which have an application in rituals. It is presented at length only in a few *āgamas* or *upāgams*. Because of their practical destination *āgamas* do not contain much of philosophical matter. And the activities in the temple can be conducted without adoption of particular ontological views.

The important development of philosophical speculation in Śaivasiddhānta is found in a later stage of the literature. It appears to be the contribution of śaivācāryas residing in *maṭhas*. Philosophical matter is presented mostly in commentaries on *āgamas* and in short treatises or *prakaraṇas* generally written in a very refined and polished literary form. The best part of it seems to have been written in Kāśmīr in 10th and 11th century. The prominent figure in Kashmirian Śaivasiddhānta is Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, a great *śāstrin* and polemist. He has defended with great dialectical power his dualistic and realistic doctrine against the idealistic views of Buddhists. The contribution of Tamilnadu to the same movement is equally important and it occurred through the person of Aghoraśivācārya.

We cannot speak of Śaivasiddhānta as a unitary doctrine. There are basic principles common to all authors. But there are also many differing fundamental ontological views, so that every author has to be examined with care. Aghoraśiva has written several commentaries on *prakaraṇas* of Sadyojyoti and Rāmakaṇṭha, and an important sub-commentary on *Mygendrāgama*'s *vidyāpāda*, to mention only those works of his which are available to us. His style is very clear and his thought very well systematized. Sometimes he is really forcing the interpretation of an original text he claims to explain. These passages are particularly interesting for the historian, because in such cases the originality of the commentator appears more clearly. To show the originality of Aghoraśiva we have to compare his conceptions with those of his predecessors. I may give as an example his conception of *tattvas* or fundamental entities of creation.

In *āgamas* there is no established number of *tattvas*. It varies from *āgama* to *āgama*. *Rauravāgama*'s *vidyāpāda* gives several times a list of 30 *tattvas*. It enumerates 28 material *tattvas*, the well-known 24 of Sāṃkhya school and, above that, *rāga*, *vidyā*, *kalā* and the basic *māyā*. Two more *tattvas* are spiritual entities, Śiva and Puruṣa. *Rauravāgama* knows also several spiritual entities such as Mantreśvaras, Mantras, Rudras headed by Virabhadra, etc. He introduces them as emanating from Śiva, Śiva being their material cause (*upādānakāraṇa*). Thus in *Rauravāgama* the difference between matter and Śiva is clearly marked. But nothing is told nor can be directly inferred about the relation of Puruṣa and Śiva.

Sadyojyoti an early *ācārya* (before Somānanda of 9th cent.), has written a *Tattvasaṃgraha* which is an exposition of the contents of *Rauravāgama* on the subject of *tattvas*. He gives the same number and list. He presents a more definite ontological position. He upholds a view according to which there is complete difference between matter and Śiva. Śiva is made of *cit* which is *kriyā* and *jñāna*. *Cit* is that by which a being is animate and has knowledge. Matter or *māyā* is *acit* and it is an eternal entity, having the same degree of reality as *cit* entities. Sadyojyoti is the first *ācārya* to assert with clarity this realism and dualism.

Chronologically we find next the *Tattvapraśāṅgikā* of King Bhoja on the same subject. This text gives a list of 36 *tattvas*, adding *kāla* and *niyati* in the material sphere and a few spiritual entities, *Śakti*, *Sadāśiva*, *Īśvara* and *Śuddhavidyā* at the top of the scale. Bhoja accepts the dualism of *cit* and *acit*, but he admits in the scale of *tattvas* spiritual entities above the material ones.

Aghoraśiva has commented on these two *Prakaraṇas*. In spite of the difference between the two, in spite of their unequal number of *tattvas*, he interprets them as presenting the same conception. In addition to this he makes an important modification in the doctrine. He conceives the scale of *tattvas* as comprising only *acit* or material entities. His dualism is extreme. The *cit* principle Śiva is only an efficient cause (*kartr*). It cannot be a material cause (*upādānakāraṇa*) and cannot have any contact with matter. Therefore it cannot have any place in the scale of

creation. In a realistic view where the matter principle is an eternal entity, creation is not the making of new entities, it is only a process of transformation. Now Aghora has to comment a text which places pure spiritual entities in the scale of *tattvas* of creation. He interprets that the name *Śiva* denotes *bindu* or *mahāmāyā*, a duplicate of *māyā* in the pure sphere at the top of the scale, that the name *Śakti* denotes *nāda*, the primordial sound conceived as matter and first evolute of *mahāmāyā*, etc.

Bhoja defines *Śivatattva* as :

“vyāpakam ekaṃ nityaṃ akhilasya tattvajātasya /

jñānakriyāsvabhāvaṃ śivatattvaṃ jagadur ācaryāḥ //

“Teachers have told that *Śivatattva* is all-pervasive, unique, eternal, cause of all the class of *tattvas* and having the nature of knowledge and action.”

Aghoraśiva reads the words of this definition as referring to the pure material entity *bindu*. The words *vyāpaka*, etc. can be applied to this material entity. But “jñānakriyāsvabhāvaṃ” in its obvious sense of *bahuvrīhi* compound “whose nature is knowledge and action” cannot be applied to matter. Therefore Aghoraśiva takes it as an *upapadasamāsa* of a *kṛdanta*,—*bhāva* with two *upapadas*, one signifying the object (*karman*) *jñānakriyā*-, the other signifying the location (*adhikaraṇa*) *sva*:- “jñānakriyē svasmin sthite ātmanāṃ bhāvayatīti (it makes the knowledge and action of souls to be placed in itself)”. It means that matter allows the powers of knowledge and action of souls to stand in itself. The separation of *cit* and *acit* is thus preserved.

Aghoraśiva is a *śāstrin*. He uses etymology for the purpose of asserting his dualistic conception. He uses logic to establish on rational grounds all his concepts. He has not devoted much of his talent to polemics with rival schools. His main contribution is the systematizing and establishment of an extreme form of dualism with the instrument of Sanskrit *śāstras*. The main trend of ancient Śaivasiddhānta is dualistic. But I have not seen in any other author such an extreme and systematic form exposition. This conception of *tattvas* as pure material entities, even at the top of the scale, does not appear in other authors. Śaivasiddhānta is an original and independent system with

dualistic and realistic inclinations directly opposed to the general monistic and idealistic trends of other systems. And in Śaivasiddhānta Aghoraśiva stands as an extremist drawing the dualistic and realistic tendency to its farthest consequences.

To conclude a word has to be told on the influence of Aghoraśiva. His influence has been maintained upto our days in the field of rituals, by his *Pāddhati* which is still remembered and used by priests in temples of Tamilnadu. Many manuscripts of his *Kriyākramadyotikā*, complete or in the form of extracts, are found only in South India, especially in Tamilnadu, unlike manuscripts of *Somaśambhupaddhati*, which has been current in Tamilnāḍu but also elsewhere in India, as manuscripts of it are found in Kaśmīr and Nepal. In the field of the doctrine Aghoraśiva does not seem to have been followed. The prominent trend after him is also a kind of dualism, but blended with monism. The main movement is that which has its origins in the Sanskrit āgamic literature, but which has taken Tamil as a medium of exposition, from the time of Meykaṇḍadevar in 13th century. It has different ontological foundations.

Tamil Śaivasiddhānta literature is a great contribution of Tamilnadu. Earlier in Coḷa times Tamilnadu had already contributed a lot to the history of Śaivasiddhānta and produced the most extreme and pure form of the doctrine in the philosophical works of Aghoraśivācārya.

Appendix.

We give below the text of the *Aghoraśivācāryacaritam* from a transcript preserved in the French Institute of Pondicherry, of the unique known manuscript belonging to Tiruvadudurai Math.

Cidambarasāre brahmānandaśaṃkarayatiśvarasamvāde
śrīmadaghoraśivācāryacaritam

yatra pratiṣṭhitaṃ liṅgaṃ patañjalimahātmanā
tatra gatvā mahādevaṃ śiṣyairiḥ sākāṃ yatīśvaraḥ // 1 //
phalapuṣpākṣatair gandhaiḥ samabhyarcya yathāvidhi
dvārād bahiḥ samāgacchan brahmānandayatiśvaraḥ // 2 //
“Śivā! yasya purato vahnikoṇe virājitam
dṛśyamānam idaṃ sthānaṃ viṣṇor vā śaṃkarasya vā // 3 //

iti teṣāṃ vacaḥ śrutvā tat kathāṃ gurur abravīt
trisahasramunīndrāś ca cidambarapure vare // 4 //

śrautas mārtaḍikarmāṇi prakurvanto yathāvidhi
naṭeśārādhanam kṛtvā vedenoditavartmanā // 5 //

tatrāgatebhyah sarvebhyo dvijātibhyo yathākramam
tebhyo 'nnaṃ saṃprayacchanti nivasanti dvijottamāḥ // 6 //

saṃtataṃ sarvavarṇebhyo dadāty annaṃ cidambaram
evaṃ vadanti lokeṣu [manu] gandharvanirjarāḥ // 7 //

durvāsās tadvacaḥ śrutvā śiṣyeṇa sahito muniḥ
annadānapariḱṣārthaṃ sarvalokeṣu viśrutam // 8 //

suṣupteṣu ca sarveṣu tilvaranyaṃ samāyayau
śeṣapūjitaliṅgasya nikaṭe munipuṃgavaḥ // 9 //

bhavati bhikṣāṃ dehīti trivāraṃ samudirayat
bhikṣāṃ dātum kāpi nārī nāyayau nidrayā tayā // 10 //

munis tadānīm durvāsāḥ kopasaṃtaptamānasah
'tilvaranye' rkabhūyiṣṭhasamaṃ tat paridṛśyate // 11 //

iti pūrvam samuccārya cottaraṃ gaditum tataḥ
na vidyate śivas tilva iti vaktum samudyataḥ // 12 //

tadā nṛttagaṇādhyakṣaḥ svamātaram acintayat
bhikṣām ādāya tāṃ gaurī iti matvā mudānvitaḥ // 13 //

pradakṣiṇanamaskāraiḥ stotrair saṃpūjya sādaram
mūrdhāñjalipuṭas tiṣṭhan śivakāmīm hṛdā smaran // 14 //

gaury uvāca

"he vatsa śṛṇu bhadraṃ te lokānugrahaḱāriṇam
aghoraśivanāmānaṃ naiṣṭhika brahmaḱāriṇam // 15 //

śivāgamārthatattvajñam tvacchiṣyaṃ śuddhamāna [sa] m
sūdiṇam śivabhaktānām dikṣāṃ kartuṃ yathavāidhi // 16 //

asmin sthale sthāpaya [tvam] bhaktānām hitakāmyayā "

ity uktvāntardadhe gaurī cidambarasabhāntare // 17 //

saśiṣyo munisārudūlas tāṃ diśam saṃpraṇamya ca
saṃkalpya vāsasadanam sarvālaṃkāraśobhitam // 18 //

grhaṃ praviśya vidhivad vāstuśāntipurashsaram
śrīmukhābde śuklapakṣe puṣyarkṣe pañcamīthau // 19 //

vaiśākhe guruvāre ca śubhalagnasamanvite
 gauryāś cājñāṃ hṛdi dhyātvā durvāso munipuṃgavaḥ // 20 //
 sambhṛtya sambhārān ānayitvā ṛṣin tataḥ
 paṭṭābhiṣekam akarod aghoraśivanāmakam // 21 //
 tataḥ śiṣyaṃ samāniya citsatḥāyāṃ muniśvaraḥ
 puṣpāñjalim kārayitvā trisahasramuniśvaraiḥ // 22 //
 naṭeśasya naṭeśasyai ca phalādini nivedya ca
 cidambaram darśayitvā nīrājanapurahsaram // 23 //
 śivārpitaśaṅkhatoyair elāgandhādhivāsitaiḥ
 prokṣayitvā śiṣyamūrdhni devasya tveti mantratṛḥ // 24 //
 aghoraśivācārya iti nāmadheyam cakāra saḥ
 trisahasramunīndrebhyaḥ svarṇapuṣpaṃ samarpya ca // 25 //
 pradakṣiṇanamaskāraiḥ priṇayitvā sathāpatim
 tataḥ svamāśramam prāpya saśiṣyo munipuṃgavaḥ // 26 //
 tatra liṅgam pratiṣṭhāpya samabhyarcya yathāvidhi
 “ aghoraśiva he vatsa liṅgam enam supūjaya // 27 //
 śivadvijānāṃ śarveśām sūdrāṇāṃ ca yathāvidhi
 dikṣāṇāṃ samayādināṃ tattadvarṇānusārataḥ // 28 //
 1. liṅgānāṃ śivaberaṇāṃ śaktināṃ ca tathaiva ca
 āgamāni samālokyā paddhatih kuru suvrata ” // 29 //
 ity uktvā sthāpayāmāsa naiṣṭhikabrahmacāriṇam
 tataḥ kailāsam agamat pañcākṣaraparāyaṇaḥ // 30 //
 tathaiva paddhatim kṛtvā dikṣākarma karoti ca
 caritram śivabhaktasya bhaktānām avadad guruḥ // 31 //