CHAPTER II

I. The clarificatory work in the previous chapter made it clear that the term Śāṭhala means a number of things both physical and spiritual which are the different forms of Reality as well as knowledge. A very important meaning from another standpoint is this that it is dialectic (mīmāṃsā) - a way of systematization of philosophical literature. We have mīmāṃsākrāpa of every school's source literature which marks the beginning of the development of systematization of the school. This primary metaphysical activity can be traced to the Vedic literature which may help us to have a kind of insight to know more about the metaphysical or dialectical activity of the Śāṭhala school of thought.

II. "The word mīmāṃsā itself together with its derivatives is already employed in the Brāhmaṇas to denote the doubts and discussions connected with certain contested points and discussions connected with certain contested points of ritual." This is a very important work

1 G. Thibaut, the Vedanta sutras, pt. I. at the Clarendon Press, 1890, p.x.
that is to be found in almost all schools of religious
both orthodox and heterodox. This is a very old acti-
vity to be traced to the ancient literature such as the
Vedas.

(a) The earliest dialectical basis or principle is
neither God nor the identification of soul with the
Brahman but happiness, health and wealth. This is in
accordance with the true religious and moral spirit which
we find at work. This is happiness oriented doctrine on
which the Vedic literature was systematized. "The
four parts of the Vade, the hymns, the Brakmanas, the
Spryakas and Upanisads answer to the four stages of the
Vedic Aryan's life." This represents two orders of life
and thought, namely, the inner and the outer, the
personal and the social or perception and introspection
i.e. simple knowing and critical thinking. This marks the
beginning of the activity of thought in its synthetic
aspect. This is the synthetic nature of the people's
mental activity. So the writers on Indian philosophy

2 S. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, Vol. I., George
Allen and Unwin, 1940, p. 132.
observe: "that religion and philosophy do not stand
sundered in India. They indeed begin as one everywhere,
for their purpose is in the last resort the same,
viz., a seeking for the central meaning of existence."

It is for this reason the activity of thought in India
is not for the sake of knowledge, but for the highest
purpose that man can strive after in this life. This is
a striking characteristic of this richness. There is
equal emphasis on the reality of the external world on
the one hand and the internal reality on the other
which is dialectical in nature as Hegel says. Dialecti­
ces in West is what Mimeshakerana is in Indian philosophy.

3 (i) M.Hiriyanna, Outlines of Indian Philosophy,
George Allen and Unwin, 1959, p.17.

(ii) "Whether religion leads to philosophy, or
philosophy to religion, in India the two are insepa­
parable, and they would never have been separa­
ted with us..." P.Max.Muller, the Vedanta
Philosophy, Susil Gupta (India) Ltd., 1965, p.15.

(iii)"Indian philosophy is essentially spiritual.
Philosophy and religion are intimately connected
with each other in India." Jadunath Sircar: Intro­
duction to Indian Philosophy, Vol.1., “ere, 1949,
p.1., as quoted in Indian Philosophy, Vol.1. p.236.

4 Max Muller, Six Systems of Indian Philosophy,
p.370.
(b) We find a change in the course of life and as a result a change in the activity of thought. Both life and thought in all their aspects go hand in hand in the journey. As life gives a turn to thought so also it is thought that gives a new turn to life. Thus the effect is alternative.

In the second stage of the dialectical development we find a clear-cut distinction which is the mark that we do not find in the earlier phase. The whole of life is divided into two sections. One is the life of the ritualistic activities, the other is that of enlightenment. So also the society. Those who accepted the ritualistic life are supposed to be not intellectuals, whereas the others, who embraced the life of enlightenment, are supposed to be the men of intellect. Thus the literature was systematised according to the needs of mind. The systematised literature was named Karmakāṇḍa and Jñānakāṇḍa. The former was called the Kuru-mimamsā, and the latter was called the Uttaramimamsā. The Karmakāṇḍa was identified with the Veda, whereas Jñānakāṇḍa with the Upaniṣads. The systematisation of the Karmakāṇḍa of the Veda led to the elaboration of two
classes of works, viz., the Kalpasūtras on the one hand, and the Pūrvavimāṇasūtra on other hand. The former give nothing but a description as concise as possible of the sacrifices enjoined in the Brāhmaṇas; while the latter discuss and establish the general principles which the author of the Kalpasūtra has to follow, if he wishes to render his rules strictly conformable to the teaching of the Vedas. This is still a higher form of activity of the philosophical temperament which is at the basis of such an activity. They represent two forms of thought and two forms of life in the ancient Indian philosophy which influenced the religio-philosophical bent of mind since then. Both Veda and Upaniṣad i.e. Pūrvavimāṇa and Uttaravimāṇa, were supposed to be the supreme authority. Pūrvavimāṇa deals with Vedic ritual and religion. Uttaravimāṇa deals with ontology and epistemology.

(c) We reach a third stage in the course of development of life and literature. This is marked with still higher

---

activity of the dialectic. The *Mimamsa* also known as *Kalpasutras* were divided into *Srauta, Vyaya* and *Dharma-
*sutras.* "The *Srauta* *Sutras* profess to systematize the sacrificial lore of the Brhamapas, but do not include much later material. The *Vyaya* *Sutras* portray the ideal of life from the standpoint of the family and describe ceremonies such as marriage and upanayanam or the initiation by the teacher of the pupil into the study of the Veda. The *Dharma* *Sutras*, dealing with customary law and morals, present the norm of life from the standpoint of the state or society. All these scholastic codes like the *Mantras* and the Brhamapas, are concerned chiefly with priestly life; and whatever advance they indicate

---

6 "If in this *Mimamsa* two branches have to be distinguished, the so called earlier (parva) *Mimamsa*, and the latter (Uttara) *Mimamsa*, the former undertakes to systematize the *Karmakanda*, i.e. that entire portion of the Veda which is concerned with action, pre-eminently sacrificial action, and which comprises the sacrifice and Brhamapas exclusive of the *Sastra* portions; the latter performs the same service with regard to the so called *Jnanakanda*, i.e. that part of the Veda writings which includes the *Sastra* portions of the Brhamapas and number of detached treatises called *Upanishads*. Its subject is not action but knowledge of Brahman." C.Thibaut, (fr. The Vedanta *Sutras*, Pt.1. at the Clarendon Press, 1890, p. IX.)
or whatever further amplification they contain is ritualistic in character so that their interest for philosophy is but indirect." They contribute much to the philosophy of religion, sociology, political science and morals.

The work of mīmāṃsākara, i.e. dialectical work, in the other section of the Veda, called Uttaramāṁsā or the Upanisads is of much value. The work was already in practice as Max Muller rightly points out: "We can watch the growth of these thoughts in the Vedānta-Uttras. When we read Upanisads, the impressions they leave on our mind is that they are sudden intuitions or inspirations, which sprang up here and there, and were collected afterwards. And yet there is system in all these dreams, there is a common background to all these visions. There is even an abundance of technical terms used by different speakers so exactly in the same sense, that

7 M. Hiriyanno, Outlines of Indian Philosophy, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1933, p.39.
8 F. Max Muller, the Vedānta Philosophy, Sunit Gupta (India) Ltd., 1988, p.39.
one feels certain that behind all these lightening-flashes of religious and philosophical thought there is a distant past, a dark background of which we shall never know the beginning. There are words, there are phrases, there are whole lines and verses which recur in different Upaniṣads and which must have been drawn from a common treasury; but we receive no hint as to who collected that treasury.

The third stage of systematization as already found in the Upaniṣads was recognised and was followed. This was resulted in an aphoristic way. The unity of the central teaching of the Upaniṣads becomes conspicuous which formerly was not easily known. This is marked with still higher form of analysis combined with the synthetic bent of dialectic. It is analytic in so far it analyses the subject matters and synthetic in the sense that it gives a systematic form to the whole thought process resulting into a system. The genesis of the six orthodox systems are found in the Upaniṣads which were developed into full systems. We find that they are independent but the deeper investigation reveals that they, by the dialectical process, form a
synthetic system culminating into the Advaita of the 
Brahmasūtra. Again the nīmaññakāraṇa - the activity of 
thought - finds its expression in a new form in the 
writing of the commentators.

This brief sketch of the dialectical movements is 
necessary to get insight into the dialectics of Āgniic 
literature. Because the Nāthaṅkarat values the Āgamic 
games depend on Veda in explaining whatever they have 
to explain. The verse runs:

\[ \text{yāni hīgamaśatrēṇi yacā kacitpravṛttayaḥ} \]
\[ \text{tāni vedāṇa puruṣekṛtya pravṛttāni yathā kṛṣṇāḥ} \]

\( (\text{All the Šaṅkaraṇas, some of the āptis and purāṇas}) \)
\( \text{that are available in this world depict the sayings of} \)
\( \text{the Veda seriously.) We may quote other sources which} \)
\( \text{will help us to realize the importance of the saying.} \)

\( \text{Appayya Šīkara states in his Sivatattvaviveka:} \)

\( \text{-------------} \)

\( 9 \text{ quoted by Shambulaś Shivacarya on p.30 in Śrama-} \)
\( \text{parījātāśa, Pranabacara electric press, Ayore, 1989.} \)

\( 10 \text{ E.J.Pavote, Veeranga Philosophy of the Šāṅkara,} \)
\( \text{Hubli, (1927), p.1.} \)
Salvãganas are the essence of the Veda, without any defect and are holy. They (i.e. Salvãganas) are better authorities than the  Āgama which are other than the Salvãganas). Earlier to this man, an authoritative work on Skottarasattsthala, namely, Siddhãntasikhamåni II states:

vedadharmabhidhyitvatsiddhãntàkhyah savãganaḥ /
vedebhùhyavirodhitvàvedesañastu ucye //
vedasiddhãntavreikyakÉrthapratisamst //
pránapyaù sadguru jñâyān menditairayossad //

(This Āgama, namely, Siddhãnta teaches the religion taught in the Veda and criticises the religions that are against the Veda. Therefore this Āgama is in conformity with Veda. The subject matter of Veda and Āgama are one and the same. Therefore, they are one. So the learned people should accept the authority of them both without any discrimination.)

11 K.N. Karibasvavastri (Ed. & Com) Siddhãntasikhamåni, Nagore, 1921, Ch. V, sts. 12, 13.
There are Śaṅkaraśaṅkaraśāstra that support the view:

1. *siddhānto vedaśāravatāḥ - Suprabheda*
2. *vedaśāravatāḥ vratamāḥ - Māyurāgama*
3. *vedāntarthaḥ idāḥ jñānaḥ siddhiḥ sattvaḥ paraśvānāthaḥ - Ārgyendrāgama*

Śaṅkaraśaṅkaraśaṅkaraśāstra also is of the same opinion. It states:

*vedāgama purāṇeśvā sarabhutaśa tavapriya/ *very similar, if not identical, view is expressed by Śrīkṣenṭha in his commentary on *Vedāntasūtra*, II.2.26. The Vedas and the Śaṅkaraśaṅkaraśaṅkaraśāstras are of equal authority, as both are proceeding from the Lord...

There are two types of source literature (1) Sanskrit and (2) Regional languages. We have religion, philosophy in both the forms of literature. Kannada is one of the regional languages in which we have it.

---

13 Śaṅkaraśaṅkaraśaṅkaraśaṅkaraśāstra, patale X.57.
14 S.J. Suryanarayana Shastrī, op.cit. p.9.
Vacanae are pithy sayings. The vacana literature is an important source literature in Kannada. These two forms of literature are valuable sources. Saivāgamas are twenty-eight. The inscriptions show that they were already in existence even prior to the 5th century A.D. Dr. S. Chandimath shows that some of their date goes to pre-Christian era. Saivāgamas just like the Vedas are systematised by the teachers differently according to the traditions they belong. We find the dialectical movement or systematisation in the Saivāgamas. This is of value.

(vi) The Veda is four - ṛk, brāhmaṇa, ṛgvyāka and ṭapaniṣad. So also the ṛgma is four - kriyāpāda, caryāpāda, yogapāda and jñānapāda (or vidyapāda). The Vedic Karmakāṇḍa consists of mantra and brahmaṇa. The ṛgma Karmakāṇḍa consists of kriyāpāda and caryāpāda. Vedic ṽāṇa Karmakāṇḍa consists of ṛgvyāka and ṭapaniṣad. ṛgma


Jñānakāṇḍa consists of yogādhara and jñāna (i.e., Vidyā) pāda. The Vedic Karmakāṇḍa deals with rituals and construction of altars. Jñānic Karmakāṇḍa deals with rituals and inauguration of temples and installation of Āgāmas. Vedic jñānakāṇḍa deals with yoga and knowledge. Jñānic jñānakāṇḍa deals with yoga and knowledge.

(b3) Jñānakāṇḍa again goes on in a new direction in the Āgama. The Āgama states that it is based on 'darsana'. Paramesvara tantra states that there are 16 six darsanas:

tatāntre sādvyakāṁ prakītāṁ sa darsanā vṛbhudātah //
vīraśāivāṁ vaśeṣavāṁ ca saktāṁ saurāṁ vināyakāṁ //
kaṇḍalakāti jñāyaṁ darsanāṁ sa vajravi //

Cunnabasavacchā and Īrīlikopādi quote the ancient text in order to show that the Jñānic darsana is six fold. They enumerate the above said six darsanas. These differ from six systems of Indian philosophy. The Jñānic six systems also said to be darsana as they give the idea as they give the idea of ultimate Reality. Hegel also

18 Paramesvarāgama, I.20, 21.
is of the same opinion when he says that the religions also give us the idea about the universe in which we live like the philosophy and hence religion also is philosophy. Thus we have two types of six āras - one of the Vedic and the other of the Śāṅkara. Both the lines of thought are two great forces of Indian life.

We find in the Āgama ākṣara, jñāti as other synonyms for karmakāṇḍa and jñānakaṇḍa. They play very important role in mīmāṁsākara. We find these in Sūkṣma āgamas, 21, 22 vātulāgama and Pārameśvarāgama. Ākṣara refers to ontological categories, jñāti to epistemological categories.

(01) We have still higher form of dialectics when the problem of sābda is dealt with in the Śaivāgamas. The direction in which the study of sābda began has its roots in the Veda. Thus in the Āgveda we find the

evidence of speculation on the nature of speech. At some places we are astonished to see the depth of philosophical insight into the nature of speech...

"In the Vedic period we find a creative mind at work. Thinkers of the time have tried to study all the aspects of language although their duty may lack in details and seem to be inadequate, but they have certainly paved the way for more analytical and logical study of those aspects of language..." The Vedas are eternal and impersonal sources. The impersonal eternal view of the Veda is the one view we find in the Śivāgama. 

Śrīnandrāgama states:

\[
\text{pratikāle meheśanah purusārthaprajñāhara '/}
\text{vidotte vimalajñānām pānḍuṣrovetabhūhitāṁ '}
\]

(Fārmeśavera gave the form of divyāgama to the pure conscious hidden in Meheśavera through the face of his...)  

\[\text{Meaning in...}\]

23 R.C. Pandey, the Problem of Indian Philosophy, Motilal Banarası, New Delhi, 1965, pp. 14, 15.

24 We may also show that in what sense the impersonal view of word has two interpretations.

25 Quoted by Shri Shambhulinga Shivaswamy, op.cit., p.19.
own which are Sadyojäta, etc., in the beginning of creation in order to have the wealth of enjoyment and liberation which are the highest values.) This is the metaphysical view of Sáhásra and in the unmanifest form it is called Pātīvāk. This is the Ævadic view. Ævada states that it was Rudra who was requested to protect the Vāk as he was supposed to be the most powerful who enjoyed the highest place in the Ævada. "The theory of evolution of sounds (nāda) from the Real (Śiva) is not an innovation that the school has made. It is based on the Veilic conception of speech." It is how the Veilic and Ævadic views are similar. Śiva is the stage stated in the Śaṅga. This is the Ævadic dialectical development of the higher form which could be developed in detail as the need arise when it is necessary. Thus we have different stages of the dialectical movement in the Śaṅga.

27 K.C. Pandé, op. cit., p. i+.
28 R.J. Pandé, op. cit., p. 15.
One may show the advance in the dialectical movement in the Vaisesika literature over the Agamic literature with the help of present available material. Siddhānta Sīkhamani is one of the authoritative Sanskrit work which is the essence of the Agamic literature which is that portion of the Saivāgama called āgamanas or Siddhāntākhyā tantra just as the Gītā is the essence of Upaniṣads.

Siddhānta Sīkhamani states:

\[ \text{snugastasakil\text{\textier{}}saiva tantrai samastaiḥ} / \]

So this gives clue on what line the Satuṭhalaśiddhānta developed its mīmāṃsikaraṇa in the Agama and also it serves as the ground for knowing the mīmāṃsikaraṇa in versâma literature as differs from the earlier Vaisesika literature found in the Agamic form. The doctrines of dharma, adhikāra and tora are those that are at the basis of dialectical activity in the Agamic literature of the Satuṭhala school as stated in the Siddhānta Sīkhamani. This show that the Agamic āgama and

30 N. Kariboseva Shastri, (Ed. & Com.), op.cit., V.2a.
The gave way for one more idea adhikāra. This stands for jñāti in this system and therefore systematization of literature in it recurs. We have similar dialectical doctrines in Buddhist literature. They are ācāra (ethics), metaphysics and Dhama (doctrines). These are the principles on which the three pithikas are classified. Therefore the same is found in other religious literature. There is the same view put differently in the Vātalūgama. It states:

vīraṃheaṃvaram tantrāṃ jñātevyam trividhāṃ sute
śāmīnyam ca viṣegam ca nirbhāram krsnābhavat //

This is mainly philosophical as it is found explained. The same is found mentioned in the Vaca literature. It is said to be philosophical because the idea that predominates each of the tantra is the ascending or clearer idea of the Absolute. There are different rituals prescribed therein accordingly. But this is not an amalgamation as understood by S.N. Dasgupta.

31 Vātalūgama, X. 29-30.
This Vīraśāiva again is systematised on the basis of general principles. They are action i.e. bāhyopāsanā and Antarāśāmyuṣṭandhīne i.e. contemplation. This is found in the Siddhānta Śikhāmāṇi. We find it in the sayings of the Śivāverse. The six-fold sthala or stage thus looked from this angle is reduced to Vīraśāhavēsvara and Vīraśāiva. They, however, are called Mārgekriya and Mridikriya respectively.

The 3̣satsthale dialectics in the metaphysical sense is compared to the dialectics of Hegel. We find abundant evidence of this process in Vēcana literature. The Vēcana literature is called Śatsthalekaṭṭu in the systematised form. It is also called Śatsthaleśatra. The available Vēcana literature is known with the advent of Devara Dāsimeyya and Kopaḍagoli Kesirāja as the students of history of Kannada literature showed. They belong to eleventh century.

33 R. D. Renade, Pathway to God in Kannada literature, Bhavane Publication, Bombay, 1960, p. 116
34 R. Narasimhaiah, Karnataka Kavicerite, Vol. I.
According to the Agamic method jāna and yoga play a role in the work of āghāṣikarāṇa, whereas in vaishnava literature we find that there are two terms, namely, sāṅge and linga that play a role in systematization. The āghāṣikā vaṣcepts are marked with āśāra or religious action and linga-thala vaṣcepts are marked with contemplation. There are synonyms of these terms. Some of them are: āśāra, arivu, sākāra, nirākāra; and so on. The former is meant to teach rituals and the latter meant to teach the contemplation. Sūkṣma tantra states:

\[
\text{vīresviva nirātṛ prāṇālingasāvayanaḥ} \\
vīresviva nirātṛ bhakṣate cūttamottanaḥ
\]

So the observances in bhakṣesthala and māhesvarasthala belong to Īgālinga-puṣṭa and Prāṇalinga-puṣṭa. This is the highest kind of sciences or spiritual lores to be taught in two types of literature. This does not mean that there are two types of castes but it means that

35 Sūkṣma tantra, IX. 12, 13.
there are two types of tantras suited to the mental abilities of the persons belonging to "Virasaivism."
This is common practice to be found in the Vedas, Srimuñikas, and Jaina literature. The object of mīmāṁsākaraṇa is in this sense based on the psychological need of the people.

But this is rejected by the Śivasaraṇaṇa like Gennabasavanne. They advocate the enlightened view of the psychology. They, therefore, introduced a new kind of mīmāṁsākaraṇa in which the synthesis of contemplative and conative temperaments is sought. This is in accordance with the nature of self as there is no contemplative ability without the conative ability or no conative ability without the contemplative ability. They are the abilities of all the souls both dull and intelligent. The opportunity, training that help to predominate one kind of ability of self over the other. This is not the harmonious development. So Gennabasavanne to have full synthetic growth and complete realisation tried to develop the kind of science or metaphysics that could meet the need. This is in accordance with the simultaneous evolution as against the serial evolution. The diagram given on the
page ( ) is in accordance with the simultaneous evolutionary view. So Gannabasavanna is called Śaṭ-
sthalemārpaya parasmāstera where the basic metaphysical notion is in view in stating this. This simultaneous view of experience would be traced to the saying of the Upaniṣads where we find turiya or to the Śaṅgic kṛṣṇa in kṛṣṇa, cavya in kṛṣṇa, yuga in kṛṣṇa and jāna in kṛṣṇa. These are the earlier kinds of śaṁśān-
kāraṇa in ancient literature which we find in the twelfth century mystic thinkers who led the revolution.

The leadership of the type of movement is attributed to Gannabasavanna.

The kind of practice Gannabasavanna advocated is called the synthetic worship i.e. worshipping āṭṭalīṅge
and āṭṭalīṅga at one and the same time and identifying each other as against worshipping āṭṭalīṅge and āṭṭalīṅga independent of each other. āṭṭalīṅgapūjā, as it

36 It was Dr. R.C. Hiremath who pointed out that there was a controversy among the mystics of the twelfth century regarding the two types of Śaṭsthala notions. One is serial i.e. first Āṭṭalīṅga to be known and practised then the śuḥhānāstha to be understood and practised. This was the view held by Basavanna. As against this Gannabasavanna advocated the latter view vigorously and won the point. This was shown in his Śaṭsthala prabhe published by Karnatak University.
is stated by Basavena, is the source of fruits. Prāṇaliṅga-pujā, as it is stated by others, is the way for nothingness and abstraction. So both when the worship is did independently of each other, as was the practice among the Viśesaśivas according to which the literature was systematised, would lead to partial end. So the synthetic approach was the golden approach and was vigorously advocated and rigorously practised to have the full realisation and the ideal end. This is evident from the sayings of the Sivamārgaś like Akkamahādevi and Basavena. This type of practice is called 'Saṃsthāna samuccaya' to put it in the technical terminology. This is not restricted to the worship of Jagalīnga and Prāṇaliṅga only. It could be applied to other fields of philosophy.

The thought and the language are in full union as form and matter. The metaphysical language and the thought which work together is the form of philosophical literature that is called Saṃsthāla-śāstra. This is theory of language of Viśesaśivas
called सत्याचार्य which is beautifully expressed:

वेगरथविवेकस्प्रक्तां वेगरथारतिपत्ताये
सृजितपत्रायों पृवतपरस्मेषक्षये //

There is no word (i.e. Siva) without artha (i.e. Sakti) and there is no Sakti (i.e. artha) without Siva or Sakti. To put the same in other words is that there is no Baga without Liiga and there is no Liiga without Baga. This is the सत्याचार्यमुन्याय from this point of view.

सत्याचार्यमृत्युष्यो यो एन्धीकृतम् भक्तिर प्रविष्टम्
क्रियाधार्य समुच्चयोऽर्थभक्तिर ज्ञानम्
वह दर्शते तु ज्ञानाय स्वस्तिकम् नानाधीनस्य
ज्ञाने गौतमस्य सुविशेषता और स्वन्यत्वात्

gaita or BtiMs, to put the game in other words is that there is no Baga without Liiga and there is no Liiga without Baga. This is the सत्याचार्यmumycaya from this point of view.

सत्याचार्यमुन्याय is, as explained by Gennabasa-vamna, Kriyādhāra samuccaya or devotion and knowledge (i.e. bhakti and jñāna). He states that unless the jñāna (i.e. knowledge) is merged in devotion (i.e. ritualistic action) there cannot be samajñāsoha and hence it is jāda (inert or fruit bearing) which en-chains men to rebirth. Similarly if devotion is not

37 के.लिंदे.स., It was in the writings of के.लिंदे.स. that the philosophy of विरसेविन is synoptically given expression writes Dr. S.N. Basagusta in the Vol.V of History of Indian Philosophy.
at the core of knowledge (i.e. merging of devotion in knowledge) there cannot be egotismness (or nirbhāra-tyā) which is the root cause either of the cosmic play or of the individual's rebirth due to ignorance. In both cases it is the principle of ignorance. This is the synthesis of Saṃsthāla or Saṃsthālamuṇḍa as taught by Gopāla. It is on this synthesis Gopāla is harping when he draws the attention of the Śivasaṃśāna pointing out the example of Māyāmapātha whose body is lost itself in motion as it is identified with work and the mind is lost in knowledge at the same time. This is Saṃsthālamuṇḍa. The literature is systematised accordingly. This is the higher type of systematisation of Saṃsthāla literature.

There is another form of literature which is a new type of work in the philosophical literature. It is called 'Udghargaṇi' sūhitya. This is a new form in Kannada literature where we find mudras, akṣaras, etc. We find a parallel case in Buddhist tantric literature. The material is old as the Tantra literature.

---

36 J. Basavappa, (Ed.) Śūnyasamipādāc, Mallanāsanka, Mysore, 1969, p.236. V.863.