From the middle of the first millennium CE, South Asia saw the emergence and rise of Tantrism within all of its major religious traditions: Śaivism, the Vaiṣṇava Pāñcarātra, the Buddhist Mantrayāna, and Jainism. Despite the fact that Tantrism grew to become such an integral part of the religious landscape, our understanding of how early Tantric initiatory groups were actually organized and how they positioned themselves in society is still limited. This collection of articles by leading scholars on early Tantra offers new insights into fundamental questions regarding the socio-religious history of Tantric traditions by examining questions of community formation, boundaries and identities, all factors that needed to be negotiated in the Tantric interactions with the wider society.
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Preface

The present volume on the socio-religious history of Tantric communities in the early medieval Indic world is an outcome of research activities conducted at the Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia (IKGA) of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (OEAW), in the context of the large-scale interdisciplinary research project “Visions of Community” (VISCOM), a “Special Research Programme” (Sonderforschungsbereich, SFB) funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF, F 42). Over two four-year periods (2011–2015, 2015–2019), the project was carried out in collaboration with the Institute for Medieval Research and the Institute for Social Anthropology at the Austrian Academy of Sciences (OEAW), as well as the Department of History and the Institute for Eastern European History at the University of Vienna. The mission of VISCOM was to investigate, from a comparative perspective, ethnicity, region, and empire throughout medieval Eurasia, extending from Christian Europe to Buddhist Tibet via the Islamic Arabic peninsula. A central concern of the project was how Christianity, Buddhism, and Islam impacted the conceptions of religious and political communities in the medieval world, and how these were negotiated in discourses on the formation and legitimation of particular communities constructed around various religious, ethnic, or political interests. VISCOM was meant to go beyond a static comparison in the sense of a mere contrastive analysis of pre-interpreted social, cultural, and historical constructs; it sought, rather, to actively create comparative objects by fostering, on a regular basis, the collaboration of researchers of diverse disciplinary approaches – socio-historical, micro-historical, socio-anthropological, historical-philological, etc. – and to critically examine culturally-loaded, descriptive concepts that were too often employed uncritically.

While the IKGA’s contribution to VISCOM initially focused solely on imperial Tibet, the research context was subsequently broadened to also include the Tantric traditions of early medieval and medieval India. This turn toward the Indian Tantric traditions was prompted by the following considerations: First, in their Buddhist versions, these traditions had played
a central role in shaping Tibetan religious identities, beliefs, and practices from the ninth and especially the eleventh century onwards. Second, while competing for royal patronage, the Indian Tantric traditions had developed close ties to political power, a major concern for VISCOM. And third, major advances in the field of Tantric studies in the last decades have led to the emergence of new data from manuscript sources and inscriptions, which open up the opportunity to investigate questions of community formation, boundaries, and identities at play as Tantric circles increasingly engaged with wider society. Rooted in this research context, the present volume aims to comprehensively investigate these trajectories by considering sources from the various Tantric schools active in the premodern Indic world. For this purpose, leading experts of the field were invited to contribute to this volume, based on papers and discussions held at the international symposium “Tantric Communities in Context: Sacred Secrets and Public Rituals,” held at the IKGA, February 5–7, 2015.

We have adopted various conventions to present the material as consistently as possible. The Sanskrit spelling has generally been normalised, unless diplomatic editions are presented. Each of the Sanskrit passages is also translated into English. In order to ensure readability, abbreviations have been kept to a minimum; only if Sanskrit text titles are mentioned frequently within a chapter, abbreviations are used after the first mention of the text. The following introduction to this volume provides a brief overview of the broader research context as well as of the specific topics discussed in each contribution.

In publishing this volume, we are most grateful to the Holzhausen-Legat for providing financial support to cover the production costs. We would also like to express our thanks to Birgit Kellner, the series editor, and the publication commission of the Austrian Academy of Sciences for having accepted the manuscript to be included in the series “Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens”. Thanks also go to the staff at the Austrian Academy Press for their support in the production process. We also thank Dennis Johnson for proof-reading the volume, and Csaba Kiss for producing the index and providing some technical support. Last but not least, we are extremely grateful to the contributors of this volume for their excellent chapters and their patience during the production process.
Introduction

Starting with the middle of the first millennium, South Asia saw the emergence and rise of Tantrism within all major religious traditions, a development that resulted in the production of a rich textual corpus expounding the ritual and philosophical systems of Śaivism, the Vaiṣṇava Pāñcarātra, the Buddhist Mantrayāna, and Jaina Tantra. Despite the fact that Tantric traditions grew to become such an integral part of the religious landscape of early medieval South, South-East, and East Asia, the social reality of how these initiatory groups were organised on the ground and concretely interfaced with the wider community of non-initiates or with competing traditions during this period is still little understood. This is partly due to the fact that the surviving Tantric textual sources are prescriptive in nature, propagating an idealistic vision of their position in society and rarely addressing questions of social relevance.

In order to address the resulting methodological challenge of using these sources for reconstructing the underlying social reality, specialists of the textual traditions and practices of pre-modern Tantric traditions were invited to investigate these largely normative texts for elements that inadvertently reveal aspects of the underlying social reality or larger political agendas at play. Departing from the notion of a religious community, that is to say, a community defined through a shared ritual repertoire and socio-religious visions, the contributors pursue a range of guiding questions that are at the heart of the VISCOM research project, such as: How does a community define itself and what binds it together? How is a sense of belonging expressed? Can we identify networks of relationships through concrete interactions such as collective activities and habitual practices? Which religio-political strategies may be at play in shaping community identity; or to what extent do religious propagators create new religious identities in order to appeal to the royal elite or reach out to mainstream communities? How are deeply embedded social identity norms related to
birth status – the caste and class system in South Asia – negotiated in the context of emerging religious movements that essentially challenge these existing socio-religious structures? And how do religious communities that have developed around esoteric Tantric cults appeal to mainstream communities?

Applying these research questions to ancient texts, often only preserved in unpublished manuscripts, the contributors trace aspects of the socio-religious history of the emergence and institutionalisation of these traditions in different literary genres, including Tantric scriptures, ritual manuals, philosophical treatises, and commentaries as well as non-Tantric sources that contain representations of Tantric communities such as the Purāṇas, early sectarian Dharma literature, and bellettristic works. In addition, some contributions complement text-based approaches with field studies and art historical analyses. The themes of this volume include the development of Tantric rituals and symbols in relation to the political sphere, the domain of social ritual as an indicator of the various degrees to which Tantric communities were socially integrated at a given place or time, specific points of interface between initiatory and lay communities, and the modalities of the construction of broad as well as specific “confessional” Tantric identities.

**Structure of the volume**

The volume opens with a keynote article by Alexis Sanderson, based on a lecture he delivered at the Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia at the Austrian Academy of Sciences in Vienna on February 5, 2015. In his contribution, Sanderson outlines the possibilities and ground-breaking advances in tracing the socio-religious history of South Asian Tantric traditions, based on his long-standing expertise and research experience with Śaivism also in interaction with other Tantric traditions, including the Vaiṣṇava Pāñcarātra and Buddhist as well as Jaina Tantra. In many ways, Sanderson’s ground-breaking research on the historical development of early Tantric traditions in South Asia and beyond has fundamentally shaped and influenced the field of Tantric studies.
Following the opening contribution, the book is divided into four parts. The first contains contributions investigating textual sources that detail certain “Tantric identities.” These chapters offer insights into how various Tantric communities – or groups within a Tantric community – were conceptualised in a range of sources, including those inside and outside the Tantric textual genre.

Shaman Hatley examines the representation of female practitioners and the divinisation of women in the *Brahmayāmala or Picumata*. This voluminous Tantric Śākta-Śaiva text affords an unusually detailed (as well as early) window into women’s participation in Tantric ritual. On the one hand, this includes their role as female consorts – called dūtīs – in the coital rituals performed for the śādhaka practitioner’s purposes of attaining supernatural powers (siddhi). On the other, Hatley also points to passages that intimate independent female adepts in representations of yoginīs, a category which intrinsically blurs boundaries between women and goddesses. In doing so, he engages with the methodological challenge of deriving social-historical data from literary representations in this genre of Tantric literature.

Csaba Kiss presents a diachronic investigation into the term *bhasmāṅkura*, a term used to describe a social group defined as “the offspring of a fallen Śaiva ascetic and a Śūdra prostitute” in the well-known fifteenth-century Brahmanical, non-Tantric *Jātiviveka*, a treatment of the various castes and classes. Tracing references to this term in Śaiva Tantric literature, including Saiddhāntika ritual manuals as well as the Śaiva scholar Abhinavagupta’s famous work *Tantrāloka*, Kiss locates the origins of this terminology and explores what these passages reveal about the social setting of certain Tantric communities at various times. He shows how the position of the Bhasmāṅkura as the son of a Śaiva ascetic was highly problematic in the Śaiva Tantric socio-ritual world and often condemned. At the same time, he draws attention to the extent to which these insider accounts differ from Brahmanical sources, in which the Bhasmāṅkura is at times associated with Devalakas, who are defined as temple priests that live of the offerings made to idols and thus considered of low status.

Robert Leach’s paper deals with two important sub-traditions within the Vaiṣṇava tradition of Pāñcarātra – the Āgamasiddhānta and the Mantra-
siddhānta – in South India in the early centuries of the second millennium CE. He examines their relation to each other as well as the possible reasons why the Āgamasiddhānta has ceased to exist as a separate tradition in the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries. Leach shows how the textual evidence suggests that these traditions were in competition with each other for the control of public temples and the right to perform rituals for fee-paying clients. In this process, the followers of the Āgamasiddhānta characterised themselves as exclusively seeking liberation from rebirth and as worshiping Viṣṇu to the exclusion of all other deities. According to Āgamasiddhānta scriptural testimony, these two characteristics set them apart from other Pāñcarātrikas, and there are several passages in Āgamasiddhānta texts wherein the worship of God for mundane and heavenly rewards as well as the worship of gods other than Viṣṇu are roundly condemned. At the same time, there are a number of indications that at least some Ekāyanas modified their positions on both of these issues.

Klaus-Dieter Mathes depicts an example of how Buddhist monastic communities integrated Tantric elements, such as sexual yoga during empowerment (abhiṣeka) and subsequent practices that were considered problematic from the point of view of mainstream Buddhism. On the basis of thorough text analyses of works of Indian and Tibetan teachers, such as Maitrīpa (986–1063), his disciple *Sahajavajra, 'Gos Lo tsā ba gZhon nu dpal (1392–1481), and Dwags po bKra shis rnam rgyal (1511–1587), he shows how the so-called mahāmudrā teachings were embedded into Madhyamaka philosophy concepts and thus Tantric and Sūtric methods were syncretically combined into a single system for liberation.

Christian Ferstl turns his attention to the value of Sanskrit poetry as a source for clues about the perceptions and representations of Tantric communities outside the body of Tantric prescriptive literature. Focusing on the Kādambarī, a work of the sixth-century court poet Bāṇabhaṭṭa, he examines the portrayal of an elderly Dravidian – often referred to as holy man (dhārmika) – living in a goddess temple near Ujjainī. Identifying features that associate this holy man with practices and works of certain Śaiva initiatory groups, such as the Pāśupatas, Kālamukhas, or Tantric practitioners of the Bhairava branch, Ferstl attempts to trace the religious milieu and associated values envisaged by the poet in the seventh century.
The second part of the volume gathers contributions presenting sources that show how Tantric communities construct identities through rituals that draw boundaries to the non-initiated world by appealing to the exclusitivy of the respective Tantric circle.

Judit Törzsök explores the way in which Tantric communities saw themselves within a larger context by analysing their treatments of sama-\(\text{-}ya\), that is to say, the rules a Tantric Śaiva or Śākta neophyte is to follow after he is introduced into his new community and has received an initiation name, thus essentially constituting part of what defines the Śaiva or Śākta Śaiva Tantric community. Investigating three different types of sama-\(\text{-}ya\) sets, namely those of the Siddhānta, the heterogeneous lists of early Śākta scriptures, and the strictly “nondualist” rules of later Śāktas, she demonstrates to what extent they, on the one hand, relate to Brahmanical rules of the Dharmaśāstra and, on the other, carefully demarcate various Śaiva and Śākta groups. Further, the author presents some material on lay Śaiva practitioners, showing that in spite of their overall conformity to traditional Brahmanical prescriptions, they also saw themselves as following a different set of laws and rules.

Ellen Gough, one of the rare scholars who studies Tantric aspects of the Jaina traditions, presents the history of the Digambara Jaina ritual of mendicant initiation (dīkṣā). This ritual that features Tantric elements, such as maṇḍalas and mantras, was introduced into the Digambara tradition in the twentieth century. Modern Digambaras claim that this practice is a return to “ancient,” that is, pre-sixteenth-century times. Investigating evidence for this statement, Gough tracks the historical development of this ritual from the first half of the first millennium to the sixteenth century based on thorough textual studies of relevant Jaina works. Thanks to her fieldwork undertaken in Rajasthan in 2013, she also vividly provides insight into the present-day practice and shows that Tantric ritual components have also been used to create Jaina communities.

Péter Szántó provides rare insights into the early history of the gaṇacakra, a ritualised communal feast as celebrated by followers of the Vajrayāna, i.e., Tantric Buddhist communities. The earliest Buddhist evidence for this ritual, which was probably originally designed by imitating a Śaiva ritual, dates to the early eighth century or possibly slightly earlier.
While several Buddhist works from this time onwards describe or refer to the \textit{ga\'nacakra} ritual, there are only two known complete, self-standing manuals surviving in Sanskrit, as Szántó demonstrates. One is found in the so-called Ngor Hevajra\'s\'dhana collection, the other one, the \textit{Ga\'nacakravidhi} attributed to Ratn\'\kara\'\shanti and transmitted in a Nepalese manuscript, is presented here. Szántó delivers an annotated diplomatic edition of this work, which is supplemented by a – because of several difficulties of the text – tentative translation and a detailed explanation in order to make the content of this fascinating document accessible also to non-Sanskritists.

Turning to the sphere of Buddhist Tantric rituals for the public domain, Ryugen Tanemura examines surviving pre-modern ritual manuals and exegetical works on Buddhist Tantric death rites and explores how they may inform us about the potential clientele served by Buddhist Tantric priests. Having identified the relevant textual sources – all of which were edited by the author for the first time – he focuses in particular on the \textit{Mrtasugatini-\textit{yojana}}, a manual of the funeral rite by Śūnyasamādhivajra, the final section (\textit{Antasthitikarmodde\’śa}) of Padmaśrīmitra’s \textit{Ma\'ndalop\'yikā}, and the final chapter (\textit{Nirvatavajrā\'\c\c\y\u\'nty\u\’s\i\l\a\’\k\a\’\n\u\’\d\i\’\h}) of Jagaddar\u{\a}\’s \textit{Cary\u{\a}kriyāsamuccaya}. In his analysis, he principally concentrates on passages that indicate which kind of Tantric practitioner is intended as the recipient of a Tantric funeral, which, in turn, offers clues about the scope of Tantric community envisaged by the sources.

The third part of the volume consists of contributions that collect and discuss sources that provide insights into how certain Tantric communities construct a public identity, negotiated through apotropaic empowering rituals for the royal sphere or public rituals and festivals.

Marion Rastelli describes a specific strategy pursued by Tantric officiants of the Vai\'\ṣṇava tradition of P\u{\a}\n\c\r\u\’\tra to convince rulers to employ their services. The \textit{Ahirbudhnyas\u{\a}mhītā}, a South Indian work probably from the thirteenth century, expounds the ritual worship of Sudar\’śana, the discus of Vi\’\ṣṇu. This worship mainly serves the purposes of kings, including, for instance, military purposes. These rituals are usually not performed by the king himself but by his personal priest (\textit{purohita, purodhas}). Rastelli
demonstrates how it is a great concern of the Ahirbudhnyasamhitā to show the importance of a personal priest and his relation to the king, which is why it also presents several narratives. These narratives mostly follow a similar pattern: a particular king is in a certain form of distress and finally reaches a solution to his problem with the help of a purohita, namely, the sudarśanamantra and its ritual worship. While the primary purpose of these narratives is evident, they also throw light on the background of the redactor of the Ahirbudhnyasamhitā as well as its target audience, that is, kings and their specific needs.

Francesco Bianchini provides yet further insights into the Ahirbudhnyasamhitā by highlighting passages that exhibit the ruling elite’s concerns and the services that Tantric officiants could supply, thereby adding to our understanding of how Tantric traditions advanced and spread in society through affecting and gaining support by the rulers. Among the issues that he addresses are the association of specific Tantric theological tenets with offices and concepts of the royal court, the methodological problem of identifying different classes of officiants on the basis of the kind of information given by the Ahirbudhnyasamhitā, the main goals of the rulers, and the repertoire of rituals that the Tantric priest as described in the Ahirbudhnyasamhitā offered in comparison to that of a traditional Atharvavedic officiant.

Dominic Goodall examines the emergence and development of festivals (mahotsava) in Śaiva Tantric communities, i.e., the Śaiva Mantramārga. While such religious processions are commonplace in several South Indian Tantric scriptures, Goodall observes that these are never mentioned in pre-twelfth-century Tantric authoritative scriptures. First, he traces the earliest sources on Śaiva religious processions, namely the sixth/seventh century non-Tantric Śivadharmaśāstra. Second, he provides an in-depth analysis of the damanotsava, a festival in which Śiva is worshipped with the various parts of the Damana plant (Artemisia indica). His treatment demonstrates how Śaiva Tantric priests adopted a popular annual festival associated with spring and with love, transforming it into a Śaiva reparatory ritual with soteriological function, and he explores the socio-religious reasons that may have driven such changes in the Tantric ritual repertoire. In his analysis, he also includes critical observations on the transmission history of the
famous South Indian twelfth-century Saiddhântika ritual manual Jñâna-ratnâvalî.

Gudrun Bühnemann deals with the worship of the monkey deity Hanumān under royal patronage in mid-seventeenth- to mid-eighteenth-century Nepal. Presenting rich sources including texts, such as inscriptions, accounts in chronicles (vamśâvalî), and ritual works, and both published and hitherto unpublished images of sculptures, paintings, and line drawings, she provides new insight into how the kings of the late Malla period promoted the worship of Hanumān in the Kathmandu Valley and what goals they wished to attain through the worship of both the public exoteric and the specifically esoteric, Tantric manifestations of the guardian deity.

The fourth part of the volume presents contributions that engage with the role of lay communities and examines how their shared community practices and self-representations relate to the emerging Tantric traditions.

Nina Mirnig turns to the sixth/seventh-century Śaiva text Śivadharmaśāstra, the earliest extant normative work to promote an entire Śaiva social order, which has proven pivotal for understanding the emergence of Śaivism and the Tantric traditions in the early medieval period. Against the historical backdrop of the religious milieu at the time – including the prominence of Vaiṣṇava devotional movements, Buddhism, and Śaiva ascetic traditions – Mirnig discusses the novel ways in which community identity is constructed in the Śivadharmaśāstra by promoting Śaiva devotees as divine beings on earth, granting them a superior spiritual status independent of the existing socio-religious system defined through caste and class, thereby also opening the system up to lower social classes. Identifying the various social and ritual implications initiated by this new conceptualisation, this contribution also traces the ritual and conceptual continuities into the Śaiva Tantric sphere, whose propagators build on the kind of socio-religious structures expounded upon in the Śivadharmaśāstra.

Peter Bisschop analyses the ways in which the earliest extant Śaiva texts of the sixth and seventh centuries deal with the worship of other gods than Śiva, thereby investigating how emerging Śaiva communities promoted their religion as superior to their competitors. Building on Paul Hacker’s theory of inclusivism as “a specifically Indian way of thinking” and a
means of inclusion by subordination, Bisschop investigates three works that were practically unknown at Hacker’s time but provide important case studies for tracing this phenomenon in early medieval South Asia: the sixth chapter of the Śivadharmaśāstra, which contains a lengthy mantra of pacification (śāntimantra) invoking all deities for protection; Skandapurāṇa chapters 27–28, which are related in content to the teachings of the Śivadharma; and the third chapter of the Nīsvāsamukha, which deals with mundane religion and has a lengthy section on the worship of different gods. In his investigation, he presents the varying degrees of “inclusivism” suggested by these early sources, a strategy that also reflects the socio-religious setting in which these newly emerging Śaiva communities had to secure their position among the dominant religious traditions of the time.

S.A.S. Sarma deals with the ritual worship of the female deities collectively known as the Seven Mothers (saptamātrī) with Bhadrakālī as the principal deity. He investigates how these rites bind together certain Tantric ritual communities, presenting hitherto unpublished Mātrtantras composed in South India and sharing his vast knowledge about the communities and temples associated with this worship. The first part of his paper describes important works devoted to the worship of the Seven Mothers, namely, two texts labelled Brahmayāmala and associated with the Kolārāmā Temple of Kōḷār, the Māṭrsadbhāva, composed in Kerala before the fifteenth century, three chapters of the Śesasamuccaya attributed to Śāṅkara, and several texts on the rare cult of the goddess Rurujit, a specific form of Bhadrakālī. The second part of the paper then deals with the Keralese communities associated with the worship of Bhadrakālī and especially Rurujit. These include the Nampūtiri Brahmins, who are the officiating priests in Bhadrakālī temples, as well as three particular non-Nampūtiri communities, namely, the Mūssads, the Piṭāras, and the Aṭīkaḷ. Finally, Sarma depicts illustrative examples of rituals in concrete South Indian temples that also address the multifarious interactions of various communities of South Indian society.

Gergely Hidas turns to the earliest extant manuscript sources on Buddhist dhāraṇī, a popular practice centered on spells. Focusing on the Mahāpratisāra-Mahāvidyārājñī, a magical-ritualistic scripture of Dhāraṇī literature that has likely emerged in North India between the third and sixth
centuries, he presents and examines newly identified fragments in the Gilgit collection and places them within the whole Mahāpratisarā corpus. His treatment also pursues the question why so many copies of the same scripture were likely to be kept in one collection and what this could tell us about the ritual practices of the Buddhist community in the area as well as its relation to esoteric Buddhism.
How public was Śaivism?

Alexis Sanderson

Introduction

The study of Śaivism in its many forms is certainly one of the areas within Indology that invites and benefits from a sociological perspective. However, in its infancy the subject suffered from the myopia that has hampered progress in many other areas in the study of Indian religion. I refer to the tendency to read texts with insufficient attention to their human context, avoiding questions that should be at the forefront of any attempt to understand their meaning, questions such as: What can the body of prescription and interpretation that make up this text or group of texts tell us about the position and aspirations of the authors and their audiences in the larger pattern of Indian society at that time? How far were these aspirations realised? How widespread were the practices that they prescribe? What impact did these forms of religion have on the adherents of other traditions? How were these traditions established and propagated? To what extent did they engage with and influence religion in the public and civic domains? What do these texts tell us about how the various groups that produced them saw each other?

It is easy to understand why such questions tended to be overlooked. The principal reason is that the texts do not foreground these issues, since awareness of them could be taken for granted when the texts were composed. Though this unstated lived context was a large part of the texts’ meaning, the perception of this fact was further hindered, if not completely blocked, by the tendency of scholars to limit their interest to a single tradition and often to one strand of one tradition in one region of the Indian subcontinent. We had specialists of what was called the Śaivism of South India or the Śaivism of Kashmir, and their interest tended to be focused on
ritual or devotion in the former case and on esoteric mysticism or philosophy in the latter. There was little consciousness of the need to question the integrity of such disciplinary and regional divisions, to seek a larger picture of the historical processes that led to the two clusters of learned Śaiva literature and practice stranded in modern times at opposite ends of the subcontinent; and this hindered the development of a sociological perspective, because it was largely when one looked at the nature of the coexistence of these traditions and their views of each other that such issues tended to come more sharply into focus, prompting one to go back to the texts to see if there were not material relevant to these issues that one had been overlooking.

In my own work I have tried to find this larger picture. I started in the 1970s with precisely the limitations I have described. After studying Sanskrit I spent several years in Kashmir reading the texts of what I knew as Kashmir Śaivism and meeting regularly with Swami Lakshman Joo (Rājānaka Lakṣmanā), the last surviving exponent of that tradition, to put to him the questions that this reading was constantly throwing up. In this way, with his more than generous assistance, I came to see the system from the inside as it was understood then.

This was an immensely valuable start, but as I progressed, I began to formulate more and more questions that could not be answered from the surviving knowledge base and so realised the need to go beyond it.

In the first stage of my further endeavours I was mostly focused on searching for manuscripts of scriptural sources that the Kashmirian authors had drawn upon in constructing their system of doctrine and practice but which had ceased to be copied in later centuries and had therefore disappeared, it seemed, without trace. By this time I was familiar enough with the system to have located several of its exegetical fault lines and to have seen that most of these were at points at which it seemed that elements of diverse origin had been welded together into a supposedly seamless whole. I hoped that by gaining access to texts that contained these elements prior to their Kashmirian systematisation or independently of it I would gain insights into how the systematisation had proceeded, to catch it in the act, as it were, and thereby achieve a better understanding of the Kashmirian authors' intentions, much of which surely resided in seeing how they were
using these sources, sometimes no doubt simply incorporating their testimony but at other times redirecting it to serve purposes that only the confrontation of source and interpretation would reveal. Moreover, in the magnum opus of the Kashmirian tradition, the *Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta, these scriptural materials were mostly presented in the form of paraphrases and these were often ambiguous for modern readers, since we, unlike Abhinavagupta’s target audience, were unable to read these paraphrases with their sources in our memories or at least accessible.

So my work shifted its focus eastwards along the Himalayas to the Kathmandu valley, a stronghold of Tantric Śaivism from early times, with an abundance of early palm-leaf manuscripts of Nepalese and East Indian Śaiva texts, many of them dating from before or around the time of the Kashmirian authors, mostly preserved in Nepalese collections but also in libraries in India and Europe. My efforts were rewarded by the discovery of a good number of scriptural texts that had been lost in Kashmir and the realisation of the relevance of others that were known to exist but had not been read in depth or read at all. Many gaps still remain, but the materials I was able to assemble over the years have thrown a flood of light on the nature of the Kashmirian Śaiva project and at the same time opened to view a much more diverse panorama of Śaiva traditions, leading to many new questions about their history and distribution, and the nature of their coexistence. Kashmirian Śaivism of the kind that had attracted my initial interest was now beginning to be contextualised as one element in a much larger picture.

Once this process had begun it was natural, if not inevitable, that I should also start considering the question of the relations between the largely Śākta-oriented Śaiva traditions of my Kashmirian, Nepalese, and East Indian sources and the rich non-Śākta Sāiddhāntika Śaiva tradition that had survived in the Tamil-speaking South. Here too early Nepalese manuscripts played an important role. It soon became apparent that though the two Śaiva traditions I had encountered at the beginning of my research at opposite ends of the subcontinent, the Śākta Śaivism of Kashmir and the non-Śākta Śaivism of the South, seemed to occupy different universes in modern times, they had in earlier centuries been intimately connected. In short it soon became clear that South Indian Sāiddhāntika Śaivism, though
greatly enriched and diversified in its South Indian setting, was rooted in a
tradition that had been dominant in much of the subcontinent, including
Kashmir, and had spread beyond it into large parts of mainland and mari-
time South East Asia, in the centuries before and during the production of
the Kashmirian Śākta Śaiva literature. It also became clear that it was nec-
essary to understand the latter as attempting to synthesise its Śākta-oriented
traditions with this established Śaiva mainstream in a multitiered hierarchy
within which all levels of Śaivism were accepted as valid, the hierarchy
residing in the belief that while the mainstream Siddhānta constituted the
public, institutionalised face of Śaivism, the more Śākta systems offered
private, more powerful methods of transcendence and supernatural effect.

It also became evident that both of these forms of Śaivism were much
more than methods followed for personal salvation. Both were sustained by
predominantly royal patrons who looked to enhance their power, the
Siddhānta predominantly through the legitimisation and sacralisation of roy-
al authority and the Śākta Śaiva traditions by offering rituals of state pro-
tection particularly in times of danger. It is this service to patrons that
explains the emphasis that we find in most of the practice-oriented Śaiva
literature on rituals that aim to bring about such supernatural effects (sidd-
dhiḥ) as the warding off of dangers present or predicted (śāntiḥ), the resto-
rati on of vitality (puṣṭiḥ), the blocking, routing, or destruction of enemies
(abhicāraḥ), and the control of rainfall.

To be beginning to understand the internal dynamics of Śaivism in such
ways was definite progress; but this commitment to contextualisation could
not proceed solely within the boundaries of the Śaiva traditions. It was
necessary also to seek to understand how the Śāivas had understood and
negotiated the relationship between their Śaiva obligations and those of
mainstream Brahmanical religion and the extent to which the latter had
accepted or rejected its claims. As one would expect, it became clear that
this relationship was subject to change and was far from constant across the
range of the Śaiva traditions in different regions and periods and that the
history of Śaivism was in important respects the history of this unstable
relationship.

Nor was the picture complete with the Śaiva traditions that I have men-
tioned so far. On the one hand there were also earlier Śaiva systems that
had left traces in the record, whose connections with the better documented traditions that followed them remained to be understood; and on the other there was a vast mass of literature articulating what we may call the lay Śaivism of the general population as opposed to the systems developed by religious specialists that had been engaging my attention. How should we understand the relationship between this Śaivism and those systems? Were the latter the source of this literature of lay devotion? Or should we rather see the Śaivism reflected in that literature as an independent phenomenon on which the more publicly engaged of the systems that I had been studying were dependent, even parasitic? I now incline to the latter view.

Finally there were questions concerning the relationship between the non-lay Śaiva systems and those of their principal rivals for patronage: the Buddhists, Vaiṣṇavas, and Jains. My work in that domain has, I believe, demonstrated that the Śaiva systems exerted a powerful influence on all three of these religious groups, causing them to develop ritual systems along Tantric lines derived from Śaiva models.

The picture that has been emerging is based primarily on textual sources, but these are not just the works of high learning and the scriptural texts that they interpret. There are also many much humbler and often anonymous works, mostly unpublished, that set out ritual procedures for the guidance of Śaiva officiants and other initiates. The great value of these materials is that they are as close as written prescriptions can be to a record of actual practice in specific communities. They therefore enable us to see which systems have been prevalent or left their mark. The elevated works of scholarship, such as the Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta, present a wealth of information concerning this or that Śaiva system, but they do not enable us to know how widely these systems were adopted. By locating and examining materials of this humbler variety in the regions of the subcontinent in which they have survived we can hope that a differentiated pan-Indian history of Śaivism will emerge.

Nor is it sufficient to study the kinds of sources that I have mentioned so far. I have learned much that I could not learn from these prescriptive texts by reading inscriptions that record grants to religious officiants and foundations. These enable us to build up a picture of the patronage of the religion and its dissemination through the subcontinent; and in conjunction
with the study of material evidence in the form of temples or their remains and religious images they give us some idea of the strength of Śaivism in specific regions over time in relation to its rivals. They also provide on occasion a corrective to the tendency of the texts to idealise, revealing, for example, a degree of routinisation and mundane motivation that the texts tend not to acknowledge. Finally, there is much to be learned from modern ethnographic accounts of surviving religious practice and institutions. The Kathmandu valley and the Tamil South, where Śaiva traditions of both Śākta Śaiva and Saiddhāntika have survived, have much to teach us in this regard. One cannot simply read the present or recent past back into the early centuries of these traditions; but ethnographic data can prompt us to interrogate the textual evidence of the past in ways that might otherwise be overlooked.

The main constituents of Śaivism

In what follows I shall touch on all four of the divisions that in my present understanding make up the territory of the religion: lay Śaivism, the Atimārga, the Mantramārga, and the Kulamārga.

There is a primary dichotomy here between lay Śaivism and the other three, which we may distinguish from it as forms of initiatory Śaivism that demanded a much deeper commitment and promised much more. While lay Śaivism offered its observant adherents temporary translation at death to the paradise of Śiva (śivalokaḥ, rudralokaḥ, śivapuram), the systems within the Atimārga, Mantramārga, and Kulamārga promised their initiates the attainment of final liberation, either at death or in the case of the Śākta-oriented systems even in the midst of life, and, in addition, in the Mantramārga and the Kulamārga, the means of bringing about the supernatural effects already mentioned and of attaining before final liberation entry into paradises far more elevated than that of the laity.

The terms Atimārga and Mantramārga are taken by me from the literature of the latter. The Atimārga in that testimony covers certain forms of Śaiva ascetic discipline that predate the emergence of the Mantramārga and coexisted with it. In our earliest testimony it comprises two systems: the Pāncārthika Pāṣupata and the Lākula, also called Kālamukha. While the
Pāñcārthika Pāṣupata Atimārga and the Mantramārga seem radically different in many respects, what we now know of the Lākula tradition has shown that many of the key features that set the Mantramārga apart from the Pāñcārthika Atimārga were already present in the Lākula Atimārga, revealing the earliest Śaivism of the Mantramārga to have developed out of it.

Later doxography adds a third division of the Atimārga, that of the Kāpālikā followers of a system known as the Somasiddhānta. My current view of this addition is that it evidences a Lākula tradition that incorporated into the Atimārgic framework radically new forms of Śākta worship that would have a lasting impact on the non-Saidhāntika Mantramārga and Kulamārga by being carried forward into those traditions.

The Mantramārga comprises the Saidhāntika Śaiva tradition and Śākta-oriented ritual systems primarily focused on the propitiation of various goddesses and Bhairava. While the former was more publicly engaged and generally stayed within the boundaries dictated by Brahmanical criteria of ritual purity, the non-Saidhāntika Mantramārga drew its power from ritual transgression of these boundaries.

The same applies to the Kulamārga, which inherited the Śākta traditions that had entered the Atimārga with the Kāpālikā development, stressing collective orgiastic worship, initiation through possession, the ritual consumption of meat and alcoholic liquor, and sexual contact with women regardless of caste.

Many of these Kaula elements are also to be found in texts of the Śākta-oriented Mantramārga. This lack of a clear boundary is not unique to the relation between the Mantramārga and the Kulamārga. The labels attached by our texts to the various traditions are used by them as though they apply to quite distinct unchanging entities. But in reality, the boundaries between the various branches of the Śaiva tradition were contested and shifting as the ascetic groups and householder communities that adhered to them worked to elevate their status in relation to each other or to achieve greater acceptance in Brahmanical society. We may never be able to see even the majority of these shifts, but we should remain alert to the fact that our texts are snapshots of an ever-changing situation. Moreover, while the learned exegetes tended to stress the separation between their own traditions and the others, we should not let this close our minds to evidence of a greater
degree of interaction, cofunctionality, and hybridisation than reading the works of the learned systematisers leads us to expect. Here the humble manuals are revealing, since they show precisely the blurring of boundaries that the learned condemn.¹

I turn now to the topic indicated by the title of my lecture: ‘‘How public was Śaivism?’’. Evidently one cannot claim to have a realistic picture of a religion if one does not have some sense of where the boundary lies between the private and the public, of how far the activities of adherents of the religion are publicly visible or at least publicly significant. For even rituals considered secret and conducted away from the public gaze may nonetheless be designed to have an impact in the public domain, not through being witnessed but through being known to have occurred. Thus, for example, in the case of the king, a status-enhancing Tantric ritual conducted in private may become a very public event by being framed by military parades and marked by a public holiday. Our sources tend to be parsimonious in revealing this civic dimension of the religion. One can read much without encountering it since the texts are focused on what the solitary individual initiate should do. But evidence is nonetheless present. I shall be drawing attention to some of it in what follows.

**Lay Śaivism: joint agency and civic spectacle**

I begin with the distinction between lay Śaivism and initiatory Śaivism, that is to say, between a Śaivism open to lay people (*upāsakāḥ*), who by adopting it were not thought to have radically changed their position in relation to orthodox Brahmanism, who were not considered to have taken on a religious identity that challenged the reach of Brahmanical authority, and who did not claim to have done so, and the Śaivism of other groups whose members by taking a personal initiation (*dīkṣā*) did consider themselves to have risen above the domain of religious efficacity proper to the mainstream religion and to have gained access to a personal liberation not accessible in their view to the followers of Brahmanism or its non-initiatory Śaiva inflections.

¹ For a detailed review of these traditions and their literatures, see Sanderson 2014.
The literature for initiates in the Mantramārga distinguishes two categories of lay Śaivas: (1) those who enacted their devotion to Śiva following orthodox Brahmanical authorities, either (1a) liturgies addressed to the Vedic Rudra, such as the lost Rudrakalpa of the Kaṭhas, or (1b) forms of worship of Śiva taught in the Purāṇas, thus either Śrauta (1a) and Śmārtā (1b), and (2) those who opted for what appears to have been an intensified form of lay commitment by following the injunctions of scriptures that we may call the Śivadharmottara, principally the Śivadharma and the Śivadharmottara, which instruct lay Śaivas on the forms of personal observance appropriate to them and exhort them to dedicate a considerable part of their wealth to the support of the religion.2

For some time, before I had given these texts a more than cursory examination, I assumed that this Śivadharmottara literature must have emanated from within the community of the initiated as a means of securing lay sup-

---

2 For this distinction between the modalities of lay Śaivism, see, e.g., Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, Mataṅgavṛtti on Vidyāpāda 4.49–50: upāsakaivyānugrahāsādhanampṛāṇīnīta matanagunumineva pūrvaṃ śrutiśvadivhītena (em. with the Kashmirian mss.: śrutav vihitena ed.) śivadharmoditenā vā vidhesvaropāsanaiva kāryā. “Lay devotees must, like the sage Mataṅga, first worship Śiva with the procedure ordained in Śrutī or with that taught in the Śivadharmottara texts as the means of receiving the means of [Śiva’s] grace.” See also Kiraṇavṛtti on Vidyāpāda 6.22d–12: tarhi kim tair nityam anuśheyaṃ. laukikena rūpēṇa śivadharmoditenā vā vathāsakti devagurutadbhaktaparīcaṇādikam eva svataḥ putrabhrtyādipreṣaṇeṇa vā. “So what is the religious duty of these people [who are exonerated from the post-initiatory duties]? It is such activities as serving Śiva, the guru, and their devotees to the extent of their ability, either themselves or [if that is not possible] by sending their sons or servants [as proxies], either in the mundane modality or in that taught in the Śivadharmottara texts.” Mataṅga on Vidyāpāda 26.58–59b defines the mundane modality of observance as such activities as chanting hymns, singing, and bowing down to an image of Śiva, either a linga or anthropomorphic. I have preferred the reading śrutiśvadivhīteṇa seen in the Kashmirian mss., not because they are generally more reliable than the South Indian witnesses used by the editor Bhatt, though they are, but because the reading śrutav vihitena that he has adopted is less satisfactory. For it is implausible that Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha would have restricted the non-Śivadharmottara option to Śrauta worship. For the Śrauta forms of worship envisaged by the Kashmirian Saiddhāntikas, see Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, Mrgendravṛtti on Vidyāpāda 1.6. These include the lost Rudrakalpa of the Kaṭhas (p. 16, ll. 7–8: tathā hi *kāhake sūraparīṣiṣṭye rudrakalpe, “in the Kāṭhaka Rudrakalpa that is a supplementary text of the [Kaṭhas’ Yajñā] śātra”).
port. I have rejected that perspective now. My view is that these texts cannot plausibly be attributed to teachers of any of the initiatory systems. Although they show awareness of the Atimārga or the Mantramārga or both, they certainly cannot be read as teaching watered-down versions for the laity of either of these initiatory Śaivisms. There are too many discontinuities for that to be plausible. One can imagine that if gurus of the Atimārga or Mantramārga were to create a system for the laity, they might have omitted reference to the higher levels accessible to initiates, but not that they would have put forward a worldview such as we see in these texts which shows little continuity with the doctrines of either the Atimārga or the Mantramārga. I now consider that this literature represents a mainstream tradition within the Śaiva community on which the much smaller communities of initiates were parasitic, that they latched on to these traditions and imposed their authority on them, usually with royal patronage, becoming in this way the officiants of various Śaiva institutions which had their own independent histories. A strong indication of the proposed independence of this tradition can be seen in the program of deities installed in Śaiva temples, for this is quite distinct from the programs ordained for worship in the initiatory systems and remained largely unchanged when control of these foundations passed from the Atimārga to the Mantramārga.³

Many features set the Śaivism of the Śivadharma corpus apart from that of the initiatory traditions, but that which is most striking in the present context concerns the beneficiaries of the pious activities that are advocated. In initiatory Śaivism those who perform the rituals prescribed are acting as individuals for their own personal benefit or that of named clients. But in the Śivadharma corpus, the person performing the activity or having it performed, commonly the king, is considered to be acting not only in his own right but also as the representative of the community that he heads, so that the rewards of his piety are shared. Here, then, ritual is not a purely private and personal affair but has a strong social and civic dimension.

I shall give two examples of this concept of action for the group. The first speaks of the benefits of what it calls the śadaṅgavidhiḥ (“the six-element rite”), a simple form of liṅga worship requiring the offering of six

products of the cow to be performed by the king and by extension by others that is the subject of the first chapter of the Śivadharmottara. The relevant passage is as follows:

Through this six-element rite the deity becomes propitious. In both this world and the next he bestows all that one desires. So a king who is a devotee of Śiva should worship Śiva with this rite. He will rescue twenty-one generations [of his patriline]. Establishing them in heaven, he will ascend himself [above that level] to the eternal abode of Śiva. Moreover, every honest minister who has been employed in the king’s service will proceed together with him to that great and illustrious paradise (śivapuram). After he has enjoyed endless pleasures [there] together with all his staff, he will in due course return to this world and become a universal sovereign who will rule the whole earth.  

The second passage concerns a ceremony taught in the second chapter of the same text in which the king is to have a sacred text copied and then donate it to a guru:

The donor will dwell in the paradise of Śiva for as many thousands of aeons as there are syllables in the manuscript of the scripture of Śiva [that he has donated]. Having rescued ten generations of his patrilineal ancestors and the ten that will follow him, he will establish them, his

---

4 Śivadharmottara 1.87c–91: anena vidhinā devaḥ śāduṅgena prasīdati || 88 || iha loke pare caiva sarvāṃ kāmāṃ prayacchati śāduṅgavidhinā tasmāṃ napatīḥ pūjayec chivam || 89 || śivabhuktāh samuttārya kulānāṃ ekaviṃśatim | svarge sthāpyaṃ svayaṃ gacchēd aśvaram padam avyayam | 90 | aśtāḥ sarvasvabhṛtyāḥ ca devakārya-niyojitāḥ | prayānti svāminā śārdham śīmac chivapurāṃ mahat | 91 || bhūtvā bhojān sa vipulāḥ bhṛtyavargasamanvitaḥ | kālāḥ punar ihāyātah prthivyām ekarāḥ bhavet ||.

5 Similar promises are found in mainstream Brahmanical sources. See, for example, Manusmṛti 3.37: daśa pūrvāṅ parāṅ vanśāṅ ātmānam ekaviṃśakam | brāhmīputraḥ sukṛtakṛn mocayaty enasaḥ piṭān. “When a son by a woman married by the Brāhma rite (brāhmīputraḥ) performs a meritorious action, he frees from sin the ten heads of his patriline before him, the ten after him, and himself as twenty-first.” Commenting on this, Medhātithi allows the claim that future generations can
mother, his father, and his chief wife in heaven and then go on to Śiva. He will go to Śiva’s world by virtue of this gift of knowledge attended by his harem and accompanied by all his ministers.  

But the light that this body of texts for the laity sheds on the transpersonal be freed from sin is mere arthavādah, that is to say, a promotional statement that is not to be taken literally. But he accepts the principle that a pious act can free one’s predecessors from sin, since to deny this would be to deny that śrāddha ceremonies performed for one’s ancestors are efficacious. I am not aware of any place in the Śivadharma literature in which this issue of the rites of the living benefitting unborn descendants has been addressed directly. But it can be argued that it has been covered by the claim that none of Śiva’s statements are arthavādah, that all are to be understood as literally true and that this should be kept in mind especially with regard to what the texts have to say about the consequences of meritorious and sinful actions. See Śivadharmottara 1.39–42. 44avya: vidhīvāyam idaṁ śaivaṁ nārthavādah śivāmakah | lokāmugrahakartā yaḥ sa myārathaṁ katham vadeḥ || 40 sarvajñāḥ paripūrṇavatvād anyathā kena hetumā | brūyād vākyam śivaḥ sāntah sarvadāvavarijitaḥ || 41 yad yatāvasthitam vastu guṇadosaiḥ svabhāvataḥ | yāvat phalaṁ ca puyaṁ ca sarvajñas tat tathā vadeḥ || … 44 tasmād śivarākhyāṇi śraddheyāṇi vipāccitāḥ | yatāvasthitam phuyapāpeṣu tadaśraddhā vrajed adhāḥ. “This teaching of Śiva consists [entirely] of literally true statements (vidhīvāyam). There is no Śiva arthavādah. How could [Śiva], the saviour of all beings, utter a falsehood? For what reason would Śiva lie, he who is omniscient because he embraces the whole of the real, who is at peace in his transcendence, and free of all defects? Being omniscient he must relate everything as it is by nature, with its virtues and defects, including the [actions that he advocates as] virtuous and the rewards [he promises to those who do them]. … Therefore the learned should put their trust in [all] the statements of Śiva concerning meritorious and sinful actions as corresponding to reality. If one lacks that trust, one will descend [into the hells].” See also Tantrāloka 4.232ab: nārthavādādiśaṅkā ca vākye māheśvare bhavet, “One should entertain no doubts about the teachings of Śiva, suspecting, for example, that they are arthavādah;” and Tantrāloka thereon: yad uktam “vidhīvāyam idaṁ tantraṁ nārthavādah kaḍācana | jhaṭṭī pratyaśeṣu satkriyāṇāṁ phalesv api” iti | tathā … nārthavādah śivāgamah. “As has been stated [by Śiva himself]: ‘This teaching (tantram) consists [entirely] of statements of fact. It is never arthavādah particularly [in its statements] with reference to sin and the rewards of pious actions;’ and ‘The scriptures of Śiva are not arthavādah.’”

Śivadharmottara 2.78c–81: yāvadekṣarasamkhyaṇam śivajñānasva pustake || 79 || tāvad kālpasahasrāpi dātā śivapure vaset | daśa pūrṇān samuddhṛtya daśa vamśyāṁś ca pościmān || 80 || mātāpirdharmapatiṁ dharmeṣu svarge sīhpīṇa śivaṁ vajrata | sāntaḥpura-parvāraḥ sarvabhrtyasamanvitaḥ || 81 || rājā śivapuraṁ gacched vīyādānaprabhāvataḥ.  

6. Śivadharmottara 2.78c–81: yāvadekṣarasamkhyaṇam śivajñānasva pustake || 79 || tāvad kālpasahasrāpi dātā śivapure vaset | daśa pūrṇān samuddhṛtya daśa vamśyāṁś ca pościmān || 80 || mātāpirdharmapatiṁ dharmeṣu svarge sīhpīṇa śivaṁ vajrata | sāntaḥpura-parvāraḥ sarvabhrtyasamanvitaḥ || 81 || rājā śivapuraṁ gacched vīyādānaprabhāvataḥ.
aspect of religious action is not limited to what may be inferred from its belief that pious activity benefits the group led by the individual who carries out or commissions that activity. One of the severe limitations imposed on our understanding by most accounts of ritual in the texts of the initiatory forms of Śāivism is that they are generally concerned only with what a single individual, initiate, or officiant is having to do and say. They very seldom pull back to show us what is happening around this officiant that might involve other agents and even extend into the civic space. This is less so with the Śivadharma literature. For the Śivadharmottara, concerned as it is with forms of ritual that involve and benefit groups, does offer some intriguing views of this wider picture, opening a window on to the extension of ritual action into the civic domain. Its account of this ritual of text donation is rich in this regard. After describing how the new copy of the scripture should be prepared, the text tells us that after its completion a pūjā should be performed and the night passed in festivities. Then:

śivavidyāvimāṇam ca kuryāḥ prātaḥ suśobhanam
47 pañcāṇḍakam tribhaumam ca dāruvāṃśādinirmitam
vicitravastrasamchannam sarvaśobhāsamanvitam
48 vidyāsanastham tannadhya śivajñānasya pustakam
hemaratmacitam divyam aṭhavā dantaśobhitam
49 vicitracitrayuktaṃ va bahiruktiṃnakambikam
pārśva carmasamāyuktaṃ dṛḍhasūtraniṃkhandhanam
50 saṃpūjaṃ gandhapuṣpādyaiḥ pūrvakāṇḍhinā budhaiḥ
samutkṣipyaṇayet bhaktāya tad vimāṇam śivāśramam
51 susthitaṃ rathamukhyena puruṣair vā balānvitaiḥ
chatradhvajapatakādyair vimānais tūryanīsvanaiḥ
52 maṅγalair vedaghoṣādyaiḥ sadhūpaiḥ kalaśaiḥ sitaiḥ
cāraṇaiḥ vandabhir vādyaiḥ strīsaṃgītaīr vibhūṣitam
53 cārucaṃmarahastābhīṣi cītraḍaṇḍaiś ca darpāṇaiḥ
mahatā janasāṅghena purataś ca mahīpataiḥ
54 dharmavṛddhaya svayaṃ gacchet sarvaśobhāsamanvītaiḥ
athavā hastīyānastham kṛtvā pustakam ānaye
55 rājasārgena mahatā nagaraṇaiḥ pradakṣiṇaiṃ
sarvāyatanapūjāṃ ca svadhānaiḥ kārayen nṛpaḥ
56 daśa dīkṣu baliṃ dadyān nagarasya samantataḥ mārge 'pi purato gacchan baliṃ dadyān nirantarām
57 gandhapuṣpākṣatonmiśram udakam ca tadāṅugam gaccheyur yatayaś cātra sarvāyatanavāsināḥ
58 purataḥ śivavidyāyāḥ śivamantram anusmaret śuklāṃbaradharāḥ sarve bhaveyuh puravāsināḥ
59 ucihrayeyuh patākāś ca janās taddeśavāsināḥ grhadevāṃś ca sampūṭya kāryaś cāpy utsavo grhe
60 brāhmaṇān bhoyayeyuṣ ca grheṣu grhamedhināḥ annapānair janapadā yāṭrāṃ kuryuḥ śivāśrame
61 acchedyāś taravaḥ kāryāḥ sarvahimsāṃ nīvārayet bandhanasthāś ca moktavyā varjyāḥ krodhādiśatravaḥ
62 akālakaumudumīṃ kuryāḥ divasadavyam īśvare śivāyatanam āsādyā vimānasthāṃ tam arghayet
63 punyāhajayaśabdaś ca mahatā tumulena ca sthāne susamśkrte ramye śivasya purataḥ śanaḥ
dhāpayitvā guror bhaktyā tat praṇamya nivedayet śāṃtirathām ekam adhyāyaṃ gobrāhmaṇaṃmahibhṛtāṃ
dhāpayitvā ramye śivasya purataḥ śanaḥ
dhāpayitvā guror bhaktyā tat praṇamya nivedayet śāṃtirathām ekam adhyāyaṃ gobrāhmaṇaṃmahibhṛtāṃ
dhāpayitvā guror bhaktyā tat praṇamya nivedayet śāṃtirathām ekam adhyāyaṃ gobrāhmaṇaṃmahibhṛtāṃ
dhāpayitvā guror bhaktyā tat praṇamya nivedayet śāṃtirathām ekam adhyāyaṃ gobrāhmaṇaṃmahibhṛtāṃ
73 rājyavrddhiś ca vipulā nityaṃ ca vijayī nṛpaḥ
vardhate putrapaurānīś ca matir dharme ca vardhate
74 vidyādānaprasadena nṛpasya ca janasya ca
Śivadharmottara 2.46c–74. A = University Library, Cambridge, ms. Add. 1694, f. 47r4–; B = Add. 1645, ff. 42r4–; C = Bodleian Library, Oxford, ms: Or. B 125, ff. 55v2–; D = National Archives, Kathmandu, m. 3–393 (NGMPP A 1082/3), Śivadharmottara ff. 5v3–; E = National Archives, Kathmandu, ms. 6–7 (NGMPP A 1028/4).

Early next morning [the king] should prepare a beautiful shrine for the scripture of Śiva. It should have five spires and three stories, and be made of materials such as wood and bamboo. It should be draped with lengths of cloth of many colours and provided with every adornment. In it [he should place] the manuscript of Śiva’s teaching on a text-throne. It should be splendid in appearance, inlaid with gold and precious stones or adorned with ivory, or it should be beautified with a charming painting, or have [two] boards that are engraved on their outer faces. It should be bound in leather and have a strong cord to secure it. After making offerings to it of scented powders, flowers, and the rest following the aforesaid procedure, the wise [monarch] should lift that shrine and with devotion bring it to the Śaiva monastery (śivāśramam) firmly secured on a superior vehicle or [carried] by strong men [on their shoulders], beautified with parasols, flags, and banners, palanquins (vimānaiḥ), and the sound of musical instruments, with such auspicious sounds as the chanting of the Vedas, with burning incense, and fine vases, with singers and bards, with instrumental music, with singing by women, [with women] holding beautiful fly whisks, with mirrors with elegant handles. To promote the faith, the king himself should lead the procession decked out with every adornment together with a large crowd. Alternatively he may conduct the manuscript [to the hermitage] after placing it provided with every adornment in a howdah on an elephant (hastiyānastham). Following the great royal highway the king should proceed in a clockwise direction within the [boundaries of

---

7 My translation “or have [two] boards that are engraved on their outer faces” is no better than a guess, because the word kambikā in the Bahuvrihi compound bahirutkāraakambikam is unknown to me in any relevant sense. My guess is guided by the fact that the text speaks of the kambikā- being engraved on the outside. I note, stepping outside my competence, that KITTEL’s dictionary of Kannada gives as one of the meanings of kambi “a plate with holes for drawing wire” (1894: 368a7–8). Boards used for manuscripts commonly have holes through which the binding cord can pass; see, for example, the illustrations in FOGG 1996: 48, 119, 121, 127, 132, and 137.

8 vimānaiḥ. I am uncertain of the meaning intended here. The word vimānam means a vehicle of various kinds, terrestrial or aerial, a bier, a palanquin or sedan, a palace, a temple, or a shrine. My decision to take it to refer to a palanquin is a guess.
the capital, and he should have offerings made at every temple at his personal expense. He should make bali offerings in the ten directions all around the city, and as he proceeds make such offerings continuously along the route, following these with water mixed with scented powders, flowers, and unhusked rice grains. With him here should go the ascetics that live in all the temples. [As he walks] in front of the [manuscript of] Śiva’s scripture he should meditate on Śiva’s [six-syllable] mantra [om namah śivāya]. All the inhabitants of the capital should be dressed in white and those that dwell in the region (taddeśavāsinah) should erect banners. After making offerings to their house gods, people should hold festivities in their homes. The married heads of households should feed Brahmins in their houses with food and drink. The populace should go on pilgrimage to the hermitage [attached to the temple] of Śiva. The king should enact a ban of the cutting down of trees, forbid all harm [to living beings], release those being held in prison, avoid the [six] enemies beginning with anger, and arrange for an extra-calendrical kaumudī festival (akālakaumudī) for two days in honour of Śiva (īśvare). When he has reached the [main] Śiva temple, he should

---

9 The term kaumudī refers to a joyful festival celebrated on the full-moon day of the months of Kārttika. An akālakaumudī is an extra-calendrical (akāla-) festival of the same kind decreed to mark some auspicious occasion such as a king’s victory in war. The Ur-Skandapurāṇa, a text of the sixth or seventh century, describes such a non-calendrical kaumudī festival in some detail (75.11–47). It is decreed by Hiranyākṣa, leader of the Asuras, to be held for eight consecutive days and seven nights in honour of Śiva to celebrate his victory over the gods. A proclamation is made in every square and assembly hall in his city. Guests are invited from far and wide. The streets are to be cleaned and anointed. The citizens are to bathe with full submersion and put on previously unworn clothes and flower-garlands. Singers and dancers are to perform. Banners must be raised in every private home, in the streets, and in the markets. Houses must be anointed. Flowers must be strewn in them and garlands draped. Brahmins should be fed and text-recitations staged. The Vedas should be chanted and “auspicious day” declared throughout the city. At night oil lamps must be kept fuelled and burning on the royal highway and in every home. Young men should stroll about in the company of young women, enjoying themselves, laughing, singing, and dancing. There should be performances of drumming and the wives of the Asuras must dance. Offerings of all kinds must be made to Śiva. Domestic animals should be slaughtered and the best of Brahmins fed. Whoever
prostrate before the god and make an offering of guest-water to him in the shrine. Then with shouts of “auspicious day” and “victory” and amid great noise he should slowly set down [the shrine] in a pleasing and ritually well-prepared place in front of Śiva and then donate that [manuscript] to the guru after bowing before him with devotion. An excellent cantor should then recite one adhyāya of the text for the warding off of dangers from cows, Brahmins, the king, and the inhabitants of the country and capital. The cantor should be of the finest quality. He should be a scholar who has a thorough understanding of the metres and he should be a fine poet, with a melodious voice and a knowledge of music. The guru should then rise and wet the king on his head with a little of the water prepared for the warding off of danger (śāntītoyena), and then all the people assembled there. Having asserted the removal of danger from all (avadhārya jagacchāntim), he should end the ceremony by doing the does not obey will receive corporal punishment. On each day of the festival, Hiraṇyākṣa bathes [a linga of] Śiva with the five products of the cow and pure, fragrant oil, pouring over it vessels filled with milk, ghee, yoghurt, and other liquids, flowers, fruits, seeds, jewels, scented ash, and water, a thousand vessels of each. He then feeds Brahmins, and honours them with gifts. The other Asuras do the same. The festival is clearly non-calendrical though the text refers to it only as kaumudī rather than as an akālakaumudī. However, that expression is used to describe the revelries with which the Asuras Sunda and Upasunda celebrated their having been granted a boon from Brahmā (Mahābhārata 1.201.29: akālakaumudīma caiva cakrapuḥ sārvakāmikāṁ | dāityendrāv paramaprītān tayoś caiva suhrjanaḥ).

The element of compulsion to which this mythological narrative refers no doubt reflects historical reality. The extent to which religious observance in early medieval India was not a matter of personal choice is an issue that has received insufficient attention. Considering the ability of the king to mobilise the citizenry for an event such as this narrative assumes, one can readily understand the emphasis that the Śivadharmottara places on converting the king to the religion of Śiva. For, it says, if he is converted, the rest of the population will follow, out of respect for his authority and out of fear: jagaddhitāya ṛṇatītī śivadharme *niṣṭhitaye (B: nivedayet A) || tan-niyogād ayaṁ lokaḥ śucih syād dharmataparāḥ | yaṁ yaṁ dharmam naraśreṣṭhāḥ samācarati bhaktitāḥ || tam tam ācārate lokas tatprāmāṇyāh bhayena ca (A f. 43v3–4; B f. 39v1–2). “For the good of all, [the guru] should establish the king in the Śiva-dharma. If the king commands it, these people will be pure and devoted to religion. Whatever religion the king follows with devotion the people follow, because they consider him authoritative and fear [his displeasure].”
same for the king. The king should then feed the guru and give him a fee. He should eat there himself in the company of his harem. When the people have eaten, he should mount spectacles of many kinds [for their entertainment]. When all this has been done in the manner stated, there will follow without a doubt a warding off of all ills (mahāśāntih) from the king, the capital, and the cities of the [whole] realm. Calamities will cease. Plague will not take hold. All horrors will disappear along with all dangers. All possessing spirits will be rooted out. Enemies will perish. Natural disasters will fade away. There will be no danger of famine. Impeding spirits will be destroyed. The greatest good fortune will prevail. There will be a vast expansion of the realm and whenever the king goes to war, he will be victorious. He will have ever more sons and sons of his sons; and by grace of this donation of knowledge both the king’s and the people’s respect for the faith will grow.

So here we are shown a ceremony of a very public kind, one which displays to the inhabitants of the capital in unambiguous terms an enactment of the king’s empowerment by his Śaiva guru. Here there is no Tantric secrecy. All could witness the king’s progress with the enthroned text round his capital in the company of the Śaiva ascetics who reside in its temples, see the king’s meeting with the guru at the latter’s residence, hear the recitation of the text, see the guru blessing the king with the water to ward off ills, and, if they were fortunate enough to be within range, feel drops of this liquid being scattered over themselves. One imagines an eager even ecstatic crowd pressing forward for this privilege. There is no indication here of anything happening behind closed doors. On the contrary, the public is obliged to turn out to participate in this civic event; and the beneficiaries are not only the king himself but all his subjects. As we shall see, sources of the Mantramārga mention the king’s going to meet his guru in full military parade and returning to his palace in the same way, mounted

---

10 That is to say, ascetics who reside in mathas, also called śivāśramas, attached to these temples, and perform or supervise the performance of the rituals that take place in those temples. The Śivādharmottara gives a detailed description of the design of a śivāśrama (2.137–162).
on an elephant, with the citizenry lining the route. Perhaps we should imagine a similar arrival and return in this case too.

**Initiatory Śaivism: sādhakas and ācāryas in the Atimārga**

I turn now to initiatory Śaivism and, within that, to the Atimārga. To what extent were the forms of Śaivism so classified engaged in the public domain? If we look at the literature of the first of the strata of the Atimārga, the Pāncārthika Pāśupata tradition, and look only at the earliest of our sources, namely the *Pañcārthabhāṣya*, the commentary of Bhagavat Kauṇḍinya on the *Pañcārtha*, otherwise known as the *Pāśupatasūtra*, we get a picture of ascetics seeking complete detachment from the world of Brahmanical values, openly courting abuse by apparent rejection of those values in order to intensify their separation from that world. Yet we have evidence from inscriptions of Pāncārthika ascetics who appear to be powerful and well-integrated members of society. One might take this as evidence that the religion attested in these epigraphical records has fallen from its textual ideals, losing its original vitality in a process of domestication. But this inference requires the assumption that Kauṇḍinya’s account of Pāncārthika practice is comprehensive. It certainly seems to be. It recognises two kinds of practitioner, whom it terms sādhakas and ācāryas. It outlines the ascetic practices required of the sādhaka and tells us little about the ācārya other than his role as teacher and initiator; but one may be forgiven for assuming that since the ācārya or guru is the sādhaka’s superior and no alternative discipline is prescribed for him, he would be a person who had gone through the sādhaka’s discipline and then been elevated to the office of ācārya in recognition of his superior spiritual attainment. However, there is an obvious flaw in this reasoning. For the sādhaka’s discipline is described as one of progressive isolation, culminating in his ending his life in a cremation ground by means of a meditation technique in which he was to cut the connection between his soul and his body. It follows that the ācārya could not be a person who had completed the discipline of the sādhaka but rather one who had perhaps begun it but had turned aside from it at some point in order to take up the role of teacher and initiator. Nothing to this effect is found in the *Pañcārthabhāṣya*. But this is
not the only authoritative text of the Pāñcārthikas that has reached us. We also have the Gaṇakārikā and a commentary on it (-ratnaṭīkā) attributed to a certain Bhāsarvajña; and this commentary contains a passage, presented as a dialogue between teacher and disciple, that clarifies the difference between the sādhaka and the ācārya and does so in terms that remove the need to assume that the inscriptions, which are referring to ācāryas rather than sādhakas, testify to a decline in the rigorou'sness of the Pāñcārthika ascetic discipline:

O Lord, is the observance of all the injunctions of the Pañcārtha the only means of attaining the end of suffering? No, that is not the only means. It is also possible for a person to attain it even though he does not have the capacity to put all those injunctions into practice, if [as a holder of the office of ācārya] he properly favours [through initiation and the rest] such outstanding Brahmins as approach him as candidates. Why? Because he is [thereby] safeguarding the tradition. For by doing so he enables many who seek to attain the end of suffering through the power of that tradition to achieve their goal. By this means he accumulates merit that will bestow infinite reward. It is through this [merit] that he will attain union [with Rudra] and thence, through [Rudra’s] favour, the end of suffering.11

The ācārya, then, is declared here to be a person who lacks the capacity to follow the ascetic discipline. His role is rather to maintain the tradition by enabling others to follow it. He is nonetheless promised the liberation that the sādhaka achieves by adopting and completing that discipline through the argument that by executing his duties he will achieve infinite merit, merit, that is, that will somehow transcend the limitation of religious merit

---

11 Gaṇakārikāratnaṭīkā p. 2, ll. 7–12: kim nu bhagavan pañcārthasamastaniyo-gānupālanād eva duḥkhāntah prāpyata iti. ucyate. na kevalaṃ tataḥ kim tu samasta-niyogānvaśāsaktivikalenāpi brāhmaṇaviśeṣāṁ śisyatvenopagatānāṁ samyag-anugrahakaranād api duḥkhāntah prāpyate. kasmāt. sampradāyarakṣanāt. sampradāyaṃ pālayatā hi tatsampradāyasāmarthyaṃ duḥkhāntam gamiṣyatām bahunām api duḥkhāntah sampādi bhavati. tato 'nantaphalapunyopacayaḥ. tato yogaprāptau prasādād duḥkhānta iti.
as generally understood in India, namely that however great it may be it is finite and can bestow only a finite reward. The ācārya is revealed, then, as a figure standing at the interface between the world of the inner community of liberation-bent ascetic sādhakas and the outer community of merit-accumulating lay devotees; and this is underlined by a passage in this text which is more specific about how the ācārya is to accumulate the infinite merit that will carry him to the sādhaka’s goal. He is to achieve this not only by initiating and instructing would-be sādhakas but also by being the public face of the tradition, making himself available to lay devotees, conversing with them (sambhāśanam), or simply granting them the sight of his person (darśanam).

\[\text{Ratnaṭīkā on Gaṇakārikā 1cd, p. 3, ll. 6 and 12–14: suparīksitam brāhmanam dīksāviśesena pañcārthajñānaviśesena ca śisyam saṃskurvan saṃskartā ity ucyate. sa ca tajjñair mukhyata eva gurur ucyate. gurur ācāryah śraddhāvatām āśraminām darśanasambhāsa-ṇādibhir api pāpaghnaḥ puṇyātiśayakārī cety arthaḥ.} \]

[The guru] is one who prepares a Brahmin [for the path], after thoroughly examining him, by bestowing on him the superior initiation [of this tradition] and, once he has become his pupil [through initiation], prepares him by imparting the superior knowledge contained in the Pañcārtha. This is the primary sense in which the learned use this word. But the guru or ācārya also destroys sin and generates superior merit by such means as showing his person to those members of the community of householders who have faith [in Śaivism] and conversing with them.

There is therefore no reason to read the inscriptions as evidence of a decline. For the followers of the Atimārga that they reveal to us are not sādhakas. They are ācāryas.

The contrast between the world of the sādhaka and that of the ācārya at the interface with the laity is even more striking in the Lākula and Kāpālika forms of the Atimārga, since Śaiva textual sources reveal that the obser-
vances of their ascetics were more extreme, involving such practices as using a human skull as a begging bowl, carrying a staff topped by a human skull, living in cremation grounds, wearing a sacred thread made from twisted hair gathered from corpses, and rejecting all Brahmanical restrictions on food and drink.\textsuperscript{12} We can see this contrast clearly in the case of the Lākulas, also called Kālamukhas, followers of the Lākula division of the Atimārga, since they are recorded in an extensive body of inscriptions in Maharashtra, Karnataka, and Andhra. The stark contrast between their epigraphic and textual representations has been noted, in reliance for the latter on a brief characterisation found in the South Indian Vaiṣṇava authors Yāmuna and Rāmānuja, and has been explained away by the hypothesis that these influential theologians were attempting to discredit their Kālamukha rivals by attributing to them the extreme practices that characterised the Kāpālikas.\textsuperscript{13} We also have a number of statues of Kālamukha ascetics from this region that confirm the contrast. These Kālamukhas have the appearance of Śaiva ascetics, but with no sign of skull begging bowls, skull staffs, ornaments made from human bone, or sacred threads made of twisted human hair taken from corpses.

In the light of the evidence of the commentary on the \textit{Gaṇakārikā}, we can now read this contrast not as evidence of expurgation but rather as evidence that we are looking here not at sādhaka but at ācārya at the tradition’s interface with Brahmanical society. It may well be the case that Kālamukha sādhakas or some division of them had moderated their ascetic discipline. But we cannot infer this from the appearance of their ācāryas.

This laxity of the ācārya in comparison with the sādhaka is much more than a matter of external appearance. Inscriptions show us ācāryas of the Atimārga as owners of property – and this is as early as the fourth century CE – with the funds that enable them to make endowments of their own. Moreover, we find endowments for religious foundations that are not strictly within their own tradition. If ācāryas were bound by the restrictions that apply to sādhaka this would be highly irregular. For when a person took

\textsuperscript{12} \textsc{Sanderson 2006: 163–166.}

\textsuperscript{13} \textsc{Lorenzen 1991: 4–6.} \textsc{Ghurye} too noted the discrepancy \textsuperscript{2} (\textit{1964: 128}) but interpreted it as evidence that by the twelfth century, the date of his evidence, the sect had purged itself of the objectionable practices mentioned by Yāmuna and Rāmānuja.
initiation to begin the Pāñcārthika discipline, he was required to own nothing thereafter other than the basic accoutrements required for his ascetic observance, and he was required to undertake to discontinue the worship of his ancestors and all other gods. Indeed he was required in the course of the ceremony to request their pardon for abandoning them now that he would be offering worship to Rudra alone. But in our epigraphical evidence, and in its earliest period, we find Pāñcārthika ācāryas founding shrines for the worship of the Mother-goddesses, deities who lie very much outside the focus of the tradition as recorded in our prescriptive sources. In later times, when epigraphic evidence is more plentiful, we also find them married, passing on office through hereditary lines to their sons. In the thirteenth century in the west of Saurashtra at Somnath Patan, a major Pāñcārthika stronghold, we see king-like ācāryas in charge of the sacred city, with the means of establishing new foundations, engaging in major building projects, and building fortifications. These are very far from the ideal of the sādhaka presented in the prescriptive texts.

I have mentioned the ācārya’s contact with the laity. Naturally this extended to interactions with the monarch, such as we have seen in the passage of the Śivadharmottara presented above. Here too we see a major departure from the ascetic discipline of the sādhaka, who is expressly forbidden to have any dealings with the court.

---

14 This epigraphical evidence is found in seven copper-plate grants of Mahārāja Bhuluṇḍa of Valkhā (modern Bagh in the Dhar District of Madhya Pradesh), part of a hoard of 27 plates discovered there in 1982 and published in 1990. The seven were issued in years 50 to 59 of an unstated era. This might be the Kalacuri, in which case the dates would correspond to 299–308 CE. But on palaeographic grounds it is more probable that it is the Gupta, in which case the years covered by these grants are 370–379 CE. They refer to unnamed Pāśupatas as being among those with rights to enjoy, cultivate, and inhabit the temple lands granted; and one issued in year 56 (376 CE) records a gift of land made by the Mahārāja to support the worship of the Mothers in a temple of those deities (mātrsthānadevakulam) that, we are told, had been established by a Pāśupata officiant or teacher (pāśupatācārya) called Bhagavat Lokodadhi. For the inscription, see RAMESH & TEWARI 1990: 21–22 (no. 10); SANDERSON 2009: 52, n. 28.

15 See the Somnāthpatan Praśasti of 1169 CE (OZHĀ & BÜHLER 1889) and the Cintra Praśasti (ed. BÜHLER, EPGRAPHIA INDICA 1: 32).

16 Pāñcārthabhāṣya, p. 22, ll. 14–15: ato ‘trāṣyavahāras tantre siddhaḥ, saṃvyavahāraḥ ca dvividhaḥ. tad yathā krayavikrayasaṃvyavahāro rājakula-
Ascetics and householder initiates in the Mantramārga

The learned literature of the Mantramārga or Tantric Śaivism encourages the impression that this division of the Śaiva religion, unlike the traditions of the Atimārga, was Śaivism brought from the domain of ascetics into the domain of those in the midst of the social world, a Śaivism designed to accommodate them. There is much truth in this perception. It is certainly the case that unlike the Atimārga the Mantramārga was open to men in the world. They could receive initiation without having to abandon their Brahmanical obligations, merely adding above these a new and more exacting layer of Śaiva observances; and they could aspire as initiates to becomes gurus by receiving the ācārya consecration (ācāryābhisekaha).

However, this did not entail the exclusion of ascetics from the Mantramārga’s forms of the religion. The Śaiva asceticism of the Atimārga was carried over into the Mantramārga, and although the doctrinal apparatus and rituals underwent fundamental changes in this process, ascetic guru lineages continued to flourish. This is not apparent from the works of such learned authors as Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, Abhinavagupta, and Kṣemarāja, the Kashmirian giants of the Śaiva exegetical traditions both Saiddhāntika and Śākta Śaiva. For these were evidently writing for an audience consisting largely if not exclusively of householders. But the epigraphical record enables us to see that the alliance of otherworldly asceticism and royal power exemplified in the passage cited above from the Śivadharmaṭottara remained central to the Mantramārga’s public self-presentation. For it is ascetic gurus of the Saiddhāntika tradition that appear repeatedly in our inscriptions in the role of the royal preceptor (rājavārakaḥ) who empowers the king through Śaiva initiation; and it appears to have been believed that the more unworldly the ascetic the greater the empowerment that the king could expect. The ideal, therefore, would be to induce an illustrious hermit to agree to be enthroned as the royal preceptor in a maṭha in the king’s capital. Whether such a transformation was ever achieved cannot be determined now. But it was certainly believed to

\[\text{samvyavahāraś ceti. “Therefore it is established in this teaching that practitioners should not engage in transactions. These are of two kinds: buying and selling and having dealings with the royal palace.”}\]
have occurred, as we can see from the account of the ninth-century Guru Purandara, the royal preceptor of a king Avantivarman and founder of two major Saiddhāntika monasteries, at Mattamayūra and Aranipadra in the old princely state of Gwalior, given in an inscription found in the remains of the second of these monasteries, composed to commemorate works undertaken there by a certain Vyomaśiva, a spiritual successor of Purandara four preceptorial generations later:

Then came the Guru Purandara, befitted a guru had the gravity that comes from the highest wisdom, whose teachings concerning the duties [of Śaiva initiates] are never to this day contradicted by scholars learned in the way of discipline, whom the glorious and virtuous king Avantivarman made efforts to bring to this land, because he desired to receive [Śaiva] initiation and had heard from one of his agents that there was a certain holy ascetic in the vicinity of Uttamaśikhara shining in unimaginable glory, shedding his radiance like the sun. Avantivarman then went to [Purandara], who was practising austerities in Upendrapura, and having striven to win his favour succeeded in bringing him back to sanctify his kingdom.

17 Saiddhāntika ascetics have initiation names, generally ending in -śiva or, in our earliest evidence, also -jyotis. So Purandara might seem not to be an initiation name. However, I propose that, since Purandara is a name of the deity Indra, it is a familiar substitute for the initiation name Indraśiva that is attested elsewhere in Saiddhāntika records. The Bangarh Praśasti of Mūrtiśīva reports that a Saiddhāntika guru of this name was given a monastery (maṭha) near Koṭivarṣa in Northern Bengal by the Pāla king Mahīpāla (r. ca. 977–1027) (v. 9: śrīmān indraśivaḥ ... samabhatvac chīyāyo sya puryātmanaḥ | yasmai ... -maṭhan daḍāv iha mahīpālo repas taitvavit (ŚIRCAR 1983). An Indraśiva is anthologised in Saduktikarṇāmṛta 742; and another Indraśiva is reported as a royal preceptor (rāja-guru) in an inscription in the Dharwar District (SOUTH-INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS 11: 156). It appears from the first of the verses I have cited here, v. 10, that this guru was the author of a ritual manual, a Paddhati, for the guidance of initiates. But I am not aware of any other reference to it.

18 The identity of Upendrapura is not known to me, but it is probable that it was in Mālava, since EPIGRAPHIA INDICA 20: 11, an inscription of 1110 CE issued by Naravarman, the Paramāra ruling that region, speaks of the village of Kadambapadāra in the Mandāraka Pratijāgaranāka in the Upendrapura District (ll. 5–6: upendrapuranāndale mandāraka pratijāgaranāke mahāmaṇḍalikaśrījāyadevabhujaṃ- māṇakadambapadāragrāme). It is likely that it was founded by the early Paramāra
Then, having served him with devotion he duly received Śaiva initiation [from him]. The wise king then presented him with the best part of the wealth of his kingdom as guru’s fee and so brought his human birth to fulfilment. In the splendid town of Mattamayūra the sage then caused a richly endowed Meru-like monastery to be built, a treasury of jewel-like ascetics, the fame of which has reached [throughout the continent] to the oceans. This foremost of sages, himself unmatched in his virtues, built and richly endowed a second and most splendid monastery, [this] hermitage of Araṇipadra.¹⁹

Initiating the monarch and the spread of the Sādhdhāntika Mantramārga

The often very large amounts of revenue that kings would make over to their royal preceptors as payment for initiation must have been a more than

king Upendra to bear his name (svanāmā). In the account of the Paramāra lineage given by Padmagupta in the Navasāhasāṅkacakarita, Upendra is the first historical king mentioned in the lineage after the “Ādirāja” Paramāra (11.76–80). His foundational status in this dynasty is suggested by the tradition reported there by Padmagupta that he sanctified the land with golden yūpas commemorating his Śrauta sacrifices (11.78: akāri yajvanā yena hemayūpāṅkitā mahī). Uttamaśikhara is otherwise unknown, as is this king Avanti

¹⁹ EPIGRAPHIA INDICA 1: 41 (the Ranod inscription, ed. F. Kielhorn), vv. 10–15:

10 tasmā purandara-gurur guruvad garimṇaḥ
prajñātreka-ajantasya babhūva bhūmih
yasyādhnāpi vibudhair itikṛtyaśaṃsi
vyāhanyate na vacanaṃ nayamārgavidbhīḥ

11 vandyah ko ‘pi cakāstya acintyamahīnā tulyam munir bhāṣvatā
rājān uttamaśabdapāṁravāṅkharābhyarṇum prakārnadyutih
dīkṣārthī vaco niśamya sukṛtī cāroktam urvīpatir
yasvēhārayāṇāya yatnam akaroc chrīmān avantiḥ purā

12 gatvā tapasyaṇtam upendra-pārvī caryā tādā śrimadavantivarṇa
bhṛṣṇaṃ samārādhya tam ātmabhūmin kathaṃcid āṇya ca kāra pūtām

13 athopasadyāya ca samayag aśīm dīkṣāṃ sa dākṣo gurudakṣinārtham
nivedya yasmāi nijāra-jāyāsāram svajanmasāphalāyam avāpa bhūpah

14 sa kārayām āya samṛddhiḥbhiṣajam munir matham saṃmuniraṇabhūmin
prasiddham āvāridhi merukalpaṃ śrīmatpure mattamayūranāmāni

15 punar dvitīyaṃ svayam advitiyo guṇair munumindro ’raṇipadrasaṃjñam
tapovanam śreṣṭhamatham vīdhāya preṣṭhah praṃśṭhāṃ paramāṇuṃ nināya.
sufficient inducement to surrender an ascetic’s tranquillity for this publicly conspicuous role. With the funds thus acquired, the Saiddhāntikas were quickly able to expand their power across the subcontinent, founding new monasteries and installing their disciples in them as guru abbots who would repeat the process, creating a far-reaching network of branch-organisations. In this way there arose major gurus whom inscriptions report to have been the dīkṣāgurus, the initiating preceptors, of not one but numerous kings spanning the Indian subcontinent, exercising in this way a religious authority that spread far beyond the borders of a single kingdom.

The initiating of kings became, then, the principal motor of the spread of the Saiddhāntika Mantramārga. However, to accomplish this required a major adjustment to the institution of Śaiva initiation. The benefit promised to all initiates was that the ceremony would destroy the bonds of the soul on a subliminal level in such a way that one would achieve liberation at death. But until death came the initiate was obliged to adhere to a new life of regular and time-consuming ritual obligations added to the Brahmanical. Such a life of intensified observance was evidently incompatible with the duties of a ruling monarch. So the Mantramārga circumvented this obstacle on the back of the doctrine that it is initiation itself that frees the soul rather than a particular lifelong routine of post-initiatory duties. This enabled them to claim that only those who were able to take on the usual post-initiatory duties need be required to do so and that those who were unable to take them on, notably the monarch, could be freed of them yet still reap the reward of initiation. It was enough according to the Saiddhāntikas that such a king should continue to observe the much less-demanding duties of a lay Śaiva monarch as prescribed in the Śivadharma literature, the essence of which was to support the faith and its institutions. Kings, then, were offered the benefit of initiation without the inconvenience of a regular initiate’s lifelong routine. Moreover, as though in admission that the promise of liberation at death might not provide a sufficient incentive, we find inscriptions praising royal initiation as a means of enhancing the king’s prestige and military might.

---

22 See here n. 2.
23 Sanderson 2009: 258–259.
Consecrating the monarch in the
Saiddhāntika Mantramārga

By the tenth century at the latest, the practice of bestowing Śaiva initiation on monarchs was extended through the creation of a Śaiva version of the Brahmanical royal consecration ceremony (rājiyābhisekah) for an initiated king and his chief queen. We have a rich description, unfortunately somewhat lacunose, of this new ceremony in our earliest surviving ritual manual for the use of officiants of the Saiddhāntika tradition, the Naimittika-kriyānusamdhāna of Brahmaśambhu, completed in Śaka 860 (937/8 CE).

I wish to draw attention to two features of this ceremony. The first is its hybrid character. Properly Śaiva and Brahmanical elements are combined and the royal weapons, royal standards, and royal armour are added to the recipients of worship, embedding the power of the esoteric Śaiva elements in an exoteric, more public context. Moreover, although the ceremony is added to the Saiddhāntika repertoire as a variant of the consecration of a guru (ācāryābhisekah) or sādhaka (sādhakābhisekah), the stated purpose of the ritual remains that of the Brahmanical ritual, namely to consecrate the monarch to his non-Śaiva office as the person responsible for the preservation of the Brahmanical order of the caste-classes and religious disciplines, and for this purpose the consecration mantra is not Śaiva at all. Rather it is the Brahmanical text prescribed for this purpose.

The second feature I wish to bring to your attention is the fact that this account, like that of royal text donation in the Śivadharmottara, gives us a rare glimpse of the impressive public setting of what we might otherwise

---

24 Naimittikakriyānusamdhāna, f. 74v1, 4.118: varṇānām āśramānām ca guru-bhāvāya bhūpateḥ | yo 'bhisekavidhīḥ sopi procyate đikṣitāmanah. “I shall now also teach that [form of the] ritual of consecration whose purpose is to empower the king, once he has been initiated, to be the guru of the caste-classes and religious disciplines.”

25 This is the mantra for periodic royal reconsecration, beginning with the words surās tvām abhiṣiñcantu, that is given by the sixth-century Varāhamihira in 47.55–70 of the Br̥hatasamhitā, the well-known classic on divination. He reports there that he is basing his account of this ritual on that of the Elder Garga (47.2), who received it from Bhāguri. He refers, I presume, to the Gargasamhitā, a huge treatise on divination whose first version, according to Pingree (1981: 69), was composed during the first century BCE or CE. I am unable at present to ascertain whether or not this royal consecration text is found in that work.
have taken to be a purely private event. I give here a brief synopsis of the account.

In a large pavilion constructed for the ceremony equipped with various altar platforms, the ācārya should worship the Lokapālas and their weapons in vases filled with river water. Then he should worship Śiva, Agni, the [royal] weapons, and the [royal] banners on the altar-platforms. He should summon, gratify, and worship the eight Śaiva Cakravartins from Ananta to Śikhaṇḍin, in vases set up on another platform, and, in vases below it, the Rudras, Mātras, Gaṇas, Yakṣas, Grahas, Asuras, Rākṣasas, and Nāgarājas.

In the Śivagni, a sacrificial fire consecrated through the transformation of the deity Fire (agnih) into Śiva, he should make 108 oblations to each of the deities and put out bali offerings for the various classes of supernaturals in each of the directions. This ends the preparatory rites.

The king should be brought into the pavilion accompanied by his [chief] minister (mantri) and his chaplain (purohit) and then the chief queen (devi) accompanied by an elderly female companion (vrddhasakhi). When they have been made to offer worship to Śiva, the Fire, the [royal] weapons

---

26 These are the deities more commonly called the Vidyeśvaras. See, e.g., Rauravasūtrasamgraha 2.9–13; Matalaṃpāromeśvara, Vidyāpāda 5.5–16, Svachanda 10.1103c–1104, Tantrāloka 8.342–343. In Saiddhāntika scriptural texts, they are commonly required to be worshipped surrounding the core mantra-group (garbhāvaraṇam) consisting of Śiva and his ancillaries, with the Lokapālas and the Lokapāla’s weapons forming two outer circuits, as in Niśvāsamāla 4.4c–5: pūrvoktena vidhānena madhye devam tu pūjyate || vidyeśvarān dvītye tu lokapālam stṛtyake | caturthe pūjaye 'strāṇī gandhapuspāir yathākramam. “Following the aforesaid procedure, he should worship in the [proper] order Śiva in the centre, the Vidyeśvaras in the second [circuit], the Lokapālas in the third, and the weapons in the fourth.”


28 Naimittikakriyānusamhāna 4.137: static astottaram hutvā pratyekaṁ ca śivānale | digbhūtagaṇasāṅghebhyo dattvā dīkṣu bāhirbalim.
and the [royal] banners, the ācārya has them spend the night sleeping in the pavilion. He says a prayer that an auspicious dream may be seen by the king, his queen, their companions, or himself.29

After sleeping there himself, the next morning he examines the dreams and counters with oblations any that are inauspicious. He then summons the deities that are the guardians of the hall of sacrifice and worships them as before. He pours oblations to Śiva, to the royal weapons, the royal banners, and the king’s armour (kaṅkaṭāṇi). He makes offerings to the Vidyēśvaras on their platform as before, and to the Rudras and the others in the vases. Then he spreads the skins of a fighting bull and a cat on each of the platforms.30 A lacuna of one folio follows. But the missing action was no doubt to prepare the platforms to receive the king and queen for their consecration, since such skins are required in Brahmanical sources to cover the platform before the king sits on it to receive the consecration to his office (rājyābhiṣekah).31

29 Naimittikakṛtyānusamdhāna 4.138–146: tatas tam avaṇṇātham anāhāram anākalam | snatam candanaaliptāngam sīrasragvatrabhūsanaṁ || 39 praveśya dvāramārgena daksīṇena pracetasaḥ | sārdham mantrapurodāvhyāṃ śivam arcāpayaṁ kramāt || 140 devīṁ *vrddhasakhī cāsyāḥ (em. : vṛddhasakhī cāsyāḥ cod.) saumyenaśvabhāsaḥ pateḥ || praveśya pātayec chambhor niyamasthām padaṁbhyoḥ || 141 sīvāgniḥetikūṇām kāritāvhyāṃ athārcaṇan | paṇcagavyam caruṃ tāvhyāṃ dattvā ca dvjaśodhanam || 142 sthāpayīvā tu tu tatra sarakau vedikāvaye | *prthak (corr. : prthā cod.) prākṣirasau mahyōḥ sannyatau kṣaumaśavyayoḥ || 143 yad vā tapratimau viprav śivabhaktv upoṣitau | śubhasvapnāvabodhāya tayor vaṁśakramāgatau | 144 *samabharyacāyip (conj. : samabhyaarcepe cod.) samḥṛtya śivaṁ sthandaḍilato nale | tatra ṛtvā ca carvādi doṣāṇām upaśāntaye || 145 nṛpasyaṁṣya devyā vā tadāpānāṁ namāḥhavā | svapnāṁ śubhāśubhapṛapṭhiṇāṁ | pradarśaya || 146 ity adhyeya praṇamyaśī pājāyīvā praṇrocyac | tatraiva roḍhayed yāvac caturthaḥbhīṣeṣa*nam (corr. : na cod.).

30 Naimittikakṛtyānusamdhāna 4.147–152: athādhvārasraṃ ganāmin nirasya niśi niḍrayaḥ | prātārni niśāviferante sādhusvapnāṁ niśāmya ca || 148 samāvarjita sarvāngam gośākṛdī + + + | nṛpabhiṣecanāyālam adhitisṛṛham gurus tataḥ || 149 tatra *yajvahasadadhṛiḷaṁ yajīṇaḥ (corr. : yajnah cod.) āmantryeṣvār ca pūrvavat | kāraṇaṁ kāraṇanāṁ ca tarpayīvā + + + ṇam || 150 hetiḥ astreṇa ketumś ca varmanā kaṅkaṭāṇi api | sagandhapuspadbhūpyāyair naivedyāntaṁ prapaṇyāya ca || 151 anantaṁḥ ca ved + + + + + vedyāś ca pūrvavat || rudrāṁś ca ghaṭesvīś ca vedyor ārdhavam athāhastaret || 152 brhadākṣhoro tiṣṭirasva vrṣadamśasya carma ca | caturpām asū. With this f. 76v ends.

31 Brhatsamhitā 47.43–44: ādāva naaḍāhaś carma jarayā saṃprāṭāyusah | praśasta-
When the text returns, the king is being consecrated with the liquid from the vases, and Brahmans are being made to chant the consecration benedictions (abhiśekāśīṣaḥ) “known in mundane usage (loke) and in the Veda” and [then] “the verses taught by the Rṣis.” The last are then given in full and they are the Brahmanical royal consecration mantra taught for this purpose by Varāhamihira in his Brhatsaṁhitā.\(^{32}\)

After his consecration, the king is to give the pavilion and its ritual equipment to the officiants, make large donations of money to the Brahmans and of mounts to the bards. There follows an account of the spectacle of the king’s return. He is to come out of the pavilion with his queen, mount a fine elephant or white horse and, shaded by a white parasol with a golden handle and fanned with white chowries, set forth to return to his palace in a procession with his army of elephants, chariots, cavalry, and infantry (caturaṅgabalopetaḥ), all obstacles removed by the row of war banners (ketumālayā) that precedes him fluttering in a favouring breeze, and acknowledging his being showered with parched grain by women of good family positioned on platforms on the tops of their whitewashed mansions. He should reenter the palace “worshipped by the citizens with their long eyes wide in wonder that surpass the beauty of blue lilies.” The heir-apparent should be consecrated to his office in the same way.\(^{33}\)


\(^{33}\) Naimittikakriyānusāṃdhaṇā, f. [84?]r1–5, 4.269c–276b: + + + + + + + + + + mbarabhūṣaṇaḥ || 270 desīkebhyaḥ sayajñāgam datvā tam yajjamanḍapam || prabhūtaṁ vasu virebhya vāhanāni ca vandinām || 271 pūrvadvāreṇa nihkramya svamahisyā samanvitaḥ || ārādhao bhadrāṁśāyām athavā vājinaṁ sitam || 272 ātapatreṇa śabhrena hemadaṇḍena copari || nigṛhamāpaḥ śvetair vījamānaḥ ca *cāmaraiḥ (em.: cāparaiḥ A) || 273 caturaṅgabalopetaḥ purataḥ ketumālayā || astavighno 'nukūlaṁ dhūtāyā mātarīśvaṇā || 274 saudhāgraṇvedikāsthābhīḥ kulapatiḥbhir āدادāt || prayuktaṁ lājavāraṇaṁ ca manyamāno *bahu (conj.: vaha cod.)
That the king should appear in a full military parade shows the extent to which the Śaivism of the Mantramārga had succeeded in spite of its Tantric and therefore esoteric character in making itself visible in the public domain. Though the ceremony of consecration takes place within a closed pavilion, the whole population of the city is mobilised to witness that the ceremony has occurred; and the impact on the populace is magnified by the king’s processing back to his palace in a full military parade.

That this was the norm in the case of royal Tantric ceremonies is indicated by similar prescriptions found in other sources. A guide for the initiation of the Amṛṭeśa form of Śiva based on the Netratantra, which has come down to us in a Nepalese manuscript, rules as follows:

Then [on the day] after [his initiation] the pupil should [go] with a joyful heart accompanied by his wives and sons, with his ministers, soldiers, and mounts [and] offer himself before his guru in thought, speech, and, above all, in deed.34

There can be no doubt that the initiand envisaged in this guide is the king, since the compound sabhṛtyabalavāhanah, which I have translated “with his ministers, soldiers, and mounts,” can have no other reference and is in any case a stock epithet in metrical descriptions of monarchs.35

There is further evidence in the account of rites concluding the initiation ceremony prescribed by the Saiddhāntika scripture Brhatālottara. For that states that the guru should close the initiation by sprinkling with the water from the vase of the weapon-mantra (astraśalasaḥ), one of the two main vases prepared in the course of the ceremony, the horses, elephants, chariots, and soldiers of the army “in order to remove all obstacles and to ensure

priyam || 275 praviśet svapuraṁ paurair arcyamāṇo vikāsibhiḥ | nilanīṟaruha-cchāyātasksarair āyatekṣanaiḥ || 276 anenaiva vidhānena yuvarājaḥbhisekanam. 34 Viśveśvara, Amṛteśadīksāvidhi, f. 16v6, vv. 44–45b: 44 sabhāryah sasutaḥ paścāt sabhṛtyabalavāhanah | śīṣyāḥ prahṛṣṭamanasaḥ guror āghre nivedayet || 45 ātmānam manasā vācā karmanā ca viśeṣataḥ | 45a ātmānam em. : ātmānaḥ cod.

35 See, e.g., Mahābhārata 1.63.14; 3.82.63; 3.195.10; 7.123.15.
victory in battle." Evidently the initiation being described here is that of a monarch; and it seems reasonable in the light of the other passages cited to understand from this remark that the king would have come for the ceremony in a full military parade.

The Mantramārga, then, in spite of its Tantric emphasis on secrecy, had found ways of ensuring that the rites with which it empowered the monarch were fully public events of the kind that occasioned national holidays. Indeed the very secrecy of its rituals must have heightened the impression made by these events on the populace, who could believe that their monarch had emerged having received an empowerment of such intensity that the ceremony itself, unlike the Brahmanical royal consecration, had to be concealed from the uninitiated, that his power and consequently their security had been enhanced to a degree not possible by more exoteric means.

The Śaiva-Brahmanical social order

I have said that the Śaiva adaptation of the royal consecration ritual prescribed by Brahmaśambhu in his Naimittikakriyānusāṃdhāna served the Brahmanical purpose of consecrating an initiated Śaiva monarch in his traditional role as the varṇāśramaguruḥ, the guardian of the Brahmanical order of caste-classes and religious disciplines. But it should be understood that what is envisaged here, indeed what is enacted by the ritual, is not a purely Brahmanical social order but a two-tiered Śaiva-Brahmanical hierarchy within which the monarch’s duty is not only to maintain the boundaries that separate the castes and disciplines but also to ensure that Śaivism is maintained as a higher level of religious observance above the Brahmanical, one that does nothing to destabilise the Brahmanical social order but which offers members of that social order a means of transcendence not available through its religious practices. This obligation is no more than implicit in the Naimittikakriyānusāṃdhāna; but it is fully expressed in the following passage of the Mohacūḍottara, a Saiddhāntika scripture whose specialised subject matter is pratiṣṭhā, the design and consecration of tem-

---

ples, monasteries, images, royal palaces, and new settlements. Indeed we are told that if he maintains the Brahmanical social order in this modified form his kingdom will prosper. The unstated corollary is that if he does not it will not:

4.275 praṇāpālaḥ smṛto rājā tasmān nyāyyaṁ tu rakṣaṇam
varṇānāṁ anupūrvena dharmam desāpyen nrpaḥ
276 śrutismṛtipurāṇāṁ āgama dharmadesakāh
etair yo vartate rājā sa rājyaṁ bhunjate ciram
277 purāṇam bādhyaṭ vedair āgarāśa ca taduktayaḥ
sāmānyam ca viśeṣam ca śaivaṁ vaiśeṣikam vacaḥ
278 bādhyaḥbādhakabhāvena no vikalpyaṁ vicakṣanaiḥ
yad yathāvasthitam vastu sarvajñas tat tathā vaḍet
279 āgamānāṁ bahute tu yatṛa vākyadvayaṁ bhavet
kiṁ pramāṇaṁ tadā grāhyanṛ pramāṇaṁ śāmkaraṁ vacaḥ
280 †granthāḥ granthāntaram īkāḥ śāpekusāntrapēkṣayoḥ
samādhaṇaṁ tayoḥ kāryam arthāpattyādisādhanaiḥ
281 evaṁ jñātvā surādhyaṅsa nirvṛtiṁ paramāṁ vraja
evam dharmānvite rājñi svarāṣṭre sarvadā śivam

Mohacūḍottara, ff. 21v6–22r2

278b vikalpyaṁ conj.: vikalpam cod. 278d tat tathā conj.: tat tadā cod.

Tradition declares that the king is the protector of his subjects.\(^{37}\) Therefore it is right that he should protect the caste communities and ensure that they are instructed in their duties, each according to its station. The sources that convey these duties are Śruti, Smṛti, Purāṇa, and the [Śaiva] scriptures (āgamāḥ). If the king abides by these, he enjoys a long reign. [The correct order of authority in which they should be applied is as follows.] The Vedas [comprising both Śruti and Smṛti] take precedence over the Purāṇas, and the [Śaiva] scriptures take precedence over the teachings of the Vedas.

\(^{37}\) See the Brahmanical sources given in SANDERSON 2009: 244, n. 594.
There is the common [Brahmanical authority of Śruti, Smṛti, and Purāṇa] (sāmānyam), and then there is the special (viśeṣam). The Śaiva [scriptures] (śaivam) are the latter (viśeṣikaṃ vacaḥ). [So] the learned should not doubt their authority when they find that they conflict with [a Brahmanical injunction]. Being omniscient, [Śiva] can only state everything just as it is. Given the plurality of scriptural authorities, whenever there is a question as to which of two [conflicting] statements takes precedence, he should adopt that which has been taught by Śiva. He should reconcile the two, whether self-sufficient or depending for the understanding of its meaning on [examination in the light of] other sources of the same kind, related sources, and, [where they fail], learned exegesis, by applying such modes of reasoning as presumption (arthāpattiḥ). Understand this, O Indra, and thereby attain the ultimate bliss. When the king understands the duties of religion in this way his realm will always prosper.

Public engagement in the non-Saiddhāntika

Mantramārgic ritual systems

In comparison with the Saiddhāntika Mantramārga, the Mantramārga’s non-Saiddhāntika cults seem to have been rather less engaged in activities in the public domain. Saiddhāntika gurus, for example, appear to have dominated officiation in the Mantramārga’s very public and prolonged rituals for the consecration of temples and fixed substrates of worship, notably the consecration of the major temple and its liṅga that any Śaiva king worthy of the name would establish in his name to mark his reign.  

---

38 My emendation of tat tadā to tat tathā restores proper syntax by balancing the yad yathā of the subordinate clause. But it also has the support of a close parallel in Śivadharmottara 1.41: yad yathāvasthitāṃ vastu guṇadosaiḥ svabhāvataḥ | yāvart phalam ca punyam ca sarvajñās tat tathā vadet. The parallel also supports the optative vadet. It might otherwise be tempting to emend tathā vadet to tadāvadat, making this a statement that Śiva has taught things exactly as they are.

39 A Śiva installed in a fixed liṅga was given a two-part compound name whose first half would generally be that of the founder and whose second half would be -iśvara. Thus, for example a Śiva founded by an Avantivarman would be named Avantīśvara. If the deity were a Viṣṇu then the name would be Avantisvāmin. The purpose of such naming was not merely to immortalise the founder. It also served a
marked contrast, Abhinavagupta, speaking for the non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga in his Tantrāloka, insists that the mantras of his tradition must never be installed in fixed images, which is to say, in the relatively public environment of the temple, where their worship would be the responsibility of no one individual. They may be installed only in small, mobile substrates for the personal cult of an individual initiate:

2 eteśāṃ ārdhaśāstroktamantrāṇāṃ na pratiṣṭhitim bahiś kuryād yato hy ete rahasyatvena siddhidāḥ
3 svavīryānandamāhātmyapraśevaśaśāśālinīṃ ye siddhim dadate eteṃ bāhyatvaṃ rūpavicyutīṃ
4 kim ca śāktasamāveśapūṛṇo bhoktrātmakaḥ śīvah bhogalāṃpatyabhāg bhogaviccheda nigrāhātmakaḥ
5 śāntatvagyakriyoddhāta jīghatsābhmhitam vāpyaḥ svayaṃ pratiṣṭhitam yena so 'syābhoge vinaśyati
6 uktam jñānottarāyāṃ ca tad etat parameśinā śivo yāgapriyo yasmād viśeśān mātrmadhyāgāḥ
7 tasmād rahasyasāstreṣu ye mantrās tān budho bhaiḥ na pratiṣṭhāpayej jātu viśeśād vyaktarūpīṇāḥ
8 ata eva mṛtasyārthe pratiṣṭhānyatra yodita sātra sāstreṣu no kāryā kāryā śādharāṇī punah

Abhinavagupta, Tantrāloka 27.2–8


legal purpose. Giving a personal name to the deity installed in the principal idol of a temple enabled it to be the locus of the foundation’s juristic personality. It was then possible to appoint officials who could, when necessary, go to court to defend its legal rights, notably its right to whatever properties and revenues had been gifted to it by the founder, and any later donors, to fund its activities.
He should not install in the public domain (bahiḥ) these mantras that have been taught in the higher scriptures, because it is by their remaining hidden that they grant success. The success that they bestow abounds in the power that comes from [their] ability to lead one into the vastness of the bliss that is their inner vigour. For such mantras to be installed externally [in fixed substrates] is for them to fall from their nature. Moreover, when Śiva is fully expanded [as Bhairava] through immersion in Śakti he tastes the offerings of food and drink with much greater eagerness to devour them, and if his pleasure is ever interrupted [through omission] he will be eager to punish. If a person installs a deity form that is energised by this urge to devour that arises from rising above the tranquil transcendence [of the Saiddhāntika mantras], he must feed it without fail. If he does not do so he will be lost. It is this that the Supreme Lord refers to in the Jñānottara[saṃhitā] in the words:

Śiva is all the more attached to his offerings when [as Bhairava] he is the midst of the Mothers. For this reason, an initiate should never install the mantras [taught] in the esoteric scriptures outside his private cult, particularly not with anthropomorphic form.

This is why the installation [of a Bhairava] on behalf of the deceased that has been taught elsewhere must not be done with [the mantras of] these [non-Saiddhāntika] scriptures. It should be done instead with one of the exoteric mantras.40

40 Seven such mantras, termed universal (sādhāraṇāḥ), are listed by Abhinavagupta in Tantrāloka 22.20: praṇavo māṭkā māyā vyomavyāpī śaḍakṣarāḥ | bahu-rūpo 'tha netrākhyah sapta sādhāraṇāḥ amī. “The following are the universal mantras: OM, the syllabary, HṛM, [the 81-unit] Vyomavyāpimantra, Oṁ NAMĀ ŚIVĀ (śaḍakṣarāḥ), Bahurūpa (the 32-syllable Yajurvedic Aghoramantra), and Oṁ JUM SAH (Netra, Mṛtyuṣjaya).” The Saiddhāntika Vidyākānta also lists seven but with the Prāśāda in place of the Netra in Bhāvacūdāmaṇi, f. 4v16-5r2, quoting an unidentified source: sādhāraṇena māntreṇeti. sādhāraṇāḥ mantrāḥ sapta. yad uktam saṃhitāntare “praṇavo māṭkā <māyā> vyomavyāpī śaḍakṣarāḥ | *prāśāda (corr. : prasādo cod.) bahurūpaś ca sapta sādhāraṇāḥ smṛtā” iti. The Prāśādamantra is HAUṀ, the seed-syllable of Śiva in the Saiddhāntika system of the Kālottara recensions. See Sārdhatrisatikālottara 1.11 and Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha
The last verse of this passage establishes that the mantras of “the higher scriptures” that should not be installed in fixed, non-private substrates of worship are not just those of the Trika, the Śākta system being expounded in the Tantrāloka. For the scriptural source to which Abhinavagupta is referring here without naming it is Netra 18.120–121, which enjoins the installation of a Bhairava image accompanied by two, four, or eight Śaktis in the cremation ground on behalf of a deceased and cremated initiate. The mantras that should not be installed in this case are not those of the Trika but those of the worship of Bhairava taught in texts of the Mantrapīṭha. From this we can infer that the prohibition was intended to apply to the whole range of non-Saiddhāntika mantras.

How strictly observed, one is bound to ask, was this boundary between the outer world of public installations, recognised as the domain of the Saiddhāntika Mantramārga or of non-Saiddhāntika officiants using Saiddhāntika procedures, and this strictly private world of non-Saiddhāntika practice? After all, the separation between the two is presented to us through a prohibition; and a prohibition is more likely to be designed to stop a practice that was current than to prevent a practice that was not.

I am aware of one major case in which this prohibition was not observed, and I suspect that there are others that further work with ritual manuals, inscriptions, and ethnographic data may bring to light. The case to which I refer is that of the South Indian Brahmayāmala tradition. For that has its roots in the non-Saiddhāntika cult of the goddess Aghorī and her Śaktis taught in the Picumata/Brahmayāmala but has the nature of a temple-based cult in the hands of non-Brahmin officiants whose primarily purpose was state protection.41

Other cases that may well be of this kind are the cults of the royal goddesses Siddhalakṣṇī, Guhyakālī, and Kubjikā, who have several inaccessible but conspicuous temples in the Kathmandu valley.42 If these Tantric cults among the Śaiva Newars of the Kathmandu valley did cross the line drawn by Abhinavagupta, then they no doubt did so as elements of a

---

broader process that is widely attested, namely the co-opting of non-Saiddhāntika Śaiva cults by royal patrons for the protection of their persons and the state.

I have drawn attention to a number of such cults in previous publications, notably the state cult of the goddess sisters Jayā Vijayā, Jayantī, and Aparājitā and their brother Tumburu[bhairava] that was established in the Khmer realm early in the ninth century to guarantee the state’s enduring independence;\textsuperscript{43} the cult of Svacchandabhairava incorporated in the \textit{Uttarabhāga} of the \textit{Līṅgapurāṇa} as a means of warding off danger from the king and restoring him to health;\textsuperscript{44} the elaborate ritual of consecration for victory (\textit{jayābhīṣekāḥ}) that co-opts the goddess pantheon of the \textit{Kujjikāmata}, which is taught in the same Purānic source;\textsuperscript{45} and the cult of Bhadrakālī practised by the Paippalādin Atharvavedin officiants of Orissa to enhance the power of kings and protect them when they go into battle, which has co-opted the \textit{mantras} of the Kaula Kālikula tradition.\textsuperscript{46}

\textbf{The Kulamārga and the state}

With the examples of the application of non-Saiddhāntika cults to the empowerment of the monarch and protection of the monarch, I have crossed from the Mantramārga into the Kulamārga, since that is the territory of the Kālikula and the cult of Kujjikā. Here more than in any other area of Śaiva practice, the reader of the learned literature might expect to find worship operating in an entirely private world cut off from and indeed concealed from mainstream religion. For these were extreme cults that involved orgiastic celebrations, contact with women of low caste, the consumption of meat, alcohol, and other impure substances,\textsuperscript{47} and they surely needed to keep their heads down if they were to avoid the hostile intervention of state authorities. There certainly was a degree of hostility; but as the examples cited indicate this may have been stronger in the case of mainstream Brahma-

\textsuperscript{44} SANDERSON 2005b: 235.
\textsuperscript{45} SANDERSON 2005b: 236.
\textsuperscript{46} SANDERSON 2007: 255–298.
\textsuperscript{47} On these substances, see SANDERSON 2005a: 110–114, n. 63.
manical thinking than it was among actual and potential royal patrons. The notion that the transgressive cult of the Mothers was an effective source of state protection is well illustrated in the South Indian **Brahmayāmala** tradition and in the cults of the royal lineage goddesses of the Kathmandu valley. Indeed this view is made explicit in the treatment of Kaula worship given in the Kashmirian **Netratantra**, a text devoted to the rituals to be performed by a variety of Śaiva officiants who had moved into the territory traditionally reserved for the king’s Brahmanical chaplain (**rājapurohitah**):

The [Mothers] should be worshipped with abundant offerings for the warding off of danger from all living beings by one desiring power in accordance with his particular aim. As for the **gurus** of kings, O goddess, they should worship them with special lavishness. For it is by their favour alone that any king on this earth enjoys sovereignty in good fortune, with all his enemies destroyed.\(^{48}\)

Thus while it appears that it was Saiddhāntika officiants that were the public, institutional face of the Mantramārga, interacting in a manner visible to the public with royal and other patrons in the context of such ceremonies as initiation, royal consecration, and the installation of fixed images in royal and other temples, presenting themselves as protectors of the Brahmanical

---

\(^{48}\) **Netra**, f. 30v3–4 (**K\_ED** 12.6c–8): *sarveśāṃ caiva śāntyarthāṃ prāṇināṃ bhūtān icchatā || 7 || bhūriyāgena yaśtavyā yathākāmānurūpataḥ | viśeṣena tu yaṣṭavyā bhūbhṛtānāṃ tu daṣiṣṭāḥ || 8 || āśām eva prasādena rājyaṃ niḥatakānākām | bhūtiṣṭa sarvarājānāḥ subhaṅgā hy avanīlale ||. **6c** sarveśāṃ caiva **N**: sarveśāṃ eva **K\_ED** 7b yathākāmānurūpataḥ **K\_ED**: yathākārmanurūpataḥ **N** 7c viśeṣena tu yaṣṭavyā **N**: višeṣānā devi yaṣṭavyā **K\_ED** 7d bhūbhṛtānāṃ tu **N**: bhūbhṛtām api **K\_ED**.

I have edited the text here on the basis of a Nepalese palm-leaf ms. of 1200 CE, which transmits the text as it was prior to the expurgation of most of its non-Paninian forms that we see in the Kashmirian mss. that are the basis of **K\_ED**. For my reasons for judging that this is a Kashmirian text and one that was composed between about 700 and 850 CE, probably towards the end of that period, see S\_ANDERSON 2005: 273–294. The colophon of the ms. reports that the ms. was penned by a Paṇḍita Kirtidhara who was commissioned to do so by Viśveśvara (f. 89r4–5: *samvat 320 caitra śu di 9 śaṅdine višeśvareṇa likhāpitam idam pustakaṃ || paṃḍitaṁ kīrtti-dharṇa>śv >a likhitam mayā). It is probable that the commissioner was the Viśveśvara to whom we owe the **Āṃrīśadikṣāvidhi**.
social order, it was by no means the case that the non-Saiddhāntika Śākta-oriented cults of the Mantramārga and Kulamārga were entirely domains of private spiritual practice. For learned Kashmirian authorities such as Abhinavagupta and Kṣemarāja this may seem to have been the case, because they place such stress on these cults as means of liberation. But they do not suppress evidence that these cults were also engaged in rituals designed to protect the king, the royal family, and indeed their subjects from all forms of misfortune. What is known of the role of Tantric ritual in the Kathmandu valley strongly supports the notion that while such ceremonies were no doubt carried out away from the public gaze, the populace was not unaware of their occurrence, especially when they were embedded in calendrically fixed ritual complexes in which the whole populace participated in the manner exemplified by Brahmaśambhu’s account of royal consecration. Indeed in Newar society, in which Tantric rituals have played a vital role down to modern times, major calamities such as the massacre of the Nepalese royal family in 2001 have been attributed by traditionalists to failure to perform or perform correctly some Tantric ritual considered vital to their welfare and that of the whole community. As we have seen, Abhinavagupta warns of the danger of neglecting the worship of such deities. Where the cult is entirely private, as it is in the context in which Abhinavagupta refers to it, the only person endangered is the individual who has committed himself to it. Where the cult is for the benefit of all, the welfare of all, from the king down, is jeopardised.
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TANTRIC IDENTITIES
Sisters and consorts, adepts and goddesses: 
Representations of women in the *Brahmāyāmala*

Shaman Hatley¹

**Women, revelation, and esoteric community**

In the study of early-medieval India’s Tantric traditions, we face enormous difficulty recovering substantive glimpses of historical women. The prospects for meaningful recovery of women’s own voices seem particularly discouraging.² Nonetheless, discourse on women abounds in Tantric literature and may afford scope for reconstructing at least limited aspects of their participation in some early Tantric traditions. One of the richest potential sources is the *Brahmāyāmala* or *Picumata*, a voluminous Śaiva Bhairava-tantra of the goddess-centred Vidyāpīṭha division which may date in some

¹ I would like to thank Vincent Eltschinger, Nina Mirig, and Marion Rastelli for inviting this contribution and for organising such a stimulating symposium. This essay was initially drafted prior to publication of TÖRZSÖK’s (2014) insightful article, “Women in Early Śākta Tantras: *Dūtī, Yoginī* and *Śādhakī*.” Though her aims are broader, these overlap in subject matter and in some of the particular evidence analysed. I am grateful that she has nonetheless encouraged me to complete and publish my essay, noting that our emphases have in many respects differed. In revising, I have tried to place these essays in conversation and to curtail the degree of overlap, though some inevitably remains (especially the discussion of *Brahmāyāmala*, chapter 24). I am grateful to Alberta Ferrario, Ayesha Irani, Csaba Kiss, and the volume’s editors for their comments on drafts of this essay. Quotations from the *Brahmāyāmala* are from the editions of HATLEY (2007 and 2018) and KISS (2015), for published chapters, and otherwise from my draft editions based on the principal manuscript (siglum “A” in the critical edition; see the bibliography). Passages adduced from the *Brahmāyāmala* generally follow the orthography of this Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript, as discussed in the introduction to HATLEY (2018). The language of the *Brahmāyāmala* is highly non-standard; for a detailed discussion, see KISS (2015: 73–85).

² Notwithstanding the controversial claims of SHAW (1994). For a striking exception to the relative absence of women’s voices, albeit from early twentieth-century Tibet, note the case of Sera Khandro, admirably studied by JACOBY (2014).
form to the mid-seventh to early-eighth centuries.\textsuperscript{3} Spanning more than 12,000 verses, the \textit{Brahmayāmala} (hereafter “BraYā”) affords a comparatively broad as well as early window into women’s involvement in a Śāktā-Śaiva cultic context, tinted though this is by preoccupation with the virtuoso male sādhaka and his quest for supernatural attainment (siddhi).\textsuperscript{4}

While the sādhaka’s rites frequently demand solitude, the BraYā nonetheless intimates the existence of an esoteric community structured around the institution and person of the guru. Initiates contravene conventional social identities, entering into new modes of relationality based on initiatory lineages and hierarchies. Practitioners also enter into “kinship” with the deities, a bond established by entry into particular deity clans (kula) during initiation. Unfortunately, the social dimension and corporate ritual of the BraYā’s cult receive minimal elaboration and must to a large degree be inferred through scattered remarks.\textsuperscript{5} Despite their disinterest in codifying or describing social religion, the redactors nonetheless articulate a detailed, if highly idealised vision of the BraYā’s textual community.

In the revelation narrative of chapter (\textit{paṭala}) 1, the BraYā portrays its redaction as a cosmogonic process, narrating the “descent” (avatāra) of the primordial scriptural wisdom (jñāna) into the world in the bounded form of text. This narrative simultaneously articulates a social vision by delineating the scripture’s lineage of redactors, a metacommunity spanning levels of the cosmos (tattva) and cycles of time. More than 25 persons find mention, in the majority of cases with specific designation of caste identity and region of origin.\textsuperscript{6} Details such as affiliations with Vedic schools (śākhā), pre-initiatory names, native villages, or even the name of a parent flesh out some of the descriptions. Mirroring revelation’s vast temporal and cosmological framework, the narrative invokes an expansive Indic geography: individuals involved in the BraYā’s transmission span from Oḍradeśa in the east to Sindh (sindhuviṣaya) and the Swat Valley (oḍḍiyāna) in the northwest, and Kashmir (kaśmīra) and Lampā in the far north. Two facets

\textsuperscript{3} For an overview of Tantric Śaivism’s branches and literatures, see SANDERSON 1988 and 2014. On the \textit{Brahmayāmala}, see HATLEY 2007 and 2018, and KISS 2015.

\textsuperscript{4} The rites of the sādhaka form the focus of volume II of the BraYā, published by KISS 2015.

\textsuperscript{5} Note, for instance, passing reference to a communal meal in the guru’s home, in BraYā 45.227–230; and to a feast involving non-initiates following the rite of image-installation (pratiṣṭhā), in BraYā 4.707–709 (quoted in n. 92 below).

\textsuperscript{6} Cf. the discussions of SANDERSON (2009: 296, n. 703) and HATLEY (2007: 228–234).
concerning the persons described stand out: the prominence of male Brahmans in the production and transmission of scripture, and the simultaneous inclusion of a spectrum of other castes. Brahmin males figure among the individuals named, representing a variety of regions and Vedic śākhās. The lineage features two Kṣatriyas and two Śūdras and includes two members of the “tribal” māṭanga community as well; the remaining individuals belong to unspecified castes. This inclusive metacommunity may reflect the actual diversity of participants in the BraYā’s cult, for caste and gender, in principle, do not determine eligibility for initiation. The lineage of the text’s redactors also intimates the reality that textual production and the status of officiant were likely domains in which male Brahmins predominated.

From the outset, the BraYā articulates a vision of its readership community, its idealised community of practice, that explicitly incorporates women. In the opening chapter, Bhairava prophesies, “‘In home after home, O great goddess, whether they be men fit for siddhi, or women fit for siddhi, [the Brahmāyāmala] shall spread to all of their homes. But those unfit for siddhi, whether a man or women, shall not attain even the mere vidyā-mantra, O great queen.’ Thus did speak Bhairava.” This is not isolated rhetoric, for references to initiated women abound in the text, and two women figure prominently in the revelation narrative. One of these participants directly in the text’s transmission. She is in fact the goddess Bhairavī or Aghorī herself, the divine interlocutor whose questions to Bhairava structure the text. Incarnate in the world in response to a curse, she was born as the girl Sattīkā in a village near Prayāga to a Brahmin named Meghadatta and is said to possess intellect (buddhi) and the marks of auspiciousness (laksanānvidī). Worshipping the linga perpetually with great devotion, at the age of thirteen she attained perfection (siddhā) through the grace of the supreme sakti, thence ascending into the skies where she re-

---


8 The name appears only once in the BraYā’s old manuscript, where the orthography is ambiguous: both santīkā and sattikā are possible. I consider the latter more probable and interpret this as the Prakrit equivalent of Sanskrit śāktekā.

gained her consort, Bhairava, and the divine name Aghorī. This sets the stage for Bhairava once again to reveal to her the BraYā, which Śrīkanṭha had earlier imparted to him, setting in motion the process by which the scripture once more reaches the world in redactions of various length.

One other woman participates in revelation, though indirectly: Deikā of Ujjayinī. After numerous miscarriages, she bathed and approached the Mother-goddesses, praying for a son; impelled by the sakti, the Mothers placed in her womb a failed sādhaka named “Without a Mantra” (Amantrin), an initiate who in a previous birth had broken the initiatory pledges (samaya). Belying this ignominy, Amantrin’s combination of Tantric initiation and breach of the initiatory pledges in a past life defines the exalted type of sādhaka known as the tālaka, whose virtuoso transgres-

---

10 The narrative concerning Amantrin or Svacchandabhairava and his disciples, spanning two Kalīyugas, comprises BraYā 1.78c–118 (published in Hatley 2018). See especially BraYā 1.81–86b: ujjainyāyān tu samjāto viprajo tukapatrakah? | deikā tasya vai mātā bahugarbhaprasāritā | 81 || snātācāmati mārṣṇams purataḥ putrakākṣiṇi | japtavidyo mahāvyāṣ samayalanghaprabhāvataḥ | 82 || kṣipiyanti hy asiddhatvāni mātarāḥ śakticoditaḥ | tasyā garbhe mahābhāge amantrānāmakas tathā | 83 || tatas tasya mahādevi tāsām caiva prabhāvataḥ | vidyāṃ prápyā japam krtvā tataḥ śāstram sa vetsyati | 84 || tato nibbṛḍhagranthaḥ ca divyasaṅgānu-bhāvataḥ | dasasāhasraṇārtham aśeṣāṃ kathayisyati | 85 || tatas tenaiva jñānena paścāt siddhiṃ sa lapsyati |
sive rituals are among the BraYā’s paramount concerns.\textsuperscript{11} Reborn, Amantrin regains the BraYā’s \textit{vidyā-mantra} “by the power of the Mother-goddesses” and attains \textit{siddhi}. Consecrated as Svacchandabhairava, he learns a redaction of the BraYā from Krodhabhairava, the primordial disciple of the goddess. His own disciples preside over ever-diminishing redactions of the scripture at the twilight of the cosmic cycle, at the end of which goddesses known as \textit{yoginīs} hide away the teachings altogether.

Of contrasting pedigree and attainment, the women of this narrative share in more than having vernacular, Prakrit names: both appear to lack Tantric initiation, engaging in lay devotional worship which ultimately bears fruit by divine grace. This is particularly striking in the case of Sattikā, who in effect recovers her former, forgotten divinity through devotional worship (\textit{liṅgapūjā}) alone rather than Tantric methods. Given the abundant evidence in the text for female initiation, this invites questions concerning the nature of women’s roles in the religion.

\textbf{Terms for women, terms for goddesses}

Discourse concerning women occurs primarily in the BraYā’s descriptions of ritual, whose paradigmatic agent is the male sādhaka or mantrin (less frequently, \textit{yogin}). Initiation binds him to the demanding ascetic and ritual regimens delineated over the course of this twelve-thousand verse scripture, above all in chapter 45, recently edited and studied by Kiss (2015). In addition to the sādhaka, who is of three grades,\textsuperscript{12} the text envisions two other categories of initiated practitioner: the neophyte, called the samayin or pledge-holder; and the ācārya (also deśika or guru), the Tantric officiant who is entitled to confer initiation.\textsuperscript{13} Supernatural attainment (\textit{siddhi}) is the predominant ritual aim, and in contrast to the mainstream of the Mantramārga, the BraYā does not envision a category of liberation-seeking practitioner distinct from the sādhaka (known in other sources as the pu-

\textsuperscript{11} On the \textit{tālaka}, whose ritual program is a key topic of BraYā 45, see Kiss 2015: 35–55.

\textsuperscript{12} See Kiss (ibid.). The grades of sādhaka are the transgressive tālaka, the \textit{miśraka} of “mixed” purity, and the vegetarian, celibate carubhojin. A somewhat different fourfold typology of sādhakas appears in the latter chapters of the BraYā (\textit{paṭalas} 91–94).

\textsuperscript{13} Initiation (\textit{dīkṣā}) and consecration (\textit{abhiseka}) are mainly treated in a cycle of seven voluminous chapters, \textit{paṭalas} 32–38.
A number of rituals also require the participation of one or more individuals referred to as “assistant sādhaka” (uttarasādhaka) or “friend/companion” (sakhāya), presumed male. These expressions indicate a ritual function rather than grade of initiation, though the uttarasādhaka may typically have been a neophyte. A distinct and more nebulous vocabulary applies to the women involved in ritual. Multiple words may refer to female practitioners, terminology which TÖRZSÖK (2014) has fruitfully analysed in the contexts of the BraYā and the closely-related Siddhayogeśvarīmata. Generic Sanskrit words for women occur throughout the BraYā, such as strī, vanitā, nārī, and abalā. In some cases, these may apply to female practitioners; in particular, TÖRZSÖK (2014: 358–364) highlights the frequent occurrence of abalā (“powerless,” a member of the “weaker sex”), suggesting that this usage contrasts the “powerless” condition of womanhood with the possibility of apotheosis through Tantric ritual: a transformation from abalā to a state of divine power and autonomy. More often, the BraYā employs terms which specifically intimate a woman’s status as an initiated practitioner, principally Śakti, dūtī, and yoginī (or yogesi), and secondarily bhaginī, bhairavī, and adhikārini. In contrast to the Siddhayogeśvarīmata, the term sādhakī, feminine of sādhaka, does not occur in the BraYā, nor does sādhikā, a term appearing in numerous much later sources.

Notably, each of the BraYā’s main terms for female practitioners possesses a double sense, potentially designating female initiates, but in other contexts referring to female divinities. In contrast, few terms for male practitioners apply also to deities (one of these exceptions being vīra, “hero”). This distinction may reflect the emphasis on female divinisation prevalent in Śākta-Śaiva traditions. These two levels of meaning obtain even with lesser-used designations for initiated women, namely bhaginī (“sister”), which also designates the cult goddesses of the vāmasrotas (the “leftward

---

14 The possibility that a sādhaka might seek liberation alone is intimated in BraYā 25.342cd: “These three pantheons are taught for the sādhaka who desires liberation” (etad yāgatrayam proktam mumukṣoḥḥ sādhakasya tu).

15 sakhāya is a variant stem of the irregular Sanskrit sakhi (“companion”); see EDGERTON (1953, vol. I: §10.8). On the desired qualities of the uttarasādhaka, which include knowledge of the initiatory pledges (samaya), see BraYā 21.51–54 (KISS 2015).

16 Concerning sādhakī, which occurs in chapter 10 of the Siddhayogeśvarīmata, see TÖRZSÖK 2014. sādhikā seems mainly to occur in late-medieval East Indian Śākta Tantras, for instance Kaulāvaliniñāya 9.94.
To a large degree, context dictates the use of terms for women. While the expressions śakti and dūtī appear almost exclusively to designate a female participant in sexual rites, the BraYā avoids the expressions yoginī and bhaginī in this context. These two pairs of terms thus correlate with strikingly divergent representations of women.

dūtī, “female messenger/go-between,” in this literature has the sense of “female companion,” i.e., ritual consort. Applied to deities, dūtī designates four of the eight goddesses who comprise the core retinue of Kapāliśabhairava, the BraYā’s principal male deity. Known also as “the handmaidens” (kiṅkari), their status is secondary to the tetrad of devīs or guhyakās. All eight goddesses serve as dūtīs of Kapāliśabhairava, who, in the BraYā’s opening verse, is said to sport as a liṅgam in their lotuses with unexcelled pleasure. Applied to women, in the BraYā dūtī refers exclusively to female participants in sexual ritual, in alternation with śakti. Though similarly restricted to the context of sexual ritual, śakti is in fact the most widely occurring term for initiated women in the BraYā. This accords with the fact that -śakti is appended to female initiation names, much as male names end with -bhairava. Doctrinally, śakti denotes the power (gendered female) of the (male) supreme deity, both in its totality and as differentiated into various aspects, such as Śiva’s powers of knowledge, action, volition, and grace. Personified as the singular supreme goddess, śakti also pervades the cosmos as the myriad female deities who are her rays (raśmi, gabhasti, etc.). These embodiments include the flesh-and-blood śaktis who serve in ritual as conduits to this transcendent power.

In contrast, the category yoginī may designate women as autonomous ritualists or even living goddesses beyond the context of sexual ritual. Integral to the category yoginī (synonym yogesī) is its blurring of boundaries between the divine and human, for this category of divine female repre-

---

17 This term occurs in BraYā 45.575a and thrice in paṭala 24, which uses the expressions anadhikārīṇī (“a woman not authorised,” 24.74a), pūrvādikārīṇī (“previously [but no longer?] authorised,” 24.75a), and guptādikārīṇī (“secretly authorised,” 24.85d).

18 BraYā 1.1b: dūtīnāṃ padmaṃ padmaśe ‘samakśhavilasal liṅgaḥpuṣṭi bibharti ’. 
sents a state of being women seek to attain through ritual perfection. Applied to goddesses, yogini (“female yogi” or “possessed of yogic power”) designates flying, shapeshifting deities central to Vidyāpīṭha cults such as the BraYā’s, goddesses with whom sādhakas sought visionary, power-bestowing encounters (melaka). A sextet of yoginis belongs to the BraYā’s core deity pantheon, and its extended pantheon incorporates multiple similar sets. Applied to women, the BraYā uses yogini in a sense close to “female sādhaka” (mantrin or yogin), as illustrated by these terms’ occasional pairing. Note, for instance, BraYā 22.72cd, which promises, “A sādhaka or yogini [becomes] perfected [through this worship system (yajana)], without a doubt, O goddess” (siddhas tu sādhako devi yoginī vā na samśayaḥ).

Strikingly, in the BraYā this usage mainly occurs in ritual contexts of a non-sexual nature. In other words, unlike the terms śakti and dūtī, the BraYā avoids using yogini in the sense of “ritual consort.” It is thus ironic that WHITE’s (2003) monographic treatment of Tantric sexual ritual revolves so squarely around the figure of the yogini, whom he conflates with the Tantric ritual dūtī or śakti, counter to the usage prevalent in many, if not most, early Tantric Śaiva sources. If the term śakti suggests a view of female practitioners as necessary complements to the male, conduits to the ultimate source of power – Śiva’s śakti – yogini reflects a vision of female practitioners as independent and powerful, as actual or potential goddesses. Even in a rare instance where yogini describes a woman potentially engaging in sex with a sādhaka, she is represented as instigating the encounter herself, stirred by the supreme śakti. As I will argue subsequently, in the yogini we glimpse the possibility of women as autonomous ritualists who act to attain their own objectives rather than facilitating the aims of men.

A similar possibility underlies the term bhaginī or “sister.” This occurs sparsely in the BraYā, but is notable for suggesting, as TÖRZSÖK (2014: 360) observes, a non-sexual relationship based upon initiatory kinship: bhaginī occurs mainly in explanations of the verbal and non-verbal codes (chomma) used to identify and communicate with other initiates – the

---

19 For analysis of the category yogini, see TÖRZSÖK 2009 and HATLEY 2013.
20 See also the introduction to patala 14, cited below in n. 96.
21 BraYā 24.75c–76b: āsām madhyē kadā cit syād yogini śakticoditā [em.; ecoditaḥ ms.] || 75 || ichate sādhakaṃ devi bhoktavyā -m- avisaṅkite [em.; avasaṅkite ms. ] || (“If a yogini among those women at some point desires the sādhaka, impelled by the śakti, she may be enjoyed without hesitation, O goddess.”).
sādhaka or bhrāṭr (“brother”) and yoginī or bhaginī (“sister”). This category of women receives meagre attention, perhaps on account of lacking immediate relevance to the male sādhaka’s ritual life – the text’s predominant concern.

It should be emphasised that the contextual, relational nature of these terms for women leaves open the possibility of significant overlap. A woman represented in one context as a śakti or dūtī could be viewed in another as a yoginī or bhaginī.

Nonetheless, I will argue that the BraYā’s divergent ways of representing female practitioners point toward women of diverse status and accomplishment, and not merely a multiplicity of ritual roles.

**Women as ritual consorts**

The BraYā’s most extensive references to women occur in the context of rituals involving coitus, where dūtī and śakti serve as their main designations. Descriptions of the dūtī or śakti in sexual ritual provide a vivid, though entirely one-sided window into women’s ritual roles. Much data derives from the BraYā’s sādhakādhikārapañjala, chapter 45, a treatise of 674 verses on the disciplines of sādhakas published by Kiss (2015). Of the three grades of sādhaka, who is unambiguously male, only the disciplines of the tālaka or “pure” (śuddha) sādhaka mandate ritual coitus. While the tālaka’s demanding disciplinary regimen is delineated with abundant detail, the dūtī with whom he consorts finds mention only when she features in his ritual. Her religious life is little expanded upon beyond her role in the tālaka’s practices. Nevertheless, it is abundantly clear that the BraYā envisioned ritual consorts as initiated practitioners.

Delineating the characteristics desirable in a consort, a passage in chapter 45 of the BraYā (vv. 186–189b) depicts the ideal dūtī as an accomplished ritualist. Beauty appears among her desired qualities (186d), but this is not expressed in particularly erotic terms. On the other hand, her capacity for asceticism and meditation, devotion, learning, and her understanding of nondualism (advaita) are key. The ideal female partner, in other words, is an accomplished Tantric adept:

---

22 See BraYā 56.98c–102, quoted in n. 123 below.
23 Cf. TÖRZSÖK’s (2014: 341–342) cogent remarks on the fluidity of the categories of women she identifies in early Śāktā-Śaiva works.
24 This omission is not entirely determined by gender; a similar silence surrounds the sādhaka’s male assistant (the uttarasādhaka).
25 Text as constituted by Kiss 2015, except as noted; translation mine. This pas-
guru-m-ādešasamprāptā sōbhānā lakṣaṇānvita || 186 ||
jitāsanā mahāsattvā tantrasadbhāvabhaṇītvā |
gurudevapatiḥbhaktā kṣutipāṣājitaśramā || 187 ||
advaśasitaṁ nityaṁ nīrviṣalpā hy alolūpā |
samādhījñā̃ha yogajñā jñānajñā saṃsitavrata ṛṣi taught in his ritual manual (tiṣṭhānkalpaprastaraḥ) tu dāpayet ||
pīruḥ kalpoktaṁ tu samācāreṇ
dhautāśpaṁ hariṇamārṣaṇaṁyuktāṁ muktakāṁ drāhavratām || 198 ||
pīṭhaṁ tu-m-ārcayet tasya astrodakasamanvitām | vilepayitvā gandhais tu āśanaṁ tatra kalpayet || 199 ||
ṛṣṭaṁ tu-m-ārcayet tasya astrodakasamanvitām | vilepayitvā gandhais tu āśanaṁ tatra kalpayet || 199 ||
yāgam pūrvavidhāṇena aśeṣam tatra vinyaset | bhūmyāṁ 
tathāśaṅam kṛtvā svalpaprastaranāntikām || 200 ||
upaviṣyāpayet tatra cumbanādyāvaḫiḥanam | kṛtvā kṣobhaṁ samāraḥṣya pavitraṁ gṛhya sādhatvaḥ || 201 ||
prāśaṁyāṁ tu tuḥṣataṁ yāgadravyāṁ praksyante | arcanaṁ hi tataḥ kṛtvā naivedyāḥi 
tu dāpayet || 202 ||.

[186c–87] Obtained by the command of the guru, lovely, possessing the marks of auspiciousness, who has mastered the sitting postures (jitāsanā), possessing great spirit, purified by the true essence of the Tantras, devoted to the guru, the deity, and her husband (pati), unfatigued by hunger and thirst, [188–89b] ever steeped in nonduality, free of discriminative thoughts and lust, well-versed in trance (samādhī), yoga, and scriptural wisdom (jñāna), steadfast in the observances (vratas): after obtaining [a woman like] her, a man of great wisdom should practice what is taught in his ritual manual (kalpa).

Despite this emphasis on her skill and virtue, the dūṭī or śakti is represented as having minimal ritual agency, and the BraYā expands little upon her religious life beyond her sexual role. She enters into action in chapter 45 after nearly 200 verses dedicated to the male sādhaka and his preparatory rituals. “Firm in her resolve” and with hair unbound, she is naked but for the Five Insignia (mudrāpāṇcaka) fashioned of human bone. The sādhaka worships her vulva and prepares a bed. They copulate and then consume the mixed sexual fluids “joyfully.”28 Their alternating patterns of worship, coitus, mantra incantation, and fire sacrifice have numerous inflections, as

sage is also discussed by TÖRZSÖK 2014: 343.

26 samśita” | em.; samśita” ms.; samśita” ed.
27 “prāṇīḥ” | em.; “prāṇīḥ” ms., ed.
28 BraYā 45.198–202 (edited by Kiss 2015): agrataḥ śaktim āropya ūrdhva- 
rūpāṁ digāṁbaram | 
udrāpāṇcakasāmyuktāṁ muktakesi dṛḍhavratām || 198 ||
piṭhaṁ tu-m-ārcayet tasya astrodakasamanvitām | vilepayitvā gandhais tu āśanaṁ 
tatra kalpayet || 199 ||
ṛṣṭaṁ tu-m-ārcayet tasya astrodakasamanvitām | vilepayitvā gandhais tu āśanaṁ 
tatra kalpayet || 199 ||
yāgam pūrvavidhāṇena aśeṣam tatra vinyaset | bhūmyāṁ 
tathāśaṅam kṛtvā svalpaprastaranāntikām || 200 ||
upaviṣyāpayet tatra cumbanādyāvaḫiḥanam | kṛtvā kṣobhaṁ samāraḥṣya pavitraṁ gṛhya sādhatvaḥ || 201 ||
prāśaṁyāṁ tu tuḥṣataṁ yāgadravyāṁ praksyante | arcanaṁ hi tataḥ kṛtvā naivedyāḥi 
tu dāpayet || 202 ||.
do their costumes and sexual positions. Throughout the performance, the sādhaka is the principal ritual agent. She stands, sits, lays down, or is entered into as the ritual demands. Along with the mandala and fire, her vulva serves as a primary locus for installation (nyāsa) and worship of the mantra-deities. Her role is passive to such an extent that she is repeatedly instructed not to rise from the bed while the sādhaka performs worship (yāga) or fire sacrifice (homa). Indeed, at least in this chapter, it is unclear whether she actively engages in worship with the sādhaka at all between bouts of coitus. A passage from another chapter (30) epitomises the consort’s lack of ritual agency: the tālaka, in the absence of a flesh-and-blood śakti, is instructed to create a substitute made of clay or kuśa-grass.

The degree to which the BraYā’s sexual rituals are framed in terms of the sādhaka’s religious aspirations is illustrated by the rites for seeing his past lives.

29 Kiss (2015: 47–48) summarises the pattern of worship as follows: “The basic ritual ... includes ritual bathing (śnāna), mantric installation (nyāsa), him entering the ritual site (devāgāra) and the performance of worship (pujā). The sādhaka should perform pantheon worship (yāga) and fire rituals (homa), facing south, his hair dishevelled, naked, his body covered in ashes. His female partner should be standing, naked, her pīṭha, i.e., her genitals, are to be worshipped, and the installation of the pantheon (nyāsa) should be performed on them. She then sits down, he kisses and embraces her, he brings her to orgasm, collects the sexual fluids, and they eat these sexual fluids together. Homa is performed again with transgressive substances such as cow flesh. He inserts his linga in her pīṭha, and finally homa of meat is performed.” This basic pattern is inflected for different ritual aims, for details of which see the edition and translation.

30 See BraYā 45.278cd, 282, 309, 312, etc.

31 BraYā 30.218–219b: naktabhojī mahāvīrah śaktiyuktas tu tālakah | śaktyālbhe mahādevi mṛṇmayīṃ [em.: mṛṇmayī ms.] kārayed budhah || 218 || kuśamāvīṃ vāpi deveśi śaktihīno na kārayet }. (“The greatly heroic tālaka should eat by night, together with the śakti. In the absence of a śakti, O great goddess, a wise man should fashion [an effigy of one] out of clay or kuśa-grass. He should not perform [the ritual] without a śakti, O queen of the gods”) [understanding kārayet as non-causative in sense].

32 BraYā 45.529c–636.
women. Led by his consort, the women sit in a row, dressed in red. Over a period of seven days, the sādhaka copulates with each in turn in the course of the daily rites. During interludes, they are instructed to pass the time in song and other pleasant diversions (vinoda).\(^\text{33}\) The most elaborate version of the rite requires eight women, performed while sequestered in an earthen hut or cave (bhūghā) for a period of six months. The women recruited should be “led by one’s consort, lovingly devoted, full of faith, initiated, and free of shame and aversion.”\(^\text{34}\) They enter the dark chamber with hair unbound, naked but for a yoga-cloth, or else wearing red garments.\(^\text{35}\) Arrayed like goddesses in the eight directions around the Bhairava-like sādhaka, he copulates with them in turn in the daily rites. No reward is promised to the women for their trouble, while the sādhaka may attain mastery over all mantras and omniscient vision.\(^\text{36}\) One is left to imagine the claims and incentives motivating women’s participation, on which the text is silent.

Who served as Tantric consorts, and under what circumstances? What kinds of relationships obtained outside of ritual? In general, the prescriptive literature affords meagre insight into such questions. Some useful data nonetheless emerges from the study of chapter 24 of the BraYa and a section of chapter 22, which concern the “secret nectars” (guhyāmṛta).\(^\text{37}\) These include alcoholic drinks, for which the text provides numerous recipes (āsavalakṣaṇa, BraYa 24.129c–189). Its principal concern, however, is with sexual and menstrual fluids. In this context the consort’s role is like a milch cow prised for her ritual-sustaining fluids and her mantra-empowered vulva.\(^\text{38}\) One remarkable rite even uses her body as catalyst for producing magical pills (guḍikā), which are made from a pulverised dildo

\(^{33}\) BraYa 45.540c–542b.

\(^{34}\) BraYa 45.597c–98b (KISS 2015): nāryaṣṭaka samāḥryta śaktyādyā bhaktivatsalā || 597 || śraddadhānādhiṅkāri ca nirājā niḥṛṇās tathā |.

\(^{35}\) BraYa 45.608c–609 (KISS 2015): yogapattaṅkṛtāṅgābhī digvāsābhī tathaiva ca || 608 || raktavāsottarīabhī muktaśeṣābhī āvṛtāḥ || praviśet sādhako dhīras tādṛṣṭāhuto na samśayah || 609 |.

\(^{36}\) BraYa 45.649 (KISS 2015): animādīguṇaśvaryam tadā tasya praṇāyate | mantra kīkaraṇāṁ yānti tadā devi na samśayah || 649 ||.

\(^{37}\) Both of these chapters were read, in part, in the Second International Workshop on Early Tantra of 2009, in a session led by Alexis Sanderson. My understanding of the material has benefitted considerably from this. Emendations not my own have been noted as such.

\(^{38}\) For a detailed account of the BraYa’s rites of the “secret nectars,” see TÖRZSÖK 2014: 343–344.
fashioned of various impurities, including beef and faeces, after it has been churned in her yoni.39

This discourse on fluids furnishes valuable detail concerning the \textit{tālaka}'s sexual regulations and the women he consorts with. We learn, for instance, that a \textit{tālaka} may either be “wedded to a single consort” (\textit{ekāśaktiparigrāhīn}) or consort with multiple women. The path of committing to a single \textit{sādhu} bestows rapid success; yet, as the BraYā twice asserts, such monogamy is “difficult, even for Bhairava.”40 A monogamous \textit{sādhu} must avoid intercourse with all other women,41 even if divine \textit{yoginī} is perfected in \textit{yoga} hanker after him.42 Comparative ease marks the path of the \textit{tālaka} having multiple consorts, but his ritual bears fruit more gradually. A polygamous \textit{sādhu} “resorts” to his consorts alternately in the daily rites (\textit{āhnika}),43 apparently maintaining ritual relationships with multiple women concurrently, in addition to his actual wife or wives (who may or may not be Tantric consorts).

How a \textit{tālaka} meets and enters into relations with potential consorts receives scattered attention. One passage speaks of him taking as consort a woman he identifies as a secret initiate.44 Most of the BraYā's discussions, however, characterise the \textit{dūtī} using kinship terms: “Mother, sister, daughter, and wife are indeed held to be consorts.”45 Problems attend interpreta-

---
39 The recipe for these magical dildo pills appears in BraYā 22.153–155: \textit{dra-vya-prāśay[ṃ] puraś kṛtvā gomānaṃ kiṃcasyayutam | surāṣṭhīnā samayuktam piṣṭaṃ piṇḍikṛtan taṭāḥ || 153 || kṣobhadravyena saṁmardya liṅgākāraṃ tu kāravet | pra-kṣiped yoṇimadhye tu nimeṣaṃ cāyaṃ pīdayet || 154 || mantram uccārayen mantri saṃkhyāyāṣatasan taṭāḥ | karṣayīvī tu tuṃ liṅgoṃ guḍikāṃ kāravet taṭāḥ || 155 ||. In this passage and elsewhere in the BraYā, \textit{kiṃcitkincit} (“a little [something]?”) can refer to faeces, oddly enough; the meaning of \textit{surāṣṭhī} is uncertain.

40 BraYā 24.110: \textit{ekāśaktiparigrāhī āśu [corr.; āśu ms.] sidhyati tālakah | duścaraṃ bhairavasyāpya ekāśaktiparigrāhāṇa || 110 ||} (110cd is repeated in 114cd).

41 Presumably the \textit{ekāśaktiparigrāhī} is either unmarried or else married to his ritual consort, but this is not clarified.

42 BraYā 24.111c–112: \textit{manasaḥ hi deveśi ekaśaktiparigrāhe || 111 || yoginyo yogyasiddhāḥ tu yadā ta icchayanti hi | tābhīḥ sārddhan na kartavyaṃ saṅgo vai sid-dhiḥ icchatāḥ || 112 ||} (understanding kartavyaṃ as agreeing with saṅgo).


44 BraYā 24.85c–87b, quoted below, p. 63.

45 BraYā 24.32cd, quoted below.
tion of these terms; as TÖRZSÖK (2014: 345) observes, it is unclear “whether they express the relationship of the dūtī with the sādhaka, or the status of these women, or denote certain conventional types of dūtīs defined by the tradition itself.” Some statements imply that kinship terms express modes of relationship rather than blood kinship. Take for instance BraYā 24.32c–35b, which has multiple difficulties:

\[
mātā ca bhaginī putrī bhāryā vai dūtayah smṛtāḥ \quad 32 \quad \| \|
\]
\[
dātavyan tantrasadbhāvaṃ nānyathā tu kādācanaḥ\quad 33 \quad \|\|
\]
\[
svaśaktīṃ sādhakasyātha adhikārapade sthitā \quad 34 \quad \|\|
\]
\[
avikalpakarā nityam jñānatattvārthabhiḥvātā \quad 35 \quad \|\|
\]
\[
nānyaṃ ṭvai taraneś caiva svāmivat sarvabhāvataḥ \quad 36 \quad \|\|
\]
\[
bhrātaram pitarām putram patim vā paśyate sadā \quad 37\|\|
\]

[32c–33] Mother, sister, daughter, and wife are indeed held to be consorts. The essence of the Tantras should be given [to them], but never otherwise. The sādhaka’s own śakti then has entitlement [to perform ritual] (adhikārapade sthitā). [34–35b] Always free from discriminating thought (vikalpa), purified by the essential meaning of the scriptural wisdom (jñānatattvārtha), †she truly ...[serves him?]...† and no other as master, with all her heart. She ever looks upon him as brother, father, son, or husband.

The verb paśyate implies an affective relationship: she “sees,” i.e., looks upon the sādhaka as brother, father, etc., a choice perhaps dictated by age difference or the nature of their interactions outside of ritual, including actual kinship. Another point of interest is the suggestion, in 33ab, that a sādhaka may himself initiate a woman as a śakti, giving her the “essence of the Tantras” and becoming, in effect, her guru, despite lacking formal consecration as an officiant (ācāryābhiṣekā).\(^{52}\)

\(^{46}\) smṛtāḥ ] em.; smṛtā ms.
\(^{47}\) kādācanaḥ ] em.; kādācanaḥ ms.
\(^{48}\) svaśaktih ] corr.; svaśakti ms. (unmetrical)
\(^{49}\) sthitā ] em.; sthitāḥ ms.
\(^{50}\) patim ] em.; patis ms.
\(^{51}\) I am unable to interpret tarane and suspect that a finite verb such as sevate underlies this. Csaba Kiss suggests the possibility of tarpayet, on a diagnostic basis.
\(^{52}\) This is consistent with indications in chapter 38 that a sādhaka – and not only the ācārya – may bestow the initiation for neophytes (samayākaraṇa), an issue meriting closer study.
Subsequent passages both enrich and complicate this picture. BraYā 24.49–61 seems relatively unambiguous in envisioning actual kinswomen as consorts:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mātā siddhipradā proktā bhaginī ca tathaiva ca} & | \\
\text{putrī caiva nijā śaktīḥ}^{53} \text{ sarvvasiddhipradāyikā}^{54} | & 59 || \\
\text{tatkālavatirekenā punar lobbā}^{55} \text{ na sambhajet} & | \\
\text{garbhiniṁ}^{56} \text{ naiva kṣobhāta dravyārtham sādhakottamaḥ} | & 60 || \\
\text{bhāryāṃ āñikavartjayā}^{57} \text{ tu garbhiniṁ api kṣobhayet} & | \\
\text{bhaginīm vāṭha putrīm vā na kuryā}^{58} \text{ kurute yadā} & 61 ||
\end{align*}
\]

[59] Mother, sister, and likewise daughter are said to bestow siddhi; one’s own consort (nijā śaktī) bestows all siddhis. [60] Aside from the time [of ritual], one should not copulate with them out of lust. The excellent sādhaka must not sexually stimulate a pregnant woman to procure substance (dravyā). [61] Excluding the daily rites, he may [however] sexually stimulate his wife, even if she is pregnant. He should not do so to sister or daughter; when he does do so …

There follows a rite of reparation by which the inappropriately-bedded “sister” or “daughter” becomes fit (yogyā) again for ritual. In restricting coitus with consorts to ritual, prohibiting ritual coitus with pregnant women, and allowing for non-ritual coitus with one’s wife, even if pregnant, this passage evokes a realistic domestic milieu. The distinction made between “one’s own consort” (nijā śaktīḥ) and “mother, sister, and daughter” could also suggest that in addition to his principal consort (his wife?), a sādhaka might have various auxiliary consorts drawn from among kinswomen. There is little to suggest that terms such as “sister” here refer to affective relations or consort types rather than actual kinship relationships. A subsequent passage reinforces this impression, delineating a large num-

---

53 śaktīḥ | corr.: śaktī ms.
54 pradāyikā | ms. (after correction); pradāyikāḥ ms. (before correction)
55 lobbā | em. (Cs. Kiss; understand as ablative, with loss of the final consonant);
lobbo ms.
56 garbhiniṁ | em.; garbhini ms.
57 Understand as ablative (“varjyāt”), or perhaps emend to the accusative.
58 Understand kuryā as optative in sense, with loss of the final consonant.
ber of familial relationships and ending with the statement, “One should take these and other women as consorts.”

Although sexual fidelity is expected of a śakti, a sādhaka may apparently lend or transfer her services to someone else. A problematic section on this subject (24.91c–96b) merits quoting in full. Depending upon how one resolves a textual problem in the initial verse quarter (91c), this passage may address both the circumstances in which a sādhaka lends or transfers his consort as well as what to do when he wishes to end this relationship with her:

\[
\text{utsṛṣṭā tu}^{61} \text{ sadā deyā svāsaktya}^{62} \text{ sādhakena tu} \parallel 91 || \\
\text{abhīyāgatasya}^{63} \text{ devesī devakarmaratasya ca} | \\
\text{prārthitena svayam vāpi yāgakāle na samśayāḥ} \parallel 92 || \\
\text{sāmānyasyāpi dātavyā srotāsuddhiprapālanāt}^{64} | \\
\]

---

61 BraYā 24.68–72b: bhagini putrinī bhāryā yāgakāle [conj.; ādyākāle] vidhiḥ smṛteḥ | mātāmahī pītāmahī tathā mātrāvāsā [corr.; ’svasā ms.] -m- api || 68 || pīr-bhrātus [em.; ’bhāryās ms.] tathā bhāryā bhṛtāur [em.; bhṛtāus ms.] bhāryā [em.; bhāryās ms.] tathāiva ca | bhāgneyī tu snuṣā caiva pautrīḍhīrtkās [em.; ’pautrīḍhīrtkās ms.] tathā || 69 || mātulasya tathā pīrmātrāvāsā [corr.; ’svasā ms.] tathā ṭīṭrīn | bhṛtāt tathā pītā vāpi putrīnim bhṛtārās tathāpi vā† || 70 || evamādi tathā cānyā[ḥ] śaktayaś caiva kārayet | mātuḥ sapatni [em.; svaṭpatni ms.] ṭnīte vāḥ śaktīya vā [conj.; vai ms.] kārayed budhaḥ || 71 || anyathā kurute mohāt prāyaścitam samācāret |. (“[68–69b] At the time of worship, [this] is said to be the procedure: sister, daughter, wife; or else maternal grandmother, paternal grandmother, mother’s sister, paternal uncle’s wife, brother’s wife, [69c–70] sister’s daughter (bhāgneyī), daughter-in-law (snuṣā), granddaughters and daughters of one’s maternal uncle, one’s maternal or paternal aunt (pīrmātrāvāsā), † and … or else one’s brother’s daughters †,[71–72b] One may take these and other women as consorts. Otherwise, a wise man should take as a consort the co-wife of one’s mother † … †. One who does otherwise, due to infatuation, should perform expiation.”). The interpretation of this problematic passage is somewhat conjectural. In 71d, śaktīya is accusative singular in sense, though formally nominative, śaktīya being a non-standard alternative stem of śakti. Cf. the stem devyā (for devī), which occurs throughout the BraYā. On the accusative for nominative in –ā stems, see Edgerton (1953, vol. I: §9.20–22).

62 BraYā 45.89cd: “A wise man should take as consort a woman who does not give sexual company to other men” (nānyasaṅgamaśaṅcārām śaktīṁ kuryād vićakṣanah).

63 Understanding svāsaktya as nominative (with the irregular stem -yā).

64 abhyāgatasya | em.; abhyāgatasya ms.

65 ṭprāpālanār | em.; ṭprāpālanā ms. (otherwise understand as ablative in sense,
[91c–92] O queen of the gods, when she has been released (\textit{\textit{utsṛṣṭā}}), a sādhaka should undoubtedly always give over his consort to a visiting [sādhaka] who is devoted to deity worship, at the time of pantheon worship (yāga), either on request or of his own accord.\textsuperscript{69} [93ab] She may also be given to someone of the same lineage (sāmānyasya) in order to guard the purity of [one’s] stream of transmission (?). [93c–94b] An ācārya may also give her to his own disciple, O woman of renown, with a mind free of conceptualisation, whether in his own pantheon worship or his disciple’s. [94c–95b] For this is the autonomous convention declared by Bhairava. It is to be done by one desiring siddhi, but devoid of jealousy. [95c–96b] O great goddess, one who has offered over his śakti must not, undoubtedly, lust for her afterwards (?).

A number of questions arise: Does the entire passage concern the śakti whom a sādhaka releases? Do some cases of transfer apply only for the duration of ritual? Were consorts economically or socially dependent in ways that warranted assignation to another sādhaka – a kind of “remarkable

\begin{itemize}
\item svāśiṣyasyāpi\textsuperscript{65} dātvāyā ācāryena mahāyaśe || 93 ||
\item svayāge śiyāyāge vā nirvikalpena cetasā |
\item svatantarstrasamayo hy esā bhairaveṇa prabhāṣītan || 94 ||
\item karttavyo\textsuperscript{66} siddhikāmena\textsuperscript{67} īrṣāyā varjītena tu |
\item takālāt\textsuperscript{68} tu mahādevi pralobhaṃ naiva kārayet || 95 ||
\item yasya śakti samarpitā tena devi na samśayaḥ |
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{65} svāśiṣyasyāpi ] em.; svam śiyāpi ms. Alternatively, read svāśisye 'pi, as conjectured by Alexis Sanderson (in the Pondicherry Early Tantra workshop).
\textsuperscript{66} karttavyo ] em.; karttavyā ms.
\textsuperscript{67} kāmena ] corr.; kāmeṇa ms.
\textsuperscript{68} takālāt ] em. (Cs. Kiss, personal communication); takālan ms.
\textsuperscript{69} This interpretation depends on the conjecture of utṣṛṣṭa tu (“[a woman] let go/dismissed) in 91a for the ms.’s phonetically similar and contextually unintelligible utkṛṣṭas tu (“[an] eminent [man]”). While the emendation is conjectural, the reading of the ms. seems implausible here. I had initially conjectured utkṛṣṭasya instead, in which case 91c–92b could be understood thus: “O queen of the gods, to a visiting [sādhaka] who is distinguished (utkṛṣṭasya) and devoted to deity worship, a sādhaka should undoubtedly give over his own consort, either on request or of his own accord.”
\textsuperscript{70} The construction in 24.95c–96b is grammatically flawed, and the interpretation somewhat speculative.
riage” – if abandoned? Was continued alliance with a sādhaka integral to a woman’s belonging and status in the esoteric community? Less ambiguous is the presumption of a sādhaka’s control over his consort, to the extent of exclusive power to transfer his ritual “conjugal” rights. (An early twentieth-century Tibetan woman, Sera Khandro, writes of precisely this experience: being transferred from the custody of one Lama to another without consultation.71) This sakti-sharing finds justification in “ritual nondualism:” the transcendence of discriminative, dualist conceptualisation (vikalpa), based most fundamentally on the false dichotomy of “pure” and “impure.”72

A somewhat different picture emerges from a contrasting passage (BraYā 24.85c–87b), which may speak of male and female initiates forming temporary, voluntary relationships:

\[
\text{ādiṣṭo vātha nādiṣṭo}^73 \text{ jñātvā guptādhikāriniṃ} \parallel \text{85} \parallel \\
\text{śaktyā tu kārayed devi nityam eva hi sādhakah} | \\
\text{pakṣam māsaṃ ritum vāpi śatnāsam abdam eva vā} \parallel \text{86} \parallel \\
\text{āgantūnām}^74 \text{ vidhi hy esā śaktīnāṃ tālakasya tu} |
\]

If he comes to know that a woman is secretly an initiate, whether he is instructed to or not, a sādhaka should always make a consort of her,75 O goddess – for a fortnight, month, season, six months, or year. This is the procedure for the tālaka and for adventitious (āgantū) śaktis.

Qualifying śaktīnām, the expression āgantūnāṃ could have the sense of “unexpected visitors,”76 but I would suggest that it has a more technical meaning. A classification of yoginīs in chapter 14 of the BraYā, discussed in the next section of this essay, describes the āgantū as a woman who attains the wisdom of yoginīs through her own ritual accomplishment (14.266). While ambiguous, the passage seemingly intimates a scenario in which a sādhaka recognises a woman as a secret initiate and approaches her to enter into a temporary relationship (perhaps by recourse to secret

71 JACOBY 2014.
72 On “ritual nondualism” in early Śākta Tantras, see TÖRZSÖK 2013.
73 vātha nādiṣṭo ] em.; nātha vādiṣṭo ms.
74 āgantūnām ] corr.; agantūnāṃ ms.
75 In 86a, śaktyā appears to be accusative singular in sense, though ostensibly a nominative formed on the extended stem śaktyā (for sakti); see n. 59 above. One might instead emend to śaktyām.
76 Cf. the reference to visiting (abhyāgata) sādhakas in BraYā 24.92, quoted above.
signs, chomma). As with the subsequently-discussed descriptions of hidden yoginīs, the female practitioner envisioned here seems to have a degree of autonomy.

On the whole, the BraYā’s representations of sexual ritual ascribe minimal agency to women, treat them as subordinate to the male practitioner, if not as chattel, and largely ignore the question of whether and how they might derive spiritual or temporal benefit. While the sādhaka’s goals, ritual actions, and subjective states are delineated minutely, few such instructions are directed toward the consort. There are, for instance, no indications that she should meditate or incant mantras during copulation. In these respects her subjectivity is virtually ignored; yet in contrast, female desire, pleasure, and sexual agency do sometimes feature as concerns. This may seem incongruous with the emphasis on ascetic and religious virtues as preconditions for a consort’s selection but accords entirely with the rites’ emphasis on the flow of the “secret nectar” (guhyāmṛta).

Did the BraYā envision all women involved in sexual ritual as initiated practitioners? Two cases might suggest otherwise: those of the coital ritual known as the asidhārāvrata (“sword’s edge observance”) and the sexual rites of the miskraka, the sādhaka of “mixed” purity. In the asidhārāvrata, the subject of chapter 40, the description of the ideal consort contrasts sharply with that of chapter 45. In this case her erotic appeal receives overwhelming emphasis (40.2–8b):

[2–3b] [One should find] a woman desirous of lovemaking who possesses the aforementioned qualities (pūrvalaśanasyuktā), endowed with surpassing beauty, proud of her pristine youth; [3c–4] flirting with humour and amorous dance, making coquettish gestures and so forth, possessing [fine] garments and jewellery, adorned with all [kinds of] ornaments – endowed with necklaces, armlets, rubies, and strings of pearls – or obtained to the extent of one’s means, even if she has very little adornment. [5–6b] Smeared with perfumes and lac (?), ever marked with sandalwood paste, possessing plump, raised breasts very round in girth; her nipples are beautified by flower strands, and her breasts firm. [6c–8b] Devoted and loving, [having] superlative bangles (?), endowed by nature with good conduct, clever and flirtatious, either a Kṣatriya woman, or a woman belong-

---

77 On women’s sexual agency, note for instance BraYā 24.75c–76b, quoted above in n. 21.
I would suggest that this emphasis on the consort’s beauty and concupiscence is a departure reflecting the distinctive history and aims of the asidhārāvrata. This observance has roots in an orthodox ascetic discipline of the same name by which men strove to attain self-restraint in the face of extreme temptation. As I argue elsewhere (HATLEY 2018), earlier Tantric versions of the observance emphasise the erotic appeal desired of a consort but do not envision her as initiated. The BraYā’s version of the asidhārāvrata maintains the emphasis on erotic beauty but departs in envisioning the consort as an initiate. This is intimated, in particular, by the fact that following the evening meal, the consort and sādhaka perform worship together. Her erotic appeal serves to augment the vrata’s difficulty and potential efficacy, and it is a stipulation additional to the diūḍ’s usual qualifications. This is signalled by the statement that she should, first of all, possess “the aforementioned qualities” (pūrvalakṣaṇasamyuktā, 2a) – in all likelihood a reference to the list of virtues cited above from chapter 45. In other words, the consort’s dazzling sexiness in the BraYā’s asidhārāvrata is merely an inflection of ritual syntax, of the same order as variations in garb, gesture, paraphernalia, and mantra. She must still be an initiated diūḍ.

In contrast, the rites of the “mixed” (miśraka), middle-grade sādhaka more clearly evince the possibility of non-initiated women’s participation. His disciplines in most respects mirror those of the tālaka or “pure” sādhaka, yet, as a general rule, exclude coitus. As an exception to his ritual

78 Text and translation from HATLEY (2018); see the latter for discussion of the passage’s numerous problems of text and interpretation. BraYā 40.2–8b: pūrvalaṅgaṇasamāyuktāṃ yoṣitaṃ suratocchukāṃ | aivārūpasampannāḥ navayaavanadārppitaṃ || 2 || hāsyalāsvayūlīsīnyāṃ vibhramādvidhānākāṃ | vastrālankārasampannāḥ sarvābharaṅabhūṣitām || 3 || hārakeyūramānīkṣamuktaśrasyasamhītām | yathāvibhavasamprāptāṃ svalpahūṣaṇākāpi vā || 4 || sugandhamāyā kālā tu gandhapankāṅkitā sadā | pinnonnatāsatarṇetām abhogaparināśaṇālām || 5 || cūcukā sragdāmaśobhā saghanā tu payodharā | bhaktān caivānurakātaḥ ca valayān uttamaṇā || 6 || prakṛtyā śilasampannāṃ vidaḏhām ca vilāsīnām | rājānayaṣāṃ vāpi anyavarṇmāṇatām api || 7 || tādhvirūdhopabhogaś ca ātmīnaṃ samalāṅkaratsa.

79 BraYā 40.18cd: niśavrataṃ tā nīkramya tāya tādrddham samācaraṃ.

80 That a passage from chapter 45 is referred to as “earlier” (pūrva) suggests that the chapters were reordered at some point; see HATLEY 2018: 70.

81 On the miśraka’s chastity, note, e.g., BraYā 45.435a. “He is always engaged in celibacy” (brahmacaryaṇa niṣṭīyaṃ); and 447cd, “And he should not have intercou-
chastity, he may perform coital ritual by command of the guru (ādeśena), but only if he succeeds in magically summoning a female being, whether human or divine.\textsuperscript{82} It seems that any which female one magically attracts becomes a suitable consort, with no stipulations or restrictions concerning initiation. He must in fact accept whomever appears, at the pain of expiation.\textsuperscript{83} Minimal detail concerning women emerges from these passages. Beyond vague indications that celestial maidens (divyakanyā) were the preferred targets of magical summoning (ākarsana).\textsuperscript{84} Nonetheless, an encounter with an initiated, flesh-and-blood woman is key to the curious circumstance by which a miśraka takes up the tālaka’s path (tālakamārga), as a somewhat doubtful passage describes (BraYā 45.523c–526b):\textsuperscript{85}

\begin{quote}
ādeśam tu vijānīyād yadāsau laksanānvitā\textsuperscript{86} || 523 ||
upatiṣthe svayaṃ śaktiḥ ādiśṭā sakticoditā |
puṣpakāle bhaven nityaṃ phalam yasyā\textsuperscript{87} na saṃsayaḥ || 524 ||
\end{quote}

se with women” (strīśaṅgam ca na kuryā).

\textsuperscript{82} The circumstances permitting coitus are first addressed in BraYā 45.439: “By command, O great goddess, [the miśraka] may attract and enjoy [a woman]; conjoined with [this] consort, he may accomplish all rites.” (ādeśena mahādevi ākryākrya bhuñjayet | sādhayet svarakarmāni śaktyuktas tu miśrakah ||). This accords with a discussion of the miśraka in BraYā 24.100c–101.

\textsuperscript{83} BraYā 45.505–508 (ed. Kiss 2015; translation mine): “Having repeatedly magically attracted a beautiful divine maiden, he [the miśraka] should enjoy her. Together with them [i.e., her], the mantrin should again observe what is stipulated in his ritual manual, in due sequence. The miśraka sādhaka should without hesitation take a woman attracted by mantras as his consort, undoubtedly. Otherwise, the miśraka should always observe celibacy. Without a doubt, he attains siddhi while situated in a sacred field – not otherwise. But he must not [in this case] enjoy a [woman who is] attracted; [if so,] the miśraka must perform expiation of 12,000 mantra recitations.” (ākryākrya bhuñjita divyakanyāṃ manoramāṃ | tābhi sārdham caryena mantri kalpokāni punaḥ kramāḥ || 505 || ākṛṣṭā ya bhaven mantrai sa saktiṃ nātra saṃsayaḥ | kartavyaṃ miśraka- kenaiva sādhakāni śaktiṃ śirāṃ śirāṃ | 506 || athavā brahmacaryena vartaye miśrakah sahāḥ | siddhyate hy aviccāreṇa kṣetram āṣīrya nāṇyathā || 507 || ākṛṣṭām na tu bhuñjita prāyaścitam samācāret | dasāsāhāsrikāṃ jāpyaṃ kartavyaṃ miśrakaṇa tu || 508 ||).

\textsuperscript{84} Note for instance BraYā 45.532ab: ākryākrya mantrais tu divyakanyāṃ ma- noramāṃ |

\textsuperscript{85} Text as per Kiss 2015, except as noted; my translation departs in a few respects and is somewhat conjectural.

\textsuperscript{86} lakṣaṇānvitā | em.; lakṣaṇānvitah ms., ed.

\textsuperscript{87} Perhaps emend to phalam yasyā: “[a woman] from/of whom there are results,” i.e., who enables the fruition (siddhi) of the sādhaka’s ritual.
[523c–24] He should recognise [my] command [to become a tālaka] when a consort possessing the auspicious marks would spontaneously approach him, by [divine] command, impelled by the [cosmic] sakti. In all cases she would be in her menses, which undoubtedly give results [in ritual] (?). [525–26b] When a female neophyte endowed with devotion appears to him, then, O goddess, he should recognise my command;\textsuperscript{88} not otherwise. A mantra should likewise discern [my command] when it is spoken by yogini.\textsuperscript{89}

As will be elaborated further below, ritual imbues a sādharma’s encounters with female beings with meaning, whether nocturnal visions of airborne goddesses, sightings of villagers, or chance encounters with a solitary woman. In the miśraka’s case, an auditory exchange with goddesses or fortuitous meeting with a menstruating female initiate serves as the sign to embark on the tālaka’s discipline, which requires a qualified consort. Unusually, here her initiatory status is stated explicitly: that of the neophyte (samayī, an irregular feminine for samayinī).

Beyond the magically summoned consorts of miśrakas, non-initiated women are largely peripheral to the BraYa’s ritual. To some extent the cultic focus on goddesses translates into ritualised reverence for women. Respectful behaviour is mandated for those undertaking ascetic observances (vrata): a sādharma, for instance, must address women he encounters as

\textsuperscript{88} In 525d, ādeso should be understood as accusative in sense; cf. EDGERTON (1953, vol. I: §8.36).

\textsuperscript{89} As KISS (2015) notes, yogibhiḥ (526a) is non-standard, occurring for the feminine yoginibhiḥ. I have interpreted this line somewhat differently, primarily in light of BraYa 45.184–185ab. The latter passage seems to state that one commences the tālaka path either by command of the guru or of the yoginiṣ, as received in melaka, a visionary encounter: evam[ṇ] melakam āpanno ādiṣṭam tair varānane | ālamārga[m] tadā kuryād yadā śuddhas tu sādhakah || 184 | gurvādeṣena vā kuryād yogibhiṣ ca samarpitah ā. (“Having thus attained a visionary encounter, he is commanded by them [the yoginiṣ], O fair woman. He should undertake the path of the tālaka when he becomes pure. He should do so either by the command of the guru or when offered over [?] by the yoginiṣ.”).
“mother” or “sister,” and never display anger. Sexual violence is prohibited emphatically. Reverence for women is also a formal element of a ritual involving the wider, non-initiated community. Following pratiṣṭhā, the rite by which an officiant empowers a religious image, rendering it fit for worship, one is to feed the leftover food offerings (naivedya) to maidsens and women, including those of the lowest social status (antyaśā), alongside the more usual suspects – Śaiva ascetics and Brahmmins. Despite such ritualisation of respect for women, their erotic conquest remains one of the BraYā’s most widely advertised magical attainments (siddhi). An accomplished sādhaka “becomes like the god of love, bringing joy to the hearts of women.”

**Women as ritualists, women as goddesses**

A degree of ambiguity surrounds female initiation. The BraYā’s cycle of chapters devoted to initiation (dīkṣā) and consecration (abhīseka), pataclas 32–38, is largely silent on the subject. However, its instructions for the assignation of initiatory names based upon the cast of a flower into the maṇḍala (puṣpapāṭa) provide a naming convention for females. This silence, punctuated by a note on women’s initiatory names, in all likelihood reflects the matter-of-fact acceptance of female initiation at this level of the tradition. As noted by TÖRZSŐK (2014: 355–361), the BraYā and

---

90 BraYā 21.24: striyo dṛṣṭā namaskṛtya mātā ca bhagīnī ca | evaṃ saṃbhāṣayen mantri kroṣanān tu na kārayet ||

91 E.g., BraYā 84.17cd: divyākṛṣya [em; “kṛṣya ms.] tu bhuṇjīna na ca stri sa-balā | [em; “sabalā ms.] kvacit. “One may draw down a divine maiden (dīvya) and enjoy her, but must never [take] a woman by force.” (In 17c, divyā should be understood as accusative in sense; cf. śaktṛya, discussed above in n. 59.)


93 BraYā 64.161ab: bhavate ‘naṅgavaḥ [em; “bhavete naṅgaṇaḥ ms.] strīnāṁ hṛdayāṇāndakārakaḥ ||

other Vidyāpītha and Kaula sources frequently refer to practitioners as belonging to either gender, not only in the context of the initiation of neophytes (samayadikṣā), but in a broad range of ritual contexts. In its more than 750 verses concerning initiation rites, the BraYā makes no allusion to exclusions or modifications for women, and there are no grounds to assume that the ritual differed in substance. In the narrative of the girl Sattikā’s apotheosis and her role in transmitting revelation, the BraYā even tacitly provides a model for female guruship.

Chapter 14 of the BraYā, the “chapter of the wheel of the sky-travellers” (khecaraṇakrapaṭāla), stands out among early scriptural texts for presenting a practice system designated specifically, though not exclusively, for initiated women.95 Demanding though it may be, this teaching is framed as a concession to women’s supposed limitations. The goddess complains that the process of worship Bhairava had taught earlier is too elaborate. She characterises female initiates – here referred to as yoginīs – as weak in both intellect (budhi) and spirit (sattva), yet dedicated to their husbands and full of devotion to the gurus. On this account, she requests an easy means (sukhopāya) for them to attain siddhi.96 The system expounded in response has as its basis an alphabetical diagram known as the “wheel of the sky-travellers” or “wheel of the flying yoginīs” (khecaraṇakara). From this are formed three principal mantras: the samayavidyā or lower (aparā) kulavidyā (“vidyā–mantra of the goddess clans”) for neophytes, the kulavidyā proper, and the higher (parā) kulavidyā, also called “heart of the yoginīs” (yoginīḥṛdaya).97 Rites based on the khecaraṇakara differ little in most respects from those of the BraYā’s various other alphabetical circles (cakra), such as the vidyācakra of chapter 17 or bhautikakacakra of chapter 19. What may somewhat set them apart is an emphasis on the aggressive magical acts

95 An edition of chapter 14 of the BraYā may be included in volume III of the Brahmayāmala (currently in progress).

96 BraYā 14.1–5: devy uvāca | yoginīyo svalpabuddhyās tu svalpacitālpasatvikāḥ | bhautikacakra | siddhir yathā deva tān me brūhī samāsataḥ | tāsāṁ siddhis tu yena siddhim labhanti tāḥ || 1 || evam vai prchito bhaktīyā samkṣepārthaṁ mayā purā | yāgan tathāiva devesa vistaraṁ kathitaṁ tvayā || 2 || samkṣepa yāgamārγena sūkhopāyena caiva hi | kulakramāṇī ca vā tāsāṁ yena tāḥ siddhim āpnuyāt || 3 || deva uvāca | vistaraṁ kathítan devi sādhabhūtm āhitāy vā | adhunā sampravakṣyāmī yoginīṁ mahodayam || 4 || yāgakramavidhiḥ caiva tān me nigadātā śṛṇu | sadā karmaratā yās tu yena siddhim labhanti tāḥ || 5 ||

97 Cf. the Siddhayogēśvarīmata’s mantra khphrem, the “heart of the yoginīs” (yoginīḥṛdaya), which, as TÖRZSÖK (2014: 361) points out, is described as particularly efficacious for women.
sometimes associated with yoginis, such as entry into another’s body (parakāyapraśā) and extraction of the vital fluids (amṛtākārṣaṇa).

While chapter 14 of the BraYā ostensibly expounds practices for women, much of its content seems strikingly incongruous with this purpose. Some material might more accurately be characterised as rites for a sādhaka to attain mastery over both divine and mortal females. One short passage, for instance, teaches the “technique for making [a woman] wet” (ksaraṇaprayoga), aimed at rendering her mad with desire for the sādhaka.99 The chapter also has a lengthy exposition of hathamelaka, techniques for forcibly drawing down and mastering dangerous goddesses, in which there is little ambiguity concerning the maleness of the ritual subject.100 As a whole, the chapter appears oriented toward male mastery of ritual disciplines associated with yoginis, practices envisioned as those women perform in their quest for divine apotheosis. Only in this limited sense does the chapter concern women’s ritual. It seems implausible to conceive of initiated women as the true intended audience; at most, one might envision the chapter as a basis for oral instructions to female disciples.

The BraYā’s conceptions of “female” ritual practice receive further elucidation in this chapter’s creative taxonomy of accomplished women. Appended to chapter 14 is a notable passage classifying the yoginis who possess mastery of the khecarīcakra (BraYā 14.260c–266). This threefold classification differs in both premise and detail from the text’s threefold typology of sādhakas. Among the three categories of yogini, the āgantukā (“adventurous” or “newcomer”) likely represents the normative female practitioner who attains awakening through ritual means. In the other two cases, notable by its absence is formal initiation: the jñānagarbhā (“wisdom-in-the-womb”) yogini and kulodbhavā (“clan-born”) yogini both learn the kulavidyā mantra directly from their mother, either in the womb or after birth, experiencing the awakening of wisdom (jñāna) later in life. This transformative gnosis defines

---

98 See especially BraYā 14.193–260. Concerning these techniques, see nādyudāya, pañcāṃrtākārṣaṇa, and parakāyapraśā in TANTRIKABHIDHANAKOŚA, vol. III.

99 BraYā 14.230–235; this is called ksaraṇasya prayogāḥ in 235cd. Upon completion of the rite, the woman in question “being agitated, assuredly approaches and follows after the sādhaka, afflicted with passion” (234d–235b: … kṣubhite ma- danāturā || upaviśayati sāvasyam sādhakam cānugacchati ]; understand upaviśayati as active in sense; cf. EDGERTON 1953, vol. I: §37.22–23).

100 hathamelaka is treated in BraYā 14.204–217. The maleness of the subject in this section of the text is explicit in the aforementioned passage on “love magic,” 14.230–235.
them as yoginīs, a designation which slips here into its double-sense of both female Tantric adept and Tantric goddess:

\[
\text{kauli} \, \text{kaudihi}^{101} \text{ prokto yoginī} \text{kaulikanandana}^{102} \| 260 \| \\
yasyās^{102} \text{ cakrasa tamprāpti -m- avasya tasya=jāyate} \| \\
kulavidya^{103} \text{ ca deveśī tām śṛṇuṣya samāhitā}^{104} \| 261 \| \\
jānagarbha bhaved yā tathā caiva^{105} \text{ kulodbhava} \| \\
āgantukā^{106} \text{ tu yogesi}^{107} \text{ prāpnuvanti na sāṃśaya}^{108} \| 262 \| \\
jānī mātā pitā caiva jānagarbheti kirtitā | \\
garbhashāyās tu vai mātā^{109} \text{ kulavidyānī}^{109} \text{ samarpayet} | \\
ārdratrayodase varṣe jānām^{110} \text{ prāpnoti sā dhruvaṃ} \| 263 \| \\
pariṣṭānavati mātā nādhikārī pitā smṛtaḥ | \\
sā bhave tu kulotpānā mātā tasyās tu kārayet \| 264 \| \\
karna jāpana^{111} \text{ tu jātāyāḥ śanmāsām}^{112} \text{ kulavidyā} | \\
caturvīnśatime^{113} \text{ varṣe jānām tasyāh}^{114} \text{ prajāyate} \| 265 \| \\
caruṇā yāgamārgena^{115} \text{ amṛtasya tu prāśanāt}^{116} | \\
yasyā jānām^{117} \text{ prajāyeta āgantuḥ}^{118} \text{ sā prakīrtitā} \| 266 \| \\
ānena kramaya goṇa jānakośa^{119} \text{ suvistarāḥ}^{120} | \\
siddhāḥ^{121} \text{ siddhī mamiṣyanti yoginyo nātra sāṃśaya} \| 267 ||
\]

101 vidhiḥ | ms. B (palm-leaf); vidhi ms. A (palm-leaf)
102 yasyā | yasyā A
103 vidyā | vidyā AB
104 samāhitā | em.; samāhitā AB
105 caiva | em.; caiva tu AB (unmetrical)
106 āgantukā | em.; āgantukān
107 yogesi | B; yogesi A
108 mātā | Bc; mātām AB
109 vidyāṃ | em.; vidyā AB
110 jānām | B; jānām AB
111 karna | A; varṇa B
112 vīnśatime | B; vīnśatime A
113 tasyāḥ | A; tasya AB
114 yāga | A; yagā B
115 prāśanāt | cor.; prāśanāt A; prāśa)nāṭ B (marked as error)
116 jānām | B; jānā A
117 āgantuḥ | B; āgantu AB
118 kosa | B; kosa A
119 vistarāḥ | em.; vistarāḥ AB
120 siddhāḥ | B; siddhā A.
121 Brahā 1.29–30.
This [aforementioned ritual] is called Rite of the Clans (kaulika vidhi), [for it] gives delight to the clans of yoginīs. [261] She who obtains the Wheel of the Clans ([kula]cakra) will assuredly gain [the mantra known as] the kulavidyā, O queen of the gods. [Now] hear of her, being well-composed. [262] She who is [known as] “wisdom-in-the-womb,” the one “born of a clan,” and the “newcomer yogini” – [all of them] obtain [the kulavidyā], undoubtedly. [263] [One whose] mother and father both possess the wisdom, [and whose] mother would bestow the kulavidyā to her while in the womb, is known as “wisdom-in-the-womb.” At [the age of] half of thirty years she certainly obtains the wisdom. [264–265] The mother fully possesses the wisdom, [but] the father has no entitlement: she is¹²² [one] “born in a clan.” Her mother would whisper the kulavidyā in her ear for six months when she is born. After twenty-four years, the wisdom arises in her. [266] She in whom the wisdom would arise through [consuming] the oblation gruel (caru), through the path of deity worship (yāga), or through consuming the [secret] nectars, is known as the “newcomer.” [267] The perfected yoginīs shall attain siddhi in this order, without a doubt, possessing vast troves of wisdom.

A remarkable view of female Tantric adepts emerges from this passage. While males seek communion with the goddess clans (kulasāmānyatā), or their mastery, women seek to awaken their identity as goddesses, or simply come to manifest this spontaneously. This calls to mind the girl Sattikā of the revelation narrative, who regained her lost divinity at age thirteen through devotional worship. Apotheosis, either through ritual or by sudden awakening, is thus a key theme in the representation of accomplished women. As this passage indicates, their attainment may be congenital, predicated on birth to initiates (either the mother alone or both parents) as well as matrilineal transmission of the kulavidyā. This custom of informal, matrilineal transmission points toward the possible existence of female communities of practice only nominally aligned with the Tantric lineages established through formal initiation.

The BraYā’s treatises on coded communication and “the characteristics of yoginīs” (yoginīlakṣaṇā) (chapters 56 and 74) provide glimpses of women as initiated ritualists operating beyond the constraints of coital ritual,

¹²² bhāve should be understood as optative, with loss of the final consonant (cf. EDGERTON 1953, vol. I: §29.42).
though these representations are obscured by elements of visionary fantasy. Here the focus lies not on the “sister” initiate, mentioned mainly in passing, but on encounters with yoginīs secretly inhabiting the world (martyasaṃgamataḥ, BraYā 74.40d). These living goddesses are represented as potential sources of power and as guardians of esoteric knowledge, oral “lineage teachings” (sampradāya) which men may learn only by their propitiation. This vision of Tantric wisdom laying hidden within the circles of yoginīs, beyond direct access by sādhakas, undergirds a gendered ritual logic by which men seek out encounters with accomplished female adepts as well as goddesses. In this context the boundaries between women and divine beings readily collapse. yoginīs assemble in the sacred fields (pīṭha, kṣetra, etc.), but may also live inconspicuously in the village or town. In chapters 56 and 74 the BraYā delineates taxonomies by which sādhakas can recognise concealed yoginīs and identify their Mother-goddess clans (mātrkula), clans to which sādhakas themselves belong through initiation.

The distinguishing qualities (lakṣaṇa) by which one recognises yoginīs span bodily appearance, comportment, food preferences, and the decorative

---

123 On the purpose of coded communication (chomma) and the distinction in this context between “sister” initiates and semidivine “yoginīs,” note especially BraYā 56.98c–102: echommakāh kīdśā deva kulānāṁ sādhakasya ca || 98 || prajñāyate yathā bhrāṭā bhaginī vá viśeṣaṭāḥ | caryāyuktasya deveṣa yathā jñāsyantī yoginīḥ || 99 || parasaparaḥ ca vīrāṇām ekatantrasamāśrayaṁ | ālāṁpārthe mahādeva kathayasya prabhāṣaṭāḥ || 100 || bhairava uvāca || śrnu devi pravakṣyami cchomakānāṁ tu lakṣaṇam | yena vijñāyate bhrāṭā bhaginī vá mahēśvari || 101 || jñātva ca yoginīm mantri śivecchācoditātmavān | sādhakas tu tato dadyād vācikāṁ mudralakṣaṇam || 102 ||, (“[98c–100] ‘O god, what are the secret signs of the [goddess] clans and sādhaka like, such that one may specifically recognise a brother or sister; such that one carrying out the observances (caryā) recognises yoginīs, O lord of the gods; and for the mutual conversation of heroes who follow the same Tantra? Tell [me this], O great god, by way of explanation (prabhāṣataḥ).’ Bhairava spoke: [101] ‘Listen, O goddess; I shall teach the characteristics of secret signs, by which a brother or sister is recognised, O Mahēśvari. [102] Having recognised a yoginī, himself propelled by the will of Śiva, the mantra-bearing sādhaka should then give [her] a verbal message characterised by mudrā [names].’” For a discussion of the interpretation of this passage, see Hatley 2007: 378–379.

124 The idea of “attaining the lineage teachings” appears in the context of encounters with yoginīs in multiple sources, often expressed in similar terms; the phrase sampradāyaḥ ca vindati occurs as Siddhayogesvarīmata 27.16d and BraYā 3.230d, 45.295d, and 73.13b. Cf. sampradāyaḥ na vindati, BraYā 85.143b. Similar expressions occur in the Tantrasadbhāva (e.g., dadante sampradāyakam, 13.60b) and Jayadrathayāmala (e.g., sampradāyaḥ prayacchanti, III, 28.21c).
emblems women draw on their homes. Take for instance the description of a yoginī belonging to the clan of the Mother-goddess Vārāhī (BraYā 74.61–65):

[61] [A woman] with full lips and large eyes, whose frontal locks have tawny ends, who is ever fond of the act of painting, skilful in dance and music, [62] always fond of spirits and meat, lusty and deceitful; she draws on her house the insignia of the fang, or else the staff or chain, [63–64] and she likewise draws a snout, an angle, or a cremation ground, a lotus, or pot. One should know her sacred day to be the twelfth of both lunar fortnights, O fair woman; both Vārāhī and Vaiṣṇavī are ever fond of the same sacred day. [65] She should be recognised [thus] by the best of sādhaka, his mind suffused by mantra. After one sees such characteristics, following the [appropriate] response-mudrās, after one month she bestows siddhi upon the mantrin carrying out the observances, O goddess. 125

This creative taxonomy reads the female body, comportment, and domestic art as potential signifiers of membership in matriarchal esoteric lineages. Though initiated into the same divine clans, which span levels of the cosmos, the sādhaka remains on the periphery by virtue of his gender and lack of ritual accomplishment. His preparatory period of wandering asceticism (vratacaryā) thus entails an almost voyeuristic fascination with women, whom he carefully observes for signs of concealed divinity.

Recognised and duly propitiated, the living goddesses disguised as women of the village or town may respond to sādhaka of their own initiatory clans. Exchanges of coded communication take the form of mudrā or verbal utterance, or they may combine verbal and nonverbal codes. The

---

125 Text and translation from Hatley (2007: 331, 412–413), with minor changes: lamboṣṭhī ca viśālakṣī piṅgalāgrāgrakesīnī | citrakarmapriyā nityam nṛtyagandharaṣṭaṇī || 61 || māṃsāsavapriyā nityam lollupā sarpaśātvikā | svaghe damṣṭra-mudrā dranḍāṣṭrikhalam eva vā || 62 || likhate ca tathā ghoṇam koṇam vātha śmaśānakam | padmanā vā karpparaṇ caiva ubhe pakṣe tu parvanī || 63 || dvādaśī tu vijñāṇīyād tasyāh sā varavarnāṇī | vārāhī vaṣṇavī caiva ekaparvvaratā sadā || 64 || jñātavyā sādhakendreṇa mantraviśeṣena cetasa | idṛśaṃ lakṣaṇaṃ dṛṣṭvā pratimudrāṃsārīnī | māsaikātī siddhiḥā devī cariyuktasya mantriṇah || 65 ||. In 62b, I have emended the unintelligible sarpaśātvikā to sarpaśātvikā. As Tőrzsők (2014: 349–351) notes, highlighting the example of Kaumārī-clan yoginīs, descriptions of women belonging to the clans of Mother-goddesses are remarkably similar across Vidyāpīṭha texts.
living yogini may bless the sādhaka by prognosticating future occult attainments, or enable a visionary, power-bestowing encounter with her divine clan sisters. The following exemplifies the liminal encounter envisioned between a sādhaka and concealed yogini, who foretells his future attainments through gesture (BraYā 56.132–135):

[132] When [she] puts her hands on the tip of the nose and moves her head around, she in that way relates “[you shall attain] an encounter with the Nine [deities] in a vast forest.” [133] She who would look down and begin to draw on the ground [with her toes indicates], “[you shall have] an encounter with female beings of the netherworlds in a temple of the Mother-goddesses.” [134] She who gazes at her own tongue, and afterwards trembles, [fore]tells of an encounter with female beings dwelling in the waters. [135] She who shakes her hands from feet to head would indicate an encounter [with the goddesses] at whichever level of the cosmos (tattva) she abides, beginning with the śivatattva.126

After receiving the prognostication, a sādhaka venerates the perfected adepts (siddha) of the past and wanders forth until he attains a power-bestowing, visionary encounter with the specified goddesses.127 The embodied yogini who dwells in the world, concealing her identity, hence forms a vital link between the male aspirant and the goddesses whose divine realms and powers he seeks. These encounters with worldly yoginis paint a picture of autonomous, powerful living goddesses who straddle the female social world, communities based on initiatory kinship, and unseen realms. These representations, no matter how stereotyped and suffused with fantasy, may intimate the existence of female initiatory communities, oral teachings, and ritual traditions existing at some remove from the more


127 BraYā 56.136–137 (ibid.): so ’pi mudrāpatiḥ pūjya tathā mantānabhairavam | bhaktīyā paryoṣanāṁ kuryād yathātantraprabhāṣitam || 136 || namo ‘stu digbhyo devabhyaḥ pūrvvasiddhavināyakāṁ | datvāgarhāṁ parayā bhaktīyā tato melāpakaṁ bhavet | tattāmānyāṁ mahādevī sarvvaikalāyānasampadam || 137 ||.
official, male-dominated Tantric lineages whose writings come down to us. This is precisely the scenario the Siddhayogeśvarīmata intimates when it ascribes the “heart of the yoginīs” to women’s oral tradition, a mantra never before written down and only rarely mastered by men.  

**Gender, text, and Tantric communities**

Despite the BraYā’s large scale and detailed vision of its community of readership, the text provides only a limited window into the social dimension of one somewhat marginal Tantric tradition. There are, moreover, severe limitations to our knowledge of the text’s social and historical contexts and the kinds of community which coalesced around its cult. As the preceding discussions have highlighted, the text nonetheless may have much to contribute towards understanding women’s involvement in early Tantric traditions. 

In reviewing the BraYā’s discourse on women, two divergent kinds of representation have come into view. These more or less map to the categories of dūtī and yogini, and their respective ritual milieux: initiated women functioning as consorts in coital ritual, on one hand, and comparatively independent, potentially powerful women pursuing their own ritual aims, on the other. Both play essential, albeit contrasting roles in the sādhaka’s quest for supernatural attainment (siddhi). Depictions of coital ritual combine lurid detail with near silence on women’s subjectivity and ritual agency. Whatever the social reality may have been, the BraYā envisions ritual consorts (dūtī or śakti) as subordinate to the aims and authority of male sādhakas, despite partaking of Tantric initiation. Contrasting representations of female practitioners emerge in discourse on yogini, who embody the possibility of a religious life neither defined nor constrained by ritual consortship. 

These contrasting representations may of course obscure the real possibility that yogini were sometimes dūtī: such divergent images of women are likely in some measure to be contextual. Much as the categories yogini and devī (“goddess”) may blend to the point of being indistinguishable, at the opposite end of its semantic field, yogini overlaps with other desig-

---

128 Siddhayogeśvarīmata 28.41–42b: puruṣenādhi kāro ’sti asmin strīvidhikarmān | strīvāyāḥ siddhido hy esaḥ kadačit puruṣasya ca || vaktṛād vaktṛagatam strīnām na ca likhyati pustake | (see TÖRZSÖK 2014: 361 for a translation and some discussion).  
129 Note also the overlap of yogini with terms such as mār, dākinī, etc.; see the articles on these lexemes in the TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA.
nations for initiated women (dūtī, sakti, bhaginī, samayinī, adhikārinī, sādhakī). Despite these convergences, the BraYā’s contrasting representations nonetheless seem likely to intimate women of varied status and circumstance, and not merely different ritual roles. While the data is limited, the BraYā tends to portray consorts as belonging to the sādhaka’s immediate social world, if not family – women potentially under his own tutelage whose religious commitment could in some cases be limited to ritual consortship. In contrast, representations of yoginīs seemingly intimate independent female adepts and matriarchal lines of transmission beyond the sādhaka’s orbit and control. The extremes of these types – the kinswoman consort and the yoginī as liminal, living goddess – may have disproportionate prominence in the BraYā on account of their essential roles in the sādhaka’s ritual life. In contrast, the text says little about the kind of initiated woman referenced, usually in passing, by bhaginī – the “sister” initiate who, valued neither as a source of sex nor of potent blessings, remains somewhat peripheral.

An enigma presented by the BraYā is its explicit embrace of women in its readership community and systems of ritual while simultaneously neglecting to articulate their perspectives. Its myopic focus on the sādhaka entails virtual silence on women’s ritual aims and motivations, particularly in the context of sexual ritual. What were the respective roles of coercion and the allure of sexual or emotional fulfilment, social status, and ritual power (siddhi)? In chapter 14 – devoted, promisingly, to ritual for women – this silence becomes particularly conspicuous, for the predominant concern emerges as the revelation of yoginīs’ inner secrets for the benefit of male sādhakas. Here the BraYā reveals itself as a text fundamentally about women, both human and divine, but rarely for them. Despite the rhetoric of female inclusion, the pretence of a mixed-gender community of readership, and pervasive references to initiated women, male concerns dominate: women feature primarily as vehicles for the sādhaka’s perfection. Nonetheless, in its narrative of the girl Sattikā’s ascent to divinity and her role in revelation, in its matter-of-fact embrace of female initiation, in its teaching of a mantra-pantheon (yāga) specifically for women, in its imaginative anthropology of accomplished females, and in the very figure of the yoginī, who straddles the human and divine, the BraYā provides glimpses of an esoteric community in which women’s participation was both normative and multiply enacted, and at least in some contexts not under male control.
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The Bhasmāṅkura in Śaiva texts

Csaba Kiss

This short article focuses on a fascinating but not very well-known category of person in mediaeval India: the Bhasmāṅkura. After examining how the Bhasmāṅkura appears in published and unpublished texts of the Jātiveka genre, I will deal with earlier, Śaiva sources that are mainly in the form of unpublished manuscripts to explore the origin and history of the term. I will then try to raise some questions, rather than giving answers, concerning the figure of the Bhasmāṅkura: What are the origins of the Bhasmāṅkura? Why is he denied certain rights? And most importantly: Can he tell us anything about the social setting of Śaivism in the Śaiva Age? Indeed, to what extent can Śaiva texts in general help us in mapping the actual social environment of mediaeval India? SANDERSON (2009: 298) raises this question, and while addressing the extension of Śaivism beyond the higher classes he also draws to attention the daunting problem of making any definite statements concerning the socio-religious changes brought about by Śaivism (italics mine):

Our sources reveal, then, that the Śivas extended their recruitment beyond the high-caste circles from which most of our evidence of the religion derives. But, of course, they do not readily reveal the extent to which it was adopted outside these élites. The epigraphical

---

1 I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to Prof. Alexis Sanderson for his valuable feedback, to Judit Törzsök, Shaman Hatley, and Gergely Hidas for their constant help, to Prof. Rosalind O’Hanlon for sharing with me her manuscripts of the Jātiveka genre, and to Prof. Vincent Eltschinger, Nina Mirnig, and Marion Rastelli for inviting me to contribute to this volume. I gratefully acknowledge the financial support received from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) in the context of the SFP Project “Visions of Community” (VISCOM).

2 I borrow the term “Śaiva Age” from Prof. Sanderson’s grandiose article published in 2009: “The Śaiva Age: The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period.” The period referred to is the fifth to eleventh centuries CE (SANDERSON 2009: 41).
evidence is almost entirely restricted in this regard to records of the pious activities of rulers and brahmins, and the Śaiva sources, being largely prescriptive in their concerns, tell us much about what should or could be done by or for various categories of person but give us no sense of how widely these prescribed activities were adopted or supported. One of the tasks of future research, then, should be to gather data that will improve our ability to address this question.

That prescriptive texts are insufficient if we strive to understand to what extent the prescribed activities were actually performed at a given time is a chronic problem, and I am unable to offer any remedy for it. Rather, in accordance with Sanderson’s piece of advice, here I will only attempt to gather and display small pieces of data, in the hope that this may be useful for further investigations.

The first time I became aware of the category “Bhasmāṅkura” was while reading a manuscript of the Jātiviveka. This text, attributed to Gopīnātha, was probably composed in the fifteenth century and discusses the complex network of mixed castes (saṃkarajāti). It has never been published or translated properly but is relatively well-known. For instance, the work has been used by Kane for his History of Dharmaśāstra, in which he paraphrases the Jātiviveka’s definition of a Bhasmāṅkura as an offspring “from a Śaiva fallen ascetic and a Śūdra prostitute” and confirms that the Bhasmāṅkura is also “called Gurava by the Jātiviveka.” 5 More precisely, the Jātiviveka (2.126–129) defines the Bhasmāṅkura as the offspring of a fallen (patita), i.e., outcaste, Śaiva or Pāśupata ascetic and a Śūdra prostitute: 6

3 For more information on the Jātiviveka and related texts, see O’HANLON & HIDAS & KISS 2015.

4 Riccardo Nobile’s edition and translation of the Jātiviveka (“Jātivivecana,” NOBILE 1910) is rather fragmentary and unreliable. Note also that a great number of passages cited in the Bālambhaṭṭi ((1), pp. 294–305) are closely parallel with the Jātiviveka.

5 In vol. 2, part 1, p. 102.

6 The following conventions for Sanskrit texts are used in this article: em. (X) = emendation (by X), corr. = correction, acorr. = ante correctionem (before correction), pcorr. = post correctionem (after correction), ms(s) = manuscript(s), fol. 2r = folio 2 recto side, fol. 2v = folio 2 verso side, cod. = codicum, ‘≈’ means ‘approximately,’ text in ( ) should be eliminated from the Sanskrit text, ‘(?)’ after a letter or syllable in italics means that its reading is uncertain, text in [ ] is supplied by the editor, text cancelled (e.g. kuhāpohā) was cancelled by the Sanskrit scribe, ‘●’ indicates that the lemma or variant is part of a longer compound or word, ‘•’ separates variants found
śaivāḥ pāṣupatāś caiva tapodharpaparāyanāḥ ।
ārūḍhapatiśās te syuh śūdrapanyāṅganārataḥ ||126||
tebhyas tābhyas ca samjāto bhasmāṅkura iti śmṛtaḥ ।
sa jaṭāhhasmadhārī ca śivalingam prapūjayet ||127||
tāṃbūlam aksatā dravyam gāvah kṣetrāni śākinī ।
śīvāya prāṇibhir dattam anyat kim api bhaktītaḥ ।
candāṃśam tad iti khyātaṁ tena taṣyeha vartanam ||128||
śaivāḥ pāṣupatāś proktāḥ mahāvratadhārās tathā ।
turyāḥ kālāmukhāḥ proktāḥ bhedā ete tapasvināṁ ||129||
ya eva śivadharmāḥ śivabhaktānāṁ tāpasaṇāṁ ta eva bhasmāṅkurāṅām ।
iti bhasmāṅkura gurava ।

Witnesses:
A = BORI no. 233 of the Viśrama (ii) collection, Paraśurāmapratāpa fol. 50v
B = 1638B, Eggeling Catalogue, British Library, Jātiviveka, fol. 13v

126a śaivāḥ | A : śevāḥ B 126b tapo° | A : naro° B • parāyanāḥ ] em. ;
2.126c ārūḍha° | A ; ārodyat° B 126d panyā° | A ;
2.126e panyā° B 127b bhasmāṅkura ] em. ; bhasmāṅkura AB 2.127d śivaliṅgam ] ABcorr ; sī cavaliṅgam Bcorr 128b sākini ] A ; sālini B 128c
prāṇibhir ] A ; pāṃibhir B 128d api ] A ; ami B 128e ; candāṃśaṁ ] B ;
candāṃśa (also Brhadjātiviveka, see n. 9, and Śūdrācāraśiromani, see n. 11) • tad ] A ; tam(?d) B 128d tena ] A ; tene B 129a pāṣupatāś ] A ;
pāṣumatāḥ B 129b ṇhāraś ] B ; carās A 129c turyāḥ ] B ; kuryāt A
129d tapasvinām ] em. ; maniśinah A ; tapaścinā B Prose after 129:
ya eva ... bhasmāṅkurāṅām ] omitted in A • ya eva ] em. ; sa evam (?) B •
dharmāḥ ] em. ; dharmā B • tāpasaṇāṁ ] em. ; tāpasaṁ B • iti
bhasmāṅkura ] B ; nasmaṅkura A • gurava ] em. ; gurucu A ; gurova B

The Śaivas and Pāṣupatas are devoted to asceticism. They fall from their elevated status (i.e., they become outcastes) if they enjoy Śūdra prostitutes. [The offspring] born from them (i.e., from Śaiva/Pāṣupata

in the same pāda, ‘ - - - ’ indicate syllables marked as missing/illegible by the scribe,
IFP = Institut Français de Pondichéry/French Institute of Pondicherry, EFEO = Ecole française d’Extrême-Orient, BORI = Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
males and Śūdra prostitutes) is called a Bhasmāṅkura. He wears twisted locks of hair and [besmears his body with] ashes and worships the śiva-liṅga. People offer betel, unhusked barley-corns, goods, cows, landed properties, lands planted with vegetables, and many other things to Śiva out of devotion. These [offerings] are called Caṇḍa’s share (caṇḍāṃśa).7 He (i.e., the Bhasmāṅkura) makes a living from that in this life. The classes of ascetics are taught to be these: Śaivas, Pāśupatas, the Mahāvratsins, and fourthly the Kālāmukhas. The Bhasmāṅkuras should follow the same Śiva dharmas (regulations/rights/duties) as devotees practising asceticism. This is [the definition of] the Bhasmāṅkura, [also known as] the Gurava.

Just before the Jātiviveka concludes that the Bhasmāṅkura’s duties are the same as those of Śaiva ascetics, in some recensions of the text extensive quotations are inserted from the Śivadharmaśāstra as well as from the Purāṇcaryāṭava on the Śaiva’s rosary, on bathing in ashes, on the worship of ashes, and on the nirvāṇa. The remains of a garland-offering to a deity (see text in Appendix 1). This insertion probably serves to evoke the duties of Śaiva ascetics, from which the duties of the Bhasmāṅkura, in the absence of such prescriptions addressed exclusively to him, are to be deduced.

Later recensions of the Jātiviveka and texts that draw on it, or at least resemble it, contain several variants of the definition found in the Jātiviveka: The Brhadjātiviveka repeats the Jātiviveka’s definition, together with all the quotations from the Śivadharmaśāstra.8 The probably sixteenth-century Śatapraśnkalpatātā gives a prose paraphrase of the Jātiviveka’s definition, omitting the remark on caṇḍāṃsa/caṇḍiśa and emphasising that

7 Note that some mss. read caṇḍiśa for caṇḍāṃśa. In both cases, the Bhasmāṅkura may be associated with, or even represented as, (a human form of) Caṇḍesha, “the consumer of offerings that have been made to Śiva” (GOODALL 2009: 351).

8 The Bhasmāṅkura in the Brhadjātiviveka (fol. 22vff.): śaivā yāḥ pāśupataḥ [corr.; pāśupataḥ cod.] caiva mahāvrataparāś tathā | turyāḥ[ḥ] kalāmukh(y)āḥ pro-kā[ṛ]s] tapo [em.; tavor cod.] dharmaparāyānāḥ [corr.; “parāyānāḥ cod.] svakarma-niratāḥ te syah śūdrapanyakāgaṇa-rātāḥ [corr.; -taḥ cod.] | tebhyaḥ ca tābhyaḥ ca jāto bhasmāṅkura itītiḥ | sa jaṭābhasmadhārī ca śiva-liṅgām prapājyayet | tāmbilam aksata dravyaṃ gāvah kṣetraṇi śākīṇi || śivāya prāṇibhir dattam anyata kim api bhākitaḥ | caṇḍiśaṃ tad iti khyātaṃ tena tasyeṣa jīvanam || dhārayec chivavīrāmyaṃ bhaktiyā lobbhān na dhārayet | bhakṣaṇāṃ narakaṃ gacchet bhūṣaṇā[ḥ] caiva mūḍhādhitāḥ | nandikeśvaras prati śivadharmāme uvāca...
the Bhasmāṅkura collects the highly impure śivanirmālya. The Śūdracāraśiromani does not omit the reference to caṇḍāśalacāṇḍīsa, but it modifies the definition by stating that the mother of a Bhasmāṅkura is a Śūdra wife (śūdrāpatnī), not a prostitute as such. The same is true for the seventeenth-century Śūdrakamalākara. The gloss by Bālambhāṭṭa on the commentary Mitākṣara on the Yājñavalkyasūtra in the eighteenth-century also echoes the Jātiviveka’s definition. Bālambhāṭṭa classifies the Bhasmāṅkura, quite logically, as an Anuloma, or permitted birth, in which the father’s varṇa is higher or equal to that of the mother.

Most of these sources add that a Bhasmāṅkura is called a Gurava in the vernacular, more specifically in Marathi. The etymology of the term


10 Śūdracāraśiromani (16th c., p. 21): saivāḥ pāṣupatāḥ kaścid āryāḥ hāṭam patito yadi | tasmaj jātaḥ śūdrapatiṣṭhāṃ putro bhasmāṅkuraḥ śaptāḥ || śivārcanam tu tatkāryam śivādyena jīvitaṃ | sa jaṭabhāsamadharī ca śivalingaṃ prapūjayet || tāmbūlam aksaṭāḥ dravyā gāvah kṣetṛāni śakinī (śakinī?) || śivāya prāṇibhir dattam anyat kim api bhaktītaḥ || caṇḍāṇaḥ tad iti khyātaṃ tena tasyeha jīvikāḥ |. See Śūdrakamalākara, p. 284.

11 See Śūdrakamalākara.

12 See n. 4 above.

13 This is Bālambhāṭṭa’s gloss on the Mitākṣara (18th c., in: The Sacred Books of the Hindus, Volume XXI, p. 204; note that the remark in brackets in the translation stating that the Bhasmāṅkura is “the priest of a Śiva temple” is not in the Sanskrit text of Bālambhāṭṭa’s gloss.): “(22) Bhasmāṅkura. ‘The Śaivas, and the Pāṣupatas following the path of Yoga, when having attained a certain stage, fall down from it, and connect themselves with Śūdra and other public women, they give rise to children called ‘Bhasmāṅkuras.’ [sic] A Bhasmāṅkura keeps matted hair and besmears the body with ashes and worships the Śivalinga. (He is the priest of the Śiva temple) and maintains himself with the offerings made by the pious to that temple.’ He is an Anuloma and is called Gurava in the Mahārastra language.” Sanskrit text in Bālambhāṭṭi. Book I. p. 297: saivāḥ pāṣupatāḥ kaścid āṣūrāḥ [āryāḥ] patito yadi | tasmaj jātaḥ śūdrapatnāṃ putro bhasmāṅkuraḥ śaptāḥ || śivārcanam tu tatkāryan śivalāyena jīvitaṃ | sa jaṭabhāsamadharī ca śivalingaṃ prapūjayet || tāmbūlam iṣyādyāśvāya antaṃ iti anayatra | ayaṃ anulomoc guruva iti mahāraṣṭrabhāṣayā prasiddhaḥ.
Gurava is unclear. One could suggest that it stands for Sanskrit gaurava, meaning “of the guru,” i.e., “the guru’s son,” but the Guravs/Gurao are also a known jāti in Maharashtra, in parts of Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, and Madhya Pradesh, and some of them insist on gurava being the plural of Sanskrit guru (guravah).\textsuperscript{14} Traditionally, they have been temple priests as well as musicians. They even have their own Jātipūrāṇas, composed at the beginning of the twentieth century, to support their earlier claim to Brahminhood. In one of these modern Jātipūrāṇas, they are identified with the Devalakas, or temple priests, in another one, a lustrous being called Bhāsmāṅkura(!) is born from the earth when the Śuddhaśaivas engage in battle with the god Agni.\textsuperscript{15}

Turning back to the Bhāsmāṅkura, it is easy to see that the term has managed to maintain a blossoming career up to modern times, from a rather low status Devalaka-type figure to a jāti claiming Brahminhood. An examination of the Bhāsmāṅkura as he appears in sources that predate the Jātiviveka, i.e., those prior to the fifteenth century, could broaden our perspective even more. While I have been unable to find any occurrences of Jāṅkura, at least that is what Jāṅkura suggests.\textsuperscript{17} Or do they rather clari-

\textsuperscript{14} See SOUTH ASIAN FOLKLORE: AN ENCYCLOPEDIA, p. 274 (with guru spelt gūrū).
\textsuperscript{16} See SANDERSON 2014: 41.
\textsuperscript{17} Tantrāloka 23.7cd and 9–10: samastaśivaśāstraśrārthaboddhā kāruṇiko guruḥ | 7 | (... paśvatmanā svayambhūṣṇur nādhikārī sa kutracit | bhāsmāṅkuro vṛatisuto duḥśīlātanayaḥ tathā | 9 | kundo golaś ca te duṣṭa uktam devyākhyayāmāle | punarbhūḥ cānyalīgo yāḥ punāḥ śaive pratisṭhitāḥ | 10 | (...). “The guru should be knowledgeable in the meaning of all Śaiva Śāstras and should be compassionate. (…) The Svayambhūṣṇa is nowhere [held to be] entitled [to become an ācārya] because he is a bound soul (paśu). The Bhāsmāṅkura, the son of an ascetic, also the
fy the meaning of Bhasmāṅkura, stating that a Bhasmāṅkura is the son of both a vratin and a woman of ill repute, so the Bhasmāṅkura is the son of a Śaiva ascetic and probably a prostitute, just as the Jātiveka puts it? Jayaratha the commentator remains silent on this matter.

In any case, the Bhasmāṅkura is mentioned here in a list which also contains the Kuṇḍa, “the son of a woman by another man than her husband while the husband is alive,” and the Gola, “a widow’s bastard.” These suggest that the Bhasmāṅkura must indeed be somebody with a problematic origin, resembling the Kuṇḍa and the Gola. Apparently though, for Abhinavagupta this is not problematic to such an extent that it would pose a problem, for he states that no prohibition concerning these categories is taught in the Mālinīvijayottaratantra, the root scripture, and as Jayaratha summarises: “In our religion there is no such rule, except for [the requirement that the guru] must be knowledgeable.” This fits in well with the advaitacāra attitude of non-Saiddhāntika Tantras in general, or to put it very simply, with the notion that one should usually not distinguish between good and bad, pure and impure, high and low.

Naturally, the Śaivasiddhānta’s view is different from that of Abhinavagupta. For example, in the Uttarakāmika a Bhasmāṅkura is not allowed to be consecrated as ācārya, like all others characterised by impure practices, impure bodily and mental features, and problematic origins.

son of a woman of ill repute, the Kuṇḍa and the Gola, they are impure: this is taught in the Devyāyāma. Also the Punarbhū, who was attached to another religion and then returns to Śaivism (…)” (On the Svayambhūṣṇu [a self-appointed guru] and the Punarbhū, see TANTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA III in the entry on punarbhū.)

There is the theoretical possibility the tathā connects bhasmāṅkura with svayambhūṣṇu, as suggested by Judit Törzsök (personal communication).

18 Both in MONIER-WILLIAMS sub vocibus.

19 Tantrāloka 23.11 with Jayaratha’s introduction: asmaddarsane tu jñānavaitvatam antareṇa na kaścid ayaṃ nityaṃ iṣṭaḥ “śrīpūrvaśāstre na tv eṣa nityamāḥ ko ‘pi coditaḥ | yathārthataitvasaṅghajñānāḥ tathā śiṣye prakaśakah |.” “In our religion there is no such rule, except for [the requirement that the guru] must be knowledgeable. This is why the author says: In the root scripture, there is no such prohibition taught. [The guru] knows all the various ontological entities as they really are, and he exposes them to the disciple according to truth.” See also Tantrāloka 23.16c-17b: ato desakulaśārabhaḥsākāsanāpānāṃ || anāḍryaiṣva sampūrnajñānāṃ kuryād gurur gurum |. “Therefore the guru creates an omniscient guru without considering his place of birth, family, conduct, and bodily features.”

20 Uttarakāmika 24.12-14 (before the 12th c., see SANDERSON 2009: 279, n. 663;
Since the *Dīkṣādarśa* cites the *Kāmika* (see Appendix 2), initially the instructions here are similar to the ones above. However, when it subsequently cites the *Cintyaviśva*, it also provides further details (see verse 9 and the following). The text states that *gurus* are essentially defined by their being guardians of good conduct (*ācāra*). Those who fall from good conduct (*ācārāntu paribhraṣṭās*) should be avoided and ignored, just as one abandons a broken stone *liṅga*. The offspring born as a result of a broken religious observance is called a Bhasmāṅkura, and he should not be allowed to grant initiation or to consecrate *liṅgas*. His offspring is named Antara, and the Antara’s offspring in turn is termed Kauśika. A transcript of a manuscript of the *Jñānaratnāvali* reads *bhagāṅkura* instead of *bhasmāṅkura*, but it helps in understanding the previous passage, the one in the *Dīkṣādarśa*. Here the Bhasmāṅkura’s offspring is called Kandhaka, whose offspring is named Kogika. The same text also refers to the Bhasmāṅkura with the synonym *bhasmaprarohā* in a citation of the beginning of the fourth *pariccheda* of Brahmaśambhu’s unpublished *Naimittikakriyānu- sandhāna*, completed in the tenth century. The context here is categories of people that are unqualified for *abhiṣeka*, and again, the Bhasmāṅkura/Bhasmaprarohā is mentioned next to the *Kuṇḍa*, the *Golaka*, and a certain

---

"...abhaṣṣyabhāṣṣakaṃ caiva kuṇḍaṃ bhasmāṅkuraṃ tathā..." (Ācāryābhiṣeka, p. 1297: abhaṣṣyabhāṣṣakaṃ caiva kuṇḍaṃ bhasmāṅkuraṃ tathā | khaṭvāṅgiśyāmadantau cāpy āraudham putitaṃ tu vā [12] alasaṃ vr̥salam caivam vr̥tyam vaiśāyatim (vesyā-?) tathā | asacchāstraśr̥taṃ [em.: -chastra- cod.] kli̊baṃ vyādhitam kunakhaṃ tathā [13] ātha vyasaninam pāradārikaṃ vr̥sālipatiṃ | ci̊trakam gāyakaṃ caiva nartakaṃ ca vivarjayet [14]. “He should not allow these to be consecrated as ācāryas: anybody who consumes things that are forbidden, the son of a woman by another man than her husband while the husband is alive, the Bhasmāṅkura, one with a khaṭvāṅga (perhaps emend to khalvā- (“bald”), see commentary by Jayaratha ad *Tanṭraloka* 23.12, who cites *Svachchandatantra* 1:24ab: kā́no vidveṣajaranānaḥ khalvātuś cārthanānaḥ), one with blackened teeth, one who has fallen from his elevated status [i.e., an outcaste], who is lazy, a Śūdra, a Vṛṣya, a harlots’s husband[?], the composers of heretic texts, an unmanly person, anyone who is ill or has ugly nails, anybody with addictions, who is with somebody else’s wife or is the husband of a Śūdra woman, a painter, a singer, or a dancer.”


22 I am grateful to Prof. Alexis Sanders for this reference and for sending me the e-text of this passage in the Naimittikakriyānusandhāna edited by him, together with additional pieces of information (personal communication, August 18, 2015).
Katthaka/Kanthaka. The *Somāsambhupaddhativyākhyā* echoes the *Jñānaratnāvalī*’s definition of the Bhasmāṅkura, and connects the Bhasmāṅkura with a certain *bhasmaprada*, which is most probably corrupted from *bhagnavrata.* Note also the variants of names here for the offspring: Kalara and Kuśika. The *(Pratiśṭhā)*lakṣaṇa(sāra)*samuccaya*, which may have been composed in the tenth century, after giving definitions for the Śvayambhū, the Punarbhū, and the Gola, defines the Bhasmāṅkura as follows (chapter 2, Ācāryādiparīkṣā, variants omitted here):

\[\text{ācāryadharmapatiṁṣu yo jātah sa guroḥ suta[h]} |\]
\[\text{prāvrājayān naśyate pūrvaṁ strīyogād aparāṇaḥ tathā [99]} |\]
\[\text{ubhābhyyāṁ yah pranaṣṭaḥ syāt tasyāpyataś tu katthakah} |\]
\[\text{trikarnoṭṭhāḥ trikarnaḥ ca trikapāṇātmakarnakāḥ[h] [?] [100]} |\]
\[\text{niḥyanaimittikāṅgantugurudevāṅgnyāpyājanāt} |\]
\[\text{bhasmāṅkurasa tu katthothhas}^{26} |\]
\[\text{tatsuāḥ kauśikādayaḥ [101]} |\]
\[\text{bhajakā vratiputraś ca kauśikānyāś ca kutsitāḥ} |\]

The one who is born from the ācārya’s faithful wife is the guru’s son. [If] he first abandons his asceticism and [then sins] by union with a woman: the offspring of one who fails in both [matters] will be called a Katthaka. Those born from the Trikarṇas and the Trikarṇas are *trikapāṇātmakarnakas*[, because they do not worship the guru, the devas, and the fire during the daily, occasional, and optional [rituals]. Now, the Bhasmāṅkura is born from the Katthaka. His offspring are the Kauśika etc. The Bhojakas, the sons of ascetics, the Kauśikas, and others are contemptible.\(^{25}\)

This passage is problematic. For example, the Trikarṇa is a category obscure to me, but what seems to be taught here is that the *guru*’s illegitimate

\(^{23}\) *Jñānaratnāvalī* (p. 407–408): *avikhaṇḍitacāritaḥ na punarbhū [em.; pu-

\(^{24}\) *Somāsambhupaddhativyākhyā* (p. 190): *tāvat te guravo jīyeṇāḥ yāvad ācāra-

\(^{25}\) According to Sanderson 2014: 28.

\(^{26}\) *katthothhas* corr.; *sthas* cod.

\(^{27}\) The translation of this passage, especially of the second sentence, is tentative.
son is called Katthaka, and the Bhasmāṅkura is the Katthaka’s son. This is slightly different from what we see in other sources. Note also that there seems to be another reference to Caṇḍeśa in the following passage:

\[
\text{rāṣṭrakṣayakarā hy ete ye ca pāśāndino}^{28} \text{ ṇarāḥ ||102||}
\text{samayādi(ṁ) vinā mūḍhah sthāpanaṁ kurte tu yah |}
\text{śāstrāvilokanād}^{29} \text{ eva caṇḍeśas tasya śāsakaḥ ||103||}
\text{yo ‘śaiваḥ sthāpayed īṣaṁ lobhavyāmūḍhamānasah |}
\text{sa yāti narakam sadyo yājnikaiḥ saha dāiśikaiḥ ||104||}
\]

These and the heretics are the destroyers of the kingdom. A fool who would perform without [conforming to] the appropriate rules etc. will be chastised by Caṇḍeśa, because he has neglected the Śāstric prescriptions.\text{30} If a non-Śaiva teacher, his mind confused by greed, installs Śiva’s image, he will go to hell immediately together with the sacrificers.

Finally, the Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhate mentions the Bhasmāṅkura in a puzzling manner (or simply in a corrupted form): it mentions the term in the dual when stating that the Bhasmāṅkura should be excluded from rituals. He is defined here as the offspring of some body whose observance (vrata) has been ruined, or broken, and thus is fallen, or an outcaste (patita).\text{31}

As regards the names of the Bhasmāṅkura’s offspring (and in the case of the (Pratiṣṭhā)lakṣaṇa(sāra)samuccaya also that of his father), it seems certain that we are dealing with a fixed pair of terms modified by textual corruption and/or local variants. One appellation emerges from Kanthaka/Kandhaka/Kandhana/Katthaka/Kalara/Antara, the other from Kauśi-

\[\text{28 pāśāndino] corr.: paśāndino cod.}\]
\[\text{29 śāstrāvilokanād] em. Törzsök; śāstrāvalokanād cod.}\]
\[\text{30 I am indebted to Judit Törzsök for the emendation in the Sanskrit of this sentence and for its translation.}\]
\[\text{31 Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati, after 3.11.10, on who cannot be a guru: atra yo-gaśivapaddhatau […] kāverikōkkanodbhūtā ninditaḥ svayamā̄n śmrtaḥ | kaṇḍādaśaś ca}
\text{rogaśaśa nindyāḥ syur desajā api || bhraṣṭavratāś ca patitād utpanno yo narādhamaḥ |}
\text{bhasmāṅkuraḥvayau[?] tvājau ninditaḥ sarvakarmasau. “gurus born near the River}
\text{Kāveri and in the Koṇḍa area are prohibited. The Koṇḍa etc. and those who are ill}
\text{are prohibited even if they were born in proper places. The vile man, who is born [from}
\text{a man whose] vow has been broken [and is thus] an outcaste, is a Bhasmāṅkura and is}
\text{to be excluded, and he is to be prohibited from [performing] any rituals.”}\]
ka/Kuśika/Kogika. It is safe to say that of these Kanthaka (perhaps from "kanthā, “a rag, patched garment [especially one worn by certain ascetics]")\textsuperscript{32} and Kuśika are the most probably correct Sanskrit forms. Regarding the exact meaning of the term bhasmāṅkura, one may suppose that its meaning is “a sprout grown from ashes,” i.e., an offspring of an ascetic who uses ashes during his observances, typically a Pāṣupata or Śaiva ascetic, and who should be non-reproductive, dry as ashes, so to say, but from whom new life has now been produced. More specifically, the ashes here may refer to a Śaiva ascetic’s ash-bed,\textsuperscript{33} where the Bhasmāṅkura is conceived. To demonstrate that modern researchers are not always familiar with the connotations of the term bhasmāṅkura, we can refer to Gnoli’s Italian translation of this passage from the Tantrāloka.\textsuperscript{34} He translates bhasmāṅkura as “somebody who besmears his hair with ashes.” In fact, Monier-Williams’ Sanskrit-English Dictionary gives the secondary meaning “hair” for the word aṅkura. This may have been the reason for understanding bhasma-aṅkura as “ash-hair” or “hair with ashes.” To refute this interpretation, we can remark that it would be odd for any Śaiva text to say that those who use ashes in their daily rituals, a common practice among Śaivas, should be excluded from the office of ācārya.

As we have seen above, the descriptions of the Bhasmāṅkura point in the same direction but are richly varied. The original concept and some descriptions of the Bhasmāṅkura are possibly based on earlier models. One such model is the Brahmanical Avakīrṇin, a sannyāsin who has broken his brahmācārya vow.\textsuperscript{35} In the Yājñavalkyasūtra (chapter 3, verses 320–321), for example,\textsuperscript{36} the Avakīrṇin occurs in a list of categories unfit for śrāddha rituals, a list that is reminiscent of those containing the Bhasmāṅkura found in the Śaiva Paddhatis and in Jātiviveka texts:

\textsuperscript{32}Monier-Williams s.v. I am grateful to Prof. Alexis Sanderson for this suggestion.
\textsuperscript{33}I am grateful to Prof. Alexis Sanderson for this suggestion.
\textsuperscript{34}Gnoli’s translation of Tantrāloka 23.8cd-9 (Gnoli 1999: 474, emphasis mine): “[Riprovati come maestri in talune scritture] sono anche coloro che portino i capelli sparsi di cenere, che siano figli di asceti, figli di donne di facili costumi, figli adulterini e di vedove. Secondo il Devyāyāmalatantra, riprovati sono anche coloro che, dopo aver portato segni settari, hanno sì aderito alla doctrina di Śiva, ma debbono [per il loro passato] nascere un’altra volta.”
\textsuperscript{35}See Yājñavalkyasūtra 3.280ab: avakīrṇi bhaved gatvā brahmacārī tu yosītam. (“The Brahmacārīn becomes an Avakīrṇin if he approaches a woman [sexually].”)
\textsuperscript{36}See also, e.g., Āśvalāyanaśrūtasūtra 12.8.25.
Of these categories, the following terms occur in the Śaiva passages quoted in this article: rogin//rogārta/vyādāta, kāṇa, paunarbhava/punarbhava/punarbhū (albeit in different senses), kuṇḍa, gola, kunkhī/kunkhā, śyāvadantaka/śyāmadantaka, kliṅga, vrṣal/vrṣāli. Note especially that the Bhasmāṅkura is usually placed next to the Kuṇḍa and the Gola in lists of this kind, as is the Avakīrṇa here. The main difference between the two categories is of course that the Bhasmāṅkura is the offspring of somebody who has broken a vow, while the Avakīrṇa is one who has broken his own vow.

As regards later occurrences of the term and later models, the Bhasmāṅkura seems to be a Śaiva version of the Brahmanical Dola, which is defined thus, e.g., in Jātiviveka 2.184:

> vipraḥ svīkṛtya samnyāsam ārūḍhapatito bhavet
> brāhmaṇīṃ kāmayed rauḍām tasyām ca janayet sutam
> sa dolaḥ karmacāṇḍālo 'syā sparśat pātakaṃ mahat


If a Brāhmaṇa who has entered upon a life of renunciation falls from his elevated status and has sex with a Brāhmaṇa widow and begets a son, this [son] will be a Dola, a Cāṇḍāla by deed. It is highly sinful to touch such a person.

Although the circumstances of the conception of the Bhasmāṅkura and the Dola are similar, there is one significant difference in their descriptions in the Jātiviveka: the Bhasmāṅkura is not condemned as harshly as the Dola. By this time, the Bhasmāṅkura may have reached a status somewhat above that of a karmacāṇḍāla (see below). Alternatively, the author Gopīnātha’s
Śaiva affiliation may have caused him to tone down his description of the Bhasmāṅkura. Further, in texts of the Ājītviveka genre, the Bhasmāṅkura also seems to represent a variant of the Devalaka, the temple priest (unfit for śrāddha and sacrifice, see, e.g., Manu 3.152) who subsists on the offerings made to an idol, as noted above.

But the main question remains: to what extent can we suppose that the definitions found in the Ājītviveka and related texts are applicable to Śaiva texts, such as the Śaivāntika Paddhati or the Devyāyāmala cited in the Tantrāloka? The main difference between the two kinds of definitions concerns the Bhasmāṅkura’s association with the temple. We have no Śaiva reports on the Bhasmāṅkura as someone who lives on offerings made to an image in a temple, like a Śaiva Devalaka does, something that is confirmed, or at least suggested, by all Ājītviveka sources. Thus, there must have been a process in the course of which the Bhasmāṅkura, first only a category excluded from certain offices and rituals, was transformed into a Śaiva temple priest. But when was the category of the Bhasmāṅkura first associated with the Gurav jāti? Was it around or before the time of the composition of the Ājītviveka, i.e., the fifteenth century? Or is it a later interpretation inserted into that text? Several eleventh-century Old Kanarese inscriptions that are mentioned by LORENZEN (1991: 115) seem to refer to Goravas, who are said to have been the supervisors of temples. Were these Goravas really “Śaiva mendicants”? Do they have anything to do with Bhasmāṅkuras?

And how real, or how theoretical, is this category as it appears in the earlier sources, before it is associated with a well-defined jāti with its own rights and duties? There is no reason to suppose that Śaiva ascetics never

---

38 On Devalakas not being condemned in some communities, see SANDERSON 2009: 277.
40 See EPGRAPHIA INDICA XV, pp. 85–94 (goravar in line 49, verse 14 on p. 90) and also ibid. p. 156: “Goraga […] is the Telugu form of the Kanarese gorava, which according to Kittel means a Śaiva mendicant. It is now obsolete in Telugu. In the inscription [the Bezwada Pillar Inscription of Yuddhamalla] it is used in the sense of a Śaiva devotee or teacher.” N. 1 (ibid.) mentions “erotic goravas” in the “Yēwūr inscription of A.D. 1077” (EPGRAPHIA INDICA XII, p. 290, from the translation of the inscription: “Whether it be the head of the establishment, or the Gorava, or such as are under the rules of this establishment; if there should be a man who lusts for venery in this establishment, the establishment and the king must expel him.”).
broke their *brahmacarya* vows, never visited Śūdra women or prostitutes, and never begot illegitimate children, so it must have been a real-life issue.\(^{41}\) (The Bhasmāṅkura might also originally have something to do with offspring produced as a result of Tantric sexual rituals,\(^{42}\) in which case there are no broken vows.) Also, the fact that the social status of a category of man is repeatedly discussed, with an emphasis on the fact that this category is denied certain rights, may suggest that we are not dealing with theoretical possibilities here. In fact, it may seem that prohibitions concerning groups of people could sometimes tell us more about what exactly happened in the past than prescriptive passages do when they tell us what should be done. The fact that the Bhasmāṅkura became a distinct category (probably long before Abhinavagupta’s time) indicates that sons born from Śaiva ascetics were not an isolated and negligible phenomenon, and they posed a problem for the Śaiva socio-ritual world.

Another question could be raised about the extent to which the term was widespread. The oddities in the Sanskrit texts – the dual in the *Īśānaśiva-gurudevapaddhati*, the corruption of the term itself elsewhere, and the various obscurities – could be just the usual errors introduced randomly by scribes, or they could indicate that even the redactors sometimes had little idea what a Bhasmāṅkura was. Jayaratha’s silence on the matter is again inconclusive, but it might be indicative: either he considered the Bhasmāṅkura sufficiently well-known to not comment on it, or he was himself unfamiliar with it. We are also left wondering when the Bhasmāṅkura ceased to be a well-known category.

Moreover, one would suppose that the Bhasmāṅkura may have posed less of a problem for non-Saiddhāntika sources than for the Siddhānta. Non-Saiddhāntika traditions “have shown themselves much less willing to tolerate such compromises [concerning peoples’ origins and caste than the Siddhānta], seeing them as a contamination of the true Śaiva tradition […]” (Sanderson 2009: 292). Most of our available Śaiva sources for the Bhasmāṅkura are Saiddhāntika, and we have seen that all of our sources, apart from the *Tantrāloka*, condemn the Bhasmāṅkura. Even our only non-Saiddhāntika scriptural source, the lost *Devyāyāmala*, which is cited by Abhinavagupta and was probably a Vidyāpīṭha/Trika text,\(^{43}\) treats the

\(^{41}\) See Kane vol. 2.2: 952 on *sannyāsins* having wives and concubines.

\(^{42}\) Such as described, e.g., in *Brahmayāmala* 45, see Kiss 2015.

Bhasmāṅkura as problematic. Is Abhinavagupta’s approach to categories such as the Bhasmāṅkura filled with idealisation or exaggeration? Were Bhasmāṅkuras ever really consecrated as ācāryas in non-Saiddhāntika communities?

And what is the exact problem with a Bhasmāṅkura in Śaiva texts that prohibits him to become an ācārya? Some sources, such as the Dīkṣādarśa, state that only those that belong to the four varṇas, plus the offspring of the six Anuloma unions in which the father’s varṇa is higher or equal to that of the mother, can be consecrated as ācāryas. Theoretically, the child of a Śaiva ascetic and a Śūdra woman, even a prostitute, is very likely to be an Anuloma offspring, as Bālambhaṭṭa rightly tells us.\(^44\) However, if the Bhasmāṅkura’s father is supposed to be an ascetic, then his son is certainly the result of a sin, and this fact that the ascetic has broken a vow is relevant here. The issue is not primarily a problem of caste/jāti that concerns possible combinations of mother and father, but rather a question of sinful conceptions. One’s sin makes one a karmacāṇḍāla, someone who would not be a cāṇḍāla, an outcaste, normally, but whom some sinful deed, some adharmic karma makes one. So it may be only secondarily, by his father sinking to the status of a special kind of cāṇḍāla, before the birth of his son, that the Bhasmāṅkura can be denied the office of ācārya. This is exactly what we see in the case of the Dola, a category which strikingly resembles the Bhasmāṅkura (see above, p. 94). This fact that the Bhasmāṅkura has neither truly condemnable caste-affiliations nor repulsive personal features may have acted as an important factor in his later rise to a higher status. It is also interesting to note that our texts never dwell on the impurity of the Bhasmāṅkura’s mother. On the contrary, it is always the breaking of a vow by the father that is emphasised. One reservation concerning the Bhasmāṅkura could have been that he may inherit his father’s lack of discipline, but more importantly, we may see in the rejection of the Bhasmāṅkura a hint at the office of ācārya being hereditary. The existence of an illegitimate son may have caused tension when the retiring ācārya chose his successor.\(^45\) Prohibitions that stop a supposedly Brahmacārin ācārya of a matha to consecrate his son as his successor may well have been needed to maintain the integrity of the institution.

\(^{44}\) See p. 89 above.

\(^{45}\) On hereditary rights of a priestly community and gurus choosing their successors, see SANDERSON 2009: 255 and 279.
There could be many more questions raised, and there could hopefully be many more passages collected and edited concerning this exciting figure of the Bhasmāṅkura to see more clearly in these matters. His association with Čaṇḍesa is especially intriguing. What seems to be certain at this point is that the Bhasmāṅkura is the product of the Śaiva Age. It seems to be an original Śaiva category, based on earlier models of sinning ascetics, reflecting socio-ritual problems that were a result of Śaiva practices. It adds to our understanding as to what extent caste boundaries and problematic births were ignored in Śaiva ritual practice, and by doing so, it allows us to peek into the past and see a glimpse of real-life issues in mediaeval India, ones that usually remain obscured by our prescriptive texts.

Appendix 1

The Jātiveka in the Paraśurāmapratāpa (sixteenth century?, fol. 50rff.) quoting the Śivadharmaśāstra (diplomatic transcription):

```
 rudrākṣa kaṇkaṇa haste syāj jatāikātha mastake |
  lingaṁ śivāśramam sthanāṁ bhasmasnāmaṁ trisamdhyakaṁ |\n kāmrte mūrdhni pavitre vā rudrāksān dhārayet tataḥ |
  āgamoddhistasamkhyaṁkān rudralokam sa gacchati |
 rudrabhaktaiḥ širasy ekā dhāryā rudrajatā sthirā |
 dhvaṁsinī sarvaduḥkhānāṁ tayā rudratvam āpnyāt |\n kṣitena bhasmanā kuryāt trisāmyaṁ yas tripūrdrikaṃ |
  sarvapāpinirmuktaḥ śivaloke mahīyate |\n mūrdhni haste śārire ca dhṛtvā rudrākṣamālikā |\n yas tu bhūjīta tadbhaktaiḥ sa rudro nātra saṁsāyah |\n rudrākṣadhāraṇaṁ yasmā nityāṁ loke pavitraṁ |
  sarvaropagrasamanāṁ sarvakleśavināśanāṁ |
  sarvatirtheṣu yat punyam sarvayaśīṣu yat phalam |\n```

\[46\] ≃ Śivadharmaśāstra 11.18 (pp. 129ff): rudrākṣaṁ kaṇkaṇaṁ haste gale caiva hi mastake | lingaṁ śivāśramasthanāṁ bhasmasnāṁ ca tripūrtrakam |. 
\[47\] ≃ Śivadharmaśāstra 11.43c-44b: dhvaṁsanaṁ sarvaduḥkhānaṁ rudratvam samavāpnyāt | kṣitena bhasmanā kuryāt trisāmyaṁ yas tripūrtrakam |. 
\[48\] ≃ Śivadharmaśāstra 11.44cd. 
\[49\] ≃ Śivadharmaśāstra 12.91cd: mūrdhni hastopavite vā kṛtvā rudrākṣamālikā |. 
\[50\] ≃ Śivadharmaśāstra 12.92: yas ca bhūjīta bhasmānīgī rudrair bhuktan na saṁsāyah | rudrākṣadhāraṇaṁ tasmān nityām eva praśāryate |.
tat phalaṁ labhaṁ sarvaṁ bhasmasnānāṁ na samśayāḥ

bhasmasnānāṁ paramāṁ snānaṁ pavitraṁ naiva vidyate[52]

itya uktā munidevebhyaḥ snātō devaḥ svayaṁ śivah[53]

tatāḥ prabhṛti brahmādyā munayaś ca śivārthinaḥ[53]

sarvpavrasu yat tena bhasmasnānāṁ pracakriye[54]

duṣṭa[ḥ] śilamukto vā yo pāpāpy upalaksitaḥ[54]

bhūtiśāsanasyayogāt sa pūjyo nātra samśayāḥ[54]

na go brāhmaṇaḥ bhasmaṁ līṅga chāyām padā sprṣṭet[55]

na lamghayeta nirmāṇyam apsu tiṣṭhen na nagnakaḥ[56]

dhārayec chivanimāṇyam bhaktāyā lobhān na dhārayet[57]

bhakṣāṇāṁ naraṁ gacchet bhūṣaṇaḥ caiva múḍhadaṁ[57]

na tatra sthānapūjācāṁ pratigrhṇāti śaṅkaraḥ[57]

yatā naivedyanirmāṇyam malaṁ dhṛk pūjaye ca chivam[58]

asamsprṣyo bhavet so 'pi yas tasyāṁ gamalaṁ sprṣṭet[59]

tasmān nāṁ samsprṣel līṅgaṁ naro nirmālayaṁśaōśitaḥ[60]

yatā naivedyanirmāṇyam samkīrṇa kalasāṁ śubhāṁ[61]

snāṇāyam kriyate bhaktāyā na tad grhnāti śaṅkaraḥ[61]

rudrākṣāṁ kaṇṭhadeśe daśanaparimitāṁ mastake viṁśati dve

ṣat śat karnapradēṣe karayugaḷagātāṁ dvādaśa dvādaśaiva[62]

bāhvarv inḍoḥ kalāṇi prthag iti ganiṁḥ ekam ekam sikhāyāṁ

vākṣasya āṣṭāḥdhikā yaḥ kalayati śataśam sa(h) svayaṁ rudra eva[62]

---

[51] Śivadharmaśāstra 11.50.
[52] = Śivadharmaśāstra 11.52: bhasmasnānāṁ paramāṁ snānaṁ pavitraṁ naiva vidyate[52]
[53] = Śivadharmaśāstra 11.53: brahmādyāṣ ca tadārābhyā munayaś ca śivā-

ṛthinaḥ[53]
[54] = Śivadharmaśāstra 11.55: duṣṭa[ḥ] śilamukto vā yo vā ko vāpy alakṣanāḥ[54]

bhūtir śaśaya sanyogāt sampūjāyā rājaputrayat[54]
[55] = Śivadharmaśāstra 12.11cd: na gobrāhmaṇabhāsmagānīliṅgacchāyān na

lamghayet[55]
[56] = Śivadharmaśāstra 12.12: na lamghayeta nirmāṇyam apsu bhūmuṇaiveśayer[56]

dhārayec chivanimāṇyam bhaktāyā lobhān na dhārayet[56]
[57] = Śivadharmaśāstra 12.13: bhakṣāṇāṁ naraṁ gacchet tadvilaṁghī ca

mūḍhadaṁ[57]
[58] = Śivadharmaśāstra 12.14ab: - - naivedyanirmāṇyam mardayam pūjaye ca chivam[58]
[59] = Śivadharmaśāstra 12.15ab: asamsprṣyo bhavet so 'pi yathāvāṃgalasprṣī[59]
[60] = Śivadharmaśāstra 12.15cd: tasmān na samsprṣel līṅgaṁ naro nirmālayaṁśaōśitaḥ[60]
[61] = Śivadharmaśāstra 12.16: - - - vedyanirmāṇyam samkīrṇaṁ kalaśādibhiḥ[61]

snānaṁ tu kriyate bhaktāyā na tadgrhnāti śaṅkaraḥ[61].
Appendix 2

Dīkṣādarśa (of Vedājñānaśivācārya, sixteenth century, compare with Uttarakāmika 24.12–14, see n. 20, verse numbering mine):

[varjyagurulakṣaṇavidhiḥ]

(...)

iṣvāraḥ kāmike |
kāmikādīśivajñānam vedārthajñānam eva ca |
saman yo manyate mohāta tam prayatnena varjayaḥ ||4||
deveyajñānam tathāmbāṣṭham ūḥāpohavivarjitaḥ |
samanagotrasambandhaṁ kusumākṣaṁ ca varjayaḥ ||5||
parivettā parivittā ca devalaṁ ca punābhavam |
abhakṣyabhakṣanāṁ caiva kundaṁ bhasmāṁkuraṁ tathā ||6||
khāṭvāṅgamaṁ adantāṁ ca ārūḍhapatitam tu vā |
alasam praksāalanāṁ [vṛṣaṁ?] caiva prāśyaṁ [vṛāyaṁ?] veśyāpātīṁ tathā ||7||
asacchāḥstraparam klībaṁ śaktiṁ sutakaṁ tathā |
asat[tha?] vyasaninam pāradārikam vṛṣalīpatiṁ |
citrakaṁ gāyakaṁ caiva nartakaṁ ca vivarjayaḥ ||8||
(...)
cintyaviśve |
tāvat te guravo jñeyā yāvad ācārāpālaṁkhā |
ācārāṁ tu paribhraṣṭāṁ tuṇḍyāṁ tu bhagnalīṅgavat ||12||
bhagnavratat samudbhūto yo 'sau bhasmāṁkuraṁ smṛtaḥ |
tajjātaṁ antaraṁ jñeyāṁ tajjāṭāṁ kausikāṁ smṛtaḥ ||13||
dīkṣāthāpanayaṁ ete samātyāyāṁ bhūbhāṁkṣibhiḥ |
etalḥ pratiṣṭhitaṁ liṅgam bhūkthemuktyor asādhanam ||14||
evamāḍigunair yukto na pāyo hi mahītaṁ |
asyaivācāryanāmatvam abhiṣekam na kāreyat ||15||
pramaṇād abhiṣekam tu kṛtam ced doṣabhāk bhavet |

\[\text{62} \approx \text{Puraścaryārṇava 6.232 (part II, p. 438): tantrāntare } \text{rūdrākṣaṁ kaṇṭhadase} \\
\text{daśanaparimitaṁ mastaka viṁśati deve śat saṭ kaṁnaprādase karayugalakṛte } \text{bābhvar} \\
\text{indōḥ kalābhir nayanayugakte caikam ekam śikhāyāṁ vākṣasya aśṭāhakam yaḥ} \\
\text{kalayati śatakram sa svayam niṁkanṭhah ||}
\[\text{63} \text{Perhaps emend to khalvāya- ("bald"), see commentary by Jayaratha ad } \\
\text{Tantrakāloka 23.12.}\]
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Renegotiating ritual identities:
Blurred boundaries between Pāñcarātra ritual communities in South India

Robert Leach

“In medieval India,” writes GRANOFF (2000: 399), “rituals often served as identifying markers that divided one religious community from another.” By adopting or rejecting a certain ritual or class of rituals, religious communities could define themselves in particular ways, and by placing limits on the authority to perform certain rituals or by introducing ideas of correct ritual performance, other communities could be differentiated and excluded (ibid.). In medieval Tantric Śaiva traditions, as Alexis Sanderson has shown in a number of publications, strategies for inclusion and exclusion often materialised in the form of hierarchies, both of particular rituals and of the practitioners who were qualified to perform them. Tantric Vaiṣṇava traditions used similar classificatory methods. As Granoff goes on to explore, participation in the same rituals could, by the same token, effect a transcendence of sectarian boundaries or a blurring of distinctions between communities. In the event of different communities practising the same rituals, those committed to preserving sectarian boundaries were forced to maintain that the important distinctions lay elsewhere, for example in the supra-ritual identity of one community of practitioners or in the particular

---

1 This article was written with the generous support of the Swiss National Science Foundation and the Institute of Asian and Oriental Studies, University of Zurich. I am very grateful to both. My sincere thanks also to Nina Mirnig, Marion Rastelli, and Vincent Eltschinger for their valuable comments and corrections, and to Angelika Malinar for her numerous helpful suggestions. Any errors are my own.

2 My thanks to Angelika Malinar for drawing my attention to this article.

(i.e. different) mental attitude they adopt. The results of the present study may suggest, however, that such identity markers were less effective than ritual.

Numerous textual sources attest to the fact that in South India in the early centuries of the second millennium of the Common Era (CE) there were a number of distinct sub-traditions within the tradition of Tantric Vaiṣṇavism called “Pāñcarātra.”4 In the South Indian Pāñcarātra literature itself, the number of these sub-traditions is most commonly given as four, and these are usually named as the Āgasiddhānta, the Mantrasiddhānta, the Tantrasiddhānta, and the Tantrāntarasiddhānta.5 We also find this fourfold division in the Pāñcarātraraksā (“Defence of the Pāñcarātra”) by the fourteenth-century Viṣiṣṭātvaavedānta author Viśiṣṭa-Viśaṅga, whom I shall refer to henceforth as Vedāntadeśika, the honorific by which he is now more commonly known.6 Of the published Pāñcarātra Saṃhitās at our disposal, none, as far as I am aware, affiliate themselves with the Tantrasiddhānta or the Tantrāntarasiddhānta, though in his Pāñcarātraraksā (pp. 30,18–31,6) Vedāntadeśika reports that the Śrīkarasamhitā, an apparently lost scriptural work, aligns itself with the latter. Several extant South Indian Pāñcarātra texts, or portions thereof, do however associate themselves with either the Āgasiddhānta or the Mantrasiddhānta,7 and it appears, on the basis of these texts, as well as Yāmuna’s Āgama-prāmāṇya8 (“The Va-

4 In what follows, I refer to the tradition as “Pāñcarātra” unless I am referring to a particular text or passage which uses the earlier designation (“Pañcarātra”), since by the time of the composition of the (post-Yāmuna) South Indian Saṃhitās, which form the principal subject matter of this article, the former name, literally meaning “pertaining to” or “belonging to” the Pañcarātra and previously used to denote the followers of the tradition (see, e.g. Kumārila’s Tantravārttika on sūtra 1.3.4 and Bhaṭṭa Rāmakarṇa’s NPP 87.22ff.), had become the standard name for the tradition itself.

5 For a discussion of these classifications and a list of the Pāñcarātra texts in which they appear, see RASTELLI 2006: 185–251 and LEACH 2014. The term siddhānta, ordinarily meaning an established conclusion or doctrine, is best understood here as, in RASTELLI’s (2006: 185) words, “eine Lehre und die damit verbundene Tradition, die sich vor allem auf die religiöse Praxis bezieht” (a teaching and the tradition bound to it, which refers above all to the religious practice). The Saṃhitās provide their own explanations of the term (see RASTELLI 2006: 185–186).

6 On the four Pāñcarātra Siddhāntas in the Pāñcarātraraksā, see LEACH 2012.

7 For instance, the PārS (e.g. at 19.522ff.) associates itself with the Āgasiddhānta, while the PādS (1.1.86cd), the BhT (22.88, 24.17–50), the ŚrīprS (16.31c–34), and the MārksS (1.26ab) associate themselves with the Mantrasiddhānta.

8 Although he does not name either the Āgasiddhānta or the Mantrasiddhānta, Yāmuna clearly distinguishes between two (unnamed) Pañcarātra traditions: one
lidity of the Authoritative Texts [of the Pañcarātra]”) and the aforementioned Pañcarātrarākṣa, that these were the two most prominent Pañcarātra traditions in South India between roughly the twelfth and the fourteenth centuries.9 The textual evidence suggests that there were also two principal Pañcarātra traditions in North India in earlier centuries.10

whose followers belong, by way of their family lineage, to the Vājasaneyna branch of the Yajurveda, who perform their life-cycle rites in accordance with the domestic ritual manuals of Kātyāyana and so on (yaḥ ete vamśaparamparayā vājasa-neyasākḥāṃ adhīyānāh kātyāyanādīghyoktamārgena garbhādhānādīsamaskārāṇa kurvate, ĀP 169.5–6); and one whose followers have abandoned the religious duties of the triple Veda (“from the recitation of the Sāvitrī [mantra] onwards”) and who perform the 40 life-cycle rites enjoined only by the Ekāyana Śruti (yaḥ punah sāvitrī- anuvacanaprabhūtīdyāharmayaagenaśāṇyanaśruti-vihūtān eva catvāriṁśat sam-skārāṇa kurvate, ĀP 169.7–8). As will become evident below, the latter group are clearly followers of what is elsewhere (most likely later) called the Āgamasiddhānta. I provisionally accept YOUNG’s (2007: 237) estimate for the lifetime of Yāmuna as ca. 1050–1125 CE, with the Āgama-prāmāṇya being written “in the late eleventh or early twelfth century” (ibid.: 260).

9 It should be pointed out that these two traditions are not always called “Āgamasiddhānta” and “Mantrasiddhānta.” For instance, in perhaps the earliest extant classification of the four aforementioned Pañcarātra sub-traditions, contained in the Pauṣṇa (38.293c–294c), the Āgamasiddhānta is called simply “Siddhānta” (see RASTELLI 2006: 197). Meanwhile, in his NyPR (p. 477), section 3.2, Vedāntadeśika calls the Mantrasiddhānta the “Divyasiddhānta,” and in his PRR (p. 30,18) he reports that the Śrīkaraśaṃhitā calls the Āgamasiddhānta the “Vedasiddhānta.”

10 See, for instance, Ratnakara’s Haravijaya (ca. 830 CE), which distinguishes (at 47.55–56) between the Ekāyanas and the followers of the teaching (śāsana) of Saṃkaraṇa, and Bhāṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha’s Nareśvaraparikṣāprakāśa (ca. 950–1000 CE) which distinguishes between the Saṃhitāpāñcarātras and the Saṅka-ṛṣaṇa-pāñcarātras. Sanderson, who has drawn attention to both of these passages, thinks it very likely that these two works refer to the same groups – in other words, that the Saṃhitāpāñcarātras are the Ekāyanas (SANDERSON 2009: 108). The two groups differ from each other, according to Rāmakaṇṭha, in their views on the embodied self (jīva). On the one hand, the Saṅkarṣaṇa-pāñcarātras say that consciousness is merely a product of (the mental faculties comprising) the “internal organ” (antarbhaka- ranacaitanikāḥ, NPP 87.22). On the other hand, the Saṃhitāpāñcarātras, along with the “knowers of the Upaniṣads” who subscribe to the theory of the transformation of the original cause, say the following: “Embodied selves are truly distinct [from the mental faculties comprising the internal organ], but they are non-pervasive (i.e., atomic), and they originate from the imperishable supreme cause, which is either the referent of the word brahman [for the knowers of the Upaniṣads] or is called Nārāyaṇa [for the Saṃhitāpāñcarātras]. Like a pot, for example, [originates from
In this article, I argue that the available textual sources convey important information concerning the relations between the Āgama and the Mantra Siddhāntas and the apparent blurring of certain distinctions between these two traditions in consequence of the circumstances in which Āgamasiddhāntins found themselves in South India in the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries. In the first part of the article, I briefly describe certain aspects of the socio-religious context within which the Āgamasiddhānta and its adherents, the Āgamasiddhāntins or Ekāyanas, and the Mantrasiddhānta and its adherents, the Mantrasiddhāntins, existed in South India during the period in question. In the second part, I discuss the fact that by the end of this period, probably subsequent to the career of Vedāntadeśika, the Āgamasiddhānta appears to have ceased to exist as a separate tradition within the Pāñcarātra. Thereafter, I address several passages in scriptural works and in the Pāñcarātrarākṣā, which may provide clues as to why this happened and as to what became of the Āgamasiddhāntins or Ekāyanas.

As RASTELLI (2006: 185ff.) has shown, the textual evidence indicates that, for at least part of the period between the twelfth and the fourteenth centuries, the Āgamasiddhānta and the Mantrasiddhānta were in competition with each other for the control of Pāñcarātra temples and the right to perform rituals for fee-paying clients. An apparent outcome of this rivalry, which is recorded in several scriptural works as we will see below, was that Āgamasiddhāntin authors on occasion condemned or disparaged certain practices of the Mantrasiddhānta, at least partly, no doubt, as a means of asserting their own superiority over that tradition. In a similar manner, Mantrasiddhāntins presented their own tradition as the superior one, and this involved claiming, for instance, that Āgamasiddhāntins do not belong clay and will eventually dissolve back into it, so the independent natures [of embodied selves] originate from and [will eventually] dissolve back into their own cause” (parinātivedāntavidhyāṃ samhitāpāñcarātrīś caḥuh satyaṃ bhinnā eva jivātmān, te tu paramakāraṇād anasvarād brahmaṇadavācyād avyāpakā eva ghajādivat sva-kāraṇalayasvabhāvāvām copadyantā iti, NPP 91.18ff.).

11 In keeping with this attitude, ekāyana was understood by South Indian Ekāyanas of this period to mean “the only way.” See PārS 1.57c–58b (→ IŚ 1.19): mokṣāyanāya vai panthā etadanyo na vidyate | tasmād ekāyano nāma pravadanti maniśinah |. “There is no way other than this for going to liberation; therefore, the wise say that [this] is called Ekāyana (i.e. ‘the only way’).” Cf. the following excerpt from a version of the Puruṣasūkta contained in the Taittirīya recension of the Black Yajurveda and quoted by Rāmānuja in his Śrībhāṣya (on śūtra 2.2.35): nānyah panthā ayanāya vidyate (excerpt from Taittirīyāranyaka 3.12.7).
to a Brahmanical kinship group (gotra)\textsuperscript{12} and are not qualified to use Vedic mantras\textsuperscript{13} or to perform certain rites, including the investiture of God’s icon with the sacred thread (pavitrāropana), the rites relating to the construction of temples (karsanādi), and the installation of divine images therein (pratīṣṭhā).\textsuperscript{14} The Pādmasaṃhitā,\textsuperscript{15} a South Indian Pāncarātra scriptural work which affiliates itself with the Mantrasiddhānta, declares that an Āgamasiddhāntin should ask a Brahmin who has been initiated into the Mantrasiddhānta to perform these latter rites on his behalf.\textsuperscript{16} The Āgamasiddhāntin author/s of the slightly later Pārmeśvarasamhitā counter several of these claims by enjoining adherents of the Āgamasiddhānta to perform precisely these actions.\textsuperscript{17} The discord between these two Pāncarātra Siddhāntas during this period is conveyed well by the fact that in their texts the same reparative rites are prescribed for mixing ritual injunctions from separate Pāncarātra Siddhāntas as for mixing ritual injunctions from separate ritual and doctrinal systems (tantra), whether the latter be Vaikhāna or Pāśupata according to the Pārmeśvarasamhitā (19.520, 549). Indeed, the Pādmasaṃhitā (4.19.125ff.) explicitly states the equivalence between the mixing or confusing of Pāncarātra sub-traditions (siddhāntasaṅkara) and the mixing or confusing of the Pāncarātra with other religious systems (tantrasaṅkara).

At least in normative terms, then, the divide between Siddhāntas is radically more pronounced than the distinctions found in apparently earlier classifications of different types of Pāncarātra devotees, such as the distinction between those “with desires” (sakāma) and those “without desires”

\begin{itemize}
\item[12] See e.g. PādS 4.21.41ab.
\item[14] See e.g. PādS 4.21.33–35b, 43–46.
\item[15] As is the case with much of the anonymous Pāncarātra literature, it is extremely difficult to establish the date of the composition of the Pādmasaṃhitā. RASTELLI (2003) argues that it can be determined only in relation to other Saṃhitās and places the bulk of its composition between that of the Paramasaṃhitā, from which it borrows, and that of the Pārmeśvarasamhitā. Her suggestion that it is subsequent to the Ahirbudhīnayasamhitā as well as to the lifetime of Rāmānuja would most likely place it towards the end of the twelfth century, or shortly thereafter.
\item[16] PādS 4.21.45: yāceta mantrasiddhānte dīkṣitaṁ viprasattamam | pūjārtham ātmātmam bimbapratishṭhākaraṇadīṣu (corr., karanādiṣu ed.) ||. For a fuller discussion of this and aforementioned passages in the Pādmasaṃhitā, see RASTELLI 2006: 198–216.
\item[17] For instance, the claim that Āgamasiddhāntins are not qualified to perform the rites involved in the construction of temples and the installation of images of God is countered at PārS 15.14c–20 (on which see RASTELLI 2006: 203).
\end{itemize}
(akāma, niṣkāma) which we find in the Pauṣkarasamhitā and the Sātvatasaṃhitā. Although the Sātvatasaṃhitā reports, for example, that devotees with desires and those without desires perform divergent rites on different days of the month during the yearlong vow (vrat) to worship the four differentiated forms of God (vyūha) (SS 7.37ff.), and that they recite the Heart Mantra with different endings (SS 19.84c–85) etc., there is no indication of any rivalry between these different types of worshippers, or indeed any sign that such worshippers organised themselves into groups. In fact, the Pauṣkarasamhitā even claims that once devotees with desires, or those who seek “enjoyments” (bhoga), are satiated by such pleasures, they practice “disengagement” (nivṛtti), which means that they renounce their desires.18 This implies, if we are to take it literally, that a worshipper may go from being sakāma to being niṣkāma purely according to his own inclinations. As we will see below, this is not the case with regard to membership of a Siddhānta.

According to scriptural testimony, as with the sakāma and niṣkāma worshippers, members of each of the four Pāñcarātra Siddhāntas could belong to any of the four social classes (vāna). The four Siddhāntas are differentiated from each other in a variety of ways, including the different principal deity or deities worshipped and the different mantras used, though many of the accounts we have of these matters contain conflicting information, with “insider” and “outsider” descriptions of a particular Siddhānta only occasionally in agreement with one another.20 One distinguishing feature between the Āgama and the Mantra Siddhāntas which is reported in several Mantrasiddhānta sources and does not appear to be contradicted by any Āgamasiddhānta account (see RASTELLI 2006: 193–195) is that the Āgamasiddhānta cannot be joined via a ritual of initiation (dikṣā).21 Rather, there are a number of textual clues, including those found

18 PauS 19.51–52b: pravrtyti ca nivrtyti ca karma caitad dvidalh 'bjaja | jayanti bhogaikarat pravrtytena tu karna| || partipuś tu sambhogair nivrtyenācaranti ca |.

“And action, this is twofold, O Lotus-born: engagement with worldly activities and disengagement from worldly activities. Those intent upon enjoyments only, they acquire [those], to be sure, by means of engaged action. But those satiated by [such] enjoyments, they proceed with disengaged [action].”

19 See e.g. PādS 4.21.37–73b on the Āgama, Tantra, and Tantrāntara Siddhāntas, and 3.1.15c–17b and 4.2.61c–64 on the Mantrasiddhānta.

20 In the cases of the Tantra and the Tantrāntara Siddhāntas, as already mentioned, we have no insider accounts.

21 See e.g. PādS 4.21.53 (→ BhT 24.25): na dikṣā naiva dehasya dahanādi-
in several passages which I address below, which indicate that the Āgamasiddhānta is accessible only by birth. To my knowledge, the earliest reference to the idea that one is born an Ekāyana is found in the so-called Samvitprakāśa by the Kashmirian author Vāmanadatta. In the closing verses of each chapter (prakaraṇa) of this work, the author claims that he is a Brahmin “born into the Ekāyana.”

Another of the distinctions between the Āgamasiddhānta and the Mantrasiddhānta which appears to have been uncontroversial is the fact that in South India in this period the adherents of the former tradition claimed to base their teachings on a certain Ekāyanaveda, an apparently mythical urtext which Āgamasiddhāntins declared both antecedent to and superior to the Vedas, for which reasons they call it the “original” or “principal” Veda (mūlaveda). In reality, this Ekāyanaveda, the earliest clear references to which occur only in the Āgama-prāmāṇya (in the form of ekāyanāsruti, ĀP 169.7, 170.4), may have been represented by the three scriptural works which were, from around the fourteenth century (Leach 2014), called the “three jewels” of the Pāñcarātra scriptural canon, namely the Jayākhyasamhitā, the Pauṣkarasamhitā, and the Sātvatasamhitā. This much, at least, has been hinted at in the Śrīprasnasamhitā, one of the

viśodhanam | nāṅganyāśāḥ sakalam neṣṭam ekāyanādhvani ||. “Neither initiation, nor indeed the purification of the body through [visualising it as] burning etc., nor the assignation etc. [of mantras to the various] parts of the body – none of this is desirable according to the way of the Ekāyanas.”

22 However, see PādS 4.2154ab (↔ BhT 24.26ab), which speaks of “those familiar with the threefold knowledge (i.e. the three Vedas)” (traividya) who have “entered into the Ekāyana.” As Rastelli (2006: 195) points out, this must apply only to those traividyas who do not already belong to another Pāñcarātra Siddhānta, since at PādS 4.21.74–75b it is said that should a man abandon one Siddhānta and enter another, he is guilty of committing an offence (kilbiṣin).

23 Samvitprakāśa 1.137c–138b reads: ekāyane prasūtasya kaśmīreṣu dvijātmanaḥ || kṣir vāmanadattasya seyaṃ bhagavadāśrayāḥ ||. “Depending on the Lord, this is a work of Vāmanadatta, a Brahmin born in Kashmir into the Ekāyana [lineage].” Cf. verses 2.61, 3.60, 4.98, and 5.52 from later chapters. On the title of the Samvitprakāśa, see Sanderson 2009.

24 There is, however, a possible allusion to the Ekāyanaveda in a North Indian work, namely Bhaṭṭa Jayanta’s Āgamousambhara (composed between 883–902 CE). Here, the character known as Dhairyarāsi refers to “the designation ‘Veda’ that people apply to the texts (vacana) of the Pāñcarātra” (see Dezső 2005: 237). The earliest reference to an actual “Ekāyanaveda” may be that found in the PādS (4.1.3) or in the opening chapter of the Pārś (1.32, 56).
later scriptural works which possibly postdates Vedāntadeśika, as well as by the nineteenth-century Śrīvaishṇava scholar Alasiṅgabhaṭṭa who, in his Sātvatārthaprakāśikā, a commentary on the Īśvarasamhitā, claims that these three works constitute the “sūtras” of the “original Veda.”

In contrast to the Āgamasiddhāntins or Ekāyanas, Mantrasiddhāntins claimed to belong to a Vedic school which was widely recognised as such, namely the Vājasaneyasaśākha. In his Āgamaprāmāṇya, Yāmuna distinguishes several times between the Ekāyana and the Vājasaneyya or “Vājasaneyaka” schools (śākha) and their respective followers within the Pañcarātra, while the later Pādmasamhitā, in its account of the origin of the Mantrasiddhānta (at 4.21.2ff.), places this tradition firmly within that of the White Yajurveda by claiming that the Mantrasiddhānta’s first initiates were 8,000 seers (ṛṣi) belonging to the Kānya and Mādhayandina recensions (i.e., of the Vājasaneyasamhitā). Once they had been initiated, we are told, these seers were instructed to recite the “Kāṇṭi” and “Mādhayandī” recensions, and to accompany their performance of Vedic rituals such as somayāga with visualisation (dhyāna) and worship of Viṣṇu (bhagavat, PāḍS 4.21.9–11b). A few verses later, the author of this section of the Pādmasamhitā asserts that Mantrasiddhāntins “should meditate on” or “should visualise” (dhyāvyełyuh) and honour Vāsudeva’s image (bera) with Vedic mantras (trayīmantra, PāḍS 4.21.28c–29). The Pādmasamhitā presents this amalgamation of Pañcarātra Viṣṇu-worship and Vedic ritual as indicative of the Mantrasiddhānta, and a later scriptural work which borrows from the Pādmasamhitā and which affiliates itself with the same Siddhānta, namely the Bhārgavatantra, calls Mantrasiddhāntins “mixed” (miṣra) as opposed to “pure” (śuddha) Vaiṣṇavas (the latter being the Āgamasiddhāntins), apparently for this reason.

25 See ŚrīprśŚ 49.471c–473, wherein the Jayākhyasamhitā, Sātvatasamhitā, and Pauṣkarasamhitā are presented as offering different versions of the Mūlaveda, tailored to suit the varying abilities of students. See also the Adhikāh Pāṭhaḥ section of the JS (1–12b), wherein the “three jewels” are presented as constituting a single teaching (ekāṣāstra).

26 SāPr on IS 1.64–67: idām sāvata paūṣkarajayākhyatantratrayam mūlavedasya sūrārūpam.

27 See ĀP 140.5–7, 141.8–10, and 169.5–8.


29 See BhT 24.17–18 and the discussion in RASTELLI 2006: 223. The mixed Vaiṣṇavas are described here as “learned in the three Vedas” (trāvidūra), while the “pure” Vaiṣṇavas follow the Ekāyanaveda. COLAS (1990: 26) reports that the Vaikhānasa work Kriyādhikāra, which was composed around the time of Yāmuna
In spite of their differences and the apparent enmity which led followers of both Siddhāntas to criticise and subordinate the other, several Pāñcarātra works enjoin coparticipation in temple rituals between Ekāyanas and other Pāñcarātrikas, including those who, like the Mantrasiddhāntins, are described as having expertise in the Vedas. For instance, in the final two chapters of the Sātvatasamhitā, which are likely a later addition to this text (LEACH 2012: 144–146), four Ekāyanas are named among the professional assistants to the officiating temple priest (guru) – they are called the “guardians of the image” (mūrtipa) – in a sequence of rites relating to the construction of a temple (SS 24.282–433) and the subsequent installation and worship of an image of Viṣṇu (SS 25.39–260b). These Ekāyanas, who are to be seated by the guru in the four cardinal directions (SS 24.310cd) at the fire sacrifice during the installation of the pots, are identified as Brahmins (vipra, e.g. SS 25.118d), and they receive instructions from the officiating priest together with the other professional assistants (SS 25.106ab), who are also identified as Brahmins and who are said to be experts in one or another of the four Vedas (e.g., SS 24.291a, 25.157ab). These latter assistants are evidently also Pāñcarātrikas, and indeed they are explicitly identified as such for they are called bhagavanmaya (“consisting of the Lord,” SS 24.288b, 326b), which is a common way of referring to Pāñcarātrikas both in the Sātvatasamhitā and in other scriptural works. It is notable that throughout the installation rites the Ekāyanas are instructed to recite not only Pāñcarātra mantras but also Vedic ones (e.g. at SS

(COLAS 2011), also divides the Pāñcarātra into miśra and śuddha sub-groups, and that according to the Yajñādhikāra, another Vaikhānasa work from the same period, the latter does not conform to Vedic norms (vedamāryādā).

See e.g. PādS 4.21.14–15. It appears that in this period the label “Bhāgavata” was associated especially with Mantrasiddhāntins (see also PauṣS 38.41c–42). However, Ekāyanas also used the term in reference to their own tradition (e.g. PārS 1.177–78).

See e.g. PādS 1.191cd: “This Tantra is rooted in Śruti and is an authority like the Kalpaśūtras” (śrutimālam idam tantram pramāṇam kalpaśūravat). This verse is also found in the Viṣ (8.5ab) as well as in the later MārkS (1.38ab) and ŚrīpurS (1.26cd).

See e.g. SS 6.74cd, 7.107c–109b, and 22.46. Elsewhere, see e.g. JS 16.7–9, 18.6 and PauṣS 27.207cd, 32.88–89.
and that they are enjoined to recite the latter together with the specialists in the relevant Veda from among the other Pāncarātrikas. This prescription for the Ekāyanas to recite Vedic mantras is, of course, at odds with the aforementioned claim in the Pādmasāṁhitā that Ekāyanas are not permitted to use Vedic mantras.

Chapter 42 of the Pauṣkarasāṁhitā presents a similar scenario to that given in the Sātvatasāṁhitā. Here it is said, for instance, that during the offering of whole grain barley (sāksata) and sesame seeds into the sacrificial fire, which forms part of the sequence of rites in establishing the foundations of a temple, the Ekāyana Brahmins (vipra) are to be seated in the cardinal directions (prāgāda) and the Pāncarātrikas with expertise in the Vedas are to be seated in the ordinal directions (“from northeast to northwest,” īśād vāyupathāvadhī) (PauṣŚ 42.31–32).

These sections of the Sātvatasāṁhitā and the Pauṣkarasāṁhitā are written in the optative mood, and should accordingly be interpreted as offering prescriptive rather than descriptive accounts of the rituals in question. However, as far as I am aware, there is little reason to doubt that these rituals were performed approximately according to instruction, albeit via the mediation of the officiating priest or preceptor who is the addressee of the injunctions. The Īśvarasāṁhitā, which postdates the Pārameśvarasāṁhitā, informs us that (at the time of its composition, probably in the thirteenth or fourteenth century) Hari is worshipped according to the dictates of the Sātvatasāṁhitā in Yādavācala (Melkote or Melukote in modern-day Karnataka) and the Pauṣkarasāṁhitā in Śrīraṅgam, and the slightly later Adhikaḥ Pāṭhaḥ section of the Jayākhyasāṁhitā corroborates these claims. It is also noteworthy that the majority of these sections of the Sātvatasāṁhitā and the Pauṣkarasāṁhitā were incorporated into one or both

---

33 These are listed by HIKITA 2005.
34 See also PauṣŚ 42.122c–126, where the Ekāyana Brahmins are seated together with the experts in the Śāma śeda “on the west side facing east” (prānnukhāma paścime bhāge) of the sacrificial hall (yāgāra).
35 The bulk of the Pāncarātra Śaṁhitās have the function of manuals which are intended to guide the preceptor (usually ācārya or guru, less commonly deśika) through the officiation of rituals. As far as the other participants in the ritual are concerned, it is the preceptor rather than the text which acts as the guide. See LEACH 2012: 21–24.
36 See IS 1.67: etattantratrayokyotena vidhīna yādavācāla | śrīraṅge hastiśaile ca kramāt sampāyate harīḥ || and the Adhikaḥ Pāṭhaḥ of the JS 12c–13b: sātvataṃ yaduṣailendre śrīraṅge pauṣkarāṃ tathā || hastiśaile jayākhyāṃ ca sāmrājyaṃ adhitīṣṭha ṭi. Yaduṣaila is another name for Yādavācala or Melkote.
of the *Pārameśvarasamhitā* and the *Īśvarasamhitā*, and that these texts were also used in, respectively, Śrīraṅgam and Melkote.37 Moreover, although the epigraphical record from Śrīraṅgam is silent on the issue, the *Pāremeśvarasamhitā* provides testimony that a community of Ekāyanas was active in Śrīraṅgam, and participated in temple rituals there, at around the same time that Rāmānuja supposedly held the position of temple manager (*śrīkārya*) at the Raṅganāthasvāmin Temple (RASTELLI 2006: 243–244).38 Neither Rāmānuja nor his predecessor Yāmuna, who himself includes the Ekāyanas among the Pāncarātrikā Bhāgavatas defended by him in the Āgama-prāmāṇya, were themselves Ekāyanas. Such considerations further indicate that there existed, at the least, a degree of cooperation between Ekāyanas and other Pāncarātrikas who, like Yāmuna (see NEEVEL 1977: 35–36), performed or supported the performance of a combination (or “mixing”) of Pāncarātra and Vedic rituals. This cooperative ethos also extended to the production of scriptural texts, with Āgamasiddhāntin authors borrowing from works composed by Mantrasiddhāntins and vice versa.39

As well as textual borrowings, there are also signs of mutual influence between the two Siddhāntas, especially with regard to the classification of Pāncarātra scriptures (LEACH 2014). Presumably the Ekāyana claim that the Ekāyanaveda is unauthored (or, literally, that it does “not derive from a [human or divine] person,” *apauruṣeya*) is an instance of the Ekāyanas

---

37 For the parts of chapters 24–25 of the SS incorporated into the *Pāremeśvarasamhitā*, see RASTELLI 2006: 577–578; for the parts incorporated into the *Īśvarasamhitā*, see LEACH 2012: 143, n. 241. Chapter 42 of the PauṣŚ contains parallel verses with the *Pāremeśvarasamhitā* (see RASTELLI 2006: 574) and the *Īśvarasamhitā*. In the latter case, these include PauṣŚ 42.18c–71 → IS 16.29c–82; PauṣŚ 42.115–117 → IS 14.58–60; PauṣŚ 42.121–123b → IS 18.45c–47; PauṣŚ 123c–126b → IS 11.102c–105b. That the *Pāremeśvarasamhitā* was used in Śrīraṅgam and the *Īśvarasamhitā* in Melkote (Yādavādri) is attested in the Adhikāh Pāṭhah of the JS 13c–14b: *pādmatranāṃ hastiśailē śrīraṅge pāremeśvaram īśvaram yādavādruva ca kāryakāri pracrāyate*. The Adhikāh Pāṭhah is datable to the fourteenth century (SOUNDARA RAJAN 1981: 27). In addition, the *Pāremeśvarasamhitā* contains, in its tenth chapter (vv. 108ff.), a panegyric to the Raṅganāthasvāmin Temple in Śrīraṅgam, while IS 20.118ff. is written in praise of Melkote (Yādavācala or Yādavagiri).

38 This is further corroborated by the later Kōyiloḷu (see HARI RAO 1961: 45ff.), the Tamil “chronicle” or “record” of the Raṅganāthasvāmin temple, though this is, in itself, hardly a reliable source (ORR 1995).

39 For instance, the Āgamasiddhāntin *Pāremeśvarasamhitā* borrows from the Mantrasiddhāntin *Pāḍmasamhitā* (see RASTELLI 2006: 570–571). On Mantrasiddhāntins borrowing from Āgamasiddhāntins, see LEACH 2014.
having been influenced by the ideas of thinkers, such as Yāmuna, who were rooted in the tradition of Vedānta and venerated the Veda alongside the Pāñcarātra ritual texts.\textsuperscript{40} However, in general the Ekāyanaveda is presented in contradistinction to the Veda. For example, in contrast to the exoteric Vedas which enjoin the worship of multiple deities for various mundane and heavenly rewards, the Ekāyanaveda is said by Ēkāyanas to belong to a secret tradition (rahasyāmnāya) whose members worship only Vāsudeva, especially in his fourfold form (cāturāmya), and who pursue a single goal, namely liberation (mokṣa) from the realm of rebirth.\textsuperscript{41} On account of their monotheism and their pursuit of liberation to the exclusion of all other goals, the South Indian Ēkāyanas often called themselves “Ēkāntins,” after the paradigmatic liberation-seeking worshippers of Nārāyaṇa as depicted in the Nārāyaṇīya section of the Mahābhārata.\textsuperscript{42}

Monotheism and the pursuit of liberation alone are also, according to Ēkāyanas, the principal characteristics which set the adherents of the Āgamasiddhānta apart from those of the other Pāñcarātra Siddhāntas, though Mantrasiddhāntin authors disputed this by claiming that their own tradition also worships Vāsudeva alone and pursues liberation to the exclusion of all other rewards.\textsuperscript{43} According to the Ēkāyanas, not only does their monotheism and their recognition of liberation as the single goal set them apart from other Pāñcarātraitikas, these characteristics also mark them out as superior. This attitude is exemplified in several passages in the Pauṣkarasamhitā. Modern scholars have commonly assigned a relatively early date and a North Indian provenance to this work, but as I have argued elsewhere (Leach 2012), there are numerous indications that significant portions of the extant Pauṣkarasamhitā were composed and added to the text in South India. At least some of these interpolations appear to have been authored by Ēkāyanas (ibid.). Among such passages, we encounter several descriptions both of the Ēkāyanas and of other Pāñcarātraitikas. While the former are variously presented as Ēkāntins (e.g., PauṣS 36.261a), as devotees without

\textsuperscript{40} See Yāmuna’s claim that the authorlessness (apauruseyatvā) of the Ēkāyana recension (ekāyanaśākhā) is “treated at length” in the Kāśmirāgamaprāmāṇya (ĀP 170.7–9). For the Ēkāyana claim that the Ekāyanaveda is unauthored, see e.g. PārS 19.523–525b (→ĪŚ 21.561b–563) and ŚrīprŚ 2.38–41.

\textsuperscript{41} See e.g. PārS 1.16c–19b, 32c–34, 74c–75; 10.145–146.

\textsuperscript{42} On the figure of the Ēkāntin in the Nārāyaṇīya and in later Pāñcarātra literature, see Leach 2012: 177ff.

\textsuperscript{43} See e.g. PādS 4.21.11c–12, 25 and the discussion in Rastelli 2006: 230.
desires (akāma, PauṣS 31.203cd), as those who do not desire the fruits of worship (aphalārthīn, PauṣS 31.286ab), and as those who worship no other God (ananyayājīn, PauṣS 27.710c), other Pāñcarātrikas are presented as “mixed worshippers” (or worshippers that mix together their rituals, vyāmiśrayājīn, e.g. PauṣS 36.79) who desire mundane and heavenly rewards, and who worship gods other than Viṣṇu, including his subordinate deities (gaṇa), as a means to achieving these. Such worshippers, we are told in the Pauṣkarasamhitā, attain lesser rewards than the Ekāyanas: “[Rituals] such as the sacrifice are known to grant only meagre fruits to worshippers with desires, even if they grant heaven.” The worshippers without desires, meanwhile, are granted the world of Acyuta (acyutaloka, PauṣS 31.203cd) and are united in the supreme self (PauṣS 31.227cd). Earlier in the same chapter, we are told that the approach to worship characteristic of the “mixed worshippers” is forbidden by God: “The omniscient abiding in the heart does not permit [worship that is performed with] desire. One who grants heaven to his devotees even when it is not asked for – what is it that is not given by him? Therefore, one should abandon requests!” The following passage from the Pauṣkarasamhitā articulates what appears to be a representative Ekāyana attitude:

Knowing thus [i.e., that Puruṣottama is the “inner ruler” (antarīyāmin) of all gods], one should certainly never perform mixed devotion. (259) Indeed one who desires the supreme goal must avoid [that] with every effort. Those Brahmins that are called Ekāyanas are truly devotees of Acyuta. (260) They who worship Viṣṇu as a duty [that is] without fruit, worshipping no other [God], are Ekāntins who [will] exist in their true state after death. (261) [In other words,] at death they attain the state of Vāsudeva, O Lotus-born! And the other...
ers are mixed worshippers – they are, however, considered to be false devotees. (262) Those Brahmins are [easily] recognised on account of their worshipping the subordinate deities in various different ways.  

In the remainder of this article, I address the apparent disappearance of the Āgamasiddhānta as a separate tradition within the Pāñcarātra by focusing on several textual passages from the Pāñcarātra Saṁhitās and from Vedāntadeśika’s Pāñcarātrarākasā, which may partly explain the manner of this disappearance and provide us with clues as to why it happened. In an earlier article (LEACH 2014), I have given a fuller account of the reasons we have for supposing that the Āgamasiddhānta ceased to exist as a distinct tradition within the Pāñcarātra, and in the following I begin with a summary of that account.

As is demonstrated in a number of works including the Āgama-prāmāṇya, the Pādmasaṁhitā, and the Pārāmeśvarasaṁhitā, the idea of the Ekāyanaveda and the name “Ekāyana” were, for a certain period of time, probably during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, indubitably linked with one Pāñcarātra tradition in particular, namely that which called itself, according to certain sources, the Āgamasiddhānta. However, in several of the later scriptural works, we find the term ekāyana being used by non-Āgamasiddhānta authors to refer to the Pāñcarātra and its adherents in general. Among such works we can count the Śrīprāśnasamhitā (e.g. at 2.38ff. and 16.20, 31c–34) and the Śrīpuruṣottamasamhitā (1.12) (LEACH 2014). This apparent extension of the semantic scope of the term ekāyana, which can be found already in a passage in the PādS (4.13.66c–72b) and which probably represents, rather, a reversion to an older use of the term, coincides with an increasing tendency among the later Saṁhitās to present the Pāñcarātra as a single, integrated system with an extensive scriptural canon. In the majority of these later works, no mention is made of the distinct Pāñcarātra Siddhāntas (ibid.). As mentioned above, Ekāyana Pāñcarātrikas appear to have been responsible for the authorship of the Pārāmeśvarasaṁhitā, and for parts of the Pauṣkarasaṁhitā and the Sāt-

---

47 PauS 36.259c–263b: jānauvāṃ bhaktisāṅkaryṇaḥ na kuryāḥ evam eva hi || 259 varjanīyaḥ prayatnena ya icchēd uttamām gatim | viprā ekāyanaḥkhyā yey te bhaktāḥ tattvato 'cyute || 260 ekāntinah sutattvasthā dehāntāṁ nānayośyānāh | kartavyatvam ye viṣṇum saṁyajanti phalam vinā || 261 prāpnuvante ca dehānte vāsudevatvam abhyaja | vyāmśrayajinaḥ cānaye bhaktābhāsāś tu te smṛtyāḥ || 262 parijñeyās tu te viprā nānāmārgapāḍārcanāt |
vatasamhitā. Judging by the extant Pāñcarātra scriptural corpus, the Āgamasiddhānta was not nearly as textually prolific as the Mantrasiddhānta, and we can assume on the basis of their relatively small literary output and the fact that we have little evidence for their existence outside of Śrīraṅgam that the Ekāyanas very probably represented a minority within the South Indian Pāñcarātra. While there is good reason to believe that a community of Ekāyanas still existed in Śrīraṅgam in the fourteenth century, when Vedāntadeśika authored the Pāñcarātraraksā, there is no obvious indication that any of the Saṃhitās which probably postdate Vedāntadeśika were authored by Ekāyanas (ibid., LEACH 2012). Thus, it appears that the culture of rivalry between the Āgamasiddhānta and the Mantrasiddhānta subsided and was replaced by one in which non-Āgamasiddhānta Pāñcarātrikas represented the Pāñcarātra as a single and cohesive system.

In an effort to determine why such changes may have taken place, I will begin by addressing several short passages from the Pauṣkaraśamhitā which I believe to have been authored by Ekāyanas:

Listen! I will explain the foundation provided by fruits, roots, and [other] foods, for those who desire the fruits [of worship, phalārthiṇ]. In the three worlds there is no gift better than the gift of food. (143) It immediately gives pleasure [and] is appetising and restorative to beings. Even at the stage of preparation [and] dressing the tastiness of food is well-known! (144) [All] living beings come into being from food. From that everything is founded, and by one who has dedicated that, by him everything is founded. (145) As long as he lives in this world [and] in the heavenly world called Brahma[loka], he [who dedicates food] may live without sickness and pain. (146) By means of [donating] food, he reaches lasting prosperity, with sons, wives, and wealth. He receives the greatest, supreme honour from eminent persons. (147) The gods, seers, and perfected beings always consider carefully the highest welfare for him, together with increased longevity. (148) Thus, being joyful and well-nourished, he is ever-satisfied. Enjoying numerous pleasures, at death he goes to the abode of Nārāyaṇa (149) by means of moon-like chariots made by the gods. Abiding in all worlds, beginning with heaven, for many hundreds of Kalpas, (150) in the course of time he comes here again, to a supremely auspicious place. Achieving a birth in a respectable family, the most excellent birth, (151) he is born with handsome form, eloquent, devoted to learning and knowledge.
Evermore beloved, he is revered by all, even his enemies. (152) Possessed of good character, might, constancy, and strength, a donor is always best among Brahmins, intent upon the welfare of beings. (153) He is an Ekāntin, a knower of dharma, wholly devoted to Nārāyaṇa. Thoroughly enjoying the group of three (i.e. the three puruṣārthas), possessed of the desired qualities, (154) repeatedly performing meritorious actions of endless qualities through [numerous] lifetimes, knowledge is reached, by which he advances to the supreme abode.48

There is little doubt that this passage has been inserted into the Pauṣka-rasamhitā, for the redactor responsible has made no effort to disguise the fact – the next verses follow on from those which precede this excerpt.49 My reason for proposing that this passage has been authored by a self-identifying Ekāṇya is that the donor (dātr) is promised a rebirth as an Ekāntin (I suggest that Ekāntin is to be understood synonymously with Ekāṇya here, as it is elsewhere in this text),50 a reward which is hardly likely to have been offered by a non-Ekāṇya Pāñcarātraika, for whom the initiation rite (dīkṣā) establishes the candidate’s eligibility to be liberated

48 PauṣS 41.143–155: phalamālāṇānapratiṣṭhām śṛṣṭa vaksya phalārthinām | nāmadānā pariṇām dānam triṣu lokesu vidyate || 143 sadyahprītikaraṁ hṛdaya prāṇadām prāṇinām api | utpattāv api samskāre rasam annasya kṛttam || 144 annād bhavanti bhūtāni tasmat sarvaṁ pratiṣṭhitam | tāc ca pratiṣṭhitam yena tena sarvaṁ pratiṣṭhitam || 145 āmanā saha loke śmin svarloke brahmasaṃjñīte | yāvav jīvaṁ ca nīrogo vased duḥkhavivarjitaḥ || 146 putradāradhanair annair vṛddhiṁ yāti kṣaṇāḥ kṣaṇāḥ | prā phụnot pariṇāmāṁ pūjāṁ uktreṣṭeḥyō mahattarāṁ || 147 devātī rṣayaḥ siddhāḥ tasya samcintayanti ca || nityam eva pariṇām vṛddhiṁ āyuṣaḥ saha connatām || 148 hṛṣṭāḥ puṭus tato bhūtāḥ trptāḥ bhavati sarvadāḥ | bhaktvā bhogān savipulāṇe ane nārāyaṇālayam || 149 yāti candrapracitkāsair viṁśaṁnair devanirmitaṁ || svargādu sarvaloke tu sthitā kalpaśatān bahūn || 150 kālā api pariṇāmāṁ deśe sarvottamāṁ subhe || satāṁ kule samāśaṅgā janaṁ jārayuitamāṁ mahat || 151 jāyate rūpaṁ vāgmi vidyājñānaparāṣayaṁ || dvīsātam api sarvesvaṁ pūjāṁ priyataraṁ sadā || 152 śilāvān sauraśaṃpamno dhṛtyutsahasmanvitah || dvījadevaparo niyāmāṁ dātāḥ bhūkhatē ratāḥ || 153 ekāntiṁ dharmavetāṁ vai nārāyaṇaparāḥ || trīvargaṁ akhiśaṁ bhaktvā yathābhimataklāśayā || 154 *jannabhāyas (corr., jannābhyaś ed.) taṁ sūbhāṁ karmā kṛtvānantaṃ punaḥ || jīnānāṁ āśāyate yena pravātī pariṇāmām padam || 155.

49 The preceding section (PauṣS 41.98–142) is concerned with the establishment (pratiṣṭhāpana) of the stepwell (vāpī), vertical well (kūpa), tank (tātāka), and pleasure garden (ārāma), and the following verse (PauṣS 41.156) returns to this theme.

50 See e.g. PauṣS 32.72cd. See also 36.261, translated above, and LEACH 2012: 147–150.
from rebirth and to join Viṣṇu in his “supreme abode.”\footnote{See e.g. PādS 4.21.15, LT 41.5c–6, ŚrīprśS 16.18c–19.} The idea expressed here which is especially relevant to the present discussion— that one can ensure one’s future as an Ekāyana by making a donation to the temple—represents a radically different conception of the Ekāyanas from those which we ordinarily encounter. The fact that these verses are addressed to worshippers who desire fruits (phalārthin) only serves to emphasise the dramatic nature of this shift in attitude, for elsewhere in the Pauskarasamhitā, as we have seen, such worshippers are openly censured. Here, they are presented with the opportunity to become worshippers who do not desire fruits (aphalārthin), as the Ekāntins (PauśS 31.286) or Ekāyanas (PauśS 36.260–261) are elsewhere characterised. Only then may they achieve the highest reward.

Elsewhere in the Pauskarasamhitā we find similar expressions of the same idea. For instance, in a passage concerned with the festival centred around the investiture of God’s icon with the sacred thread (pavitrāropaṇa), it is said that a man who makes donations of cattle, land, and gold (gobhūsuvarṇa) on a daily basis (pratyahā) for as long as he lives will attain the fruit of these donations “during a maximum lifespan” (paramāyuṣī) and will then journey to heaven (diva) “by means of moon-like carriages” (yānaiś candrapratikāśaiḥ) (PauśS 30.174c–177). Born again into an auspicious family, he will become devoted to Nārāyaṇa in thought, word, and deed (karmaṇā manasā vācā nārāyaṇaparpo bhavet, PauśS 30.180cd), will live a long life free of sickness and sorrow (vyādhiśokavinirmukta), with sons and wives etc. (putradārādika), and will then go to White Island (śvetadvīpa), where he will achieve identification with the supreme Brahma (param brahma bhuvam āyāti) (PauśS 30.178c–184b). Although there is no explicitly “Ekāyana” terminology employed in these verses, they are likely to have been authored by an Ekāyana (or “Ekāntin”) for the same reasons I have put forward with regard to the passage concerning the donation of food to the temple: a worshipper who desires the “fruits” of his worship cannot attain liberation in this lifetime. The best he can hope for, soteriologically speaking, is an auspicious rebirth as one who is completely devoted (“in thought, word, and deed”) to Nārāyaṇa.\footnote{Cf. PārS 13.114c–115, where rebirth as an Ekāyana is promised as the reward for the performance of one’s ritual duties (see RASTELLI 2006: 194–195).} Only then is he an Ekāntin who may go to White Island.
In another passage of the *Pauṣkarasamhitā* which conveys the same idea, the identity of the author is more explicit. This passage is a continuation of the passage quoted earlier (PauṣS 36.259c-263b), wherein mixed worshippers are condemned as “false devotees” (*bhaktābhāsāḥ*) and the Ekāyanas are named as the true devotees of Acyuta. Having censured the “mixed worshipper” (*vyāmiṣrayājinī*) in this way, however, the author of these verses goes on to assert that provided he (the mixed worshipper) has undergone initiation and is completely devoted to Nārāyaṇa, to ceremonial rites such as mantra-repetition (*japa*), and the offering of gifts into the sacrificial fire (*homa*) as well as to singing the praises of God (*stuti*), “even he, indeed, can attain the world of Viṣṇu at death and, after obtaining a superior rebirth, he may become, from [the time of his] childhood, O best among the twice-born, a Tanmaya, well-versed in the rituals pertaining to the Lord and having him as his chief object. And not aiming at the fruit [of his worship], even in times of distress, after abandoning the body [at death], he does not achieve a rebirth in this world.”

What does it mean to become a Tanmaya in this instance? The term *tanmaya* is used quite commonly in Pañcarātra texts to denote a meditative state in which there is a perceived identity between the meditating person and the object of their visualisation (see RASTELLI 2009), but in several works it is also used to refer to a particular group of Pañcarātrikas, namely the Ekāyanas. For instance, in the aforementioned section of the *Sātvatasamhitā* which details a sequence of rites relating to the installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) and worship of a divine image in a temple, the four Ekāyanas who are named among the professional assistants to the officiating temple priest are referred to as Tanmayas (SS 25.132a). Additionally, in the *Pādamasamhitā* the Tanmayas are instructed to recite mantras belonging to the Ekāyana “school” or recension (*śākhā*) in contrast to “the most excellent knowers of mantras” who recite from the four Vedas. In this passage in the *Pauṣkarasamhitā*, then, after contrasting the Ekāyanas and the “mixed worshippers,” and condemning the latter, the author is declaring that an initiated mixed worshipper who is completely devoted to Nārāyaṇa and to performing his ritu-

---

53 PauṣS 36.265–267b: *dehaṁte vaiṣṇavaṁ lokam prāpnyāṁ punar eva hi janma cāsādyan cotkṛṣṭam ābāyāṁ dvijasattamaḥ | bhagavatkarmanisnātās tatparas tanmayo bhavet | nāḥhisandhāya ca phalam āpatekalagato ‘pi vai | tyaktvā dehaṁ punar janma nāpnyād iha... |

54 Cf. the parallel references in the Pārś (15.378a) and the IŚ (18.255a).

55 PādS 4.11.242c–243b: *dikṣu vedāṁś ca catureḥ paṭheyur mantravittamāḥ | vidikṣv ekāyanāṁ śākhāṁ tanmayāṁ sumukhāṁ tathā... |
al duties can be reborn as an Ekāyana and can in that way achieve liberation from future rebirths.

These passages in the *Pauṣkarasamhitā*, which promise rebirth as an Ekāyana to those who make donations to the temple and to mixed worshippers who are completely devoted to worshipping Nārāyaṇa, show that, despite their professed ideals, Ekāyanas were active in advertising their ritual expertise, both to prospective patrons and to other Pāñcarātrikas. The verses concerned with the endowment of food (*Pauṣ* 41.143–155) may be addressed specifically to royal patrons, since their description of a superior rebirth includes references to typically Kṣatriya qualities such as valour (*śaurya*), steadfastness or resolve (*dhrīti*), and strength or energy (*utsāha*) as well as a reference to “enemies” (*dvīṣat*).

In another chapter of the *Pauṣkarasamhitā*, Pauṣkara asks God for a clarification as to the status of mixed worship, while pointing out that this has been repeatedly prohibited thus far. God replies:

This is true, O wise one, just as you have urged. But when this other type of ritual (i.e. “mixed worship”) is performed, then there is no fault for those who are qualified, (48) since for them Acyuta is assuredly superior to all. [Therefore], because they are subordinate to him, there is indeed no fault in worshipping other gods, (49) just as in one’s everyday life [there is no fault] in paying honour to a retinue (*gaṇa*) of servants (or “ministers,” *bhṛtya*), or to one’s brothers, or to one’s lawful wives.58

What can we deduce from these verses? First of all, they were evidently composed after those portions of the *Pauṣkarasamhitā* which forbid the practice of mixed worship, for they refer directly to these prohibitions. Since the parts of the *Pauṣkarasamhitā* which forbid mixed worship were

---

56 See e.g. *Arthaśāstra* 6.1.3–5, where *utsāha* is listed among the exemplary qualities of a king (*svāmin*), and *śaurya* is named as one of its attributes (*guṇa*); and *Mahābhārata* 6.40.43 (*Bhagavadgītā* 18.43), wherein the duty of the Kṣatriya (*kṣat­rakarma*) is said to involve *śaurya* and *dhrīti*.
57 *Pauṣ* 38.47ab: “O God, being a mixed worshipper is repeatedly prohibited” (*deva vyāmisrayājītvam pratisiddham punah punah*).
58 *Pauṣ* 38.48–50c: *satyam etan mahābudhhe yathā saṅcoditaṃ tvayaḥ | kin tu kriyāntare prāpte na doṣas tv adhikariṇām || 48 yasmāt sarvapararvam hi teṣām asty acyutam prati | tadāśīrātvād devānām anyesāṃ pājanāt tu vai || 49 na doṣo hi yathā loke bhṛtṛbhṛtyāgaṇarṣya ca | mānaṇād dharmapatnāṇāṃ… || 50.
most likely authored by Ekāyanas, who called themselves Ekāntins and proclaimed themselves superior to mixed worshippers partly on account of their monotheism, we must assume either that a.) these verses were authored by a Pāñcarātrika who was himself a mixed worshipper as opposed to an Ekāyana, or that b.) they were authored by an Ekāyana, and therefore provide evidence that some Ekāyanas, at least, changed their attitude towards “mixed worship” and adopted an attitude which is close to what GRANOFF (2000) has called “ritual eclecticism.”59 I propose that the second explanation is more likely to be the correct one, for the passage in which these verses are found, concerned with the installation (pratiṣṭhā) of the image of God (bhagavadbimba) in a temple, is almost certainly the work of an Ekāyana. This is evident from the fact that the principal ordinance (mukhyakalpa, Pauṣ 38.41b) for the installation is assigned to knowers of the five times who are “exclusive” devotees (ananyāḥ, Pauṣ 38.31a), who are devoted to the four Vyūhas and who “also perform the renunciation of [the fruits of] ritual” (karmoṇām api saṃnyāsam kurvanti, Pauṣ 38.32), while the secondary or “substitutive” ordinance (anukalpa) is to be performed by initiated twice-born Bhāgavatas who are “established in the dharma of the triple Veda” (trayīdharmasthitaiḥ, Pauṣ 38.41c–42). The former group clearly denotes the Ekāyanas, while the “initiated twice-born Bhāgavatas” designates the Pāñcarātrikas who are elsewhere referred to as “mixed worshippers.”

We also encounter an indication that some Ekāyanas may have changed their attitude towards “mixed worship” in the Pārmeśvarasamhitā:

After worshipping Vāstu (or “Vāstvīśa,” i.e., Vāstupuruṣa, the guardian deity of the temple), Kṣetraśa, Garuḍa, Dvārśrī (also known as Dvārakalakṣmī), Čaṇḍa, and Pracaṇḍa with arghya and so on, one should then worship the temple gods in the temple, in the pavilion at [each of] the four [entrance-]gates, and in the other [places]. (125c–126) Then, at the three gates [one should worship] Dṛṭr and Vidhāṭr, and also Jaya and Vijaya, and Bhadra and Subhadra, and the Lord of the Gaṇas (Gaṇeśvara, i.e. Viṣvakṣena). (127) Worship [performed] by a man [who is] an Ekāntin which is directed towards the subordinate class of deities which forms God’s retinue,60 begin-

59 GRANOFF (2000: 401) defines “ritual eclecticism” thus: “The group of insiders explicitly acknowledges that others have rituals, and then enjoins or permits the practice of those rituals along with the rituals specific to the group itself.”

60 I take aṅga here in the sense of “God’s retinue” following Alaṅgabhaṭṭa, who
ning with the gatekeepers and ending with Viṣvaksena, assuredly causes distress to men who have little understanding. (128–129b) [But] not worshipping them, even if [this is done only] by the pupils [of the priest], causes obstacles to what is being accomplished.\textsuperscript{61} (129cd) Therefore, worship with [one’s] thought [directed upon] the [deities who are the] servants of God is enjoined in order to elicit their compassion, though [it should be done] without devotion and trust. (130) They (the subordinate deities), mentally visualising the supreme good in the heart, humbly receive with their mind[s] that which has fallen from the hands [of worshippers], even if it is given without respect. (131) Since they are all made of Acyuta, their minds are surrendered to his mind. Thus, from the worship of these [subordinate deities] by an Ekāntin guru, (132) strife will be cast out, since they are the servants of Hari.\textsuperscript{62}

It is difficult to draw any firm conclusions from this passage, the bulk of which is also found in the Īṣvārasamhitā.\textsuperscript{63} Indeed, we cannot even be certain that “Ekāntin” here is to be understood as meaning “Ekāyana.” However, there are good reasons for believing this to be the case. First of all, there are other places in the Pārmeśvarasamhitā where the term ekāntin is used to refer to the Ekāyanas. Indeed, these include the only uses of the term ekāntin which occur in the Pārmeśvarasamhitā prior to the above passage. Both instances belong to the first chapter, where the Ekāyanaveda glosses aṅgabhāvam with bhagavatparivāratām in his commentary on the same verse in the ĪṢ. See Śāvatārthaprukāśikā on ĪṢ 4.2.

\textsuperscript{61} Again, I follow Alaśīngabhaṭṭa here in taking api together with śisyāṇām rather than with prakṛtasya, which would be, grammatically speaking, the more orthodox reading. See Śāvatārthaprukāśikā on ĪṢ 4.4cd.

\textsuperscript{62} Pāṛś 6.125c–133b: vāstukṣetresāgarudadvārśīrṣīcandapracandakāṁ || 125 abhya-
rcyāryāryāyādyādibhir devān prāśādāsthānās ca pūjayaḥ | prāśāde ṭha caturdvāre maṇḍape 
cetareṣa ca || 126 dvāraśraye ṭha dhāṭāraṃ vidhāṭāraṃ jayaṃ tathā | viṣyam cāpi 
bhadram ca subhadram ca ganeśvaram || 127 yad aṅgabhāvam abhyeti dvārṣṭhāyaṃ 
devatāgaṇaṃ | viṣvakṣesāvasānam ca narāṇām alpamedhasām || 128 jantor ekāntinās 
tad vai cittakchedākyd arcanaṃ | vighnaṃ prakṛtasyāpi śisyāṇām tadanarcanam || 129 
atus tadanukampārtham devabhṛtyadhyāycanām | bhaktiśraddhajhitaṃ caiva vihitam 
tv evam eva h || 130 te tatpānicṣytaṃ (corr. taptprānicṣytaṃ, cf. ĪṢ 4.5c) prahvā āttam 
apīvahelāyā | grhnanti manasā śreyah paraṃ dhyāvī dhyāvī hṛdi || 131 yatah sarve 
ˈcyutaṃayās taccittārtpitamānasāḥ | etāvad arcanaṁ teṣām guror ekāntinas tu vai || 
132 syād virodhanirvāṇas tu yato bhṛtyas tu te hareḥ ]

\textsuperscript{63} Pāṛś 6.125c–126b → ĪṢ 3.101; Pāṛś 6.128–133b → ĪṢ 4.2c–7.
is called the *dharma* of the Ekāntins (ekāntidharma, PārS 1.60) and the *dharma* of the Lord (bhagavaddharma) which is followed by Ekāntins (ekāntibhir anuṣṭhitah, PārS 1.85cd).\(^{64}\) Secondly, it is very difficult to make sense of this passage if we take ekāntin in its alternative or, shall we say, its primary sense, which is merely descriptive, for then we are left with an account of a man or a guru who is described as being “devoted to one [God]” (ekāntin) in the same passage that he is described as worshipping multiple deities. Such a man is evidently not an ekāntin in the literal sense of the term, which supports my proposal that we take ekāntin here not in its literal sense, but in the only other sense which is authorised by its use in the *Pārameśvarasamhitā*, namely as a proper noun which is an alternative name for “Ekāyana.”

The passage appears to indicate that Ekāntins or Ekāyanas were being criticised in some quarters for worshipping the subordinate members of Viṣṇu’s entourage, such as Viṣvaksena, the gatekeepers to the temple, and other temple deities.\(^{65}\) Presumably, if such criticism genuinely existed, it was based on the notion that worshipping these deities compromised the Ekāyanas’ commitment to monotheism and, by extension (since the subordinate deities cannot grant liberation), to liberation as the exclusive goal to be sought. It is to be noted that in his *Āgamarāmāya*, Yāmuna also makes the point that the subordinate deities are, like the lord of Viṣṇu’s retinue (Viṣvaksena), “dependent upon Viṣṇu.”\(^{66}\) However, Yāmuna does not make this point in response to a specific criticism of the practice of worshipping Viṣṇu’s subordinate deities. Indeed, there is no indication in the *Āgamarāmāya* that the Pāṇcārātra’s traditionalist opponents included this practice among the litany of those which earned their opprobrium. If the criticism of the Ekāyana worship of Viṣṇu’s entourage was not coming from traditionalist outsiders, then from where was it coming? This is a difficult question to answer, but we should not discount the possibility that it came from other Ekāyanas, perhaps those who were less flexible or less willing to adapt to the changing circumstances in which they found themselves. The author’s strategy in the above passage appears to be to legitimate the Ekāyana worship of the subordinate deities by providing scriptur-

---

\(^{64}\) See also the first use of the term ekāntin which occurs after the quoted passage from the sixth chapter of the *Pārameśvarasamhitā*. Here, at PārS 10.285–289, the names ekāntin and ekāyana are used interchangeably.

\(^{65}\) On the mythical plane Caṇḍa, Pracāṇa, Dhārt, Vidhātṛ, Jaya, Vijaya, Bhadra, and Subhadra are the gatekeepers of Vaikuṇṭha, Viṣṇu’s heaven.

\(^{66}\) ĀP 168.6–7: devatāgaṇōḥ guṇabhūtāḥ śruto viṣṇor viṣṇupārīṣadeśavat |.
al authority for it, but he also attempts to minimise the “distress” that this may cause by emphasising that this worship is, and should be, performed without devotion, trust, and respect, and that, in any case, the subordinate deities are “made of Acyuta,” and so any charge of abandoning monotheism is inapplicable.

Finally, I turn to Vedāntadesīka’s Pāñcarātraraksā, most likely composed in Śrīraṅgam during the early decades of the fourteenth century (HARI RAO 1976: 116–117). After quoting the PādS (4.19.131–132) to the effect that a Brahmin who is initiated into one Tantra or Siddhānta should not perform rites prescribed by another, Vedāntadesīka goes on to qualify this statement: “Having said this, it is also said, however, that there is authority in the lower Tantras for those following a higher Tantra.” He then quotes, without attribution, a passage which claims that there is an ascending order of Pāñcarātra initiates, beginning with those who belong to the Tantrāntarasiddhānta and culminating in those who follow the Āgamasiddhānta, and that all initiates are qualified to perform the rites not only of their own Siddhānta but also, as far as possible, of those Siddhāntas which are lower than their own. Thus, since the Āgamasiddhānta is at the top of the hierarchy, its followers are always entitled to worship God in accordance with the other three Siddhāntas, a Mantrasiddhāntin is additionally qualified for the Tantra and Tantrāntara Siddhāntas, and a Tantrasiddhāntin is also eligible for the Tantrāntarasiddhānta. A Tantrāntarasiddhāntin is qualified only for his own Siddhānta and must worship in his own home. Vedāntadesīka reports that it is also said here (i.e. in the same unnamed text) that members of each Siddhānta have the authority to worship in temples (sthāna) which have been established by a Siddhānta “inferior” (apakṛṣṭa) to their own, which would mean that Āgama-siddhāntins are entitled to worship in any Pāñcarātra temple.

---

67 There are echoes here of a process which GRANOFF (2000: 409) describes as an “acknowledgement that rituals cross sectarian boundaries and that some explanation for this that preserves those boundaries is required.” In this case, a boundary is preserved by the instruction that the subordinate deities should be worshipped “without devotion, trust, and respect.”

68 PRR 13.9: ity uktvā punar apy uparyupari tantrasthitānāṁ adho ‘dhas tantrādhistānāṁ utkṛṣṭaṣṭhānāṁ ādhyātma uktam.

69 PRR 13.10–14.2.

70 PRR 14.3–4: atrāpy utkṛṣṭasiddhāntasthitānyāpy apakṛṣṭasiddhāntasthāneṣu tat tatsiddhāntapraṇāya na pūjāniyātānaḥ uktam.
According to Vedāntadeśika’s anonymous source, therefore, members of the Āgamasiddhānta have the authority to perform all rites which are enjoined in the Mantrasiddhānta, the implication being that they can execute this entitlement without being guilty of “mixing Siddhāntas,” which is forbidden by both traditions as Vedāntadeśika elsewhere acknowledges. He then quotes again the same anonymous text which reinforces this idea: “If they are qualified for the principal [ordinance, then] they are qualified for the secondary ordinance.” An initiate who is qualified for the Āgamasiddhānta is qualified also for the Mantrasiddhānta, and therefore for acts of “mixed worship” undertaken by that tradition’s adherents. Here, it may be useful to ask whether this anonymous source might reflect and give legitimacy to what was actually taking place – in other words, whether Āgamasiddhāntins were, in fact, aligning themselves with the more dominant, Veda-congruent Pāñcarātra traditions. When read in tandem with the aforementioned scriptural passages which indicate that some Ekāyanas were changing their attitude towards, and participating in, acts of “mixed worship,” we are perhaps in a reasonably good position to give a provisionally affirmative answer to this question. Certainly, this could help to explain the apparent disappearance of the Āgamasiddhānta, not only as a named Pāñcarātra tradition but also as a strand within the Pāñcarātra whose representatives claimed the superiority of their own tradition over that of the Veda.

The period of mutual animosity between the Āgamasiddhānta and the Mantrasiddhānta, which was probably current for a period during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, did not last long, and the main reason for this appears to have been that the Āgamasiddhāntins or Ekāyanas could not compete effectively with their more orthodox rivals. This was, no doubt, primarily due to the fact that they could not claim affiliation with a recognised Vedic school (śākhā), and in the Śrīvaśva-influenced conservative religious environment of South India at this time were therefore less attractive than the Mantrasiddhāntins in the eyes of prospective patrons. However,

---

71 See e.g. PRR 9.6ff., where Vedāntadeśika reports that the Caryāpāda (the fourth section) of the Pādmasamhitā explains in detail the “offence” (doṣa) involved in the mixing of Siddhāntas and Tantras (siddhāntasāṃkara and tantrasāṃkara); and PRR 18.15–19.5, which quotes the Pārś (19.545–548b) on the prohibition of the “mixing of Siddhāntas” (siddhāntasāṃkarya).

72 PRR 14.6: mukhyādhikārināḥ santi yadi gaunādhikārinah.

73 By “orthodox” here, I am referring to the way in which Mantrasiddhāntins position themselves with regard to the Veda. For them, the latter remains, at least nominally, the highest textual authority.
er, another cause of the inability of Āgamāsiddhāntins to compete effectively with their rivals may well have been self-inflicted, for in a commercially competitive environment wherein the ritual expertise of professional priests would have been shaped to a large degree by the needs of their clients, the Ekāyanas had given themselves a distinct disadvantage. For they could not promise these clients, as reward for loyalty and generous support, the attainment of liberation at death. The best they could offer them, soteriologically speaking, was rebirth as an Ekāyaṇa.

An apparent consequence of the greater resources available to the Mantrasiddhānta in their efforts to attract patronage was that some members of the Āgamāsiddhānta began to incorporate into their repertoire the same ritual practices that their Mantrasiddhāntin rivals engaged in—practices that their own tradition (i.e. the Āgamāsiddhānta) had previously condemned. These included rituals granting rewards to those desirous of the “fruits” of worship (phalārthin) as well as acts of “mixed worship” such as the worship of Viṣṇu’s subordinate deities for rewards other than liberation from rebirth. The Pārṣ (6.125c–133b, and the parallel passage in the Īśva-rasamhiti) appears to contain a small clue that some Āgamāsiddhāntins or Ekāyanas continued to condemn such practices after others belonging to their tradition had begun to engage in them. But we hear little of these protests, and, if indeed they existed, they seem to have been otherwise excluded from the textual record. Rather, several sources attest to the fact that the religious identities of these two Pāncarātra Siddhāntas began to merge, or rather that the need to draw distinctions between them disappeared, which is why in the later scriptural literature, including works roughly coeval with and succeeding Vedāntadeśika, we increasingly see the Pāncarātra presented as a single homogeneous tradition with, for example, a single scriptural canon.
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During the final phase of Buddhism in India, monastic communities started to integrate more readily elements of Tantric Buddhism from the milieu of the great Siddhas. While the philosophy of the methods of perfection (Pāramitānaya), i.e., non-Tantric Mahāyāna, could be easily brought in line with the methods of mantras (Mantranaya), certain elements of the latter, such as sexual yoga during empowerment (abhiśeka) and subsequent practices, remained problematic in mainstream Buddhism that continued to be dominated by monasticism. However, since empowerment was an important requirement for the Tantric path, though, ordained practitioners faced the conflict of either strictly following the monastic rules or practising the new powerful and effective techniques.

Such must have been the situation in a typical Buddhist community when Maitrīpa (986–1063 CE) interrupted his career as a monk-scholar at

---

1 In other words, great accomplished adepts. The term *mahāsiddha* refers to any one of a group of Indian Tantric masters. Many of these were historical figures. See BUSWELL & LOPEZ 2014: 508–509.

2 In his *Tattvaratnāvali*, Maitrīpa includes Tantra within mainstream Mahāyāna by dividing the latter into non-Tantric Mahāyāna, which he calls Pāramitānaya, and Tantric Mahāyāna, which he calls Mantranaya. See TRĀ 342.9–10 and MATHES 2015: 59.

3 Lit. “anointment,” a term originally used to refer to the anointment of a king. By extension it was applied to the anointment of a Bodhisattva as a Buddha (see BUSWELL & LOPEZ 2014: 12). In Mantranaya, an abhiśeka refers to a ritual that allows the adept to employ Tantric means of practice, such as visualising himself as a deity, reciting its magical formula (mantra), or generating exemplifying bliss in sexual yoga (see MATHES 2015: 10–14).

4 ROERICH (1949–53: 842) settled on 1007/10–1084/1087, while TATZ (1994: 65) suggested ca. 1007 – ca. 1085. ROBERTS (2014: 4 and 212, n. 8) rightly points out, however, that ’Gos Lo tsā ba gZhon nu dpal’s (1392–1481) Tibetan historical sur-
Vikramapura Monastery\(^5\) to search out the great Siddha Śāvaripa. Having received empowerment and “great seal” (mahāmudrā)\(^6\) teachings from him, Maitrīpa returned to the academic milieu and started composing several texts that embed mahāmudrā in his favoured Madhyamaka philosophy of non-abiding (apraśṭhāna).\(^7\) The Sanskrit term apraśṭhāna also means “non-foundation,” which conveys the idea that there is no foundation in anything whatsoever by which the latter can be reified in any conceivable way. Maitrīpa’s student Rāmapāla equates apraśṭhāna with mental non-engagement (amanasikāra),\(^8\) a term that Maitrīpa also interprets as luminous self-empowerment.\(^9\) This means that the practitioner not only refrains from projecting mistaken notions (such as an independent existence or characteristic signs) onto anything arisen in dependence, whether skandhas, dhātu, or āyatanas,\(^10\) but also realises the luminous nature of mind. With such a fine blend of mahāmudrā and Madhyamaka, Maitrīpa and his disciples considerably contributed to integrating the new teachings and practices of the great Siddha into mainstream Buddhism.

A key role in this process is played by the Tattvādaśaka, or “Ten Verses on True Reality,” a text in which Maitrīpa combines an analytic Madhyamaka path of excluding what true reality is not (via negationis) with a direct approach of experiencing true reality as luminosity (via emi-

\(^5\) According to some Tibetan sources (the biography in the ‘Bri gung bka’ brgyud chos mdzod, Dpa’ bo Gtsug lag phreng ba’s Chos byung mkhas pa ’i dga’ ston and the one in the Tucci Tibetan fund (ms 1095) being an exception), Maitrīpa did not leave Vikramapura but was expelled from Vikramalaśīla for being involved with alcohol and women (BRUNNHÖLZL 2007: 511).

\(^6\) In its Tantric context, mahāmudrā stands for the fruition of the path, but for *Saḥajavajra the term is also used to qualify pith instructions and the true reality they reveal. See MATHES 2015: 229.

\(^7\) Later known as the collection of texts on non-conceptual realisation (amanasikāra). For an edition and translation of this corpus, see MATHES 2015.

\(^8\) It is very clear from the Sekanirdeśapañjikā of Rāmapāla (one of the four main disciples of Maitrīpa), who glosses apraśṭhāna as “not to become mentally engaged” and “not to superimpose.” See Sekanirdeśapañjikā on SN 29 (SNP 192\(_c\)): apraśṭhānam amanāsikāro ’nāropāḥ.

\(^9\) This will be further explained below. See also MATHES 2015: 20 and 247.

\(^10\) SNP 192\(_b\): sarvasmiṁ iti pratītyasamatpannaskandhātvāyatanādau...
11 In his commentary on verse 8 of the Tattvadaśaka (i.e., the *Tattvadaśakaviśikā), Maitrīpa’s disciple *Sahajavajra explains the via eminentiae in terms of a mahāmudrā practice that differs from the usual Tantric mahāmudrā. It seems to fall in between the distinction of Mahāyāna into Pāramitānaya and Mantranaya, since it takes the Tattvadaśaka as Pāramitānaya pith instructions that accord with, or follow,12 Mantranaya.13

To be sure, this kind of mahāmudrā path is beyond the pride of being a deity (ḥa’i nga rgyal) and the sequence of the four seals, i.e., the generation and completion stages of formal Tantric practice.14 It could be argued that we have here an Indian predecessor of what came to be known in Tibet as mdo lugs phyag chen, i.e., “śūtra-style mahāmudrā.”15 The implication of *sūtra-mahāmudrā is that the advanced practices of the great Siddhas are possible even without formal Tantric empowerment. In Tibetan Buddhism, there were of course also other strategies of adopting the empow-

---

12 Tib. rjes su mthun par. Unfortunately, the Indian original of the *Tattvadaśakaviśikā has not come down to us, but in Maitrīpa’s Mahāyānaviśikā, verse 4 (in which the term is used in a similar context) we find the Sanskrit equivalent a-nusāraṇa. (MATHES 2015: 451).
13 TDṬ (B 1b4–2a2, D 161a2, P 176a4,5): “Having presented in detail the stages of penetrating the meaning of non-abiding in accordance with Pramāṇa, Madhyamaka and authoritative scriptures (āgama), [Maitrīpa] wished to compose brief Pāramitā[naya] pith instructions which accord with the tradition of the secret Mantra[naya]…” (ṭshad ma dang | dbu ma dang | lung ṣmams gis ’dir rab tu mi gnas pa’i don la ’jug pa’i rim pa rgyas par bstan nas ṣgang ngaṅs kyi tshul dang rjes su mthun pa’i pha rol tu phyin pa’i man ngaṅ mdor bsdus pa byed par ’dod pa) | … a B bzhin D nyid de bzhin nyid P du ṣ P om. ṣ D brlabs ṣ BD ba’i). First quoted and translated in MATHES 2015: 215.
14 The pride of being a deity, often referred to as vajra pride in the secondary literature, is an important element in the generation stage of Tantric practice, during which the adept not only generates himself as a deity but is also proud of that. The four seals are the karmamudrā, dharmamudrā, mahāmudrā, and samayamudrā. Their sequence describes the completion stage in the Yogini Tantras. mahāmudrā corresponds here to the level of the fruit, and dharmamudrā to the ultimate (i.e., dharmadhātu, or the like), which is meditated upon or cultivated on the path. This path is fully in accordance with Pāramitānaya but can be effectively initiated with the help of a karmamudrā, which involves sexual union with an actual woman in order to identify the goal of co-emergent joy. The samayamudrā is the display of Tantric form kāyas for the sake of others as a result of having attained mahāmudrā (see MATHES 2009: 89).
ment ritual to a monastic environment, such as substituting the critical parts with less-offensive ritual elements, but *sūtra-mahāmudrā offers a more elegant solution to this problem and also helps to legitimise the substitution in the case a formal empowerment is still preferred.

However, a third approach beyond the methods of pāramitā and mantra is absent in the only other known work by *Sahajavajra, the *Sthitisamāsa. The possible explanation proposed in this paper is that Pāramitānaya instructions that accord with Mantranaya become part of the Mantranaya. It will be further argued that *sūtra-mahāmudrā does not mean that mahāmudrā becomes “Sūtric,” but that sūtra passages that support pith instructions become Tantric. This “upgrade” of sūtra passages must also be seen in the wider context of integrating the new mahāmudrā teachings into mainstream Buddhism by showing that they are in line with the view, conduct, and practice of traditional Mahāyāna. In the process, Tantric terms were explained in a broader Mahāyāna context with the purpose of demonstrating that their meaning was already latent in more traditional forms of Buddhism. By showing that mahāmudrā is compatible with more traditional presentations of view and meditation, such as apratīṣṭhāna and amanasaṅkāra (see below), it must have been easier for Maitrīpa to propagate the teachings of his guru Śāvaripa among the communities of the big monastic universities in Northern India. Once the bridge between mahāmudrā and amanasikāra had been built, it was possible to traverse it in both directions.

To what extent this was in fact intended by Maitrīpa is another question. In Tibet, however, sGam po pa (1079–1153) and the Dwags po bKa’ brgyud lineages profited from this bridge by giving mahāmudrā teachings without Tantric empowerments on the basis of calm abiding and deep insight. The possibility of such a *sūtra-mahāmudrā was already indicated in Jñānakīrti’s Tattvāvatāra and (probably in dependence on that) in *Sahajavajra’s *Tattvadāsakaṭīkā. Later bKa’ brgyud masters, such as ’Gos Lo tsā ba gZhon nu dpal (1392–1481) and Dwags po bKra shis rnam rgyal (1511–1587), discerned in these Indian masters’ writings a doctrinal foundation for their mahāmudrā approach of combining Tantric and Sūtric methods into a single system of liberation.

---

16 The guhyābhiṣeka is thus conferred by bestowing the adept a drop of alcohol from a skull (kapāla) instead of the sexual fluids from the guru and his consort; and the prajñājñānābhiṣeka is performed by showing the adept a small drawing (Tib. tsak li) with a Tantric couple, and not the adept’s union with an actual consort.
In his *Ratnagotravibhāgavavyākhya* commentary, gZhon nu dpal thus claims, on the basis of the *Tattvadāsaka* and its *ṭūkā*, that what Maitrīpa called *mahāmudrā* is a Pāramitānaya path that accords with the secret Mantranaya (see below). The way in which the Pāramitānaya would accord with the Mantranaya is evident in gZhon nu dpal’s description of how those who rely on pith instructions take refuge by seeing their *guru* as the Buddha:

Those who rely on pith instructions must be certain about [their] refuge in the Three Jewels. For this reason, they have to take refuge with the confidence that [their] *guru* is a Buddha. The *guru*, furthermore, cannot be anyone, but he must be one who has seen reality. This is what Maitrīpa called *mahāmudrā*, a Pāramitā[na]ya path that accords (rjes su mthun pa) with the secret Mantra[na]ya. This is the meaning derived from the *Tattvadāsaka* and its *ṭūkā*. Likewise, it is obvious that the well-known *guruyoga* exclusively accords with the Mantra[na]ya. If it is not right for followers of Pāramitānaya\(^\text{17}\) to practice something that only accords with [Mantranaya], then it is also not right for Śrāvakas to pacify sickness with *mantra* formulas, which lean on [Mantranaya].\(^\text{18}\)

In other words, *guruyoga*,\(^\text{19}\) or rather one’s reliance on somebody who has seen true reality as it is, in this case upgrades ordinary Pāramitānaya into a system that deserves the label *mahāmudrā*. It could be argued that *guruyoga* is tantamount to Tantric empowerment, since one receives the *guru’s*

---

\(^{17}\) Lit. “Pāramitāyāna.”

\(^{18}\) DRSM 190₉₋₁₃: ‘dir man ngag pa dag ni dkon mchog gsum la skyabs su ’gro ba ni nges par bya dgos pa yin kyi | de las kyang bla ma nyid sngs rgyas su mos nas skyabs su ’gro bar bya ba yin la | bla ma de yang su yang rung ba ma yin gyi | bden pa mthong ba zhi gzin no zhes bzhed de | ’di ni mai tri pas phyag rgya chen po zhes bya ba pha rol tu phyin pa’i lam gang zhi ggsang sngags dang rjes su mthun pa yin no zhes bya ba’i don ’di de kho na nyid bcu pa’i rtsa ’grel du ’byung ba yin la | de bzhin du bla ma’i rna ’byor zhes grags pa ni sngags dang rjes su mthun pa kho nar snang la | de pha rol tu phyin pa’i theg pa bas rjes su mthun pa tsam yang nyams su blang du mi rung na so sor ’brang ba’i rig sngags kyi s na zhi bar byed pa ynan thos nams la mi rung bar ’gyur zhing | ....

\(^{19}\) That is, a Tantric ritual of *guru* devotion, during which the adept visualises his root *guru* as not being separated from the Buddha. It is mostly practiced together with three other preliminary practices, i.e., prostration, Vajrasattva purification, and *maṇḍala* offering (see BUSWELL & LOPEZ 2014: 339).
blessing and thus the wisdom of mahāmudrā.\textsuperscript{20} The Eighth Karmapa Mi bskyod rdo rje (1507–1554) clarifies this in his sKu gsum ngo sprod rnam bshad as follows:

Sgam po pa explained: This mahāmudrā of our bKa’ brgyud [tradition] first of all involves a fortunate disciple taking to the limit [his or her] devotion to a qualified teacher [in the way that] Nāro relied upon Tīlo, Mar pa upon Nāro, Mi la upon Mar pa, and ’Brom ston upon the master Atiśa. This is referred to as “making devotion the path.” Its power makes it possible for the blessing of the guru to enter [the disciple]. When a [corresponding state of] mind (blo) arises, the samādhi of calm abiding and deep insight arises effortlessly. This is referred to as “making blessing the path.” Through its power, the abiding mode of the true nature and the extent of all phenomena are seen directly. This is “making direct perception the path.”\textsuperscript{21}

The *Tattvadaśakaṭīkā*

* Sahajavajra’s commentary on the Tattvadaśaka has not come down to us in its Indian original, so that we have to rely on its Tibetan translation contained in the bsTan ’gyur. It was translated by Vajrapāṇi (b. 1017)\textsuperscript{22} and mTshur ston Ye shes ’byung gnas (a translator related to ’Brog mi). This paṇḍita-translator pair is also known to have translated Maitrīpa’s Kudṛṣṭinirghātana, Mahāyānaśīlaṣṭikā, Premapaṇcaka, Sahajaṣṭaka, and accord-

\textsuperscript{20} In the chapter on the transmission of mahāmudrā lineages In his Deb ther sngon po (984\textsuperscript{18,20}), gZhon nu dpal states that “… the remedy, which is not mere theory, is the wisdom of mahāmudrā. It arises from the blessing of the genuine guru.” (des na lta bar ma gyur pa ‘di’i gnyen po ni phyag rgya chen po ‘di ye shes yin la \( \text{de ni bla ma dam pa ‘i byin brlabs nyid las ‘bying ba yin no} \)).

\textsuperscript{21} Mi bskyod rdo rje: sKu gsum ngo sprod rnam bshad, vol. 21, 168\textsuperscript{6–9a}. rje sgam po pas ‘o bkol gyi bka’ brgyud ‘di’i phyag rgya chen po ‘di la slob ma skal ldan gyis bla ma mshan ldan la dang por mos gus tshad du skylod pa nā ros tai to bsten pa dang | mar pas nā ro pa bsten pa dang | mi las mar pa bsten pa dang \ ‘brom gyis jo bo bsten pa ltar bston pa de la mos pa lam byed bya ba yin \ ‘de ltar mos pa lam du song ba’i mthus bla ma’i byin brlabs ‘jug tu rang ba’i blo skye zhing de ltar skye ba la zhi lhag gi ting nge ‘dzin rtsol med du skye ba de byin brlabs lam byed yin \ byin brlabs lam du song ba’i mthus chos thams cad ji lla ba dang ji snyed pa’i gnas tshul mngon sum du mthong pa de la mngon sum lam byed yin |. I thank Dr. Martina Draszczyk (Vienna) for this reference and also its translation.

\textsuperscript{22} ROERICH 1949–53: 843.
ing to the Peking bsTan ’gyur also the Tattvadaśaka. Compared to these translations, I did not find any evidence that would call into question the authenticity of the *Tattvadaśakaṭīkā. Yet, Ulrich Timme Kragh raises doubts because *Sahajavajra’s commentary quotes Kamalaśīla’s Bhāvanākrama(s), of which no Sanskrit manuscript “has ever been found outside Tibet.” However, there is an untold number of Sanskrit manuscripts that are not found outside of Tibet, and the fact that no other quotation of the Bhāvanākramas could so far be identified is not very telling. Given the intense economic and cultural relations between Central Tibet and its southern neighbours at the time, it is difficult to see how such important texts of the Yogācāra-Madhyaṃaka school should have remained unknown in India. On the contrary, the quotation of the Bhāvanākramas in *Sahajavajra’s commentary demonstrates their presence in eleventh-century India, just as there is evidence for the presence of Kamalaśīla’s Madhyamakāloka in India from this time onwards.

If the text was, however, for the sake of argument, composed within a Nepalese or Tibetan tradition that had been in need of scriptural support for Pāramitānaya-based mahāmudrā, the author would not have referred to the Hevajratantra (i.e., HT I.8.44cd) in support of a non-conceptual access to the ultimate. This reference to Maitrīpa’s preferred Tantric source perfectly adds to the picture that this commentary on the Tattvadaśaka can be taken as a genuine Indian source.

Although *Sahajavajra already reports a mahāmudrā practice of firmly realising reality, the main context of mahāmudrā in Maitrīpa’s system is

---

23 The Derge bsTan ’gyur mentions Tshul khrims rgyal ba as translator.
24 There are, to be precise, three of them.
25 Kragh 2015: 75, n. 110.
26 See Keira 2004: 7–8.
27 HT I.8.44 (HT 95s.5): “The whole world should be meditated upon [in such a way] that it is not produced by the intellect. Meditation is actually non-meditation (or non-production by the mind), the thorough knowledge of all phenomena.” (bhāvyate hi jagat sarvaṃ manasā yasmān na bhāvyate | sarvadharma-parijñānaṃ bhāvanā naiva bhāvanā ||).
28 In his subcommentary on the *Tattvadaśakaṭīkā, Ti pi ’Bum la ’bar uses this opportunity to claim that the direct approach, or non-conceptual bodhicitta, manifests during empowerment: “As to the non-analytical [bodhicitta here, in the secret Mantranyaya a non-analytical realisation manifests during the fourth empowerment.” (‘Bri gung bka’ brgyud chos mdo, vol. kha, 184a3: ‘di la dpyad pa med pa’i sens ni gsang sgags kyi theg pa’i la dbang bzhis pa’i dus su ma dpyad rtsis pa’ char bas so }).
provided in his *Sekanirdeśa*,²⁹ where it is embedded in the sequence of the four seals. In this context, it primarily represents the goal of Buddhahood that is attained through the experience of four joys on a physical karmamudrā-level and/or the four joys on a verbal dharmamudrā-level.³⁰

According to *Kāropa*, another disciple of Maitrīpa, the karmamudrā is not required in order to embark on the path to enlightenment,³¹ and Maitrīpa claims in his *Tattvaśiṣṭikā* that in Tantra, inferior practitioners rely on a karmamudrā, while a more direct approach to mahāmudrā is available to those with sharp faculties.³² In other words, the sequence in which mahāmudrā is embedded is not so strictly prescribed, and it does not cate-

²⁹ The *Sekanirdeśa* and the *Tattvadāśaka* belong to the same collection of Maitrīpa texts, referred to as *Yid la mi byed pa’ichos skor* in the Tibetan tradition (see MATHEs 2015: 4–6).

³⁰ See Rāmapāla’s commentary on the *Sekanirdeśa* (SNP 191.10.11): “Now that the karmamudrā, which has the nature of the four joys and is based on physicality, has been propounded, he teaches the dharmamudrā, which has the nature of the four joys and is based on speech.” (caturūṇandasvabhāvāḥ kāyikā karmamudrāktaiva vācasaṁ dharmamudrāṃ caturūṇandasvabhāvām āha |). For Maitrīpa and his disciples, the four joys are joy, supreme joy, co-emergent joy, and no-joy. They are first enjoyed physically with a karmamudrā (the technical term for a consort). This proceeds to the subsequent phase of dharmamudrā in which the practitioner realises the four joys again, but this time on the basis of teachings of how the manifold manifests in the co-emergent and so forth (see MATHEs 2009: 89 and 112–113).

³¹ In Rāmapāla’s commentary on the *Sekanirdeśa*, we are informed that the dharmamudrā relates to a central practice of the outer creation phase, while karmamudrā practice extends through the perfect completion stage. In other words, the way dharmamudrā is presented here suggests not so much a progressive succession following from the karmamudrā empowerment but rather the possibility of an alternative path which begins with the outer creation phase. According to *Kāropa*, a disciple of Maitrīpa, the four moments and joys can also arise directly on the level of dharmamudrā, and one must rely on a karmamudrā only when this is impossible. See MATHEs 2009: 94.

³² It should be noted, however, that creation stage visualisations can occasionally be employed in the advanced levels of the completion stage.

³³ See TV 7 and 11 (TV 459.12–13 & TV 460.16–17): “Those with inferior capacities have perfectly cultivated the circle with the help of the karma- and samayamudrā. [With a mind] directed to the external in the matter of pure reality, they meditate on enlightenment. (TV 7) ... The yogin who has seen true reality, however, is wholly devoted to mahāmudrā; his faculty being unsurpassable, he abides in [the realisation of the] nature of all entities.” (TV 11). (karmasamayamudrābhāṣyam cakhran niśpāda bhāvītāḥ | dhīyanti mṛdavo bodhim āvād śuddhatattve bahirmukhāḥ || ... dveṣatattvāḥ punar yogī mahāmudrāparīyaṇaḥ | sarvabhāvasvabhāvena viharedd uttamendr śyāḥ||).
gorically exclude *Sahajavajra’s mahāmudrā as being outside the sequence of the four seals. Moreover, mahāmudrā is not only fruition (i.e., Buddhashood): in his Sekanirdeśa,33 Maitrīpa introduces his purely Madhyamaka presentation of mahāmudrā by equating the latter with non-abiding, which Rāmapāla equates, as already mentioned, with the practice of amanāsikāra (i.e., the withdrawal of one’s attention from conceptually created duality34).35 Rāmapāla also makes it clear that the doctrinal source for this is the Jñānālokālamkārasūtra as well as the Avikalpapraveśa-dhāraṇī, an earlier non-Tantric Dhāraṇī text. Here four sets of characteristic signs, i.e., the mistaken projections of the ordinary phenomenal world, remedies, true reality, and the fruit, are abandoned through the practice of not becoming mentally engaged. In the last of the eight verses on mahāmudrā found in the Sekanirdeśa, Maitrīpa takes up this topic and thus establishes, according to Rāmapāla’s commentary, an essential link between mahāmudrā and the abandoning of characteristic signs through mental non-engagement.36 It should be noted, however, that for Maitrīpa the term amanāsikāra stands not only for mental non-engagement but also for “luminous self-empowerment.”37 For this reason, I propose to translate amanāsikāra in its Tantric meaning as “non-conceptual realisation.”

In his commentary on verse 7 of the Tattvadāsaka,38 *Sahajavajra refers to precisely this context when he quotes verse 36 of the Sekanirdeśa. In

33 Sekanirdeśa, verse 29 (SN 38611-12) reads as follows: “Not to abide in anything is known as mahāmudrā. Because self-awareness [i.e., mahāmudrā] is stainless, [the moments of enjoying] manifold [appearances] and so forth do not arise.” (sarvasmim apratiśthānam mahāmudrati kṛtyate | vimalatvā svasaṃvitter vicitrāder na sambhavah ||).

34 See Mathes 2015: 248–258.

36 In his commentary on SN 36, Rāmapāla offers a nearly verbatim citation from the section of the Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī that describes the abandonment of the four sets of characteristic signs through amanāsikāra. For details, see Mathes 2016: 327–331.

37 At least this is Maitrīpa’s final analysis of the term amanāsikāra in the Amanāsikārādīhāra (AMĀ 497a.7): “[The letter] a stands for the word ‘luminous,’ and manāsikāra for the word ‘self-empowerment’ (svādhīṣṭhāna). It is both a and manāsikāra, so we get amanāsikāra.” (a iti prabhāsvarapadam | manāsikāra iti svādhīṣṭhānapadam | aṣ cāsau manāsikāraś cety amanāsikāraḥ).

38 Verse 7 of the Tattvadāsaka (TD 487a.7) reads as follows: “The world itself, which is free from knowledge and knowable objects, is taken to be non-duality. But even vain clinging to a state free of duality is taken, in like manner, to be luminous.”
verse 5 of the Tattvadaśaka, Maitrīpa explains that phenomena are experienced as being luminous, and verse 7c even takes helpful concepts such as the clinging to a state free from duality to be this way. *Sahajavajra then comments that for Maitrīpa the characteristic signs, which are abandoned through amanasiṅkāra in the Avikalpapravesadhāraṇī, are all realised as luminous. In other words, for Maitrīpa nothing is really abandoned. One simply realises everything for what it truly is: luminosity. This perfectly fits Maitrīpa’s interpretation of amanasiṅkāra as luminous self-empowerment in his Amanasiṅkārādhāra.

To recapitulate, I suggest that *Sahajavajra here refers to the mahāmudrā part of the Sekanirdeśa not because of its being embedded in the sequence of the four seals, but because of its Madhyamaka context of non-abiding (i.e., Apratiṣṭhāna-Madhyamaka)\(^{39}\) and the related practice of amanasiṅkāra – understood as a practice of realising the luminous nature of everything. This calls into question whether mahāmudrā in the Sekanirdeśa stands only for fruition, as would be required by the strict Tantric context of the four seals. We have already seen that through its equation with non-abiding and amanasiṅkāra, for Rāmapāla mahāmudrā also includes the path. In his *Tattvadaśakaṭīkā, *Sahajavajra offers an additional interpretation following his citation of Sekanirdeśa, verse 36: “Here mahāmudrā [refers to] the pith instructions on the true reality of mahāmudrā.”\(^{40}\)

Thus, as true reality, mahāmudrā refers not only to the fruition and the path, but also to the foundation. In sum, this provides the familiar triad of foundation, path, and fruition (gzhì, lam, ḃras bu) mahāmudrā. In his Phyag chen zla ba ’od zer, Dwags po bKrashīn rgyal also comes to this conclusion with a particular reference to the definition of mahāmudrā in the Sekanirdeśapaṇḍitikā:

(jñānajñeyavivṛtāḥ ca jagad evāvivṛtāḥ matam | dvayābhāvābhāvāḥ ca tathaiva hi prabhāvahāvāḥ ||). In the eyes of *Sahajavajra, here Maitrīpa replies to the possible objection that he postulates the same characteristic signs which are to be abandoned through amanasiṅkāra. His reply then is that this is achieved through realising their luminosity.

\(^{39}\) All eight verses on mahāmudrā in the Sekanirdeśa are Madhyamaka. Some of them are also found in the Apratiṣṭhāna section of Maitrīpa’s Tattvatattvāvalī.

\(^{40}\) See MATHES 2005: 24. In the quotation of the *Tattvadaśakaṭīkā in his Ratnagośtravibhāgavyākhyā commentary, ‘Gos Lo tsha ba gZhon nu dpal omits “reality” and only states: “Here mahāmudrā refers to mahāmudrā pith instructions.” (DRSM 46218–19: ’dir zang phyag rgya chen po zhes ba ba ni phyag rgya chen po’i man ngag ste \(]\).
In the Sekanirdeśapaññikā composed by Rāmapāla [we find]:

“Then, given that it impresses its seal (mudrā) on the three [other] mudrās, [mahāmudrā] is both great (mahā) and a seal. It is beyond analysis, and its nature is non-abiding. It is made manifest [by] the diligent and continuous cultivation of the wisdom of the path. It is non-existent (i.e., lacks an own-being), free of the hindrances of the knowable, and the basis of everything perfect. It has the identity of [cyclic] existence and nirvāṇa as its nature, consists of universal compassion, and has the unique form of great bliss.”

Such are the definition and the identification of mahāmudrā, by which foundation, path, and fruition mahāmudrā are recognised.

41 The Sanskrit text which served as a basis for bKra shis rnam rgyal’s Tibetan quotation must have read: *avīcārāga-tā-pratīṣṭhānārūpā.* In the edition by ISAACSON & SFERRA (SNP 190). we find instead: vicārāga-tā-pratīṣṭhānārūpā-, which means that both of the two compounds are in compound with what follows, thus describing the wisdom of the path instead of mahāmudrā. The other difference is that vicāra (“analysis”) is not negated, so that we get a “wisdom of the path that is reached by analysis.” ISAACSON’s & SFERRA’s Sanskrit edition is also supported by the Tibetan translations of the SNP in the bsTan’gyur editions and the dPal spungs edition of the Karmapa VII’s Phyag chen rgya gzhung (ISAACSON & SFERRA 2014: 236, l. 3–4). The compound vicārāga-tā-pratīṣṭhānārūpā- perfectly describes the path, but the path is not the main subject in this definition of mahāmudrā. Moreover, avīcārāga-tā and pratīṣṭhānārūpā are well-established attributes of mahāmudrā: In SN 29ab, pratīṣṭhāna is equated with mahāmudrā, and in his commentary on SN 30, Rāmapāla explains that pratīṣṭhāna is inexpressible wisdom that does not arise from analysis but is effortless and occurs in its own sphere (SNP 193.8: *cāpratīṣṭhānām acintyām jhānam na tad vicārāgataṁ kim tarhy anābhogam svarasābhīgataṁ*).

42 Dwags po bKra shis mam rgyal: Phyag chen bla ba’i ’od zer (148–149): dbang bskur nges bstan kyi bka’ ’gro rla ma pā las mṭzad pa las | phyag rgya gsum la rgyas gdab pa’i phyor | ’di chen po yang yin la phyag rgya yang yin te | dpayad pa ma ’ongs pa mi gnas pa’i ngo bo nyid | lam gyi ye shes gus pa dang bcos shing rgyun mi shad par goms par byas pa mgon du byas pa dngos po med pa | shes bya la sogs pa’i sgrīb pa spangs pa | phun sum tshogs pa ma lus pa’i gzhi gyur pa | srid pa dang mya ngan las ’das pa ngo bo nyid kyis gcig pa | dmigs pa med pa’i snying rje chen po’i lus can | bde ba chen po’i sku gcig pu ni phyag rgya chen po’o | | zhes phyag chen gyi nges tshig dang ngo bo ngsō ’dzin dang | de mams kyis gzhi lam ’bras bu’i phyag chen ngsos bzung dang... First translated by LHALUNGPA (2006: 103–104).
Impressing its seal on the lower three seals means that \( \text{mahāmudrā} \) is the nature of these seals, and therefore it can be made to shine through by cultivating the wisdom of the path. Shortly after this, in a section entitled “Clearing away the confusion of other schools” (\( \text{Zhar bzung gzhana gyi log rtog gsal ba} \)), which is basically a response to Sa skyā Panḍita’s (1182–1251) critique of the author’s \( \text{mahāmudrā} \) tradition, Dwags po bKra shis rnam rgyal writes:

Moreover, in your \( \text{Thub pa’i dgongs gsal} \) [you claim that] if it is \( \text{mahāmudrā} \), it must have arisen from empowerment. This is not acceptable for the following reasons: One would have to explain that the primordial abiding nature of all phenomena, i.e., foundation \( \text{mahāmudrā} \), has arisen from empowerment. If one did not maintain such a foundation \( \text{mahāmudrā} \), one would be forced to deny also path and fruition \( \text{mahāmudrā} \), since the fruit must be actualised after having cultivated on the path that which abides as the foundation. Moreover, one would have to engage in the deeds of abandoning the \( \text{dharma} \) enunciated in many \( \text{mahāmudrā} \) works such as the ones by those gone before us – the elder and younger Saraha, Tilopa, Nāropa, and Maitripa – as well as [other] works such as the seven works on accomplishment.

The point made here is that if \( \text{mahāmudrā} \) is the fruit, it must also be the foundation, the true nature of all phenomena. This argument presupposes the position found in the \( \text{Caturmudrānvaya} \), namely that an uncontrived fruit cannot be produced by something contrived. While it is true that the

---

\( ^{43} \) Dwags po bKra shis rnam rgyal: \( \text{Phyag chen zla ba’i ’od zer, 1563:11: yang khyed kyi dgongs su } | \text{phyag rgya chen po yin na dbang las ’byung dgos pa’i khyab ’cha ba’ang mi rigs te } | \text{de ltar nachos thams cad kyi gdod ma’i gnas lugs gzh’i phyag rgya chen po de yang dbang bskur las byung tshul brjod dgos par ’gyur ba’i phyir dang } | \text{de ’dra ba’i gzh’i phyag chen khas mi len na } | \text{gzh’i la gnas pa lam gyis goms par byas nas ’bras bu mngon du byed dgos pas } | \text{lam gyi phyag chen dang ’bras bu’i phyag chen yang med par smra dgos pa’i phyir dang } | \text{sngar bshad pa’i sa ra ha che chung tat lo nā ro mai tri pa sogs kyi phyag rgya chen po’i gzhung dang } | \text{grub pa sde bdun la so gsog pa’i gzhung mang po la chos spong gi las sgrub dgos par ’gyur ba’i phyir dang } […] \) First translated by Lhalungpa (2006: 109).

\( ^{44} \) The \( \text{Caturmudrānvaya} \), which is ascribed to the Tantric Nāgārjuna, served as a basis for the \( \text{Sekanirdeśā} \), and thus it represents the most important source for Maitripa. The text explains how something artificially created, such as the physical experience of the four joys (i.e., the wisdom arisen from a \( \text{karmamudrā} \)), can initiate
nature of everything becomes manifest through empowerment, the questions remains which elements constitute the latter and whether formal empowerment is required at all. It may be argued that mahāmudrā can also be manifested by the practice of abandoning all characteristic signs through amanaskāra based on the kindness of the guru. In fact, this can be gathered from the commentary on verses 29 and 31 of the Sekanirdeśa, the latter being another one of the eight verses on mahāmudrā that are purely Madhyamaka. In his explanation on these two verses, Rāmapāla emphasises the importance of the guru’s kindness that enables a direct realisation of true reality. 45 In his commentary on the second part of SN 29, 46 Rāmapāla then adds that this occurs beyond the impure moments and joys. Isaacson and Sferra object to this that mahāmudrā’s freedom from the impure joys only refers to the “single undefiled moment within the sequence of the moments and the Blisses (i.e., joys) of the sexual union of the third consecration.” 47 In my opinion, however, Rāmapāla addresses the possible ob-

45 Rāmapāla on SN 29 (SNP 192:10–12): “One should not think that [this amanaskāra as taught in the Jhānañāmakārikā] cannot be practised, for by the kindness of [one’s] venerable guru, mahāmudrā, which has the defining characteristic of being endowed with all supreme qualities, can certainly be made directly manifest.” (...āsākyāniṣṭhānata ca na manvantarā, sadgūrupāpasādānāvāsāṃ sarvākārāvaro-petalakṣāṇamahāmudrāyāḥ pratayāśikartum ācārote.). First translated in MATHES 2007: 555–556. Rāmapāla on SN 31 (SNP 193:12–15): “If … this reality was to be experienced directly … [then] it should be known through an awareness [which is obtained through] the kindness of a genuine guru.” (yady … tat tattvāṃ pratayāśikam amubhūtam syāt … sadgūrupāpasādāvadāvem jīteyam.). First translated in MATHES 2011: 120.

46 SN 29cd (SN 386:12): “As self-awareness (i.e., mahāmudrā) is stainless, [the moments of enjoying] manifold [appearances] and so forth do not arise.” (vimalatvāvā svasanvītā svitaicītriśad na samghavah.). The commentary (SNP 192:13–15) reads as follows: “How is it, then, that [mahāmudrā] does not have the nature of the four moments? [In 29c] it is stated: ‘Being self-awareness [i.e., mahāmudrā] is stainless.’ Being stainless, the three stained moments of the manifold and so forth do not occur in it. Therefore the three [impure] joys do not arise in it either.” (nany as atra kathām na catuḥsānāraśpūtā, āha – vimalatvāsvasāvītā sīmālāvāvāvācītriśad kṣanatrayasā yām samalasya nātra sambhavah. tato nāṇandatrayasambhavah |). First translated in MATHES 2007: 556.

47 ISAACSON & SFERRA 2014: 413.
jection that mahāmudrā does not have the nature of the four moments if the practice is exclusively amanasikāra, so to say. Rāmapāla’s reply, then, is the reassurance that the three impure moments do not occur in mahāmudrā. While it is true that the third moment and co-emergent joy are related to mahāmudrā in the context of assigning the four joys to the four mudrās (although mahāmudrā is beyond the four joys), in his Caturmudrapadesa Maitrīpa explains the following just before referring mahāmudrā to co-emergent joy:

mahāmudrā [stands for] the union of all phenomena into a pair with [their own] true nature of non-arising. It is free from [any] thought relating to a perceived object and a perceiving subject – the hindrances of defilements, knowable objects, and so forth having been abandoned. One experiences it as it truly is according to its specific characteristic. It is called the fruit which is stainless. As for its nature, it does not have a form [like] all phenomena everywhere, [and] it is all-pervading, unchangeable, and ever-present. mahāmudrā is therefore perfect enlightenment in a single moment, and not [something that can be] broken down into four moments and four joys…

[When it comes to] reality as it truly is, it needs to be learned from the mouth of the guru when [he sets] the wheel of the dharma [in motion].

---

48 CMU (B 13a2–3, D 214a7–b1, P 234a1–2): “Still, there is a presentation of the four joys in relation to the four seals. The karmamudrā is joy, the dharmamudrā supreme joy, mahāmudrā co-emergent joy, and the samayamudrā the [joy of] no-joy.” (*on kyang phyag rgya bzhi la ltos nas dga’ ba bzhi bzhag ste | las kyi phyag rgya ni dga’o | | chos kyi phyag rgya ni mchog tu dga’ ba’o | | phyag rgya chen po ni lhan cig skyes pa’i dga’ ba’o | | dam tshig gi phyag rgya ni bral lo |).

49 Here Maitrīpa explains how the four seals can be taken as the four joys in their relation to mahāmudrā (see below).

50 CMU (B 12b5–13a1, D 214a3–214b1, P 233b6–234a2): phyag rgya chen (*po ni* a) chos thams cad skye ba med pa’i ngo bo zung du ’jug pa | gzung ba dang ’dzin pa’i rtog pa dang bral ba | nyon mongs pa dang shes bya la sogs pa’i sgrib pa spangs pa | ji lta ba bzhi du rang gi mtshan nyid nyams su myong ba ste | dri ma med pa’i ’bras bur brjod do | | de’i ngo bo ni mtha’ dbus kyi chos thams cad gzugs can ma yin pa dang | thams cad du khyab pa dang | mi ’gyur ba dang | dus thams cad pa’o | | des na phyag rgya chen po ni skad cig ma gcig a mngon par rdzogs par sangs rgyas pa ste | skad cig ma bzhi dang dga’ ba bzhi dbye ba ni med do | … de nyid ji lta ba bzhi chos kyi ’khor lo’i dus su bla ma’i zhal la ltos par bya’o |. *a P po’i b P cig.*
To be sure, “enlightenment in a single moment” does not mean here that mahāmudrā is experienced for a single moment only, but that it is attained instantaneously, for it is clear that once true reality is experienced as it is, this realisation remains. That it is not the co-emergent joy of karmamudrā practice also follows from the closely related Caturmudrānvaya that calls the wisdom that arises from a prajñā an “image of the real co-emergent, and in verse 8cd of his Mahāsukhaprakāśa Maitripa must be referring to something similar when he notes that the “pure apparent truth should be known to be something in which there is a false manifestation of bliss.”

This raises the question to what extent the verses on dharmamudrā and mahāmudrā in the Sekanirdeśa still belong to the prajñā wisdom empowerment. In his *Guruparamparākramopadeśa, Maitripa’s disciple Vajrapāṇi thus categorises empowerment under supreme, average, or inferior types: inferior empowerment corresponds to the outer creation stage (up to the master empowerment); average empowerment to karmamudrā (including both the profound creation stage and the completion stage proper); and supreme empowerment to dharmamudrā (the supreme creation stage). mahāmudrā, then, is taken as the most supreme empowerment (the natural completion stage).

Based on this, I agree with ISAACSON & SFERRA (2014: 413) that the “reference to the necessity of the favour (i.e., kindness) of a true teacher (to directly manifest mahāmudrā or realize reality in the Sekanirdeśa) should

---

51 This can be compared to the ekakṣaṇābhisamaya in the Abhisamayālaṃkāra, which refers to the Bodhisattva’s simultaneous realisation of all aspects of the three knowledges in the vajra-like samādhi during the last moment of the tenth bhūmi, which is immediately followed by the attainment of Buddhahood (Brunnhölzl 2010:60). To be sure, “perfect enlightenment in a single moment” does not mean that it only lasts for a single moment, for once mahāmudrā is attained it will never be lost.

52 CMA 392c-6: “All that [appears as] co-emergent is called co-emergent because it duplicates the image of the [real] co-emergent. [This] image of the co-emergent leads [the adept] to realise [a type of] wisdom that is similar to the co-emergent. The co-emergent is thus [only in this limited sense] the wisdom based on a prajñā.” (sahajam tat sarvaṃ sahajacchāyānukāritvā sahajam ity abhidhīyate | sahajacchāyā sahanasadṛśam jñānam pratīpādayatīti sahajam prajñājñānam). First translated in MATHES 2011: 110.


54 GPKU (B 299b–300a, D 170a–b3, P 191a–b3), for an English translation see MATHES 2015: 142–143.
rather suggest a Tantric context. However, on this level these can hardly be pith instructions on karmamudrā. In this context, they are rather pith instructions on true reality (such as Dohā songs or Pāramitānaya pith instructions that accord with Mantranaya). As can be seen in the *Tattvadaśakaṭīkā, such pith instructions on the reality of mahāmudrā (mahāmudrā pith instructions) are also based on non-Tantric sources, such as the Samādhirājasūtra. In order to demonstrate that characteristic signs are luminous (or pure and unborn), *Sahajavajra quotes a group of verses from this sūtra (SRS 32.92–105), the content of which corresponds to a verse quoted below, i.e., verse 30 of the Sekanirdeśa, the second of the eight verses on mahāmudrā:

Effortless wisdom
[Can] be taken as inconceivable.
Something “inconceivable” that one has [been able to] conceive
Cannot be truly inconceivable.

One could argue that when passages of the Samādhirājasūtra are used as pith instructions that enable direct access to true reality or emptiness, they become Tantric or “accord with Mantrānaya,” to use *Sahajavajra’s words. In this context, it is interesting to note that in his Advayavivarana-prajñopāviniścayasiddhi Padmavajra refers to the Samādhirājasūtra as Samādhirājatantra when he quotes verse 72 from the first appendix to the Samādhirājasūtra. The Madhyamaka-based mahāmudrā explanations of

---

55 The additions in brackets are my own.
56 That is, following gZhon nu dpal’s reading of the *Tattvadaśakaṭīkā (see above).
57 For a translation of this part, see MATHES 2005: 24–27 and BRUNNHÖLZL 2007: 177–181, who also identified the verse following the Samādhirājasūtra quotes as SN 30.
58 SN 386:18-19: anābhogā hi yaj jñāṇam tac cācintyam pracaksyate | sāmcintya yad acintyam vai tad acintyam bhaven na hi ||
59 The attribution of the Advayavivarana-prajñopāviniścayasiddhi to Padmavajra is seen as critical by Adam Krug, because the text also quotes Anāgavajrapāda’s Prajñopāviniścayasiddhi (and in that text it is clear that Anāgavajra treats Padmavajra as his teacher). Communicated by e-mail on September 10, 2015.
60 AVPUV 215:17-18: “Thus it has been said in the Samādhirājatantra: ‘All living beings will become a Buddha, there is absolutely no sentient being who is unworthy.’” (tathā coktaṃ samādhirājatantre (sūtre): buddha bhavisyati sarvajano 'yam nāstiha kaścid abhājanasattvaḥ). The quotation accords with SRS 317:13–14 (appendix 1, verse 72cd). I thank Adam Krug, UC Santa Barbara, for this reference.
the *Sekanirdeśa* fulfil a similar function as certain parts of the *Samādhīrajājasūtra*, in that they enable one to directly point out *mahāmudrā* in a process that Vajrapāṇi calls the most supreme empowerment. Whether such teachings then belong to the Pāramitānaya or Mantranaya was at times regarded as a difficult question, and this issue is very diplomatically addressed by Maitrīpa’s disciple Vajrapāṇi in his pith instructions on the *Prajñāpāramitāḥrdayasūtra*:

One may doubt whether these special instructions on the meaning of the *Prajñāpāramitāḥrdyasa*[trajectory] belong to the philosophical vehicles or the mantra vehicles. They appear differently in the mind of sentient beings, but in terms of the profound nature of phenomena [to which they refer] there is no difference.\(^61\)

The Pāramitānaya-based pith instructions of Maitrīpa’s *Tattvādaśaka* can be seen in the same light. Moreover, they may be used in a full-fledged empowerment or else in direct mind-to-mind transmission of realisation, such as the one Maitrīpa received from Śavaripa.\(^62\)

The best support for the case of a *mahāmudrā* practice outside the sequence of the four seals remains the *Tattvādaśakaṭī* on verse 8, where *Sahajavajra identifies a mahāmudrā approach distinct from both the Mantranaya and Pāramitānaya. From the *Tattvādaśaka*:

By [the power of] having realised this reality,
The yogin, whose eyes are wide open,
Moves everywhere like a lion,
By any [chosen] means and in any [chosen] manner.\(^63\)

* *Sahajavajra immediately adds the commentary:

---

\(^61\) BhPTAP D 293a1-2; P 317a1-3: *shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i snying po’i don gyi gdam ngag ’di mtshan nyid kyi theg pa yin nam sngags kyi theg pa yin zhes the tshom za na | sens can rnams kyi blo’i snang ba la tha dad du snang mod kyi zab mo’i chos nyid la tha dad med de | de lta bas na shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i sngags ’di ni gsal sngags rnams kyi don kyi snying po yin no |.

\(^62\) According to one version of Maitrīpa’s life story reported in the ’Bri gung bk’as brgyud chos mdzod (see Mathes 2014: 374–375).

\(^63\) TD 487b15-16: *etattattvāvabodhena yena tena yathā tathā | vivṛtākṣo bhramed yogi keśarīva samantatāḥ ||.*
Thanks to the yoga of firmly realising the previously taught nondual reality through the pith instructions of the genuine guru.\textsuperscript{64}

He subsequently elaborates on this point as follows:

Well then, if one asks, what is the difference compared to a yogin who follows Mantranaya? [The answer is as follows:] because [the yogin’s practice] is [conducted] without [following] the sequence of the four seals, and because it takes a long time to perfect complete enlightenment through the type of equanimity that lacks the experience of great bliss resulting from pride in being the deity, there are great differences with regard to what is accomplished and that which accomplishes. On the other hand, it differs from the yogin in the Pāramitānaya, specifically because the suchness of indivisible union, the emptiness discerned through the instruction of a genuine guru, is firmly realised. Therefore, those who do not practice austerities [but rather] have perfect certainty that the reality of one taste is emptiness are like [skillful] villagers grasping a snake: even though they touch the snake, they are not bitten. Some call this the wisdom of reality [or] mahāmudrā.\textsuperscript{65}

In reference to this passage, Kragh speculates that “certain passages, perhaps the text’s reference\textsuperscript{66} to a non-Tantric form of Mahāmudrā, could be
later interpolations.” Moreover, he claims that “in Indian and Tibetan sources, the use of the pronoun ‘some’ (kha cig, ke cid, or kaś cid) often marks a rhetorical statement, in which the author distances himself from what is said by attributing it to someone else.”\(^{67}\) Besides the fact that there is no formal linguistic indication for taking this passage as an interpolation, there is also no reason to do so if one includes Pāramitānaya-based mahāmudrā within Tantra, even though it is outside of the sequence of the four seals. *Sahajavajra certainly does not call it non-Tantric,\(^{68}\) which means that there does not need to be a contradiction between it and the *Sthitisamāsa. In this context, it should be noted that Dwags po bKra shis rnam rgyal’s path of direct cognition also belongs to the Vajrayāna, namely as a category separate from the path of blessing.\(^{69}\) As for the issue of ke cid or kaś cid, even though these indefinite pronouns may introduce a statement opposed to the author’s view, they are also found in Sanskrit philosophical texts with the connotation of “we” (i.e., “we are of the opinion that…”), which fits the context here much better.\(^{70}\) Moreover, I cannot understand why Kragh has a “fundamental difficulty” with my “line of argument when it comes to establishing a connection between the Indian sources and the beginnings of ‘Sūtra Mahāmudrā’ in Tibet. … The problem is (i.e., according to Kragh) that the texts stemming from the Indian circle of Maitrīpa and his students are hardly ever referred to in the *Dags

---

\(^{67}\) Kragh 2015: 75.

\(^{68}\) In my first publication on this topic, I used “non-tantric” (Mathes 2006: 220 and 224), but always in the sense of *Sahajavajra’s “Pāramitānaya pith instructions that accord with Mantranaya.” In Mathes 2008 I thus preferred “not specifically tantric.”

\(^{69}\) Dwags po bKra shis rnam rgyal: “This very tradition in the cycle of Dohās and cycles of mahāmudrā in symbolic transmission belongs, in terms of the sūtra/mantra divide, to the secret Vajrayāna. From among the latter’s threefold [sub]division into the path of blessing, the path of reassurance, and the path of direct [cognition], it is explained as the last of [these three]. It has been [further] explained that a ripening empowerment is needed, an extensive or abbreviated one, whatever is appropriate.” (Phyang chen bla’i ‘od zer 156.15.19: do ha’i skor dang | phyang chen brda bryud kyi skor ‘ga’ zhiṅ tu | lam srol ’di nyid mdo sngags gnyis kyi nang nas gsang sngags kyi theg pa dang | de la byin rabs kyi lam dang | dbugs dbyung gi lam | mgon sum gyi lam gsum du phyi ba’i phyi ma yin par ’chad la | smin byed du dbang rgyas bsdu gang yang rung ba zhiṅ dgos par bshad pa dang …). First translated by Lhalungpa (2006: 109).

\(^{70}\) I thank Prof. Diwakar Acharya for this observation.
My own “fundamental difficulty” with Kragh’s argument is that the Tshogs chos material of the Dwags po’i bka’ ‘bum, i.e., the larger part of the corpus based on notes taken by sGam po pa’s disciples, contains hardly any quotations of original sources, and the texts of the Tshogs chos yon tan phun tshogs feature a threefold division of the path similar to the one in the *Tattvadaśakaṭī. It is well-known that Indian and Tibetan masters incorporated ideas and whole systems of thought from others without acknowledging this. Abhinavagupta’s works, for example, are strongly influenced by Śaṅkara, but the latter is not even referred to once. In such cases, it makes perfect sense to look for similarities. According to gZhon nu dpal, the fact that the Tattvadaśaka and its commentary lend doctrinal support for sGam po pa’s “pāramitā-mahāmudrā” was already observed by rJe rGod tshang pa (1189–1258). Moreover, the importance of the *Tattvadaśakaṭī for the Mar pa bka’ brgyud schools is also stressed by the Eighth Karmapa Mi bskyod rdo rje.

Finally, I would like to take issue with Kragh’s statement that my “analysis has thus established that there were rare, isolated Indian cases of using the otherwise Tantric word mahāmudrā in its contemplative sense as referring to advanced non-Tantric stages of meditation.” I agree with Kragh that mahāmudrā is a Tantric term. But why should Pāramitānaya pith instructions that accord with Mantranaya not be labelled with this term? Moreover, as I have already pointed out in previous publications, the two main sources for Pāramitānaya-based mahāmudrā are not isolated but

---

71 Kragh 2015: 76. The addition in brackets is my own.
73 Oral information from Prof. Diwakar Acharya.
74 As reported in Mathes 2006: 206. For a comparison of *Sahajavajra’s passage with a similar one in sGam po pa’s Tshogs chos yon tan phun tshogs, see Mathes 2008: 40–41.
75 Mi bskyod rdo rje: sKu gsum ngo sprod kyi rnam par bshad pa, vol. 21, 132.1–3: “If one wonders how the view of the two truths transmitted by the Mar pa bKa’ brgyud is, it must be said here that it is roughly the one of Jina Maitripa’s Tattvādaśaka and *Sahajavajra’s *Tattvādāsakaṭī. … They are taken to be Pāramitā[naya] pith instructions that accord with the Mantra[naya].” (rje btsun mar pa lo tsa ba’i bka’ bgyud las ‘ongs pa bden gnyis kyi lta ba ji lta bu’o snyam na | rgyal ba mai tri pa’i de kho na nyid bcu pa ches pa’i ‘grel pa slob dpon chen po lhan cig skyes pa’i rdo rjes mdzad pa de nyid kyi don che long ‘dir brjod par bya ste | … sngags dang rjes su mthun pa’i pha rol tu phyin pa’i man ngag mdor bsdus mdzad par bzhes pas).
76 Kragh 2015: 75.
closely related to each other, in view of the fact that *Sahajavajra quotes and comments on a verse from Jñānakīrti’s *Tattvāvatāra* (still in the context of explaining TD 8):

For outstanding yogins
The union of insight and means is simply meditation.
The victorious ones call it
*mahāmudrā* union.\(^77\)\(^78\)

[But] the followers of the [Mantra]yāna point out that the mere meditation of uniting means and insight is not *mahāmudrā* meditation; otherwise it would follow that the traditions of Pāramitā[naya] and Mantra[naya] are not different.\(^79\)

The verse just cited is taken from the beginning of the fourth chapter in Jñānakīrti’s *Tattvāvatāra*, which considers the mode of Mantrayāna for those of superior faculties. The same verse is also found in the *Subhāṣitasamgraha*, where it is explained at length. The *Subhāṣitasamgraha* leaves no room for Pāramitā[naya]-based *mahāmudrā*. Its purely Tantric description of *upāya* diverges from Jñānakīrti, however, in that the latter understands it in the more general Mahāyāna sense of the threefold compassion.\(^80\) In his explanation of compassion without a focus, Jñānakīrti then

\(^77\) Lit. “*mahāmudrā* union is called meditation by the victorious ones.” It should be noted that *mahāmudrā* union does not mean that one unites with an objective reality called *mahāmudrā*; it refers rather to a realisation that lies beyond a perceived object and a perceiving subject (oral information from Chetsang Rinpoche).

\(^78\) TA (B 327b-3, D 43a–b, P 47b-3): *thabs dang shes rab mnyam sbyor ba’i | | bsgom pa nyid ni mal’ byor mchog gi ni | | phyag rgya chen po’i mnyam sbyor ba | | sgom’ par rgyal ba ruams kyis gzungs* \(^\ast\) B gis \(^a\) BP por \(^c\) D bsgom. For the Sanskrit of this verse, see *Subhāṣitasamgraha* (SBhS, part 1, 3978–9): *prajñopāyasamāyogo bhāvanāvāgavayogināṃ | mahāmudrāsamāyogo bhāvanā bhānyate jīnāth [[*]].

\(^79\) BD\(^{\text{ENDALL}}\) reads -yogā- (I forgot to make this emendation in MATHE 2015: 238).

\(^80\) That is, compassion directed towards sentient beings, compassion born from beholding the impermanent nature of phenomena, and compassion without a focus.
addresses the question whether or not insight and means are cultivated simultaneously:

When cultivating compassion without a focus, the compassion of [the yogin who is] identical with means and insight is not at all like that of cultivating the opposite, [compassion with a focus.] … What then is the meditation like for someone who is identical with means and insight in the state of cultivating compassion without a focus? An answer is given in the following:

In his identity with the nature of all phenomena,
The yogin is [naturally] endowed with compassion.
On a later meditation level,
He will become identical with mahāmudrā. 81

The relation between the Tattvāvatāra and the Subhāṣitasamgraha requires further investigation, but it should be noted at this point that while the Subhāṣitasamgraha accords with Jñānakūtri in the explanation of insight, 82 its Tantric presentation of the means does not. It is worth recalling here what I have already mentioned in previous publications: namely that for Jñānakūtri advanced Pāramitānaya practitioners of śamatha (calm abiding) and vipāśyanā (deep insight) are already in possession of mahāmudrā even at an initial stage. 83 Moreover, in his description of the Pāramitānaya, Jñānakūtri

See TA (B 331a-b; D 45b–46a; P 50a-b): dmigs pa med pa’i snying rje sgom pa’i gnas skabs su ni thabs dang shes rab de’i bdag nyid can8 gyi | snying rje cig shos sgom pa’i gnas skabs su ni ma yin te | … yang dmigs pa med pa’i snying rje sgom pa’i gnas skabs su thabs dang shes rab de’i bdag nyid can du bsgom par ji ltar ’gyur ro zhe na | | brjod par bya ste | dngos kun rang bzhiin bdag nyid du | | rnal ’byor snying rje can gyur pa | | sgom pa’i rim pa phyi7 nas ni | | phyag rgya che bdag nyid can ’gyur |. 8 DP yin8 B phye.

82 Even though the explanation of insight is mainly Madhyamaka, a Tantric context is indicated by an unidentified verse quoted in the Tattvāvatāra and the Subhāṣitasamgraha, in which insight is taken as the awareness of the mind-vajra. See MATHE 2015: 239.

83 It should be added that Jñānakūtri structures his Tattvāvatāra according to the
kīrti links the traditional fourfold Mahāyāna meditation with mahāmudrā by equating the goal “Mahāyāna” in Ānīkatārasūtra 10.257d with mahāmudrā.84

In summary, the fact that *Sahajavajra quotes Jñānakīrti’s Tattvāvatāra demonstrates that he was familiar with Jñānakīrti’s system of classification, and the same could probably be said of his master Maitripa. In other words, they could have picked up the idea of a mahāmudrā path outside of the sequence of the four seals from this famous master. It should also be noted that Jñānakīrti’s work was translated, in cooperation with Padmākararman, by the translator Rin chen bzang po (958–1055), who helped the king Ye shes ‘od (947–1024) to initiate the revival of Buddhism in Tibet known as the later dissemination of the dharma.85

**The *Sthitisamāsa***

The only other known work by *Sahajavajra is the *Sthitisamāsa,86 in which a summary of the four traditional “positions” (sthiti) of the Vaibhāṣika, Sautrāntika, Yogacāra, and Madhyamaka is immediately followed by a presentation of Mantranaya. I have already observed87 that the Mantranaya part of the *Sthitisamāsa begins with a summary of the Madhyamakacrowned analysis of true reality, which is the quintessence of Pāramitānaya (SS V.1–2b). The actual exposition of Mantranaya begins with line V.2c:

---

84 See Mathes 2008: 36.
86 There is only one Sanskrit palm-leaf manuscript which has been photographed. Confusingly, the microfilm of the manuscript (B 24/4) and the photos (B 25/5) were catalogued separately. Further, both texts (the original and the photographed text) were provisionally catalogued under the title Kośakārikā by the National Archives in Kathmandu and consequently also by the NGMPP. The text was identified by Matsuda (1995: 848–843 (= 205–210) as *Sahajavajra’s “Sthitisamuccaya” (SS). I thank Alexis Sanderson, who pointed out that the correct title of the work should be *Sthitisamāsa.
87 In Mathes 2006: 222–223.
Based on the Mantra tradition,
By virtue of its being linked with the four mudrās,

[True reality is realised] without confusion, [even] when not analysed. This is because of the special experience of emptiness [received] from the guru.
It is the bliss of insight and means,
Which must be experienced through self-awareness.

It should be noted that the explanation of Mantranaya begins immediately after the one of the Pāramitānaya is completed. If *Sahajavajra had intended to formally distinguish a third category, i.e., a pāramitā-based mahāmudrā outside of Pāramitānaya and Mantranaya (as in the *Tattvadaśakaṭīkā), this would have been the place. Moreover, such a third category is found nowhere in the *Stītisamāsa, and it is also ruled out in SS V.7cd:

When [one’s practice] is free from investigation,
How can it be free from the tradition of mantras?"  

Tantra is presented in the *Stītisamāsa in a way that diverges from Maitrīpa’s system. First, *Sahajavajra still endorses Maitrīpa’s preferred sequence of the four moments. This is evident from SS V.18ab, where *Sahajavajra claims:

The [moment of] the co-emergent should be known as the third.
In the empowerment of forceful [yoga] (ḥathayoga) it is the fourth.

In his “Proof that master Nāropa’s and Maitrīpa’s presentation of empowerment are in accordance” (mKhas grub nā ro mai tri dbang gi bzhed pa mthun par grub pa), Zhwa dmar IV Chos kyi grags pa (1453–1524) takes hathayoga to refer to the empowerment found in Nāropa’s Sekoddeśaṭīkā, i.e., the system found in the Kālacakratantra.

---

88 SS 11a1–b1: *mantranītaḥ (em., mantranīta cod.) samāśritya caturmudrānva-yāgamāt || avicāraṃ asamīdghaṃ visiśṭānubhavād guruh | śānyatāyāḥ svasaṃvedyaṃ praśnopāyamahāśukham ||.
89 SS 11b1: parāmarśaṃ vinaiva syāt kathāṃ mantranayaṃ vinā ||.
90 SS 12b1: tṛtiyāṃ sahaṇaṃ vidyār | seke tu *turīyaṃ (em., turīyaṃ cod.) haṭhe ||.
91 Zhwa dmar Chos kyi grags pa, mKhas grub nā ro mai tri dbang gi bzhed pa
In the section of the *Sthitisamāsa that follows verse V.18ab, *Sahajavajra surprisingly explains empowerment in line with the Sekoddeśa, with verses V.21–28 of the *Sthitisamāsa being nearly identical with the verses 80–82, 135, and 139–143 in the Sekoddeśa:92

It has been said [in the Sekoddeśa]:

Joy is the descent of the semen
[From] the lotus at the crown [to the one at the] spot between the eyebrows.
[From] the throat to the heart it is supreme joy.
From there [further down] there is intense joy93,94 (SS V.21, see SU 80)

Through manifold play [with a consort, the semen] abides at the navel.
As long as one is inside the secret lotus,
[The semen] remains in the secret jewel.
As long as it is not emitted, there is co-emergent joy.95 (SS V.22, see SU 81)

92 For the Tibetan edition of these verses from the Sekoddeśa, see OROFINO 1994: 81 and 100–103. The English translation of V.24–28 mainly follows OROFINO 2009: 32.
93 That is, the meaning of *virama (for Tib. dga' bral) in a Kālacakra context.
94 SS (B 185b–186a, D 97a3, P 104b1,2): de gsungs pa | dga' ba khu ba' | a 'bab pa4 | ste | | gtsug tor | bsmi phrag | padma'i tsha'i | | mgrin pa snying gar mchog | dga' | ste | | da8 nas dga' ba dang bral bar 'gyur |. A B 'babs | B smig phrag | P smin phyag c BD tsha'i d BP de.
95 SS (B 186a1, D 97a3,4, P 104b2): | sna tshogs rol mos lte ba gnas | | ji srid gsang ba'i padmar son | | de srid gsang ba'i nor bur gnas | | ma 'phos bar bu lhan cig skyes |. A DP nas.
It is non-abiding nirvāṇa,
[The state of the] lord full of great passion.
The bliss which is not emitted lacks [ordinary] passion
And one abides in nirvāṇa.\(^{96}\) (SS V.23, see SU 82)

There does not exist a greater transgression than the lack of passion,
No greater merit than supreme bliss.
Therefore one should constantly seek to actualise
The mind of immutable bliss.\(^{97}\) (SS V.24, see SU 135)

From emission is born dispassion.
From dispassion suffering is born.
From suffering the elements are ruined, and as it was handed down,
From the ruin of the elements death will come.\(^{98}\) (SS V.25, see SU 139)

After death they will be born in another [existence],
Bound in cyclic existence, and born [again].
Therefore one must avoid
With all effort the loss of passion.\(^{99}\) (SS V.26, see SU 140a–141b)

Without passion one would [even] not be a [good] lover,
And not seek out the Kāmaśāstra.
If this is so, why would a yogin create suffering
In accordance with the Tantra I proclaim?\(^{100}\) (SS V.27, see SU 142)

\(^{96}\) SS (B 186a₁₂, D 97a₄, P 104b₂₃): | mi gnas pa yi mya ngan ’das | | ’dod chags chen pos’ khyab bdag gtso\(^b\) | | ma’phos’ bde ba chags bral te | | de’ ni mya ngan ’das rab gnas |. \(^P\) po‘i’ \(^B\) nyid’ \(^D\) ’phros’ \(^DP\) ’di.

\(^{97}\) SS (B 186a₂₃, D 97a₅₅, P 104b₄₅): | chags bral las ni sdig pa med | | bde ba mchog las bsod nams med | | de phyir mi’gyur bde ba’i sems | | rtag tu nges’ gnas mos par bya |. \(^A\) D der.

\(^{98}\) SS (B 186a₃₃, D 97a₅₆, P 104b₄₅): | ’pho ba las ni chags bral ’byung | | chags bral las ni sdug bsngal ’byung | | sdug bsngal las ni kham’s zad de | | kham’s zad nas’ ni’chi bar gsungs |. \(^A\) B las’ \(^P\) ’gyur.

\(^{99}\) SS (B 186a₃₅, D 97a₆, P 104b₅₆): | shi bas de dag ’gzan du’ang’ byung | | srid par ‘ching zing skye ba ste | | de phyir ‘bad nas’ thams cad kys | | chags pa dor ba rnam par spang |. \(^3\) D ’bzin du’ang P ’gzan du’ang’ \(^B\) pa’ \(^C\) DP spangs.

\(^{100}\) SS (B 186a₅₅, D 97a₆₅, P 104b₅₆): | chags bral ’dod ldan ma yin te | | ’dod pa’i sbyor thabs ma’’dod na | | nga yis bstan pa’ \(’c’rgyud du’i\) yang | | ci ste rnal ’byor sdug bsngal bskyed |. \(^3\) D ’di’ \(^B\) DP pa’ \(^C\) P ’gyun du.
Taking advantage of the nature of immutable bliss, 
One must attain the supremely immutable. 
Once the support is released, 
The supported [yogin] will be passionless.\textsuperscript{101} (SS V.28, see SU 143)

There is no refutation or critical assessment of this relatively long quotation. In other words, with his tacit acceptance of these verses, *Sahajavajra not only contradicts his own initial statement but also stands against his teacher in one of the most controversial debates in eleventh-century India. On the other hand, it could also be argued that Maitrīpa himself had already given an explanation of this contradiction: in treatises such as the Hevajratantra, the correct sequence was not made explicit in order to protect the instructions from those who do not rely on a guru.\textsuperscript{102}

The second problem with these Sekoddeśa verses in the *Sthitisamāsa is that *Sahajavajra implicitly endorses the strong emphasis of disadvantages that result from releasing one’s semen, a teaching that is directly opposed to what we find, for example, in Maitrīpa’s *Caturmudropadeśa, where the co-emergent joy (in the third position) corresponds to two of altogether four descending drops at the tip of the jewel and two on the stamen of the lotus. The fourth joy is then experienced when all four drops are inside the lotus.\textsuperscript{103} Khenpo Phuntsok, the abbot of Lekshay Ling Monastery in Kathmandu, warned, however, against a too literal reading of these lines from the *Caturmudropadeśa, stressing that it is the real drop (don gyi thig le) and not the material drop (rdzas kyi thig le) that is being released.\textsuperscript{104}

To summarise, there is a strong Kālacakra influence in *Sahajavajra’s *Sthitisamāsa, which is missing in Maitrīpa’s own works.\textsuperscript{105} Given these differences, one could be inclined to doubt whether the author of the *Tattvadaśakaṭīkā is the same person who composed the *Sthitisamāsa. Of

\textsuperscript{101} SS (B 186a₅, D 97a₇, P 104b₆₋₇): | bde ba mi ’gyur rang bzhin gyis | | mi ’gyur mchog ni bsgrub par bya | | rten ni shor bar gyur pa yis | | brten’ pa chags dang bral ba yin |. \textsuperscript{a} D rten.

\textsuperscript{102} CMU (B 11b₁₋₂ ; P 232b₆₋₇): de ni bla ma la ltos\textsuperscript{a} pa dang bral ba\textsuperscript{b} glegs bam gyis mkhas par byed pa’i gang zag gi ched’ du dkrugs nas bshad de |. \textsuperscript{a} P ltos \textsuperscript{b} P om.\textsuperscript{c} P phyed.

\textsuperscript{103} See MATHES 2016: 314–316.

\textsuperscript{104} For Khenpo Phuntsok, there are in reality not four drops but one drop.

\textsuperscript{105} See also ISAACSON & SFERRA (2014: 83, n. 104), who notice early Kālacakra influences in the *Sthitisamāsa.
course there are other possible explanations, such as that *Sahajavajra may have adopted his doctrine in an environment of growing Kālacakra influence. But if this was the case, he could have also abandoned his idea of Pāramitānaya-based mahāmudrā.

Conclusion

To conclude this discussion, I would like to propose that Pāramitānaya-based mahāmudrā practice falls into the category of Mantranaya, although it can be independent of the formal Tantric practice of the creation and completion stages. What counts is that the adept is considered to profit from an immediate access to emptiness, just as in Tantra. In other words, since the particular form of Pāramitānaya under discussion here has, thanks to the pith instructions of the guru, an important Tantric element, it not only accords with, or follows, Mantranaya, but it is Mantranaya. This would then be in line with the direct access to mahāmudrā described in Maitrīpa’s Tattvavimśikā, verse 11 (“The yogin who has seen true reality, however, is wholly devoted to mahāmudrā; his faculties being unsurpassable, he abides in [the realisation of] the nature of all entities”106), as well as the mahāmudrā union of insight and means taught in the verse from the *Tattvāvatāra quoted by *Sahajavajra (“For outstanding yogins the union of insight and means is simply meditation. The victorious ones call it mahāmudrā union”107). In other words, *sūtra-mahāmudrā then does not mean that mahāmudrā becomes “Sūtric,” but that sūtra passages that support pith instructions become Tantric. This reversal is a key point. That Padmavajra refers to the Samādhīrājasūtra as a Tantra must be certainly seen in this light.

---

106 See above, n. 32.
107 See above, n. 78.
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Bāṇa’s literary representation
of a South Indian Śaivite

Christian Ferstl

Introductory remarks

Bāṇa’s Kādambarī is an ornate prose composition with a fictional plot and fictional characters (a Kathā in terms of Sanskrit poetics) revolving around the love story between prince Candrāpiḍa and the celestially beautiful princess Kādambarī. Its composition was probably begun in the first half of the seventh century in Northern India under King Harṣavardhana’s reign,1 as can be assumed from the author’s other prose work, the Harṣacarita. As tradition has it, Bāṇa did not complete the Kādambarī himself, and it was his son Bhūsaṇabhaṭṭa who added the less-extensive, concluding “latter part” (uttarabhāga) to his father’s larger “former part” (pūrvabhāga).

Among a whole range of historical and cultural details, the novel contains a passage which deserves the attention of historians of both religion and literature because of its description of a certain South Indian Śaivite who lives in a North Indian temple of the goddess Caṇḍikā. The Sanskrit term used to denote the temple dweller is dhārmika, for which a satisfying translation is difficult to find.2 As a preliminary working translation, I suggest

---

1 Harṣa is generally accepted to have ruled 606–647 CE; see, e.g., KULKE & ROTHERMUND 2010: 140. LIENHARD (1984: 248f.) states that Bāṇa probably “worked in the second half of King Harṣavardhana’s reign,” i.e. in the second quarter of the seventh century.

2 This nominalised adjective literally indicates some kind of (habitual) relation to dharma, that is, to a (religious) law, custom, or virtue, or someone who is “characterised by dharma” in whatever sense of the word. See HALBFASS 1988: 310–333 on various notions of the term dharma and especially p. 328f. (§ 24) on orthodox Brahmanical interpretations of the term dhārmika.
the rendering “holy man,” the limitations of which will be reconsidered towards the end of this paper.

**The Caṇḍikā temple episode**

To start with, I quote from the first and still well-known English translation of the *Kādambarī* by Ridding (1896: 172):

> And on the way he [i.e., Candrapīṇḍa] beheld in the forest a red flag, near which was a shrine of Durgā, guarded by an old Dravidian hermit, who made his abode thereby.

Here, as in many other places of her translation, Ridding decided to give a “condensed” summary instead of an actual translation. The original Sanskrit passage is really a lengthy and minutely descriptive composition that spans over several printed pages. An English translation of it was available already in 1917, and a translation of the complete *pūrvabhāga* was published in 1924, followed by a number of partial and complete translations. Nevertheless, despite the availability of editions, translations, and Sanskrit commentaries, this passage is often omitted in summaries of the

---

3 Other renderings of dhārmika in this passage of the *Kādambarī* which have been brought forth are “hermit” (Ridding 1896: 172), “asceet” (Scharpē 1937: 361), “ascetic” (Kale 1924: 287, Layne 1991: 225, 228, Hatley 2007: 73ff.), or “priest” (Rajappa 2010: 234, 236), each referring to a certain way of living or social-religious function, but neither of which is made explicit by the term or by the whole passage. Smith (2009: 157) calls the dhārmika a “pseudo-saint,” which is quite to the point but takes too quickly a decision on the ambiguous nature of the figure. Bakker (2014: 131) translates the term with “pious ones” in a Gupta inscription from the seventh century.

4 Ridding’s abbreviations were all translated into Dutch by Scharpē (1937); the description of the Caṇḍikā temple and the dhārmika is found in ibid.: 359–364.

5 Nearly five full pages (p. 223, 9–228, 7) in the ed. Peterson 1889 (henceforth K) and p. 392, 9–401, 6 in the ed. Parab 1908, where the text is accompanied by a running commentary. For other editions, see n. 22–24 below.

6 Mehta & Joshi 1917.

7 Kale 1924. This was attached to Kale’s own edition in 1968 (1896).

8 Subsequent translations and substantial secondary literature up to the 1960s are listed in Lienhard 1984: 253, n. 44. See also Scharpē 1937: 108–127. The most recent complete English translation was prepared by Layne (1991).

9 Tripathy 2007: 8–16 describes no less than 14 Sanskrit commentaries, three of
text and failed to attract much attention by western scholars, with the notable exception of Lorenzen (1972: 17f.), Tieken (2001: 226f.), and the more detailed studies by Hatley (2007: 73–82) and Smith (2009).

The Kādambarī can be a demanding composition, especially in passages like those Ridding decided to abbreviate. The Caṇḍikā passage is no exception to this. The sheer unending syntactical suspense and semantic density of the passage presents considerable difficulties to the modern reader. For the largest part, it consists of a single sentence which, as mentioned, extends over several pages in the printed editions and which gives the subject of the description together with its predicate only at the very end of the syntactical construction, a common feature in Bāṇa’s style.

Another reason for the omission may be that although a prose description of this kind can be appreciated for its stunning phrasing and poetical embellishments, it hardly adds anything substantial to the plot development. The Caṇḍikā episode, too, has no further effect on the plot of the story. Its omission nevertheless leads to a distortion of the bigger picture. Among other things, it provides an occasion to display the author’s skill in creating different sentiments (rasa), such as the comic one (hāsyata) that is a rare feature in the Kādambarī. It also serves to lighten the general mood of the narration, which at this stage is dominated by the hero’s longing which had been unavailable to him or only known from references in other commentarial works.

Thus, note that several of the summaries of the Kādambarī given in compendia of Sanskrit literature fail to even mention the episode (cf., e.g., Liénard 1984: 253–255). Warde (1983: 43), in a comparatively short paragraph (§ 1728), does refer to the “mad pseudo ascetic,” but merely to diagnose “a certain shallowness of [Caṇḍāpiḍa’s] character, rather than a seriousness of his education.”

In this regard, Bronner’s article on Subandhu’s lengthy compounds (2014) and Shulman’s remarks on Bāṇa’s prose syntax (2014: 287–292) are both appreciative and enlightening.

Given that the legend of Bāṇa’s early death and his son Bhūṣanabhaṭṭa’s completion of the Kādambarī is true, it is possible that the latter was unsure about what his father had in mind and how to deal with the dhārmika episode that may have originally been intended to influence the further development or conclusion of the main plot. The story of Bāṇa’s untimely death, however, is seriously challenged by Tieken (2014).

Unfortunately, the dhārmika episode was not even accepted to the appendix of Ridding’s translation, “in which [abstracts of] a few passages, chiefly interesting as mentioning religious sects, are added” (Ridding 1896: xxii).

Another explicitly humorous passage of the Kādambarī is Caṇḍāpiḍa’s parody (krīḍālāpa) of the princess’ talking birds’ love quarrel (K: 194, 10–196, 3).
for his beloved. At this point, Candrāpīḍa, the son and successor of King Tārāpīḍa of Ujjayinī, is experiencing the pangs of separation after having fallen in love with the Gandharva princess Kādambarī – and vice versa.

But why ridicule an aged hermit for this purpose? The peculiar way this interlude distracts the reader from the main story gives rise to the suspicion that Bāṇa had a certain intention in doing so. We will return to this point below.

**Literary aspects**

Before highlighting the major topics of the plot, I will briefly address Bāṇa’s literary style together with his representation of the Śaiva believer and the latter’s dwelling place.

The syntactical complexity of the passage in question here is more a means to an end than an end in itself. As indicated above, one long sentence presents a detailed description of what is explicitly named only at the very end of the construction, namely the goddess of the temple and its inhabitant. By suspending the grammatical predicate and its direct object for as long as possible, Bāṇa creates a sustained tension as if to convey the hero’s own awe and amazement at the moment of entering and beholding the temple area. In this sense, the syntactical construction mirrors or at least adds to the subject matter of the passage, and this effect is lost in all available translations of this and comparable passages.15

As a rule, descriptions of this kind are employed in the introduction of characters who play a major role in the plot. The obvious pattern is that the more important the character, the longer the description. A similar style is described by HUECKSTEDT (1985: 23): the longer a story (of which there may be several within a single narrative work), the longer the sentence that introduces it. The location and relationships of the protagonist may be included in the main clause or presented in a subordinate or independent clause. For example, a king is presented together with his resident city and his chief queen, while the exhaustive account of an eminent sage is replete with a description of his forest hermitage and his pupils. The same holds true for metrical literature, where a number of relative clauses can form what commentaries refer to as kulaka, i.e., stanzas “in which the government of noun and verb is carried throughout” (MONIER-WILLIAMS, s.v.).16

---

15 A similar interpretation is offered by SMITH 2009: 150f.
16 See, e.g., Meghadūta 2.1–15, where at the very beginning of the uttaramegha
When we compare descriptive single-sentence constructions taken from the Kādambarī’s prose, it turns out that the Cāṇḍikā temple receives a remarkable amount of attention by the author in terms of its length. In the edition prepared by Peterson in 1883, nearly four pages (K: 224,13–228,7) make up a single syntactical sentence devoted to the description of the Cāṇḍikā temple and its old resident. This sentence is one of the longest of its kind, comparable to those containing the descriptions of the heroine Kādambara and her most intimate girlfriend, the ascetic girl Mahāśvetā (pp. 186,4–189,16 and 128,12–131,20 respectively), and surpassed only by that describing King Tārāpīḍa’s residence (K: 86,19–92,5). Note that the elaboration of King Tārāpīḍa’s residence (rājakula) is not presented at the first introduction of the king and his reign, but only on occasion of the celebration of the perfection of Cāṇḍīpīḍa’s education. It extends over nearly five-and-a-half pages of the edition.\(^\text{17}\)

At the beginning of the Cāṇḍikā episode, the reader (or the audience) of the Kādambarī is therefore likely to expect another comprehensive story within this deeply nested narration, a “subplot” (patākā) or an “intervention” (prakārī) in terms of Indian poetics.\(^\text{18}\) The extent of the embedded story and the significance of the Cāṇḍikā episode can be presumed by the comparatively vast proportions of its descriptive opening. This also means an even longer delay on Cāṇḍīpīḍa’s route to his father’s residence and, more importantly, a prolongation of the lovers’ separation. The starting

\(^{17}\) K 86,19–92,5. Further examples of long single-sentence descriptions are: King Śūdraka: half a page (p. 5,5–18) and again almost one-and-a-half pages (pp. 8,21–10,5); the Cāṇḍāla princess: more than one page, including a description of her attendants, an old māṭaṅga and a young Cāṇḍāla boy (pp. 10,11–11,19); Māṭaṅga, the Šābara chief: a little more than two pages (pp. 29,20–32,1); Jābali: two pages (pp. 41,11–43,9); his āśrama: nearly two-and-a-half pages (pp. 38,15–40,21); Hārīta: roughly one-and-a-half pages (pp. 36,9–37,19); the city Ujjainī (in Jābali’s account): two-and-a-half pages (pp. 50,1–52,10); Indrāyuḍha, Cāṇḍīpīḍa’s horse: one-and-a-half pages (pp. 78,14–80,3); the Acchoda lake, where Mahāśvetā’s hermitage is situated: one-and-a-half pages (pp. 122,16–124,5); an empty Śiva temple nearby (śūlapānena śīnanyāṃ siddhāṣṭatanām): one-and-a-half pages (pp. 126,13–128,3); and finally the forest on the way to the Cāṇḍikā temple: a little more than one page (pp. 223,9–224,12).

\(^{18}\) See Warder 2009: 54f. (§ 122).
point of the main action (the “seed,” bīja) is at risk to lose its continuity (bindu, lit. “drop”) as the action falters due to another “obstacle” (avamarśa) or “pause” (vimarśa), yielding no fruition of a happy ending. The Caṇḍikā episode, however, is suddenly completed in only a fraction of the time it took to be introduced. The sinister temple site in the forest is turned into a rather casual setting of the prince’s sojourn. No new adventures unfold, neither assistance nor obstacles are presented to the hero, and no curses are spoken by the temple dweller. Superficially and in terms of narrative structure, the old Śaiva ascetic is deprived of all powers that would usually be expected from a devotee of the goddess. He is represented as a hapless and grumpy old man, whose appearance and habits make him a mere object of ridicule rather than a source of awe.

The satirical depiction of the quirky Dravidian constitutes an amusing relief from the frightening atmosphere which has been created by the precursory description of the journey through the forest, the scary remains of a sacrifice in the temple, and the image of a fierce goddess. Expectations are built up and then surprisingly subverted. Like a snake that turns out to be a rope, the inhabitant of the dreadful Caṇḍikā temple turns out to be a mere laughing stock, and strained expectation dissolves into amusement.

The suspense begins with a lengthy description of the journey of the hero and his army through a sinister forest, which is difficult to traverse for its climbers, roots, and fallen trees, a place where outlaws have left secret signs of communication and where memorials have been erected at the horrifying sites of self-sacrifice (vīrapuruṣaghātasthāna). The forest description, a masterly piece of literature in itself, concludes with the depiction of the red flag that spotlights the temple in the depths of the jungle and

---

19 On the “conjunctions” (sandhi), i.e. significant points in the development of the plot, and their applicability to any form of Kāvya literature, see WARDER 2009: 57–59 (§ 128–134) and 77 (§ 182).

20 WARDER 2009: 55 (§ 123f.) and 73 (§ 175). Though LIENHARD stresses the fact that Sanskrit compositions were judged rather by details of phrasing (1984: 34–37) and descriptions (pp. 230–234) than by the structure and composition of the work as a whole, the latter criterion should not be neglected, despite the difficulty of keeping track of the plot and its characters (ibid.: 233).

21 For numerous instances and various aspects of the connection between asceticism and power in ancient and modern Indian culture, see OLSON 2015.

22 K 223,9–224,12; further editions used: PARAB 31908: 392,9–394,8; KANE 1911: 93,21–94,23; SASTRI 31982: 633,3–636,5. For a concordance of PETERSON’s with three more editions (not consulted by me), see SCHARPÉ 1937: 495.
serves as a thrilling preparation for the ornate description of the Caṇḍikā temple.

Thus, the sentiment of Candrāpiḍa’s lovesickness gives way to another one, namely the fearful (bhayānaka rasa). This sentiment is further intensified by means of the description of the dreadful and hideous details of the Caṇḍikā temple area. Finally, the unexpected use of the comic sentiment (hāsyā rasa) is supposed to relieve the horror-laden atmosphere of the forest and temple passages by way of an innocuous conversation between the old temple dweller and the prince.

The descriptions of the temple area and the Caṇḍikā image go beyond mere abundance in fanciful detail and poetic ornamentation. They are poetically ornamented with figurative expressions, like similes (upamā), metaphorical identification (rūpaka), and poetical ascriptions (utpreksā), which intensify the sentiment and sometimes exaggerate the descriptions. Nevertheless, the subjects of the comparisons (upameya) always remain tangible, and even their objects (upamāna) as well as the ascriptions of the utpreksās are never too far-fetched and go without the surreal and supernatural, which maintains a realistic tenor to the passage. This realism, which Smith called “one of Bāṇa’s trademarks,” culminates in the description of the “holy man” who lives in the temple. Here, similes of every kind, including the utpreksā, one of the author’s most frequent figures of speech, are quickly dismissed, that is, after the first three objects of description (the old man’s protruding veins, his scars, and his hair). The remaining part of the description covers nearly two pages and consists of one long series of plain descriptive characterisations (jāti or svabhāvokti). Besides this, the figure of double entendre (śleṣa), which frequently features in other de-

25 One single mythological allusion is found at the beginning of the description of the temple area (K 224,17), where the iron image of a buffalo (lohamahiṣa) features palm prints of red sandal (raktacandanahastaka) and hence looks “as though he had been gently patted by the God of Death’s bloody hands” (rudhirāruṇayamakaratatā-sphālita, translation by LAYNE 1991: 223f.).
26 SMITH 2009: 160. On the realism in Bāṇa’s metrical work, see TUBB 2014, who also attests a distinctive “boldness in the choice of subject matter” (p. 346).
29 K 226,13–228,7.
scriptive parts of the Kādambarī as well as other prose works, is absent from the forest and the temple passages.  

Another stylistic device of the author is the careful use of colours. Notably, red is used to depict the temple scene, which abounds with offerings of animals, human heads, and the remains of bloody sacrifices. The intentional choice of the colour red is introduced by the depiction of the large, red flag that marks the transition from the forest to the temple passage. While this flag still belongs to the forest passage syntactically, physically it is already part of the temple. It is mounted “atop an old, red sandalwood” and “seemed wet with dabs of lac, like bloody chunks of fresh, moist flesh; the tree’s trunk was ornamented with red banners that were like lolling tongues, and with black fly-whisk streamers that appeared like matted hair or the limbs of freshly butchered animals.”

By mentioning the colour red and reddish items, the author refrains from conveying an atmosphere of auspiciousness and solemnity that would easily and naturally be expected. The sentiment thus evoked in terms of colour is the fearful one, and it prevails throughout this part of the narration. The narrator fancies that Candrāpīḍa “saw from afar the large, red flag that seemed to be searching here and there on the path for travellers who could serve as offerings (for Dur-gā).” The colouring is carried on when Candrāpīḍa enters the temple area, where he finds “a line of black, iron mirror plates with reddish chowries” right at the entrance (dvāradeśa) that is furnished with an iron gate. The temple area abounds with flower offerings of “red lotuses that resemble the eyes of jungle buffaloes, slain by śabara tribesmen,” Agati and Palash flowers that are compared to the bloody claws of lions and tigers (their resemblance is striking indeed), and “tufts of blood-red Kadambaka flow-
ers that are hung to the limbs” of the mūrti. These and further details are beheld in the reddening light of the setting sun. The predominance of the colour red then ceases in the description of the “holy man,” in which references to the colour black prevail.

The colouring of a scene is a strongly suggestive literary device that does not necessarily impose a restriction on its realism. It features also in other passages in the Kādambarī, for instance in an earlier episode prior to the prince’s love story, in which Bāṇa conceives the figure of the beautiful Apsaras Mahāśvetā. She lives as a hermit in “an empty shrine of the blessed Trident-wielder,” i.e., Lord Śiva, at the banks of the Acchoda lake on the foot of the Kailāsa mountain. The Apsaras’ complexion, her garment, and her modest jewellery are white, she plays an ivory vīṇā, and carries a conch as an alms bowl. The shrine on the banks of the Acchoda lake is also portrayed as all in white. Hence she is called “the acme of whiteness.” Here as well, a certain colour is strongly emphasised and not left to random choice. It is further in accord with the lunar lineage of the girl and clearly serves as an illustration of her divine and pure character.

36 śonitām rakadambastabakṛtārcanaiḥ (…) ivāṅgaiḥ (K 225,19–21).
37 K 225,19f. Further instances of the colour red are: blooming red Ashoka trees; hastaka marks of red sandal on the iron buffalo (see above, n. 25); red cocks; drops of elephant must-fluid taken for red pearls according to the poetic convention; reddened rags in the garbhaṛha; red (but also blue and yellow) mirrors hung at the door panels; red rags at the feet of the mūrti; ornamental cords reddened with sandal; offerings of red Kadambaka flowers; Caṇḍikā’s lips which are red from betel offered by Śabara women; red flames of the resin (guggula) lamps; and red jewels on the heads of cobras (another poetic convention).
38 bhagavataḥ sūlapañeh śūnyam siddhāyatanam (K 128,2f.). The ornate single-sentence description which is syntactically completed with this line runs from pp. 126,13–128,3.
39 K 130,23–131,3.
40 śankhamayena bhiksākapālena (K 133,15).
41 See K 128,12–131,20 for a portrayal of the outer appearance of the girl (in one single sentence extending over three and a half pages) and pp. 122,16–128,11 for the lake and the shrine where she lives (transl. LAYNE 1991: 125–136).
42 LAYNE 1991: 133, translating iyattām iva dhavalimnaḥ (K 129,21f.). See also: “She seemed to have been made only out of the abstract quality of whiteness” (LAYNE 1991: 132, translating dhavalaguhīnaiva kevalotpādītām, K 128,21).
The Caṇḍikā temple and its main image

Candrāpiḍa and his army come across the temple in the forest on their way from the Kailāsa mountain, the residence of his beloved Kādambarī, to Ujjaini, where he was summoned to by his father Tārāpiḍa. Progressively advancing towards the inner parts of the temple area, the narrator provides a detailed description of the site (āyatana) and its central image of the goddess Caṇḍikā.\(^{43}\) The temple area is enclosed by an ivory fence (dan-takapāṭa), and its entrance (dvāradesa) is framed by an iron archway. Ashoka trees flower in the courtyard (aṅgaṇa) that comprises an area referred to as uddieśa, possibly a forecourt. The inner courtyard (ajira)\(^{44}\) leads to the entrance of a sanctuary (garbhagṛha), which is furnished with two door panels (kapāṭapaṭṭa) and ivory bolts (daṇḍārgala). The image (mūrti) is seated on a throne (pīṭha), which is resting on an inner pedestal (antahpiṇḍikā). Facing the goddess from a separate rock platform (śilāvedikā) is an iron buffalo (lohamahiṣa). This is an image of the buffalo demon named Mahiṣa, which is more commonly depicted with the goddess stamping on him or piercing him with a trident.\(^{45}\) Finally, there are also cobras that live in an empty sanctuary (devakula).

The fierce image of Caṇḍikā is covered in darkness, which makes it difficult to distinguish offered fruits from the heads of sacrificed children. Scattered at the feet of the image are the remains of sanguinary offerings or even self-sacrifices.\(^{46}\) Among these are found tips of deer horns (hariṇaviṣāṇakoṭi), cut out tongues (jīhvāccheda), bloody eye-balls (raktanayana),

\(^{43}\) K 224,13–226,9.

\(^{44}\) The terminology of modern secondary literature on temple architecture in many instances differs from Bāṇa’s choice of words (see, e.g., MEISTER & DHAKY 1991, HARDY 2007, LORENZETTI 2015). Hence, it remains unclear to me what exactly is denoted by uddieśa (K: 225,8) and ajira (K: 225,10).

\(^{45}\) The story of Caṇḍi killing the buffalo demon Mahiṣa is known from the Mahābhārata and several Purāṇas (see STIETENCRON 1983, YOKOCHI 1999). The act of Caṇḍi’s killing the demon with a kick of her left foot is told in Skandapurāṇa 68,12–23 (ed. YOKOCHI 2013: 341–343) and represents nearly the sole topic of Bāṇa’s Caṇḍiśataka (ed. QUACKENBOS 1917: 243–362).

\(^{46}\) Offerings of one’s own blood, body parts, or head to a goddess are well attested in mediaeval Indian history (see DEZSŐ 2012: 82 for references to it in Kāvyā literature, inscriptions, and reliefs). To Dezső’s list we may here add the above-mentioned sites of self-sacrificers (vīrapuruṣa) from the forest passage. In the description of the Caṇḍikā temple passage, it is not always clear whether the offerings are human or animal sacrifices.
and skull bones (muṇḍamaṇḍala), all of which indicate “the violence of offerings” (upahārahīṃśā). Streams of blood run visibly through the inner courtyard. These offerings can be partially assigned to the frightening Śabara tribesmen who, as a literary topos, live and hunt in the Vindhya forests. The offerings of the Śabaras are said to consist in flesh, and they worship the gods with the blood of animals. The chief of a Śabara army is described as having his arms scarred from repeatedly offering his own blood to Caṇḍikā. Throughout the Kādambarī, the Śabaras are described as a horribly violent tribe. Though this is not made explicit, they must cause considerable trouble to the pitiable temple dweller.

The “holy man”

The “old Dravidian holy man” (.jaraddrviḍadhārmika) who lives in the temple is represented as a quirky old fellow regarded as an object of ridicule by the village people and by Candrāpīḍa’s convoy. Even his physical appearance is diametrically opposed to what one would expect from an honourable Brahmin sage presiding over an āśrama where pupils study the Veda and the forest deer peacefully drink from the freshly watered tree roots. One of these stereotypical, ideal sages is Jābāli, the Brahmin who narrates the main portion of the Kādambarī story to the parrot chick Vaiśampāyana that was saved by one of the āśrama’s pupils. However, the “holy man” from the Caṇḍikā temple passage is not one of those men equipped with learning, authority, and a divine eye. Quite the opposite is true of him: one of his eyes has lost sight due to the extensive use of some magical collyrium (siddhāñjana) once given to him by a quack doctor (kuvādi). While the epic sages are notoriously radiant like the sun or shine like the moon, their skin white from the holy ashes, this “holy man’s” skin

47 K 27,5–34,19. The tribe of the Śabara hunters also occurs, e.g., in the Vāsava-dattā, where they frighten the deer in the Vindhya forest witless (ed. SHUKLA 1966, p. 13,19–21).

48 paśurudhiṃa devaṛcānam, māṃsena balikarma; K 32,9f.


50 The use of “a black pigment, often applied to the eyelashes” (TANTRIKĀBHĪ-DHĀNAKOŚA I: 99 [s.v. añjana]) is said to bring about magical powers, like seeing hidden treasures or invisible things, even becoming invisible oneself. Magical collyrium is often referred to in narrative literature but also in Tantric works of the Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava traditions. For references to the latter, see ibid.
is black. His body is covered by a web of veins, in the same way the trunk of a burnt tree is covered by all kinds of lizards,\textsuperscript{51} whereas Jābāli’s veins, which have also obtruded due to his severe asceticism, are compared to the creepers on the wish-fulfilling tree (kalpataru).\textsuperscript{52}

It seems significant that the old man who lives in the temple is not given a proper name, since the name of every other significant character in the Kādambarī is usually given right when they are introduced to the story. While proper names hardly characterise real people, literary names are often significant and meaningful, revealing the origin, fate, or intentions of the named character.\textsuperscript{53} This is common practice in fictional literature, and the Kādambarī is no exception. For example, Candrāpīḍa’s name (“[he who wears] the moon as a chaplet [on his head]”) hints at his provenance from the moon god and relates him to his father Tārāpaḍa (“[he who wears] the stars as his chaplet”); the heroine’s name Kādambarī alludes to the sweetly fragrant flowers of the evergreen Kadam tree; the background of Mahāśvetā’s name, “the Great White,” was already mentioned above; the name of the sage Jābāli is borrowed from the famous sage of the Rāmāyaṇa (2.100–103); and so on. The Dravidian “holy man,” on the other hand, remains anonymous, and an important piece of information is thus withheld from the reader. The old man himself is not silent on private matters, for Candrāpīḍa manages to soothe the irascible old man and make him speak about personal matters, such as his origins and the reasons for his living in the temple:

With coaxing words and with a hundred sweet ones of conciliation, Candrāpīḍa somehow mollified him and, in order, asked his birthplace, caste, education, whether he had a wife and children, his

\textsuperscript{51} K 226,9f. The colour (varṇa) of the skin may be an allusion the social class (varṇa), as McComas Taylor’s discourse analysis of jāti suggests (TAYLOR 2007). However, Taylor’s thesis is severely criticised in MAAS 2013–2014. It may also allude to the quality of the soul according to the Sāṃkhya classification of pure (white), impure (black), and mixed (red) souls. On historical overinterpretations of this matter, see also ADLURI/BAGCHEE 2014: 187.

\textsuperscript{52} K 42,17f. A passage a few lines before (ibid.: 42,12f.) mentions the protruding veins on Jābāli’s neck (kaṅṭhanāḍī). Several instances of the topos of the gaunt ascetics’ protruding veins are already attested in the Mahābhārata and in Buddhist literature (see OLSON 2015: 86).

\textsuperscript{53} GABRIEL 2014: 168f.
wealth, his age, and the reason for his renouncing domestic life. And on being questioned, the ascetic told about himself.  

An account of their talk, however, is not given. The narrator is primarily interested in depicting the “holy man” as he appears to visitors. He is not concerned with the old man’s past life or the reasons for his devotion to Cāṇḍikā. The “holy man’s” self-presentation is tersely outlined and merely serves to portray his boasting talkativeness. By the unlikelihood of its content creates but another punchline of the passage:

The king’s son was very much amused by him as he continued to narrate his past heroism, handsomeness, and wealth.

One more detail is worth addressing here, precisely because it is left unmentioned by Bāṇa: the “holy man’s” sacred thread (yajñopavīta or brahmaśūtra). This is one of the items which Sanskrit authors would rarely fail to mention in a description of a major Rṣi, sage, or ascetic. For example, Jābāli and his pupils in the forest hermitage most certainly carry one; even Kādambarī’s ascetic girlfriend Mahāśvetā, “who had taken the Pāśupata vow” (pratīpannapāśupatavratā),  

57 carries a brahmaśūtra; and Bhairavācārya, the royal officiant featured in the third chapter of Bāṇa’s Harṣacarita, is also said to wear one. Although the unorthodox and more transgressive Śaiva cults from no later than the seventh century exhibit great variety in this matter, ranging from a thread of human hair to no thread at all, the latter case would be rather unusual. Thus, Bāṇa’s silence on the thread in the present case is likely to be intentional. This would im-

54 K 228,12–15: upasāntvanaiś ca katham api priyālāpaśatātmayaiḥ praśamam upanīya, krameṇa jannahumīm jātīm vidyām ca kalātram apiyāni vibhavam vasekramām pravrajyāyās ca kāraṇam svayam eva praaprača. prṣṭau cāsāv avarṇayad ātmānam. Translation based on LAYNE’s (1991: 228).
56 K 42,13f. (Jābāli’s sacred thread), 37,2f. (Hārīta’s sacred thread) etc.
57 K 131,20. The Pāśupata vow is known from the Pāśupatasūtras, a short scripture from the first or second century CE that prescribes an ascetic kind of worship of Śiva Pāśupati (see ACHARYA 2011). Originally, the Pāśupata vow was restricted to Brahmin males, and Mahāśvetā appears to represent a later stage of the cult’s doctrine.
58 K 130,18.
59 Ed. FÜHRER 1909: 164, 16. On Bhairavācārya, see below, n. 74.
60 See Brahmayāmalatantra 21.1–123.
ply that the author denies this “holy man” a proper socio-religious status, because it would seem inappropriate for a such a “pseudo-saint,” to use Smith’s pungent rendering here, or perhaps a Dravidian.\footnote{According to Medhātithi’s Manubhāṣya and Kumārila’s Tantravārttikā, adherents of the Śaiva Mantramārga were to be considered outside the Veda (Sanderson 2015: 160f.). According to Manusmṛti and other sources (see Halbfass 1988: 176, n. 13), dravīdas and daradas (from the Afghan region) as well as pahlavas (Persians) etc. are not entitled to wear the sacred thread, since they are excluded from the varṇa system. The Skandapurāṇa and many other sources, on the other hand, list dravīdas as a fivefold group of Brahmans (pañcadravīda, as opposed to the group of pañcagauḍa that is said to be found south of the Vindhya mountains and to comprise dravīdas as a sub-group (Deshpande 2010).} In any case, the literary ruse of disregarding the sacred thread ads to the general picture of the temple dweller as a worshipper of the powerful goddess but also as someone who himself lacks every trace of power and authority, an amusing but eventually insignificant character. It also adds to the ambiguous identity of the nameless, old man whose social status and proper function in the temple remains undiscussed.

The ways in which the “holy man” is represented does not command anyone’s respect. On the contrary, by mentioning neither his name nor his varṇa, the description shows signs of irreverence and is thoroughly amusing or at best piteous. Amusement is not merely the modern reader’s impression, for upon sight of the old man Candrāpiḍa has to “laugh for quite a while” (suciram jahāsa). He visibly smiles despite his pangs of separation from Kādambarī\footnote{For example, he is described as “very steadfast by nature” (atidhīraprakṛti, K 80,5), even when the astonishing horse Indrāyudha is first shown to him.} and although he is depicted as a rather serene character in other parts of the story.\footnote{K 228,11f. (with a minor variation in the eds. Sastri 1982 and Parab 1908).} Eventually, however, he restrains himself and has his army stop making fun (upahasant) of the poor fellow.\footnote{K 228,10f. (with a minor variation in the eds. Sastri 1982 and Parab 1908).} The occasional lay temple visitors also have fun (viḍambana) with him. During the
spring festivals, for instance, they are said to marry him to an old servant (vṛddhadāsī), whom they carry around on a broken bedstead.\footnote{K 227,21f.}

What exactly is so amusing about the “holy man”? And what is the reason for his tragicomical lack of authority? As explained above, he is presented as quite the opposite of what would be expected from a secluded hermit, a severe ascetic, or a powerful officiant. The old man thus represents anything but an idealised and normative character. By twisting and inverting the ideal and in order to ease the sinister sentiment of the whole intervention (prakārī), Bāṇa makes him the laughing stock of temple visitors, including Candrāpiḍa. In fact, several aspects of his appearance, behaviour, and skills are likely to arouse laughter.

First of all, in Bāṇa’s audience his physical appearance is destined to arouse amusement rather than respect. He has a hunchback and a crooked neck. His dark body is speckled with wounds and blisters, and he has protruding teeth. One of his arms is shrivelled from inadvertently and severely beating himself with a brick (iṣṭakāprahāra), and the fingers of one of his hands are contracted from another mistake. Monkeys have wounded his nose, a bear has scratched his head, and so on.

Secondly, he appears quite clumsy, which is the cause of much of his pitiable condition. His head, for instance, is injured from bilva fruits (śrīphala) falling from the trees.\footnote{The fruits of the Bael tree (Aegle marmelos Correa) are common in the worship of Śiva. The edible, round fruits of about 1–2 inches in diameter have a woody shell (SAHNI 1998: 49f.). Hence, a falling fruit is likely to hurt if it hits one’s head. In contrast to this mishap, it is said of more accomplished hermits that branches from the trees bow down to offer their fruits, or that the trees’ fruits fall directly into the alms bowls of the tapasvins, as, e.g., in the case of Mahāśvetā (K 134,2–4) or of an eminent Pāṣupata ācārya in Koṭhala’s verse narration Līlāvī (v. 211–214).} Travellers and temple visitors shudder when he plays the vīṇā, which is accompanied by his shaking head and him humming like a mosquito.

Finally, he has a tendency to exaggerate what he undertakes. Whether it is simple prostrations at the feet of the goddess, medical treatments, magical rites, the use of elixirs (rasāyana) – in the end it causes him more harm than benefit. For example, he has a callus (arbuda) on his black forehead, resulting from the prostrations to the feet of Ambikā, the Mother-goddess;\footnote{The callus is possibly an allusion to hypocrisy. In Śyāmilaka’s satirical play (bhāṇa) Padatāditaka (p. 26), one hypocrit, the aged “pimp” (viṭa) called Dayita-}
increases his blindness (timira), and he also suffers from night blindness (rātryandhatā); and although “improperly prepared elixirs have caused him periodic fevers,” instead of a prolongation of his life span, he is said to have “developed a morbid inclination towards mineralogy.” Hence one might suspect creeping poisoning induced by the improper use of elixirs and substances as a possible cause for his grotesque behaviour.

Whatever the exact cause may be, the “holy man” appears like an “officiant with inauspicious signs” (ācārya aśubhalaksana). A list of such characteristics can be found, for instance, in the Śaiva Tantric scripture Śvacchandatantra, which defines the type of officiants that should be preferred and those that should be rejected. If this is applied to our Čandikā devotee, we find that more than half of the items in the list can easily be related to him either positively or negatively. For instance, an officiant who is inclined to wrath (krodhana, v. 1.16a) or who has protruding teeth (dantura, 1.16.c), both of which is said of the old man, should be avoided, whereas one who is polite (dāśinyasamyuta, 1.14d) or “whose whole body is adorned” (sarvāvayavabhūṣita, v. 1.13b), neither of which is said of the temple dweller, should be sought out. In my understanding of this Kādambarī passage, Bāṇa has created an amusingly exaggerated and condensed portrait of a follower of the Śaiva dharma who displays a great number of possible characteristics of a “officiant with inauspicious signs.” Indeed, neither disciples nor devotees are mentioned, and neither Candrapīḍa asks for the “holy man’s” advice, nor does the latter ask for the help of the prince.

The religious tradition that underlies Bāṇa’s depiction of the old temple dweller was examined by Shaman Hatley, who identified it as that of the viṣṇu, is said to “have his forehead and knees hard with triple calluses (…) due to his worship of gods” (devārcanāt … kiṃatrayakāṭhoralāṭajānuḥ).

68 K 226,16f. and 227, 16 respectively.
69 K 226,19f.: asamyaktarasāyanātākālavara.
70 K 227,1f.: samjātadhātvādavyāyu. In the Ayurvedic medical sense of the term, vāyu denotes a “morbid affection of the windy humour” (as it is translated in APTE’s Sanskrit dictionaries) that manifests itself in different kinds of mental disturbance. Accordingly, it is glossed in the commentaries with vātyāvādhi (“affection of the wind element”), vikriyā (“seizure, disease”), and similar expressions.
71 In a note on Kṣemendra’s Kalāvilāsa 8.11–12, Vasudeva (2005: 367) links serious “behavioural oddities” of goldsmiths to their frequent use of mercury and alkaline salts.
72 Śvacchandatantra 1.13cd–18ab. I thank Somdev Vasudeva for this reference.
73 K 227,10 and 228,1 (krodha); also ibid.: 227,9f. (atiroṣaṇatā) and p. 228,10 (kupita).
Bhairavatantras. These scriptures of early Tantric Śaivism elaborate on many of the magical and power-seeking practices that are adopted by Bāṇa’s “holy man.” Where are these scriptures to be placed within the history of Śaiva traditions?

According to a model developed by Alexis Sanderson, early Śaivism that was followed not by laymen but by initiate ascetics had developed into two major branches by the fifth century: the Atimārga, the “Path Beyond,” i.e., beyond the orthodox Brahmanical system and therefore considered non-Vedic and antinomian, and the Mantramārga, or the “Path of Mantras.” The Atimārga was centred on the worship of Śiva, and the main goal of its ascetic adherents was liberation from rebirth, especially so in the earlier developments that are known as the Pāśupata and Lākula traditions. This tradition was open only for initiated Brahmin males. A later development of the “Path Beyond” was widely known as the tradition of the Kāpālikas, ascetic devotees of Śiva “with the skull” (kapālin), that is, the skull of the beheaded god Brahmā. One of the more noticeable ascetic features of Kāpālika practice was the imitation of their god’s external appearance by means of their characteristic use of skull cups in rituals and as begging bowls as well as their performance of cremation grounds practices. Initiation into the Kāpālika cult was possible also for women and non-Brahmins. Out of the Atimārga then emerged the Mantramārga, which also transgressed the Vedic, Brahmanical socio-religious order and developed a number of new ritual technologies aimed at accomplishing supernatural powers (siddhi). The Mantramārga includes various branches, from the more orthodox to the more transgressive. Some of these, including the Bhairavatantras discussed here, centre on the worship of Śiva in his manifes-

74 Hatley 2007: 73–82. The cult of Bhairavācārya in the Harsacarīta is also identified as belonging to the Bhairavatantras. See also Smith 2009, who compares the dravidadhārmika to Bhairavācārya. The latter officiated in the South and performed important rituals for King Puṣyabhūti, a probably fictive ancestor of Harṣa. He displays an “ostensible contrast” to the dhārmika (Smith 2009: 156), since he has by far more power, authority, and success. See also Bakker 2007: 4 on Bhairavācārya and Bakker 2014: 78–80 on Puṣyabhūti.


76 Hatley (2007: 74–76) refers to scriptures like the Bhairavatantras, the Brahmayāmalatantra, and Abhinavagupta’s Tantrāloka that are connected with these and other Tantric elements. On subdivisions of the Mantramārga, see Hatley 2007: 7f. and Sanderson 2004: 229.
tation as skull-bearing Bhairava (“the Dreadful”) as well as his female consort, variously called Durgā, Aghoreśvari, Cāṇḍi, and similar names indicating the goddess’ fierceness and wrath. Another branch within the Śaiva initiatory systems is an even more esoteric “path,” the Kulamārga, which centred on various hierarchical “clans” (kula) of female divinities and spirits (yoginīs) and permeated much of the Mantramārgic Bhairava cult.\footnote{Sanderson 1988: 668–672 and 679f.}

The Cāṇḍikā passage in the Kādambarī appears to most prominently allude to the Mantramārgic Bhairavatantras. First of all, the “holy man” who lives in the temple is depicted as a devotee of the fierce goddess called Cāṇḍikā, Durgā, or Ambikā, “good mother.” Among his possessions is a “hymn to Durgā recorded on a small tablet (or ribbon),”\footnote{K 226,22: paṭṭikālikhitadurgāstotreṇa. See Tāntrikābhidhānakośa III s.v. paṭa and paṭṭa (pp. 371–373). The size of the writing surface suggests a rather short hymn (stotra).} and “with his prayers he importunes Durgā for the boon of sovereignty over South India.”\footnote{K 226,20f.: dakṣināpathādhirāyavaranaprārthhanākadarthitatadurgeṇa.}

An interesting passage in terms of identifying the religious traditions associated with the “holy man” refers to a manuscript in his possession, namely “a written record of the doctrine of Śiva Mahākāla”\footnote{Śiva Mahākāla and the goddess Cāṇḍikā are also linked in Bāna’s Harṣacarita (Hatley 2007: 80f.).} based on the teaching of an aged (and eminent) Pāśupata.”\footnote{K 226,23–227, 1: jīrṇamahāpāśupatopadeśalikhitamahākālamatena.} This passage features the term mahāpāśupata (lit. “eminent Pāśupata”), a term that appears in various literary and epigraphical sources. However, it has not yet been clearly established which group of Atimārgic practitioners this refers to, and it may have been a more widely-used term. Nevertheless, if we accept this reading here,\footnote{The eds. by Parab and Sastri omit the honorific mahā and read jīrṇapāśu-patopadeśa-. Lorenzen (1972: 18f.) discusses the expression mahāpāśupata in the Kādambarī and other works of Sanskrit literature as a technical term denoting either Pāśupatas who practiced the “great observance” (mahāvratā), i.e. Kāpālikas, or Śaivas following the Kālamukha doctrines. Bakker (2014: 150), drawing on a passage from the earliest part of the Nīvīsatattva corpus (ca. 6th c.), identifies the Mahāpāśupatas exclusively with the Kāpālikas.} it could refer to a kind of practitioner closer to the more Kāpālika-type of Śaivism within the Bhairavatantra branch. That this is indeed the case is strengthened by the fact that the Brahmayāmalatantra, a Śaiva Tantra from the sixth to seventh centuries, contains a chapter with the same title as the manuscript of our “holy man,” namely “the doctrine of Śiva...
This dual association with the Atimārgic Kāpālika branch as well as the Mantramārgic Bhairava-tantras is appropriate, since, for instance, the *Brahmayāmalatantra* itself comprises Kāpālika doctrines of the Atimārga and several characteristics of the Mantramārga.\(^{84}\) Sectarian borders generally were somewhat fluid during this period, both in etic as well as in emic accounts of the time.\(^ {85}\) For example, it is noted that the Kāpālikas were the most transgressive group of the Atimārga branch of Śaivism but also part of the Mantramārga. Their striking appearance soon made them stock characters in stage plays and works of narrative literature.\(^ {86}\)

Bāṇa’s “holy man” is also said to “know a thousand wonder-tales of the mountain Śrīparvata,”\(^ {87}\) a pilgrimage site located in today’s Andhra Pradesh. In literary sources, the earliest of which are Bāṇa’s *Kādambarī* and Bhavabhūti’s stage play *Mālatīmadhava* (eighth century), this site is frequently mentioned in connection with Kāpālikas.\(^ {88}\)

Apart from this, the “holy man” is also said to be a collector of palm-leaf booklets\(^ {89}\) “which contain magical formulas from scoundrel manuals.”\(^ {90}\) These manuals (*tantra*) and formulas (*mantra*) are not connected with a certain Śaiva tradition, but they represent another attempt by the old man to acquire supernatural powers and add to his general dubiousness. The old man’s worship thus seems to be motivated at least in part by

\(^{83}\) Hatley 2007: 78 and 80f.; see also Kiss 2015: 24 and 26.

\(^{84}\) Sanderson 2014 : 39f.

\(^{85}\) Sanderson (2015: 49) describes the case of permeable borders of tradition in the Kālī cult that “remained both Kaula in its self-definition and firmly Kāpālika in its practice.”

\(^{86}\) A large number of Sanskrit and Prakrit works of fiction from the seventh and later centuries that feature Kāpālika characters are introduced and discussed in Lorenzen 1972: 48–71. The earliest literary description of a Kāpālika ascetic is probably the description of a young woman in the Prakrit anthology *Gāhāsattasaī*, the stanzas of which were collected during the first centuries CE (see Lorenzen 1972: 13 and Törzsök 2011: 355).

\(^{87}\) K 227,3f.: śrīparvalaścaryavārtasahasrabhijñena.

\(^{88}\) See Lorenzen 1972: 18–20 and 50–52 respectively. The connection between this site and various Śaiva cults, most prominently that of the Kāpālikas, is also evident in inscriptions and other non-fictional works, like the early biographies of Śaṃkara (ibid.: p. 31f.) and the twelfth-century chronicle *Rājarātarāgini* (ibid.: 66).

\(^{89}\) For codicologists it may be worth mentioning that these palm-leaf manuscripts (*tālapatra*-…-*pustikā*) are “written with smoked red lac” (*dhūmarakalaktakāksara*).

\(^{90}\) K 226,22f.: kuhakatantramana (ed. Sastri omits -*mantra*). On this line, see Hatley 2007: 78, n. 144. A variety of more serious books are used in Jāhali’s forest hermitage, where they are read out loud (*vācyamānavividhapustaka*, p. 40,5).
worldly intentions rather than by soteriological aims. This assumption is supported by a number of other traits, like his pursuit of supernatural powers (vibhava) and accomplishments (sādhana) for which he resorts to mineralogy, elixirs, ointments, and magical formulas (mantra).

Furthermore, certain rituals for the worship of the female goddesses, also called Mothers (mātr), require female partners (dūtī). This may be alluded to when it is said that the old man throws magical powder (cūrṇa) at old mendicant women (jaratpravrajitā) who happen to stay in the temple in order to make them submissive (vaśīkaraṇa), for his celibacy is said to be merely compulsory. It is these dubious practices that reflect considerable discredit on the “holy man’s” more sincere spiritual gains like his “unwavering self-identification with Śiva,” a line that seems predestined to cause trouble in the course of textual transmission. In the sense of “meditative identification” this is an element found in Tantric Śaivism and bears clear soteriological connotations. However, a more general, and rather primary, meaning of the phrase would be “pride of being a devotee of Śiva.” It is likely possible that Bāṇa intended both meanings as a pun (ślesa). This would make the “holy man” appear liberated and haughty at the same time; or rather, if one of the two possible interpretations was to be stressed while still retaining an idea of the other, it would create the ambiguity of presenting him either as an imitator (with only little cause for his pride) or as possibly dangerous (an odd person that may really be a powerful ascetic).

92 HATLEY (2007: 74) prefers to link this line exclusively to the Bhairavatantras for its reference to the ritual use of powders.
93 K 227,8f. He has adopted “the celibacy of horses” (turagabrahmacarya), known as such because a stud is chaste only in the absence of mares (see the Sanskrit commentaries in PARAB 1908: 399,33f. and SASTRI 1982: 645,23–25, and KANE’s notes on p. 234). It is also said that the old man madly longs for heavenly maidens (yakṣakanyakā) but fails to successfully attract one (K 227,2f.).
94 I follow the reading avimuktaśaivābhīmānena in the eds. by KANE (1911: 97,9f.), KALE (1968: 339,5), and SASTRI (1982: 645,3) (including the editors’ commentaries). K 227,5 and PARAB 1908: 399,6f. read avamukta-., i.e., “loosened, let go” instead of “unwavering.”
95 HATLEY’s (2007: 75) interpretation of śaivābhīmāna as a technical term.
96 This interpretation was accepted in the notes by KANE (1911: 234) and is in accord with a gloss by Bhānucandra (aham eva śaivo nānyah) and a similar one in the Candrakalā commentary (śaivo 'ham ity avalepaḥ).
Historically noteworthy is Bāṇa’s reference to strings of the so-called rudrākṣa-beads, the dried seeds of the tree in the genus Elaëocarpus, which is widely used even today. As we are told, the “holy man’s” “tuft of his hair hangs down to his ears, looking like a string of Rudra beads.” This is one of the earliest pieces of textual evidence for the use of rudrākṣamālās. A variety of rosaries or strings of various materials are mentioned in the Kādambarī. The Brahmin sage Jābali and his pupils are said to have strings made from ordinary rudrākṣa-beads, but they also have some made from jewels, which are known since no later than Kālidāsa’s time. Hārīta, Jābali’s most eminent pupil, has one “hanging down from his right ear.” Many more such strings are mentioned in the Kādambarī, some of which are also used by female ascetics. Note again that the “holy man” does not wear any such string of beads.

97 K 226,12: karnāvatamsasamsthāpitayā ca cūdayā rudrākṣamālikām iva da-dhānena. According to normative sources, rudrākṣa-strings are to be worn on the wrist, chest, or head, not on the ear (see, e.g., śīvadharmaśāstra 11.19; see also tāntrakābdhānakōsa I, p. 79f., s.v. aksamālā). However, in the Kādambarī another string is mentioned hanging from the ear of a most eminent ascetic (see below, n. 103).

98 According to Dominic Goodall in a personal communication, November 2013.

99 Jābali has one of these (rudrākṣavalayā, K 43.5f.), and many of his pupils in the āśrama count the beads of their strings (gaṇanā rudrākṣavalayesu, p. 41.4f.) that have been strung together there (grathyamānākṣamāla, p. 40.9f.).

100 Jābali is said to have one “made from pieces of pure crystal” (amalasphaṭikāsakalaghaṭhitam aksavalayam, K 42.15f.). Puṇḍarīka holds one in his hand and counts its beads (sphaṭikākṣamālikām kareṇa kalayāntam, K 140.1), and Mahāśvetā will find and wear it later (K 145.20–146, 1).

101Kumārasambhava 6.6 describes the mythological seven Rṣis as wearing “rosaries made of gems” (raṭakṣasūtra, transl. SMITH). Māgha’s Śiṣupālavadha 1.9 mentions “strings of clear crystal beads” (ačhaṃsphaṭikākṣamālā) in the description of God Nārada.

102 K 36.18f.: sphaṭikākṣaṃvalayena daksināśraṃvaṇavilambāṇā.

103 The Pāṣupata girls (paṣupatavratadhārīṇi) that live with Kādambarī are also busy with “turning their rosaries” (aṃsālāpaprīvartana, K 208.19f.), and even a lotus pond (kamalīṇī) in Jābali’s āśrama is metaphorically said to be adorned by “circles of honey bees (resembling) rosaries” (madhukaramaṃḍalāksavalayā, K 48.7). Bāṇa’s preference for valaya (instead of māḷā or mālīkā) may be explained by his characteristic predilection for short syllables (see HUECKSTEDT 1985: 139–148).
Social aspects

While the prince probably is a rare person to talk to, the “holy man” certainly does not live in isolation. Daily life in his temple is animated by monkeys, black antelopes, goats, rats, cobras, cocks, and crows, but also by travellers, mendicants, village folk, and Śabara tribals. The old temple dweller however is unable and sometimes unwilling to fulfil any of their needs. Every once in a while, he is wrestled down by a passersby (adhvaga) after unsuccessfully attempting to drive him away from the temple, which is also the reason for his crooked spine. He has the habit of scolding locals (janapada) for no reason, and his bad temper often results in blows and wounded limbs. He throws mustard seeds (siddhārthaka) that were made ritually effective by the invocation of magical formulas (abhimantrita) towards those possessed by night fiends (piśāca). He does not succeed with the exorcism, however, and a slap in the face is what he earns instead. This together with the above-mentioned old, mendicant women and the remains of the offerings made by the tribesmen indicates that the temple is far from being inaccessible. In fact, the Caṇḍikā temple is easily reached by all kinds of folk, and even children come to the temple and play their pranks on the old Dravidian. It is worth noting that there is no mention of any initiatory community, pupils, or temple employees.

The “holy man’s” social contacts are neither restricted to the Caṇḍikā temple nor to followers of the Śaiva faith. For example, the above-mentioned quack who gifted him the magical ointment (siddhāṇjana) and an ill-educated Buddhist mendicant (duḥṣikṣitāśramaṇa, if we accept this reading) who recommended to him a mark on the forehead (tilaka) to pro-

---

104 These largely ill-reputed animals make up the satirical counterpart of the elephants and lions that are said to live in perfect harmony in Jābāli’s āśrama (K 38.15–40.21). This is also where the orphaned parrot chick Vaiśampāyana was raised, which plays a major part in the nested narration of the Kādambarī.

105 K 227.4f. In the second chapter (ucchvāsa) of his Harṣacarita, Bāna states that “mustard seeds were strewn on his head” (śikhāsaktasiddhārthaka, FÜRER 1909: 91.8f.) as a blessing at the moment he set out for his journey to the royal court. In another passage of the work (at the end of the third uucchvāsa), mustard is mentioned in connection with the Mahākālahṛdaya ritual. In this ritual, the eminent Śaiva officiant Bhairavācārya uses black sesame seeds (kṛṣṇatila, FÜRER 1909: 164,9) besides mustard seeds, the latter of which are said to have protective power (raksāsārupa, FÜRER 1909: 164,2).

106 For literature on maintenance workers in ancient Indian temples, see LORENZETTI 2015: 138, n. 159.
mote his powers could have been encountered not only in the Caṇḍikā temple but virtually anywhere. In any case, the old man himself is known to have visited other holy places (āyatana) to lay down and fast at the feet of the images installed there (pratiṣayita or pratiṣayana). However, all this was in vain and he was left unrewarded by the goddess, which is just another instance of his blatant lack of success in all his undertakings.

The peculiar and ambiguous character of the fellow living in the Caṇḍikā temple fails to meet the expectations of a proper holy man. An idea of the ambiguity, perhaps even irony, in Bāṇa’s use of the term dhārmika can perhaps best be conveyed by the use of quotation marks, as it has been done throughout this paper. To speak of a “holy man,” that is, the so-called “holy man,” in the Caṇḍikā episode contradicts neither the meaning of the word dhārmika nor the old man’s behaviour. At the same time, it is less judgemental than “pseudo-saint” and conveys more of a good-humoured wink.

**Geography**

After leaving the temple and the “holy man” at the very end of the forest interlude, it takes Candrāpiḍa “but a few days” (alpair evāhobhīḥ) to reach Ujjayinī. He rides his horse Indrāyudha (“Indra’s weapon”), which he

---

107 There are various readings of this line, including differences in how the mark was obtained: either from an “ill-educated (Buddhist) mendicant” (duḥṣiksitaśramaṇa-, eds. SASTRI 1982: 664,2 and KANE 1911: 97,1f., including the commentary Candrakalā in the former [p. 644,13f.] and KANE’s notes [p. 232f.] in the latter edition) or after “listening to an ill-educated one” (duḥṣiksitaśravaṇa-, eds. PARAB 1908: 399,1, including Bhānucandra’s commentary, p. 399,12 and K 226,21). There may be a joke in the phrase duḥṣiksitaśravanaḍāṭatilaka (“a mark on the forehead recommended by an ill-educated [Buddhist] mendicant”), which lies in the juxtaposition of the mark on the forehead and the Buddhist mendicant (śramaṇa, most likely understood as a disparaging term to denote a Buddhist monk in Bāṇa’s time). For forehead marks are particularly uncommon with Buddhist traditions. The reading śravaṇa might have been motivated by the need to resolve this apparent incongruity.

108 The former reading pratiṣayita is accepted by PETERSON (K 227,22). In the preceding description of the temple area, Bāṇa fancies (by way of an utprekṣā) that black antelopes seem as if they had adopted the same practice of “importuning” (pratiṣayita. K 226,6f.; likewise SASTRI 1982: 642,1). PARAB 1908: 397,9 reads pratiṣayana, which is glossed with pratītalpa by Bhānucandra (p. 397,33); SASTRI comments his reading with kṛtapratiṣayana (p. 642,9).

109 K 229,12–14.
received as a gift from the King of Persia (pārasīkādhipati) and which had magically emerged from the sea.\textsuperscript{110} This is the same horse he rode all the way from Kailāsa, far more than a thousand kilometres covering mountains, river fords, and woodlands. While it is futile to calculate the distances a fictitious character can travel on a supernatural horse, we may assume that the army accompanying Candrāpīḍa without supernatural mounts will have kept with its commander’s pace in more mundane dimensions. Given the storytelling is plausible and consistent, the Cāndikā temple should thus be located somewhere in or near the ancient region of Malwa, on the route from the (Trans-)Himalayan mountains, i.e., north of Ujjayinī.

This city is well-known from a great number of works of Sanskrit literature and plays a central role in the history of early Śaivism. According to Kauṇḍinya’s commentary on the Pāśupatasūtras,\textsuperscript{111} God (bhagavat) descended to Kāyāvataraṇa (or Kārohaṇa, today’s Karvan, Gujarat) in the form of a Brahmin and walked northeast to Ujjayinī (today’s Ujjain, Madhya Pradesh, about 380 kilometres on modern roads). There he initiated his only pupil Kuśika. According to the original Skandapurāṇa, which was also in existence in Bāṇa’s time,\textsuperscript{112} Śiva alias Lakulīśa descended to earth in Kārohaṇa, and after granting yogic perfection to a Brahmin called Somaśārman he went to Ujjayinī and initiated Kuśika. After that, Lākulīn went north and initiated Gārgya and Mitra in Jāmbumārga and Mathurā respectively as well as a fourth pupil in Kānyakubja. All four were taught the pañcārtha doctrine by Śiva/Lākulīn.\textsuperscript{113}

The temple of Śiva Mahākāla in Kālidāsa’s Meghadūta is said to be near Ujjayinī and somewhere on the way north to Daśapura (today’s Mandor) in the Malwa region.\textsuperscript{114} These and other examples that predate the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[110] K 78,2–4. The horse’s former “abode in the sea” (udadhinivāsa) is mentioned on p. 79,3f., its “roaming in the ocean” (jalanidhisaṃcaraṇa) on p. 79,8.
\item[111] Kauṇḍinya’s Pañcārthabhāṣya ad Pāśupatasūtra 1.1 (3,15–4,12); see also BAKKER 2000:14 and BISSCHOP 2006: 45.
\item[112] The earliest manuscript of the Skandapurāṇa is dated 810 CE (see YOKOCHI 2013: 3). Text-critical evidence, however, points to a date of its first redaction around 600 CE (BAKKER 2014:3f.), possibly in the period between 570 to 620 CE (ibid.: 137).
\item[113] BISSCHOP 2006: 44–50. BAKKER 2007: 1–3. Besides the accounts from the Skandapurāṇa, evidence for the Pāśupata history in Mathurā is also well attested from a pillar inscription dated 360 CE (see BHANDARKAR 1931–32 and BISSCHOP 2006: 45f.).
\item[114] Meghadūta 1.36–39. Ujjayinī, alias Viśālā, is mentioned in vv. 1.28 and 31, the ancient city Daśapura in v. 1.50. On the air route from one city to the other is
composition of the *Kādambarī* demonstrate that the Caṇḍikā temple is situated in one of the historical centres of early Śaivism, and Bāṇa’s placing it there is certainly not purely fictional.

**Imperial history and humour**

Imperial history suggests an alternative approach to the interpretation of the Caṇḍikā passage. In consideration of the historical situation of the author and his patron King Harṣa, the unflattering depiction – to say the least – of the “holy man” and his temple might be in debt to Harṣa’s temporary defeat by Pulakeśin II, the well-known ruler from the South Indian Cālukya dynasty, in the year 630 CE. Since the Caṇḍikā temple should be located somewhere north of the Narmadā river and within the reign of Harṣa, Bāṇa possibly ridiculed the temple dweller in order to level criticism against South Indian traditions which were gaining foothold in the north. He did this by deconstructing, as it were, the southerner’s Tantric cults by denying it seriousness and power, and he did this with good sense of humour. Despite the political conflicts, the representation of the temple and the Dravidian shows no obvious traits of hostility or malice. Finally, it ends on a jovial and conciliatory note. In fact, Candrāpiḍa does not leave without leaving plenty of riches, thus fulfilling a desire of the old “holy man.”

**Closing remarks on poetic license**

One final word on the fictional character of the *Kādambarī* may be in place here. It is not despite but exactly because the *Kādambarī* is a fictional work of literature that some of its descriptive passages can be so remarkably naturalistic. In the episode of the “holy man” (as in many other passages), Bāṇa makes use of poetic license not in order to fantasise in the sense of purely diverting from real-world phenomena, but, on the contrary, to represent these phenomena more vividly and in a more concentrated form than this would be possible in non-fictional accounts. The ambiguity of the religious life of the “holy man,” his eclectic use of rites and practices, the utter

---

situ[115] This connection was suggested to me by Csaba Dezső. The complex situation of Harṣa’s military conflicts with many other dynasties throughout the Indian subcontinent is tentatively reconstructed in BAKKER 2014: 104–113. Compare KULKE & ROTHERMUND 2010: 141; SASTRI 1999: 134f.
lack of success in all his efforts, and his relieving but also tragic lack of power have sprung from the author’s lively imagination as much as from his rare observation skills and an outstanding literary talent.
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TANTRIC RITUAL COMMUNITIES
Whose dharma? Śaiva and Śākta community rules and Dharmaśāstric prescriptions

Judit Törzsök

Introduction

Shared rules, whether they are explicit or implicit, are among the characteristics that define any given community. In this paper, I propose to examine different sets of rules of conduct that various Śaiva Tantric communities claimed to follow, or rather, rules that their scriptures prescribed them to follow. There are several limitations to such an investigation. As it is commonly pointed out, scriptures – as many other types of written sources – are prescriptive and therefore cannot be taken to reflect the social reality of their time. This is true in more than one sense. Scriptures and the rules they define may represent an ideal state of affairs, thus they may include injunctions that were never actually followed in reality. At the same time, there may have been additional rules that were left unmentioned for various reasons: because they went against some of the principles established in the scriptures or elsewhere, because they were not considered worth mentioning (no matter how interesting they would be for us now), or because they had a limited sphere of application, for instance in the case of certain local rules.

1 The first version of this paper was delivered at the workshop “Visions of Community. Tantric Communities in Context: Sacred Secrets and Public Rituals” (February 5–7, 2015, Vienna, Austrian Academy of Sciences), in which I was able to participate thanks to the support of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) VISCOM SFB Project. I would like to thank Nina Mirnig, Marion Rastelli, and Vincent Eltschinger for inviting me to this event. I am grateful for all the comments made by the participants present, in particular to Jung Lan Bang for discussing difficult passages of the Tantrasadbhāva and sharing her draft edition as well as manuscript photos, to Shaman Hatley for helping to understand obscure expressions in the Brahmayāmala, and to Csaba Kiss for corrections, comments, and issues raised in the last stages of the writing of this paper.
And there are additional pitfalls. Tantric scriptures, just as non-Tantric ones, were meant to be applicable eternally and without any restrictions as to time and place. This implies, first of all, that they are notoriously difficult to date or to locate. But it also means that we cannot always know what is chronologically or geographically particular in them. In the case of community rules, it would be difficult to tell where and when particular injunctions were to be applied or whether certain rules were pan-Indian or local.

With these problems in mind, what one can actually study in scriptural sources is not some factually verifiable historical reality but rather the self-representation of certain religious groups who composed or tried to follow certain scriptures and their prescriptions. It may be disappointing not to stumble upon hard-and-fast historical data. However, such self-representation is actually part of the historical reality that we are trying to understand.

The picture appears to be even further removed from what may have been real when we attempt to compare Tantric prescriptions to Brahmanical orthopraxy. Orthopraxy as laid down in the Dharmaśāstras seems to have been a theoretical framework, or, in any case, one could say that most Dharmaśāstric rules “were considered normative within particular Brahmin circles at particular times, though we cannot now know where or when exactly.” (LUBIN 2015: 228)

This leaves us with a very vague basis indeed: comparing Tantric prescriptions with Dharmaśāstric ones may seem like comparing two ghosts. However, I would again argue that the situation is not as bad as it seems. First, similarly to Tantras, Dharmaśāstras can also be read to see how certain religious groups represented themselves. Thus, we compare the self-representations of different religious communities, not what they actually were or what they did. Second, concerning Dharmaśāstras, it has been observed that their terminology was also used in inscriptive sources that were to define local or regional law. Whatever are the full implications of this, the use of Dharmaśāstric terminology in epigraphical legalese shows that Dharmaśāstric prescriptions had more than a mere theoretical existence, even if they provided a framework or a normative model rather than a law-code proper.

In what follows, I shall limit my investigations to certain community rules called samayas that figure in Tantric scriptures; but one must bear in mind that there is a corpus of texts that establishes Śaiva rules for the so-called lay (laukika) Śaivas who did not receive Tantric initiation: the
Śivadharmas were perhaps the first body of texts that attempted to define a particular set of rules for Śaiva communities; and Tantric scriptures may in fact presuppose their existence and application. I do not intend to discuss the Śivadharmas here, which are being edited and studied; but, by way of introduction, in order to show how lay Śaivism proposes different solutions compared to orthodox Brahmanical procedures, I would like to present a Purāṇic example.

Śiva versus Manu: a Purāṇic example

The example comes from the Skandapurāṇa, datable in its earliest form to around the end of the sixth century CE. I have chosen to present this case because it shows very clearly how Dharmaśastric principles may have been and probably were opposed by distinctly Śaiva ideas and solutions. The story is related in chapter 52 of the text, which forms part of a series of chapters dealing with hells and how people can be saved from suffering in hell, particularly by their sons. The idea of the son saving his ancestors agrees with Brahmanical ideology. However, the way the birth of the son is ensured is not according to traditional prescriptions. The story runs as follows.

A Brahmin of the Gautama lineage called Bhūmanyu marries an ātreyī woman called Yaśā. They do not succeed in having a son, and Bhūmanyu is getting old. One day Bhūmanyu, dejected, talks to his wife about a solution. He says: “People desire to reach a better world and to get rid of their debt towards their ancestors by having a son. I am already very old and still have not got a child. With my full consent, you should resort to someone in my lineage (gotra) to have a son. With folded hands, I beg you to do this.”

A for the texts belonging to this corpus and their place in Śaiva literature, see SANDERSON 2014: 2–4.
2 Several people are working on various texts belonging to this corpus, such as Peter Bisschop, Florinda de Simini, Nirajan Kafle, Timothy Lubin, Anil Kumar Acharya, Nina Mirmig, and Paolo Magnone.
3 For the edition and synopsis of this chapter, see Skandapurāṇa vol. IIB.
4 I give a summary rather than a translation above. For reference, here is the Sanskrit text, Skandapurāṇa 52.29–32: gautamasyānvaye vipro nāṃ mā kṛṣṇa iti prabhuh | tasya putro ‘bhavat khyāto bhūmanyur iti nāmatah | tasya patny abhavat subhrūr ātreyī nāmato yaśā || sa kadācit kṛtadvāho bhūmanyur nāma gautamaḥ | nāvindata sutaṁ tasyā jarayā cābhisaṃvṛtaḥ || sa bhāryām āhu duḥkhārta idaṁ vacanakvidiaḥ | “putreṇeccaḥanti lokāṁ ca anṛṇaḥ ca bhavanty uto | jarāpapiṇataḥ
In his request, Bhūmanyu applies a well-known principle taught for instance by the Manusmṛti (9.59), which prescribes that if a couple fails to have a son, another male member of the family may replace the husband, provided the necessary authorisation has been obtained:

> If the line is about to die out, a wife who is duly appointed may obtain the desired progeny through a brother-in-law or a relative belonging to the same ancestry.⁶

Now in our story, the wife replies the following:

> I can’t believe my ears! You cannot have said this! How could someone like me even think of such a terrible thing? I was born in the noble family of Atri and came, through marriage, to the eminent Gautama family. How could someone like me commit such a shameful act, condemned by the virtuous? Those who desire wealth, happiness, sons, a family, or a better rebirth practice asceticism. So go and practice asceticism yourself, great sage!⁷

After this, the wife gives several epic and Purānic examples of sages who managed to have a son thanks to their asceticism, and then concludes:

> You should also practice asceticism with full absorption of your mind, and you shall obtain an eminent son who will have extraordinary yogic powers. When Atri, Brahmā’s son himself, saw me once, he said: This woman shall have a true son. This prediction should come true. Whatever ascetic power I have been able to accumulate, cāham na ca me drīyate sataḥ || sā tvam kaṃcit sagotraṃ me anujñātā mayā śubhe | abhipadyasva putrārtham yāce tvāṃ prāṇjalir nataḥ।।

⁶ Manusmṛti 9.59: devarād vā sapinḍād vā striyā samyaṇaḥ niyuktayāḥ prajepit-adhistantasya samāntasya parikṣaye, transl. OLIVELLE 2005: 193. Cf. “On failure of issue (by her husband) a woman who has been authorised, may obtain, (in the) proper (manner prescribed), the desired offspring by (cohabitation with) a brother-in-law or (with some other) Sapinda (of the husband).” (Transl. BÜHLER 1984: 337)

⁷ Skandapurāṇa 52.33-35: na mayā śrutam etat te tathā noktam tvayānagha | mādṛśi katham etad dhi manasāpy abhicintayet || atrīṇāṁ tu kule jātā gautamaṁ kulam āgatā | madvidhā katham etad dhi kuryād sadbhir vigarbhitam || tapasā dhanam anvicchej jīvitāṇi sukhāni ca | putrān kulaṁ ca lokāṇās ca tapaḥ kuru mahāmune।।
through your grace, you shall have it. Armed with my tapas and yours, you must worship Rudra.8

Thus, the wife not only rejects Manu’s solution to the problem but even finds it outrageous. She argues that the replacement of the husband is a custom condemned by the virtuous. By saying this, she justifies her rejection through the Dharmaśāstric principle according to which “an activity that the Āryas praise is righteous (dharma), and what they deplore is unrighteous (adharma).”9

Let us remark here that the rejection of the levirate is not unknown to the Manusmṛti either. Contradicting rules are given as to whether the levirate is an approved or rejected practice, and whether it should be stopped after begetting the first son or having a second one is also permitted. However, the prohibition appears to concern the remarriage of widows rather than the replacement of a living husband.10

In any case, using the authority of the virtuous, the wife argues against the replacement of her husband. She proposes a particularly Śaiva solution to the problem, which obviously does not come from mainstream Dharmaśāstric authorities. Obtaining a son through tapas is certainly not condemned by any authority either, therefore such a solution is a legitimate supplement to what is dharmic. The concluding sentence adds the Śaiva element already expected all along the argument but not yet overtly expressed: the tapas accumulated should be used to worship Rudra, who shall then bestow one’s wish.

The story shows that while lay Śaivism certainly did not claim to go against the norms of orthopraxy, it had its own solutions that did not necessarily follow what was laid down in Dharmaśāstras.

It is also interesting to note that in the above extract the man represents the traditional Brahmanical solution borrowed from Manu, and the woman

8 Skandapurāṇa 52.38–40: tathā bhavān api tapaḥ karotu susamādhinā | lapsyase tvam sutaṁ śreṣṭhaṁ mahāyogabalinavitam || māṁ hi dhstvā purā prāha atrir brahmaśutaṁ svayam | satputriṇī bhaveṣyate na mithyā tadbhaveṣyati || tapo ‘sti mayi yat kincit tvatprasādātī samārjitaṁ | tena svaṁ ca saṁyukto rudram ārādhaya prabhō ||.

9 Apastamba Dharmaśūtra 1.20.6–7: yat tv āryāḥ kriyamānaṁ praśamsanti sa dharmaḥ yad garhante so ‘dharmaḥ, transl. OLIVELLE 2000: 57. The same Dharmaśūtra in fact goes on to warn readers that sometimes the conduct depicted in scripture is not legitimate in the present day, since the ancients had “extraordinary power” (tejoviśeṣa) that people lack in later ages (2.13.7–9).

10 See in particular Manusmṛti 9.64–66.
defends the better, more virtuous Śaiva one. Women, along with Śūdras, were certainly treated better in Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism than in mainstream Brahmanism, at least in the sense that they had access to some form of initiation (even to full initiation in the Śākta branches) and therefore hope for potential liberation, from which they were entirely excluded according to mainstream Brahmanism. It may not be accidental in our story that it is the woman that proposes the Śaiva solution.

Whose pledges?

After this detour to Purānic Śaivism, let us turn to the so-called samaya rules or pledges. They are recited at the end of the so-called samaya rite that introduces new members to the Śaiva Tantric community. Now who was to follow these rules?

It is often reiterated that women, along with children, the elderly, the sick, and the like are to be given a so-called “seedless” initiation (nirbija-dikṣā), which excludes the obligation to follow the post-initiatory rules (samaya). The king, who is too busy to deal with these obligations, is also included in the list. As it is stated in the locus classicus, Svacchandatantra 4.88:

Children, fools, the elderly, women, kings, and the sick – for these, initiation is seedless, [i.e.,] it excludes [the obligation to follow] post-initiatory rules etc.11

All these categories of people are considered to be unable to follow the rules of the community, therefore they are given an easier version of initiation that is also less powerful.

It is nevertheless surprising to see here that women are considered unable to follow the samaya rules. For the so-called samaya ritual itself, which is a preliminary to initiation proper (dikṣā) and which ends with the recitation of the rules to be observed, can also be performed for women, who in

11 SvT 4.88: bālabāliśavṛddhasthānaghaḥbhugvyādhitāmanām | esām nirbija dikṣā samayādvivijātī ||. According to Kṣemarāja’s commentary, the word “etc.” refers to other ritual obligations, such as the annual reparatory pavitraka rite (ādiśaabdā pavitrakāviddhīḥ). On this rite, see the entries pavitraka and pavitrāropahaṇa/pavitrāropaṇa in TANTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA vol. III, where it is also pointed out that the earliest Tantras do not describe this rite. Thus, it is possible that the Svacchanda’s author(s) had something different in mind than Kṣemarāja.
some systems receive their own, female initiation names. It seems quite absurd to perform the samaya ritual for everybody and to recite the rules to be observed in front of every neophyte, only to later declare a large number of them unable to follow these rules. Indeed, this category of reduced initiation is absent from the earliest surviving Tantras of the Śaiva Siddhānta as well as from Śākta scriptures. The “seedless” initiation was most probably introduced at a relatively later point. I would therefore argue that samayas, at least initially, were in fact meant to be observed by all initiates.

**Samayas in the Śaiva Siddhānta**

Scriptures of the Śaiva Siddhānta list relatively few samayas, and they tend to cluster around four major topics (as numbered below). Traditionally, eight such rules are given, which figure already in the Nayasūtra of the Niśvāsa.

1. One set of rules concern different types of nindā, i.e., defamation or criticism. This is mainly a Śaiva application of the Brahmanical rule that forbids vedanindā, reviling the Vedas, and gurunindā, reviling the guru. In Śaivism, those who must be treated with respect are the deity (deva), scripture itself (śāstra) that comes from him, the guru, through whom the deity can act, and other Śaiva initiates (termed variously as sādhaka, putraka, dīkṣita, bhakta). These four nindās are formulated in four traditional samayas. Fire, which is also identified with the deity, can also be included in the list. Moreover, it is also sometimes added that one must always obey one’s guru.

2. It is always mentioned that nirmālya, i.e., what has been offered to the deity and been touched or consumed by him (devajagdha), should not be eaten. According to Bhojadeva, the eight traditional samayas also include that one should not step over the nirmālyā, and this is also mentioned for instance in the Svāyambhuvasūrāsāṃghraha, which adds that the nirmālyā should not be given away either.

   At this point, the Niśvāsa Nayāsūtra (1.104ab) adds something difficult to interpret: nirmālyabhakṣane vāpi balidāne paśor api (ms.: balidāna-paśor api). Perhaps it means, as it is understood in GOODALL et al. 2015, that one must perform a reparatory rite “if the nirmālya is eaten or if it is given to an animal as a bali offering.” However, I propose that one could also

---

12 See the entry nirbījadikṣā by Dominic Goodall in TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOSA vol. III.
13 See, e.g., Manusmṛti 4.163 for vedanindā and 2.200 for gurunindā.
understand that the transgression the Niśvāsa condemns here is the eating of an animal offered in sacrifice, if we read balidānapāšor api with the manuscripts and construe it with -bhaksane as a sāpekṣasamāsa. In other words, one must perform an expiatory rite “if one eats either the nirmālya or the animal given in/destined to a bali sacrifice.” I suspect that the prohibition to eat the animal offering was later forgotten because nobody would have thought of eating meat anyway, whether prepared as an offering or not. However, this injunction is in accordance with the frequently repeated rule which forbids the touching or eating of any offering (naivedya).14

The Svāyambhuvaśūtrasamgraha’s parallel, which is also difficult to understand, seems to say something along the same lines,15 but it is also possible that a different transgression is meant here.16 In any case, the Svāyambhuvaśūtrasamgraha clearly continues by stating that such things should not be done even when one is in great danger,17 in other words the nirmālya is not to be used or consumed even if there is a famine or some similar situation in which one may be allowed to resort to āpaddharma. Such rules about nirmālya seem to be specifically Śaiva ones.

(3) Some samayas forbid initiates to accept food touched by certain categories of women: mainly those who have their period or those who have recently given birth. The traditional eight samayas mention only women during their menses,18 but scriptures often include women in the postpartum period (śūtikā).19 Such samayas reproduce faithfully the Brahmanical principle according to which one is not to accept food from these wom-

---

14 See, for instance, Mataṅgapārāmeśvara Caryāpāda 1.7: niveditaṃ vā yat kimcid devadesasya śālinaḥ | na ca tat svapayogīya kartavyaṃ manasaṃy atihā |
15 SvāSS 10.24cd–25ab: nirmālya-laṅghanam [-]dānam [-]bhjanam ca vivarjayet || tatrāvīplavanam (for tantraviplōvanam?) dānam avinītabaleḥ paśoḥ ||. Perhaps understand “one should avoid stepping over, offering, or eating the nirmālya as well as divulging scripture and offering (dāna) a sacrificial animal (paśu) whose sacrifice (bali) has not been performed (aviniṭa) or has not been performed properly.” (I understand a kind of sāpekṣasamāsa here, whereby nirmālya- is to be understood or supplied with -dānam and -bhjanam. The same applies in the next citation.)
16 One could read tantraviplōvanam dānam avinītābale paśu, “divulging the Tantra or giving it to an uninitiated person (paśu) who lacks any decency or strength.”
17 SvāSS 10.25cd: nācarec chivamāraṣṭhah mahātayagato ‘pi san (clearly corrupt for mahābhayagato ‘pi san). sandhi is not applied here at the end of a pāda.
18 See ārtavisṛṣṭam in the Niśvāsa Nayasūtra 1.104cd.
19 See Sarvaṅgapottara 15.26a: sūtikāyānasaṃspraṣṭām; SvāSS 10.24b: saṃspraṣṭam puṣṭavatvāṇānam (for puṣpavatvāṇānam) svaryādāni ca sautikam.
en (Manusmṛti 4.232). The Manusmṛti (5.85) also points out that touching such women, just as touching an outcaste or a corpse, defiles one and requires a purificatory bath. In the same vein, the Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha’s version adds that one is also to avoid food touched by someone who has gone to heaven.20

(4) Finally, one should not step on the shadow of a liṅga. By extension it is also enjoined sometimes that one should not step on the sacrificial area (catvara).21

These four types of rules – nindā, nirmālya, not accepting food from certain women, not stepping on any (Śaiva) sacred space – cover the eight traditional samayas and many other, extended lists in the Śaiva Siddhānta. Most of them are either taken from Brahmanical rules of conduct or are Śaiva versions of such rules, except rules concerning the nirmālya and the liṅga, which appear to be particular Śaiva ones.22

Although, as is obvious from the above rules, the Śaiva Siddhānta certainly offered a form of Śaivism that conformed to orthopraxy and assimilated Dharmasāstric principles in its samayas, it also saw itself as different from the orthodox mainstream and defended its own territory and validity against Vaidikas, at least at the initial stages represented by the Niśvāsa. For the Nayasūtra (1.106cd–108ab, just after mentioning the samayas) clearly warns against returning to Vedic ritual and turning one’s back to the Śaiva community:

If someone studies the Śaiva scripture and performs Śiva worship, [but then] sacrifices with Vedic rites, reviles devotees of Śiva, and venerates and praises Brahmans with other religious affiliations, then Hāṭha-kuśmāṇḍa-rudra shall punish that evil-minded person.23

In the same vein, the Nayasūtra (1.105cd–106ab) also warns against following other, possibly Tantric prescriptions:

20 See svaryātānān in the above citation.
21 Sarvajñānottara 15.26b: cchāyācatvaralāghanam.
22 Note that different rules for the nirmālya apply in Pāńcarātra scriptures, for which see the entry by Marion Rastelli in TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOSA vol. III.
23 Śivatantram adhitvā tu śivayajñām prakurvvaete || yajate vaidikair vajñāḥ śiva-bhaktām ca nindate | viprāṁś caivānyaliṅgasthām pājayer stutateti ca || hāṭhakaśmāṇḍarudras tu taṁ vai badhnāti durmattam |.
If someone undertakes a solemn religious observance, but then abandons that Śiva-observance and takes up an observance taught in another [= non-Śaiva] scripture, Devī shall punish him for that.24

These prohibitions show that there must have been people who did not refrain from changing affiliations. Perhaps turncoats or renegades were not so uncommon, for the boundaries between Śaiva and Vaidika or Śaiva and non-Śaiva may not have been as strict for common people as more ardent Śaivas (or Vaidikas) would have preferred. It was probably not considered impossible to try out (Saiddhāntika) Śaivism and then turn back to Vedic ritual or try out yet something else, probably remaining, by and large, within the rules and boundaries of orthopraxy.25

Eclectic samayas of early Śākta Tantras

Since Śākta Tantras prescribe nondual Tantric practice such as the offering of alcohol and meat and the use of various impure substances, one would expect that their samayas also prescribe whatever goes against orthopraxy. It is therefore surprising to see that earlier Śākta Tantras appear to give a very heterogeneous list of samayas: they mix some rules taken over from Dharmaśāstras with those that enjoin the very violation of Dharmaśāstric rules.

The short recension of the Siddhayogesvarimata (of around the seventh century),26 which is otherwise rather concise on many topics, gives a fairly detailed list of such samayas, and the list has many parallels in related texts. With regard to their conformity to Dharmaśāstric prescriptions, there are three kinds of rules here.

---

24 pratijñāvratam ērūḍho punas tyaktvā śivam vratam || anyattantravrataṁ grhṇed devī tena nibandhati ||. I would like to note here that my translations of the Niśvāsa passages are indebted to GOODALL et al. 2015. In most cases, I follow the interpretations given there and alter the translation only slightly, mainly to fit better in the context of this paper.

25 In this context, it must be remarked that converts are a recognised category of Śaiva initiates, who normally do not have the right to take up one of the two Śaiva offices, namely that of the ācāryas or sādhakas. They are called “the reborn,” punarbhū-, see the entry in TANTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA vol. III. by Dominic Goodall. This category, however, comprises prāṇalingins, i.e., those who had a previous sectarian mark. The expression suggests that they were Vaiṣṇava or Saura (worshippers of the sun god) or Baudhā and did not simply belong to the nonsectarian/mainstream Brahmanical tradition (vaidika).

26 See TÖRZSÖK 1999 and TÖRZSÖK forthcoming.
First, there are *samayas* that are in total agreement with orthopraxic prescriptions and are practically taken over from mainstream Brahmanical sources. We have seen that those *samayas* of the Śaiva Siddhānta that forbid people to accept food from women in periods of impurity also belong to this category. The *Siddhayogesvarīmata* and the *Tantrasadbhāva*, however, add many other such *samayas*: one should not perform fruitless acts, one must not look at naked women, one must avoid having sex during daytime if one wishes to succeed in obtaining supernatural powers (or liberation), one is not to urinate in certain places such as in a field, on the road, on a cremation ground, etc. All these rules have their equivalents in the *Manusmṛti*, either fully agreeing with the Tantric ones or having only some minor variations. Although they are rather generic rules of conduct, their inclusion in the *samayas* suggests a certain adherence to general Dharmaśāstric principles. It also betrays perhaps the intention of the authors to become as authoritative in a particular Śākta community as Manu was among the orthodox – or to create, as it were, their own Dharmaśāstra.

Second, several *samayas* are Śaiva inflections of Dharmaśāstric rules, just as the *nindā* rules are in the Śaiva Siddhānta. Similarly, the deity or the scriptures are not to be reviled in Śākta Tantras either. One must mentally invoke and worship the deity at the three junctures of the day, and one must worship one’s ācārya.

---

27 SYM 6.46a (= Mālinīvijayottara 8.133a): *nisphalam naiva ceṣṭeta*. (See also TSB 9.531c: *nisphalam varjyaev ceṣṭām*.) Cf. *Manusmṛti* 4.63a: *na kurvi na vrthaceṣṭāṃ, 4.70c: *na karma nisphalam kuryān*.


31 In the SYM for instance *śāstranīndā* is mentioned in 6.45c, while 45ab enjoins *naivedya* for the deities whenever one eats (as does the TSB in 9.531a).

32 Śakti in the SYM (6.49ab: *traṅkāłam cintayec chaktim sakalikṛtavigrāhaḥ*);
Third, many *samayás* are completely unparalleled in Dharmaśāstras. Some of them are merely specific to certain Śākta texts, for instance that the words *dākīni*\(^{34}\) or *rēre*\(^{35}\) should not be uttered, probably because they carry particular power and are therefore considered dangerous. But other *samayás* clearly go against Dharmaśastric prescriptions, for instance that one should not revile alcohol or those who are unmanly (*klība*).\(^{36}\)

The Brahmanical aversion to alcohol is well-known. It is perhaps less often pointed out that those who are considered unmanly (whatever that means exactly, including the impotent, the effeminate, transvestites, hermaphrodites, etc.), designated with the generic word *klība*,\(^{37}\) are also treated with much contempt. In *Manusmṛti* 3.150, *klības* are put in the same group as outcastes, thieves, and atheists: “Brahmins who are thieves, fallen from their caste, or impotent or who follow the livelihood of infidels — Manu has declared these unfit to participate at divine or ancestral offerings.”\(^{38}\)

---

\(^{33}\) See SYM 6.49cd: *vanded ācāryam āsamanm dārastham dhyānayogataḥ.*

\(^{34}\) SYM 6.51ab: *dākīnī na vaktaivyam pramādān mantrinā —m— api;* the word śākīni is mentioned in the parallel in TSB 9.533ab: *śākīnī na vaktaivyam.* Words denoting dangerous female spirits (*dākīnī* or *śākīnī*) were not to be pronounced in general.

\(^{35}\) In SYM 6.46cd: *rēreśadbham sadākālam na prayuṇīyā[ṛ] kadācana.* A similar injunction is formulated concerning the word *hehe* in TSB 9.532ab: *rēreśadbham na coccārāṃ heheśadbham tathaiva ca.*

\(^{36}\) SYM 6.45cd: *surāṃ klībam na nindyāī,* with a parallel in TSB 9.542cd ff. SvT 5.48 also includes other commonly avoided substances that one should not be disgusted of: meat, fish, and so on. Moreover, those who do or do not obey general rules of conduct (*ācāra*) should not be treated with disgust either.

\(^{37}\) See OLIVELLE’s note on *Manusmṛti* 3.150 (p. 263–264): “[T]he term *klība* has been subject to widely different interpretations. It probably did have a range of meanings, and in different contexts may have assumed somewhat different meanings. In general, it refers to males who are in some way sexually dysfunctional or deviate from the culturally constructed notions of masculinity. Such individuals include the impotent, the effeminate, transvestites, hermaphrodites and the like. This term does not refer to castrated eunuchs; I think the term *sāndha* indicates such a person, although there is scholarly disagreement even with regard to this. A verse of Kātyāyana cited in the Dāyabhāga (5.8) gives a definition of *klība:* ‘If a man’s urine does not form, if his stool sinks in water, if his penis has no erection or sperm, he is called a *klība.*’"

\(^{38}\) *Manusmṛti* 3.150: ye *stena†pa†t†a†k†ī†bā ye ca nāśākavṛtyayaḥ | tān havyakavṛyov viprāṃ anarhaṃ manur abraorvī]|, transl. OLIVELLE 2005: 116. Cf. “Manu has declared that those Brahmans who are thieves, outcasts, eunuchs, or atheists are unworthy (to partake) of oblations to the gods and manes.” (transl. BÜHLER 1984: 103).
Eunuchs are also said to have a polluting presence (if they watch a Brahmin eat, for example). As to inheritance, Manu says: “Eunuchs [or rather, those who are unmanly, klība J.T.] and outcasts, (persons) born blind or deaf, the insane, idiots and the dumb, as well as those deficient in any organ (of action or sensation), receive no share.”

As the last verse (as well as other passages) of Manu show, people who have any physical defect also belong to the bottom of the Brahmanical hierarchy – and it is precisely these people that should not be despised according to the longer list of samayas in the Tantrasadhāva:

The deformed, the depressed, eunuchs, the unmanly, the blind, and those who suffer [from any illness] [...] should not be treated with contempt.

Women, who – just as eunuchs and unmanly males – are considered potentially polluting in Brahmanical orthopraxy, are also included in the list of those who should not be reviled in Tantric sources. Furthermore, in the Tantrasadhāva many outcastes and low-status members of the Brahmanical society are enumerated among those who must not be treated with contempt: tribal people such as the Bhillas and Ḍombas, fishermen (kaivarta), foreigners (mleccha), wrestlers (mallā), leather-makers (carmakāraka), and so on. At the end of the list, the Tantrasadhāva also mentions that, in addition, others who have not been mentioned should not be reviled either.

---

39 Manusmṛti 3.239: cāṇḍālaḥ ca varāḥaḥ ca kukkuṭaḥ śvā tathāvai ca | rajasvalā ca ṣaṇḍhaḥ ca nekṣeram aśnāvā dvījān ||. “A Caṇḍāla, a pig, a cock, a dog, a menstruating woman, or a eunuch must not look at the Brahmins while they are eating.” (transl. OLIVELLE 2005: 120).

40 Transl. BÜHLER 1984: 372. Manusmṛti 9.201: anaṃśau klībapatītau jātya-ṇḍhābādhīrāu tathā | unnattjaḍādāmākāś ca ye ca ke cin nirindriyāḥ ||. Cf. OLIVELLE’s translation (2005: 200), who understands (against the commentators and Bühler) nirindriya also to refer to the absence of manly strength: “The following receive no shares: the impotent, outcastes, those born blind or deaf, the insane, the mentally retarded, mutes, and anyone lacking manly strength.”

41 TSB 9.552cd... 555a: vairūpyaṃ duḥkhitam ṣaṇḍham klībaṃ andham tathātum || ...na nindeta varārohe.

42 See 6.45cd in the very heterogeneous list of the SYM: striyaṃ sāstraṃ surām klībaṃ na nindyaḥ kanyakām api. “One should not despise women, the scripture, alcohol, the unmanly, and young girls.”

43 See the following provisional edition of the passage kindly provided by Jung Lan Bang. Because of the focus of this paper, textual problems, which remain quite
See also a similar list in the Kubjikāmata 5.65cd–66ab, mentioning wrestlers (mallā), leather-makers (carmākāraka), liquor-sellers (dhvaja), butchers (śūnākara), fish-killers (matsyaghāta), and hunters (lubdhaka).

This set of samayās thus appears to defend several categories of those who are marginalised according to Brahmanical rules.

Now was there some sense of social justice or equality that prompted our authors to establish such samayās? I am afraid there is no statement to this effect. There is, however, one passage in the Brahmayāmala that appears to give a theological justification that comes relatively close to revealing a certain sense of equality.

The passage in question starts with an enumeration of things and people that are not to be hurt or spoken ill of (na dūṣayet) according to Bhairava’s command: those who are unmanly, madmen, drunkards, those who are delirious, naked, or are absorbed in sexual union, alcohol, women, and so on. The text then goes on to say that since the goddesses and Śiva can be found everywhere, one should not revile anyone or anything subject to decay or old age, or someone or something deformed. A practitioner who abides in knowledge,\(^45\) who has received the samayās and intends to follow them, must see different kinds of worship, the varṇas, various (ritual) acts, substances, and bodies in the same way.\(^46\)

---

\(^{44}\) This passage, repeating some elements from the TSB above, also lists several categories that I cannot translate with certainty (see underlined words, of which the first may denote jugglers and the final one archers): kundakam mallakosādhvāchippakam carmakārakam dhvajaramaṃśākaraṃ vāpi matsyaghātāṃ tu lubdhakam.

\(^{45}\) More precisely, “he who is in the stage of life for/of knowledge.” The text seems to create a fifth stage of life (āśrama) added to the traditional four. The name suggests that it is characterised by the knowledge of the doctrine it propounds. It may have been conceived of as an āśrama that is beyond the four, in the manner of the atyāśrama of the Pāśupatas.

\(^{46}\) This is not a full translation of the text, which has a few textual difficulties; Brahmayāmala 62.124127ab: guhyam klībādi conmattam pramattam vihvalam priye nagnam suratanasaktam mṛtyudhaliyajantam surā striyāḥ. (Perhaps read mṛto ‘ndham or mṛtodharantaḥ?) na dūṣayet[‘] ṭvase vātha yantranā bhairavasya tu sarvatas tu tato devyah śivaḥ ca labhate priye a to na nindayet sarvam jārātham tu virūpakaṃ jiśānā-srami makhāṃ varṇanāṃ kṛyādavyām tathā tanumā tulyabhāvena
Let us note that the same sort of theological explanation is given to justify or explain the use of impure substances in ritual: since everything is made of Bhairava and the goddess, one must treat all substances alike.\footnote{For various usages of this argument, see TÖRZSÖK 2014.}

Now a somewhat similar argument also figures in the *Svacchanda* in the context of *samayas*. It is, however, not about the equal treatment of substances or people, but about the validity of different Śāstras. When the *Svacchanda* prescribes that Bhairava and his teaching should not be reviled, it adds the following:

The Śaṃkhyā, the Yoga, the Pāñcarātra, and the Vedas should not be reviled either, for they all come from Śiva and they all bestow the fruit of final liberation.\footnote{ŚVT 5.44cd–45ab: *sāṃkhyaṃ yogam pāñcarātraṃ pañcarātraṃ vedāṃś caiva na nindayet | yataḥ śivodbhavāḥ sarve hy apavargaphalapradāḥ ||. Let us note the alternative reading given by Jayaratha in the *Tantralokaviveka* (ad 1.18 and 13.302): *yataḥ śivodbhavāḥ sarve śivadhāmaphalapradāḥ, “for they all come from Śiva and bestow the fruit of abiding in Śiva,” and by Abhinavagupta himself in the *Mālinījayaavārttika* (2.290: *svacchandatantre tenoktaṃ sarvaśāstre śivah phalam | yataḥ śivodbhavāḥ sarve śivadhāmaphalāḥ iti*). The same reading in the singular (*yataḥ śivodbhavam sarvam śivadhāmaphalapradam*) is also mentioned ad loc. by Kṣemarāja, who claims that some people read this version in old manuscripts (*iti pāṭhaṃ purānapustakādṛṣṭam iha kecit paṭhanti*). However, the Nepalese manuscript agrees basically with the edited SvT here: *sāṃkhyaṃ yogam pāñcarātraṃ vedāṃś caiva na nindayet | yataḥ śivodbhavāḥ sarve hy apavargaphalapradāḥ ||.}

Thus, just as the *Brahmayāmala* argues for the equality of all substances and people because they are all Śiva’s creations, so too does the *Svacchanda* argue for the validity of all Śāstras, since they are also Śiva’s creations. After this statement, the *Svacchanda* adds a final member to the list of teachings that should not be reviled: the prescriptions of Śhartis, because they demonstrate the proper ways to behave and act (*smārttaṃ dharmam na nindet tu ācārapathadarśakam, 5.45cd*). This confirms, once again, an adherence to the generic *smārtta* rules of conduct.

Now there is yet another group of *samayas* that are worth pointing out in early Śākta Tantras: those that reproduce or are closely related to the special *samayas* of the Śaiva Siddhānta.

The *Tantrasadbhāva*, for instance, mentions that one should not step over the shadow of a linga.\footnote{It extends this *samaya* to the various attributes}

\textit{pasyeta samayī samayārthīnaḥ}. Transcription kindly provided by Shaman Hatley.
(āyudhas) of gods that are also not to be stepped over or touched with the foot (9.562–568 ending with: pharakam vāpi khadgaṁ vā anya vāpy āyudham priye | pāde naiva sprṣen mantri na tu langhet kadācana ||. “The master of mantras should never touch with his foot or step over the shield, the sword, or any other [divine] weapon, my beloved.”).

The Brahmayāmala also includes what resembles the samayas of the Śaiva Siddhānta in two passages. In the first (62.123cd), it overtly refers to the rule of those who follow dualist practice:

One should under no circumstances consume the nirmālya, which is not to be consumed according to the dualist mantra(mārga) tradition.

The second passage mentions the eight samayas, some of which recall those of the Śaiva Siddhānta, although the Brahmayāmala gives its own version and certainly fewer than eight:

There is no higher god than Śiva. And in this Tantra, the respectable persons are the ācārya, the Mothers, the practitioners, and the pious. They are not to be despised or insulted, they must be worshipped as well as one can. These are the eight samayas that increase devotion and faith. Obeying these rules of conduct is the cause of all success.

It is possible that the idea of having precisely eight samayas was more prevalent in the Śaiva Siddhānta than in Śākta texts (which had numerous ones) and mentioning the samayas as being eight in number may have im-

49 TSB 9.550: varṣās tu navabhiś caiva liṅgacchāyāṁ na lamghayet. I am not sure how the first half of the verse is to be understood, perhaps it means that the rule applies from age nine of the person (understanding a corruption and/or irregular expression standing for navavarsāt, and the idea being that younger children may not comply with such rules and may be allowed to skip over the shadow of a liṅga).

50 The term “dualist” always refers to ritual dualism in this text, cf. TÖRZSÖK 2014.

51 Brahmayāmala 62.123cd: dvaitamantre tu nirmālyaṁ nābhakṣaṁ bhakṣayet kvacit ||. Transcription kindly provided by Shaman Hatley.

52 The expression “mothers” may refer to female ancestors and family members as well as to various groups of female spirits and goddesses of the Śākta pantheon.

53 Brahmayāmala 86.3cd–5: na śivasya paro devah ācāryo mātaraṁ tathā || 3 || asmin tantrte tu guḍavaḥ sādhaṁ sādhuṁ eva vā | nāvamāṁyā nādhiśeṣpyā pūjanyāṁ ca šaktiṁ || 4 || aṣṭau tu samayāḥ ete bhaktiśraddhāvivardhakāḥ | siddhāṁ karaṇam hy etat samayācārāpālaṁ || 5 ||.
plied that the *samayas* of the Śaiva Siddhānta were alluded to. In any case, in this passage they include only those that correspond to existing Siddhāntika *samayas*, without the numerous additional Śākta ones.

The *Brahmāyāmala*, however, does not end the list of *samayas* at this point. It goes on to give another set of eight (with the count being somewhat problematic again, since here we have perhaps more than eight), in this case a set that does not resemble those of the Siddhānta. While the previous eight were simply said to bring success if one maintains them, the second set is labelled “the eight supreme *samayas*,” distinguishing them from the first, presumably ordinary, set:

The eight “supreme *samayas*” are these: One must not be attached to another deity, one must have no qualms or hesitation [concerning the use of impure substances] and be free of greed. One must be non-dual [in the ritual sense] and careful, observing the rules of conduct. One must observe the *yama* of maintaining celibacy while actively consorting with women. One must be free of anger and transmit [this Tantric tradition].

This complete recreation of the eight *samayas* points to a new development: to the establishment of nondual Śākta *samayas* that have nothing to

---

54 This would be the natural interpretation of *vikalpa* in the *Brahmāyāmala*’s nondualist ritual context. However, as the parallel of the *Jayadrathayāmala* pointed out below shows (3.32.6cd: *tantroktam guruvākyam vā vikalpaṁ nāvatārayet | | “One should not transmit the teaching of the Tantra or the guru’s words with *vikalpa*.”), it could also refer to a different/fancy interpretation (of scripture or of the guru’s teaching).

55 Interpretation suggested by Shaman Hatley (in a personal communication). Csaba Kiss has adduced a parallel, 24.108–110, which may point to the expression meaning an alternation between celibacy and sexual relationship with women. He has also kindly pointed out that 68.69ab appears to support Shaman Hatley’s interpretation of the two things happening at the same time: *nārīcaryasamāyuktā brahmacyarasamanvītāḥ*.

56 *Brahmāyāmala* 86.6–7: *ananyadevatāṁ saṅgo hy avikalpo hy aloḷupāḥ | advaitaś cāpṛamādaś ca samayācāraṇeṣṭīva[h] || *nārīcaryasamuttānāṁ brahmacyāryam tathā yamah | akrodha srotasāśircāra ity aṣṭau samayā parāḥ || (Shaman Hatley’s transcription). To be free from anger (*akrodha*) is commonly considered a separate injunction (see, for instance, SvT 11.144), but then there are altogether nine *samayas*. This may not have been perceived as a problem by the authors, or it is also possible that two of the previous *samayas* were regarded as one.
do with those of other Śaiva currents, and even less with prescriptions of Dharmaśāstras, although they may intend to underline some remote relationship to the eight *samayas* of the Śaiva Siddhānta, by the mere fact that there are eight of them.\footnote{In other passages, the *Brahmayāmala* still includes elements of the original eight Saiddhāntika *samayas* as well as rules coming from the Dharmaśāstra literature, as shown above (as in 62.121ff.: *na nagnām vanitāṃ pasye na cāpi prakāṭastaniṃ | nālokayet paśukrīḍā kṣudrakarman na kārayet ||*). It must also be noted that in this paper I do not deal with the various prescriptions concerning meat-eating and which meats are not to be consumed. These *samayas* of the Śākta scriptures are possibly related to the animal-headed deities worshipped in these Tantras.}

To summarise the situation in the early Śākta Tantras examined above:

*They* include *smārtta* rules of conduct in their *samayas* as well as prescriptions that appear to go against Dharmaśāstric ones. These may be considered somewhat self-contradictory, but some of them may also be understood as alternatives, possibly for different kinds of practitioners. In some cases, they also cite, include, or refer to the *samayas* of the Śaiva Siddhānta. I take this apparent eclecticism to suggest that these Śākta Tantric currents did not intend to separate themselves completely from Brahmanical society and its norms, nor from the Siddhānta, despite the fact that in their ritual and theology they clearly defined themselves as following different or even opposite principles. Even if the inclusion of Dharmaśāstric rules was only a way to pay lip service to Manu and involved only generic rules of conduct, it was apparently thought to be necessary, and the establishment of the rules of the community to some extent still occurred along Dharmaśāstric lines.

**The extreme nondualism of later Śāktas**

This seems not to be the case in later Tantras, in particular those of the Kaula and the Krama. Their *samayas* are exclusively nondual, in other words, they go against standard Brahmanic prescriptions in promoting the use of impure substances and rites. No Dharmaśāstric or Saiddhāntika influence is discernible here.

Concerning the *samayas*, the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* represents a transition between what we see in earlier Śākta Tantras and in later Kaula or Krama ones, for some of its *samayas* are close to those of the *Brahmayāmala* (a parallel pointed out by Shaman Hatley in his transcription of the *Brahma-
yāmala), but it retains mainly those samayas of the Brahmayāmala that are particularly Śākta.

It begins with the set of nindā rules. These are still somewhat reminiscent of the first four samayas of the Siddhānta: one must not revile but worship and respect Śiva, the different gods, the guru, the teaching, (other) practitioners, and yoginis. The text seems to call these rules the three precepts (padatraya) of the three other Tantric currents (trayasyānyasya bhedaśya, lit. “of the three other divisions”) that should be taught. 58

Following these nindā rules, the Yoginīśaṃcāra gives a more explicit and elaborate version of the Brahmayāmala’s set of Śākta samayas, renamed here as the eight samayas of the Lāmās (a category of female beings and practitioners). I have noted the equivalents of the Brahmayāmala in parentheses.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Yoginīśaṃcāra 9.6–10} & \quad \text{Brahmayāmala 86.6–7} \\
\text{Jayadrathayāmala 3.32.6–10} & \\
\text{anyasmiṃ devatāsamo} & \quad (= \text{ananyadevatāsaṅgo}) \\
\text{hāsyenāpi na kārayet} & \\
\text{tantroktāṃ guruvaṅkaṃ vā} & \quad (= \text{avikalpo?}) \\
\text{vikalpair nāvatārayet} & \quad (= \text{alolupaḥ}) \\
\text{viṣayeyv alolupas tiṣṭhen} & \quad (= \text{cāramadāsa ca}) \\
\text{nīyamair hy apavāhinīm} & \quad \text{samayācārasteṣāsu} \\
\text{samayācārasteṣṭāsu} & \quad \text{samayācārasteṣṭītaḥ} \\
\text{aprāmādī sadā bhavet} & \quad (= \text{advaitaś}) \\
\text{ātmānaṃ sarvataḥ paśyed} & \quad (= \text{nāricaryasamutthānam}) \\
\text{advaitaparibhāvitaḥ} & \quad \text{brahmaśaṃtato yamaḥ) } \\
\text{nāricaryāsamutthena} & \quad \text{samayamo vratapālanam} \\
\text{samayamo vratapālanam} & \quad \text{tithau tathaiva tat kuryān} \\
\text{niyataih paribhuṣitam} & \quad \text{samayamo vratapālanam} \\
\text{svavikalpena lāmānām} & \quad \text{tithau tathaiva tat kuryān} \\
\text{sampradāyo nivartate} & \quad \text{samayamo vratapālanam} \\
\end{align*}
\]

58 Jayadrathayāmala 3.32.3–5, which is 9.3–5 of the Yoginīśaṃcāra: samayān tāva vakṣyāmi ye ’smiṃs tante sudurlabhāḥ | śivā parāparā devā ācāryo yaḥ sa eva tuḥ (?) || ye tante guravo devi sādhakā ye mahāmāte | yānī śāstrāṇi siddhāḥ ca yoginī yoḥ divāṁgamaḥ || na nindāyā nāpy adhiḥśeṣayaḥ puṣyat tāṃ tu nityāsah | trayasyānyasya bhedaśya etac chikṣet padatrayam ||. I am grateful to Alexis Sanderson for making available his draft edition of the Yoginīśaṃcāra.
śrotrasaṃcaraṇe caiva
nityam akrodhano bhavet
ity aṣṭau samayā proktā
lāmāvargasya siddhidā

One must not be attached to another deity even for fun, one is not to transmit the words of the Tantra or of the guru with an alternative interpretation. One must not covet the objects of the senses, and one should serve Her-Who-Takes-[Them]-Away with the optional observances. One must always maintain the samayas unfailingy. One is to see one’s self everywhere with a nondual state of mind and observe the vrata(s), the vow (saṃyama) that comes from engaging with women (?). One must do the same on the tīthi days, but with special restrictions. The traditional teachings of the Lāmās [may] cease because of one’s own error. One must always be without anger when transmitting the teaching. These are the eight samayas of the Lāmās, which bestow success.

The next set of samayas is called those of śākinīs (śākinīnāṃ maheśāni samayāṃ śṛṇu sāṃpratam, 3.32.11.1), and the last set perhaps belongs to yoginīs (adhunā sampravaksyāmi yogināṃ yogasiddhidā, 3.32.24.1, yogī being commonly used for yoginī in Tantric texts). One of the last sentences of the passage adequately summarises these numerous rules: one must follow left-hand practice in all actions (vāmācāreṇa varteta sarvakarmasuvrate, 3.32.44.1).

Kaula and Krama texts indeed seem to have a tendency to prescribe only “left-hand” rules. They may mention, among other things, that the guru must

59 The text may be corrupt. In any case, the parallel with the Brahmayāmala suggests that here too, celibacy combined with being with women is meant.

60 This translation is very tentative, for the text is sometimes very terse or ambiguous, and sometimes the construction may be irregular (or there may be a corruption). On two occasions, the Brahmayāmala appears to establish different rules. The first is the above-mentioned avikalpa. The second is in the final line, for the Brahmayāmala could be interpreted to denote two rules (“one must orally transmit the teaching, and one must be without anger”), while the Jayadrathayāmala seems to prescribe only one (“one must be without anger when transmitting the teaching orally”). If the latter is understood in the Brahmayāmala too (although this seems a rather unlikely rule), then the Brahmayāmala passage may feature the required eight samayas.
be respected or daily ritual is to be observed, but these rules are more or less lost among samayas that require a particular Kaula attitude and behaviour.

The Devīpañcaśatikā (6.5–12ab), for instance, gives the following samayas:

One should not revile Kaula conduct or its substances. One is not to pronounce the words kālī and dāvī. One must always worship Kumārī/a young girl⁶¹ and cultivate one’s knowledge of the Self. One must be ready to abandon one’s life, wife, land, and possessions for the sake of one’s guru. One must perform the regular recitation of mantras and never omit the daily ritual. One should not be disgusted by what women or heroes (i.e., male or female practitioners) do or do not do. One must not disobey one’s guru, and one must worship the Kula teaching. One must avoid acting as a bound soul and being excessively arrogant. One must not feel aversion to Kula scriptures, neither to their argument nor to their expression. One must give up dualist Śaivism and embrace nondualism. One should worship autonomous Lāmās and should not revile those who are clad in black. One should not be disgusted by whatever has been taught by the Supreme Lord or by the Emaciated Goddess herself, one should worship their teaching as Hara is worshipped. Those who observe these samayas and are devoted to Kālī, O great lord, will obtain success shortly and reach the heavenly realm.⁶²

---

⁶¹ The word kumārī can denote a category of female beings or goddesses in the pantheon, but also an actual young girl before puberty whose worship may be prescribed.

⁶² Devīpañcaśatikā 6.5–12ab: na ninde[‘] kaulikācāraṃ taddravyāṇi na nindayet | kālīti vākyam na vaded dāvīśabdam (em., dārīśabdam edMIRI) na bhāṣayet || kumārīṃ pūjayed nityam ātmajhānarato bhavet | gurvarthena tyajet prājān dārābhāmi- dhanāni ca || nityam eva kuriyā āhnikam na vilopayet | na jugupṣeta nārīṇam vīrāṇam ca kṛtāyaṃ || guror no laṁghayed ājnāṃ kulaśāstraṃ ca pūjayet | na kuryā paśuvaṭ kāyaṃ nārtgarvaṃ ca bhāvayet || tarkārthe vāṭha śabdā-ṛthe na jugupṣe[‘] kulāgamam | parītyajya śivadwaiṛam advaiṛam paribhāvayet || svacchandāṃ pūjayel lāmāṃ kṛśnavāśāṃ na nindayet | yadvuktaṃ paramēṣaṇa (em., paramēṣaṇa edMIRI) krśodaryāḥavā śvayam || na jugupṣet tataḥ śāstraṃ vandāṇyam yathā hara|h] | etatsamayasyaṃktaḥ kālībhaktō mahēśvara || acirāt Siddhībhāgī syāt[ṛ] prāpya vaihīvasīṃ gatim | Ed. M. Dyczkowski (MIRI), square brackets enclose my minor additions for better understanding of the irregularities.
Sometimes elements of earlier Śākta *samayas* recur in a combined form. The Ūrmikaulārṇava, for instance, prescribe not just the worship of women or *yoginiḥ*, but also the worship of women who are blind or crippled. Furthermore, it clearly goes against orthopraya by enjoining the worship of women who have their period, a rule that was not yet among the *samayas* of early Śākta Tantras, even if the *Brahmayāmala*, for instance, does include the worship of women who have their period in its chapters on ritual:

> The eminent practitioner must worship Mothers (*mātṛ*), perfected *yoginiḥ* who know the Kālikā conduct, whether they are naturally born ones or are born in sacred places, old women as well as girls, those who observe the Kula vow, who are naked, flat-nosed, those who have their period. He must also worship them if they are destitute, blind, or crippled.\(^{63}\)

These Kaula or Krama rules do not seem to be related to other, non-Śākta sets of *samayas*. They appear to betray a much more radical antinomian standpoint and a much more categorical rejection of orthopraxy than early Śākta Tantras. Nevertheless, the lack of any Dharmaśāstric rules may also signal that it was no longer felt necessary to define the *samayas* along Dharmaśāstric lines, because the authority of Dharmaśāstras had perhaps to some extent faded.

**Conclusion**

Four different forms of Śaivism have been examined here, in order to see which community rules they establish and how they demarcate themselves from orthopraxy. These four are, in order of increasing distance from mainstream Brahmanism: non-initiatory lay Śaivism, the Śiva Siddhānta, early Śākta Tantras, and later, more esoteric Kaula and Krama Tantras.

Lay Śaivism, although it adheres to mainstream Brahmanical orthopraxy and prescribes no *samaya*-type rules of its own,\(^{64}\) proposes particular

---

\(^{63}\) Ūrmikaulārṇava 4.29cd–31ab: *sahajā pīṭhajā vātha vrddhastrī bālikanyakā || kulavrataadharaḥ nagnā bhagnanāsā rajasvalā || mārārah ēdhasyoginīyaha kālikā- cārapāragāh || pūjayet sādhakendrenā dīnānḏhā vikalāḥ tathā .

\(^{64}\) Again, the Śivadharma corpus and Purāṇic Śaivism do prescribe their own set of injunctions concerning devotion to and worship of Śiva, but these are not comparable to the Tantric *samayas*. 

Śaiva solutions to problems such as infertility. In this way, it marks its difference, without nevertheless going against any basic rules of orthopraxy.

The Śaiva Siddhānta most commonly establishes a set of eight community rules to be observed after initiation. These include borrowings from mainstream Brahmanical rules of purity (mainly concerning the avoidance of female impurity) or Śaiva applications of Brahmanical prescriptions (respect of the teaching and the guru, for instance). They also include a few special rules of their own system: (1) concerning the nirmālya, or offering, made to Śiva that should not be reused, and (2) concerning the shadow of a liṅga and Śaiva sacred spaces, which must not be stepped upon/over.

The post-initiatory community rules are surprisingly heterogeneous in early Śākta Tantras (around the seventh to eighth centuries CE?). They include several samayas of the Siddhānta and a number of Dharmaśāstric rules, to which are added their own ones, even though in most cases they clearly go against Dharmaśāstric principles. These Śākta samayas often appear to be in favour of those who are not particularly treated well in Dharmaśāstras: women, those who are considered genderless or unmanly, the handicapped, the outcast. The theological argument that supports these rules is that everybody is created by Śiva and must therefore be treated with respect.

The inclusion of many Dharmaśāstric rules, however, seems to suggest that these Śākta communities probably did not want to separate themselves from those who represented mainstream orthopraxy and the Śaiva Siddhānta. They had an inclusivistic attitude towards other religious forms and currents. The theological justification was, once again, the fact that all teachings originated in Śiva.

By contrast, the Niśvāsa, which is the earliest surviving Tantric scripture (whose earliest stratum may date to 550–650 CE), insists on delimiting its own territory as opposed to Vaidika religion and warns against following other teachings. This attitude may be explained by the religious context of the period: for the Niśvāsa was composed when Śaivism was about to establish itself as a new initiatory religion, and perhaps it was important to show in what way it proposed something better than mainstream Brahmanism.

The eclectic samaya sets of early Śākta Śaiva Tantras seem to disappear in later, more esoteric Śākta branches of the Kaula and Krama systems. Many explanations are possible here. One certainly is that they simply define themselves more categorically as following left-hand or antinomian practice. But it is also possible that by the time of their composition it was
not felt necessary to use the authority of the Dharmaśāstras, because by that
time Śaivism itself had become the dominant form of religion.\textsuperscript{65}
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Tantric ritual components in the initiation of a Digambara Jain

Ellen Gough*

In this volume and in other scholarship, a defining component of a Tantric community is a particular type of non-Vedic initiation (dīkṣā) its members must undertake in order to perform the ritual practices of their cult. Various Buddhist and Hindu traditions have been deemed “Tantric” because they require this type of initiation, which usually involves the construction of a mandala and the imparting of esoteric mantras from guru to disciple. Jainism, however, has not been considered a “Tantric tradition,” or “Tantric cult,” nor have Jains been seen as members of a “Tantric community,” in part because their initiations have been understood as monastic, not Tantric. The few examinations of Jain dīkṣā that have been published emphasise

* Fieldwork for this study was undertaken in 2013 under the auspices of a Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Grant. I thank Phyllis Granoff, Koichi Shinohara, David Brick, John Cort, and the editors of this volume for feedback on earlier versions of this text.

1 Hamburg’s Centre for Tantric Studies, for example, has titled its journal *Tantric Studies: A Journal for the Study of Initiatory Religions of Indian Origin*, and defined “tantric traditions” as “initiatory and esoteric forms of religion emphasizing mantric forms of deities.”

2 SHINOHARA (2014a: xiii) notes that the beginning of the use of the All-Gathering Maṇḍala in Chinese Buddhist initiation ceremonies in the sixth century “may be taken as the beginning of the self-aware Esoteric [i.e. ‘Tantric’] tradition.” GOODALL (2004: xxi) argues that “the central fact that characterizes these [Śaiva] tantric cults is that they are private cults for individuals who take a non-Vedic initiation (dīkṣā) that uses non-Vedic (as well as Veda-derived) mantras and that is the means to liberation, a liberation which consists in being omnipotent and omniscient, in other words in realizing the powers of Śiva.”

3 AGRAWAL 1972, CORT 1991, and HOLMSTROM 1988 have described image-worshiping Śvetāmbara dīkṣā ceremonies, but they do not discuss the uses of mantras and maṇḍalas. SHĀNTĀ (1997: 444–472; 653–660), from her fieldwork on Jain sādhvīs of various sects in the 1970s, provides the most detailed portraits of dīkṣā found in secondary literature on Jains, but she confesses that when it comes to the
the ascetic and monastic components of the ceremonies, such as the taking of mendicant vows and the pulling out of hair. Michael Carrithers, for example, highlights the ascetic core of modern Digambara dīkṣās by focusing on how the initiate severs ties with all worldly connections upon initiation:

"[T]he form of the ceremony (...) gives no place to the notion of the muni saṅgha. Unlike the Buddhists, the Digambar Jains do not en-shrine the collectivity of ascetics in their initiation (...) Nor is anything passed on which might form a bond, such as the mantra which is part of many Hindu ascetics' dīkṣā."  

Carrithers emphasises how modern Digambaras reject the ties to a worldly community and thus uphold the “original project of Jainism, which stressed tapas,” not collectivity (CARRITHERS 1990: 154). He promotes a common view  that Jains, since the formation of the tradition around the fifth century BCE, have maintained a deeply ascetic, individualistic tradition: unlike Buddhists and Hindus, they were not influenced by medieval Tantric developments in initiation practices that required the transmission of esoteric mantras from guru to disciple.

Modern Digambara dīkṣās contain several components of Hindu and Buddhist initiations termed “Tantric”: the construction of a maṇḍala-like diagram, the transmission of karma-destroying non-Vedic mantras from guru to disciple, and the imparting of non-Vedic rites of passage (saṃskāra). And searching for these modern components in pre-modern texts can lead us to previously unstudied medieval Digambara discussions of initiations. Indeed, no pre-modern manual on Digambara dīkṣā has been published, Digambara texts are not entirely devoid of discussions of initiation, and if we know what to look for, we can find it. If we reverse the more common methodology of using texts to lead us to the field – if we allow fieldwork to determine how and what we read – we can bring a new perspective to pre-modern texts.

---

*dīkṣā* ceremony, “the subject of mantras is too vast and too complex to be considered here, for it requires a separate study” (SHÂNTÂ 1997: 656, n. 56).


5 To date, too little scholarship has been produced to discredit JAINI’s (1979: 254) claim that “Jainism has remained for the most part untouched by the sort of tantric practices which typified many Śaivite cults and eventually permeated the Buddhist community as well.”

6 This methodology is encouraged in CORT 1990.
In the following pages, I will do use close study of a modern Digambara initiation to guide us to medieval textual descriptions of Jain dīkṣā rites that exemplify a blend of monasticism and Tantrism. We will see how medieval Digambaras had, probably by the ninth century, integrated the “Tantric” construction of a maṇḍala and imparting of karma-destroying mantras with earlier ascetic rites of mendicant initiations. Jains, then, unlike their Buddhist counterparts, require their followers to undertake a “Tantric” initiation into a maṇḍala in order to become a celibate mendicant. While Buddhist monks can undergo a Tantric initiation into a maṇḍala (abhiṣeka), unlike Jains, they do not have to construct a maṇḍala and receive esoteric mantras from their guru in order to become a monk.

Examining this blend of a monastic and Tantric initiation raises questions about the nature of the “Tantric communities” at the focus of this volume. While Digambara monks could, in one sense, be considered to be “Tantrics,” in part because they undergo a Tantric initiation, they are only in some ways Tantrics, and it would be too simplistic to claim that they belong to a “Tantric community” or a “Tantric cult.” Indeed, it may be too simplistic to designate people, or religious traditions, or even rituals as wholly “Tantric,” because, as we will see in the case of Jain initiations, religious actors, communities, and rituals cannot be defined by one term – they are composites of many layers of history. Rather than thinking in terms of “Tantric communities,” it might be better to think in terms of Tantric ritual components that allow for the formation of communities. Examining the history of a modern Digambara dīkṣā will allow us to do just that.

Modern Digambara mendicant initiations

For many Digambaras today, the story of modern dīkṣā begins at the outset of the twentieth century, specifically, on November 25, 1913. On this day, on a remote hilltop in Kuntalgiri, Maharashtra, a 47-year-old lay Digambara Jain named Śīvgouḍā Pāṭil stood in front of a temple icon of a Jina, removed his clothes, pulled out his own hair, and, according to his followers, reinstated the order of naked Jain monks after a near-complete absence for hundreds of years. This man, who was known as Muni Ādisāgara Ankalikara after his initiation, chose to stand before an image of the Jina – he chose the

---

7 This chapter will focus on Digambaras, but image-worshiping Śvetāmbara monks also include Tantric components in their initiations and promotions. On the use of the sūrīmantra in the promotion of a Śvetāmbara ācārya, see DUNDAS 1998.
founder of Jainism as his initiatory guru – because he did not know of any living naked monks who could initiate him. From about the beginning of the thirteenth century, the Digambara Jain community had been mostly led by bhaṭṭārakas, sedentary renunciants who wore orange robes and had established themselves as leaders of certain caste groups and the trustees of the temple complexes where they reside.8

Muni Ādisāgara, in rejecting these bhaṭṭārakas and embracing nudity, made a radical departure from the Digambara Jainism of his day and an argument for a return to the ascetic practices of the first Jain monks. And this departure was extremely successful. By the time of his death in 1944, he had initiated 32 naked monks, many of whom would go on to establish mendicant lineages that persist to this day.9 Today, no bhaṭṭārakas remain in North India, only 14 remain in South India,10 and peripatetic successors of Ādisāgara and his disciples number in the hundreds.11

In CARRITHERS’ (1990) study of Digambara dīkṣā, he uses the example of self-initiation in front of a temple icon to emphasise the solitary nature of these modern, reformed Digambara munis.12 However, modern Digambara dīkṣās are anything but solitary endeavours, and they include processions throughout the town, communal offerings of foodstuffs to a mandala made of coloured powder, and a daylong ceremony in which dozens of mantras are imparted from guru to disciple on stage in front of cheering laypeople. Ādisāgara may have rejected the orange robes of the bhaṭṭārakas, but his followers quickly readopted the devotional, communal, and Tantric components of mendicant initiations that had been layered onto the ritual before and during the rule of these pontiffs. By outlining the components of a modern Digambara initiation and then searching in earlier texts for precedents for these components, we can see how medieval, early modern, and modern Digambaras added devotional and Tantric layers to

8 On the bhaṭṭārakas, see FLÜGEL 2006: 339–344.
9 For a collection of essays on Ādisāgara, see JAIN (B.M.) 1996.
10 For brief biographies of each of these Bhaṭṭārakas, see JAIN TĪRTHVANDANĀ (2012: 26–47).
11 SAUDHARMBHATTAPOGACCHĪYA JAIN ŚVETĀMBAR TRISTUTIK ŚRĪSANGH (2013: 407) documents 740 living Digambara munis, though it is not specified how many of them trace their lineages to Ādisāgara, and not to one of the other founders of modern muni lineages, Śāntisāgara “Dakṣiṇa” and Śāntisāgara “Chānti.”
12 CARRITHERS (1990: 141–150) focuses on the other modern Digambara muni to self-initiate, Śāntisāgara “Dakṣiṇa,” who did so in 1918 and is identified as the founder of the majority of contemporary Digambara lineages.
the ascetic core of early Jain mendicant initiations not to emphasise individuality, but in order to strengthen communal ties.

Becoming a Digambara monk in 2013

In November 2013, in a small town 90 miles southwest of Jaipur, in Kekri, Rajasthan, I joined hundreds of Digambara laypeople to witness a dīkṣā ceremony of three people into the mendicant community (saṅgha) of the Digambara Ācārya Vairāgyanandī. Ācārya Vairāgyanandī traces his lineage to Ādisāgara Aṅkalikara, and, from the two main traditions lay Digambaras follow – the “Path of Twenty,” the Bīsapantha, or the “Path of Thirteen,” the Terāpantha – he identifies as a Bīsapanthī. In 1994, Vairāgyanandī was initiated as a muni in Kunthalgiri, Maharashtra, by Ācārya Kunthusāgara, himself a disciple of Ādisāgara Aṅkalikara’s successor Mahāvīrakirti (1910–1972). Eleven years later, in 2005, Ācārya Vairāgyanandī was promoted to the rank of ācārya, becoming a leader of his own mendicant community.

In Kekri in November of 2013, Ācārya Vairāgyanandī initiated a husband and wife as a full monk (muni) and nun (āryikā), respectively, and one man as a lower-level initiate who wears two garments (kṣullaka). In my interview with Ācārya Vairāgyanandī after the initiation ceremony in Kekri, he would not tell me the details of the dīkṣāvidhi he follows, stressing that the instructions for performing dīkṣā must only be passed from guru to devoted disciple. Even so, he admitted that the basic structure of the initiation ceremonies he performs are found in a manual of mendicant rituals entitled “Collection of Pure Devotion,” Vimal Bhakti Saṅgrah (VBhS), which was compiled by the contemporary nun Āryikā Syādvādamatī Mātā, who also belongs to one of the lineages stemming from Ādisāgara Aṅkalikara.14

Monks and nuns of different lineages have compiled several different manuals of this sort, but often multiple lineages accept the same manuals, and the descriptions of rites are nearly identical in these collections.15 The

---

13 On Bīsapanthīs and Terāpanthīs, see FLÜGEL 2006: 339–344.
14 VBhS, pp. 442–452. Āryikā Syādvādamatī belongs to a different sub-lineage of Ādisāgara Aṅkalikara called the “Vimala Saṅgha,” which traces its origins to another of Ādisāgara Aṅkalikara’s disciples, Vimalasāgara (1915–1961).
15 In Jaipur in February 2013, when I met with a monk who is mostly connected to Terāpanthīs, Ācārya Vībhavasāgara, he also mentioned the Vimal Bhakti Saṅgrah as his main published reference for the rituals for mendicant initiation.
exact same outline of the initiation rites in the *Vimal Bhakti Samgrah* is also included in other texts on renunciation of various lineages, both Bīṣapanthī and Terāpanthī. While each mendicant leader certainly must individualise the rituals included in these manuals, the published text available in these sources seems to have become the standard framework for modern Digambara initiations of all Digambara lineages.

Because Ācārya Vairāgyanandī mentioned the *Vimal Bhakti Samgrah*, I will provide an outline of that text’s instructions for initiating different levels of mendicants and then compare the text to the rituals I observed in Kekri. The *dīkṣāvidhi* in *Vimal Bhakti Samgrah*, composed in simple Sanskrit with some Prakrit mantras, outlines the rituals for four levels of mendicant: (1) *muni*, a fully initiated naked monk, (2) *kṣullaka*, a “junior” monk who wears a loincloth, a white cloth around his shoulders, and can eat from a plate, not his hands, (3) *upādhyāya*, a higher-level initiate who is trained as a mendicant teacher, and (4) *ācārya*, a monk at the highest level of promotion, a leader of a mendicant group (*saṅgha*) who can initiate disciples. The *munidīkṣā* is summarised below.

- On the day before the initiand takes the five vows of a mendicant, he should eat a meal and then go to the temple, where he should approach his initiatory *guru* and take a vow to fast for a particular period of time (*pratyākhyāna*). As part of this vow, he should recite two of the Sanskrit devotional praise poems called “Bhaktis,” the *Siddhabhakti* and the *Yogibhakti*. These different Bhaktis play an important role in the *dīkṣā* ceremony and will be discussed in more detail below. Having taken this vow, he should bow before his *guru* and recite more of these praise po-

---

16 These manuals include the “Collection of Rituals,” the *Kriyā-kalāpah* (KK), a compendium of ritual instructions the lay Terāpanthī scholar Pannalāl Sonī-Śāstrī compiled in Agra in 1935, and the “Ritual Actions of a Monk,” *Municaryā* (MC), a collection of rites compiled by the most prolific living Digambara nun (*āryikā*), the Bīṣapanthī Jhānammāt Mātā. For an English summary of many of the rites outlined in these manuals, mixed with accounts from interviews, see SHĀNTĀ 1997: 656–660.

17 Even the handwritten notes of ritual specialists (*pratiṣṭhācārya*) align with these texts. Paṇḍit Vimalkumār Jain, a ritual specialist who resides in Jaipur, has outlined 24 rites (*kriyā*) that correspond exactly to the rituals described in published manuals. He confirmed that he performs these rites for both Bīṣapanthī and Terāpanthī mendicants. Interview with author, Jaipur, February 2013.
ems addressing different objects of devotion, the Ācāryabhakti, Śāntibhakti, and Samādhibhakti.

- According to their means, members of the community should then worship the diagram for the pacification of bad omens (sāntika) and another geometric diagram, the “Ring of Disciples” (gaṇadharvalaya). Below, I will discuss the “Ring of Disciples” in detail and outline what this text means when it prescribes its “worship” (pūjā).

- After the completion of the worship of these diagrams, the initiand is ritually bathed and ornamented as lavishly as his means allow. The guru should then, with grand celebration (mahāmahotsavena), lead the initiand to a temple.

- [The next morning] the initiand should worship the Tīrthaṅkaras and ask for forgiveness from the community.

- In front of the community, next to his guru, having put on white clothing, the initiand should sit on an eastward-facing seat that married women whose husbands are still living (saubhāgyavitī) have decorated with a svastika symbol and covered in a white cloth.18

- Having recited the Yogibhakti and the Siddhabhakti, the guru, with his left hand, should sprinkle scented water on the head of the initiand three times while reciting the Sanskrit mantra for the removal of adversity (sāntimantra) that invokes the sixteenth Tīrthaṅkara, Śānti, who is said to destroy all obstacles, diseases, accidental death, misfortune caused by others, and damaging fires.19 The guru should place his left hand on the initiand’s head.

---

18 Paṇḍit Vimalkumār Jain’s notebook instructs that the svastika should be made of unbroken rice (aṅkata). Photographed in Jaipur, February 2013. SHĀNTA (1997: 657), describing the initiation of a nun, explains this part of the ceremony as follows: “On arrival, śrāvikā [laywoman] makes the outline of a svastika with saffron-coloured grains of rice on a low table that she then covers with a new white cloth….the gaṇinī [nun] seats the vaiṛāgīṇī [initiand] on the low table, facing either towards the East or the North, and sits down herself beside her.”

19 The mantra reads: oṃ namo ‘rhatē bhagavate prakṣānaśeṣakalmaṣāya divyatejo
The guru should put curd, rice (akṣata), other cow products (gomaya),\textsuperscript{20} and a blade of dūrva grass (dūrvāṅkura) on the head of the initiand and pronounce the Prakrit vardhānāmantra,\textsuperscript{21} which asks for protection in the court of the king, in battle, and in various other pursuits.\textsuperscript{22}

The guru should sprinkle a mixture of saffron and ash on the initiand’s head and recite a Sanskrit mantra to the one whose body is attired with purity and the three jewels of right faith, knowledge, and conduct, who is made of light, and who has sensory and scriptural knowledge, mind-reading capabilities, clairvoyance, and omniscience (i.e., the Jina).\textsuperscript{23} He should begin pulling out the initiand’s hair, reciting a mantra of syllables.\textsuperscript{24}

To complete pulling out the initiand’s hair, the guru should pull out five fistfuls of the initiand’s hair while reciting a Sanskrit version of the pañcananaskāramantra that honours the Five Supreme Lords of Jainism, (1) the enlightened being (arhat), (2) the liberated soul (siddha), (3) the mendicant leader (ācārya), (4) the mendicant teacher (upādhyāya), and (5) all ordinary mendicants (sādhu).\textsuperscript{25} The Siddhabhakti then should be recited.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20} Pañḍit Vimalkumār Jain’s notebook names milk, curd, ghee, akṣata, and dūrvāṅkura as the substances to be sprinkled on the head of the initiand.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Pañḍit Vimalkumār Jain’s notebook notes that the \textit{vardhamānmantra} is also called the “Mantra for Victory,” the vijaya mantra.
\item \textsuperscript{22} The mantra reads: \textit{om} namo bhayavo vaddhamāṇassa risahassa ca kākaṁ jalaṅṭam gacchai āyāsam pāyālam loyānam bhūyānam jaye vā viivāde vā rāṇamgane vā rāyyamgane vā mohena vā savyjañatānaṁ aparājito bhavatu rakkha rakkha svāhā (VBhŚ, p. 444). Here, the a stands for the enlightened soul (arhat), si for the liberated soul (siddha), ā for the mendicant leader (ācārya), u for the mendicant teacher (upādhyāya), and sā for the ordinary mendicant (sādhu).
\item \textsuperscript{23} The mantra reads: ratnatrayapavitriktottamāṇgāya jyotirmayāya matiśrutādhitmanadhaparyayakevalajitānāya a si u sā svāhā (VBhŚ, p. 445).
\item \textsuperscript{24} The mantra reads: \textit{om} hrīṁ śrīṁ kliṁ aṁ arhaṁ a si u sā svāhā (VBhŚ, p. 445).
\item \textsuperscript{25} \textit{om} hrīṁ arhadhyo namaḥ \textit{om} hrīṁ siddhebhyo namaḥ \textit{om} hrīṁ sārībhyo namaḥ \textit{om} hrīṁ pūthakebhyo namaḥ \textit{om} hrīṁ sarvasādhubhyo namaḥ (VBhŚ, p.}
\end{itemize}
Having had his head washed and having recited the *Gurubhakti*,
the initiand should remove his clothes and other ornaments.

The *guru* should pronounce 108 times a *mantra* that comprises
seed syllables and the first letters of the *pañcanamaskāramantra*.²⁶
He then should recite a Prakrit verse (*gāthā*) that praises
the three jewels, the 24 Jinas, the Five Supreme Lords, and right
conduct.²⁷

Having made these recitations, the *guru* should use saffron,
camphor, and sandalwood paste to write the seed-
syllable śrī 34
times on the forehead of the initiand in the four directions: three
śrīs should be painted to the east (pūrva), twenty-four to the south (dakṣiṇa), five to the west (paścima), and two to the north (uttara). Having written these śrīs, he should pronounce Sanskrit praises to right faith, knowledge, and conduct.

The *guru* should recite the *Siddhabhakti*, the *Cāritrabhakti*, and
the *Yogibhakti*, and place rice (*taṇḍula*), a coconut, and betel (*pūgīphala*) in the cupped hands of the initiand.

The *guru* accepts from the initiand a commitment to the 28 root
qualities (*mūlaguṇa*) of a monk: (1-5) the five vows of nonvio-
lence (*ahimsā*), truth (*satya*), not taking what is not given
(*asteya*), celibacy (*brahmacarya*), and non-possession
(*aparigraha*), (6-10) the five *samitis* of care in walking, care in
speaking, care in accepting alms, care in picking things up and
putting them down, and care in relieving oneself, (11-15) re-
straining the five senses (*indriyarodha*), (16-21) the six essential
duties of equanimity (*samāyika*), praise of the 24 Jinas (*catur-
vimśatistava*), praise of the *guru* (*vandana*), confession
(*pratikramaṇa*), performance of meditative standing pose
(*kāyotsarga*), and taking short-term vows (*pratyākhyāna*), (22)
pulling out one’s hair, (23) nudity, (24) not bathing, (25) sleep-

---

²⁶The mantra reads: *oṃ hṛīṃ arhaṃ a si ā u sā hṛīṃ svāhā* (*VBhS*, p. 445).
²⁷The verse reads: *ravaṇātāvam ca vamde cauśājaṇām taḥā vamde | paṅcagurūṇāṃ vamde cāraṇajugalaḥ taḥā vamde |* (*VBhS*, p. 445).
ing on the ground, (26) not brushing one’s teeth, (27) eating standing, and (28) taking meals once a day.\textsuperscript{28}

To accept these vows, the initiand recites a Prakrit verse first found in Kundakunda’s “Essence of the Teachings,” the \textit{Pravacanasāra} (ca. first few centuries CE). \textit{Pravacanasāra} 3.8 reads:

\begin{quote}
[The root qualities of a śramaṇa are] vows (Skt. \textit{vrata}), religious observances (Skt. \textit{samiti}), restraint of the senses (Skt. \textit{indriyarodha}), pulling out the hair (Skt. \textit{luñcana}), essential duties (Skt. \textit{āvaśyaka}), nudity (Skt. \textit{acailakya}), not bathing (Skt. \textit{asnāna}), sleeping on the ground (Skt. \textit{kṣitisayana}), not brushing one’s teeth (Skt. \textit{adandahāvana}), eating standing (Skt. \textit{sthitibhojana}), and taking meals once a day (Skt. \textit{ekabhakta}).\textsuperscript{29}
\end{quote}

\begin{itemize}
\item Having repeated, three times, “May you have the correct vows, fixed vows that constitute correct faith (\textit{samyaktva}),” the guru should recite the \textit{Śāntibhakti}, and various foodstuffs (rice etc.) should be offered to the disciple.\textsuperscript{30}

\item The guru should impart to the initiand 16 rites of passage (\textit{saṃskāra}) by reciting a mantra requesting that each quality or power of the \textit{saṃskāra} blossom in the soon-to-be monk (\textit{iha munau sphuratu}) and sprinkling cloves and flowers on the initiand’s head. These \textit{saṃskāras}, unlike the worldly Brahmanical \textit{saṃskāras} of conception, birth, naming, marriage, etc., impart the ideal qualities of a mendicant. The first four \textit{saṃskāras}, for example, impart right faith (\textit{samyagdarśana}), right knowledge
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{28} Digambara nuns adopt only 15 of the \textit{mūlaguṇas}. They do not eat standing, they do not take the full vow of non-possession, as they wear white robes (they adopt 105 of the 108 requirements of \textit{aparigraha}), and they do not uphold the \textit{guṇa} of not bathing, as they are required to bathe when they menstruate. Āryikā Subhamaṭī Mātā, personal communication with the author, Mumbai, July 2013.

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Pravacanasāra} (PraSār) 3.8: \textit{vadasamidimdiyarodho locāvāsayaḥ acelam anāhānāḥ | khidisayaḥ adantadāhavanāṃ ṭhidibhayanāṃ eyabhattām ca ||}. The reading here, “adantadāhavana” corrects the reading of “adantavāṇaṃ” in VBhŚ, p. 446.

\textsuperscript{30} Paṇḍit Vimalkumār Jain’s notes prescribe that the mother and father of the initiand offer these foodstuffs.
(samyagjñāna), right conduct (samycārita), and the ability to perform external and internal austerities (bāhyābhyantarapatap).

- The guru should place his hand on the initiand’s head and pronounce a mantra that consists of the Prakrit pañcanamaskāra-mantra – Ńamō arīḥātyāṇam Ńamō siddhāṇam Ńamō āriyāṇam Ńamō uvajjāyāṇam Ńamō loe savvasāhūṇam – plus the Sanskrit mantra ōṁ paramahāṃsāya parameṣṭhine hāmsa hāmsa hāṃ hṛṃ hṛṃ hṛṃ hraḥ hraḥ jināya namaḥ jināṃ sthāpayāmi samvauṣaṭ.\(^{31}\)

- The guru should read the names of the monks in the mendicant lineage of the initiand (gurvāli), ending by pronouncing the initiand’s new mendicant name. All current Digambara mendicant groups trace their lineages back to Kundakunda, whom they believe flourished in the first century CE. Monks initiating a disciple thus first recite “Kundakundādi” or “Kundakunda etc.” and then recite the names of the monks in their twentieth-century lineage. Monks in Ācārya Vairāgyanandī’s lineage, then, recite the names of: Ācārya Ādisagāra Anikālīkara, Ācārya Mahāvīrakīrti, Ācārya Kunthusāgāra, and Ācārya Vairāgyanandī. Thus, by simply reciting “etc.” or “ādi,” modern monks create the illusion of a continuous chain of monks going all the way back to Kundakunda, but they do not have to provide specific names from the late medieval and early modern period, when there were effectively no naked monks.

- Community members should gift the new initiate the insignia of a Digambara monk: (1) a broom of peacock feathers (picchikā), (2) a scripture (śāstra), and (3) a water pot (kamāṇḍalu). Modern monks are given the earliest Digambara text on mendicant rules, the Mūlacāra, which will be discussed below.

- The initiate should wash the ritual substances off his face and head (mukhaśuddhakriyā) (VBhS, pp. 442–449).

\(^{31}\) Paṇḍit Vimalkumār Jain’s notes term this mantra the “guru mantra.”
This outline provides only a glimpse of the ostentation and complexity of modern Digambara dīkṣā ceremonies. In the dīkṣā I witnessed in Kekri in November 2013, it took eleven days to perform all of the following rites.\(^{32}\)

November 10–17: Worship of a large ritual diagram, the “Ring of Disciples” (gaṇadharavalaya). Inside a ritual pavilion (maṇḍapa) in a worship hall (upāśraya), ritual specialists constructed a large diagram of coloured powder measuring approximately 10ft x 10ft. An icon of the Jina was established at the centre of the diagram, surrounded by three coloured rings decorated with 1,452 white dots. Each dot represented one of the original disciples (gaṇadhara) of the 24 Tīrthaṅkaras. To worship the diagram of coloured powder, the initiands would recite a Hindi line of praise to one of these disciples and then place a coconut on the diagram for that disciple.

November 17: Performance of the śāntividhāna, or the offering of food-stuffs to a coloured diagram dedicated to the sixteenth Tīrthaṅkara Śāntinātha in order to remove obstacles.\(^{33}\)

November 18: Fire offerings (havāna) to complete the worship of the ritual diagram, application of turmeric paste (haldī) and henna (mahendī) to the hands and feet of the initiands.

November 19: Procession of the initiands around town, singing of songs by women (ladies’ saṅgīta).

November 20: Initiands take a ritual bath (maṅgalasnāna), perform the physical worship (pūjā) and ablution (abhiṣeka) of a Tīrthaṅkara icon, and then, on a stage in front of the lay community, undertake the rites of monastic ordination as outlined above, pulling out their hair, removing their clothing, taking the vows, receiving mantras from their guru and a water pot (kamaṇḍalu), broom (picchikā), and scripture (śāstra) from the lay community.

\(^{32}\) The key difference between the performance in Kekri and the prescriptions in \textit{Vimal Bhakti Samgrah} was the use of substances. Ācārya Vairāgyanandī and his fellow monks used only mixtures of sandalwood paste and cloves to impart the vows and mantras, and did not use flowers, ash, cow products, blades of dūrvā grass, etc.

\(^{33}\) On this diagram, also known as the Śāntinātha Maṇḍala Vidhāna, see CORT 2008: 146–155.
The diversity of rites undertaken in the above outlines – from the worship of the Ring of Disciples to the final day of ordination – shows how this Digambara ceremony, like every ritual, did not emerge as a coherent whole, but is instead a product of a variety of historical developments and agendas. In these rituals, we can see multiple layers. We can see the extravagant, communal rites such as the procession around town and the ladies’ sangīṭā that show off and celebrate renunciation as the ultimate event in the life of a Jain. Performing ceremonies usually associated with the most celebrated life event, a wedding, by dressing the initiands in expensive garments and decorating their bodies with henna establishes renunciation as the life event whose celebration should usurp all others. On top of these communal rites, the fundamental acts of monastic renunciation performed on the final day – pulling out one’s hair, taking the vows of a mendicant, and standing on stage in front of hundreds of laypeople in a meditative posture (kāyotsarga) and removing one’s clothes – constitute another ascetic layer of the rite. There are also acts of great devotion, such as the recitation of the Bhaktis. At the same time, the ceremony also contains key components of Tantric initiation: the construction of a mandala preceding the initiation proper, and the imparting of mantras from the guru to initiand. Digambaras do, then, enshrine collectivity through their initiation rites. Through the use of ascetic, devotional, and Tantric ritual elements, they establish fundamental connections between guru and disciple, ganadhara and modern muni, and layperson and mendicant. How were all these elements incorporated into modern Digambara dīkṣā ceremonies? We can answer this question by moving chronologically through Jain texts, searching for the components of modern Digambara initiation ceremonies.

**Early Jain sources on mendicant initiation**

The earliest account of Digambara initiation may be found in Kundakunda’s Prakrit text the “Essence of the Teachings,” the Pravacanasāra, which likely dates to the first half of the first millennium and must have been composed before the eighth century. The beginning of the third chapter dedicated to mendicant duties briefly describes the process of renouncing the world:

---

34 For some datings of Kundakunda to between the first and third centuries CE, see UPADHYE 1935: 10–16. For a placement of him in the eighth century, see DHAKY 1991.
Having again and again honoured the enlightened souls (Skt. *siddha*), the mighty, supreme Jinas, and the monks (Skt. *muni*), if he desires release from suffering, may he become a monk, having taken leave of all his relatives, having been let go by elders, his wife and children, and being intent on the cultivation of knowledge, faith, conduct, austerities, and power (Skt. *vīrya*).\(^{35}\)

He prostrates himself before a monk (Skt. *śramaṇa*) who is the head of a mendicant group (Skt. *gaṇin*), fixed in virtues, endowed with distinctive family, form, and age, and honoured by mendicants, saying “Admit me,” and he is accepted into the mendicant order.\(^{36}\)

I do not belong to others, nor do others belong to me; there is nothing that is mine here: thus determined and conquering his senses, he adopts a form similar to that in which he was born [i.e., nudity] (Skt. *yathājātārupadhara*).\(^{37}\)

The [external] mark [of a Jain monk] consists in possessing a form in which one is born (being nude), in pulling out the hair on one’s head and face, in being pure, in being devoid of violence, etc., and in not attending to the body (Skt. *apratiṇāma*). The [internal]\(^{38}\) mark [of a Jain monk], which is the cause of freedom from rebirth, consists in being free from infatuation and preliminary sins, in being endowed with purity of manifestation of consciousness and activities, and in having no desire for anything else.\(^{39}\)

\(^{35}\) PraSār III.1–2: evaṃ paṇḍāmiya siddhe jiṇavaravasahe puṇo puṇo samane | paṇḍivajjadu sāmaṇṇam jadi icchadi dukkharīpanokkham | āpiccha bandhuṣaggam vimoḍido gurukalattaputtehiṃ | āsija naṇadamsanacarītatavāvīryāyāraṃ ||

\(^{36}\) PraSār III.3: samaneaṃ gaṇiṃ gūndaḍhaṃ kularūvavoyāvaṃjhamiṭṭhadaraṃ | samanehi taṃ pi paṇado padicca maṃ cedi aṇugahido ||

\(^{37}\) PraSār III.4: nāham homi pareśiṃ na me pare nāthi majjhamiha kīṃci | idi nicchido jidimo jādo jadhajādarīvadharo ||

\(^{38}\) The twelfth-century commentator Jayasena understands the first “liṅga” of this verse to be the *dravyaliṅga*, and the second the *bhāvaliṅga* (Sanskrit text in UPADHYE 1935: 279).

\(^{39}\) PraSār III.5–6: jadhajāadarīvajādaṃ uppādaikesamaṃsagūṇaṃ suddham | raḥidaṃ hiṃsādido uppādaikmaṇṇaṃ havadi liṅgaṃ | mucchāraṃbhavimukkaṃ juttaṃ avajogajogasuddhiṃ | liṅgaṃ na parāvekkhasa paṇavabhavakāraṇaṃ jainam ||
Having adopted [these] mark[s] at the hands of an excellent guru, having bowed before him, and having heard the course of duties consisting of vows, when one begins to practice [these vows], he becomes a monk (Skt. śramaṇa).\(^\text{40}\)

The next verse, *Pravacanasāra* 8.8, which outline the 28 root qualities of a mendicant, from accepting the five vows to eating only once a day, is recited to this day as part of modern Digambara initiation ceremonies (see above). These 28 qualities, which stress asceticism, were likely formulated quite early, with one of the earliest Digambara texts on mendicant conduct, the *Mūlācāra* (ca. second to fifth century CE),\(^\text{41}\) also identifying the same 28 *mūlaganās* of a monk.\(^\text{42}\)

Early Digambara sources do not provide any more information about the performance of renunciation. Śvetāmbara canonical texts (*āgama*) from the first few centuries CE,\(^\text{43}\) however, do give us some descriptions of the initial entrance into a mendicant group that may shed light on the practices undertaken by members of both of these sects, especially since the distinction between Digambara and Śvetāmbara may not have been formally fixed at this early stage. Narrative accounts of the initial entrance into a mendicant group (*pravrajyā*) from Śvetāmbara Āgamas such as the *Bhagavatīsūtra* (*BhS*) and the *Jñātadharmakathā* (*Jñā*) suggest that there was at that time a somewhat formalised ritual of renunciation. The majority of these accounts describe how the initiands face the northeast, ritually pull out their hair, remove their clothes and ornaments, and approach a senior

\(^{40}\) PraSār III.7:  olmadığı tam pi limaṃ guruṇā parmenam tam namāṃsittā | soccā savadaṃ kiriyat utsāthido hodi so samano ||. The translation above is adapted from the one found in UPADHYE 1935: 405–406.

\(^{41}\) The common dating of the *Mūlācāra* to the second century (see, e.g., CORT 2002: 72; JAINI 1991: 46) is not confirmed, but evidence suggests that the text is quite old. The seventh chapter of this text is understood to be an earlier version of the Śvetāmbara *Āvaśyakaniruykti* attributed to Bhadrabāhu (see LEUMANN 2010: 44–58). Based on *paṭṭāvalīś*, LEUMANN (2010: 78) places the earliest possible date for the completion of the *Āvaśyakaniruykti* at 80 CE. OHIRA (1994: 11, 163) argues that the majority of the contents of the present-day *Āvaśyakaniruykti*, after a long period of development, were codified between the first and fifth centuries CE. We can thus place the *Mūlācāra* in the first half of the first millennium, and parts may, indeed, date to the second century CE.

\(^{42}\) For the entire list of these 28 *mūlagunās*, see Mūl vv. 2–3.

\(^{43}\) For these dates, I rely on the “canonical stages” proposed in OHIRA 1994: 1–39.
mendicant, circumambulating him three times and expressing the intent to renounce using a standard formula found in multiple texts.

The Jñātādharmaṇakāthā contains a lengthy description of the renunciation of Prince Megha (Pkt. Meha), who decides to renounce into the mendicant order of the twenty-fourth Tīrthaṅkara, Mahāvīra. In this account, Prince Megha has his hair cut to the length of four fingers, is ritually bathed with gold and silver pots, and is paraded through the city in a palanquin. Facing east, the prince sits in the palanquin with his mother and his nurse, who carries the two symbols of a Śvetāmbara monk – a broom (Pkt. ra-yaharaṇa) and an alms bowl (Pkt. paḍiggaha) – which were bought from a shop and to be gifted to the prince upon his renunciation. After reaching a temple outside the city of Rājagṛha (Pkt. Rāyagīha), the prince stands to the northeast of Mahāvīra, removes his clothes and ornaments (Pkt. ābharapallāṃkāraṇaṃ omuyai), pulls out his hair in five fistfuls (Pkt. paṃcamuṭṭhiyaṃ loyaṃ karei), and makes three circumambulations of Mahāvīra. While circumambulating, he recites an intention to renounce found in several sources and that includes a description of the state of the world as ablaze with the fire of decay and death, a statement of faith in the Jain teachings, and a declared desire to have one’s hair pulled out and to accept the ascetic way of life. The key rite of renunciation in this and other early Jain accounts seems to be the moment of pulling out one’s hair. While the general Prakrit term for pulling out one’s hair is mundāvana, the specific rite performed at renunciation is known as “pulling out of five fistfuls of hair” (paṃcamuṭṭhiyaṃ loyaṃ karaṇa), and this phrase is often used as shorthand for renunciation.

In these accounts from the Jñātādharmaṇakāthā and the Pravacanasāra, we can see the celebratory and ascetic components of modern Digambara initiations. We see the procession around town of the initiand that promotes these Jain ideals to the larger community, proclaiming renunciation as the ideal undertaking. We also see the ascetic core of the rite: the removal of

44 Jñā 1.143.
45 Jñā 1.159. For this same statement of intent to renounce, see also BhS 2.1.34, 9.32.16, and 9.32.17.
46 Jñā 1.140–159. For a more detailed summary of Megha’s renunciation, see DEO 1956: 142. This story seems to have been drawn from a template for royal initiations, as King Śailaka’s initiation in Jñā 5.53–57 is described in essentially the same way as King Megha’s. BhS 9.33.21–82 also contains a lengthy description of the renunciation of Prince Jamāli that parallels the renunciations of royalty described in the Jñātādharmaṇakāthā.
clothes, the pulling out of one’s hair, the gifting of the insignia of a mendicant, and an ācārya’s acceptance of a disciple. These components belong to the earliest layer of the rite, found in texts from the first few centuries of the first millennium.

**The medieval tantricisation of Jain mendicant initiation**

In medieval texts, we begin to see the rites of renunciation change. Published medieval Digambara texts do not provide a full account of the rituals involved in mendicant initiation, but we can gain some ideas about these ceremonies from a few descriptions of rituals that are modelled on mendicant initiations. The first is an account of lay initiation (upāsakadīkṣā) found in Ācārya Jinasena’s Ādipurāṇa (AP), a ninth-century universal history structured around the life story of the first Tīrthaṅkara, Rṣabha (Ādinātha). Because Jinasena was a converted Vaiṣṇava Brahmin, multiple scholars have noted the “Hinduisations” of Jain rituals in the Ādipurāṇa, in particular the fortieth chapter, which outlines 16 life-cycle rites (samskāra) for “Jain brahmīns” (JAIN 1979: 292–304; DUNDAS 1998: 35). Jinasena likely had access to knowledge about non-Jain Tantric traditions, since he was employed in the court of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amoghavarṣa (r. 814–880). While Amoghavarṣa himself supported Jain endeavours, there was certainly acceptance of non-Jain, especially Śaiva, Tantric sects by Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings before, after, and around his time (ALTEKAR 1934: 19–23).

Chapter 38 of the Ādipurāṇa describes how Bharata, Rṣabha’s son and the universal emperor (cakravartin), having established himself as king in his capital, Ayodhyā, lectures his subjects on the proper ritual actions of a lay Jain. In this narrative, Bharata insists that a twice-born, or a Brahmin, has two births: one from his mother, and another from ritual actions. A true twice-born performs 108 rites: 53 rituals related to birth (garbhānvyakriyā), 48 rituals related to initiation (dīkṣānvyakriyā), and

---

47 NANDI (1973: 76–78) has drawn upon epigraphic evidence to document the flourishing of Āgamic Śaiva monastic institutions in the areas of Central and South India where Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings ruled from the eighth to tenth centuries.

48 Bharata emphasises that a person who does not perform the proper ritual actions and recite the proper mantras is a twice-born in name only (AP 38.48: dvir jāto hi dvijanmeshṭaḥ kriyāto garbhataḥ ca yah | kriyāmantravihīnas tu kevalaṁ nāma-dhārakah ||).
the seven “fruition” acts that occur only because of the fruition of meritorious acts (kartravanayakriyā).

For the purpose of our discussion, chapter 39, which outlines 19 of the 48 ritual acts (kriyā) that a Jain should perform to lead one towards dīkṣā (dīkṣānvayakriyā), is key. In essence, the dīkṣānvaya rituals outline Jinasena’s understanding of the process of converting to Jainism. They include the rites for accepting the Jain teachings, removing false gods from one’s home, and other rituals that lead up to renunciation (dīkṣā), which is referred to as the rite of removing one’s clothes or “taking the form of the Jina” (jinarūpākriyā) (ĀP 39.78). While Jinasena does not give the particulars of the rites involved in munidīkṣā, his brief outline of the rituals for an initiation of a layperson, or an upāsakadīkṣā, is likely modelled on contemporaneous mendicant initiations.

This lay initiation is called “gaining a place [in the Jain community],” sthānalābha, and is listed as the third dīkṣānvaya ritual one should undertake on one’s path to renunciation, after the first rite, “descent [into the right path]” (avatāra), in which the aspirant is compelled by a worthy teacher’s sermon to follow the true teaching and reject false teachings, and the second rite, “adopting right conduct” (vrītalābha), in which the aspirant who has approached a teacher to take an unspecified group of vows (vratavrāta) bows before the guru. Jinasena prescribes that after one accepts a guru and the Jain teachings in this way, experts should construct one of two types of colored ritual diagrams inside a pure Jain temple (jinālaya) using finely ground powder (cūrṇa) mixed with either water or sandalwood paste etc. They should construct either an eight-petalled lotus or a representation of the Jina’s Preaching Assembly (samavasaraṇa), in which a newly enlightened Jina sits on a divinely made throne, surrounded by all the beings of the universe seated in concentric circles who have gathered to hear the teachings on the truths of life and death. The diagram should be worshiped, and the mendicant head (sūri), according to ritual prescription, should have the initiand enter (the maṇḍala) facing the icon of the Jina (presumably placed at the centre of the diagram).

Touching the head of the disciple, he should pronounce, “This is your lay initiation (upāsakadīkṣā).” Having touched the initiand’s head accord-

---

49 For a list of these 108 rites, see ĀP 38.51–62.
51 ĀP 39.38–41: jinālaye śucau range padam aṣṭadalaṃ likhet | vilikhed vā jina-sthānam-aṇḍalaṃ samavṛttakam || ślakṣeṇa piṣṭacūrṇena salilāloḍitena vā | varnanaṃ
ing to the procedure of the rite of “pulling out five fistfuls of hair” and having said, “You are purified by means of this dīkṣā,” the guru, pronouncing, “By this mantra, all of your bad karma (pāpa) is purified,” should teach him the pañcanamaskāramantra. Above, we saw how modern Digambaras impart a Sanskrit version of this mantra at the time of the guru’s pulling out of the disciple’s hair, but this text presumably refers to the original version of the mantra, which is a Prakrit litany to the Five Supreme Lords of Jainism that is first found as an auspicious benediction (maṅgala) at the start of a text on karma theory dated to the first half of the first millennium, the “Scripture of Six Parts,” the Śatkaṅḍāgama (ŚkhĀ):\

Praise to the enlightened beings, praise to the liberated beings, praise to the mendicant leaders, praise to the mendicant teachers, praise to all mendicants in the world.\

Having been taught this mantra, the initiate is then allowed to break his fast and return home, where he should expel the icons of false gods (mithyādevatā) from his house, taking them elsewhere. In the next step, he is to

\[\text{manḍalasyeṣṭaṃ candaṇāḍidravena vā} || \text{tasmin aśṭadale padme jaine vā’ṣṭhāna-}|| \text{mahādeśu vāḥ} || \text{vidhinā likhite tajñaṁ viśvaṃ śaṃcitaṭārcaṇe} || \text{jinācāṃbhimukṣaṅaṃ sārīr vidihi-}|| \text{nānaṃ nīveṣayet} \ | \text{tavopāsakaḍikṣeyam iti mūrdhni mūhuḥ sprāṇ].\]

\[\text{Ś} \text{ĀP} 39.40–43: pañcamaṣṭīvīdhānena sprṣṭvāṁ adhimastakam || pūto ’si dī-}\text{kṣayet ukṛtva siddhāṣeṣaḥ ca lambhayet || tataḥ pañcanamaskārpaḍāṇy āsmaḥ upādi-}\text{ṣet} \ | \text{mantra ’ṣam akhilāt pāpāt tvāṁ punītādītirayan]].\] The text here that reads “siddhāṣeṣaḥ ca lambhayet” is not clear, so I have avoided summarising it. However, as we saw in the description of the dīkṣā from 2013, and as we will see below in discussions of medieval texts, recitations of certain praise poems called Bhaktis are key components of dīkṣās, and the Siddhabhakti is recited at the time of the pulling out of the initiand’s hair. I hypothesise, then, that this unusual term (siddhāṣeṣa) could be a bahuvrīhi compound referring to the Bhaktis, of which the remaining is the siddha. The text could be instructing the guru to cause the recitation of the Siddhabhakti. I thank Phyllis Granoff for this suggestion.
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perform Jain rites (the pūjārādhyakriyā) such as fasting, temple worship, and listening to the meanings of the Jain scriptures (āṅga).\textsuperscript{57}

After outlining 19 of the 48 rites that lead to initiation, the text describes the seven “fruition acts” (kartrtvanvayakriyā) that chart the progression of a soul from birth to eventual liberation: (1) birth as a human male in a good family (sajjāti), (2) being an honourable householder (sadgṛhitva), (3) initiating as a monk (pārivṛjya), (4) rebirth as a god (surendratā), (5) subsequent birth as a universal emperor (sāmrājya), (6) becoming enlightened (ārhytane), and (7) achieving liberation (nirvṛtti) (ĀP 39.82–211). Here, in the verses on initiating as a monk, the term for renunciation used in early Digambara texts, pārivṛjya, is glossed as “liberating initiation,” or nirvāṇadiksā. It is further described, recalling the Pravacanasāra, as adopting one’s appearance at birth (jātarūpa), i.e., nudity.\textsuperscript{58} The text emphasises that a person who desires to be liberated (a mumukṣu) must approach a Jain mendicant leader, an ācārya, on an auspicious day and at an auspicious time, to undertake this diṅśā.\textsuperscript{59} Other than this remark, the remaining description of mumukṣā does not provide any information about the rituals involved in renouncing.

While the Ādipurāṇa thus does not provide us with a detailed description of the renunciation of a monk, its discussions of initiations hint at the “tantrisation” of Digambara diṅśā, as several aspects of the upāsaka and muni diṅśās echo contemporaneous non-Jain Tantric initiations. To begin with, Jinasena’s renaming of pārivṛjya as nirvāṇadiksā suggests a correspondence with Tantric traditions such as the Śaiva Mantramārga, whose members use this very term for their highest level of initiation.\textsuperscript{60} The upāsakadiksā outlined by Jinasena also includes a key component of Tantric initiations scholars familiar with the Pāncarātra, Śaiva Siddhānta, and other Tantric initiations will immediately recognise: the construction of a

\textsuperscript{57} ĀP 39.49: pūjārādhyākhyāyā khyātā kriyā’syā syād atah parā | pūjopavāsa-sampattiyā śrṇvato ‘ngārthasamgraham ||

\textsuperscript{58} ĀP 39.156: pārivṛjyam parivṛjyo bhāvo nirvāṇadiksanaṃ | tatra nirmanamati vṛttyā jātārūpasya dharaṇam ||

\textsuperscript{59} ĀP 39.157: praśastatithiṁakṣatrayogalagnāmuḥūrtaḥ | grahamsake | nirgraṇthācāryam āṣritya diṅśā grahyā mumukṣunā ||

\textsuperscript{60} For a good overview of the different types of initiation found in the Śaiva Āgamas, the three initiations (samaya, viśeṣa, and nirvīna) codified in later ritual manuals (padhāni), and the levels of initiate (sādhaka, ācārya), see BHATT 1977: xviii–xxiii. For an overview of Pāncarātra initiation rites and levels, see GUPTA 1983: 69–91.
In addition, readers might be reminded of non-Jain Tantric initiations when they read about the principle that mantras destroy karma. Quoting from the sixth chapter of the Kiranagama, Alexis Sanderson has described how in the nirvānadīkṣā of the Śaiva Mantramārga, the mantras “are the immediate agents by which the fetters are destroyed” (SANDERSON 1992: 286). The construction of a ritual diagram and the usage of a karma-destroying mantra are thus two components of the Ādipurāṇa’s descriptions of initiation not found in early Jain outlines of renunciation but found in medieval non-Jain Tantric texts.

The Ādipurāṇa’s discussion of lay and mendicant initiations is not, however, a mere adoption of Śaiva Tantric ritual culture. It is, in many ways, exceptionally Jain. Jinasena has expertly combined early Jain teachings with medieval ritual developments. Firstly, he transforms the Jina’s Preaching Assembly (samavasaraṇa) into an initiation maṇḍala. The samavasaraṇa, in which the entire universe surrounds the newly enlightened Jina in concentric circles to hear him preach, is depicted in Jain texts and art from the early centuries CE, and in the medieval period this preaching assembly became the ideal diagram to be used in Tantric rites such as dīkṣā.

Jinasena’s description of the guru’s imparting of the pañcanamaskāra-mantra, said to destroy all bad karma, also draws upon earlier Jain teachings and practices. This idea that the pañcanamaskāra destroys bad karma is found in the above-mentioned Digambara text on mendicant conduct dated to the first few centuries CE, the Mūlācāra, which uses the pañcana-maskāra as a maṅgala – an auspicious start to the text – and declares that “this five-fold praise destroys all bad karma and is the foremost maṅgala of all maṅgalas.” Jinasena thus relies upon an old Jain understanding of the

---

61 For the construction of maṇḍalas in Śaiva initiation ceremonies, see TÖRZSÖK 2003: 179–224.

62 For some of the early textual accounts of the samavasaraṇa, see SHAH 1955: 85–95 and BALBIR 1994: 67–104. For a recent discussion of the samavasaraṇa in both Digambara and Śvetāmbara art, see HEGEWALD 2010: 1–20.

63 See, for example, the second chapter of the Pañcāśākaprakaraṇa (PP) by the eighth-century Haribhadra, which outlines the dīkṣāvidhi in which an initiand, blindfolded, should throw a flower onto a diagram of the Preaching Assembly in order to determine his worthiness for renunciation and his future birth placement (PP 2.16–29).

64 Mūl 514: eso pañcanamoyāro savvapāvaparāṇaṇo | maṅgalesu ya savvesu padamam havid maṅgalam ||.
power of sound to develop a Tantric rite of initiation. Indeed, of all the so-called “Tantric” initiations that emerged in the medieval period, this Digambara version may have the most coherent genealogy of the soteriological function of ritual utterances.

This genealogy continues into the present day, because, as noted above, modern Digambara ācāryas pronounce the pañcanamaskāra when they complete the pulling out of the initiand’s hair. This parallel between the lay initiation described in the ninth-century Adipurāṇa and modern mendicant initiations suggests that Jinasena’s upāsakadiśā was modelled on a mendicant initiation. By the ninth century, it is likely that mendicant initiations, like this lay initiation, had been tantricised in ways that persist to this day. Unfortunately, few medieval Digambara texts provide evidence for this claim. The other medieval mentions of dīśā in texts of prominent Digambara monks who followed Jinasena shed no light on the medieval ritual use of maṇḍalas and mantras in Digambara dīśā ceremonies. Instead, they focus on the recitation of praise poems called Bhaktis.

**Emphasising devotion: the medieval silence on the tantricisation of initiation**

Published pre-modern Digambara accounts of the initiation of a mendicant (munidīśā) suggest that it was appropriate for monks to emphasise the ascetic components of dīśā and to outline the praises to Jain ideals recited in these ceremonies, but little else could be discussed. As research stands now, there are two known coherent65 accounts of the rituals involved in munidīśā in medieval Digambara texts: Cāmuṇḍarāya’s “Essence of Correct Conduct,” the Cāritrasāra (ca. 1000), and Āśādhara’s “Nectar of Righteous Conduction for a Mendicant,” the Anagāradharmāṃtra composed in 1240. Both of these texts focus mostly on which of the hymns called “Devotions,” Bhaktis, should be recited for different parts of initiation.

The exact history of these Bhaktis is not known, though they feature in most Digambara lay and mendicant rituals today. Compilations of these recitations will group them into two sets of hymns called “Ten Bhaktis,” one set of Prakrit praise poems attributed to the Digambara monk Kundakunda who, as noted above, can be placed in the first half of the first

---

65 The only other known published Digambara dīśāvidhi in a pre-modern source, five verses in Vidyāmasāsana (VA), pp. 263–264, is too cryptic and corrupt to examine at this point.
millennium, and another set of ten Sanskrit Bhaktis attributed to the Digambara monk Pūjyapāda, who can be placed in the seventh century.66 Pūjyapāda and Kundakunda likely did not compose these recitations, however, and the number and names of Bhaktis in various sources are not uniform, nor is the content of the recitations. Many contemporary lists of the so-called “Ten Bhaktis” contain more than ten hymns. 67 A serious study of the history and contents of these praises is desperately needed, but for now we will just note that descriptions of Digambara dīkṣā ceremonies from the eleventh and thirteenth centuries focus mostly on the recitation of these praises, and little else.

After Jinasena’s Adipurāna, the next published account of a Digambara dīkṣā is found in a Sanskrit text composed by Cāmunḍarāya, a disciple of Jinasena. Despite being a disciple of the monk who revealed that Digambara Jains likely used manḍalas and mantras in their mendicant initiations, Cāmunḍarāya says nothing of the use of these ritual components in his manual on lay and mendicant conduct, the “Essence of Conduct,” the Cāritrasāra (ca. 1000). Cāmunḍarāya does, however, describe two stages of renunciation: (1) leaving the world to join a mendicant order (samnyāsa), and (2) the initiation (dīkṣā), which is characterised by pulling out one’s hair. He also outlines the promotion to the rank of mendicant leader (ācārya), but for all of these rites Cāmunḍarāya remains silent on “Tantric” topics, focusing mostly on when to recite certain Bhaktis.

At the beginning of the ceremony for renunciation (samnyāsa), Cāmunḍarāya explains, one should recite the Siddhabhakti praising the liberated soul. One should then listen to teachings (vācanā) and then recite the Śūrībhakti and the Śrutabhakti, in praise of the mendicant leader and

66 For the best (if brief) introduction to the Bhaktis, see UPADHYE Ś1935: xxvi–xxix. LEUMANN (2010: 6–15) examines the Bhaktis as found in different manuscripts of Prabhācandra’s sixteenth-century commentary on the Kriyākalāpa. CORT 2016 has examined a Sanskrit and Prakrit version of the Yogabhakti.

67 Thirteen different Bhaktis are listed by SHĀNTĀ 1997: 654–655. These are: Siddhabhakti, Cāritrabhakti, Yogabhakti, Ācāryabhakti, Pañcagurubhakti, Tirthākara-bhakti, Śāntībhakti, Samādhibhakti, Nirvāṇabhakti, Caityabhakti, Nandīśvarabhakti, and Vīrabhakti. Twelve Bhaktis are listed as the “Ten Sanskrit Bhaktis,” (saṃskṛt das bhaktiyām) in KĀMAKUMĀRANANDI 2009: xiv–xv. These Sanskrit Bhaktis are listed as: Arhadbhakti, Siddhabhakti, Caityabhakti, Śrutabhakti, Cāritrabhakti, Yogabhakti, Ācāryabhakti, Pañcamahāgurubhakti, Śāntībhakti, Samādhibhakti, Nirvāṇabhakti, and Nandīśvarabhakti. In this same compilation, seven Bhaktis are listed as the “Ten Prakrit Bhaktis” (prākṛt das bhaktiyām): Siddhabhakti, Śrutabhakti, Cāritrabhakti, Yogabhakti, Ācāryabhakti, and Pañcamahāgurubhakti.
the scriptures, respectively. At the completion of studying (svādhyāya), one should recite the Śrūtabhakti. Then, when the initiate finishes delivering a sermon, he should recite the Śāntibhakti in praise of the Jina Śānti, an appropriate pacification rite at the end of the ceremony to ensure a positive outcome of the ritual. After spending some time living as a monk, performing the required duties such as confession (pratikramaṇa), study (svādhya), and the practice of yoga, one should undertake dīkṣā. For this rite, when pulling out one’s hair (luścana), one should recite the Śāntibhakti and the Yogibhakti in praise of the Jina Śānti, an appropriate pacification rite at the end of the ceremony to ensure a positive outcome of the ritual. When all of one’s hair has been pulled out, the monk should recite the Śāntibhakti, listen to a lecture by the guru, recite the Ācāryabhakti, praise the Ācārya, and then recite the Siddhabhakti (CS, pp. 148–150).68

The account of mendicant initiation and promotion in one of the most well-known Digambara guides to mendicant conduct, the Sanskrit text Anagāraḥdarmāṃrta (published as Dharmāṃrtānāgāra; DhA), composed in 1240 by one of the most influential Digambara scholars, Paṇḍita Āśādhara, a layman who lived in the Paramara Kingdom, Malwa, also focuses mostly on when to recite certain Bhaktis. In this text, a single Sanskrit verse describes initiation. Āśādhara describes how when one receives the symbols of renunciation – pulling out one’s hair (luścana), receiving a new name, becoming naked, and receiving a broom – one should recite the Śiddha-bhakti and the Yogibhakti. Upon the completion of the rite, the Siddhabhakti should be recited.69

It is difficult to form a complete understanding of the historical development of the use of the Bhaktis in initiations by comparing the accounts in the texts of Cāmunḍaraṇya and Āśādhara with the modern manual outlined above, the Vimal Bhakti Samgrah. While modern Digambaras use Sanskrit versions of the Bhaktis published in the sources listed above, it is not clear

68 Cāmunḍaraṇya then describes promotion to the rank of mendicant leader. After spending some time as a monk (sādhu), with the command of the guru, humble (vinīta) and virtuous (dharmaśīla) candidates who have been designated as appropriate to become an ācārya should, in the presence of the guru, recite the Śiddhabhakti and the Ācāryabhakti. To complete the ceremonial promotion to the rank of mendicant leader, the monk should recite the Śāntibhakti (CS, p. 152).

69 The promotion to the rank of mendicant leader (ācārya) is also described with just one verse. Āśādhara says that a monk whose virtues shine (sphuradguna), having recited the Siddhabhakti and the Ācāryabhakti, at the auspicious time, with the permission of his guru, should be promoted to the rank of ācārya and then recite the Śāntibhakti (DhA 9.83).
what the contents of the praises were in the medieval period, or whether Cāmuṇḍarāya and Āśādhara were referring to Sanskrit or Prakrit Bhaktis. However, there does seem to be some continuity between these three accounts. Āśādhara was aware of Cāmuṇḍarāya’s text, as his own commentary on the Anagāradharmāṃśa the Jñānadiṃśika, composed in 1243/44, cites the Cāritrasāra when explaining the meaning of the verse on the promotion of an ācārya (DhA 9.75). And the modern manual seems to have continued the tradition of these medieval accounts, as it, too, structures the dīkṣā around the recitation of certain Bhaktis and prescribes that the Śiddhābhakti should be recited when the initiand’s hair is pulled out. Reciting praises to a liberated soul at the moment when one undertakes the required action to become that liberated soul – ascetic renunciation – highlights the purpose of this ritual action.

From the accounts of Āśādhara and Cāmuṇḍarāya, therefore, we can reason that along with the early ascetic components, the “devotional” layer of modern renunciation ceremonies, for lack of a better term, was also present by the medieval period. Not much else can be deduced from these accounts, however. If we were to base our analysis on these three known pre-modern outlines of Digambara initiation – the accounts of Jinasena, Cāmuṇḍarāya, and Āśādhara – we might be left thinking that the fundamental acts of initiation are the recitation of hymns of praise. The only evidence about Digambaras’ uses of maṇḍalas and mantras in mendicant initiation would come from a single text, the Ādipurāṇa, that clearly has been influenced by non-Jain traditions. There would be no way to confirm whether or not Jinasena’s account in the Ādipurāṇa was just an idiosyncratic account, so we could not confirm whether or not medieval Digambaras used mantras and maṇḍalas in mendicant initiations. Thankfully, however, there are other medieval sources for information on Digambara dīkṣā: manuals on the consecration and establishment (pratiṣṭhā) of temple images (bimba, pratimā, etc.).

**The initiation of a monk as depicted in image consecration rites**

Of Digambara published sources, manuals on pratiṣṭhā provide some of the best clues about the details of medieval mendicant initiations, because they not only embed the initiation of a monk into the consecration of a temple image of a Jina, they also model parts of the consecration ceremony on a dīkṣā. By looking at two of these texts from the thirteenth century, Nemican-
dra’s Pratiṣṭhātilaka (PrT) and Āṣādhara’s Pratiṣṭhāsāroddhāra (PrSā), we can find medieval roots of three of the Tantric components of the modern Digambara dīkṣā ceremony outlined above: the recitation of the vardhamāṇamantra, the imparting of the rites of passage (samskāra), and the construction of the maṇḍala called the Ring of Disciples. In these manuals, transforming an inert material to the physical presence of the Jina requires ritual specialists to use the stone or metal representations of the Jinas to reenact the five auspicious events (pañcakalāṇaka) in the life of the Jina: (1) conception (garbha), (2) birth (janman), (3) renunciation (dīkṣā/tapas/niṣkrama), (4) omniscience or enlightenment (kevalajñāna), and (5) death and liberation (mokṣa). Because the medieval authors of these texts prescribed the same rites for the icon of the Jina that were performed on humans, focusing on these texts’ descriptions of the third auspicious event (dīkṣā) sheds light on the tantricisation of this ceremony in this period.

To this day, ritual specialists performing rites for Bīsapanthīs, members of the Digambara tradition more popular in South India, follow Nemichandra’s Pratiṣṭhātilaka in image consecration ceremonies. Nemichandra composed his manual in Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu, around 1200, towards the end of the rule of the Coḷa kings, who were famous for undertaking massive temple-building projects based on the prescriptions of Śaiva Saiddhāntika texts (NAGASWAMY n.d.). As such, Nemichandra’s manual, like other Digambara pratiṣṭhā handbooks, aligns with these Tantric sources in many ways. The first thirteen verses of the tenth chapter of Nemichandra’s Pratiṣṭhātilaka outline all the rites involved in what it terms the nīṣkrāmanakalāṇaka, or the rite in which the temple icons being consecrated are made to renounce the world. On the ninth day of the image consecration ceremony,70 the pūjā of a ritual diagram called the yāgamandala should be performed, and the Jina icon should be established in front of the diagram. Lay worshipers representing gods should sing praises, taking the Jina to a pavilion established for the initiation ceremony (dīkṣāmaṇḍapa), and seating the icon below a representation of a tree, where it should be bathed, worshiped, ornamented, and rubbed with ointments (PrT 10.1–4, p. 234). Then the vardhamāṇamantra should be pronounced seven times, and married women (saubhāgyavati) should perform a lamp offering to the icon (PrT 10.5, p. 234).71 After offerings are made to the icon, it is taken to a rep-

70 Eight days after the completion of the purification rites and establishment of the ritual space on the first day of the ceremony (aṅkurārpanādi, the establishment of pots of grains, etc.) (PrT 10.1, p. 234).
71 For another mention of the vardhamāṇamantra, see PrT 10.8, p. 236.
presentation of a forest on a palanquin (PrT 10.5, p. 234). The Jina should then take dīkṣā: his hair should be pulled out and worshiped by laypeople representing gods (indra), his clothes are to be removed and worshiped, and four lamps should be lit in order to symbolize the Jina’s attainment of the fourth type of knowledge, clairvoyance (manahparyāya) (PrT 10.9–11, p. 234).72

The above summary of the dīkṣā ceremony for the Jina icon provides further evidence that some of the Tantric elements in the modern Digambara ceremony in Kekri had already in the medieval period been integrated with earlier renunciation rites of communal celebration and ascetic undertakings. Nemicandra here mentions that the Jina icon should be given the vardhamānmantra, the mantra that Digambara gurus today impart to their disciples when they become monks. While the contents of the vardhamānmantra are not outlined, Nemicandra’s Pratiṣṭhātilaka suggests that the modern practice of imparting the vardhamānmantra to the initiand traces back to at least the thirteenth century, whether or not the contents of the mantra have remained uniform over time.

Āśādhara’s Pratiṣṭhāśāroddhāra, composed in Rajasthan in the first half of the thirteenth century, provides further evidence of the medieval tantricisation of Digambara mendicant initiations. Āśādhara’s account of the auspicious event of renunciation also requires laypeople to bring the icon of the Jina to a representation of a forest, where it should be established below the tree where renunciation occurs (dīksāvrkṣa), have its hair removed, etc., and be placed behind four lamps representing the attainment of clairvoyance (PrSā, 4.99–112, pp. 100b–102b). On top of these rites, the Pratiṣṭhāśāroddhāra also prescribes that 48 rites of passage, or saṃskāras, be given to the Jina image (PrSā 4.130–135, pp. 105b–106a). Each of the 48 saṃskāras should be imparted to the icon with a sprinkling of flowers (PrSā, p. 106b). While we saw above that modern dīkṣā ceremonies list 18 rites of passage to be imparted to initiands, not 48, the first 18 saṃskāras of Āśādhara’s list are identical to the 18 imparted to initiands today,73 suggesting that this practice, like the imparting of the vardhamānmantra, has persisted in Digambara dīkṣās since at least the thirteenth century.

Both of these components – the guru’s transmission of an initiatory mantra and the imparting of non-Vedic saṃskāras – are common components of non-Jain Tantric initiations. Scholars have examined how Tantric

---

72 On the five types of knowledge, see WILEY 2009: 112.
73 Nemicandra’s Pratiṣṭhātilaka also requires the imparting of saṃskāras, but for the kevalajñānakalyāṇaka, not the niṣkramaṇakalyāṇaka. See PrT, pp. 247–250.
Vaiṣṇavas\textsuperscript{74} and Śaivas\textsuperscript{75} adapted the Vedic paradigm of imparting rites of passage to create kinship ties separate from those of the community of Brahmīns who had undertaken Vedic initiation rites (upanayana). A similar idea underlies the imparting of 48 samśkāras to the Jina icon before it achieves enlightenment. Here, the icon of the Jina, representing all Jain mendicants, must enter the Jain community through the ritual transfer of the samśkāras of right faith, right knowledge, etc., and the subsequent embodiment of the ideal characteristics of a follower of the Jain teachings. Thus, the descriptions of the auspicious rite of renunciation in these medieval handbooks on pratiṣṭhā provide a wealth of information about the introduction of Tantric components into Digambara dīkṣā ceremonies in the medieval period.

These image consecration manuals also shed light on the tantricisation of the dīkṣā because the construction of maṇḍalas made out of colored powder in pratiṣṭhā ceremonies parallels the construction of a maṇḍala for the initiation of a mendicant.\textsuperscript{76} In Nemicandra’s Pratiṣṭhātilaka and in Āśādhara’s Pratiṣṭhāśāroddhāra, depending on the image being installed – whether it be a Jina icon, a representation of a mendicant leader (ācārya), the footprints of a monk, or another type of image – a different diagram must be constructed out of colored powder in the days leading up to the moment when the image becomes established in the temple. These handbooks suggest that in order for these images to become sacred objects of worship, they must be sacralised by being placed in front of ritual diagrams into which the ideals those objects represent are invoked and onto which foodstuffs are offered. In this way, the consecration of an image is similar to Tantric initiations that require the invocation of various deities into a maṇḍala preceding the key moment of initiation.

In the summary of Nemicandra’s text above, we saw how he prescribes the yāgamaṇḍala to be offered flowers (puṣpañjali) at the outset of the

\textsuperscript{74} For the imparting of samśkāras in the Pāṇcarātra text the Paramasamhitā (composed before 1000 CE), see Czerniak-Drozdzowicz 2003: 141.

\textsuperscript{75} On the imparting of samśkāras (samśkāradīkṣā) as part of the viṣeṣadīkṣā in the eleventh-century Śaiva text the Somaśambhupaddhati, with ample references to other Śaiva sources that outline the imparting of samśkāras (garbhādhāna etc.) as part of different dīkṣā rites, see Brunner-Lachaux 1977: 112–142.

\textsuperscript{76} Shinohara (2014b: 280–294) has shown how medieval Chinese esoteric Buddhist manuals on image consecration have modelled the worship of a maṇḍala and the ritual ablution (abhiṣeka) of images in the pratiṣṭhā on the same rites performed in the abhiṣeka of an ācārya.
auspicious event of renunciation; indeed, he dictates that the deities and ideals called into this diagram be offered flowers at the outset of each day of the consecration ceremony. To this day, Digambaras will construct this diagram out of synthetic colored powders and, each morning of the consecration ceremony, while reciting prayers to the deities that have been called into the maṇḍala, they will place coconuts on the diagram (Gough 2017: 285–286). These actions are consistent with the requirement in both Nemicandra’s Pratiṣṭhātilaka and in Āśādhara’s Pratiṣṭhāsāroddhāra that flowers (pūspaṇjali) be offered to the yāgamaṇḍala in order to consecrate a temple image of a Jina (PrT, pp. 118–122; PraSā 1.173–184, pp. 19a–21a). In these texts, however, other maṇḍalas are required for other types of images, and Nemicandra and Āśādhara agree that the consecration of an image of an ācārya or another type of mendicant (ācāryādi) requires the construction of a diagram called the “Ring of Disciples,” the ganadhara-valayā (PrT, pp. 328–329; PrSā, pp. 230a–231a). Nemicandra prescribes the construction of the ganadhara-valayā on a ritual platform (vedī) on the sixth day of the worship ceremony. While the size of the diagram and the materials used to make it are not specified, Āśādhara’s and Nemicandra’s outlines of the ganadhara-valayā are word-for-word identical. At the center of the ganadhara-valayā sits a six-cornered figure with the seed syllable kṣmā at its center. Inside the six corners of this figure, the syllables a pra ti ca kre phaṭ should be inscribed from left to right. On the outside of this central figure, between each of its six corners, the six syllables vi ca krā ya svā hā, going from left to right and ending with jhraum, should be inscribed. A circle of deities – Śrī, Hṛi, Dṛṛti, Kīrti, Buddhi, and Lakṣmī – should be placed at the tips of the six-sided figure. 48 petals surround this central figure, which contain 48 different Prakrit praises to ascetic practitioners who have achieved superhuman powers (labdhi, rddhi).

Like the pañcanamaskāra, these praises inscribed in the petals, beginning with namo jīnāṇaṃ, namo ohijīnāṇaṃ, “praise to the Jinas, praise to the Jinas with clairvoyance (Skt. avadhī),” are first found as a maṅgala in

---

77 On the construction of the siddhacakra to consecrate a temple image of an enlightened soul (siddha), see Gough 2015a.

78 Temple icons of historical monks, often the gurus of wealthy lay patrons, seem to have been commonplace from the medieval period onwards. NANDI (1973: 72), in discussing the growth of the temple cult of the ācārya in the medieval period, references an inscription from 1060 to an installation of an icon of an ācārya.

79 PrT, p. 326, says that the siddhacakra for a siddhapratimā should be made of five colours.
the Digambara text on *karma* theory, the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, dated to the first half of the first millennium. In Śvetāmbara and Digambara texts from this period, the superhuman powers praised in these lines, such as the ability to fly and clairvoyance, were associated with the disciples of the 24 Tīrthāṅkaras (*ganadhara*). Thus, this diagram, the “Ring of Disciples” (*ganadharavalaya*), is named for these praises to superhuman powers inscribed in rings (*valaya*) around the central six-cornered figure. Because many parts of these image consecration ceremonies involve icons acting the rituals of humans, it would make sense that medieval Digambaras would model the consecration of an icon of a monk on the initiation of a human mendicant. Thus, we can hypothesise that by at least the thirteenth century, Digambaras constructed the Ring of Disciples as part of their initiation ceremonies. Here, too, medieval Digambaras remodelled an older Jain ritual component – an existing Prakrit invocation to powers associated with the disciples of the Tīrthāṅkaras – to fit a Tantric ritual. They inscribed these praises on a *maṇḍala* so that new mendicants who made offerings to this diagram as part of their initiations could link themselves to the origins of their lineage, the *ganadharas*, by honouring the powers of these monks.

While Āśādhara in his manual on mendicant conduct says nothing about the construction of a *maṇḍala* as part of initiation rites, preferring to follow Cāmuṇḍarāya in emphasising the recitation of devotional prayers, Bhaktis, his image consecration manual suggests that the Digambara *dīkṣā* had fully incorporated this Tantric element of *maṇḍala* worship by the thirteenth century. The account of initiation in the *Ādipurāṇa* and these image consecration manuals confirm that three key Tantric elements of modern Digambara *dīkṣā* – the worship of the Ring of Disciples, the recitation of the *vardhamānmantra* to initiate muniṣ, and the imparting of the rites of passage (*saṃskāra*) – were combined with earlier Jain ideas of renunciation (pulling out the hair etc.) and devotional currents (the recitation of the Bhaktis) in the medieval period. The description of the Ring of Disciples diagram in Āśādhara’s and Nemicandra’s image consecration texts, however, differs considerably from the Ring of Disciples diagram constructed today. While the diagram of these medieval manuals has 48 praises to practitioners with superhuman powers, modern Ring of Disciples diagrams contain 1,452 dots. To understand the connection between these two different diagrams with the same name, it is necessary to study one last important stage in the history of Digambara *dīkṣā* – the period of the dominance of

---

80 For information on this mantra and diagram, see Gough 2015b.
the orange-robed bhaṭṭārakas, whom twentieth-century munis supposedly rejected. The rituals these pontiffs composed allow us to fully understand how the modern Digambara dīkṣā was developed as an unusual combination of a monastic and Tantric ordination.

**Bhaṭṭārakas’ formulations of modern initiations**

Catalogues of the texts composed by bhaṭṭārakas and inscriptions detailing their activities in the early-modern-to-colonial period (fifteenth to nineteenth centuries)\(^81\) confirm that one of the primary roles of these pontiffs was the performance of large public rituals – the worship of large colored mandalas and temple consecrations – that garnered funds and visibility for the communities and mendicant lineages, which had by this point been divided into several gaṇas and saṅghas.\(^82\) To promote their lineages and temple complexes, bhaṭṭārakas fully embraced the Tantric elements that had entered Jainism in the medieval period and expanded many of the mandalas mentioned in earlier sources, composing elaborate rituals for these diagrams. Before this period, the Ring of Disciples diagram had barely been mentioned in texts. Between the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, however, several different bhaṭṭārakas composed manuals (vidhāna) on the worship of the Ring of Disciples, including Sakalakīrti (Balāṭkara Gaṇa, ca. 1386–1442), Padmanandī (Balāṭkara Gaṇa, bhaṭṭāraka from ca. 1514–1522), Prabhācandra\(^83\) (Nandi Saṅgha, consecrated as bhaṭṭāraka in 1514), and Śubhacandra (Balāṭkara Gaṇa, bhaṭṭāraka from ca. 1516–1556).\(^84\)

The Ring of Disciples likely rose to prominence in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries because it was worshiped as part of the promotion of a bhaṭṭāraka; extant manuscripts on bhaṭṭārakapadasthāpanā mention the gaṇadharavalaya as an essential component of the rite.\(^85\) Because the Ring

---

\(^{81}\) For the bhaṭṭārakas of North India, see KĀŚĪVĀL 1967 and JOHRAPURKAR 1958.  
\(^{82}\) On these different groupings of Digambaras, see the introduction to JOHRAPURKAR 1958: 1–12 and FLÜGEL 2006: 342–344.  
\(^{83}\) For the manuals of Sakalakīrti, Śubhacandra, Padmanandī, and Prabhācandra texts, see Śrīgaṇḍharavalay Pūjan Samgrah (SPS).  
\(^{84}\) On the dates of these bhaṭṭārakas, see the translated lists of bhaṭṭāraka successions (paṭṭāvalī) translated in HOERNLE 1892.  
\(^{85}\) Tillo Detige has collected several undated manuscripts on bhaṭṭāraka-padasthāpanā from the Sonāgiri Bhaṭṭāraka Granthālāya in the pilgrimage site of Sonāgiri, Madhya Pradesh, that confirm that bhaṭṭārakas worshiped the gaṇadharavalaya as part of their promotions. Tillo Detige, e-mail to author, December 30, 2013.
of Disciples became a key symbol of initiations and promotions in the pre-modern period, erected for the public celebrations of the appointment of a new bhattāraka, these pontiffs would have wanted to make the diagram’s components more explicitly relate to the disciples of the Tīrthaṅkaras, thus linking themselves to the founders of Jainism. Lay Digambaras in the pre-modern period were likely not aware that early Jain texts associate the gaṇadharas with the superhuman powers of the earliest version of the Ring of the Disciples diagram described in the medieval image consecration texts. Thus, bhattārakas transformed this earlier diagram with 48 praises to superhuman powers into a diagram of 1,452 dots – each dot representing one of the original disciples of the Tīrthaṅkaras – and composed ritual manuals that had laypeople singing praises to each of these disciples.

In the modern initiation in Kekri outlined above, the three initiands followed a Hindi adaption of the Sanskrit worship manual of the Ring of Disciples composed by the bhattāraka Śubhacandra in 1549 (RĀJAŚRĪ 2003). Śubhacandra belonged to the Balākara Gaṇa Digambara lineage, and he was one of the most prolific and active bhattārakas of North India, traveling widely to consecrate new temples and composing multiple manuals on the worship maṇḍalas that remain popular today. Śubhacandra’s Gaṇadharavalayavidhāna followed in Kekri was translated into Hindi and compiled in 2000 by a nun in the same lineage as Ācārya Vairāgyanandī, another disciple of Ācārya Kunthusāgara, Gaṇinī Āryikā Rājaśrī. In the Hindi introduction to the text, her guru, Ācārya Guptinandī, stresses that Digambaras must worship the gaṇadharavalaya before initiating as a Digambara mendicant (RĀJAŚRĪ 2003: 4). This seems to have become standard for Digambaras of all modern mendicant lineages; during my research in Rajasthan, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Haryana, Delhi, and Uttar Pradesh in 2013, I spoke to dozens of Digambara monks and nuns from various lineages who all confirmed that they worshiped the gaṇadharavalaya before their initiations.

Modern Digambara initiands usually take one, three, or five days to worship the Ring of Disciples before they take the vows of a mendicant, but the worship ceremony can be up to eight days long. The worship of the

---

86 On Śubhacandra and the many texts he composed, see KĀŚILĪVĀL 1967: 63–105.
87 More research needs to be done to confirm that it is, indeed, the case that all Digambaras construct the gaṇadharavalaya preceding their dīkṣās. SHĀNTĀ (1997: 656) notes that a siddhacakra is constructed before a Digambara dīkṣā, but the source of this claim is unclear, since she outlines a Śvetāmbara, not a Digambara, siddhacakra.
diagram in Kekri lasted eight days. Inside a ritual pavilion (maṇḍapa) in a worship hall (upāśraya), ritual specialists constructed a large diagram made of synthetic colored powder with an icon of the Jina established at the center, surrounded by three concentric circles with 1,452 dots on it. On the first day of the vidhāna, Ācārya Vairāgyanandī and the ritual specialists led a few dozen lay worshipers, along with the three initiands, in performing preliminary rites familiar to scholars of Tantric ritual. Ritual specialists hoisted a banner at the entrance to the worship hall to signify the beginning of the worship ceremony, six pots of water and eight pots of herbs (aṅkurārpana) were placed at the edges of the colored diagram to sanctify the space, and the three initiands and the other lay people performing the pūjā undertook the “transformation” (sakalikaraṇa) rites in which they placed (performed nyāsa) the paṅcanamaskāra on different parts of their bodies so they “transformed” into gods and goddesses (indra, indrāṇī), whom Jains envision as the ideal worshipers of the Jina.

For each of the following seven days, then, the worshipers in Kekri systematically honoured each and every one of the disciples of the 24 Tīrthaṅkaras, beginning with Vṛṣabha, the first disciple of the first Tīrthaṅkara, Ṛṣabha, and ending with Nirottama, the eleventh and final disciple of the twenty-fourth Tīrthaṅkara, Mahāvīra (RĀJAŚRI 2003: 59, 221). A ritual specialist would recite a Hindi verse honouring a disciple, Ācārya Vairāgyanandī would recite the Sanskrit mantra associated with the verse (“om hrīṃ arhaṃ vṛṣabhasenaganadalāya namaḥ arghyāṃ” etc.), and upon completion of the mantra, the laypeople seated in rows in front of the diagram would transfer a mixture (arghya) of the substances of the eight-fold pūjā from one plate to another. At the same time, the initiands would place a coconut on the colored diagram. In this way, with each praise

---

88 The worship lasted eight days because it was also performed for the eight-day festival Aṣṭāhnikā Parva, for which laypeople also construct ritual diagrams. On the construction of maṇḍalais for Aṣṭāhnikā Parva, see GOUGH 2015a.

89 Bīsapanthīs and Terāpanthīs offer slightly different substances, and both were present at the initiation in Kekri. The eight substances of a modern Bīsapanthī pūjā are: (1) water, (2) sandalwood paste (listed as gandha in ritual handbooks and used to trace a svāstika on the plate), (3) uncooked rice (aṅkata), (4) flowers, (5) sweets (naivaidya), (6) a lamp (dīpa), (7) incense (dūpa), and (8) fruit (phala). Terāpanthīs offer: (1) water, (2) sandalwood paste (gandha), (3) uncooked white rice (aṅkata), (4) yellow-colored (from sandalwood) rice (puspa), (5) white coconut pieces (naivaidya), (6) yellow-colored (from sandalwood) coconut pieces (dīpa), (7) incense (dūpa), and (8) nuts, raisins, dried dates, etc. (phala).
of a disciple, the three initiands connected themselves to the first monks – the original disciples of the Tīrthaṅkaras – and legitimated their place in the Digambara mendicant tradition that traces itself back to these ganadharas.

While this worship was structured around honouring the disciples represented by each of the 1,452 dots, Śubhacandra’s manual, which these worshipers followed, also recognises the earlier form of the Ring of Disciples outlined in image consecration manuals. Śubhacandra’s text begins, for example, with instructions for the ritual ablution (abhiṣeka) of an icon of the Jina along with a metal yantra on which the exact components outlined in the medieval image consecration manuals – a six-sided figure surrounded by rings of praises to these superhuman powers – are inscribed. In Kekri, each morning, when the worshipers would return to the worship hall to honour a section of the diagram, the ceremony would begin with these seven different ritual ablutions of a metal icon of the Jina. The lay worshipers would pour (1) sugarcane juice, (2) clarified butter (ghṛta), (3) milk, (4) curd, (5) water with herbs, (6) water from four pots, and (7) water mixed with sandalwood (sugandhīta) on the Jina icon and a metal yantra (RĀJAŚRĪ 2003: 17-19). With each abhiṣeka, the worshipers would recite a Sanskrit verse composed by Śubhacandra asking for worldly goals and liberation, and then Ācārya Vairāgyanandī would recite a mantra that includes the a pra ti ca kre phāṭ vi ca krā ya svā hā we saw at the center of the earlier version of the Ring of Disciples diagram outlined in the medieval image consecration manuals. When performing the abhiṣeka with sugarcane juice, for example, he recited:

\[
oṁ hrīṁ jhvīṁ śrīṁ arham a si ā u sā apratīcakre phāṭ vīcakrāya jhraum jhraum. I perform the ablution with supremely sacred sugarcane juice. ^{90}
\]

In this way, Śubhacandra’s sixteenth-century Sanskrit Gaṇadharavalaya-vidhāna and its subsequent adaptions expand upon the earlier Ring of Disciples, likely because the earlier version had been used for generations to initiate monks, and the bhaṭṭārakas developing these rites wished to maintain a link with these earlier practices while more explicitly connecting themselves to the first monks of Jainism.

^{90} RĀJAŚRĪ 2003: 17: oṁ hrīṁ jhvīṁ śrīṁ arham a si ā u sā apratīcakre phāṭ vīcakrāya jhraum jhraum. pavitratarekṣutasena snapayāmi svāhā.
Indeed, Ādisāgara Aṅkalikara, the founder of the lineage of the Digambaras at Kekri, is an anomaly in the history of Digambara Jainism in emphasising that mendicant initiation should be about asceticism and an individual connection with the Jina. After Ādisāgara’s self-initiation in front of an icon of the Jina, his followers quickly readopted the rituals developed by the bhaṭṭārakas. In 2002, the nun Āryikā Śītalamaṇī published a manual entitled “Various Rituals for the Initiation Rite of Passage,” Vividh Dīkṣā Saṃskār Vidhi, that contains, in Sanskrit, the prescriptions for the rites of initiation for a mendicant teacher (upādhyāya), mendicant head (ācārya), and pontiff (bhaṭṭāraka) said to have been copied from an “ancient” (prācīna) manuscript a direct disciple of Ādisāgara, Muni Sanmatisāgara, found in a manuscript house in the pilgrimage site of Śrī Atiśaya Kṣetra Bediyā in Gujarat (JAIN 2009: 16). While no date or author is mentioned in the manuscript, it should be placed sometime in the early modern period – during the reign of the bhaṭṭārakas in Gujarat – and most certainly outlines rituals that were developed before the rise of the modern naked muni tradition in the twentieth century.91

The description of the initiation of a mendicant teacher (upādhyāya) in this pre-modern manuscript is word-for-word identical to the description of this rite in the modern manual used by the Digambaras in Kekri, the Vimal Bhakti Saṃgrah.92 This rite includes the worship of the Ring of Disciples, the guru’s imparting of mantras related to the rank of the upādhyāya, and the recitation of the Siddha, Śruta, Śānti, Samādhi, and Guru Bhaktis. Apart from a few anomalies such as Ādisāgara’s self-initiation, Digambaras dīkṣās have been, for at least 1,000 years, complex combinations of devotional, ascetic, and Tantric rituals. Each of these components of the dīkṣā – from the Tantric worship of a mandala to the recitation of praise poems – strengthens communal ties between laypeople and mendicants and between Jains of the past and present.

91 JAIN (2009: 122) rightly notes that it must have been composed after the twelfth century, since the ritual outlining the promotion of a bhaṭṭāraka prescribes the guru promoting the pontiff to pronounce him as the head of either the Sarasvatī Gaccha, the Mūlasāṃgha, the Nandīsāṃgha, or the Balākara Gaṇa, and the latter two lineages emerged around the twelfth century.

Concluding remarks

This study of Digambara dīkṣā has highlighted some commonalities between the initiatory practices of Jains and those of so-called “Tantrics.” We have seen how Digambara Jain initiations, since at least the ninth century, have in some ways been “Tantric,” because they involve the construction of maṇḍalas and the imparting of karma-destroying, non-Vedic mantras. But this incorporation of Tantric elements into Jain initiations does not mean that Jains are Tantrics, or that Jains belong to a Tantric community. “Tantric” is not always an accurate or sufficiently precise term to designate religious actors or communities.

It can, however, be helpful to use the term to distinguish some ritual components from others. At an early stage, Jain mendicant initiations did not include maṇḍalas and mantras, and then, at some point, they did. Using the word “Tantric” here to refer to these components can help us chart ritual developments on the subcontinent and allow Jains access to a larger conversation about the emergence of these practices in the medieval period.

Once Jains enter this conversation from which they have been largely excluded, can we begin to see how Tantric practices are in some ways “Jain”? Can we examine how early Jain understandings about the power of certain recitations to destroy karma are echoed in later Tantric claims that initiatory mantras oblate impurities? Can we study how the very idea of a non-Vedic initiation for soteriological purposes is rooted in early ascetic traditions such as Jainism? Jains may not belong to a Tantric community, but examining their images, texts, and practices can certainly enrich our understandings of how Tantric ritual components have been used to create communities.
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Minor Vajrayāna texts V:
The *Gaṇacakravidhi* attributed to Ratnākaraśānti

Péter-Dániel Szántó

**Overview**

There are very few studies on the *gaṇacakra*, a ritualised communal feast as celebrated by followers of the Vajrayāna, i.e., Tantric Buddhist communities. Lalou’s preliminary study (1965) is still useful, and it was only recently followed up. The only monograph on the subject, which I was unable to consult in its entirety, is in Japanese by Shizuka (2007), who has before and since authored several articles on the topic, including a very useful English summary of his research (2008). Shizuka mostly worked with Tibetan canonical translations, however, as I will demonstrate below, a relatively small amount of material does survive in the original Sanskrit.

The main point of this article is to present a *gaṇacakra* manual in Sanskrit. First, I will say a few general points on the rite for the non-specialist reader. I will then give a rough overview of the earliest (eighth to ninth centuries CE) sources for this rite in Buddhist literature, followed by a brief discussion of later (tenth to thirteenth centuries CE) sources and Sanskrit manuals, or fragments thereof, specifically devoted to it. I will then turn to announce a fortunate discovery of one such manual in the original. After some introductory notes, in the next section I will provide a diplomatic edition of the text accompanied by philological notes and a tentative translation. The final section contains a diplomatic edition of a short and incomplete gloss that was found together with the manual.

The non-specialist reader will probably be baffled by the amount of philological groundwork required to clarify sometimes even very basic points as well as by the amount of unpublished and/or untranslated literature provided in the references. Alas, such is the state of our field.
General introduction

The main points of a gaṇācakra (or gaṇamaṇḍala), lit. “assembly circle,” essentially a ritualised communal feast, are as follows: The ritual should be observed periodically, at least once a year, but preferably more often. It is not a public affair, as participation is limited to initiates of a particular Tantric cult, ideally both male and female. They are headed by their master who is seated in the middle, usually accompanied by his consort, and officiates during the key points of the rite. Lesser duties are delegated to an assistant. The resources are provided by a sponsor, who is also present. The chief aim of the rite is to consume the so-called samaya (“vow,” “pledge”) substances – bodily fluids and meats – in a communal fashion. These are placed in a vessel (usually a skull bowl) filled with liquor and are consecrated by the main officiant. The vessel is then passed around, usually accompanied by verses in Apabhraṃśa, a kind of literary Middle Indic, with everyone obliged to partake. This is followed by a feast with food, drink, song, and dance. Some descriptions specify that participants should communicate using secret signs and secret codewords (both called chomā). It is usually assumed that intercourse also takes place, and we do indeed find allusions to this in some of our manuals, e.g. the one discussed here, but this is not the main point. The ritual usually takes place at night and can last until daybreak. Thereupon the participants are dismissed respectfully.

The ritual manuals explain the rationale behind celebrating a gaṇācakra in various ways. Most relevant authors will state that the primary reason is to gather the equipments of merit and knowledge (puṇya° and jñānasamāthāra), which are obligatory requisites for one’s spiritual career. Abhayākara-gupta, a highly influential East Indian author from the late eleventh and early twelfth century, claims (Tōh. 2491, 243b) that it is a transgression not to perform it, while his disciple Ratnarakṣita lists as aims (Tōh. 2494, 249a) restoring transgressed Tantric vows, gaining victory over enemies, achieving all objects of desire, pleasing the deity, and ultimately obtaining the accomplishment of the highest state of consciousness, the mahāmudrā. However, there are also dangers: at least one author, the somewhat obscure *Bhavya, warns (Tōh. 2176, 31b–32a) that participants will be killed by dākas (or dākinīs), either malevolent spirits or possibly the deities themselves, if the rules of the feast are not observed correctly.

Modern anthropological theory would no doubt find such manuals a rich resource for topics such as celebrating and maintaining identity, testing
communal loyalty, distribution of resources, ritual etiquette, transgressive behaviour and control thereof.

The earliest textual sources for the gaṇacakra ritual

While I am fully aware that the Buddhist gaṇacakra/maṇḍala probably imitates a Śaiva ritual (note that gaṇa primarily means an attendant of the god Śiva), I will ignore this point in my brief historical overview (for more on this topic, see SANDERSON 2009: 154).

To the best of my knowledge, the earliest reference in Buddhist literature to a gaṇacakra or gaṇamanaṇḍa dates to the early eighth century or possibly slightly earlier.¹ This is in a nebulous but incredibly important text, the so-called Longer Paramādyā (Tōh. 488, 238a):

The vajra-holder (i.e., the initiate) together with (i.e., holding) his vajra-sceptre should place in the middle of the assembly (tshogs = *gaṇa) great (i.e., human) blood together with camphor (i.e., semen) and sandalwood (i.e., faeces) mixed with [menstrual] blood. [In the state of] the best of yogas (i.e., meditative identification) with *Sarvākāśa (i.e., the deity?), he should taste [the mixture] as if it were Soma,² [lifting a bit from the vessel] with the [joined] tips of his ring finger and thumb; [by this] he shall obtain eternal accomplishment.³

¹ This dating is based first and foremost on the fact that the Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinījālaśaṃvara (on which see GRIFFITHS & SZÁNTÓ 2015), which borrows extensively from the Longer Paramādyā, was already extant in the first half of the eighth century. SHIZUKA (2008, 188) proposes that the gaṇacakra/gaṇamanaṇḍa is a historic outgrowth of guhyamanaṇḍalas taught in the Tattvasaṃgraha (ca. early 7th c.). This may be accurate, but one significant difference is that the pivotal moment of consuming the antinomian substances is missing in the description of the guhyamanaṇḍa in the Tattvasaṃgraha.

² Here the intended sense is more akin to “drink of immortality,” rather than a reference to the drink usually consumed in Vedic ritual.

³ Tōh. 488, 238a: | khraṅ chen ga bu r dang bcas pa | | tsan dān dmar dang sbyar ba ni | | tshogs kyi nang du rab zhugs nas | | rdo rje dang bcas rdo rje ‘dzin | | srin lag mtho bo rtse mo yis | | nam mkha’ thams cad sbyor mchos ldan | | zla ba’i bzung ba brzin myangs na | | riag pa’i dngos grub thob par ‘gyur |.
This crucial passage is reproduced with two changes (marked here in bold and irrelevant for our present discussion) in a dependent text, the famous Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara (ms. fol. 14r):

\[
\begin{align*}
mahāraktam & \text{ sakarpūram raktacandana}yojitam | \\
\text{gaṇamadhye } & \text{ pratiṣṭham śṛṣṭraciśṭarasāyanam } | ^4 \\
\text{anām}\text{āṃguṣṭha}vakraḥbhīyām & \text{ svādhidevātmayogavān } | \\
\text{somapānava}dā & \text{ āsvāyda } \text{ siddhīm āpnoti sāśvātīṃ } | ^5 \\
\end{align*}
\]

The Longe}\text{r Paramā}ḍya does not actually use an equivalent of the Sanskrit term gaṇaṃadhye, but it is not unlikely that the word tshogs (Skt. *gana) and the use of gaṇa in gaṇamadhye in the Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara are simply abbreviations with the same meaning. On the other hand, in another passage the Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara already uses the term gaṇamanḍala (ms. fol. 13v: kalpayed gaṇamandalam) and gives a more detailed but still rather obscure description. It seems to me that the point here is to recreate a “live” version of the deities, in other words, an enactment or re-enactment of the maṇḍala. The participants wear costumes, and if their number does not match the number of entities in the maṇḍala, simulacra made of wood or metal are used. There are very few restrictions imposed and possession (āvesā) plays a major part. This stands in contrast with later, more standardised descriptions, where behaviour is controlled and dignified: for example, singing and dancing is to be performed only with the officiant’s permission, and alcohol is to be consumed with moderation.

Most of the relevant verses from the Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara are rehashed and expanded in what may be regarded the classical description of the gaṇacakra, namely, Āryadeva’s Sūtaka, chapter 9. This work dates from the ninth century and played a major part in establishing one of the two major schools of exegesis of the Guhyasamājatantra, one of the most (if not the most) influential Tantric Buddhist scriptures. An English translation has been published by WeDeme}\text{yer (cf. 2008: 291ff. for the relevant part), which is, however, in need of revision.}

The next important scriptural source is the Catuspīṭhatantra (ca. mid or late ninth century), which does not explicitly mention the standard term

\[
\text{\textsuperscript{4}} \text{The word } \text{pratiṣṭham } \text{should be interpreted as a present participle. The reading } \text{oṣṭha}^{\circ} \text{is my emendation, the ms. has } \text{entīṣṭha}^{\circ}. \\
\text{\textsuperscript{5}} \text{The manuscript reads } \text{ādnoti}, \text{which I have corrected to } \text{āpnoti}. \\
\]
ganacakra or ganamanḍala, but it does have yogayoginīmandala, which in the strange language of this text means “the circle of yogins and yoginīs.” It does not give a precise description of what the rite consisted of, however, it does teach several features which later became standard, most notably the Apabhramśa songs intoned when gaining entry in the assembly and when passing around the vessel with the transgressive substances as well as the mantras to purify them (cf. Szántó 2012: I: 330ff. & 357ff.).

Later sources

Some of the later scriptures from the so-called Yoginītantras are also noteworthy: the Hevajratantra (ca. 900 CE) passages are quite well-known (II.vii.5–13 in Snellgrove 1959; there are some other details scattered throughout this text), as is the eighth chapter of the Saṃvarodayatantra, most likely a relatively late (eleventh to twelfth centuries?) Nepalese composition-compilation, one among the selected chapters published by Tsuda (1974). The commentaries on these passages are also very rewarding to consult (e.g. Padminī ms. fols. 15r–17r). Perhaps less well-known is a chapter entirely dedicated to the subject, the twenty-third of the unpublished Mahāmudrātilaka (ms. fol. 47r ff.), a scripture probably compiled in the late eleventh century. This is almost entirely a copy of the sixty-second chapter of the Vajrālābhidhāna, a Guhyasamāja explanatory scripture (Tōh. 445, 267a ff.; Kittay 2011: 728–736), one of the many parallels between the two texts.6

Further material in Sanskrit can be gathered from ritual compendia. The Vajrāvalī of Abhayākaragupta does not teach the ganacakra, but the author wrote a separate manual that survives only in Tibetan translation (Tōh. 2491). Kuladatta’s version of the ganacakra ritual, which is heavily dependent on the text we examine here, constitutes the final chapter of his Kriyāsaṅgrahapāñjikā (edited by Sakurai 2001). Dating this author is a tricky matter: he must precede 1216 CE, the date of the oldest manuscript of his compendium, but he could be as early as the middle of the eleventh century (Tanemura 2004: 5–10). Jagaddarpaṇa, a Nepalese author from ca. the thirteenth century who was heavily influenced by Abhayākaragupta, describes a number of

6 The historical aetiology of the Vajramālābhidhāna is very obscure, I will therefore refrain from assigning it a date. Some parts must date from as early as the ninth century.
Gaṇavidhis in his Kriyāsamuccaya, which probably demonstrates a local diversification among Newar Buddhists (ms. fol. 22v ff.). Some shorter but still noteworthy witnesses are the second half of the ninth section (and various details elsewhere) in the initiation manual Saṃvarodayā nāma maṇḍalopāyikā (ms. fol. 38v ff.) of Bhūvācārya, an author active before 1054 CE at Ratnagiri in present Odisha, and the fourth chapter of the anonymous and undatable Śisyānugrahavidhi (ms. A fols. 18v–19v, ms. B fols. 3v–5r), a short compendium on various subjects related to the worship of the deity Cakrasaṃvara.

**Gaṇacakra manuals**

Besides the present text, the only other complete and self-standing manual surviving in Sanskrit is to be found in the so-called Ngor Hevajrasādhanā collection as its last item (see ISAACSON 2009: §45). The manuscript is now said to be in China, and the only way to access it for the time being is through copies of Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana’s photographs taken in Tibet (ms. fols. 264v–271v). Appropriately for the collection, this text describes a gaṇacakra for Hevajra initiates, although the influence of the Catuspīṭhatantra is substantial. The work is anonymous, has no identifiable Tibetan translation, and has not been edited yet.

The manuscript NAK 1-1679 = NGMPP B 24/13, catalogued under the misleading title “Saṃjñatathānuṣārinī”, contains two fragments of one folio each from works related to the gaṇacakra. The first fragment, penned in the so-called hook-topped Nepalese script, is very corrupt, but from the statement of purpose it can be made out that it is a manual based on the Guhyasamājatantra. The available text amounts to a little more than ten verses and contains descriptions of the ideal officiant (ācārya), his empowering of the assistant (karmavajrin), and some preliminary purificatory acts. The most striking feature of this text is its very existence. Āryadeva openly admits that the Guhyasamājatantra does not contain injunctions concerning the gaṇacakra (which he equates with “practices with elaboration,” sa-prapañcacāryā), which is why he supplies the description from the Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinijālaśaṃvara (cf. WEDEMEYER 2008: 291).

From this manual, as well as the Vajramālābhidhāna description mentioned

---

7 Note that the Tibetan translation in the Derge Canon omits a significant part, as the parallel ceases after Tōh. 3305, 216a4, which is probably unintentional.
above, it would seem that followers of the *Guhyasamāja* thought they were lagging behind and needed to update their ritual repertoire.

The second fragment from the same bundle (NAK 1-1679 = NGMPP B 24/13) is penned in a rather different, bolder, hook-topped script. Here we have not the first, but the final page of a work styling itself a Gaṇacakravidhi. About seven verses survive in this fragment, but none deal with the rite proper. The penultimate verse, which is rather corrupt, describes either the author or the patron as the ruler of Dhavalapura,8 named either Sumati or Udayacandra. The colophon also contains a date falling within the reign of Abhayamalla, which can be converted to Friday, November 24, 1217 CE.

Another fragment, in this case of two folios, can be found in NAK 1-1679 = NGMPP B 24/24, catalogued as “Mahāpratisarādhārini”. Unfortunately, most of the fragment is badly effaced. From what remains legible, it can be determined that the work once described a gaṇacakra of the Catuspītha cycle, or that at the very least it was heavily influenced by that ritual system. There are several parallel phrasings with works of that cycle, the meats usually styled *pradiṇa* (“lamps”) are here called *aṅkuśas* (“hooks”), and the mantras used to empower them (śrīṃ, hūṃ, ghrum, jṛīṃ, saḥ) are hallmarks of the Catuspīṭhatantra as well (SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 359–360).

**A newly discovered manuscript**

About half a decade ago, the aforementioned Shizuka, who can without doubt be called the world’s foremost expert of Buddhist Gaṇacakra manuals, published a study of a canonical Tibetan text that is titled *Vajrabhairavagaṇacakra* (Tōh. 1995) and attributed in the translators’ colophon to Ratnākaraśānti, one of the most famous and influential Buddhist thinkers from East India (floruit ca. late tenth to early eleventh century). In the English summary of his study, SHIZUKA (2011) stated the following: “In the Sde-dge edition this manual amounts to only two and a half folios, and a Sanskrit manuscript has not yet been reported.” I am happy to announce that I have identified a Sanskrit witness of the manual (according to my notes, in 2013), which is the main subject of this paper. Since ignorance of Japanese is one among my many shortcomings, I may reproduce some of

---

8 Converted into Modern Indo-Aryan, this would sound something like Dholpur. This is a fairly common toponym, but I do not find it impossible that here we have a variant of Dhavalasrotas, for which see PANT & SHARMA 1977: 22–24.
Shizuka’s findings and claim them my own. Should this indeed occur, I apologize profusely.

The witness in question is a manuscript kept at the National Archives in Kathmandu under call number 5-7871. I had no opportunity to perform an autopsy of the manuscript, but I was able to consult it from digital images of the microfilm prepared by the Nepal German Manusciprt Preservation Project, reel no. B 104/10. I cannot tell how long the original manuscript was; here we have only three initial folios, which contain the complete text of the Ganacakravidhi and the beginning of a gloss calling or describing itself as (a) Saṃkṣiptā Pañjikā, that is to say, “a short commentary on difficult points.”

The script is a rather unusual, headless devanāgarī, employed throughout, except for the first two lines of fol. 2r and a single akṣara on fol. 3v. This hand, or a very similar one, can also be seen in other manuscripts from Nepal, both in the main text and in paratextual notes. A thorough palaeographical analysis would perhaps be aided by a hypothesis I wish to advance here: I think that this is the hand of a famous Nepalese scholar active in the first half of the nineteenth century, a man called Sundarānanda. Sundarānanda was not only an author and avid collector of manuscripts on various subjects,9 but he also maintained a scriptorium10 and occasionally copied manuscripts himself.11

From Shizuka’s wording in the aforementioned summary it seems to me that he accepted the attribution to the great eleventh-century East Indian scholar and perhaps even accepted the suggestion of the Tibetan title that this work forms part of the Vajrabhairava corpus, i.e. the group of works, both scriptural and exegetical, centred on the cult of the eponymous deity, a Buddhicised form of Śiva-Bhairava. I would disagree on both counts. First, it is quite impossible that Ratnākaraśānti, whose Sanskrit is beyond re-

9 His signature or ownership mark can be seen on the final folio of the only Sanskrit witness of Kalyāṇavarman’s Catuspīṭhapañjikā (ms. fol. 45v), dated Nepāla Samvat 132 = 1012 CE; see Szántó 2012: I:116. In my thesis (ibid. and p. 85, n. 24), I suggested that this may be Hara Prasad Śastri’s handwriting. I now wish to withdraw that statement.

10 I thank Iain Sinclair for this information as well as for making me aware of Sundarānanda’s importance and influence in the first place in personal communications (e-mail, June–July 2013).

11 For example a manuscript of the Śālihotra of Indrasena, a treatise on hippology – further testimony for his wide-ranging cultural interests – with a Nepali translation and commentary, dated Śaka Samvat 1765, Nepāla Samvat 963, that is to say, 1843 CE.
proach, would have perpetrated any of the “barbarisms” (mlecchita, mlecchabhāṣā) in diction I will point out in my notes. Second, there is not a single word about the deity Vajrabhairava in the text or even the slightest allusion in wording, or otherwise, to texts of that cycle. I suspect that the work was grouped thus on account of its Tibetan translator, who identifies himself in the colophon as “the monk rDo rje grags.” This is none other than the famous and infamous translator of the Rwa clan, the foremost propagator of Vajrabhairava teachings in the Land of Snows.\footnote{For the life of Rwa lo, see CUEVAS 2015, a recent English translation of his biography.}

Indeed, the text does not seem to affiliate itself to any Tantric cycle. On the contrary, it seeks to stay as general as possible, allowing for particular customisations according to the liturgy of whichever cycle the participants followed. The strongest scriptural influence I could detect is that of the Catuspīṭhatantra. However, this scripture, which I tentatively date to the middle or second half of the ninth century, cannot be accepted as the lowest terminus post quem, since the present text also alludes to a cakra in the navel, a feature completely missing from the Catuspīṭhatantra along with all other paraphernalia of so-called subtle body practices. The terminus ante quem is also slightly difficult to determine. As I will point out in the notes, the text’s influence on Kuladatta’s description of the gaṇacakra in the final chapter of his Kriyāsaṃgrahapāṇijīka is very clear, but Kuladatta’s dates are not fixed with certainty. The date and authorship of the gloss is impossible to determine. I find it very unlikely that the author was the scribe (Sundarānanda, if my hypothesis is correct), since the gloss uses lemmata which sometimes differ from the main text. It is also too corrupt for an autograph.

A few words about how I wish to proceed in presenting these two texts. In September 2013, in the idyllic setting of the island of Procida in the Bay of Naples during the Third Manuscripta Buddhica Workshop I had the good fortune of submitting my preliminary draft to what may be described without exaggeration as the most competent panel of experts of Tantric texts in the world. During our reading, my understanding of the texts grew considerably, but so did my despair. A host of new problems were pointed out and some passages were declared beyond redemption. Our verdict was unanimous that this is not the work of Ratnākaraśānti. Several emendations were proposed, but in the heat of the moment I stupidly forgot to record each and every person’s name who came to the rescue. Alexis Sanderson and Harunaga Isaacson will stand behind most emendations and conjec-
tures, but I also recall excellent suggestions by Kazuo Kano and Kenichi Kuranishi. I wish to apologise to anyone who might feel left out. I also wish to thank the editors of the present volume for their excellent suggestions and gentle persuasion to include a translation, something I was initially reluctant to do. In spite of all this remarkable learning that came to my aid and for which I feel forever grateful, I still think that a definitive edition and precise translation cannot be attempted at this stage. I will therefore give the text as it stands in the manuscript, accompanied by a highly tentative translation (where this is possible) and a running commentary, which may point the reader in the right direction. Needless to say, all errors are my own.

**Annotated diplomatic edition and tentative translation**

\[1\] namo Vajrasatvāya || ||

Obeisance to Vajrasattva!

This is the scribal obeisance and does not form part of the text, although most editions of Buddhist texts ignore this point. Vajrasattva is a kind of undifferentiated main deity of Tantric Buddhism, portrayed with two arms holding a vajra-sceptre (a symbol of means, upāya) and a bell (a symbol of wisdom, prajñā), which are also the two chief implements of Tantric Buddhist initiates. Most exegetes would agree that other Tantric deities (e.g. Hevajra, Cakrasaṃvara) are, roughly speaking, “emanations” or forms of Vajrasattva.

\[1\] Vajrasatvam praṇamyādaubhāvabhāvātmakam vibhum || sarvakāmapradamdevaṃvāksyehamgaṇamaṇḍalam ||

After having first bowed to Vajrasattva, the pervading Lord, embodying both existence and non-existence (i.e., conventional and ultimate reality or transmigration and liberation), the god bestowing all objects of desire (or: the absolute object of desire), I shall teach the gaṇamaṇḍala.

This is the customary maṅgala (obeisance, auspicious utterance) and pratijñā (statement of purpose). Both ādau and ’ham are superfluous: the meaning of the first is already implicit in the absolutive praṇamya, whereas
the meaning of the second can be gathered from the finite verb vakṣye. The object of vakṣye – unless we understand it to mean “I shall describe” – is a bhīmavat compound for gaṇamaṇḍalavidhīm. The description bhāvābhāvātmakam is understood by the glossator as “embodying [both] conventional/superficial and ultimate truth,” whereas sarvakāma° is interpreted as the absolute object of desire, i.e., great bliss (in this literature a synonym of Buddhahood), and not “all objects of desire.”

[2] nirvikalpaparā maṃtrī sarvakālasamāhitaḥ |
sarvataṃtrānusārajanī doṣatatvavidām varah ||

The mantra-practitioner (here: the chief officiant), whose aim is the non-discursive [state], who is composed at all times, who knows the intent of all Tantras, who is a great expert in the ten fundamentals,

This verse describes the qualifications of the chief officiant. Here he is simply called maṇtrin, but later (v. 10) more appropriately gaṇanāyaṇa. anusāra° is best understood as a synonym of abhiprāya. There are several lists for the ten tattvas (see KLEIN-SCHWIND 2012: 28 ff., she translates tattva as “fundamentals”), essentially types of rituals a vajrācārya (i.e., a Tantric Buddhist officiant, master) is expected to know, but none match the one given by the glossator (see p. 307), which is most likely an ad hoc creation and not something supported by scriptural or exegetical authority. Note his variants: nityakāla° for sarvakāla° and °vidhānavit for °vidāṃ varaḥ.

[3] gambhīrodāradharmyarbhyyā sārdravībhūtāmānasaiḥ ||
nirābhimānaḥ sacchisyaḥ sušṛṣaṇaviśāradaīḥ ||

with true disciples, whose minds are †...† in the profound and vast doctrine, who are free from pride, who are obedient [and] skilled,

This verse describes the disciples accompanying the chief officiant. The second quarter must have begun with a cvī formation, otherwise the first line is beyond repair. Perhaps the point is that the disciples should have faith in or be versed in the profound and vast doctrine (i.e., the Buddhist dharma). The ungrammatical lengthening in nirābhimānaḥ seeks to avoid the metrical fault of having both second and third syllables short.
should undertake self-worship [as taught] in this [system] in a secluded, lovely house, which is scattered with groups of deities and which bestows the five objects of desire (i.e., the five sensory objects).

The exact meaning of the first quarter is obscure. The glossator would want the deities to mean “young women passionate about reality,” but this is doubtful, unless he means yoginīs incarnated into young women. However, in that case the author would have surely used that word, which is metrically equivalent. Perhaps the first line does not necessarily describe the house, but the larger polity where the rite is to take place. In that case, devatā might refer to local deities with a friendly disposition towards Buddhism. Should the compound refer to the house after all, perhaps it means that the consecrated ritual space was adorned by images of deities on scroll paintings or sculpted. Privacy was crucial to the rite; Indrabhūti’s manual (Tōh. 1672, 196a) mentions two appointed door guardians. Āryadeva’s Sūtaka mentions both elaborate, three-storied brick palaces and more humble cottages as suitable locations (WeDEMEYER 2008: 294–295). Other manuals (e.g. Tōh. 1231, 43a; Tōh. 1439, 238b; Tōh. 2491, 243b) list the usual places for practice (a cremation ground, the top of a mountain, a thicket, a grove, banks of a river, etc.), but most stress that they should be isolated. The glossator’s explanation is somewhat opaque: “where there are no bad people [or] people” or perhaps “where there are no people, who are bad people.” “Bad people” in this kind of literature are opponents of (Tantric) Buddhism. It is perhaps not out of the question that the author used the pronominal locative ending, thus °gehesmin. The glossator, however, interprets '['smin as an equivalent of iha, meaning asmin tantrē, “in this scripture.” The collocation nijapūjā is unattested elsewhere, but nija° is sometimes mentioned in the sense of the chosen deity’s mantra, e.g. hūṃ. The deity and its mantra are not separate, and one is supposed to visualise oneself as a deity, therefore we are probably not far from capturing the intended meaning: “worshipping oneself as the deity, who is the same as its mantra.”
Homage and worship are taught [to take place] according to the rule of seniority; alternatively, according to the greatness of virtues or out of respect for a guest.

This verse explains the rule of seniority, which was observed not only in the order in which the participants are greeted and honoured, but also in the order of entry and seating. For an elaboration on jyeṣṭhāṇukrama by Kuladatta, see SAKURAI 2001: 18–19. Five kinds of seniority are listed there: according to initiation (abhiṣeka), according to observance (vrata), according to knowledge (jñāna), according to birth (janma), and according to learning (vidyā). Our glossator acknowledges only the first. For atha we should adopt the glossator’s atha vā, otherwise the line would be hypometrical. The formation ātitheyatva° is excessive for ātitheyatva° or ātitithiya°; the irregularity, however, allows for a metrical verse quarter. This last rule is especially noteworthy, because it suggests that the list of participants was not stable, but it could also include foreigners to the land, as the glossator suggests, provided of course that they are initiates. The glossator’s variants are matā for smṛtā and atitheyatva° for ātitheyatva°, provided that this latter is genuine.

[6] snānam gaṃdhāṃ ca vastraṃ ca mālābharaṇalepanam ||
artham dhūpaṃ yathāśaktyā gaṇamanḍalam ārabhet ||

[After having gathered] according to one’s means [articles for] bathing, scented powders, cloths, garlands, ornaments, ointments, the guest water, incense, one should begin the gaṇamanḍala [ritual].

This verse lists the articles of worship. Although not mentioned separately here, later on (see v. 7) a sponsor (indeed, sponsors) is mentioned, so it stands to reason that these are charged to him and that it is his duty to prepare them. We should probably see an invisible absolutive meaning “after having gathered/prepared” for the accusatives. Note the glossator’s variants mālyam ca vastra° for vastraṃ ca mālā°.

[7] samāhitāya karaṇī proktaiṣā karmayajraṇī ||
karṇe kṛtvāṃjaliṃ mūrddhī dātā cāṣṭāṃgato namet ||
The gesture calling to order is taught to be this: the female chief assistant, after having placed the folded palms on the ears [she should place them] on the head. As for the sponsor, he should perform a prostration of the eight parts [of the body].

Understand samāhītāya as samāhitatvāya. It is slightly unusual that the absolutive and the finite verb have different subjects, but otherwise the verse does not seem to make sense. It is also somewhat unusual that the chief assistant (elsewhere, as in the Tibetan translation, karmavajrin) is female, but this reading as well as its interpretation as instrumental is reinforced by the glossator. The point of her gesture (karaṇī) is to call the participants to attention. This feature is not paralleled in any other manual known to me.

The absolutive should probably be understood as a present participle. Alternatively, offering the bali and worshipping the three groups are distinct. The compound tattvatatparaḥ may suggest that the worshipper should be aware of the ultimate nature of the mentioned deities. The last group, namely the mantradevas, is interpreted by the glossator as genii locorum. The word ratna is frequently translated as “jewel,” but the actual meaning is simply “precious material,” including some metals.

After having given the food offering, which is [to be] placed in a vessel [made of some kind of] precious material [such as gold and silver] or something else [such as clay], the one intent on reality (i.e., the chief officiant) should worship the supramundane Victors, the mundane [gods], and the mantra gods.

He should [then] satisfy all [participants] with the great nectar and the ten hooks [which are placed] in a skull bowl and empowered by recitation according to the intent of the Tantra.
The transgressive substances, normally referred to as samayas, here called great (or “special”) nectars (mahāmṛta) and hooks (āṅkuśa) – both collective singulars – are placed in a skull cup (padmabhāṇḍa), empowered by recitation, and distributed. Although not mentioned here, it is usually understood that the substances are provided in small quantities (usually fashioned into a pellet) and dissolved in liquor (cf. SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 327 ff.; SAKURAI 2001: 19). Correct sarvās to sarvāṃs. The recipients are not described clearly; they could be the three groups mentioned above or, as the glossator would have it and what seems more likely, the participants themselves. We should accept the Tibetan reading and emend to tantrābhīprāya°; the glossator’s reading tattvābhīprāya° seems to be a corruption of this. The substances are alluded to below by their acronyms (see v. 16).

Two points are noteworthy here. The first is that the meats are usually called pradīpas (“lamps”), āṅkuśa is a somewhat less used term and inextricably linked to the Čatuspīṭhatantra (SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 315, 348–349). The influence of that text is observable also in v. 17, which features the odd word chiḍinga. The second interesting point is that here, as well as in v. 18, the hooks are said to number ten, but in fact this is the total number of the nectars and the meats (see commentary on v. 16). The glossator discreetly ignores this problem.

[10] sarvāḥ sādhāraṇāḥ pūjāḥ sarvaguhyottarottarāḥ ||
mahāsukhapade sthitā vartetā gaṇāṇaẏakaḥ ||

All common acts of worships and all [acts of worship which are] utterly and ultimately secret should be performed by the leader of the assembly [after having] established [himself] in the state of great bliss.

Perhaps it would make the verse more elegant to emend to sarvā guhyo°. The medial optative varteta is a barbaric form, understand vartayeta.

vipulaguṇaviśālā tatvatas tatvayogā |
hrdi vīgatavikalpā sarvanepathyayuktā
prthuṇṭarakucauygūṃ sandade kāntiḥbhāṇḍam ||

The vessel with the charming [substances] should be presented by a shy woman, whose lotus-face is bent, who is rich in extensive virtues, who is truly suitable for truth, in whose heart discursiveness has disappeared,
who is wearing all kinds of makeup, and who has a pair of exceedingly large breasts.

This verse in the mālinī metre picks up the ninth stanza. The vessel with the consecrated transgressive substances is presented (understand: distributed?) to the assembly. The usage kāntī for the amṛtas and aṅkuśas in the vessel is unknown to me from elsewhere, but this is what it must mean (see also v. 33). It is not clear who this attractive young woman is, perhaps the same as the karmavajrini mentioned above (v. 7) or the officiant’s consort. We must emend prthuṃtara to prthutara. The form sandade probably stands for samadet, another barbaric optative for samadhyāt. Kuladatta paraphrases the verse thus (SAKURAI 2001: 20): īṣannamramukhapadā (I conjecture this reading for īṣattāmra against Sakurai, his mss., and the Tibetan translation) ghananirantarataruṅgastanayugalā (I prefer this, the mss.’s reading, over Sakurai’s ghananirantarā tuṅgastanayugalā) sarvābharaṇaviḥūṣitā ativistaragunayuktā manovikalparahitā savinayā yeśid [...] “A woman, whose lotus-face is slightly bent, who has a pair of breasts which are firm, with no space in-between and very prominent, who is decorated with various kinds of ornaments, who is endowed with extensive virtues, who is free from mental conceptualisations, who is shy, [...]” There she is also to recite a verse. Note that Kuladatta does not render the most obscure of her descriptions, tattvatas tattvayogyā (the point is perhaps that she must be suitable for nondual, antinomian practice), at the same time, there is a striking parallel between his paraphrase and the glossator’s text, which breaks off at this point.

[12] kāyeṃdhanaṃ samuṣjāya jñānasaptārcisā svayāṃ ||
tatvahomāya vaktrādau pātaye|v|d rasādikāṃ ||

After having kindled at will the firewood (here: constituents) of the body (or: one’s person) with the fire of gnosis, one should drop the juice etc. in the mouth etc. in order [to achieve] the fire sacrifice of reality.

We should either emend to pātayeta to fix the metre or read pātayed with a slight pause after it. Also, samuṣjāya should be corrected to samuṣjāłyā. Juice (rasa) must mean the nectars (amṛta), in which case ādi stands for the meats. The meaning of ādau is beyond my understanding; perhaps we have a double sandhi, that is to say, we must understand vaktre ādau, where the word “first” is picked up by tato in the next verse. Alternatively,
ādau stands for the other points in the body which are reached by nectars. Otherwise the general import of this and of the next two verses is fairly clear: the tasting of the transgressive substances (normally amṛtāsvāda/na) is framed here as an internalised fire sacrifice (tattvahoma), where the fuel is the body, the fire is knowledge, and the oblation the aforementioned substances. The word svayāṃ is also slightly difficult, perhaps it does not mean more than “spontaneously” or “at will.” There are some similarities with what the commentator Bhavabhaṭṭa calls guhyahoma in the Catuspīṭhatantra (see SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 452–453).

[13] tato hṛccamdradamadhyaṃstham bimduvaṃmahāvibhum ||
athavā sveṣṭadevādiṃ cakrābharaṇabhūṣitaṃ ||

Thereafter, the deity [in form of a] drop, the great pervasive Lord located on a moon-disk in the heart, or one’s chosen deity, etc. adorned with the retinue

The worshipped recipient of this internal homa is said to be the deity either in an aniconic or iconic form. The former is in the shape of a drop (bindu) atop a moon-disk in the heart. The latter appears in the fully visualised form adorned either with a discus or, more likely (also cf. Kuladatta’s paraphrase, māṇḍaleya°, below), his retinue (cakra). Kuladatta seems to conflate the two, since he writes (SAKurai 2001: 21): tato mano-
’targatasākṣmabudbudākārapratimaṃ (I conjecture this reading against Sakurai’s °buddhabuddhākārapratimaṃ inspired by the reading of the Cambridge ms., not consulted by the Japanese editor, which is itself corrupt but more revealing: °budbuddhākāra°) mahāprabhum (I disagree with Sakurai’s mahāprabhu°) māṇḍaleyadevatāsahitam […] snāpayet; “Thereafter, he should bathe the great pervasive Lord accompanied by the deities of the manḍala (i.e., his retinue) in the shape of a subtle bubble within his heart.” budbuda, “bubble,” seems to paraphrase the word bindu.

[14] anāmānguṣṭhabhimbvagrāis tritatsvommatitaḥsuraṃ ||
svalpiḥvāgrasannyaastaḥ sudhādārāṃbubhiḥ snapet ||

should be bathed by oozing streams of nectar [emitted from the substances blazing with] rays [owing to their] having been agitated by the three realities (i.e., three mantras) placed on the tip of the tongue in a small quantity by the [joined] tips of the ring finger and the thumb.
Taking the substances with the joined ring finger and thumb is a standard and old feature, compare the section on the earliest textual sources above. The reading °bimdv° is very problematic, a (somewhat diagnostic) conjecture °baddha° would solve the problem. The three tattvas must mean three mantras, which purify (again?) the substances. The Catuspīṭhatantra teaches the triad ha, hoḥhoḥ, and hrīṛṛḥ (SZÁNTÓ 2013: I: 331, 440), which removes the disagreeable colour, smell, and potency respectively. Kuladatta (SAKURAI 2001: 19) seems to teach aṃla, hah, and hoḥ to purify the liquor holding the nectars and meats and the standard om, āḥ, hūṃ to empower it. He also uses the root math in the same context, but there it is taken literally to mean mixing in with the ring finger and the thumb. We should probably emend svalpajihvāgra° to svalpaṃ jihvāgra° and understand the irregular simplex to stand for the causative snāpayet. The description is elliptical, but perhaps we are not very far from the point: the substances are first placed in a small quantity on the tongue, and as they are swallowed, they turn into streams of nectar which then bathe the deity.

[15] nābhicakrothitair nādair ākṛṣyākṛṣya tadasaṃ ||
puṭikātrayataḥ pītvā mahāyogī sukham vaset ||

Gradually drawing in that nectar with subtle sounds (or: channels) arising from the discus in the navel, after having taken three sips, the great yogin[s] should rest at ease.

The first line of this verse seems to describe this gradual journey aided by subtle sounds (nāda) or perhaps channels (if we emend to nāla) issuing from the cakra in the navel. Kuladatta (SAKURAI 2001: 21) has vital energies to correspond to this element: tato nābhīmaṇḍalagatāyāmavāyubhis tadasaṃ ākṛṣya [...]; “Then, after having drawn in that nectar by means of the restraining[-type] of vital energies located in the discus of the navel [...].” The word puṭikā in this sense is unattested elsewhere (our standard dictionaries give “bag” or “vessel”), save Kuladatta’s text as transmitted in the Cambridge ms.; Sakurai accepted ghūṭikā° (ibid.). I am also inclined to emend puṭikā° to ghūṭikā°, especially after having consulted TURNER’s entry on ghūṭt, “gulp, swallow” (1962–1966: 242), a word ultimately of Dravidian origin. The two letters pa and gha look very similar in Old Newar and other East Indian scripts. The subject, mahāyogī, should be understood as a collective singular.
[16] vimūmaraśu _ _ d anyac ca dahanagupanaṃcakam ||
tantratamtrāṃtare proktam anyac cāpi mahāṃrtaṇa ||

[The substances are:] faeces, urine, meat, [menstrual] blood, semen as well as [the meats of] a horse, an elephant, a human being, a cow, and a dog. But there are other [such lists of] great nectars taught in various Tantras.

This is a description of the transgressive substances by their acronyms. The nectars are vi [faeces (viṣ)], mū [urine (mūtra)], mā [meat (māṃsa)], ra [menstrual blood (rakta)], and śu [semen (śukra)]. The hooks are da [horse or elephant (damya/dantin)], ha [elephant or horse (hastin/haya)], na [human (nara)], go [cow (go)], and ku [dog (kukkura)]. The second line seems to state that there are other possible lists for the nectars. By this perhaps the following is meant: the duplication of meat is usually taken for granted, but there is another list, which incidentally tallies better with the Śaiva tradition, where māṃsa is replaced by phlemg (kheṭa), see, e.g., SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 358–359. It is not entirely clear why the scribe signals two lost/illegible syllables in the first quarter. With lengthening ॐ (for māṃsa), the quarter should read vimūmāraśum anyac ca.

[17] chidringa sarvato dadyād amṭarikṣasthitāya tat ||
viro viṛāya devāya sarvadeviṃaṇāya ca ||

The hero should offer sprinklings [of] that [mixture of substances] in all directions to the hero (i.e., the chief officiant), to the gods, and to the assembly of various goddesses [visualised] in the sky.

After tasting the substances, they should be offered to the officiant, the deity, and the goddesses. It is only the latter two who should be visualised in the sky, as the officiant is present. This happens through sprinkling, which is the meaning of the odd and specifically Catuspīṭha word chidringa, also spelt chidriṅga (SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 334).

[18] tatvaṃ daśāṅkuśam prāpya dāṭṇām cittaśuddhay ||
pratipāta _ sākalyam bāhyadeviṃā ḍhaukayet ||
After having obtained the ten hooks, reality, in order to purify the minds of the sponsors †...† should be offered to the external gods.

This verse is corrupt, but perhaps the point is that some of the aforementioned offering is extended to outer gods, so that the minds of the sponsors (note the plural) are purified. The connection between the two is not readily apparent.

[19] bhūtānāṃ sarvabuddhatvam sarvabuddhatvam karunābalaiḥ ||

vajraghaṇṭānvitaiḥ stotraiś cakravarī tam arcayet ||

The one strong in compassion should propitiate the universal ruler (i.e., the deity) with praises accompanied by [shaking] the vajra-sceptre and [sounding] the bell, so that all beings may achieve absolute buddhahood.

For bhūtānāṃ the Tibetan has sems can rnams la, which may suggest a variant *sattvānāṃ. Emend “buddhatvam to “buddhaṃ”. Since we are lacking a subject and because the adjective is not apposite to stotra, we must emend karunābalaiḥ to karunābalaḥ to describe the officiant. We would have a subject in the final quarter, however, here there is nothing to pick up the pronoun tam, therefore we are constrained to emend to cakravartinam, meaning the deity, the object of the finite verb. Understand vajraghaṇṭānvitaiḥ as an elliptical compound meaning “accompanied by shaking the vajra-sceptre and sounding the bell,” alternatively, “accompanied by sounding the vajra-bell,” so called because the bell is topped by a half-vajra.

[20] śṛṃgārābhinayenaivaṃ datvā naivedyabhājanam ||

pratyekam sarvam ekaṃ vā śuddhyaśuddhaviparyayath ||

After having offered thus (?), with an (or: with the same?) erotic gesture, a vessel [containing] food, either one each or the same to all, overturning [the concepts of] pure and impure,

This verse is also puzzling. We should probably understand that the naivedya vessel presented here is not the padmabhāṇḍa with the transgressive substances, but a new vessel with food. The third quarter seems to evoke two scenarios: there is only one vessel and everyone eats from that (which is of course highly impure by Indic standards) or there are as many vessels
as participants. At any rate, the text enjoins that conventional values of purity-impurity should be suspended, indeed, overturned (we should emend to śuddhāśuddha° or śuddhyaśuddhi°). The first quarter describes the gesture with which the vessel is presented. This is elsewhere (e.g. in the Kriyāsamgrahapañjikā, see Sakurai 2001: 20; Szántó 2012: I: 327) called the kanalāvarttamudrā, an elegant gesture with which the vessel containing the samayas is received and passed on. If we emend evaṃ to eva, this would mean that the naivedya vessel is to be handled in the same way. However, the gesture was not mentioned before.

[21] yathēṣṭham bhojanaīḥ pānair nānāpūjākadamāṃbakaḥ ||
yathāsukham yatheṣṭam ca vaded dātā ca vajarīṇī ||

[a vessel accompanied] with food and drink, as much as desired, [as well as] a multitude of offerings, the sponsor should say to the initiates “as you please” or “as you wish.”

The first line should probably be construed with naivedyabhājanam from the previous verse (while correcting yathēṣṭham to yatheṣṭam). Then, the sponsor should utter the words “as you please” or “as you wish” (emend the first ca to vā or understand it to have that meaning). We should also emend vajarīṇī to vajarīnām, i.e., the initiates addressed by him. The point of this utterance seems to be that the strictly formalised part of the rite is over, and the feasting can begin. This is a standard feature of the rite (e.g. the Kriyāsamgrahapañjikā, see Sakurai 2001: 21), although the older, scrip- tural injunction does not make it clear who says the words (cf. Szántó 2012: I: 341).

[22] iti vigatavikalpaḥ simhavan nirviśāṃko
bhavaśamapadasamsīhas tatvasadbhāvayuktāḥ ||
svahṛdayasamaprajñāḥ kaiśikādīn pragāyana
sakalajinaganāughān pūjayen nṛtyato ‘pi ||

Thus, [the officiant,] uninhibited like a lion [roaming at will], in whom conceptualisation has waned, who is [equally situated] in transmigration and liberation, who is merged with the true essence of reality, accompanied by the consort pleasing to his heart, should worship the mass of all Victors singing [in various musical scales] beginning with the kaiśika, and also with dance.
There follows a session of song and dance as acts of worship. This part is
opened by the officiant accompanied by his consort (praṇā). kaiṣika is a
kind of musical scale (rāga).

[23] yasya haste pateto pātraṃ kramaśāḥ karavartanaḥ ||
bhaven mohād avajñair vā tiraskāri sa daṇḍabhāk ||

Should the vessel drop from one’s hand [during] the gradual activity of
the arms (i.e., passing the vessel around) because of lack of attention or
disgust, that person is an offender liable for punishment.

The next two verses address the issue of fines or punishments meted out in
case of slight misdemeanours such as dropping the vessel or lack of deco-
rum. Emend haste to hastā.

[24] kasyacit avinayotpanne manovākkāyakarmabhiḥ ||
yuktāṃ tasya prakalpeta daṇḍa gaṇḍādiśāmtaye ||
[Gloss in lower margin:] kapardakapalacatuṣṭayaṃ

Should one commit indecorous thoughts, speech, or deeds, it is fitting to
mete out punishment in order to counteract [karmic retribution] such as
boils. [Gloss: four weights of cowrie shells]

Emend °otpanne to °otpannaiḥ and daṇḍa to daṇḍaṃ. The idea that one
will become infected with boils (gaṇḍa) as karmic retribution for indeco-
rous thoughts, speech, or deeds is otherwise unknown to me. The Tibetan
omits rendering this word. The gloss is a rather interesting detail: to my
knowledge, this is the only case in this kind of literature where a well-
deﬁned penalty is mentioned. The amount, four palas of cowrie shells (on
the monetary use of which see GOPAL 1989: 213–214), seems rather mea-
gre. Unbecoming acts, according to, e.g., the Mahāmudrātilaka (ms. fol.
47v, the passage is copied from the Vajramālābhidhāna, Tōh. 445, 267b),
include chatting, quarrelling, expectorating, laughing, stretching the limbs,
getting up again and again, and singing or dancing without permission from
the officiant. Quarrelling during the gaṇacakra is singled out as a gross
trespass in several works containing lists thereof (e.g. LÉVI 1929: 268: gaṇacakra
vivādakārinaḥ […] sthūlāpatīr bhavati), but it is not made clear
what the subject of such a quarrel may be.
That best of experts, after having mutually propitiated [his consort] with displays of gestures with the two hands [and] nectar[-like] merriments of amorous sport and play, as prescribed,

For *vidhivat tatvatām varaḥ* there are several possible emendations: *vidhivat tadvidām varaḥ, vidhitattvavidām varaḥ*, less likely *vidhivat tattvatatparaḥ*, since we have the same compound following the predicate in the next verse.

The last quarter is an explicit mention of intercourse, since *prajñā* and *upāya* are codewords for the female and male initiates.

Emend *yajñavad* to *yajñavid*. The precise meaning of the third quarter escapes me. An exegete, Mahāsukhavajra, states in his commentary to the *Candamahāroṣanatantra* (*Padminī* ms. fol. 30r): *suratayoga evaikasmin saj pāramitāḥ pūritā bhavanti* | “The six perfections become fulfilled in a single place, the yoga of intercourse.” The list of six is older, but in later literature both are used interchangeably. Achieving the perfections (of giving etc.) occurs through arduous and lengthy practice in the non-Tantric Mahāyāna; the Tantric mode of practice has the same aim, but it offers a “shortcut.”
[28] kṣamitvā gamṭukāmo pi sāmjalim saṃmukham gataḥ ||
kāryaṃ kṛtvāgato dhīmān praviṣet praṇato nataḥ ||

As for a person wishing to leave [the assembly temporarily], he should, after having excused himself, depart with folded hands, facing [the officiant]. Having finished his business, the wise one should return and enter bowing dutifully.

This verse contains the rule for excusing oneself to leave the assembly temporarily. Emend sānjalim to sānjaliḥ, and praṇato nataḥ to prayato nataḥ or praṇato ‘bhitaḥ.

[29] sadā yogātmako bhūtvā sadā tatvaparāyaṇah ||
sadā vinayasampannah sadā cakraṃ samācaret ||

One should consistently perform the [gana]cakra, [and he should do so] always intent on yoga, always dedicated to reality, and always with due decorum.

A general injunction. The final sadā is perhaps superfluous, unless we are to understand it as a call to celebrate the ritual periodically.

[30] pakvāṇnam iva vīrānāḥ mudrā sādhāraṇā smṛtā ||
tasmān niḥśeṣakāmena svāṃ parāṃś caiva pūjayeta ||

Just like (the?) cooked food, the mudrā[ḥ] [consort[s]’ hand gesture[s]?] [are] taught to be common to [all] heroes (i.e., the male initiates). One should therefore worship one’s private [mudrā], but also those of others, with all objects of desire.

Understand the second quarter as collective singulars; alternatively, emend to mudrāḥ sādhāraṇāḥ smṛtāḥ. I am forced to emend svāṃ parāṃś to svāṃ parāś, and we must correct the predicate to pūjayet metri causa. The overall meaning is somewhat obscure. The cooked food perhaps refers back to the communal naivedya vessel. The verse might suggest that the female participants must yield sexually to all.
[31] yāvat svechā sadānandaṃ līlayā tatvalīlayā ||
tāvat tattvānijāṃ pūjāṃ kartavyāṃ prajñayānayā ||

The worship of reality as oneself (!?) should be performed together with this (?) consort (wisdom?) until one so desires, with true bliss, with grace, with the grace of reality (?).

We should correct to svechā and emend to tattvānijā pūjā kartavyā. The strange sadānanda seems to be adverbial. The overall meaning is obscure: the act of self-worship together with the consort (prajñā) should be continued while it causes pleasure?

[32] cakṣurādiṃ mahopāyai rūpādi lalānāgaṇaih ||
vijñānena mahānandaṃ bāhye nityaṃ pravartayet ||

After having empowered] the eyes etc. (i.e., the sense faculties) and form etc. (i.e., the respective objects of the sense faculties) [as] the host of [divine] women together with their consorts, with this awareness (?) one should constantly activate great bliss in the external [world].

This verse, too, is obscure. I conjecture that it may be an injunction to empower the senses (eyes etc.) as the goddesses (emend to "lalanā"), e.g. Rūpavajrā etc., together with their male consorts (in which case we must emend to sahopāyā) and thus, with this knowledge, one should experience great bliss with respect to external sensory objects during ordinary activities, i.e., outside meditation sessions. At least this accords with general Tantric practice.

[33] kuliśakamalāṇṭīṃ camdraśubhraṃ suṣubhraṃ
gṛṇivisaratirajnaughān niḥsvabhāvān svabhāvān ||
atitararātiramātṛṣaṃ prajñāyā sājñāyā ca
vīhati mukhaśuddhyā sarvasatvaṃ susatvaḥ ||

This verse is beyond my comprehension.

[34] atha visajjane prāpte maṃgalāgīṭhitotrataḥ ||
stavitvā sarvadevānāṃ cakrānām ca saṃakṣataḥ ||
Next, once the time for dismissal has arrived, after having chanted praises with hymns of auspicious songs, in the presence of all deities and [the participants of] the assembly,

This is the last section proper of the rite, the dismissal of deities and the participants. Understand maṅgalagīrīṣotraṁ: the irregular lengthening is required by the metre (but note that the very same rule is broken in the first quarter), whereas the suffix taḥ stands for a plural instrumental. stavitvā means stutvā. cakrāṇāṃ must mean the participants of the cakra.

[35] dātṛṇābhhyaksarā śisyā samajñya jinasamvaraṃ ||
sarvabuddhāni buddhatve cānusamśya niruttare ||

[the officiant] should besprinkle the sponsors, then [re]appoint [his] good disciples to the vow[s] of the Victors (i.e., buddhas), then praise (i.e., foretell? pray for?) all beings [to reach] unsurpassed buddhahood,

I conjecture dātṛn abhyuksya sacchisyān [...] saṃvare | sarvabhūtāni [...] cānuśamsya. For the plural “sponsors,” cf. v. 18 above. The Tibetan suggests placing a flower on the head of the sponsor. The accusative saṃvaraṃ is perhaps original; note, however, that the Tibetan does not mirror disciples, but has another absolutive meaning “having uttered auspicious words.” The second line is more obscure: note the irregular accusative neuter; the Tibetan also suggests plural bhūtān.

[36] ucchiṣṭadevān saṃtusya samāṣṭyā mahābaliṃ ||
dharmajñānātmako bhūtvā yunjīta matimān śubhāṃ ||

then propitiate the deities of the leftovers [by] having dispersed a great food offering. Then the clever one should perform [this] auspicious [practice] after having developed in himself the gnosis of the doctrine:

Understand or correct saṃtusya as/to saṃtosya. śubhāṃ should perhaps be emended to subhe with the meaning subhāya, in which case the translation would be: “the clever one should perform [the following] yogic exercise for the sake of auspiciousness.” For this practice (vv. 36cd–39), we once again have a parallel with the Kriyāsamgrahapanjikā (SAKURAI 2001: 21): tadānu nairātmajñānātmako buddhimān svaśirasā (although widely attested, I cannot make sense of svasvaśirasā, which I have corrected) ūrdhvam vi-
tastimātropari sravadaparyantajñānāmṛtadhāraṁ (Sakurai reproduces the present participle outside the compound) candramāṇḍalāṁ vibhāvya | tad-madhye svasvadevatābhijāni || sthire sati hṛdantaḥsūrirasthacandra-
maṇḍalopari (Sakurai reads hṛdantaḥsvāśirṣṭaṅ, which does not make sense to me) svasvadevatācihnāni yavaphalapramāṇāni vibhāvya pṛñayet ||

“Thereafter, the wise one, who has interiorised the gnosis of selflessness, should visualise one span above his head a moon-disk oozing boundless streams of gnosis-nectar. Then, in the middle of that [he should visualise] each deity’s seed[>]syllable]. When this [visualisation] has become stable, he should visualise on a moon-disk situated within the subtle space in his heart each deity’s implement measuring a barleycorn [each]. Then he should propitiate [himself as the deity].” According to Kuladatta’s paraphrase, dharmajñānātmakah means nairāmyajñānātmakah.

[37] kīṣkumātropari sūkṣmaṁ dhyātvā dharmālayāṁ jinaṁ ||
anantāmṛtavat tasmāt skravāntāṃ cintayet svake ||

After having visualised one cubit above [his head] a subtle abode of the doctrine, that of the Victors (i.e., a moon-disk), containing endless [amounts of] nectar, he should think that [streams of nectar] ooze from that onto his head.

Again judging from Kuladatta’s paraphrase quoted above, the dharmālayāṁ jinaṁ anantāmṛtavat must be a moon-disk oozing nectar. The author could not write jaināṁ for metrical reasons, but this is the meaning. Emend skravaṇtāṁ to sravantāṁ. Note that kīṣkumātropari […] svake was somewhat reformulated in Kuladatta’s paraphrase. It may be significant that this distance is twice as much as the dvādaśānta of the Śaiva tradition, note, however, that Kuladatta’s vitasti could be equal to that length.

[38] siddhārthamātra[2v]sūkṣmaṁ tat cihnaṁ vā vajrīnaṁ svakaṁ ||
vajrāgre nāśikāgre vā dhyātvā sphārayate sthire ||

Or, after having visualised either the holder of the vajra (i.e., the deity) himself or his [chief] implement (i.e., a vajra-sceptre), small in size like a mustard seed, on the tip of the vajra (i.e., the penis) or the tip of his nose. Once [the visualisation is] stable, he should emit [the nectar].
This verse is somewhat obscure. It seems to present alternatives for the moon-disk visualised above the head. If this is correct, then Kuladatta reinterpreted the passage freely, since there is no mention of the insignia of the deity (tat cihnaṃ should then be corrected to taccihnaṃ) or the deity himself (understand svakaṃ as svayam) as a suitable variant, nor does he give alternatives for the locus of visualisation (alternatively, svakaṃ is perhaps a corruption of svake, “on his head,” but that would be a repetition). For sphārayate, we should probably understand sphāray. We should also read sthire as a locative absolute as in Kuladatta. Of course, there is a variety of further ways in which one could emend the text, but this is the one that seems most likely to me.

[39] ṛṛdayāmbaramadhyesmin akhaṇḍaśaśiṃandalam ||
tatra dharmasamālīnaṃ sūkṣmavajraṃ sadā smaret ||
yavaphalapramānaṃ ca _ _ vajram bhāvayet ||

In the middle of the subtle space in his heart, he should imagine a disk [in the shape of a] full moon, and on that, joined with [that abode of] the doctrine, [he should] always [visualise] a small vajra-sceptre †...† measuring a barley corn †...†

This stanza too is obscure and corrupt. The compound dharmasamālīnaṃ is somewhat puzzling (but we had dharmālaya in v. 37 describing the moon-disk), as is the sixth verse quarter. The word sadā is a mere verse-filler.

[40] karuṇādirasopetaṃ trivimokṣaṃ manomayam ||
sarvākārārthasaṃyuktam nirvikāramahāsukham ||

Endowed with the essence of foremost compassion, [having the nature of] the three liberations, consisting of mind, endowed with †...† all aspects, unchangeable great bliss–

Here we have another parallel with the Kriyāsamgrahapañjikā (SAKURAI 2001: 21–22): tato yogatatparo yogi prajñopāyasvabhāvo mahākarunārasasanyuktaṃ viṃokṣatrayasvabhāvam sarvavastusamśuddham avikāraparamārthasukham sarvakarmasu sarvaprakārāneṇāntatathāgataparamaramārupaṃ vicinīyat ||; “Then, the yogin, dedicated to yoga, having the nature of wisdom of and means, should contemplate [the resolve of enlightenment] as being joined with the essence of great compassion, having the
nature of the three liberations, pure regarding all things (?), [equal to] the unchangeable bliss of absolute truth, having the supreme form of endless Tathāgatas, in all rituals, in all aspects.” If Kuladatta’s reading is correct, beginning with v. 40 we have a new topic, a general injunction concerning all rituals undertaken subsequently by the yogin. I suspect that Kuladatta’s text is missing the actual object of contemplation, which is the resolve of enlightenment, which is also semen in the Tantric tradition (bodhicitta), as we have it here (41c). My interpretation of karunādi° is somewhat unusual (not “compassion etc.”), but it is inspired by Kuladatta’s mahākarunā°. The point is that this is not common compassion, but the compassion felt by the Buddhist practitioner in spite of his/her knowledge that all beings and existents are ultimately empty (lacking an inherent nature). The three liberations, also often called gateways thereof, are śānyatā (emptiness), animitta (causelessness), and apranāhiita (desirelessness). Kuladatta’s sarvavastusamśuddham seems to mirror manomayaṃ, but I do not quite see how. Alternatively, it mirrors sarvākārārthasamyuktaṃ, an opaque expression. Emptiness is frequently described as sarvākārarvaropetaṃ, “endowed with all best aspects.” Perhaps °artha° is a corruption for a synonym of °vara°. Kuladatta’s °anantatathāgatakaramarūpaṃ does not seem to have an equivalent in our text, unless this is the way in which he intended to say bodhicitta, which is not impossible.

[41] prajnopāyātmaka yogī sarvakarmaṇī sarvathā ||
saṃbodhicittasadrūpaṃ ciṃtayet tatvatatparaḥ ||

[thus] should the yogin, who [unites] within himself wisdom and means [and] is dedicated to reality, contemplate the true nature of the resolve of perfect enlightenment in all [subsequent] rituals, at all times.

[42] prāṇamamtrākṣarair japtaṃ bindu prakṛtibhāsvaram ||
dharmādharmair vinirmuktam tatvataḥ paribhāvayet ||

He should contemplate the bindu, luminous by its very nature, recited with the syllables of the mantras of the vital energies (?), as utterly free of both dharma and adharma (?).

Emend to bindun. Judging from Kuladatta’s paraphrase, this verse and the next one do not form part of the practice previously described. What exactly the first quarter refers to is beyond my comprehension, since the bindu,
that is to say, the anusvāra crowning mantra-syllables, is not recited on its own. In any case, we are assured in the next verse that this practice, whatever it may be, or practice in general, is conducive to liberation.

[43] tatkāle sarvakāle vā mokṣodyamaparāyaṇah ||
kṛtvābhyāsaṁ sadākālam sa labhen mokṣasampadaṁ ||

Whether at that time (i.e., the gaṇacakra) or any other time, if the one dedicated to the effort [which brings about] liberation performs the practice consistently, he will obtain the accomplishment of liberation.

[44] sampūjyaṁ jagatāṁ manorathaparāṃ sarveṇa dānādinā
piṣṭvā sarvavikalpaḥmohagamṣadāṃ nairāṃtyavajrādinā ||
yāś cakramaḥ prativrataṁ jinaḥ parādāṃ mokṣadāṃ
tasyāryasya kṛpāparasya mahato nityām bhrāṁ śreyase ||

The supreme wish of people should be honoured with everything, giving etc. He, who after having destroyed with [weapons] beginning with the vajra-sceptre of selflessness the city of delusion [founded on] various conceptualisations, celebrates the knowledge-raising, liberation-giving assembly of the Victor-Guru, for such a great, noble man, intent on compassion, there will always be great success.

This somewhat obscure verse in the śārdūlavikṛḍita metre, which I have translated rather freely, describes the benefits of the practice (phalāśruti). Before jagatāṁ, the scribe first wrote sarva, but then realised his mistake and deleted it. Understand prativrata as simply vartayati or emend to parivrata. The compound jinaḥguror is unusual and unparalleled. It is also somewhat unclear who the intended beneficiary is. Perhaps it is the sponsor(s), but it is equally possible that all the participants are meant.

[45] gaṇāya gambhrāṇunopayuktaye
vikalpakalpājitakleśahārīne ||
savāsanāvāsavimuktamuktaye
vibhāvabhāvāya namo stu yogine ||

Homage to the yogi[s], [members of] the assembly, endowed with profound virtues, [they] who remove the obscurations acquired due to conceptualisations [entertained] through the aeons, [they] who possess lib-
eration free from the abode of latent imprints, [they] who [are beyond both] liberation and bound existence.

The work concludes with four verses of praise, and it is perhaps here that the author’s idiosyncratic usage is most visible. Apparently, he strives to achieve poetic effect through alliterative yamakas (vikalpakalpa°, savāsanāvāsa°, vibhāvabhāvāya in the first verse) and by using somewhat more sophisticated metres (vamšastha, upajāti, vamšastha, and svāgatā respectively), much to the detriment of lucidity. We should most likely understand “upayuktaye as simply “yuktāya. Emend “ājita° to “ārjita° or “ācita° and understand the first members of the compound in reverse, that is to say, kalpārjitavikalpa° or kalppācitatavikalpa°. It is helpful to go into “soft focus” while interpreting the third quarter. vibhāva probably stands for abhāva, that is to say, nirvāṇa. The object of obeisance in this verse is most likely the group of male participants (in which case we take gaṇāya literally and understand yogine as a collective singular; this interpretation is supported by the next verse) or, perhaps less likely, the officiant (in which case we understand yogine literally and gaṇāya as gaṇanāyakāya).

[46] vibhūšaṇair bhūṣitayāmgayaśtyā
cakrāmbare caṇḍrakaleva dhāmnā ||
karoti yā kṛtyakalāpakāya
namo stu tāyai lalanāgaṇāyai ||

Homage to that assembly of ladies, whose slender bodies are adorned with ornaments, who resemble the digit of the moon because of their lustre as they move through the sky that is the assembly, performing all duties.

This somewhat freely translated verse describes and pays obeisance to the female participants. The datives are at the very least irregular, note especially tāyai for tasyai.

[47] salaukikām lokagurum sacakriṇam
vibhāya bhāvyam jagatām vimuktaye ||
hitāśayā yo nukaroti maṇḍalam
namo stu tasmai gaṇacakravartine ||
Homage to the leader (lit. universal monarch) of the assembly, who, after having visualised [all] that needs to be visualised – the teacher of the world (i.e., the Buddha or Vajrasattva) together with the worldly deities and the retinue – with the intention of [bringing spiritual] benefit [for beings], imitates the maṇḍala for the liberation of the world.

This verse pays obeisance to the leader of the assembly. Understand sacakriṇaṁ as sacakraṇaṁ and hitāśayā as hitāśayena. For anukaroti, the Tibetan reads *atra karoti (SHIZUKA 2011: 69). In this case, we should translate: “who performs the maṇḍala[rite] ... in this world.”

\[\text{[48] sarvasatva}\text{[3r]}\text{gatinirmalabhāva-}\text{bhāvanodbhavamahāsukhipiṇḍam ||}\n\text{piṇḍitottamaparārtham udāraṁ}\n\text{dārayā saha name kṛtasarvam ||}\n
I pay homage to him, together with [his/my] consort, who has performed all, who [possesses] a heap of great bliss born from meditation on the spotless nature of [he] who is the refuge of all beings (i.e., the deity), who has distilled the supreme benefit for others, the lofty one.

The obscure final verse also eulogises the chief officiant. Alternatively, the object of homage is in the first line, i.e., great bliss, in which case the obeisance is performed by the author together with his consort, which is perhaps what the Tibetan translation suggests (SHIZUKA 2011: 69). Understand °gati° as śaraṇam, alternatively emend to °gata° following the Tibetan. The reading dārayā is guaranteed by the metre; ironically, the correct form would be dāraīḥ.

|| ganacakravidhiḥ samāptah ||

The Ritual Procedure for the Gaṇacakra is completed.
Diplomatic edition of the fragmentary gloss

|| namo buddhāya || ||

tṁtṛesv abhiśiktānāṁ caryāyatavennānāṁ ganacakravidhānāṁ ānta-
renā siddhir na bhavatīt kṛtvā vighnōtrānāya mahate siddhayā prāpanā-
ṛthom || sveṣādevamahāvajramdhananamaskārapūrvakagaṅacakravidhā-
nasya saṁśīptā pāṃjīkyam || ||

[ad 1] tatrādau tāvat || vajrasatvam iti || abhedāyuktiparamārthasa-
vam bhāvābhāvantakam iti || saṃyṛtiparamārthārūpe || vibhūṣ prabhūṣ ||
sabodhipakṣyogāt sarvakāma iti, mahāsukhakāma tām pradādotītī sa-
rvakāmapradaṃ, devam iti divyatītī devas tām prāṇamyādau aham-
ganamāṇḍalam, yogayoginiḥśjāva>dvayamāṇḍalam vakṣye vadisyāmi ||

[ad 2] nirvikalpaparāḥ || nirvikalpasvabhāvaḥ | maṃtram asyāsti-
ī maṃtrī | nityakālasaṃhitāḥ | niṣadyaka|karmayānaśayanānanaithu-
nādiṣu tātvasūrāṇa samāhitāḥ, sarvatamāṃtrāṇusārajñāḥ, niravaśēsa-
tamāpranugataḥ | daśatattvaśidhānāvīt | daśatattvam iti | bāhyaguhyaḥbhisekī
1 nirvikalpaviśuddhi 2 bāhyaguhyaṃāṇḍalajñāḥ 3 vivekasāmadhikovidaḥ 4
paramārthacaryādbhirataḥ 5 mudrādisarvakamāṇāgaman sarvakarmān-
sārajñāḥ 6 japahomapūjāpravartakah 7 sarvatṛṣṇāvīściruktah 8 yathāya-
thīgocaradharmadeśakah 9 advayasamātāvidhijñāḥ 10 iti || evamvīdo
yogī ganamāṇḍalam ārabhed (= 6c) iti sāṁbhandhaḥ ||

[ad 4] devatāgaṇaṃsaṃkīraṇaḥ | tattvasadbhāvānurakasayaṃvatījanākule,
rūpādipancavisāyānuṣyaḥ vivikte, asajjanajanarakute, ramye gehe, mano-
jen, asmīns tāmre nije pūjyāḥ | para[3v]mārthapūjāṃ samārabhet || ku-
ryād ity arthaḥ |

[ad 5] jyeṣṭhānukramayogena vāmāna pūjanā matāḥ || abhiśekadikṣā-
įjyeṣṭhānukramena vāmānaṇāpījanādikām kartavyaṃ | aṭha vā guṇaṃāhā-
tmanyuṃ guṇaprakarsāc ca, atitheyatvagaurāvāṭ, deśāṃtaragato ’tithitva-
gaurāvāṭ ||
[ad 6] snāṇam gaṇḍhaṃ ca maḷyaṃ ca vastrābharaṇa-lepananam | artha dhūpaṃ yathāsaktyā gaṇamaṇḍalam ārāhet | yathāsaktyā kubjaṃvo(?)-payuktena gaṇacakraṇa kartavyaṃ || śeṣaṃ sugamaṇa ||

[ad 7] samāḥitāya karaṇaḥ prokteṣaḥ karmavajriṇīḥ | karṇ'e ketāṃjaliṃ mūrdhanā kāyavaccitavikṣepārthaṃ yogakaranāḥ karmavajriṇyā gaṇānāṃ pratyekamūrdhṇī anūjaṃ kṛtyā kare kartavyaṃ || paścād dātā cā-śtārgena cakrāṃ prañāmyate ||

[ad 8] baliṃ ratnādibhāṅḍasthaṃ khādyādikām ratnādhāṇḍe sthāpayi-tvā lokottaraṃ jīnān tathāgatādīnā ādau datvaṃ paścāl laukikān harihara-hiranyagarbhādīn maṃṭra-devāṃś ca kṣetrādipratibāṃdhān pūjyat tatvāt-ātparaḥ || arcayet tatvavidhāna-jaṇaḥ ||

[ad 9] tatvāḥhiprāyayogena samāyātitaṃtrakrameṇa padmaḥbhaṅge mahāṃptaṃ || kaṇālādibhāṇḍe paṃcāmrtādikām anūjaśaś caḍau samaya-kusāṃ ca samjapya maṃṭrapūtaṃ kṛtyā sarvān tuṇ ganān pariṣayet || pradātavyaṃ ||

[ad 10] sarvāḥ sādharaṇāḥ pūjyaḥ sakalajagatsukhāvāptakāraṇāḥ sarvaguhougyuottaraḥ niravaśeṣaparāparārāharaḥṣya-nāṃ rahasyatāraḥ || maḥāsukhapade sthitvā prajñopāyasyamarase sthitvā vartanta gaṇanāyakah || taccakrarvātī

[ad 11] vineyanibbhaṇaṃ savinayā yoṣita namravakťraťraṃṇaṃ ḍhanna-mramukhapadamā vipulaṃgūṇaviśālā, ativistaragūṇayuktā tatvā tatvayogyā paramārthahataḥ paramārthagūṇayuktā, ḍṛṇī vīga [explicit ms.]
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Tantric Communities in Context
The recipient of the Tantric Buddhist funeral

Ryugen Tanemura

Opening remarks

In the medieval period, Tantric Buddhism developed various ritual practices not only in the form of private cults but also for patrons in the public domain. One of the ritual practices of the latter is the funeral (antyesī). Therefore, by examining the status of the recipient of such funerals, we can to some extent infer what kinds of people were included in Tantric Buddhist communities or were intended to become members of such communities through the funeral rite. Concerning the Buddhist Tantric funeral, I have worked mainly on the following three texts: the Mrtasugatiniyojana, a manual of the funeral rite by Śūnyasamādhivajra, the final chapter (Anta-sthitikarmoddeśa, “Instruction for the rite at one’s death”) of Padmaśrīmitra’s Mandalopāyikā, and the final chapter (Nīrvatavajrācārāṃśeṣti-lakṣaṇavidhi, “Rules of the funeral of a departed Tantric master”) of Jagadārpaṇa’s Ācāryakriyāsamuccaya. These texts do not explicitly prescribe

---

1 This is a revised English version of TANEMURA 2017.
2 The date of this Indian author is still unclear. On this author, see also TANEMURA 2007. “The last two verses [of the Mrtasugatiniyojana] say that he received the great teaching of the funeral from Venerable Bhadra (Bhadrapāda)” (TANEMURA 2007: 3).
3 We know little about this author. He calls himself Padmaśrī in the final verse. The colophon of the single codex says that he is a maṇḍala master (maṇḍalācārya) at Khasarpāṇa Monastery. For the Khasarpāṇa Monastery, see SANDERSON 2009: 95, n. 178.
4 I have presented a critical edition of the Sanskrit text of the Mrtasugatiniyojana in TANEMURA 2013a and an annotated Japanese translation in TANEMURA 2013b. The latter also presents passages from Guhyasamājatantra commentaries of the Jñānapāda school which are related to the Yoga of Resuscitation (mṛtasamījavana-yoga), thereby pointing out that the practice prescribed in the Mrtasugatiniyojana is closely related to the Jñānapāda school. With regard to the second manual, Padmaśrīmitra’s Maṇḍalopāyikā, I have presented a preliminary edition and annotated Japanese translation of the relevant chapter in TANEMURA 2012b. With regard to the third manual, Ācāryakriyāsamuccaya, I have pointed out that the text is a borrowing
the beneficiaries of the funeral, but we can gather some information about its recipients through the examination of various passages. The purpose of this short paper is to examine such passages from these and related texts that might provide clues about the recipients of the Tantric Buddhist funeral.

**References to the recipients in funeral manuals**

First, I will examine passages from Tantric Buddhist funeral manuals that refer to the recipient of the rite, especially the colophons of some manuals that refer to the status of the recipient. The first passage belongs to the final chapter of Jagaddarpana’s Ācāryakriyāsamuccaya: nirvṛtavajrācāryāntyesṭilakṣaṇavidhiḥ (ms. K fol. 57v1). This chapter colophon indicates that the primary beneficiary of the funeral rite is a Tantric master (ācārya).

Padmaśrimitra states that the funeral prescribed in his manual should be performed for Tantric masters and others who have practised the meditation-rite of Vajrasattva or some other Tantric deity (SANDERSON 2009: 127, n. 29):

On the basis of the rules at death (antasthiti), I shall explain the rite (kṛtya) to show the path for departed masters and others who have practised the meditation-rite of Vajrasattva or some other [Tantric deity].

The Vajrācāryanayottama, an anthology of Tantric ritual manuals closely related to the Ārya School of the Guhyasamājatantra, contains the fragmentary text of a manual on the Tantric funeral. The text is entitled from the whole Mrtasugatiniyojana, except its two colophonic verses (TANEMURA 2004b, 2007).

5 The status of the recipient referred to by the word ādi is unclear here. Perhaps it is a person who has been permitted to engage in the private practice but is not qualified as an officiant.

6 Maṇḍalopāyikā v.1 (TANEMURA 2012b: 105): mṛcācāryādisattvā ye vajrasyātvādiyogināḥ | vakṣye cāntasthitēḥ kṛtyam teṣām mārganidarśanāḥ ||. I suppose that here mārganidarśanā is used for mārganidarśanāya for metrical reason. Showing the departed the path to good states of existence is one of the purposes of the ritual prescribed in this manual.

7 For the manuscript of this anthology, see TANAKA 1998. Unfortunately, the condition of the NGMPP photograph is so bad that the actual foliation is unclear. I follow the folio numbers given in TANAKA 1998. For the fact that the text of the funeral manual is contained in fol. 7b, see TOMABECHI 2004: 49, n. 9. The relevant
[Pari]nirvṛtavaryācāryasatākārakrama (f. 7b7), which also indicates that the primary beneficiary of this rite is a Tantric master (ācārya). This fragmentary manual has a great affinity to the contents of the final chapter of Padmaśrīmitra’s Māndalopāyikā, including some parallel passages.

Although the recipient of the funeral is not explicitly mentioned in the Mṛtasugatiniyajana, it contains descriptions that inform us about his characteristics. The following passage gives instructions on how the donor should pay the fee to the officiant following the rite to prevent the dead from going to inferior states of rebirth (*durgatiparīśodhana):

Then [the officiant] holds a Tantric feast (gaṇacakra) in the night and calls everybody there. If possible [= if the sponsor’s financial ability is sufficient], he should construct the durgatiparīśo-dhanamaṇḍala following the rules and perform the rite [of the gaṇacakra] following the instructions (yathoktāt). In addition, the Tantric officiant should ask the heir (dāyāda) the fee. With regard to the [heir], he should pay the fee according to his financial ability. He should offer a washed robe to the same officiant. The following has been taught.

dottle of the manuscript has been transcribed in TANEMURA 2012a: 1036–1035.

8 TOMABE reports that the colophon of the relevant section is nirvṛtavaryācāryasatākārakrama (2004: 49, n. 9). There are two illegible akṣaras preceding nirvṛta- that look like pari.

9 There is a prescription of the order of precedence at the Tantric feast in the Gaṇacakravidhi of the Kriyāsāmgrahapaññikā. See Kriyāsāmgrahapaññikā, Gaṇacakravidhi (in chapter 8): jyeṣṭhāṇukramaṇa nīveṣya parikalpitasya āsaneṣu niṣādayet. pañcavidho ‘tra jyeṣṭhāṇukramah, abhiṣekajyeṣṭhāṇukramah ekaḥ, vratajyeṣṭhāṇukramo dvitiyāḥ, jñānajyeṣṭhāṇukramas triyāḥ, jamajaṁyeṣṭhāṇukramas caturthāḥ, vidyājyeṣṭhāṇukramah pañcamah. (SAKURAI 2001: (18)–(19)) “[The officiant] should cause [the members of the Tantric feast] to enter [the place] and sit on the arranged seats in the order of precedence (jyeṣṭhāṇukrama). In this case, there are five kinds of order of precedence: the first is the order of precedence by consecration, the second that by observance, the third that by knowledge, the fourth that by age, and the fifth that by science.” Obviously, the first two jyeṣṭhāṇukramas are applied only in the case that the members of the gaṇacakra belong to a Tantric Buddhist community. The other three can be applied to non-Buddhist communities, although the meanings of the jñānajyeṣṭhāṇukrama and the vidyājyeṣṭhāṇukrama remain unclear. See also SZÁNTÓ in this volume.
That which is given to the officiant by the own relatives [of the deceased] for the sake of the deceased should be understood as given to him. It is a farewell given to the deceased.¹⁰

This passage indicates that the recipient of the funeral owns property and has a relative who inherits this from him (most probably his son?).

The following quotation is a description of the funeral march to the cremation ground. The officiant should visualise the participants as deities in accordance with their roles.

Then [the officiant] should have the following strong conviction: Those who carry the corpse are the guardians of the world; the one who holds a parasol is the king of gods (Indra); the one who holds a fly whisk is Brahman; the one who holds a sword is Viṣṇu; the one who chants eulogies is Śaṅkara (Śiva); the one who performs the practical things concerning the funeral is Yama; the one who holds solid and liquid food is Nairṛti; the one who holds a flag is Vāyu; and the others are all gods, asuras, and other [divine existences]...​¹¹

Three of the above-mentioned articles – a parasol, a fly whisk, and a sword – are symbols of royalty. These items might indicate the status of the recipient of the funeral envisaged in this manual.

There are funeral manuals which mention the status of the beneficiary more clearly. One of the funeral manuals by Ānandagarbha, the *Śarvadurgatiparīśodhanapretahomavidhi¹² (Ota. 3459, Toh. 2632), mentions a

¹⁰ Mrtaṣugatiniyojana (TANEMURA 2013a: 121): tato mṛtau gaṇacakram kṛtvā sarvam samharet. sati saṁbhave durgatiparīśodhanamaṇḍalam yathāvidhinā pra-vartya yathoktād vidhiṁ viḍadhyaṁ. punar aparāṁ vajrācāryo dāyādam daksināṁ yācet. so ‘pi vibhavānurūpena pradāyāt. praksālitaṁ ca vastram ācāryāyaiva prayacchet. aha ca. mṛtam uddhiṣṭa yad dattam ācāryāya svabandhubhiḥ | tasmāi dattam iti jñeyaṃ pātheṣṭeṣaṃ svargatasya tat || 40 ||.

¹¹ Mrtasugatiniyojana (TANEMURA 2013a: 219) tato mṛtaḥhakān lokapālād adhimucya, echatraḥharaṁ devarājam, cāmaraḥgrāhakaṁ brahmānam, khaḍaḥharam viṣṇum, stutipāhakam śaṅkaram, ērdhvedehikakriyākārakam yamam, kalaśadharanam varunam, pāṭrīśvadharanam vahnim, bhakṣyabhojyadharaṁ nairṛṭīṁ, patakādharanau vāyum, anyāṁś ca sarvadevāśurādīn adhimucya...

¹² This is the Sanskrit title given at the beginning of the canonical translation, but most probably it is a mistaken reconstruction of the colophon title Ngan song thams...
Tantric master, a monk (*bhikṣu*), a lay devotee, and a householder as beneficiaries of the rite (P f. 189r3–189v6, D f. 158r6–158v6):¹³

Then [the officiant] should smear [the corpse] with camphor and other [fragrant substances]. In the case that [the recipient is] a householder (*khyim pa, *grhaṭha*), he should cover the upper part and the lower part of the body with white cloth and lap [the body with the cloth]. He should visualise the white syllable *su* on the lunar disk transformed from the syllable *a* in the heart of the [corpse]. He should visualise a wish-fulfilling jewel transformed from the [syllable *su*]. He should visualise a jewel with a flame on the top of the head of the lord of gods, Śakra decorated with all [kinds of] ornaments, as a transformation of the [lunar disk and the wish-fulfilling jewel].¹⁴

In the case that [the recipient is] a lay devotee (*dge bsnyen, upāsaka*), [the officiant] should cover the upper part and the lower part of the corpse with a white cloth. He should decorate the head of the corpse with a garland and make the palms of the hands joined in front of the chest. He should visualise the yellow syllable *muṃ* on the lunar disk in the heart of the [corpse] and then a yellow utpala-lotus transformed from the [syllable]. As a transformation of the [lunar disk and the utpala-lotus], he should visualise the [deceased] himself as blessed Mañjuśrī, who is yellow, is decorated with every ornament, holds an utpala-lotus in his hand, and gives protection.¹⁵

---

¹³ For the passages quoted below, see also KAWASAKI 2003: 8–10.

¹⁴ (1) *de nas yang *ga pur (D; ga bur P) la sogs pa’i dris byugs la *khyim pa la ni ras dkar po’i stod g-yogs smad g-yogs su bcas pas dkris la | de’i snying gar *a (P; à D) las zla ba’i dkyi’khor la su dkar po’o || *de yongs su gyur pa las (D; de gyur pa las P) yid bzhin gyi nor bu rin po che’o || de rnams yongs su gyur pa las tha rnams kyi dbang po brgya byin rgyan thams cad kyis yongs su brgyan pa spyi bo’i gtsug na nor bu rin po che ’bar ba dang ldan par bsam par bya’o ||.

¹⁵ (2) *dge bsnyen la ni ras dkar pos stod g-yogs dang smad g-yogs byas la | mgo la me tog gi phreng bas brygan te | lag pa’i thal mo snying gar sbyar la de’i snying gar zla ba la vi ge *muṃ (D; mu P) ser po | de gyur pa las *utpa la (P; autpa la D) ser po | de dag yongs su gyur pa las de nyid bcom ldan ’das ’phags pa ’jam dpal sku mdog ser po rgyan thams cad kyis brygan pa | phyag na autpa la dang skyabs sbyin mdzad par bsam par bya’o ||.
In the case that [the recipient is] a monk (dge slong, bhikṣu) or someone else who keeps the vow imposed in the monastic code (prātimokṣasamvara), the officiant should properly decorate [the corpse] with the own costume [of the deceased] such as a Buddhist robe and a garment, place the [corpse’s] left hand horizontally at the navel, and form the [corpse’s] right hand [into the hand gesture of] giving protection. He should visualise the red syllable hrīḥ on the lunar disk in the heart of the [recipient] and a lotus as a transformation of the [syllable]. As a transformation of these two [i.e., the lunar disk and the lotus], he should visualise [the deceased] himself as Blessed Śākyamuni, who is red, wears the costume of a Buddha (sugata), and is decorated with the [thirty-two] lakṣaṇas (major characteristics) and the [eighty] vyāñjanas (minor characteristics).

In the case that [the recipient is] a Tantric master or someone else who has faith in the scriptures of the Great Yoga of Mahāyāna and is initiated into the Great Maṇḍala, [the officiant] should cover the upper part and the lower part [of the corpse] with white cloth and decorate it with the five kinds of ornaments beginning with a crown. Blessed, Glorious Vajrasattva, Vajrapāṇi [i.e., the deceased], should have his hand folded in the form of the seal (mudrā) of the five-pronged [vajra]. [The officiant] should visualise the black syllable hūṃ on the lunar disk in the heart of the [corpse] and a five-
pronged *vajra* transformed from the [syllable]. As a transformation of these two [i.e., the lunar disk and the five-pronged *vajra*], [the officiant] should visualise [the recipient] himself as Blessed, Glorious Vajrasattva, who is white, holds a *vajra* and a *vajra*-bell in his hands, is decorated with all kinds of ornaments, and looks like the full moon in autumn.\(^21\)

In the passages quoted above, the recipients of the funeral are classified into four types, probably according to the precepts or observances that they have kept during their lifetimes. The recipient is visualised as a deity: a Tantric master is visualised as Vajradhara, a monk as Śākyamuni, a lay devotee as Mañjuśrī, and a householder as Śakra. We see a hierarchy with the householders at the bottom and the Tantric masters on the top. Perhaps the householder (*khyim pa*) in the above-quoted passage refers to people on the periphery of Buddhist communities. Theoretically, they were not members of the Buddhist saṅgha, and, in this sense, they might have been at the bottom of the soteriological hierarchy, since they are distinguished from the upāsakas, lay members of the Buddhist saṅgha. Alternatively, it is possible that in this case the householder is non-Buddhist, since he is visualised as Śakra, who is a non-Buddhist deity and also the petitioner in the Sar-vadurgatiparīśodhanatantra, upon which the relevant manual is based. If the latter is the case, some non-Buddhist householders were in some way involved in Tantric Buddhist communities, or Tantric Buddhists might have intended to convert non-Buddhist householders to Buddhism by means of the funeral.

One of the manuals of Agrabodhi,\(^22\) the *Mañjuśrīmanḍalavidhigu-nasambhava* (hereafter *Gunasambhava*), also clearly mentions the status of

---

\(^{21}\) (4) *rdo rje slob dpon* *la sogs pa* (D; *la sogs pa’i P) *theg pa* *pa* *chen po* *po* *rnal* *’byor* *chen po* *’i rgyud* *la* *mngon par* *dad pa* *dkyil* *’khor* *chen po* *dbang bskur ba* *rnams ni* *ras dkar* *pos stod g-yogs dang* *smad g-yogs su* *byas te* | *dbu rgyan la* *sogs pa* *rgyan* *cha lngas* *nye bar bryyan pa* | *bcom ldan* *’das dpal rdo rje sens dpa’i phyag na* *rdo rje* *rte lnga pa’i* *phyag rgya bcings te* | *de’i snying gar zla ba’i dkyil* *’khor la hūṃ* *sngon po* | *de gyur pa* *las* *rdo rje* *rte lnga pa’o* | *de dag yongs su* *gyur pa* *las de* *nyid bcom ldan* *’das dpal rdo rje sens dpa’i mdog dkar po* | *rdo rje* *rte lnga pa* *dril bu dang bcas pa’i* *phyag rgya mdo’ad pa* | *rgyan thams cad kyis bryyan pa* *ston ka’i* *zla ba gang ba* *ltu bur bsam par bya’o*.

\(^{22}\) In TANEMURA 2017, I state that Agrabodhi is another name of Vilāsavajra, following SAKURAI (1987: 104, n. 4; 2007: 159). The colophon of one of the manuscripts of the Nāmantrārthāvalokīnī, a commentary on the Nāmasamgītā by Vilāsavajra, contains a small biography of Vilāsavajra (TRIBE 2006: 25–26). The
the recipient. The passage quoted below prescribes the caitya-like pile of earthen bricks in which a corpse is placed for cremation. The number of bases of the pile differs according to the status of the recipient:\(^{23}\)

A pile of earthen bricks which is similar to a caitya should be made on the [fire pit]. The [pile] should have four windows [i.e., holes for ventilation]. In the case that [the recipient is] an ordinary man (dmangs tha mal pa), [a pile] without base (bang rim) should be made. In the case that [the recipient is] a minister (blon po) or a king, [a pile] with a single base should be made. In the case that [the recipient is] a monk (dge slong, bhikṣu), [a pile] with three bases should be made. In the case that [the recipient is] a lay devotee (dge bsnyen, upāsaka), [a pile] with four bases should be made. The corpse should be placed inside the dome. Fuel such as sandalwood or padmaka-wood should be placed there.\(^{24}\)

---

\(^{23}\) For the passage quoted below, see also SAKURAI 2007: 164–165.

\(^{24}\) Guṇasambhava (P f. 123r1–3, D f. 104r1–2): de’i steng du so phag las sreg khang mchod rten dang ’dra ba brtsig par bya ste | skar khung bzhī dang ldan par bya’o || dmangs tha mal pa la ni bang rim med pa bya’o || blon po dang rgyal po la ni bang rim gcig pa bya’o || dge bsnyen la ni bar rim gnyis pa bya’o || dge slong la ni bar rim gsum pa bya’o || rdo rje ’dzin pa la ni bar rim bzhī pa bya’o || de’i bum pa’i nang du ro bzhag la | tshandan dang shug pa la sogs pa’i bud shing la sogs pa gzhag go ||.
The ordinary man (dmangs tha ma pa) in the above-quoted passage might correspond to the householder in Ānandagarbha’s manual quoted above. Compared to the passages of Ānandagarbha’s manual quoted above, a king (rgyal po) and a minister (blon po) are added as independent categories to the list of recipients. The short passage quoted above might also give us a glimpse of the importance of royal patronage for Tantric religions.

**The recipient inferred from the function of consecration**

Next, I will examine the status of the recipient from a different viewpoint: the function of the consecration (abhiṣeka) to be bestowed upon the departed. Tantric Buddhism is an initiatory religion, and one has to undergo the consecration ritual in order to become qualified for the practice prescribed in Tantric scriptures. Although the primary function of consecration is the initiation of disciples, it also has some other functions. The first passage which I will examine is the following verse of the *Mṛtasugatīnyojana*:

[The officiant] himself should bathe [the corpse] in the same way with [water from the vase] which is filled with water empowered by her mantra [= the mantra of the goddess Locanā]. He should place a crown on the head [of the deceased] and a vajra and a vajra-bell in the hands [of the deceased].

The description of the consecration in the *Mṛtasugatīnyojana* is very concise and the actual procedure is not stated very clearly. We can see, however, that the procedure ends with the bell consecration (ghanṭābhiṣeka) and that no description of the procedure is given from the name consecration (nāmābhiṣeka) onwards. There are two possible reasons for why the consecration for the deceased ends with the bell consecration: (1) the recipient is an initiate who has already been given an initiation name, and (2) the function of this consecration is different from or not limited to initiation.

In the former case, the recipient is a Tantric master, as confirmed by the colophon of the final chapter of the Ācāryakriyāsamuccaya and the first verse of the final chapter of Padmaśrīmitra’s *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, or an initiate.

---

who has received permission to engage in the Tantric practice. In the latter case, the purpose of the consecration in the *Mṛtāsugatiniyojana* might include the purification or removal of the effects of past actions that prevent the departed from liberation. In the funeral prescribed in the *Mṛtāsugatiniyojana*, the goddess Locanā is the object of visualisation and her *mantra* is employed. The function of her *mantra* is the quelling of calamities (śāntikas). The officiant who performs the funeral wears a white robe and ornaments. White is the colour for śāntika.

---

26 Theoretically, the future Buddhahood of a Tantric master has been predicted (vyākaraṇasūtra) at the time of initiation and thus it is not necessary for him to be initiated again at the time of death. The authors of the *Mṛtāsugatiniyojana*, the Ācārya-kriyāsaṁcaramuccaya, and the Maṇḍalopayikā remain silent on this matter. In comparison, in his *Tantrāloka*, chapter 24, which deals with the initiation at the funeral (antyeṣṭidūkṣā), the tenth-century Śāiva author Abhinavagupta teaches that the initiation should be bestowed upon people of the lower religions (i.e., Vaiṣṇavas and others according to the commentator Jayaratha) if the śāktpāta is seen, that is to say “the descent of [Śiva’s] power” that indicates that the individual is ready for initiation. People of the higher religions (i.e., Śaivas and others) receive an antyeṣṭidūksā if they have transgressed the observances. See *Tantrāloka* 24.2–3 and *Viveka* ad loc.

27 I have not identified passages in primary sources that refer to this function of consecration. The *Guhyatāntra* (*Sarvamaṇḍalasaṁmānvyādhiḥguhyatāntra*), an early Tantric Buddhist scripture, teaches that there are four types of consecration. One of the merits of the first consecration, whose purpose is the attainment of the status of the master (ācārya), is that an initiate avoids entering bad rebirth states even if he remains in transmigration (Otsuka 2013: 955–957, especially 956). See *Guhyatāntra*, chapter 12: dbang bskur dang po thob pa ni […] ’khor ba na ni ’khor ba na […] de ni ṇgan song lṭung mi ’gyur […] yan laṅ nyams dang dbul ba dang […] smad pa rnams su skye mi ’gyur […] (P f. 226r4–7, D f. 116v3–5). “Those who have obtained the first consecration [...] will not fall into inferior states of existence. They will be born not as the disabled, the poor, nor those who are censured.”

28 The *Guhyasamājatantra*, one of the sources of the *Mṛtāsugatiniyojana*’s systems of mantra-visualisation, teaches that Locanā resuscitates the departed (Tanemura 2013b: 22). See *Guhyasamājatantra* 14.1–2: om ru ru sphuru jvala tiṣṭha sidhhalocane sarvārthādhanī svāhā. athāṣyāṁ gūtanātrāyāṁ sarvasampamaṇṭiṣṭaḥ | tuṣṭaḥ harsaṁpac ca buddhavajraṁ anuṣmānaṁ || 1 || buddhānāṁ śāntijanaṁ sarvakarmaprāśādhanī || mṛtasaṁyāmaṇi proktā vajrasamayodanī || 2 || (E’s 60, ll. 4–9). “om, roar! Flash! Blaze! Abide! O, you who are the lady with perfected eyes! O, you who accomplish all purposes! svāhā! As soon as [this ‘wife,’ i.e., this mantra] was recited, all that sought fortune were satisfied and acquired joy, remembering the vajra Buddha. It is taught that [this wife, i.e., the goddess Locanā] produces the quelling of calamities for all Buddhas, accomplishes all ritual actions, resuscitates the departed, and impels [a practitioner] to the vajra pledge.” The *mantra*
Whereas the system of the first half of the *Mṛtasugatiniyajana* is based on the *Guhyasamājatantra*, that of the latter half is based on the *Sar-
vadurgatiparishodhanatantra. The opening line of the latter half runs as follows:

Even though they are impelled to go on the path to liberation, some persons go on the wrong path because their roots of evil are very numerous and powerful. In order to eliminate the wrong path too, for eight days from that day [i.e., the day of the cremation], [the Tantric officiant] should perform the rites for the elimination of inferior states of existence and other [rites for the removal of their evil] following the rules taught in the Durgatiparishodhanatantra.\(^{30}\)

The above quotation might suggest that the function of the preceding part is the removal of the effects of past actions.

Whereas the consecration in the Mṛtasugatiniyojana seems to be only partially performed, that in Padmaśrīmitra’s Maṇḍalopāyikā seems to be performed completely:

After that, the officiant himself, like a disciple, should enter [the maṇḍala] and receive [the whole procedure], beginning with the consecration up to the permission [of the practice prescribed in the scripture] from his chosen deity in his visualisation. In the same way, having observed that [the corpse] has consciousness (jñānasattvaka), he should also bestow upon the corpse all consecrations up to the [granting] permission [of the practice], using [water from] vases beginning with the victory[-vase].\(^{31}\)

The author, Padmaśrīmitra, states that all consecrations up to the permission should be bestowed upon the corpse. It should be noted that in the consecration section of the Maṇḍalopāyikā the granting of the permission (anujñādāna) precedes the higher consecrations, i.e., the secret consecra-


tion (guhyābhiseka) and the consecration of knowledge of wisdom (prajñājñānābhiseka). If this order is also applicable to the consecration of the corpse, the consecration in the funeral does not contain the higher consecrations.

The last passage I will quote is from Agrabodhi’s Guṇasaṃbhava, where he teaches that the full consecration should be bestowed upon the deceased:

[The officiant] should make an altar (maṇḍala)\(^{32}\) with the five products of cow in the south of the maṇḍala and place the corpse on it. In the same way a [living] disciple is introduced into the maṇḍala, he should place the corpse on the maṇḍala. He should completely bestow upon the corpse the abhiṣekas beginning with the following rites: the request (gsol ba gdab pa, *adhyeṣaṇa), the accumulation of merits (bsod nams kyi tshogs bsags pa), the possession by gnosis (ye shes dbab pa, *jñānāveśa), the casting of a flower on the maṇḍala (me tog dor, *puṣpapāta) and the removal of a blindfold, the introduction to the maṇḍala and the showing the faces of the deities, the knowledge consecration (rig pa’i bang, vidyābhiseka), and the secret consecration (gsang ba’i dbang, guhyābhiseka).\(^{33}\)

Concluding remarks

I have presented several passages from the Mṛtasugatiniyojana and other funeral manuals. The colophon title of the final chapter of the Ācāryakriyāsambuccaya demonstrates that the primary beneficiary of the funeral is the Tantric master. If the same context is understood also in the Mṛtasugatiniyojana, the source of the relevant chapter of the Ācāryakriyāsambuccaya, the primary recipient envisaged in the Mṛtasugatiniyojana is a Tantric mas-

\(^{32}\) This maṇḍala, which is often called maṇḍalaka, is an altar usually made with soil and cow dung. This altar also represents a master or deities. See also TANEMURA 2004a: 220–221, n. 19.

\(^{33}\) Guṇasaṃbhava (P ff. 121v7–122r1, D f.103r1–2): dkyil ’khor gyi lho phyogs su ba’i rnam lngas maṇḍala byas la de’i steng du ro bzhag ste | slob ma dkyil ’khor du gzhug pa’i tshul du ro de dkyil ’khor du gzhag par bya’o || gsol ba gdab pa dang | bsod nams kyi tshogs bsags pa dang | ye shes dbab pa dang | dkyil ’khor du me tog dor te | gdong gyogs *dkrol ba (D; dgrul ba P) dang dkyil ’khor du bcug la lha ngo hstan pa dang | rig pa’i dbang dang gsang ba’i dbang bskur ba la sogs pa ste dbang rnam rdzogs par bskur bar bya’o ||.
ter. If we refer to the description of the payment of the ritual fee to the officiant, the beneficiary of the funeral is expected to have property, and the heir of the property is the *yajamāna*. Ānandagarbha’s and Agrabodhi’s manuals clearly mention the status of the recipient. The treatment of the corpse differs according to his or her status. Perhaps the manuals of Ānandagarbha and Agrabodhi mentioned people on the periphery of Buddhist communities who were distinguished from lay members of the Buddhist *sāṅgha*. Possibly non-Buddhist lay persons were envisaged as a beneficiary of the funeral in those two manuals. If that is the case, the relevant passage might reflect the actual situation that Tantric masters performed the funeral for non-Buddhist lay persons or that such masters intended to include non-Buddhist lay persons into their communities through the funeral.

I have also examined some passages concerning the consecration to be bestowed upon the deceased. Probably the function of the consecration in the funeral is not limited to initiation. If we refer to the above-mentioned passages of the *Mṛtasugatiṇiyojana*, another function of the consecration might be the purification or removal of the effects of past actions. If this is correct, the Tantric Buddhist funeral can theoretically be applied to both non-initiates and initiates.

The number of materials examined in this paper is limited. Examination of the *Sarvadurgatiparīśodhanatantra*, the scriptural source of the second half of the *Mṛtasugatiṇiyojana*, and its exegetical works, which probably include rich information about Tantric Buddhist funeral, is a task left to future research.

**Abbreviations**

D sDe dge edition.

n.e. not existent.
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TANTRIC COMMUNITIES IN THE PUBLIC SPHERE
Narratives as a medium for appealing to the royal court: A look into the *Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā*

Marion Rastelli

**Introduction**

There is ample evidence that Tantric communities not only strived to establish close relationships to rulers in order to gain support and patronage, they were also quite successful in doing so. This is true also with regard to the Pāñcarātra tradition: here we can clearly observe a development from individual ritual worship for personal purposes in the earlier extant authoritative texts to emphasis on public temple worship for the sake of kings and the kingdom in the later texts from about the eleventh century onwards. I will not, however, speak directly about this phenomenon here, but will rather examine a Samhitā, as the authoritative texts of the Pāñcarātra are called, that is quite peculiar in many aspects, namely, the *Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā* (AS).

The AS is one of the best-known Pāñcarātra Samhitās in the West, mainly because of its comparatively extensive philosophical, theological and cosmological passages. It is less known, however, for its comprehensive sections dealing with rituals, mantras, yantras, and other matters expounding the ritual worship of Sudarśana, the discus of Viṣṇu in an anthropomorphic form with a varying number of arms. Ritual worship of Sudarśana is performed mainly for the purposes of a king, as, for example, for military purposes (see also Bianchini in this volume). It is neither a personal ritual performed indi-

---

1 See, e.g., Sanderson 2004 and 2009.
2 For a more detailed exposition of this development, see Rastelli 2006: 91–98.
3 The first monograph about the Pāñcarātra in a western language, published in English by Schrader in 1916, is devoted to the *Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā*. Another monograph on the same was published by Matsubara in 1994. There are also several shorter studies dealing with this text by other authors, the majority by Bock-Raming (1987, 1992, 2002).
vidually nor a public ritual, and usually it is performed not by the king himself, but by his personal priest (purohita, purodhas).

This means that the AS is a text that was composed, at least from its ritual point of view, for kingly purposes – more precisely, for personal priests in the office of a king – or to try to convince a king of the usefulness of employing such priests. One means of convincing a ruler to employ a personal priest for the worship of Sudarśana was to include narratives. Indeed, a comparably large number of narratives can be found in the AS. This paper will focus on these narratives and what they can tell us beyond the stories they report.

The historical background of the Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā

When was the AS composed? Most of the Pāñcarātra Samhitās are compiled texts. Again and again parts of them were revised, complemented, and perhaps abbreviated. This makes dating them extremely difficult since different passages can have different dates of composition. The AS has also been partly compiled from various sources. However, it has an overall systematic structure, which gives the impression of it having been reworked by a single final redactor, who gave the text a homogeneous appearance, at least superficially.

Today, scholars date the AS to between the eleventh and thirteenth century. One of the reasons for this is the heavy influence of Śaiva traditions visible in the text. According to Alexis Sanderson, it must have been composed after Kṣemarāja (1000–1050 CE) since it shows influences from him as well as other Kashmirian Śaiva sources. According to BEGLEY (1973: 27f.), the AS cannot have been composed much earlier than the twelfth or thirteenth century for iconographical reasons: there is no evidence of images of Sudarśana in the form described in the AS before the thirteenth century.

Both scholars agree that the AS was composed in South India. The reason SANDERSON gives are the Yajurveda mantras found in chapter 58 of the AS, which are presented in the version of the Vedic branch of the Taittirīyas, which is prevalent in South India. BEGLEY’s (ibid.) argument is

---

4 See, e.g., the analysis of AS 5 by BOCK-RAMING (2002: 21–56), in which he demonstrates that the text of this chapter is based on various sources.

5 See also BOCK-RAMING 2002: 183f.

6 SANDERSON 2001: 36–38. See also SANDERSON 1990: 34, where he suggests the eleventh century as the date of the AS’s composition.

7 SANDERSON 2001: 38. See BOCK-RAMING 1992: 82–85 for a detailed argumen-
that idols of Sudarśana in the form described in the AS appear only in South India.\textsuperscript{8}

South India of the thirteenth century experienced a great deal of political turmoil. It was the period of the decline of the Cōḷas and the revival of the Pāṇḍyas. Struggles between the two dynasties gave opportunities to other major and minor rulers, such as the Hoysalas, the Cēras, the Kākaṭīyas, the Eastern Gaṅgas of Orissa, and the Telugu-Cōḍas, for gaining power through interventions and shifting alliances.\textsuperscript{9}

Inscriptions from, for example, the Raṅganāthasvāmī Temple in Śrīraṅgam and the Varadarājāsvāmī Temple in Kāṇcī show that the Cōḷas, Pāṇḍyas, and Hoysalas, although being Śaivas or preferring Śaivism, often generously supported Vaiṣṇava temples as well. Also local rulers such as the Telugu-Cōḍas, who nominally acknowledged the overlordship of the Cōḷas, were influential and supported Vaiṣṇava temples. Further, these inscriptions frequently mention commanders and generals from the Hoysala army visiting the temples and giving donations.\textsuperscript{10} This means that on the one hand the Vaiṣṇava temples faced continually changing rulers who supported them but often actually preferred Śaiva traditions. On the other hand, the presence of military forces and their importance in deciding the shifting powers was something that probably could not be ignored in daily life. Against this background, it is no surprise that a text like the AS might emerge, a text that propagates the worship of Viṣṇu’s discus for kingly and above all military purposes and, while explicitly teaching Vaiṣṇavism, is not particularly ill-disposed towards Śaivism.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{8} Apart from the AS there is also other evidence that Sudarśana worship was popular in South India in the thirteenth century. Venkataṇātha, who is traditionally dated to 1270–1369 and who knew the AS (see RASTELLI 2006: 51), composed two Stotras to Sudarśana (BEGLEY 1973: 30–32). An inscription at the Raṅganāthasvāmī Temple in Śrīraṅgam dated to about 1274 records a donation to Sudarśana (ibid.: 69f.).

\textsuperscript{9} For a detailed description of the political situation in South India at that time, see NILAKANTHA SASTRI 1955: 365–444.


\textsuperscript{11} Apart from the use of the Kashmirian Śaiva sources mentioned above, there are several other indications of Śaiva influence in the AS; see, e.g., RASTELLI 2018.
The narratives of the AS

The AS contains many stories that in style and content remind one of Purānic and epic narratives. The Saṃhitā starts with the śāstrāvatāra story, the story of the “descent of the teaching” in chapter 1, which is characteristic of almost all Pāñcarātra Saṃhitās (and also of Śaiva Tantras). There are several cosmological accounts, of which some have a narrative character (e.g., AS 11), and there is also a version of the story about the demons Madhu und Kaitabha.

There are ten stories which I would like to examine in this paper. In these stories kings are the main protagonists. In nine of these stories, certain kings are in various forms of distress and finally receive a solution to their problem in the form of the six-syllable sudarśanamantra. In the tenth story, a king behaves badly and is punished by being destroyed by Sudarśana. In eight of the nine stories just mentioned, the king receives the sudarśanamantra from or with the help of a personal royal priest (purohita). It is often not the king who then performs a ritual with this mantra, but the purohita, who performs it for the king’s sake. Only one of these nine stories is antithetical: here, instead of a purohita, the king receives the sudarśanamantra with the help of the deity Kubera and from the goddess Mahālakṣmī. And in the story of the badly behaving king, no purohita appears at all. We will see that this is also significant with regard to the role of purohitas in the AS.

Thus, these stories have several similarities, in the sense that most of them have comparable structures and almost all illustrate the eminent importance of purohitas for kings. The function of most of them seems clear: they demonstrate that in any sort of difficulty in which a king might find himself, alone the purohita can help by using only a particular mantra, the sudarśanamantra as taught by the AS. Thus, they pave the way to the royal

---

14 The wording of the six-syllable sudarśanamantra is sahasrāra hūṃ phaṭ (AS 18.34–39b).
15 This story appears in the context of repelling such an enemy, concretely, the repelling of malevolent magic (abhicāra) (AS 42.8–40b), since the malicious king produces a female demon (kṛtyā) in order to destroy Kṛṣṇa; see below. Thus, it is also a story about solving a problem by means of Sudarśana.
16 For a translation of this story and a detailed study of its function in the AS, see RASTELLI 2015.
court for *purohitas* and strengthen their position there. What is special and important in these stories with regard to the topic of this volume is that they do not concern a standard Atharvavedic* purohita* trying to gain ground at the royal court, but a *purohita* who has, albeit strongly affiliated with the Atharvaveda, a Pāncarātric background. Can these narratives provide evidence about the process of the Pāncarātrins trying to approach the royal courts and the methods they chose for this purpose? Might they even provide evidence about the composer of the AS, about the Pāncarātric *purohitas*, who were the primary target audience of his text, or about the rulers at that time, who can be seen as a kind of secondary target audience?

Let us look at the narratives more closely. Briefly, their contents are as follows:19

AS 33.24–100: King Mañiśekhara, son of Durdharṣa(ṇa) and grandson of Pramaganda, reigns in Naicāśākha according to the dharma, i.e., the socio-religious order as taught in the Brahmanical scriptures. However, a demon (*mahāsura*) called Vikatākṣa and his offspring torment his kingdom and the whole universe. Since the demon cannot be easily defeated because of a boon that he has received from Brahmā, Mañiśekhara asks his personal priest Kratu for a solution. Kratu tells him that the demon can only be conquered by Viṣṇu and advises him to take refuge with the god bearing the form of a discus, i.e., Sudarśana. Mañiśekhara and Kratu go to the sage Durvāsas, whom they ask for a means for obtaining Sudarśana. Durvāsas gives them the six-syllable *sudarśanamantra*. He says that by means of this *mantra* and with the help of the personal priest, the king can achieve everything he desires. Then Durvāsas tells them that God is present in the form of Sudarśana in Śālagrāma on the bank of the river Sarasvatī20. Mañiśekhara and Kratu then proceed to Śālagrāma. Mañiśekhara has Kratu worship God in the form of the discus for a month. Then Sudarśana with eight arms appears, kills the demon, and disappears. Mañiśekhara reigns again.

---

17 Personal priests of kings were traditionally Atharvavedins (SANDERSON 2007: 204–208), whose magic, healing, and invocation rituals were particularly suitable for kingly needs, even if this was sometimes only an ideal (WITZEL 1986: 47f.).

18 On the strong position of the *Atharvaveda* in the AS, see RASTELLI 2018.

19 For a more detailed description of the contents of the narratives, see SCHRADER 1916: 132–141.

20 Actually, the famous place called Śālagrāma is not situated on the river Sarasvatī, but is the source of the river Gaṇḍakī, see, e.g., MANI 1975 s.v. śālagrāma.
AS 42.40c–82: Śrutakīrti, king of Saurāṣṭra who reigns in Bhadraśālā and worships Sudarśana, wishes to conquer the world of the Gandharvas. However, this is not as easy as he thinks. He approaches his personal priest, who advises him to take refuge with Sudarśana. He should visualise Sudarśana with 64 arms in a big discus (cakra) with 64 spokes and recite his mantra. In addition, the priest teaches the king all weapon mantras (astramantra). By this means, Śrutakīrti is able to win the battle, whereupon he returns to Bhadraśālā. Amazed by the power of Sudarśana, he asks his personal priest if he could also reach liberation from transmigration with the help of Sudarśana. The answer is positive, and the king, worshipping the sixty-four-armed Sudarśana every day, finally reaches the supreme abode (parama pada).

AS 43.21c–44.56: Indra, the king of the gods, is tormented by a demon (dānava) called Jalaṃdhara. He consults the Maruts, and Vāyu advises him to send Bṛhaspati (who is the purohita of the gods; see SÖRENSEN 1904 s.v. Bṛhaspati) to Śaṅkara (i.e., Śiva) to ask for help. Bṛhaspati is sent to the Kailāsa mountain, where he meets and praises Śaṅkara. Then he tells Śaṅkara about Indra’s problem. Śaṅkara agrees to kill the demon by means of the sudarśanamantra. Bṛhaspati asks for the mantra and Śaṅkara gives it to him. Having gone to the Himalaya, Bṛhaspati recites the mantra and causes Sudarśana to appear. Sudarśana teaches him about his various forms. About Indra nothing more is reported.

AS 45: Kuśadhvaja, king of the Janakas, is afflicted by a “great delusion” (mahāmoha) that causes bodily pain and disturbs his memory. Initially he ignores his affliction, but then, when it torments him more and more, he approaches his family preceptor (kulaguru) Yājñavalkya to in-

---

21 Jalaṃdhara is a demon that appears in the myth of Śiva as Jalaṃdhara-saṃpāramūrti. In this myth, the demon Jalaṃdhara is killed by means of the discus Sudarśana, which, in some versions of the myth, is later given to Viṣṇu; see GILLET 2010: 210–221.

22 In Yoga and Sāṅkhya, mahāmoha is one of five types of “unreal cognition” (viparyaya) (see, e.g., Yogabhāṣya ad Yogasūtra 1.8, Gauḍapāda’s commentary ad Sāṅkhyakārikā 47). In AS 14.15c–17, mahāmoha is a term for the nigrahāsakti deluding the individual soul (jīva). Here, in AS 45, it is described as a kind of illness.

23 In this paper I do not differentiate between gurus and purohitas, since I do not find that the AS differentiates clearly between the functions of the two. In the stories presented here, gurus and purohitas have the same function. Also in the following passage describing a purohita, no clear distinction between the office of a purohita and a guru is made: “Listen, if the king cannot perform [a ritual], a skilful personal priest should perform [it]. Only he is the king’s entire property in effecting invisible
quire about the cause of this mahāmoha and its remedy. Yājñavalkya tells him that the mahāmoha is the result of a crime (pāpa): in former times, Kuśadhvaja had killed a virtuous king outside of a battle. Yājñavalkya proposes “mastering” 24 Sudaśana, because by means of his power the mahāmoha will be destroyed. Kuśadhvaja has a pavilion (maṇḍapa) constructed on the bank of the river Sarasvati, in which Yājñavalkya performs a ritual in order to pacify (śāntika karman) the prārabdha karman, i.e., the
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karman that is already active in the present life and has caused the mahāmoha in this case.

The following five stories in the AS should be considered a cohesive group. They are introduced in AS 48.3–8 by mentioning five kings who have reached their respective goals by means of a throne (āsana), a ring (aṅgulīya), a mirror (darpaṇa), a banner (dhvaja), and a canopy (vīṭāṇa).

AS 48.9–50b: King Muktāpīḍa, son of Śravas, does not care for his kingdom but is only interested in women and drinking alcohol. As a consequence, his subjects fall from the dharma and demons overcome the kingdom. But the king still does not care. His ministers consult the personal priest (purodhas) and conclude that only the personal priest can help. He produces a throne that is furnished with a yantra25 (of Sudarśana) according to the method of Vasiṣṭha and has the king sit on it. What follows in the text is a detailed prescription for a ritual serving various purposes.26 After this ritual having been performed for a mere month, the story ends with all of the kingdom’s enemies being destroyed by diseases and the earth again coming under the control of the king. Whether the king’s desire for women and alcohol also disappears is not mentioned.

AS 48.50c–64b: In the town of Viśālā, a bodiless voice from the sky speaks to the mother of the virtuous King Viśāla, telling her that her son will die within four days. When she tells this to her son, he asks her not to be afraid and goes to the hermitage of Pulaha, who is a purohita. Having listened to the story of the incident, Pulaha gives Viśāla a ring bearing the yantra of Sudarśana. When the servants of Death (here called Kāla) come to take Viśāla’s life, they are unable to come near him. Various weapons emerge from the discus and chase them away. Both the gods and Kāla are astonished that Viśāla has successfully conquered death.27

AS 48.64c–109: One day, Sumati, son of King Sunīti of Śṛṅgāra, goes to a grove to hunt. In the grove he meets a charming young woman. Passionate about her, he becomes bewildered. The woman takes him to her home and later to the Nāga world. Having reached Bhogavatī, the capital of the Nāga world, she gives Sumati to Anaṅgamaṇjarī, daughter of the Nāga King Vāsuki. Anaṅgamaṇjarī wants to marry him, and also the amazed Sumati is ready to marry the beautiful princess. In the meantime, Sunīti’s

---

25 yantras usually consist of diagram-like drawings and mantras made present in them; see, e.g., RASTELLI 2003: 142ff. and especially for the sudarśananyantra pp. 148–151.

26 This passage gives the impression of being a foreign body in the text.

27 For a translation of this and the next story, see BIANCHINI 2015: 67–71.
father misses his son and asks his ministers to find him. Spies and messengers search for Sunīti but are unable to find him. The king is inconsolable and no longer eats or sleeps because of his sorrow. Then the king’s personal priest (purohita) goes to his guru Kaṇva, who lives on the banks of the river Tamasā. Having heard the story, Kaṇva immerses himself in yoga, sees what has happened, and relates it to the purohita. He says that only by means of the power of Sudarśana it will be possible to bring Sunīti back, namely, with a mirror furnished with a sudarśanamahāyantra. The purohita goes back to the king and tells him everything. The king produces a mirror in the prescribed manner, places it on a chariot, and drives to the entrance of a cave that he has been able to find with the help of the mirror. He enters the Nāga world and fetches his son (magically?). Sumati and his wife come, the king lifts them into the chariot and wants to return with them to his own town. Vāsuki, the father of the princess, is angry about this and, supported by his army of snakes, asks the king to stop. The king asks the mirror to kill the snake army. Two weapons come forth from the mirror, one that puts the snake army to sleep and one that starts to burn the Nāga town. Seeing this, Vāsuki begs for pardon, gives the king jewels, the princess, and other Nāga women, asks him to withdraw the weapons and to go. The king agrees and goes home with his son, the Nāga women, and the jewels.

AS 49: King Citraśekhara, son of Uparicara, reigns in the town of Bhadravāṭī on the banks of the Sarasvatī. In former times, Uparicara, who had received a divine flying chariot from Indra, killed the demon Śaṅkukaṇṭha, who wanted to rob the chariot. After the death of Uparicara, Śaṅku-kaṇṭha’s son Amāraṇa wishes to avenge his father and beleaguers Citraśekhara’s army and town. His aim is to kill Citraśekhara and to capture the divine chariot. A long-lasting battle between the two armies begins, but Citraśekhara is unable to defeat the demon. Reflecting on a solution, he thinks that he will only be able to gain victory with the help of Śiva’s (mahādeva) grace. He decides to please him by means of mortifications (tapas) and leaves for Mount Kailāsa by means of the divine chariot, which he has inherited from his father. However, the chariot stops above Mount Mandara. Surprised, Citraśekhara walks around on the peak of the mountain. He meets a beautiful young man who turns out to be Kubera. Citraśekhara tells him everything that had happened, whereupon Kubera tells him that Mount Mandara is the abode of the almighty goddess Mahālakṣmī. It was she who stopped the movement of his chariot. Kubera tells Citraśekhara that he will receive all that he desires after seeing her. Kubera disappears, but one of his servants appears. The servant spends the night
with Citraśekhara and explains how to proceed towards where Mahālakṣmī lives. Having arrived there, Citraśekhara enters a gorgeous palace. In the centre of the palace he meets the magnificent Mahālakṣmī. He sings a long hymn of praise, which is composed in various meters. Having heard the hymn, Mahālakṣmī graciously tells him that she will fulfil his wishes. Citraśekhara tells her about his problems and she gives him a banner with the yantra of Sudarśana, telling him that she protects all who have taken refuge with her by means of Sudarśana’s power. Citraśekhara goes back to the battle and kills the demon.

AS 50: This story is about King Kīrtimālin, the son of King Bhadraśṛṅga, in Viśālā. Roaming once through his kingdom in the darkness in order to hear the conversations of the people, he meets a Brahmin who is immersed in yoga meditation on Sudarśana. The king desires to ask the Brahmin who he is, where he comes from, etc., but, being in deep meditation, the Brahmin does not notice the king and thus does not reply. The angry king wants to seize him, but the only result is that he is paralysed by the Brahmin’s power. Surprised, he pays obeisance from all sides and appeases him with praises. Being appeased, the Brahmin awakes and tells the king about a place called Sālagrāma, where God Viṣṇu is present in the form of the discus. There he has mastered all sādhana (see n. 24) by means of the power of Sudarśana, and now he is on the way to Puśkara. The king pays homage to the Brahmin and conveys him to a Viṣṇu temple. The next day, when the Brahmin wants to leave for Puśkara, the king asks how he might achieve happiness (sukha), also hereafter. The Brahmin teaches him the six-syllabled sudarśanamantra and other mantras belonging to it, such as weapon mantras, as well as its visualisation (dhyāna), worship, and yantra. The king wishes to give many gifts to the Brahmin, but the Brahmin refuses to accept them. The king insists on giving them to him, and finally they agree on the king giving them to other Brahmins. From that time onwards, the king reigns according to the dharma. One day he asks his ministers which countries, kings, etc. are under his control. They answer that the whole earth is under his control, but that the deities, Gandharvas, Asuras, and Nāgas do not serve him. Hearing this, Kīrtimālin also wants to conquer all these beings and asks his ministers for advice. They tell him that he will be able to conquer them easily because of his immense valour and because he has obtained divine weapons from the Brahmin. Subsequently, Kīrtimālin conquers the Nāga world as well as the Yakṣas, Gandharvas, Siddhas, and Vidyādharas. His next aim is to conquer the deities. He thus sends a Gandharva messenger named Manojava to In-
dra to ask him to send him the elephant Airāvata, his thunderbolt (vajra), and other things. Indra, confronted with this demand, laughs and tells the messenger that he will send Airāvata and the thunderbolt. The other things should be fetched by Kārtimālin himself. Indra sends Airāvata and the thunderbolt, which arrive at Kārtimālin’s fortress and invisibly kill his army. This sudden death causes confusion. Kārtimālin calls his personal priest (purodhas) and asks for advice. Reflecting upon what has happened, the personal priest assumes that it was caused by the anger of the deities. At that moment, the messenger arrives and confirms this assumption. The king consults the personal priest to find a means of revenge, whereupon he sends one of his divine weapons forth, which paralyses Airāvata and the thunderbolt. Indra is angry and sends his dreadful army to Kārtimālin’s town. Seeing this, Kārtimālin comes out of the town together with his army. In a first battle, the deities win. Being angry, Kārtimālin sends further divine weapons forth, but Indra is able to ward them off. Kārtimālin remembers that he has a chariot among the weapon mantras from the Brahmin. He has such a chariot produced (by the personal priest). It is endowed with the sudarśanamahāyantra and a canopy.28 Then he sits down in the shade of the canopy and casts a viṣṇucakra, another weapon received from the Brahmin (see AS 34.14c–16), which kills the deities. The angry Indra also casts various weapons and finally his thunderbolt, but all these weapons disappear in the viṣṇucakra. Indra is surprised. He meets Kārtimālin and asks why his weapons are now successful. Kārtimālin explains that this success is due to the canopy. Indra and Kārtimālin become friends.

AS 42.35–40b: The king of Vārāṇasī called Kāśīrāja worships Viśveśvara Mahādeva and produces a female demon (kṛtyā) in order to destroy Krṣṇa.

28 These last two sentences are my interpretation of AS 50.112c–113: “Then Kārtimālin, having become despondent, remembered the chariot that he has received from the Brahmin. Then he had it made in that way [as taught by the Brahmin (?)], bound by the sudarśanamahāyantra and equipped with a canopy.” (tato nirvedam āpannāḥ kārtimāli dvijottamā tataḥ labdhāṃ vimāṇam sasmāra tat tathākārayat tataḥ | sudarśanamahāyantryantraṃ savitānaskam || 113). These sentences are not easy to understand. No chariot was mentioned in the story before; AS 50.29–31 states that the king receives various mantras from the Brahmin. Indeed, AS 40.61ab mentions a chariot (vimāna) among the many weapons that are forms of God, as taught by the AS. Thus, we can conclude that the chariot given to the king by the Brahmin is in the form of a weapon mantra. This could explain why a chariot that the king has already received has yet to be produced, in the sense that it could have been produced through a quasi-magic ritual by using the appropriate mantra. SCHRADER (1916: 140) understands this passage in a similar way.
The female demon goes to Dvārakā to find Kṛṣṇa. As Kṛṣṇa becomes aware that the flying demon is approaching, he casts Sudarśana. The female demon flees, but the discus kills her and destroys Kāśīrāja and his town.

Names, places, and motives

In the following section I would like to examine the persons, places, and motives that appear in the stories (see also the table on pp. 360ff.). Can we derive any information from them?

Let us first look at the names of the kings in the stories. Several of the kings’ names are well-known from Vedic, epic, and Purānic Sanskrit literature.

The names Pramaganda, the grandfather of the main character Maṇiśekhara in the story in AS 33.24–100, and Naicāśākha appear in a Rgvedic hymn, namely, in RV III.53.14. Here they seem to have a negative connotation. Indra is asked to bring the property of Prámaganda and to subdue Naicāśākhá.29 According to Śāyaṇa’s commentary ad loc., Pramaganda is the name of an offspring of Maganda, who was a usurer. Naicāśākha, according to Śāyaṇa, is the property of outcast (patita) people.30 In the introduction to his Rgvedabhāṣya, Śāyaṇa simply states that Naicāśākha is a town and Pramaganda a king,31 which agrees with the story in the AS.

The main character of the story, Maṇiśekhara, is described in a fairly positive way.32 However, being the child of a usurer and related to outcast

---

29 RV III.53.14: kṁ te kṛṇvanti kīkateṣu gāvo nāśīram duhrē nā tapanti gharmām | ā no bhura prāmagnadasya vēdo naicāśākhāṃ maghavan randhayā naḥ || “What do the cows do for you among the Kīkāṭas? They do not milk out the milk mixture; they do not heat the gharma[=hot]-drink. Bring here to us the possessions of Pramaganda. Make the descendant of Nīcāśākha subject to us, bounteous one.” (Translation JAMISON & BRERETON 2014: 539).

30 RV Bh vol. 2, p. 435,1–6. In this interpretation, Śāyaṇa follows Yāska’s Nirukta 6.32, from which he also quotes in the subsequent passage (see also CHARPENTIER 1930: 336).

31 RV Bh vol. 1, p. 6,7f.: “In the same way the non-eternal meanings ‘that which is called naicāśākha is a town, that which is called pramaganda is a king’ are handed down.” (tathā naicāśākham nāma nagaran pramagando nāma rājā ity ete ’ṛthā antiyā āmnātah.) CHARPENTIER (1930: 336) sees a contradiction between the two statements of Śāyaṇa. I think that this is not necessarily a contradiction: also an offspring of a usurer could perhaps be a king, and a town could perhaps also be seen as a kind of property.

32 AS 33.27–28b: “When this aforementioned Maṇiśekhara had passed the first
people is perhaps a kind of karmic explanation of why a virtuous king is tormented by a demon.\textsuperscript{33}

Indra is the king of the gods and well-known (e.g., SÖRENSEN 1904 s.v. Indra).

Kuśadhvaja, the king of the Janakas in the story in AS 45, is known from the \textit{Rāmāyaṇa}. He is the brother of King Janaka (Rām 1.69.1–2). Another link to King Janaka is found in his \textit{kulaguru} Yājñavalkya, who is Janaka’s teacher in the \textit{Brhadāranyakopaniṣad} (e.g., BĀU 3.1.1–2).

King Viśāla from the story in AS 48.50c–64b and his town Viśālā are mentioned in the \textit{Mahābhārata} and in the \textit{Rāmāyaṇa}.\textsuperscript{34} The father of King Citraśekhara, the main character of the story in AS 49, Uparicara, is well-known from the \textit{Mahābhārata} (SÖRENSEN 1904 s.v. Uparicara).

The name Muktāpiḍa, appearing in the story in AS 48.9–50b, is mentioned in the Kashmirian chronicle \textit{Rājatarangini}. SCHRADE (1916: 96f.) takes this fact as evidence for the Kashmirian origin of the AS. According to BOCK-RAMING (2002: 20, n. 6), Muktāpiḍa was the fifth ruler of the Karkoṭa dynasty (699–736 CE) in the \textit{Rājatarangini}. It is unclear, however, if the king’s name in the story is really inspired by the name of the Kashmirian king.

Versions of the story about the Kāśirāja who worships Viśveśvara in Vārāṇasī appear in \textit{Viṣṇupurāṇa} 5.34 ≈ \textit{Brahmapurāṇa} 207, \textit{Padmapurāṇa uttarakhaṇḍa} 278, and \textit{Bhāgavatapurāṇa} 10.66.\textsuperscript{35}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{33} See DONIGER O’FLAHERTY 1980: 33–36 on the transfer of karman between parents and children.
\textsuperscript{34} According to Rām 1.46.11, Viśāla is the son of Ikṣvāku and Alambuṣā; in Rām 1.44.8–12 his town Viśālā is mentioned. In MBh 3.88.22–23 Viśālā is identified with Badarī.
\textsuperscript{35} This story could provide evidence for dating this passage of the AS. According to Peter Bisschop, a reference to the worship of Viśveśvara by a king in Vārāṇasī cannot be earlier than the twelfth century, since “the name of Viśveśvara as the central \textit{liṅga} in Vārāṇasī is not attested before the twelfth century and represents a significant departure from the period preceding it” (personal information from Peter Bisschop to Robert Leach; see LEACH 2012: 156, n. 256). See also GUTSCHOW 1994: 194f. In the Purāṇa versions of the story, the deity is called Viśveśvara but Mahēśvara.
\end{flushright}
The names of kings I have not yet been able to locate in Sanskrit literature are Śrutakṛṣṭa, king of Saurṣṭra (AS 42.40c–82), Sunīṭa (AS 48.64c–109), and Kṛtimālin (AS 50).

Let us now look at the names of the purohitas. Insofar as they are mentioned, they are all famous sages who are also well-known from the epics and Purāṇas. For example, Kratu, Vasiṣṭha (see n. 36), and Pulaha are sons of Brahmā. Durvāsas is a son of Śiva, born of his anger. Bṛhaspati is the purohita of the deities. Yājñavalkya was already mentioned above. He is also a well-known rṣī in the epics and the Purāṇas. Kaṇva is a rṣī that is known already in the Rgveda (he composed its eighth maṇḍala) as well as in the epics and Purāṇas.

An interesting case, as already mentioned, is the story in AS 42.35–40b. This story presents no purohita, and thus it seems irrelevant with regard to the role of purohitas, all the more so since it follows a different scheme than the others. In this story, the king is punished rather than saved by means of Sudarśana. However, the non-appearance of a purohita is striking if we compare this story with its Purānic versions previously mentioned. In the Purāṇas, it is the son of a Kāśīrāja who worships Śiva because he desires a means for revenging his father, who has been killed by Kṛṣṇa. In all three versions of the Purāṇas, the son worships Śiva together with a purohita. It could be by chance that the purohita does not appear in the

---

36 The stories AS 42.40c–82, 48.9–50b, and 50 do not mention the names of the purohitas. However, AS 48.16 mentions that the purohita uses a method taught by Vasiṣṭha (vasiṣṭhoktena mārgena), meaning that he stands in the tradition of Vasiṣṭha, who was the family priest of various kings, among others of the family of Ikṣvāku, see MONIER-WILLIAMS 1899 s.v. Vasiṣṭha. On the story AS 42.35–40b, see below.

37 See, e.g., MANI 1975 s.v. Durvāsas. Durvāsas also appears in the śāstrāvatāra story in AS 1.

38 For references to these sages in the MBh, see SÖRENSEN 1904 s.v. their names. For Yājñavalkya in a Purāṇa, see, e.g., AgniPur 16.8; for Kaṇva in a Purāṇa, see, e.g., BrahmaPur 26.10.

39 The Purāṇas also report the prelude to this story: Paṇḍraka Vāsudeva erroneously considers himself to be the god Vāsudeva and requests Kṛṣṇa, the actual god Vāsudeva, to give up his claim. In response, Paṇḍraka Vāsudeva and his ally, the king of Kāśī (in the Padmapurāṇa Paṇḍraka, Vāsudeva, and the Kāśīrāja are one and the same person), are killed by Kṛṣṇa.

40 ViṣṇuPur 5.34.29 (= BrahmaPur 207.29): “Having learned that he has been killed by Vāsudeva, his son consequently pleased Śaṅkara together with a personal priest,” (jñātvā taṃ vāsudevena hataṃ tasya sutas tataḥ | purohitena sahitas toṣayām
AS’s version, since it is a rather abridged version of the story. Given the general importance of purohitas in the AS, however, the purohita may also have been omitted from the story on purpose. In the Purānic versions, the purohita appears in a bad light. He helps a king who wishes to kill Kṛṣṇa and, above all, he does not succeed. It is possible that the AS’s redactor did not want to present purohitas in this role and thus omitted the personal priest in this story.

Now let us examine the places mentioned in the stories. The place mentioned most often, namely three times, is the river Sarasvatī. Twice it is the place where Sudarśana should be worshipped: in AS 33.87 Sālagrāma is considered to be located on its banks,41 and in AS 45.37 a pavilion (mandapa) for the worship of Sudarśana is constructed on its banks. In AS 49.2 Bhadravāṭi, the town reigned by King Citraśekhara, is situated on a bank of the Sarasvatī.

Two places are mentioned twice, Viśālā and Sālagrāma. Viśālā is Badarī (see n. 34), the well-known site, especially for a Pāñcarātra, of Nara’s and Nārāyaṇa’s hermitage in the Nārāyanīya.32 In the AS, it is the town that is ruled by the Kings Viśālā (AS 48.50) and Kṛitimalin (AS 50.2).

Sālagrāma is one of the few places mentioned in the narratives that is described in more detail. This is the case in both passages in which it is mentioned. Sālagrāma or Sālagrāma is a place actually located on the river Gaṇḍakī, not the Sarasvatī. Unusual black stones, also called sālagrāma,

| **āsa śaṃkaram |** PadmaPur uttarakhaṇḍa 278.15: “Having heard that his father has been killed by the Venerable Vāsudeva, Pauṇḍraka’s son, called Daṇḍapāṇi, commanded by [his] mother Mṛtyu [and] requested by his personal priest, worshipped Śāṅkara by means of a sacrifice devoted to Maheśvara.” (tasya pauṇḍrakasya suto daṇḍapāṇiḥ itirī vāsudevena bhagavataḥ niḥataṃ svapitaraṇaḥ śrutvā mātrā mṛtyunā samādiṣṭaḥ svapurohitenaḥbhīyakto māheśvareṇa kratunan śaṅkaram iyāya.) BhāgPur 10.66.27–28: “Having performed the cremation ceremony for the ruler, his son Sudakṣiṇa, having himself in view: ‘I will revenge [my] father by killing his murderer,’ worshipped Maheśvara together with [his] preceptor in supreme concentration.’” (sudakṣinas tasya sutah kṛtvā samstāhāvidhiṃ pateḥ | niḥataḥ pitrantānaḥ yāsyāmy aparicītī pituh || ity ātmanābhisandhāya sopādhyaḥ maheśvaram | sudakṣiṇo ‘rca- yāmn āsa paramena samādhiṇā).}

41 See n. 20.

42 The Nārāyanīya is not only the earliest extant Pāñcarātra text, but it also had a strong influence on the Pāñcarātra Saṃhitās, especially in their narrative passages, which borrow many motives from it; see GRÜNENDAHL 1997: 362–370 and, with a focus on the Pārameśvarasaṃhitā, RASTELLI 2006: 161–168.
are found there. Containing a fossil ammonite, they are considered parts of the discus Sudarśana and thus are sacred.\(^{43}\) This explains why Śaṅgarāma is important for the AS. Everything present in Śaṅgarāma, including plants and stones, is considered to be marked by the discus:

Having assumed the form of a boar in the boar-\(kalpa,\) the venerable one, the supreme person, pulled the earth out of the ocean. Then the goddess Earth, who was exceedingly exulted, spoke to the God (78c–79): “In order to rejoice those who are fond [of you], you should dwell in a territory on the earth forever, O lord of the world, after having obtained a dear body.” (80) Thenceforth Keśava, to whom the goddess had spoken in this way, dwelled in the auspicious territory of the earth called Śaṅgarāma (81) with the body of Sudarśana, the glorious one, the venerable one, the one who is kind to [his] worshippers. Because of the majesty of the place, because of the compassion for [his] worshippers, [and] because of the request of the earth, Hari is always present there even today. The austerity that is performed in this place is multiplied thousandfold. (82–83) Human beings, animals, insects, and birds that die in this place are without doubt marked by the conch and the discus. (84) The venerable one, the lotus-eyed one who bears the body of Sudarśana is always present there, an ocean of good, auspicious qualities. (85) The human beings, deities, animals, trees, and mountains who live at his place are all marked by the seal of the discus. (86)\(^{44}\) The unsurpassed place of Viṣṇu is called Śaṅgarāma. There the lord of the world in the form of the discus is always present. There everything that is immovable and moving is marked by the discus.

\(^{43}\) See, e.g., MANI 1975 s.v. śaṅgarāma.

\(^{44}\) AS 33.78c–86: \(vārāham rūpac āsthāya bhagavān purusottamaḥ \|| 78 ujjahāra bhuvam kalpe vārāhē salillāh tatah \|| tadāhā paramaprittā devaṁ devi vasūṃdharaḥ \|| 79 priyārtham anuraktanām sādā bhūmaṇḍale tayā \|| varitāvyaṃ jagannātha priyāṃ tānum upeyūṣā \|| 80 evam ukas tayā devyā tadā prabhṛti keśavaḥ \|| śaṅgarāmāḥvaye pūrye nyavasana manḍale bhuvah \|| 81 sudarśanavapuḥ śrīmān bhagavān bhaṅkavaisālaḥ \|| adhyōpi deśaṃādhyāṃd bhaktanām anukampayā \|| 82 bhuvah prārthanaẏā tatra nityaṃ samnīhitā hariḥ \|| atra tāpasaṁ tapo yat tat sahasraṅgutam bhavet \|| 83 manuṣyāḥ pasāvas tatra kriyasaṁ ca patitrināḥ \|| ye mṛtāḥ śaṅkha-cakraṅkās te bhavanti na saṃsāyah \|| 84 bhagavān puṇḍarīkākṣaḥ sudarśanavapaṃdharah \|| samnīdhatte sādā tatra samnīdgaṇumāṇavah \|| 85 tuddēśavāsino māryāḥ surās śīryaṇica eva ca \|| tāvaseśa taṃcalāḥ sarve cakramudrāṅkitās tadā \|| 86.
There, by merely entering [it], creatures are free of any blemish. There those who have given up their body reach supreme extinction (nirvāṇa). A Brahmin who is born at that place is approved by the learned, by means of Sudarśana’s power he has accomplished all sādhanaś. Other places mentioned in the AS’s narratives include a second sacred place, namely Puṣkara, to which the Brahmin coming from Sālagrāma wanders (AS 50.23 and 26); the Himālaya, where Bhraspati recites the su-darśanamantra (AS 44.20); the river Tamasā upon whose banks Kaṇva lives (AS 48.80); the town Bhadravātī of the Saurashtra king (AS 42.41); and the town Bhadravātī of King Citraśekhara on the banks of the Sarasvati (AS 49.2). Some places belong to beings other than humans, such as Svāstika, the town of the Gandharvas (AS 42.46–50); the mountain Kailāsa, where Śiva resides (AS 43.21, 32–33); and Bhogavati, the town of the Nāgas (AS 48.70, 83, 97). The town Śṛṅgāra of King Sunīti, whose son falls in love with the Nāga princess, seems to bear a symbolic name rather than that of a real place, since śṛṅgāra means “sexual passion.”

In conclusion, it is striking that all places, as far as they can be identified, are located in the northern part of India. As far as we can see, no place in South India is mentioned, although the current view is that the AS was redacted in the south. Not surprising is that several places that are considered sacred because of the presence of Viṣṇu or one of his forms are mentioned, including Badarī, Sālagrāma, and Puṣkara. Most of the places mentioned are known from the epics or Purāṇas.

At the end of this section, let us look at the problems the kings of the stories suffer from. Most often mentioned, namely in four stories, is the problem of demons beleaguering and tormenting the king and his kingdom that cannot be conquered by ordinary military means.

---

45 See n. 24.
46 AS 50.19c–22: sālagrāma iti khyātaṃ viṣṇusthānam anuttamam || 19 nityam samhitās tatra cakrāūpī jāgaṃpatī || tatra cakrāṅkitaṃ sarvaṃ sādhanaṃ jauṃgamaṃ ca yat || 20 tatra praveśamātreṇa jantavo vītakalmaśāḥ || tatra tyaktāsārīrīs tu yānti nirvāṇam uttamaṃ || 21 tasmin desaḥ sādhinapraṇaḥ bṛāmanah śiṣṭasammataraḥ | sudarśanaprabhāvena sādhitākhyilasādhanaḥ || 22.

47 The river Tamasā is also mentioned in the epics; see MANI 1975 s.v.
48 This problem appears in the stories told in AS 33.24–100, 43.21c–44.56, 48.9–50b (here the reason for the invasion of demons is the carelessness of the king), and 49.
these demons not real demons but demonised enemies and their troops, this was indeed one of the main problems faced by kings, especially if we consider the situation in South India in the thirteenth century (see above). This thus fits the ritual repertoire that is offered by the AS, because here too, the focus is on rituals for victory in battle (BIANCHINI 2015: 49–55, 60–62).

The other main aim of kings, mentioned in two stories, is not unrelated, since it is the counterpart of defence against enemies, namely, the conquest of further territories. Other problems and aims, each mentioned once, are mental illness caused by a crime committed in a previous life (AS 45); the threat of death (AS 48.50–64b); the kidnapping of a prince (AS 48.64c–109); and liberation from transmigration (AS 42.40c–82). All of these were probably dangers or aims that were really feared or striven for by kings, indeed, in some cases not only by kings, but all human beings.

Conclusion

Reflecting on the AS, its narratives, and the historical circumstances of its origin, has led me to the following thoughts:

1) Why did the AS’s redactor choose narratives as a means for convincing kings of the usefulness of worshipping Sudarśana?

The AS’s redactor, if indeed he was a single person, was deeply learned. Just a few examples: He knew the philosophies of Kashmirian Śaivism and of the Rāmānuja school, philosophical concepts of language, classical Yoga, the Vedas, and, especially, the Atharvaveda. He knew the Purāṇas and the epics and could imitate their literary style in a masterly way. The rich contents of the AS demonstrate to us that its redactor did not include narratives because he could not master more sophisticated texts. He chose narratives for two reasons: First, kings would certainly be more easily convinced by the practical usefulness of particular rituals than by philosophical or theological reflections. In order to communicate the use of, for example, a

49 See the stories of AS 42.40c–82 and AS 50. Compare AS 29, which gives prescriptions for rituals for the purpose of the conquest of further territories, including the upper world (ārdhvaloka) and the world of the Nāgas (nāgaloka).

50 For the influence of Kashmirian Śaivism on the AS, see SANDERSON 2001: 36–38; for the influence of the Rāmānuja school, see, e.g., the mention of the concept of ṣeṣa and ṣeṣin in AS 52.6, which is a characteristic thought of this tradition (see CARMAN 1974: 147–157); for that of Yoga, see AS 31–32; for the influence of the Atharvavedic tradition, see RASTELLI 2018.
ritual for military purposes, a narrative would be much more appropriate than a theoretical tract. Secondly, narratives with a simple structure and entertainment value were an eligible means by which the author of the AS could approach kings, who were not unlearned persons but certainly more familiar with the Purānic and epic literature and their style than with philosophical or ritual texts.

2) What strategies are used in the narratives and for what purpose?
The main characters of the stories, mainly kings and personal priests, are often well-known persons from the epics and Purāṇas. The same is true of the places mentioned in the narratives. This means that the audience of the narratives most likely already knew these names and places before hearing the story itself. The listeners considered them historical persons and real existing places, since from the traditional Indian point of view the Purāṇas and epics were considered historical documents, describing events, places, and persons that once really existed.

One is more willing to believe a story about a person or a place that is familiar than a story about persons or places one has never heard of. Thus, to tell a story about characters or places that the audience is already familiar with increases its credibility. It improves the chances that the story will also be considered a report of a historical event. This is probably one reason the redactor of these narratives mentions particularly well-known persons and places.

In addition, using the names of famous persons achieves a further effect. The many famous kings who solved their problems by worshipping Sudarśana represent a very distinguished circle. The narratives insinuate to any ruling king that by worshipping Sudarśana he could also belong to this illustrious group. The same is true for the purohita. By relating a story like this, a purohita places himself into a row of famous sages, whereby he presents himself as being like one of them.

3) The AS is currently considered to have been redacted in South India. Nevertheless, the places mentioned in the narratives are located in India’s northern region. One reason could be the one just mentioned: these are places known from the epics and Purāṇas, which increase the credibility of the story. However, a place in South India well-known to a southern king would fulfil the same function.

So there may be other reasons: Was this part of the AS perhaps composed in the north rather than in the south? However, the mere reference to places in the north is not sufficient evidence for this conclusion. Perhaps it
is precisely the emphasis on places in North India, especially sites that are classical places of Viṣṇu worship, which points to the fact that the AS was composed in South India. Did the AS’s redactor emulate the North Indian traditions because he considered them an ideal? Or was it a wish of the kings at that time to take North India as an example, a wish that the AS’s redactor tried to fulfil? Did the southern kings feel inadequate in comparison to kings in the north, wanting to be like them? Or were southern courts generally oriented to the North Indian religious and literary traditions, with the AS’s redactor reflecting this orientation? There is inscriptional evidence that Sanskrit learning was highly valued in medieval South India. Inscriptions report on the promotion of, for example, Vedic schools, settlements for Brahmins, libraries, and other educational centres, and on the recitation of the *Mahābhārata* (MADHAVAN 2013: 105–139). Perhaps places known from Sanskrit literature received the same esteem as Sanskrit literature itself.

4) It is not possible to identify a particular historical king for whom the AS was composed. Indeed, it is probable that the redactor of the AS did not aim at a particular historical person. Considering the political situation in South India in the thirteenth century, a period when the ruling king could change any day, it would not have been wise to focus on a particular king. Thus, the target of the AS, that is, the target of the purohitas who acted according to the AS, were probably rulers in general. Their political distress at the time may have been considered an exceptional chance for promoting the Pāñcarātra.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text passage</th>
<th>Name of king</th>
<th>Places mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS 33.24–100</td>
<td>Maniśekhara, son of Durdharṣa(ṇa), grandson of Pramaganda</td>
<td>Naicāśākha, Sālagrāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 42.40c–82</td>
<td>Śrutakīrti, king of Saurāṣṭra</td>
<td>Bhadraśālā, Svastika (city of Gandharvas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 43.21c–44.56</td>
<td>Indra, king of the gods</td>
<td>Kailāsa (abode of Śiva), Himālaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 45</td>
<td>Kuśadhvaja, king of the Janakas</td>
<td>Sarasvatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 48.9–50b</td>
<td>Muktāpīḍa, son of Suśravas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 48.50c–64b</td>
<td>Viśāla</td>
<td>Viśālā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 48.64c–109</td>
<td>Sunīti</td>
<td>Śṛṅgāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 49</td>
<td>Citraśekhara, son of Uparicara</td>
<td>Bhadravāṭī, Sarasvatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 50</td>
<td>Kīrtimālin, son of Bhadraśṛṅga</td>
<td>Viśālā, Sālagrāma, Puṣkara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 42.35–40b</td>
<td>Kāśīrāja</td>
<td>Vārāṇasī, Dvārakā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Name(s) of helper(s)</td>
<td>Solution to problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demon Vikatākṣa and his offspring torment all beings</td>
<td>purodhas Kratu, Durvāsas</td>
<td>sudarśanamantra, worship of Sudarśana in Śālagrāma for one month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king wants to conquer the Gandharva world and be liberated from transmigration</td>
<td>purodhas (no name mentioned)</td>
<td>visualization of the 62-armed Sudarśana, recitation of his mantra and ritual worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indra is tormented by the demon Jalāṃdhara</td>
<td>Brhaspati</td>
<td>Śiva promises to kill the demon by means of the sudarśanamantra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king is tormented by mahāmoha</td>
<td>kulaguru Yājñavalkya</td>
<td>sādhana of Sudarśana in order to destroy prārabdhakarmā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demons bring the kingdom under their control because it is neglected by the king</td>
<td>purodhas</td>
<td>a throne (āsana) with Sudarśana’s yantra in which the king is seated, performance of a ritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king will die within four days</td>
<td>purohita Pulaha</td>
<td>a ring (aṅguliya) with Sudarśana’s yantra chases death’s servants away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son is kidnapped and taken to the Nāga world</td>
<td>purohita; his guru Kaṇva</td>
<td>a mirror helps find the Nāga world and conquer the Nāga king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demon Amarśaṇa cannot be conquered by the king</td>
<td>Kubera, Mahālakṣmī</td>
<td>a banner that helps kill the demon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛttimālin cannot conquer Indra</td>
<td>brahmin, purodhas</td>
<td>a canopy with Sudarśana’s yantra helps conquer Indra and gain his friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Kāśīrāja attacks Kṛṣṇa by means of a kṛtyā</td>
<td>no helpers mentioned</td>
<td>Sudarśana kills the kṛtyā and the Kāśīrāja, and destroys his town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In case of emergency:  
Addressing rulers in the *Ahirbudhnyasamhitā*  

Francesco Bianchini

It is now generally accepted that one way in which Tantric communities sought to increase their influence and power was by creating bonds with royal courts. The present paper deals with a specific instance of this important issue, by investigating the Vaiṣṇava Pāñcarātra *Ahirbudhnyasamhitā* (AhS), probably redacted in South India around the thirteenth century, and its many strategies designed to address a courtly audience. Occasional comparisons with other scriptures will also be included in order to clarify the specific character of the AhS.

As already observed by a number of scholars, one of the prominent features of the present Saṃhitā is its great emphasis on the fulfilment of the ruler’s desires and his special needs, particularly in times of danger and natural calamities. Perhaps partly because of this, we witness an absence of the dimension of calendrical rituals as well as of the many minor tasks court officiants would be normally expected to perform.

A second general observation regards the alleged militaristic dimension of the AhS. Very little can be found in the Saṃhitā which explicitly has to do with actual war scenarios, battle strategies, empowerment of the soldiers’ weapons, and similar themes. Instead, it is the king who is at the

---

1 I would like to thank Marion Rastelli of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, who shared with me the fruits of her extensive research on the *Ahirbudhnyasamhitā* while wholeheartedly supervising my MA thesis in 2015, on which this article is based. Sincere thanks also go to Karin Preisendanz of the University of Vienna for her help with the intricacies of textual criticism. Of course, I am indebted to the organisers Nina Mirnig, Vincent Eltschinger, and again Marion Rastelli for giving a student this wonderful opportunity. My special thanks go to Katharine Apostle for her help with the English language.  
2 See RASTELLI in this volume.  
3 See in particular BEGLEY’s informative study, which deals with the iconography of the multi-armed Sudarśana and also touches upon aspects of his worship as depicted in Pāñcarātra texts (1973: 65ff).
centre of attention and it is a certain ideal of kingship which eventually emerges. The work portrays an idealised ruler who, thanks to the power of Sudarśana, the personified discus of Viṣṇu, deployed by his priest, is perfectly capable of both conquering beyond limit and of protecting his territory against dangerous enemies. What the redactors of the work are advertising is precisely this ideal of empowered kingship, which is sometimes illustrated by means of stereotypical war or calamity scenarios 4.

Regarding the editions used in this article, it should be noted that the transmission of the text remains uncertain at this point. For the philological choices of the author of this article, please consult the appendix, which attempts to outline the policies of and manuscripts used by the editors of the text and how these affect the readings.

**Introductory remarks on the structure of the AhS**

One of the main challenges of reading a work like the AhS is identifying the changes the text underwent in the course of time. A reliable critical edition is key to this process, yet how far back in history we can actually reach depends on the stemmatic relations of the witnesses.

How many revisions did the AhS undergo? How old are the current division into adhyāyas (chapters) and the praising stanzas at their beginning? For example, the adhyāyas at the end of the work could have easily been added to the main text at some later point. Unfortunately, much of this remains unclear at present (see appendix of this paper).

The portion of the text considered here is that between adhyāyas 16 to 50. The first significant mention of kings is found in adhyāya 16, where the teaching about mantras begins. The last circle of narratives ends with adhyāya 50, before the opening of an exegetical coda regarding various specific mantras which carries on until the end of the work.

Interestingly, sections dealing with closely related topics are found scattered throughout this portion of the work in a way that would appear random. Schrader had to group some of these sections together when summarising the contents of the work. 5 This might be a drastic solution, but it is also practical. The materials found in this portion could be brought together

---

4 Begley had already observed that the themes of conquest and protection mirror the distinction between Sudarśana’s offensive and defensive weapons (cf. Begley 1973: 79).

5 Cf. Schrader 1916: 118.
under the following thematic headings: mantras, yantras, rituals, narratives, divine weapons (divya astras) and yoga. One can see that the adhyāyas devoted to mantras contain a total of 269 stanzas (without counting the coda after adhyāya 50), those on yantras a total of 508, those devoted to specific rituals 435, those on narratives 694, those on divine weapons 308, and finally those on yoga 123. Obviously, this data is not very precise, but it can be used to point out the importance (at least in terms of space) given to narratives and descriptions of yantras in the AhŚ.

Again on royal officiants and rulers

Rulers and members of the royal court occupy a prominent position and can be said to be the main target audience. Particularly relevant from the historical point of view is the role played by officiants. Rastelli has identified and translated passages dealing with the royal officiant, often called purohita in the Saṃhitā, and his king. The main topics dealt with in such passages are: the superiority of the king, the qualities of the ideal officiant, the fact that he is necessary to the king, and that they ought to join forces for the welfare of the kingdom as well as for their own. References to the Atharvaveda, which is classically associated with the sphere of royal ritual, are also quite frequent. These aspects are skilfully linked to a theological background.

---

6 The correspondences are as follows: mantras AhŚ 16–19; yantras I AhŚ 20–27; rituals I AhŚ 28–29; astras I AhŚ 30; yoga AhŚ 31–32; narrative I AhŚ 33; astras II AhŚ 34–35; yantras II AhŚ 36–37; ritual II AhŚ 38–39; astras III AhŚ 40; narrative II AhŚ 41–45; ritual III AhŚ 46–47; narrative III AhŚ 48–50. See for details about this categorisation BIANCHINI 2015: 18–24.

7 Not only are the “labels” (like yantras etc.) somewhat arbitrary, but in a few cases they do not entirely correspond to full adhyāyas. For example, adhyāyas 42 to 46 constitute a good example for a section where the superstructure does not apply without difficulty. At the beginning of AhŚ 42, a long description of calamities arising in a kingdom because of an enemy’s attack by means of hostile magic (abhi-cāra) is not part of the main narrative occupying the rest of the adhyāya. The same applies to the description of the perfect court officiant in adhyāya 46, quite separate from the rest of the content (although still connected to the issue of ritual procedure). In fact, even adhyāyas could be subdivided into smaller units, and in rare cases such units would require special categories.

8 The passages translated by RASTELLI 2018 are AhŚ 16.10c–27; AhŚ 46.3–11; AhŚ 33.60c–66; and 33.74b–77b.

9 Cf. RASTELLI 2018. Some of the main ideas are that the sudarśanamantra originated from the Atharvaveda (AhŚ 20.21c–24b) and that a saṃskāra performed according to the
For example, the power of ritual action by means of mantras goes back to Viṣṇu’s creative power (kriyāśakti), and Lākṣmī stands for the idea of “fortune” residing in the institutions represented by the king and the brāhmaṇa, and this is also described as the basis of the kriyāśakti itself.\footnote{AhS 16.12–16 on these topics.}

The beginning of adhyāya 16 is a remarkable example of how these motifs can be brought together in a literary fashion. In order to avoid repetitions, only part of the passage will be quoted here. The following example is a statement about the king’s superiority:

The king is praised in revealed knowledge (veda) and systematised bodies of knowledge (śāstra) as a double brāhmaṇa (i.e., as worth twice as much as a brāhmaṇa). If one is hostile to him out of delusion, that fool is hostile to Hari [himself].\footnote{AhS 16.16: dviguṇa brāhmaṇo rājā vedāśāstreṣu gīvate | yas tu taṃ dveṣṭī saṃmohāḥ sa harīṃ dveṣṭī durmatāḥ || (16a brāhmaṇo [ed.] – brahmaṇo [A B C J]). It is interesting to notice that SCHRADER’s (1916) remarks about stemma relations seem to apply quite well to the present situation. The accepted archetypal reading might be puzzling at first due to the series of three nominatives, and a copyist could be tempted to simplify the reading by shortening the ā of brāhmaṇaḥ in order to form an ablative, which could be easily constructed with dviguṇa. However, the reading with the nominative is perfectly acceptable. The corruption is found in mss. ABC, which according to SCHRADER (1916) are very close to each other and occupy lower positions in the (hypothetical) stemma (ms. J was added in the second edition, cf. AhS Ed²: vii).}

But a much more challenging passage that does not directly concern the officiant and therefore was not included by Rastelli can be found further on in the same context:

A ruler who is a universal sovereign is entitled to the first, a provincial governor to the second, and a district governor to the third [level of] creative energy (kriyāśakti), or a twice-born chief minister [too], provided he is in charge of the protection of many people. No single man is entitled to deploy it for [just] one other person.\footnote{AhS 16.28–29: cakravartī nrpaḥ pūrvāṃ dvitrīṃ brāhmaṇāṃ saṃvatsaraḥ | adhikuryāt kriyāśaktim tṛṣṭyah viṣayēśvarah || 28 mahāmātro dvijātir vā yo bahvi raksati praśāh | imāṃ naiko naraḥ kuryād ekasmai mānavaṅga tu || 29 (28c kriyāśaktim [ed.] – imāṃ śaktim [D]; 29c imāṃ naiko [ed.] – imāṃ eko [B C E F J]).}
A few points deserve attention here. These stanzas illustrate the concept that rulers of varying power, who are arranged in a descending climax, hold a corresponding degree of entitlement to the kriyāśakti, which in the present context is related to the power of mantras. More importantly, the last verse sets the lower limit to this entitlement, apparently stating that no (ordinary) man can use this power for a single other person. If this was the case, then the whole passage would amount to limiting the context to the public dimension, in opposition to the private one. However, as many as five witnesses state exactly the contrary, reading imām eko instead of imāṃ naiko. If we follow the reading imām eko, the passage amounts to stating that what is really not accepted is that one uses the mantra for oneself alone. However, other passages seem to support the idea that the people entitled (adhikārin) to use the mantras are really members of the court, and there would be little point in mentioning all the qualified people in the present passage (and even adding yo bahvī rakṣatī praṅāh) only to end up saying that after all anyone is entitled to it. Also, if Schrader was correct in taking dvijāti as an apposition to mahāmātra and not as a fourth entitled person in his paraphrase of the passage, then jumping directly to a common person would constitute a significant gap. Without direct access to the manuscripts and with significant stemmatic uncertainties, such matters are not easily settled. They also raise the question of how much consistency one can actually expect in a work of this kind.

In search for more specific, and possibly historically relevant, descriptions of not only kings but also officiants, the present author sought to examine whether a clear distinction was made in the AhŚ between two classes of royal priests, the more “humble” class of royal chaplains (court officiant stricto sensu) and the more prestigious one of the royal preceptors (guru/rāja-guru). That such a dichotomy might indeed be relevant was instilled in the present author’s mind by Sanderson’s remarks in his important

Translating such terms as maṇḍaleśvara, viṣayeśvara, or mahāmātra with any precision is not an easy task, especially because their meaning changed according to time and place, as often explained in the corresponding entries in SIRCAR’s (1966) Indian Epigraphical Glossary, on which the renderings here heavily rely.

13 Cf., for example: “This mantra and yantra are truly prescribed for kings. O Nārada, the collections of mantras serve all general purposes. If the earth-master’s ministers are engaged in their worship, they protect the king even in the presence of bad omens [indicating that his life is in danger].” (AhŚ 27.43–44: ayaṃ mantraḥ ca ya-ntraḥ ca rājān eva vidhīyate | sarvasādhāraṇārthāṁ mantrajñātāṁ nārāda || etadabhyarcananapaḥ ma- ntriṇo yasya bhūpateḥ | abhirakṣanti rājānam ariṣṭamukhaḥ pi te ||).
study of the royal chaplain of the Śaiva scripture Netratantra, where the two figures are clearly distinguished.\textsuperscript{14} In this connection, let us consider the following passage from the AhS, while also remembering that Atharvavedic motifs play a prominent role in the work:

Such a court officiant (purohita) who is [himself] like a guru to kings is difficult to find. Such a one is verily capable of warding off the flood of misdeeds [and their consequences] for kings. Therefore, he alone is able to perform the rituals of protection of kings. He who has such a guru [by his side] shall become a sovereign king, one with a long life, one free of enemies and diseases, and a slayer of hostile heroes.

In his dominion there shall be no devastations such as droughts etc. If the king, in the absence of [such a capable] one, has a different (i.e., ordinary) guru or court officiant [at his side], that supporter of the earth shall get the opposite [result] (i.e., unfavourable things), there is no doubt about that.\textsuperscript{15}

The first expression found is gurukalpaḥ purohitah, “a court officiant (purohita) who is [himself] like a guru.” Ad 9c the officiant is simply called guru and ad 11b again the two are separated in gurur vātha purohitah, “a guru or a court officiant.” What are the reasons for this ambivalence? Is one to understand that the officiant of Sudarśana’s cult is just like a guru, even if his Atharvavedic legacy makes him technically a purohita? Is a group of purohitas close to Atharvavedic circles trying to enhance their status by promoting Tantric worship of Sudarśana in the context of the royal court? These are the important issues at stake here, gleaming, as it were, through the terminological choices of the redactors. In an attempt to avoid speculation, the quest for further evidence was continued in a context which was more likely to shed light on such details – the context of the narratives.

\textsuperscript{14} Cf. SANDERSON 2004: 233.
\textsuperscript{15} AhS 46.8–11: īḍṛśo durlabho rājñām gurukalpaḥ purohitah | īḍṛśo hi kṣamo rājñaṁ aghaughavinivāraṇe || 8 atāṁ sa eva rājñaṁ hi rakṣāvidhim athārhati | evamvidho guruḥ yaśya sa saṁrād nṛpatir bhavet || 9 dīrghāyur niśsapatnāh syād arogaḥ paravāraḥ | avagrahādyā jaṁante pīdās tadvisaye na hi || 10 tam vināyo bhaved rājño guruḥ vātha purohitah | viparītāṁ bhavet tasya mahābhartur na sarṣa-yaṁ || 11 (8d aghaughavinivāraṇe [ed.] – aghaughasya nivāraṇe [A B E F]). The passage is translated in RASTELLI 2018.
Despite the fact that the content of the narratives is basically fictional, the present author was hoping to gain at least new insights into the functions of different classes of royal priests and to subsequently build a typology which could throw light on them as historical agents as well.

For example, one kind of officiant in the narratives is the one present at the royal court, who has direct access to the king and ministers (as is the first purohita mentioned in the story of Sunanda, AhS 48.64cff.). Some narratives depict another character, which appears to reside outside of the court, for instance in a hermitage (like Pulaha in the story of Viśāla, AhS 48.50ff.). This second character can be approached directly by the king or by the court officiant. The fact that the court officiant goes to him for help could imply that the latter is more powerful or more knowledgeable about the deity Sudarśana. One would therefore be tempted to separate the characters into the group of court officiants proper (i.e., rather humble “chaplains”) on the one hand and powerful sages (who are possibly also royal preceptors) on the other.

However, two problems arise: First of all, the narratives do not present sufficient details on the characters to clearly identify and separate the kind of services they could provide. Secondly, the terms used to address them are not clearly distinct. For example, in the story of King Viśāla (AhS 48.50ff.), the king himself goes to the hermitage of Pulaha, who thus seems to be absent from the court. Nevertheless, Pulaha is called a purohita, the same term commonly used in the narratives for the officiant present at the court. But in the story of Muktāpiḍa (AhS 48.9ff.), the officiant at the court is called both purodhas as well as guru, a term which we would expect to be linked to a sage or preceptor more than to an officiant. In the story of Sunanda (AhS 48.64ff.), the officiant present at the court, called purodhas, seeks the help of Kaṇva, who is performing asceticism on the banks of a river. Kaṇva is here called “[the officiant’s] own guru” (sva-guru), as could ideally be expected. Finally, in the story of Kuśadhvaja (AhS 45), the king himself approaches Yājñavalkya, who does not live in a forest but in his own palace (mandira). Yājñavalkya is called guru as well as kulaguru (family preceptor).

Due to the paucity of descriptions concerning the functions of these characters and to the inconsistent use of their titles, it is very difficult to

---

16 Cf. AhS 48.58.
18 Cf. AhS 48.80.
19 Cf. AhS 45.17.
clearly separate the two categories of officiants. After all, it is not unlikely that this difficulty is the result of a carefully conceived strategy on the part of the redactor(s) of the narratives, who wished to convey the idea of the respectability and relative independence of the cult’s officiant.

This being the case, the only possible way to further investigate the court officiants of the AhS is to examine the actual ritual repertoire. This subject will be further discussed below in the section on notes on the ritual repertoire.

Getting the king’s attention

Among the adhyāyas devoted to the topic of yantra, adhyāyas 26–27 and 36–37 are particularly rich in descriptions of the benefits of yantra worship for rulers. Here motifs of expansion and protection of the kingdom, although virtually ubiquitous, are found side by side with many other possible attainments on the part of rulers. A key passage found in adhyāya 26 addresses these issues:

One desirous of a kingdom, one who has been deprived of it, or one conquered by [other] rulers, after having paid respect with large masses of wealth to the supreme guru, the giver of Sudarsana’s yantra, considering [him] superior to all, should propitiate God Nārāyaṇa – who has large eyes like lotuses, is [of] a dark [complexion], clad in a yellow garment, adorned with all ornaments, and with four arms – following the rules given by the teacher.

He should have the supreme yantra constructed out of refined gold, with decorations of gems and coral and with all [the necessary] adornments. Just by doing this, he shall obtain a kingdom free of disorder. Having [properly] installed it, he should respectfully worship this [yantra] which bestows all accomplishments. Then he shall obtain the [whole] earth with its seven divisions and cities. Siddhas, Gandharvas, and Dānavas will be forever subdued. On earth he will rule over the entire kingdom of the three worlds. [The demons born of] the aggressive magic (abhicāra) of [his] enemies, having failed to take hold of him, frightened, will possess the performer [of the ritual]

\[\textit{yantras} \text{ could be tentatively described as diagrams that represent the deity and catalyse its powers. An overview of their use in the Pāñcarātra context can be found in Rastelli 2003: 142–151.}\]
(i.e., the enemy himself), like a river’s fury blocked by a mountain. Droughts will end and enemies will run away. In his kingdom there will be no dangers in the form of untimely deaths, wild animals, beasts of prey, thieves, illnesses, etc. and strength shall reside in his lineage.  

Right at the beginning, the text expresses the two main concerns of rulers in the AhŚ: the wish to either increase one’s power and dominion or to retain it, for example by protecting it from enemies. The next stanza clearly implies how instrumental the officiant is for the ruler’s success. This is followed by the actual worship, with the implication that it is the king who sponsors the construction of any solid substratum (an idea expressed by the causative kārayet).

After this come the actual benefits. Note how the theme of expansion comes first and is divided into two phases: the kings are first promised the conquest of the earth and subsequently even that of the complex of three worlds (trailokya). Then the description shifts to the theme of protection, which is related to hostile magic, enemy troops, and calamities. Finally, the expression vidyate tatkule balam (“strength shall reside in his lineage”) could be taken to include other benefits such as freedom from diseases, a long life, wealth, etc.

One should also notice how the deity and its worship are given great prominence. A deity like Sudarsana is already perfectly suitable in this context, yet the redactors felt the need to state this as clearly as possible:

---

21 AhŚ 26.82c–91b: rājyārthi hṛtarājyo vā paribhūto 'ṭhavā nrpaiḥ || 82 saudarśa-
nasya yantrasya pradāśaṇaṃ guraṃ param | sarvebhyaḥ hy adhikam matvā tam abhy-
rcya mahādhanaḥ || 83 tato nārāyaṇaṃ devaṃ puṇḍarikāyatekaṇaṃ | śyāmalo pāna-
vasanaṃ sarvāḥhareṇabhūṣitaṃ || 84 ārādhayec caturbāhum ācāryenoktavi-
dhānataḥ | taptajāmbūnaḍamayaṃ maṇiāvivritamacitritam || 85 sarvāṣaṇkārasaṃnyuktam kārayed yantram uttamam | etatkaraṇamātrena rājyaṃ āpnoty anāmayam || 86 pratiśāḥpāyārcayed etat sādaraṃ sarvasiddhidam | tato bhūmim avānnoti saptadvīpāṃ samapattānām || 87 vaṣyā bhavanti satatāṃ siddhagandharadvāṇāvāḥ || trailokyarājyaṃ akhilam pālayat avanītale || 88 abhicārāḥ parakrāḥ ca yām aprāpya bhūṣitaḥ || pravi-
santy pravokṣaṇaṃ āpagevācaḥalāhātā || 89 avagrahāḥ ca naśyanti sātravo vidravanti ca | apamṛtyumṛgyāvācaśācāraṃ gāḍbhīh bhavam || 90 na tasya rājye bhavati vidyate tatkule balam || (89b bhūṣitaḥ [ed.] – dīpitāḥ [D, the first edition, adds a question mark to this reading (AhŚ Ed’1: 246)]. An English translation of a part of this passage can be found in RASTELLI 2003: 149.
“Without the propitiation of this deity [i.e., Sudarśana] there simply cannot be a king.”

Let us look at the alleged benefits more closely. Beginning with examples where promises of easy territorial expansion are prominent, the following passage found in the context of the dhārakayantra, “the yantra of the bearer [of the sudarśanayantra],” deserves mention. One should keep in mind that this is neither the only nor the first passage found in the AhS which connects yantras with conquest, but merely an example.

The king shall obtain a kingdom, victory, wealth, a long life, and freedom from diseases. A king who regularly worships shall conquer this whole earth, with its seven divisions and her garment of seas.

Clearly, the central theme is that of the attainment of universal sovereignty (cakravartitva). But even if new territory and victory are mentioned at the beginning of what seems to be a reverse climax, other benefits of a personal nature also found their way into the list. A similar list is found in the context of the daily ritual, but there the ritual “bestows long life, freedom from diseases, victory, and territory” and also “gives wealth and grains” (āyurārogyavijayabhūpradaṃ dhanadhānyadam, AhS 28.1). This points to the fact that the above is not a fixed formula but inflected according to the context. It would also appear that on certain occasions the choice of an order is influenced by stylistic criteria. These include not only the metre but alliterations as well as poetic expressions, which can also be appreciated.

22 AhS 36.46cd: devam enam anārādhya na kaścij jāyate nṛpaḥ ||
23 RASTELLI explains the use of this kind of yantra as follows: “The power of the saudarśanayantra is considered to be so great that a human being cannot wear it without additionally having a dhārakayantra” (2003: 150f.).
24 Cf., for example, AhS 25.24 as well as the following passage: “Therefore the king who worships this [yantra], being imbued with devotion, will very quickly obtain universal sovereignty over the earth. The king, his attendants, or ministers or others, wishing the benefit of the king, should all worship this supreme [yantra].” (AhS 36.24c–26b: tasmād abhyarcayed etad yo rājā bhaktismyutaḥ || so ‘cireṇaiva kālena cakravartītyam āpnuḥ || rājā vā rājābhṛtyā vā mantraḥ vāhavā pare || rājñām hitaśinaḥ sarve pūjayeṣu idam param ||).
25 AhS 27.33c–34: rājā rājyam jayam bhūtim āyur ārogyam āpnuḥ || 33 nītyam arcaṇataṃ rājñāh saaptadvīpa-vat mahīḥ || samudrabājanā caīśā viśvā vaśyā bhavisyati || 34 (33c jayam [ed.] – priyam [A B C E F]; 34c samudrabājanā [ed.] – sasa-
26 For example in the following passage, where one could notice the alliterative
in this passage itself: note the sequence viśā vaśyā bhaviṣyati and the expression samudravasanā, “garment of seas,” preserved by D (a manuscript occupying a high position in the hypothetical stemma, although often imprecise) but changed in the other witnesses.27

The term cakravartin was already found in the adhyāya 16 in the context of the important discussion about the officiant and the king. The theme receives further attention in the description of a specific ritual to aid the king’s conquest of all directions, including the upper and lower worlds and all the beings dwelling in them (AhS 29) as well as the story of Śrutākṛiti (AhS 42).

While there can be no doubt that the theme of conquest receives much attention in the AhS, it also lacks practical connotations. More interesting in terms of relevant details is the theme of protection. As seen above, danger can come from enemy troops, black magic, and calamities. A remarkably vivid description, given that it is not found in one of the narratives but in the later section on yantras, tells of a difficult situation caused by enemy troops:

When kings are overpowered by enemies with an army (or: by strong enemies), when cities are burnt down and the king’s army is driven away, when people in various districts do not have access to food [and other goods] – if the kingdom is thus oppressed by the enemies’ army, O great sage, and if in this inadequate situation the king’s enemies are unimpeded, he should have a sixteen-armed Sudarśana constructed [and properly installed, for his power is] without obstacles.28

The above description was used by Begley to illustrate how the sixteen-armed Sudarśana is closely connected to the theme of warfare.29

27 This might be further evidence for the existence of a common ancestor of ABC and EF, as proposed above.
29 Cf. BEGLEY 1973: 73.
A remarkable passage is found outside the *adhyāyas* on *yantras*, in chapter 42, which is mostly devoted to a single narrative. However, the opening of the *adhyāya* is not part of such a narrative. The passage is a good example of how calamities and war may be associated with black magic.

An abnormal modification (*vikṛti*) caused by an aggressive ritual (*abhicāra*) against kings, occurring at an improper time, dreadful and all-reaching, is characterised by these signs:

> Horses, elephants, and ministers suddenly perish; the king himself suffers from a serious illness which has seized [his] body; terrifying thunderbolts strike his dominion; the earth produces less grains and multitudes of cows fall dead; his dominion suffers from droughts again and again; the earth-master’s queens are seized by serious illness; snakes and ants appear in the palace, at the main gate, and in the pavilion (*maṇḍapa*); meteors fall violently with dreadful sounds; ministers fight with each other out of greediness; a terrifying rainbow shines in the night, even if there are no clouds; great danger because of fire arises here and there in the city; frightful jackals enter the innermost of the temple unimpededly and howl loudly during the [morning and evening] twilights, when the sky is lit up; enemies proud of their strength besiege the king’s [capital] city; [the king] is so deluded that he himself forgets what is to be done and not done; in a dream he sees himself with a shaven head and clad in a dark blue garment, travelling towards the southern direction on a cart pulled by a donkey; from such and other signs he should understand that the enemy is performing an aggressive ritual.

If the hostile spirit (*kṛtyā*) born of the enemy’s aggressive ritual takes possession of the king, the latter would die on the spot, simply after having seen her, there is no doubt about that. [The king’s] sons, ministers, chief queen as well as the city itself – the hostile spirit, clad in a garland of flames, destroys everything in just a second.

---

30 All these images are notoriously negative, especially the southward journey, i.e., to Yama’s region.

31 AhS 42.15–26: lakṣyate lakṣaṇaṁ etair nṛpānāṁ abhicārikiḥ | vikṛtiḥ prastutākāle dārūṇā sarvagocarā || 15 akānda eva naśyanti vājīvāraṇamaṇtriṇāḥ | tīvramayaparitāṅgaḥ pūdyate nṛpatiḥ svayam || 16 patanty aśaṇayaṁ tasya viśaye ghoradārjanāḥ | alpasasyā vasumaṁ viṇāśyanti gavāṁ ganaḥ || 17 bhavanti tasya viśaye punaḥ punar avagrahāḥ | tīvramayagrhiṇāṁ ca malaṁyas tasya bhūpateḥ || 18 prabhavanty
Once again, as expressed in the following lines, it is the worship of Sudarṣaṇa which will save the kingdom and the members of the royal court. Descriptions of bad omens or calamities are a common topos in literature of this kind. They are also found in the second part (khaṇḍa) of the Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa 32 as well as in the Netratantra. 33 The passage presented above amounts to the statement that calamities can be caused and/or manipulated through ritual action. In the narratives too, kings normally protect themselves against powerful demons, 34 and this contributes to the idea that the AhS is not really concerned with actual politics (or warfare) but rather with giving kings a means of dealing with the unexpected as well as the inexplicable.

As previously mentioned, benefits of a more personal kind are also promised to rulers. One could interpret some of them, such as freedom from diseases or attainment of a long life, as an extension of the theme of protection. Other benefits, such as attainment of wealth, can be connected with a different theme, that of the fulfilment of desires, which receives considerable attention, since a whole complex ritual is devoted to it (the mahābhīṣe-ka ritual of adhyāya 39, see below).

ahivalmiṇḍh pṛāṣāde dvāri maṇḍape | nipatanti maholkāś ca bhṛṣām bhūnasvanā-
vitāḥ || 19 mantraṇaḥ ca virudhyante matsarena paraśparam | rajanyāṃ rāja
t bhūna mīraṇaṃ dhanur anabhrajamaṃ || 20 itas tato vahinihayaṃ nagara jāyate
dhara | praviṣya garbhahavanam kroṣṭāra caṇīvāritāḥ || 21 kroṣanti smṛtyayavor
dūrito dīptāyāṃ dīśi visvaram | ṛndhanti nagaraṃ rājāḥ śatavo baladārpaṇāḥ || 22
cṛtyākṛtyaṃ na jānāti svayam staitmyam āśhitāḥ | svapne 'pi paśyantām ōmānumaṃ
mūḍitaṃ nīlāvāsasam || 23 raṇthe garbhadhātyaṃ vrajaṃtāṃ daksinām diśam | ityā
dīlingaṃ jānīyād abhīśaṇaṃ sapatnājamaṃ || 24 parabhīṣeṣyāḥ kṛtyā rājānaṃ praviṣita
dādi | tām dṛṣṭvā kṣipram evāsau vinaśyatā na saṃśayāḥ || 25 putrāṃ ca mantraṇaḥ
cūpi mahīṣan nagaraṃ tathā | jvalāṁśālaṁ cṛtyā sarvām nāśayati kṣaṇāt || 26 (19a
prabhavananty ahi | ed.] – prabhavanant api [A B E F]; 20c rājate [ed.] – jāyate [D]; 20d

32 Cf. Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa, khaṇḍa 2, adhyāya 136ff. The description is quite
detailed and explicitly refers to kings, speaking of how their safety as well as that
of their kingdoms might be at risk in the presence of certain bad omens. As could be
expected, much space is devoted to unusual natural phenomena. There is also a section
on interpreting animal behaviour (cf. 2.143). As in the AhS, there are also refer-
cences to a decline in people’s ability to behave according to social standards and
regulations (cf. 2.144).

33 Cf. SANDERSON 2004: 262.

34 Cf., for example, the story of Indra (AhS 43–44) and that of Citraśekhara (AhS 49).
Promising benefits and illustrating them by means of narratives can thus be seen as the main strategy, but the redactors of the work resorted to other strategies as well. One of these is threatening the court with disaster in case Sudarśana’s worship is not conducted properly:

Having had constructed [an image of] Sudarśana with such various aspects, [but] not having installed [the image properly], the kings and ministers will at once lose [all their] wealth and be defeated by [their] enemies. Because of the absence of worship, they will [eventually] be banished from the kingdom and persecuted.

Other strategies include mentioning kings of the past, usually known from the epics, who apparently would have immensely profited from the worship of Sudarśana, or explaining that the method of worship of the AhS is the perfect one for the current degenerated age.

Notes on the ritual repertoire

So far, the main focus of this paper has been on the adhyāyas on yantra worship. Now we move on to those concerned with specific rituals, where we find the same basic thematic patterns of offence/defence followed by the fulfilment of desires (kāmya).

Besides the ritual of initiation (dīkṣā, AhS 20) and the daily ritual (ārādhana, AhS 28), which are quite clearly connected to a courtly context, the repertoire of the AhS includes: a ritual to aid the conquest in all

---

35 For further considerations on the functions of narratives in the AhS, see RASTELLI’s contribution in this volume.

36 Cf. also AhS 37.18.

37 AhS 37.50–51: evaṃ bahuvidhai rūpair upetam tam sudarśanam | kṛtvā tam apratiśṭhāpya rājāno mantriṇo ‘pi vā || 50 vinaśṭasampadah sadyah paribhūtāś ca satrubhiḥ | arcanābhāvato rājyād bhraṣṭāś ciram upadrutāḥ || 51.

38 Cf., for example, AhS 47.9ff. The identification of the kings of the narratives with those found in the epic is a central issue in RASTELLI’s contribution in this volume.

39 Cf. the beginning of adhyāya 25.

40 In the case of the dīkṣā ritual description, the courtly dimension is inferred from a passage at the end of the chapter: “The practice is to be performed for the protection of the three worlds, for the sake of the [welfare of the] earth, for the sake of the kingdom, the king, or a royal officer. [It should be done] only for [their] good, never for evil [purposes].” (AhS 20.50b–51: trailokyasyātha raksāyai bhuvāś cakrasya vā kṛte || 50 rāṣṭrasya vātha rājō vā rājamātrasya vā kṛte || bhāvāyaiva
directions, including the heavens (digvijaya, AhS 29), a ritual to cure various illnesses (roganirvitti, AhS 38), one to fulfil all desires (mahābhiseka, AhS 39), and a pacificatory ritual (śānti, AhS 47). The aims attached to these rituals in the corresponding adhyāyas are generally quite straightforward. The description of the pacificatory ritual’s aims includes both the theme of protection as well as that of conquest.

Is there anything we can say about this repertoire of rituals? The method adopted here follows the one used by Sanderson in his study of the Śaiva officiant of the Netramantra. He compared the repertoire outlined in that work with a list of the purohita’s duties from the Atharvavedaparipratisāha (3.1.10), which, in his rendering, include:

1. Rituals to ward off dangers and ills of every kind from the king and his kingdom (śāntikam karma), some of them simple rites to protect the king’s person to be performed at various times every day, others much more elaborate ceremonies to be performed periodically,
2. rituals to restore his health and vigour (paustikam karma),
3. rituals to harm his enemies (ābhicārikam karma),
4. the regular and occasional rituals (nityam karma and naimittikam karma) required of the king,
5. reparatory rites

vidhiḥ kāryo naivābhāvāya karhicit || 51). In the case of the daily ritual this is slightly less explicit. Notice, however, that its benefit include victory, gaining territory, and dealing with enemies (AhS 28.1–2).

41 The description of the pacificatory ritual’s aims includes both the theme of protection as well as that of conquest. It also attempts to appear more convincing by listing the names of “rulers of old” who had performed the ritual: “[This rite] should be employed by utterly glorious sovereigns of various births – [for this rite] removes all the three kinds of sorrow which begin with the one relating to oneself; causes the destruction of all afflictions; has auspicious marks; destroys all enemies; pacifies (i.e., removes unwanted consequences of ritual mistakes etc.); is the cause of great triumph; kills the demons; brings about prosperities; subdues all, O sage; bestows the longest of lives; is meritorious; [and] was performed by ancient kings. Ambarāsha, Śukka, Alarka, Māndhārī, Purūravas, King Uparicara, Dhundhu, Śibi, and Śrutakīrtana – those kings of old attained universal sovereignty after performing this. They became free of diseases and free of enemies. Their fame was widely spread and blameless.” (47.5c–10b: mahārājaś ca mahābhāsāh prāyojyaṃ vyastajītabhiḥ || 5 adhyāi

tāhādhyāvihārāhī apī nāśanam | ādhiṃśām cāpy aśeśānām nāśanām śubhabhāvanam || 6 sarvārāhī nāśanam śāntam mahāvijayakāraṇam | raksōhanam puṣṭikāram sarvavasayakaraṇaḥ mune || 7 paramāyuhpradām puṇyam pūrvuḥ nṛpatībhiḥ kṛtan | ambarīṣaḥ ūṣa 'larko māṃḍhāśā ca purūrauvāḥ || 8 rājoparicaro dhundhuḥ śibiḥ ca śrutakīrtanaḥ | kṛtvaitac ca kramatītvapi purā prāpur amī nṛpāḥ || 9 nīrūmayā niḥsaptānā visūtraḥmaḥalakīrtayaḥ []).
(prāyaścitīyaṃ karma), and (6) postmortuary rites (aurdhvadehikam karma) in case the king or any other member of the royal family dies.\footnote{Sanderson 2005: 239.}

A mere glimpse at the passage above is sufficient to notice that many ritual duties of the traditional Atharvavedic officiant are not part of the repertoire of the AhS. Annual festivals are not considered, and rituals including minor personal services are poorly represented.\footnote{It is interesting to note that calendrical rituals and even minor services of the purohita figure prominently both in the Viṣṇudharmottara and the Netratantra (cf. Sanderson 2004: 256.).} The procedure for curing various illnesses (AhS 38) could be seen as an exception. Interestingly, postmortuary and reparatory rituals are also not covered by the AhS.\footnote{Reparatory rituals are not entirely absent from Pāñcarātra scriptures addressing kings. Saṃhitās which include this kind of procedures are mentioned in Czerniak-Drożdżowicz 2003: 142ff.} In other words, it would appear that much of what makes up the daily routine of a courtly officiant is not dealt with in the AhS, whereas special or extraordinary situations and needs receive most of the attention.

One possible explanation for this could be that the intention of the redactors is really to portray an officiant of quite a high standing, essential to a ruler in truly difficult situations.

Another missing element in the AhS is the practical side of warfare. Annual ceremonies celebrating military power, worship of weapons or horses, battle strategies – none of this is dealt with. The only hint at a dimension which goes beyond those of courtly rituals or literary fancy is the idea that yantras or divine weapons could be of actual help in difficult situations if one meditates on them. Explicit evidence for this is difficult to find outside of the narratives proper.\footnote{Cf., for instance, the story of Sumati (48.64ff.), where the “soporific” weapon (prāsvapana) and the “fiery” one (āgneya) are deployed by the king in order to win the battle.} Nevertheless, a couple of passages in the AhS are very interesting in this regard, and their very existence points at a much wider background of the practice of magic for practical military purpose.\footnote{Cf., for example, this interesting statement: “He who remembers this at the time when fear comes about or in battle or during a debate has victory in his hand. One should not doubt this.” (AhS 26.80: bhayāgame ca samgrāme vāde vā yah smared idam | vijayas tasya hastastho nātra kāryā vṛcāraṇā ||). Also relevant is a variant reading found in a passage about divine weapons. While the edition reads eṣāmī...} Again, both the Viṣṇudharmottara and the Netratantra are quite explicit about this dimension.\footnote{Also relevant is a variant reading found in a passage about divine weapons. While the edition reads eṣāmī...}
Another source which deserves mention is the Sāmrājyalakṣmīpīthikā (SLP), a manual for royal ritual from ca. the sixteenth century in which Lakṣmī is given special prominence. This South Indian work presents various similarities with the AhS. More specifically, the militaristic idioms are very close to those found in the AhS, comprising both conquest as well as protection of the state against enemies or natural disasters as benefits arising from ritual worship. Yet the SLP goes further since it addresses a more pragmatic dimension as well, in the sense that it devotes a number of sections to regular rituals and festivals, some of which are particularly charged with warfare-related imaginary. Remarkably, it includes descriptions of fortresses, horses, and weapons, potentially opening a window on realia as well.

Despite their similarities, the SLP as a whole seems to be the outcome of a different agenda, one not only concerned with marketing a cult but with setting guidelines for the court’s daily life as well. The AhS aims instead at illustrating the notion of empowerment as such.

**Final remarks**

The AhS is quite an extraordinary source of information about the strategies set in place by a certain community to captivate the attention of rulers. In the present case, the efficacy of ritual as a means of dealing with emergency situations is brought into focus. The ritual repertoire as well as the
darśanamātreṇa vinaśyanty arisainikāḥ ||, “Merely at their (i.e., of the divine weapons) sight, the hostile soldiers will perish” (AhS 40.7cd), ABE and F read eteṣāṁ dhyānamātreṇa, “by the mere concentration on these,” which makes the idea of a deliberate deployment of their power more explicit.


48 I am grateful to Somadeva Vasudeva and Péter-Daniel Szántó for pointing this out to me. The presence of such idioms is virtually found throughout the work. Particularly striking is the fact that enemies are placed at the top of a long list of threats found in chapter 10. For a statement concerning control over the entire earth, one could turn to SLP 29.30. The work also knows of the need to counter hostile magic (cf. 30.23).

49 Particularly striking in this regard are the chapters on Vijayadasamī (108) and Kumārīpūjā (110).

50 The final chapters of the work (starting with 128) are rich in such descriptions and convey a more detailed picture of ritualised warfare at the court. The section on fortresses starts with chapter 31, whereas mention of the worship of weapons can be found embedded in the description of various rituals and festivals, as for example ad SLP 105.10.
descriptions of its benefits seem to be the outcome of a well-conceived agenda. Once established inside the court, royal officiants expert in the cult outlined in the AhS would certainly enjoy an elevated status and command the fear and respect of those around them.

The important question of the actual historical impact of the cult could not be addressed in the preceding pages. The reader is reminded that some important references to epigraphical sources are given in Begley’s study quoted above. Nevertheless, a narrower focus on scriptural materials can potentially still have significant impact on our understanding of the larger context. We had a glimpse at this every time we dealt with variant readings or raised a question about the history of the text’s formation. Moreover, even a brief look at other texts which deal with rituals at the royal court had significant impact on the way we interrogate a work like the AhS.

Appendix: remarks on the Adyar Library edition of the AhS

The second edition of the AhS (a critical revision by V. Krishnamacharya) includes neither details regarding the stemma of the considered witnesses nor information about the policies adopted in the composition of the apparatus. Only a reduced description of the individual manuscripts is provided.

The first edition, however, includes a manuscript description in Sanskrit which addresses the issue of the relation of some of the witnesses and also gives estimations of their dates. These approximate (-deśīya) estimations were dropped in the new edition.

The apparatus of both editions is a negative one, which enhances the chances of committing mistakes while recording the variants. Distinctions between omissions and actual loss of the substratum (entire leaves or pages) seem to follow (in the second edition) the nomenclature of “omission” /

---

51 General remarks about Schrader’s difficulties in supervising the editorial work during the years of the First World War are found in the introductory lines to both editions.

52 However, the adjective “old” figures in the descriptions of A, C, and D.

53 Obviously, a siglum could be easily omitted. It is the knowledge of the stemma which helps detect the possibility of such mistakes. Unfortunately, in the case of the AhS the relations between the manuscripts are far from clear. An easily detectable mistake is made instead when a siglum is assigned contemporarily to two different readings, as it has happened with B ad AhS Ed²: 319.
“gap.” A case of transposition is also clearly recorded. Concerning localised damage of the substratum, the only (possible) indication was found once in the first edition, when the editor adds to what could be a missing aksara of a variant atra granthalopah sambhāvyate, or “here damage of the manuscript is likely.” The first edition also adds a number of question marks in cases where the readings are considered ambiguous. This and the preceding features would now usually be indicated by different sets of brackets. However, the second edition does not include any of these potentially useful indications. It might therefore be advisable to cross-check with the first edition, when confronted with a puzzling variant reported in the apparatus, in order to see whether the first editor found the manuscript easily legible at that given point.

A description of the stemma can be found in Schrader’s “Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā”:

Unfortunately, as can be seen from a few common omissions and errors, all of these MSS. go back to one already corrupted original. Still, on the whole the Saṃhitā is well preserved. The two oldest and best MSS. are those called E and D. The former is a Grantha MS. from Kalale in Mysore, the latter a MS. written in the Malayālam character and belonging to H.H. the Mahārāja of Travancore. E is more accurate than D. From E descend the four Melkote MSS. F to H, all of them written in Grantha characters and so completely identical that the common symbol F could be used for them. From D (or a similar MS.) descend C, A and B (in this order); C being the Adyar Library paper MS. in Grantha characters (with large omissions), A the Adyar Library palm-leaf MS. in Grantha characters, and B the Telugu MS. belonging to the Mysore Government. The badly damaged Tanjore MS. described in Burnell’s catalogue could not be borrowed and was, on inspection, found to be not worth taking into account.

---

54 Cf., for example, AhS Ed²: 296 and 345. The apparatus reports the loss of folios of ms. C, which is correctly described as “incomplete” in the manuscript description.
55 Cf. AhS Ed²: 89.
56 Cf. AhS Ed¹; 153.
57 Schrader 1916: 94.
These remarks are very important but are also somewhat ambiguous. Based on the evidence adduced in the apparatus, it would seem that the relations between the witnesses are indeed rather complex.

Sometimes, when confronted with one isolated and puzzling variant, it is possible to assume a mistake in the recording of that variant. If a feature appears more than once, the possibility of its being genuine increases.\(^{58}\)

Without having the possibility to consult the manuscripts themselves, it is safer to focus on relations which are well-attested in the apparatus, such as certain repeating patterns in the lacunae of the various witnesses.

For example, as many as 25 of D’s omissions and additions (which run throughout the work and which do not seem to be related to a loss of the substratum) are not found in either A, B, or C.\(^{59}\) Also, ABC share as many as nine omissions with EF,\(^{60}\) where D seems to read the proper text. One of these omissions is found in the *adhyāya* 28. In the middle of the description of the daily ritual, ABCEF end abruptly only to begin again 49 stanzas later, which means that D is the only extant witness for a significant part of the *adhyāya*. Although one cannot reach conclusions without a thorough assessment of the original documents, it seems prudent to keep these aspects in mind for a critical reading of the AhS.

Another aspect regards the use of sigla to refer to more than one manuscript. SCHRADER (1916) writes: “[...] the four Melkote MSS. F to H, all of them written in Grantha characters and so completely identical that the common symbol F could be used for them.” The four manuscripts are actually F, G, H, and I, with I being coupled with H in the manuscript description of both editions. As far as evident to the present author, manuscripts H and I are never found in the apparatus, probably because the siglum F, which appears regularly in the work, was indeed used to indicate them. However, on a few occasions G is actually found in the apparatus of both editions. G appears to be mentioned only at the beginning of the first volume and to always follow F.\(^{61}\) Nevertheless, the siglum F is found alone for other variants on the very same pages. Again, one would be tempted to have a look at the originals.

---

\(^{58}\) For instance, when only A and E omit a text portion (AhS Ed\(^2\): 567) or even supply the same text (AhS Ed\(^2\): 569).

\(^{59}\) Cf. AhS Ed\(^2\): 5, 29, 35, 71, 91, 117, 121, 127, 146, 149, 152, 156, 159 (twice), 168, 195, 210, 251, 252, 263, 265, 273, 278, 324, and 381.

\(^{60}\) Cf. AhS Ed\(^2\): 124, 149, 194, 198, 205, 255, 258, 322, 587.

\(^{61}\) Cf., for example, AhS Ed\(^2\): 34, 36, and 47.
In the preceding pages the text was reported as found in the second edition. The apparatus was added for increased transparency (including also the ways in which variants are reported in the first edition) along with tentative discussions on particularly relevant variant readings.
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The principal concern of this paper is the emergence of festivals (mahotsava) within the Mantramārga. It is well-known that elaborate mahotsavas involving numerous processions, typically with different vehicles on every day and attended by a socially diverse community of actors, are taught in several South Indian Temple Āgamas. But such events are not mentioned at all in pre-twelfth-century sources of the Śaivasiddhānta, whose focus is the religion of individual initiates aspiring to liberation (or, particularly in the earlier sources, aspiring first to enjoy supernatural powers before reach-
ing liberation). We do occasionally encounter the term *mahotsava* in pre-tenth-century scriptures, but only as an allusion, without any particulars, to a celebration that is to mark a moment of achievement of a significant ritual. For example, at the culmination of an installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) in the *Devyāmata*, we read that “With food and the like, one should satisfy the singers and dancers, the naked, the miserable, the blind, the wretched, children, and, having satisfied them, ask their forbearance [for any shortcomings]. At night, a great festival (*mahotsavam*) should be held, with the sounds of singing and instrumental music.”

But even though we have no detailed evidence from the early scriptures of the *Mantramārga*, we do know that great processional celebrations must have been part of Śaiva festivals from at least the time of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, whose description of temple processions in 8.11–17, even if it is not entirely clear, sounds extremely lavish:

[11] He who, on the calendrical festival days (*parvan*), performs the organisation of great *pūjās*, or of chariot-processions for Śiva by processing inside the town,
[12] with great multi-coloured flags, parasols with bells and capes, rows of flags on canopies, with bells, yak-tail whisks and mirrors,
[13] with the sounds of conches, drums and the like, mixed up with singing and instrumental music and such, with the Mothers, *yakṣas*, *gaṇas* and others [in the form of (?)] puppets (*yantraiḥ*) made of painted wood,
[14] with machines that produce water and fire and with many marvels in plenty, and with swings [for?] women, and wheel-machines (?), [and] adorned (śobhitām) with chariot-palaces,

---

4 Devyāmata, NGMPP A 41/15, f.56r: gāyakāṃ nṛtyakāṃ nagnāṃ dināṃ dhakṣapañāṃ śiśūn | (emended from gāyakā nṛtyakā nagnā dināṃ dhakṣapañāśiśūn) bhakṣabhojyādibhis tarpaya tarpitāṃs tām (emended from tārpitaś tāṃ) kṣamāpayaḥ | rātragānyakān naṁ bhakṣabhojyādibhiṣ拡tarpaya tarpitāṃs tām (emended from tārpitaś tāṃ) kṣamāpayaḥ | rātragānyakān naṁ bhakṣabhojyādibhiṣ拡tarpaya tarpitāṃs tām (emended from tārpitaś tāṃ) kṣamāpayaḥ |
5 HAZRA (1985: 296) has proposed dating the *Śivadharmaśāstra* to between 200 and 500 CE. BISSCHOP (2010: 243) cautiously remarks that “this early dating remains to be confirmed.”
6 The text here is based on a collation of NGMPP A 3/3 [Nepal] samvat 321 [scil. 1201 AD], f.27v–28r (= A); NGMPP B 7/3 [Nepal] samvat 290 [scil. 1170 AD], f.26r–26v (= B); IFP T. 32 (C20th transcript of a Grantha palm-leaf ms.) (= T); and the Nepalese “print” (hand-written by the editor for these verses) of Naraharinath (= E).
7 Mothers (*mār̥t̥r̥*), nature spirits (*yakṣa*), and Śiva’s “troops” (*gaṇa*) are three classes of potentially threatening semi-divine creatures.
[15] with gardens, earthworks, drinking spots (?), with large machinery (?), busy with important people, arranged in accordance with their wealth,
[16–17] such an excellent man, having attained the merit of all acts of giving, the fruits of all sacrifices, the merit of extreme acts of asceticism, and the fruits of [visiting] all sacred sites, possessed of glory from organising a Śiva-procession, will constantly delight in great enjoyments, like Śiva [himself], in Śivaloka.
[18] At the end of that time, he will attain the status of a king among the gods for a long time, and after that in turn he will become the glorious overlord of Jambūdvīpa.

---

8 The South Indian reading here (beginning dadhyanna) sounds as though it might be referring to the contemporary practice of setting up stalls of food and drink, in particular buttermilk, on or near processional routes, such as one may witness, for instance, in Pondicherry at the festival of Mācimakam.

9 In Purāṇic geography, Jambudvīpa is the central continent. It is further divided into nine subcontinents and it is surrounded by seven concentric bands of ocean that are separated from each other by further continents. See, e.g., Parākhyaṇatantra 5.61ff, translated in GOODALL 2004: 294ff.

10 Śivadharmasāstra 8.11–17: yaḥ kuryāt parvakāleṣu mahāpūjāpravartanam | sivasya rathayātram va nagarāntahparikramār || 11 mahācitradhvajais chaṭraih kinki-

īvarakāṇvitaī || viśāṇadhvajamālāhīr ghanācāmaradarpāṇāh || 12 saṃkhe-bhe-

ryādīnirghoṣair gāvādīyāsāṃkulaī || lēpyadārumayair yantraiv mātṛyaksaganādibhibhī || 13 udākāgneyayantraiv ca bhavāścaryair anekasāh || strīdolācakṛyanstraiv ca rath-

mandirasohbibhām || 14 udānakhaṇapānaīs ca mahāyaṇair samāyutān || mahājanasa-

mākāmān yathāvibhavakalpiṇā || 15 sa sarvadānapuṇyāṃ sarvayājñahalāṇī ca || aty-

gratapasām puṇyaṃ sarvārthapalāṇī ca || 16 labdhvā naravaraḥ śṛnūṃ sivasyaśrā-

pravartanāḥ || śivaloke mahābhogāḥ śīvavān modate sudā || 17 tasyānti devarājatvām

sucrīm kālam āpunyāt | jambudvāpaḥ śrimāms tasyānti ca bhavat punah || 18 ||

11b mahāpūjāpravartanam] BT; mahimāyā pravartanāṃ A; mahāpūjāprava-

rdhanam E 11c nagarāntoh E; nagarātama A; nagarāntu B; nāgarāntah T 12a

"citradhvajais chaṭraih] ABE; "citraih dhvajais citraih T 12b kinkiśvarakāṇvitaī T;

kiṃkiniśvarakāṇvitaī B 12d "darpaṇī A;

BT; "bhūṣitaḥ A 13b "vādyāśamkulaī ABE; "nātyāśamtyuiṭiḥ T 13c lepya ABE;

lekhyā T 13d mātṛyaksaganādibhibhī BT; nimāṇaṭaragadhibhī A 14a udā-

kāgneyayantraiv] BE; udākāgneyayantraiv A; udākāntoyayantraiv T 14b bhavāśc-

ryair anekasāh] BE; varāta(??)yeṛate(??)kapāh(? ) A 14c "dolā] BE; "dolās AT

14d rathamandirasohbibhām] BT; gajanāriḥbhīḥ soḥbitāḥ A; rathamandirasohbitāḥ T;

rathamandirasohbitām E 15ab udānakhaṇapānaīs ca mahāyaṇair samāyutān] BE;

udānakhaṇapāḍāṇandamahāśambhogasamāyutāḥ A; dadhyannapānakhaṇā-

dyaiḥ mahāsatsramāyutaiv T 15c "samākīrṇā E; "padākīrṇā A; "samākīrṇā B;

"samākīrṇā T 15d "kalpiṭān] ABE; "vistaram T 16a sa sarvadāna] ABE; sarva-
What this paper will touch upon is one of the first annual festivals, albeit one without processions, to be found described in works of the Mantramārga.

The primary purpose of this paper when it was first conceived, however, was to examine a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript that transmits a small portion of the Jñānaratnāvalī, a twelfth-century ritual manual written in Benares by Jñānaśambhu, a Saiddhāntika guru from the Cōḷa country, with a view to explaining why it should seem almost entirely different from what purports to be the same section of the same text as transmitted in two South Indian manuscripts. It so happens that the portion in question treats the annual spring rite known as damanotsava, a rite that appears to have been introduced into the liturgy of the Śaivasiddhānta from elsewhere and that seems to duplicate another festive annual rite of reparation prescribed for three months later in the year, in the month of āṣāḍha, known as pavi-trotsava. Instead of using threads braided by maidens that are called pavi-tras as expiatory offerings, Śiva is here worshipped with the various parts of the damana plant (Artemisia indica or some other variety of Artemisia). Now it might seem at once that the question that most obviously raises itself here might have been: how did a spring festival come to be adopted as a rite with an expiatory structure into the liturgy of a primarily soteriological system? So I should explain why this patent and curious problem was oddly not what first aroused my interest.

I was first intrigued to see that a Paddhati from as late as the twelfth century, describing Saiddhāntika practices that appear gradually to have died away after the twelfth century from every part of the Sanskritic world except the Tamil-speaking South, should have been copied in Nepal. Second, I was excited by the possibility that a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript, written probably several centuries earlier than all the surviving South Indian witnesses, should transmit a better text of Jñānaśambhu’s rich work. It is

dānāni T 16c atyugratapasāṃ puṇyāṃ] TE; atugratapasāṃ puṇyāṃ A; atugratapasā puṇyāṃ B 17a labdhvā naravaraḥ] E; labdhwā navaraḥ A (unmetrical); labdhā naravaraḥ BT 17c mahābhogaḥ] AB; mahābhāgaḥ TE 17d sadā] BTE; ciraḥ A 18a devarājatvam] ABT; devarājasya E.

For the date, provenance, and place of work of Jñānaśiva, see GOODALL 2000: 209–212. For remarks on the manuscript of the Jñānaratnāvalī then known to me (IFP T. 231) and on two manuscripts which might appear to transmit the work but do not (IFP T. 106 and 107), see n. 11 on p. 209. For the two principal manuscripts, both from South India, namely Madras GOML R 14898 (from which IFP T. 231 was copied) and Mysore ORI P. 3801, see GOODALL 2004: cx–cxi.
well-known, after all, that many ancient Sanskrit works have survived in a much older state of text in palm-leaf manuscripts kept in the cool, dry climate of the Kathmandu valley.

It was a worrying surprise to me to discover that the account of the rite in the Nepalese text of the Jñānaratnāvalī is much shorter than that of the two southern manuscripts, containing none of the discussions and justificatory quotations. Why? Could this have been because the southern text had been expanded by interpolations? The matter is of some importance because the southern sources present Jñānaśambhu’s work as a rich, digest-like manual that is interesting to the historian of religion largely because of the wide range of material it quotes and thereby helps to date and contextualise. If the much shorter style of the Nepalese fragment is authorial, then the value of the Jñānaratnāvalī for historians is diminished. Instead of being a large corpus of ordered material that can be confidently dated to the twelfth century or earlier, it becomes a hotchpotch of quite undatable snippets that could have been added piecemeal at any time over the course of the transmission of the work in South India.

Now that we have introduced the various issues at stake that are alluded to in the title of this paper, let us turn first to the first appearance of a damanotsava rite in the Mantramārga. The first known account appears to be that of Somaśambhu in the eleventh century, and the way in which it is introduced plainly adverts to the rite’s extraneous character.

Formerly [a] Bhairava called Damana was born from Hara’s anger. He subdued all the gods and the mighty Dānavas. Being pleased, Śiva said to him: “Be a plant on earth! Having taken this embodiment, you will serve for my pleasure. Those mortals who worship God [scil. me] with your shoots and other parts will reach the highest state, O Damana, thanks to your power. But for those men who do not observe the calendrical festival (parva) of Damana, all the fruits of their meritorious

12 On the perhaps still changing front of evidence fixing the completion of Somaśambhu’s Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī at different dates (namely 1048/49 CE, 1073 CE, and 1095/6 CE), suggesting perhaps that the work was released in more than one “edition” in the eleventh century, see SANDERSON 2007: 420–421, GOODALL 2014: 172–173 and 177–179, and SANDERSON 2014: 21 (quoting a lecture-handout of 2011).
deeds belonging to the month of Caitra will be given to you.” Although this [ritual] is taught in the Svacchandabhairava, nonetheless, because that work is [of] shared [scriptural stock] with this [system] (iha), it is practised also in the Siddhānta.  

We observe here that this myth, which in this extremely abridged form makes no allusion to anything vernal, seems not really coherent, and that the purpose of the ritual, namely to make sure that merit accrued in the month of Caitra does not pass to Bhairava, is odd, since there is no evident reason why anybody’s karman, good or bad, should be transferred to that particular god. Striking too is that no account of a damanotsava has been found in the various versions known to us of the Svacchanda: has Somaśambhu chosen a fictional scriptural affiliation to “justify” an eclectic borrowing? The fact that he includes an apology at all might seem to suggest that he is either responsible for introducing the festival into the ritual

---

13 Bruuner (1968 [SP2]: 202) translates samānātvāt with “puisque [les deux écoles] sont dans la même position;” but it is perhaps more likely that Somaśambhu uses the expression in the way that Aghoraśīva often does in his commentary on the Sarvajñānottaratantra: there, when he draws on passages from other recensions of the Kālottara, he mentions that they are Tantras that are samāna, in other words “[from a] shared scriptural [stock]” (e.g. IFP RE 47852, p. 5). Cf. also Rāmadānḍa’s use in the Paramokṣanirāṣakārikāvṛtti of the expression samānațāntrika to refer to those who share a common scriptural tradition (for which, see Watson, Goodall & Anjaneya Sarma 2013: 18).

14 SP 2.1–5 (From volume 2 of Bruuner’s edition [1968: 196ff]). In the Kashmirian edition [KSTS], these verses are 496–501.: harakopāt purā jāto bhairavo damaṇāhvayaḥ | dāntās tena surāḥ sarve dānavaḥ ca mahābhālāḥ || 1 || priṇenātha śīvenokto: viṭapo bhava bhūtale! | tām tanum tvam anuprāpya madbhogāya bhūvanīyasya || 2 || pūjāyasyanti ye mārtā devaṃ tvatpallavādibhiḥ | te yāsyanti param śāhānam damana tvatprabhāvataḥ || 3 || ye punar na kariyantī dāmanam parva māṇavāḥ | teṣām te caitrāmāsotham datam punyaphalān māyā || 4 || svacchandabhairave tante yady apidam udāhyam | tathāpunā samānātvāt siddhānte ‘py upaṇyayate || 5 ||. 1c tena surāḥ] Brunner; tenāsurāḥ KSTS 4c te] Brunner; na KSTS 5d upaṇyayate] Brunner; upapadidvayate KSTS.

15 Cf. verse 24 of Appendix III, which contains the same odd justification for the performance of the rite.

Kacchapesvara’s commentary on Aghoraśīva’s Kriyākramadhyotikā recounts a myth that takes into account the elements mentioned by Somaśambhu (see Bruuner 1968 [SP2]: 198–199), but this may well be the result of Kacchapesvara joining up the dots to “explain” Somaśambhu’s allusion, rather than of Kacchapesvara recounting the myth that Somaśambhu actually knew.
calendar or that he considers himself to be close in time to the moment of its introduction. But we should be wary of putting much weight on such a supposition, for we find the apology echoed in the Jñānaratnāvalī a century later. Furthermore, Trilocanaśiva’s twelfth-century commentary on Somaśambhu’s work quotes a half-verse attributed to the tenth-century paddhati of Brahmaśambhu that alludes, according to Trilocana, to the possibility of performing an initiation ceremony on the occasion of the damanotsava on the first day of the second month of spring. Of course this need not mean that Brahmaśambhu prescribed a Śaiva version of this rite: it might simply mean that Brahmaśambhu recognised the existence of a popular spring festival and mentions the occasion as a possible suitable moment for conducting a dīkṣā. Trilocana also quotes from a description of damanotsava in another Saiddhāntika work, the Brhatāloṭṭara, but that text appears to have been unknown to the Kashmirian commentators of the tenth century and may have been contemporary with the Somaśambhupad-dhāti or composed just after it, for the first quotations we know of it are those of Jñānaśambhu and his South Indian contemporaries. Brunner was troubled not only by the existence of this Saiddhāntika account that belied Somaśambhu’s claim that the damanotsava was not Saiddhāntika, but also by those taught in certain Temple Āgamas, since she had at that time (1968) only begun to suspect them of being later South Indian compositions (SP2, p. 202):18

… mais aucune référence n’est faite aux Āgama ou Upāgama dont nous avons dit plus haut qu’ils avaient le même chapitre que nous (ce qui, entre parenthèses, peut faire naître des doutes quant à l’ancienneté de l’Uttara-Kāmika et de l’Acintyaviśvasādākhyā). Quoi qu’il en soit, le fait même que Somaśambhu soulève le problème de la légitimité de ce rituel pour les Śaivasiddhāntin, montre qu’à son époque au moins il n’était pas couramment pratiqué dans ce milieu śivaïte, et que les sectes du Trika (où Bhairava joue un rôle

---

17 The passage in question is quoted by BRUNNER 1968 (SP2): 203.
18 Cf. BRUNNER 1968 (SP2): xiv: “[...] il serait bien téméraire de notre part de déclarer sans autre preuve que ces deux textes, ou tout au moins quelques-uns de leurs chapitres, sont postérieurs à Somaśambhu.”
Brunner had, in other words, begun to ask many of the questions addressed in this article, but she had not yet come to the firm conclusion that the South Indian Temple Āgamas must have borrowed from Somaśambhu, and she suspected that the ultimate source of Somaśambhu’s account might have been a spring festival belonging to a Bhairava-centred current of the Mantramārga. Nonetheless, she credits Somaśambhu with having assured, by including the rite in his manual, the continued popularity of the *damanotsava* in South India down to the present day.\(^\text{19}\) Although Brunner may well be right that the ritual spread across the traditions of temple worship in South India under the influence of Somaśambhu’s Paddhati,\(^\text{20}\) there seems to be little trace of the worship in South India today: Brunner, writing in 1968, implies that she knew of numerous South Indian temples where the rite was practised, but Mr. Sambandhaśivācārya, priest of a Vināyaka temple in Cuddalore and employee for many decades of the IFP, has told me today (2015) that it is extremely rarely observed and could cite no instance known to him in the contemporary temple-scene in the Tamil-speaking South of the observance of *damanotsava*.

But let us now turn to the Jñānaratnāvalī’s account. Rather than give the whole text of Jñānaśambhu’s chapter here, which would involve giving a complete translation and would therefore in turn mean getting wrapped up in the intricacies of interpretation of all its many ritual elements, I have

---

\(^{19}\) **BRUNNER** 1968 (SP2): xiv: “… la décision de Somaśambhu a eu des conséquences durables puisque Aghoraśiva, dont on sait que ses livres font encore autorité, devait reprendre la damanapūjā dans son manuel de rituel privé, et surtout dans son manuel de rituel public, si bien que nombreux sont encore de nos jours les temples du Sud qui célèbrent ce festival printanier.”

\(^{20}\) I speak of “traditions” in the plural, because I mean to include also Pāñcarātra temple worship. It seems natural to suspect borrowing from the Śaivas by the Pāñcarātra in this case, since the border between the Śaiva and the Vaiṣṇava Temple Scriptures seems to have been porous in the post-twelfth-century period and there are many other instances of shared notions and terminology that must have developed in the shared South Indian temple milieu. Examples that come to mind that illustrate this are, for instance, the practices referred to as *diśāhoma* and *nityotsava* (q.v. in TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOSA 3), and terminology that occurs in the South, such as *mūlabera* (“principal image of worship”).
given the chapter in its entirety in an appendix (Appendix I), beginning from the concluding verse of the immediately preceding verse, which wraps up the account of the pavitrotsava. I shall translate here only the opening, which contains some elements that are relevant to our discussion. (Readers interested in the details of a similar Śaiva version of this festival may of course find a full, annotated translation of Somaśambhu’s account in Brunner 1968: 196–221.)

In the Svachchandabhairava-tantra, Bhairava is known to be [the] Damana [plant]. Elsewhere (kvacit), [we learn that this plant] arose from the ashes of Kāmadeva when they were watered by the tears of [his consorts] Rati and Pṛiti. (JR 1)

In the Siddhānta, no attention is accorded to it, even by those devoted to expiatory rites. Nevertheless, there is a shared [scriptural] identity here too [scil. in the Siddhānta]. But its performance is taught here because it is mentioned in the chapters on flowers and because it is taught by earlier ācāryas. (JR 2–3b)

On the seventh or the thirteenth day in [either of] the two fortnights in the month of Caitra, having performed his daily duties, he should in the evening approach a Damana plant. (JR 3c–4b)

Among the numerous points to comment upon here, we see that although there is the same allusion to the Svachchanda, borrowed no doubt from Somaśambhu, Jñānaśambhu refers also to another aetiological myth from some other source. Whereas the myth to which Somaśambhu alludes is incomprehensible to us (and perhaps also to Jñānaśambhu, since he gives no further clues about it), the other myth can be guessed at, not because we know the source from which Jñānaśambhu knew it, but because the Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati contains what must be a related tale (kriyāpāda 22). There is no need to give that passage in full here, since Brunner has furnished a parallel text and translation of the whole chapter (SP2 Appendix II), but we may outline the story as follows: When Kāmadeva attacked Śiva, Śiva’s anger came out as fire from his third eye, which took form as Bhairava; Bhairava reduced Kāma to ashes; Śiva, pleased, told Bhairava that since he had “tamed” (dāntah) the triple world, he would henceforth be called the “tamer” (damana); Rati, Kāma’s spouse, who was among the goddesses waiting upon Gaurī, fainted away, whereupon Gaurī furiously cursed Damana to become a plant:
And he, being cursed by Ambikā, accordingly at once then became a plant, called Damana, [rooted] in the ashes of Kāma’s body, of sweet fragrance and with tender parts, watered by the flow of Rati’s tears.\textsuperscript{21}

One difference from Īśānaśiva’s account is clear: in Jñānaśambhu’s version the tears of both Kāmadeva’s spouses, Rati and Prīti, water his ashes.

As for the plant Damana, it is clear that it is some sort of wormwood or mugwort (Fr. armoise, Ger. Beifuß, Tam. marikoljuntul/marakoljuntu, etc.). Giving a more precise Latin identification than Artemisia is tricky, for it is possible that slightly different fragrant plants may be identified with damana in different regions, as Zotter has remarked.\textsuperscript{22}

Once again, as for Somaśambhu, the detailed rite that follows consists essentially in the identification and uprooting of the Damana plant, which is held to be a transformation of Bhairava, and the use of its sprouts, roots, and various parts for worshipping Śiva and his pantheon in a manner that is parallel to the annual autumnal festival known variously as pavitrotsava, pavitrārohaṇa, pavitrāropana, etc. For a succinct description of this rite, see TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA 3 (s.v. pavitrāropana), whose article begins as follows:

This is an annual rite of reparation for all omissions and mistakes committed in rituals. Whereas a given prāyaścitta, an exculpatory rite taught for a particular transgression, is of course only to be performed after committing such a transgression, the pavitrārohaṇa is an annual ceremony. The rite is thus logically to be classed as a regular obligatory one (nitya), but some works treat it as naimitika, e.g. SP2 1.7. As for the time of its performance, certain days in the four-month period

\textsuperscript{21} Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati, kriyāpāda 22.14: tathā sa śapto ‘mbikayā tathābhavat kṣaṇena vṛūd damanāhvasyas tadā | smarāṅgabhasmany abhirāmas-au-\v{r}abbhah sukomalāṅgai ratibāspasekajāḥ ||.

in which Viṣṇu is said to sleep are typically recommended, particularly the month of Āṣāḍha (see SP2 1.2–4 and notes).
The focus of the ceremony is the offering of knotted rings of woven cotton thread (*pavitraka* [2]*) and the offering of a collection of things used in religious undertakings (*vratāṅga*) and sometimes also a collection of things conducive to pleasure (*bhogāṅga* [2]*).

We cannot delve here into the origins or early history of the *pavitrāropana* rite, which is similarly to be found also in Pāñcarātra sources (once again, see Rastelli’s contribution to the same article of the TĀNTRIKĀ-BHĪDHAṆAKOŚA) and in Purānic ones (KANE V/1: 339–340 cites some of these, mediated through various Dharmanibandha works). It is sufficient for our purposes here for the moment to state that the *pavitrāropana* rite entered (or emerged within?) the Mantramārga at a much earlier stage, since we find versions of it already detailed in the *Kīraṇatantra* (chapter 36) and in the *Mohaṅḍottara*.

Now we saw above that Somaśambhu mentioned a curious benefit as the reward for observing the *damanotsava*, namely being able to keep all merit accrued in the month of Caitra rather than losing it to Bhairava. We can see that this further underlines the parallelism with the *pavitrārohaṇa*, which repairs ritual faults of omission and commission over the preceding year. Jñānaśambhu, by contrast, seems to make no clear statement of the purpose of the *damanotsava*, but we can see in the passage just cited that he too probably regards it as having an expiatory or reparatory function, since he observes that it is not typically followed in the Siddhānta, “even by those devoted to expiatory rites.”

So in Saiddhāntika accounts, the Damana-rite is a sort of reparatory one, and I have implied (following BRUNNER, e.g. 1968 (SP2): xii, who made the same observation23) that this is because both its shape and purpose were calqued upon the reparatory *pavitrārohaṇa*. To understand why it is clear that they were so calqued, further evidence must be drawn into the picture: Damana-related rituals are, it turns out, to be found in other medieval reli-

---

23 Brunner was in turn following what the primary sources themselves more or less explicitly allude to: even in the *Pārameśvarasamhitā*, a work of the Pāñcarātra, we find a reflection of the awareness that *damanotsava* was strictly parallel to *pavitrārohaṇa* (17.565c–566a): *tasmaṁ tu sukladvādaśyāṁ kuryād damanakotsavam pavitrārohat kuryāt*. (The same passage occurs in the *Īśvarasamhitā* [12.63abc], which, as MATSUBARA (1994: 28–30) and RASTELLI [e.g., 2006: 59] have shown, is largely based on the *Pārameśvarasamhitā*.)
gious traditions, and in those traditions they seem unrelated to the Śaiva ones in every particular other than in that they involve the Damana plant and that they typically occur on or close to the thirteenth day of a fortnight in the month of Caitra (a date to which we shall return below).\textsuperscript{24}

Let us consider, for example, the damanapūjā taught in a sixteenth-century Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava digest, the Haribhaktivilāsa (vilāsa 14, verses 105ff in the 1848 edition, pp. 491–493).\textsuperscript{25} (The erratic verse-numbering is that of the edition.)

Next, the festival of festooning with the Damana. On the twelfth day of the brightening fortnight of Caitra, one should perform the festival of festooning with the Damana. Its performance, taught in such works as the Baudhāyana, is written next.

On the eleventh day of the brightening fortnight of Caitra (madhoh) after completing his morning duties, he should go to the garden of the Damana plant and there worship an Aśoka tree [as] the god of love (/worship the sorrow-free god of love).

[Here is] the mantra for that: “Obeisance to you Aśoka (/sorrow-free), O Kāma, O destroyer of the sorrow (śoka) caused by women. Remove the suffering of sorrow from me; bring about joy for me

\textsuperscript{24} I should state at once that it is in no way my intention to give a complete list of textual accounts of spring festivals, since these may be found referred to in other works, such as that of ANDERSON (1993), nor even of all accounts of Damana-related worship in the month of Caitra. References to many more such accounts may be found given, for instance, in the Jayasimhakalpadruma (pp. 440–445), which mentions (p. 440) that it draws upon the Madanaratna, the Brahmapurāṇa quoted in the Nimayāṁṛta, the Nṛśimhaparicaryā, and the Rāmārcanacandrikā. Of course one may also consult KANE (V/1: 310–311), who quotes particularly from other Dharma-nibandha works, and the work of MEYER (1937). (My attention was drawn to MEYER’s remarkable, richly referenced, and extremely stimulating book, in which he devotes a large section to damanaka called “Kāmadeva als Beifuß” (1937: 38–53), by ZOTTER’s thesis (2010*). Only a few lesser known accounts and ones that are especially relevant to our theme are treated here.

\textsuperscript{25} I am grateful to Dr. Måns Broo for kindly drawing my attention to this passage (after seeing online the abstract for this paper before it was delivered in Vienna in February 2015) and for sending me pages of a Bengali-script edition. For a useful characterisation of the Haribhaktivilāsa, which appears to have been composed in 1534, see BROO 2003, in particular pp. 20–23.
every day (nityam). I shall take you [home], O tree, you who give joy to Kṛṣṇa, in order to perform worship.”

Having thus asked and bowed he should take the bright Damana plant, sprinkle it with the five products of the cow, wash it with water, venerate it, cover it with a cloth, and take it home to the auspicious sound of Vedic recitation and the like.

Now the instruction for the incubation of the Damana plant. He should raise up in front of Kṛṣṇa the Sarvatobhadra- maṇḍala; placing the Damana on that, he should let it incubate there at night.

[Here is] the mantra for that: “In order to worship the god of gods, Viṣṇu, the spouse of Lakṣmī, the Lord, come here, O Damana, be present; obeisance to you.”

And upon the Damana, in the eight directions beginning with the East, he should venerate, using their seed-syllables, 27 (1) Kāmadeva, (2) Ash-bodied, (3) Ānanda, (4) Manmatha, (5) Friend of Spring, (6) Smara, (7) Sugar-Cane-Bow, and (8) Flower-Bow, 28 in due order, accompanied by Rati, in accordance with the rules.

Having recited over him the Kāmagāyatī 108 times and having given a handful of flowers, he should venerate Kāmadeva using mantras.

---

26 There are a couple of doubtful points here. If one begins with worship of the Aśoka tree, it seems odd that the end of the ritual speech is addressed to the Damana plant, which is to be taken away according to the text that follows. Perhaps aśoka, “griefless,” is intended rather to be a description of the Damana plant? And yet Kāmadeva, as well as being identified with the Damana, is evidently also identified with the Aśoka tree in the previous verse, as well as frequently elsewhere (see MEYER 1937, in particular pp. 33–38, in which he comments in particular on Bhaviṣyapurāṇa, uttarapuravāṇ 135). A related problem is that of vrksa, which we have taken to be a vocative, even though we do not expect Damana to be any larger than a small shrub. But should we instead understand it to be part of a compound, vrksapūjārittham?

27 The size and type of plant Damana is, by the way, not referred to with any degree of consistency in our sources: some texts refer to the Damana with expressions such as taru and vrksa (see, e.g., verses 20 and 22 of Appendix III) and others, like for instance chapter 2.45 of the Vaiṣṇavakhaṇḍa of the Śkandapurāṇa, refer to it consistently as a sort of grass (tṛṇa).

28 Perhaps each has a mantra that involves a seed-syllable based on the first letter of his name: KĀM, BHAṂ, ĀṂ, MAṂ, VAṂ, etc.? All these are conventional names of Kāma and they presumably refer therefore here to manifestations of the god of love.
And this is the mantra:

"Obeisance be to [you] whose arrows are flowers, who give delight to the world, to Mannatha, the eye of the world, who bestow affection upon Rati."

"You have been called, O Lord of gods, ancient one, best of souls. I shall worship you in the morning. Be present, O Keśava. I offer you in the morning the bright Damanaka. Obeisance be always and in every way to you, O Viṣṇu. Be kindly disposed towards me."

Having thus addressed the Lord of gods he should again give him a handful of flowers. With singing and dancing and the like he should joyfully observe vigil through the night.

Next, the rite of offering the Damanaka: Having accomplished ablutions and the like in the morning, and having performed regular obligatory worship, he should conduct a great pūjā for the purpose of festooning with the Damanaka-[plant]. Then he should reverentially take the Damanaka in his hands and offer it up to Śrī Kṛṣṇa, to the accompaniment of [auspicious] sounds of instrumental music, bells and the like.

The mantra for this is: "God of gods, Lord of the universe, bestower of desired boons, fulfil all my desires, O Kṛṣṇa, who are the beloved of Kāmeśvari! Receive this Damanaka, O God, to favour me. O Lord, make this annual pūjā here complete!"

Then offering the garland of Damana, as well as incense and the like, having conducted a festival with singing and such, he should make this plea to Śrī Kṛṣṇa:

"May this annual worship, [performed] with garlands of jewels and coral and with Mandāra flowers and the like, be yours, O Garuḍa-banneled [Lord]! Just as [you wear], O God, the [garland known as the] Vanamālā and the Kaustubha [jewel] constantly against your heart, so too wear this garland of Damana and its pūjā next to your heart!"\(^{29}\)

\(^{29}\)Haribhaktavilāsa (vilāsa 14, verses 105ff in the 1848 edition, pp. 491–493): atha damanāropanotsvah | caitrasya suklaãyams damanāropanotsavam | vidadhīyāt tadvidhīr baudhāyanādyuktō 'tha likhyate || madho bhātādāṣyān ca prātākṛtyam samāpya ca | gatvā damanakārāmam tatrāśokam smaraṁ yajet | tatra mantraḥ | aṣokāya namas tubhyam kāma strīṣokaṁ nāśana (<nāśana> conj.: <nāśana> ed.) | śokārttīm hara me nityam ānandam janayasva me iti || 105 || nesyāmi vrkṣa pūjārtham tvām kṛṣṇapṛtiikāram | iti samprãrthya natvā ca gṛhyād damanām śubham || 106 || prokṣya tām païcagavyena prakṣālādyābhiḥ prapūjya ca | va-
There are several observations to be made here about how this account differs from Śaiva accounts of a rite of the same name, and perhaps we should begin with that name. The rite is repeatedly referred to as one of *damanakāropaṇa*, even though there seems in this case to be no ritual parallel to the *pavitrāropaṇa/pavitrārohaṇa*, as there is in the Śaiva case. I have, for want of better ideas, translated *ārohaṇalāropaṇa* with “festooning,” since I take it to mean “raising up and laying upon” and that it refers to the way in which the *pavitra*-threads are laid like garlands upon the substrates in which a deity is worshipped. The Damana plant here, however, seems not to be divided up into garland-like parts to parallel the different *pavitra*-threads, and it is not wholly clear whether it is used to garland Kṛṣṇa. So the use of the collocation *damanakāropaṇa* might itself perhaps be evidence of a Śaiva influence, since the name might only be supposed fully to make sense if it describes a rite parallel to the *pavitrārohaṇa/pavitrāropaṇa*.
There are, however, a couple of considerations that seriously weaken such an assumption. One is that we find that the Damana plant is explicitly used to fashion a garland to be laid upon Kṛṣṇa, both here and in more than one of the different Vaiṣṇava versions of this festival related in the Jayasimha Kalpadruma (e.g. on p. 442, where the Damana plant is used to make a vanamālā, and p. 444, where we have a clearer version of the last of the declaratory mantras: vanamālāṃ yathā deva kaustubham vahase hrādi | tadvad dāmanakīṁ mālāṁ pūjām ca hrdaye vaha
deva kaustubbaḥ vahase hrādi | tadvad dāmanakāropaṇa |). For this, the expression dāmanakāropaṇa might be said to fit perfectly. The second consideration is that, in contemporary practice in Nepal and in Orissa, the festival apparently includes the planting of Damana plants, an act which could
30 “Just as you wear the Vanamālā and the Kaustubha, O Lord, on your heart, in the same way bear this garland of Damana and these offerings [of Damana] on your heart!”
31 I have not observed this practice myself, nor have I seen it described in a Sanskrit text, but it is alluded to as being part of the ceremony in Puri on this website: www.iskcondesiretree.com/page/damanaka-ropana-dvadasi (accessed November 14, 2015):
“Damanaka Ropana Dvadasī
Damanaka Chori or Dayanalagi
The following days the following is observed in Jagannath Puri. This festival is celebrated on the thirteenth and fourteenth days of the bright fortnight of Chaitra (April). Deities of Lord Rama and Lord Krishna are taken in procession to the Jagannath Ballava Math. There the Deities get Their Dayana leaves from the garden at the math. On the fourteenth, the leaves are offered to Lord Jagannath, Lady Subhadra and Lord Balarama.
‘Damanaka is a particular type of flowering tree, Artemisia indica. In modern Oriya it is called da-ana. It is one of the two favorite flowers of Lord Jagannath, the other being campaka. It is said that Lord Jagannath comes to the Jagannath Vallabha garden in Puri to steal these flowers. Aropana means to plant. On this dvAdāsī there is a ritual planting of the da-ana tree.’”
Such planting is not mentioned as forming part of the damaṇabhauṇīkā rite described as taking place in Purusottamākṣetra (Puri) on the night of the thirteenth of the bright half of Chaitra in chapter 2.45 of the Vaiṣṇavakhaṇḍa of the Skandapurāṇa, where Viṣṇu, accompanied by Śrī and Satyabhāmā, are worshipped on a lotus-mandala and Damana grass (tṛṇa) is put in his hand so that he may enjoy crushing it (2.45.5–11), and the following day a garland of Damana is taken to Jagannātha and placed upon his head (2.45.12–15). In this case, the garland is compared not to the Vanamālā, but to a garland made from the entrails of the defeated demon Hiranyakaśipu, since Damana, according to this text, was once a demon defeated by Viṣṇu.
also be naturally described as *damanakāropana*, for it would be parallel with the expression *aṅkurāropana*, “the planting of sprouts” (for this ritual act, see TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA 1, s.v. *aṅkurārpaṇa*). In other words, there are other ritual actions that could naturally be described as *damanakāropana* and we cannot be certain that the expression originates as a calque upon *pavitrāropana*. Nonetheless, I know of no old attestation for the practice of planting Damana plants as part of the festival,32 and the oldest attestations of the expression *damanāropana/damanakāropana* seem to be in Śaiva contexts where the ritual appears to have been calqued upon the *pavitrāropana*. It therefore seems more likely to me that applying it to the “planting of Damana” would be an inventive repurposing of the term, rather than that it originally referred to planting and was repurposed by the Śaivas to describe a ritual that is parallel to their *pavitrāropana*.

In one respect the *Haribhaktivilāsa* certainly preserves here something that is surely old and that has been effaced from Somaśambhu’s ritual, namely its essentially vernal character because of the integral involvement of Kāma: From the declaratory mantras here, we learn that the Damana plant is first identified with Kāmadeva and then offered to Kṛṣṇa. It makes much more sense that a sweet-smelling plant culled for spring-time worship should be identified with Kāma than that it should be a form of Bhairava! No Śaiva influence is acknowledged, of course, for the rite is instead presented here as a Brahmanical one of hoary antiquity; but the mention at the beginning of “such works as the *Baudhāyana*” as an ancient authority for this ritual looks suspicious. Just as Śaiva sources cannily give the *Svacchanda*, a vast scripture that claims several “versions,” as a probably fictional locus of attribution for this rite, it looks as though this Vaiṣṇava work has also sought to mention a textual authority and it has done so in such a


32 There are descriptions that involve a rite of planting sprouts (*aṅkurāropana*) some days before the Damana-festival (see, for example, *Viśvāmitrasamhitā* 26.4, part of a Pāṇcarātra account), but this is a standard prognosticatory procedure before most festivals in South Indian Temple Āgamas, whether Śaiva or Vaiṣṇava, and there is no indication in these cases that the seeds involved (the reference to “sprouts” in the compound *aṅkurāropana/aṅkurāropana* is of course proleptic: it is seeds that are planted) are those of the Damana plant.
vague way that no reader could know quite where to check: after all, perhaps there is somewhere some work that can be styled Baudhāyana which describes a Damana-festival.\footnote{33}

While Śaivas appear to have colonised this spring festival by calquing its structure on another annual reparatory rite and by making the Damana plant into a transmogrified Bhairava rather than a form of Kāmadeva, there may seem at first blush to have been no Vaiṣṇavisation here, for Kāmadeva, who is in any case no enemy of Kṛṣṇa,\footnote{34} is a central figure. But the choice of lunar date for the festival might be a trace reflecting Vaiṣṇava assimilation. In the correlation of lunar days (tiḥti) with particular deities that began to involve in the Gṛhyaśūtra literature (see Einoö 2005: 101–111), the thirteenth day of the lunar fortnight is typically associated with Kāmadeva. The twelfth day, by contrast, is very frequently associated with Viṣṇu and the fourteenth with Śiva. Exactly these correspondences (Viṣṇu, 12\textsuperscript{th}; Kāmadeva, 13\textsuperscript{th}; Śiva, 14\textsuperscript{th}) may be found in another relatively early account to which Einoö in 2005 did not have access, namely the Niśvāsa- Mukhātattvasamhitā (3.127f., in Kafle 2015; see also the tabulation of Devīpurāṇa 61 below). It seems likely that a popular tradition of Kāmadeva worship would have been widely associated with the thirteenth day (Kāmadeva’s day) of the month of Caitra (Kāmadeva’s month), and that this festival was sometimes tugged towards the twelfth by Viṣṇu-devotees, as here, and sometimes to the fourteenth by devotees of Śiva. We find the
fourteenth, prescribed for instance in the *Jñānārṇavatanastra*, in chapter 26.\(^{35}\)

Similarly, we find a spring festival (*vasantotsava*) involving the worship of Skanda with, among other things, Damana (*dāmaiḥ* in 39.44) enjoined on the sixth day of the bright fortnight of Caitra or Vaiśākhī in the *Kumāratantra* (39.41–74), the sixth day being typically that of Skanda.

Since we find Śaiva-inflected, Vaiṣṇava-inflected, and Kaumāra-inflected accounts of *damanapūjā*, it will perhaps be no surprise to discover that the rite was also adapted by devotees of the goddess. Rather than quote and translate another long passage as evidence here in the body of this article, particularly since the text in question is not easy to edit because of doubts about which of its many anomalies of grammar and sense are authorial and which transmissional, I have added part of an unpublished account (kindly brought to my attention by Diwakar Acharya) of Devī-related *damanapūjā* to an appendix, so that interested readers may have an impression of the work. The text affects the style of a Tantra\(^{36}\) and, once again, it begins (verse 1), with what looks like a fictional locus of attribution: The rite is said to have been taught in a scripture vaguely named the *Pārameśvara*. Here it is the goddess who, in response to a question of Maheśa, recounts an aetiological myth in which it is explained that Damana was an overweening Asura whom she fought and felled and who, transformed into a plant, has since been used for the worship of Hara. The story is plainly influenced by that best-known of all works of goddess mythology, the *Durgā-Saptasati* (or *Devīmāhātmya*), of which, as Diwakar Acharya has pointed out to me, there are close verbal echoes (see, e.g., verse 16).

But might there be any accounts of Damana-*pūjā* that have not been inflected by Śaivism or Vaiṣnavism or devotion to the goddess or to some

---

\(^{35}\) Cf. also *Epigraphia Indica* 23, “No 29. Fragmentary Stone Inscription of Queen Uddalladevi: V.S 1294” (NĀGAR 1940: 188): ...śrī-uddaladevyā ... sanva- [tsa][rāṇāṁ] dvādašāsateṣu caturnavatyadhikēṣu *damanaka-caturdasyāṇa* [ga-]ru)[ī]re śrīvindhyeśvaradevasya ... [prā]sādayam kāritāḥ pratiṣṭhāpitaś ca. My attention was drawn to this passage by KANE V/1: 310.

\(^{36}\) Its colophonic concluding statement, however, on f. 5r, appears to read

\[\text{anuṣṭupchandasāḥ proktam saśṭhīsokerudārytaḥ | nirṇītaṁ śrīkamalākhyena parvadāmanasamjñitah | 0 || damanārohanavidhi samāptah | 0 ||} \]

The verse, once adjusted for metre and sense, might have been intended to read

\[\text{anuṣṭupchandasāḥ proktam saśṭiślokaik udārytaṁ | nirṇītaṁ kamalākhyena parva dāmanasamjñitam.} \]

“This [account of the] calendrical rite called *dāmanā*, proclaimed in *anuṣṭubh* metre in 60 *slokas*, was composed by Kamala.”
other divinity? Various works of classical literature, notably the Ratnāvalī and the Kuṭṭanīmata, allude to spring festivals of Kāmadeva, but perhaps there is no surviving detailed prescriptive account of such an uninflated Damana-related festival of love in Caitra because there may never have been a community – of monotheistic Kāmadeva worshippers, for example – who would have felt the need to set down in writing the niceties of such a public festival in the way that, for instance, Saidhāntikas did. Nevertheless, it is possible that the mentions in some Purāṇas capture details of practices that predate the appropriation of Damana-पūजा by the monotheistic devotional religions.

It is conceivable, for instance, that the Devīpurāṇa contains a faint trace of a barely inflected worship of Kāmadeva involving the Damana plant, but it is unfortunately not particularly rich in detail. Its chapter 61 lists the deities who are to be worshipped on each tithi of the month of Caitra. One of these is Kāmadeva:

On the thirteenth day, Kāmadeva is to be worshipped in accordance with the rules, together with Rati and Prīti, [and] adorned with amulets of Aśoka. [He is to be worshipped] in a pot, or drawn upon a white cloth, using leaves and fruits and the like, [and] with offerings of rice cooked with sugar-cane; [if one worships him in this way], one will attain incomparable sexual prowess.

Now there is no mention of any Damana here, but worship with Damana-sprigs (damanaiḥ) figures explicitly in the prescriptions for the worship of six of the other deities in Caitra, as the table below shows, so its use here should probably simply be understood from the use of the expression yathāvidhi, as has been suggested by MEYER (1937: 53).

---

37 These accounts are discussed at length, along with much else besides, by MEYER 1937: 11–59, as part of a long treatment entitled “Der altindische Liebesgott als Vegetationsdämon und sein Fest,” covering pp. 12–38.
38 I had been inclined to guess that aśokamāṇi referred to “gem[-like buds] of the Aśoka,” but “amulet” is the interpretation, no doubt correct, of MEYER (1937: 44), when he translates the same line when it appears in another work.
39 Devīpurāṇa 61: kāmadevas trayodaśyōṃ pājanīyo yathāvidhi | ratiprīṁsamāvukto hy aśokamāṇāḥbhūṭataḥ | kumbhe vā sitavastre vā lekhyah patraphalādi-bhīḥ | khaṇḍaśarkaranaivedyaḥ saubhāgyam atulaṃ labhet |.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tithi</th>
<th>deity</th>
<th>verses</th>
<th>substances used</th>
<th>rewards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brahmā</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Damana, gandha, dhūpa, homa</td>
<td>fruits of all tīrthas and abhiṣekas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Umā, Śīva, Fire</td>
<td>2-3b</td>
<td>havisya, naivedya</td>
<td>saubhāgya and children for women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Devī with Śaṅkara</td>
<td>3c-7</td>
<td>Damana, swing, vigil and many other offerings</td>
<td>saubhāgya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gageśa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Laḍḍus, etc</td>
<td>vighnanāśa, sarvakāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ananta and other serpents</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Milk, ghee, naivedya</td>
<td>Removal of the effects of all poisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Skanda</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Milk, naivedya</td>
<td>Happiness (sukha) and saubhāgya and attainment of Skanda-pura after death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Damana, etc.</td>
<td>bhoga, conquest of enemies, great tapas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Milk, naivedya</td>
<td>desired siddhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mahāmahi-śamardini</td>
<td>13-14b</td>
<td>Damana, incense, banners, mirrors</td>
<td>victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dharmarāja</td>
<td>14c-15b</td>
<td>Milk, naivedya</td>
<td>conquest of enemies and the supreme pada after death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vṛṣa</td>
<td>15c-16b</td>
<td>Milk, naivedya</td>
<td>wealth, sons and the world of Vṛṣa after death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Viṣṇu</td>
<td>16c-17b</td>
<td>Milk, naivedya</td>
<td>Viṣṇupada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kāmadeva with Rati and Prīti</td>
<td>17b-19b</td>
<td>Milk, naivedya</td>
<td>saubhāgya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Śiva</td>
<td>19c-22b</td>
<td>Milk, naivedya</td>
<td>the fruit of a hundred aśvamedha sacrifices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Indra with Śacī</td>
<td>22c-23b</td>
<td>Milk, naivedya</td>
<td>all desires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Much more interesting, however, is this snippet attributed to the Bhāvīṣyapurāṇa, quoted in the detailed twentieth-century commentary printed in Tripathi’s edition of the Kuṭṭanīmata (ad verse 907), for it may reflect an ancient custom of burning the Damana plant in echo of the burning of Kāmadeva by Śiva.\(^{40}\)

On the thirteenth of the brightening fortnight of Caitra, having fashioned [an image of] Madana made of Damana and having worshipped it in accordance with the rules, he should fan [it into flames] with a fan. Kāma being burnt in this context causes the increase of sons and grandsons. On the thirteenth day, Kāmadeva is to be worshipped in accordance with the rules, together with Rati and Prīti, [and] adorned with amulets of Aśoka.\(^{41}\)

MEYER (1937: 44), after examining such evidence, combined with that of European practices of burning Artemisia plants at the summer solstice (Johannisfest) to assuage unhappiness in love (1937: 44ff.), indeed assumed that the burning of mugwort was an ancient custom.

Wir sehen also: Der Beifuß ist eine Form, eine Urform des Liebesgottes, und an seinem Fest wird der Beifuß mit dem vollen Bewusstsein dieser Identität verbrennt. Der innige Zusammenschluß der

\(^{40}\)The same verses, with minor variations, occur elsewhere, for instance at the beginning of chapter 122 of pāda 4 or the pūrvabhāga of the Nāradapurāṇa (with the corruption candanātmakam in place of damanātmakam). Neither Meyer nor I have been able to find this passage in the Bhāvīṣyapurāṇa, but MEYER records (1937: 42) that he has found the first three half-lines of it attributed to the Pādmapurāṇa in Hemādri’s Caturvargacintāmani and to the Kārmapurāṇa in the Śrītisāroddhāra. As we have just seen above, the last pair of half-lines is to be found in the Devīpurāṇa, and MEYER (1937: 53) also points to other places in which they occur. We should note that the fact that the verses are not found in the extant Bhāvīṣyapurāṇa is not necessarily an indication that they did not once belong there, for it is clear that much that is quoted with attribution to the Bhāvīṣyapurāṇa by commentators and compendium-compilers is no longer to be found there (see HAZRA 1940: 167–173).

\(^{41}\)Kuṭṭanīmata ad verse 907:

\begin{verbatim}
caitrasukkula(trayodasyam) madanam damanatmakam
kṛvā sampūjya viśīvad viśayad viśanjena tu
atra samdhukṣitah kāmah putrapauravardhanaḥ
kāmadevas trayodasyāṁ pūjanīyo yathāvidhi
ratiprītisamāyukto hy aśokamaṇibhūṣitaḥ
\end{verbatim}
beiden drückt sich auch darin aus, daß der damanaka aus der Asche des Kāma, in der späteren indischen Vorstellung gewiß des von Čivas Augenfeuer verbrannten, entstanden sein soll.\footnote{\textsc{Anderson} (1993: 136–137), who seems not to have been aware of Meyer’s work, refers to anthropologists’ accounts of such rituals of the burning of effigies of Kāma in South India in recent times.}

Having now discussed the various traditions of \textit{damanapūjā} that we have encountered, let us return briefly to the text-critical problem concerning Jñānaśambhu’s work. When we compare the South Indian and Nepalese versions that purport to be Jñānaśambhu’s text (compare appendices 1 and 2), the most obvious difference is that the Nepalese version is in prose, punctuated with just a few verses. These verses are common to the South Indian text, excepting one, which is presented as a quotation from another source, the \textit{Mohacūḍottara}. At first blush, there is nothing here to surprise a reader familiar with other parts of the \textit{Jñānaratnāvali}, for although this particular section of the work in the southern sources is entirely in verse, most other sections are in a mixture of prose and verse and contain numerous marked and unmarked quotations from scriptural sources that justify or complement or contrast with what Jñānaśambhu prescribes.\footnote{Of the three other hitherto edited sections of the \textit{Jñānaratnāvali} of which I am aware, those edited by \textsc{Mirnig} (2018), namely the \textit{antyesṭividhi} and the \textit{śrāddhakarmavidhi}, are almost entirely in verse, but the treatment of Caṇḍeśa worship (edited and translated in \textsc{Goodall} 2009: 360–366) is in a mixture of prose and verse.} But when we stop to look, we see that the shared verses are in this case, with one exception, simply part of the ritual: they are formulae that are to be addressed to the Damana plant and to Śiva in the course of the rite. The one exception is the verse right at the beginning that alludes to Jñānaśambhu’s authorship and concludes the previous section of the text. In other words, no distinctive formulation is shared, other than the authorship-verse: what the two versions have in common is just the sequence of rites that are prescribed. The sequence is formulated in one case in verse and contains aetiological and other discussions – a sort of auto-commentary – and in the other case in prose with little comment. It thus seems clear that to transform the Nepalese version into the southern one would have required a vast intellectual effort of versification and reflection, an effort little different from fresh composition; to arrive at the Nepalese text from the southern one, however,
would have been a relatively simple enterprise, requiring cutting out whatever was not necessary for ritual performance and restating the ritual acts in straightforward prose. The Nepalese text bears the appearance of a true “handbook,” a guide that an officiant might hold or lay beside him while performing the rite, designed only to cover the parallel Śaiva festivals of pavītrotsava and damanotsava and consciously based on the much more literary and reflective scholastic work of Jñānaśambhu.

Conclusions

Two conclusions are in order here. The first concerns the issue of transmission. It seems clear, when we juxtapose the Nepalese and South Indian texts of the Jñānaratnāvalī, that it is, fortunately, likely to be the more literary South Indian version – full as it is of quotations, discussions, and versified instructions – that is primary, rather than the Nepalese version, which makes the impression of being a stripped down prose version that can, as it were, be held in the practitioner’s hand while he conducts the ritual. This means that we can continue to consider the rich compendium that is the South Indian text, compiled by a South Indian living in Benares, as an indicator of which scriptures were and were not available to Śaiddhāntika authors in the second half of the twelfth century.

The second conclusion concerns the subject matter of the various passages we have drawn upon, namely the damanotsava. What can explain this profusion of conflicting details in ritual performance, deity of worship, conception of purpose, and contradictory mythological explanations for the involvement of a certain plant or genus of plants? It is clear that we have with the damanotsava a widely practised rite associated with spring and with love that has been adapted by several different medieval religious communities and then coloured to suit their particular needs. In most cases, this has meant crafting a fresh aetiological myth and imagining a scriptur-

---

44 We have referred above to passages that mention or narrate myths in which Damana is variously to be identified with Kāmadeva, with Bhairava, and with a demon felled, like Mahiṣāsura, by the Goddess, but we have not hitherto made reference to a passage in which Damana is the transformation of a watery demon whom Viṣṇu sought out from the ocean, thrashed and transformed into a grassy plant. This is briefly narrated in 2.38.113ff. in the Vaiṣṇavakhaṇḍa of the Skandapurāṇa:

\[ \text{purā damanakaṇṭa daityaṁ samudrodakacārīṇam} \]
\[ \text{bādhitāraṇaṁ janāṇāṁ vai māyābalaparākramam} \] || 113
al source of authority (Svacchandatantra, Baudhāyana, Pārameśvara) to which an account of the rite and myth could be attributed; but it has also meant altering profoundly the structure of the ritual. In the Śaiva case, the model of an expiatory rite, the pavitrotsava, has been adopted wholesale, leading in turn to the rather odd solution of making the ostensible purpose of the rite into something that prevents those who perform it from “losing” the merits that they would otherwise have acquired during the month of Caitra because of their being passed over to Bhairava.

We have seen above that Brunner, misled by the probably fictional ascription of an account of the rite to the Svacchandatantra, suspected that the Saiddhāntika damanotsava had its origin in a Bhairava-oriented tradition of the Mantramārga. But it seems much more likely that the roots of Damana-worship were to be found in a spring festival of Love that belonged to popular, non-sectarian social religion of the kind termed laukika by the Niśvāsamukhatattvasamhitā.

It seems, in other words, as though the Śaivas who worked the damanotsava into their ritual calendar may have started with a popular rite that was irrelevant to them in every way: the event was devoted to Kāmadeva and to the celebration of spring and it promised no rewards that could easily be connected to the often emphasised Mantramārga goals of attaining liberation or supernatural powers. So why did they bother to include the damanotsava? It seems to me that we should think in terms of a tension between the soteriological focus of the early religion on the one

409

---

"Formerly [there was] a demon [called] Damanaka who moved in the waters of the ocean and killed people, powerful because of the force of Māyā. At Brahmā’s command, the immanent Lord, who is also possessed of Māyā, entered the ocean in his piscine form, searched [Damanaka] out, dragged him to the shore and pummelled him on the ground. The great Dānava was felled on the fourteenth of [the month of] Caitra (madhoḥ). By contact with the Lord’s hands, he became a fragrant grass."

There is perhaps a trace of a slightly different version of this myth a few chapters later in the same text when the festival (of damanabhañjikā) is described, since there the plant is said to sprout out from Damanaka’s body (2.45.7):  "It was also at night that the Immanent Lord formerly broke the demon Damana. He took great delight in breaking him. This grass rose from that [demon’s] body.”
hand and its outreach into a growing community of followers on the other. We may imagine śaivācāryas seeing their sphere of authority being further and further widened by the broadening of scope of their religion that resulted from admitting larger categories of people to initiated life, a tendency that is suggested, for instance, by the creation of the category of a “seedless initiation” (nirbija-dikṣā), an initiation for people such as “women, fools, and kings,” in other words, those who for different reasons were held to be unable to follow the time-consuming post-initiatory rituals and religious activities of regular initiates. As the social base broadened, so too did the liturgy, which could naturally be expanded by adapting the calendrical feasts of popular religion.

Early literature of the Mantramārga shows little interest in socio-religious rituals of any kind and appears, as we have seen, to describe no utsavas at all. We have seen that this is not because utsavas did not exist at the time of the early scriptures, and so it must be assumed that this is because such utsavas had no soteriological function. The first utsavas to figure in the canon of rites, if one does not include the celebratory rituals surrounding a pratiṣṭhā, appears to be the pavitrotsava, which we find described, for instance, in the Kiraṇatāṇtra and in the Mohacūḍottara. The inclusion of this festival before all others is perhaps to be explained by its being something that could be given a soteriological function: that of reparation of expiable offences of which one might not be aware. The damanotsava seems to be the next to have been roped in, after first being rewritten upon the model of the pavitrotsava. The motive for its inclusion was, I propose, to harness the popularity of a people’s festival that, in the early Siddhānta, would have been of no interest to those composing scriptures – to harness this popularity while reducing to an absolute minimum the relevance of spring and the god of love in the festival! Such a broadening of the ritual canon prefigures the total transformation of the religion that begins to be reflected a century later, in the twelfth century, in the South Indian Temple Āgamas, a huge corpus of literature that attempts to describe every aspect of the socio-religious life of a large South Indian temple. This literature, while purporting to belong to the Śaivasiddhānta, in fact pays almost no further attention to soteriologically important rituals such as nirvāṇadikṣā (salvific initiation), and discusses instead at great

---

45 For more detailed reflections on the gradual social broadening of the current of the Mantramārga that became the Śaivasiddhānta, see GOODALL, SANDERSON, ISAACSON et al. 2015: 47–59 and, with a particular focus on the growing prominence of women, GOODALL 2015: 23–49.
length the courtly protocol of rites and processions for temple images. The Śaivasiddhānta had, it seems, by then become so “mainstream” in South Indian society that it became transformed, almost beyond recognition, by the popular temple-based religious traditions that it had engulfed and swallowed.
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De\textit{vīpr\textit{ūṇa}}
\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

Dev\textit{vāmata}
\begin{quote}
NGMPP A 41/15.
\end{quote}

Nāradapur\textit{aṇa}
\begin{quote}
\textit{Atha Nāra\textit{diya}mahāpuruṇ\textit{aṇam prārabhyate.} Ed. Śrīkrṣṇaś\textit{āsa Khemarāja. Bombay: Śrīveṇkaśe\textit{vara Steam Press, 1867.}
\end{quote}

Niśvāsamukhatatt\textit{vasaṃhitā}
\begin{quote}
See KAFLE 2015.
\end{quote}

Pārameś\textit{vrasaṃhitā}
\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

Bhāviṣyapuruṇ\textit{aṇa}
\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

Viśvāmitrasaṃhitā
\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

Śīvadharm\textit{aṣṭāstra}
\begin{quote}
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
– Also NGMPP A 3/3 [Nepal] samvat 321 [scil. 1201 AD], f.27v–28r (= A); NGMPP B 7/3 [Nepal] samvat 290 [scil. 1170 AD], f.26r–26v (= B); IFP T. 32 (C20th transcript of a Grantha palm-leaf ms.) (= T).
\end{quote}
Sarvajñānottararvṛtti of Aghoraśiva
   IFP RE 47852 (paper manuscript in Grantha script).
Somaśambhupaddhati (SP1, SP2, etc. = BRUNNER 1963, 1968, etc.)
Somaśambhupaddhatiṭīkā of Trilocanaśivācārya
   Forthcoming edition of S.A.S. Sarma, based on, among other manuscripts,
   Madras GOML M. 14735 (paper manuscript in Devanāgarī script).

Skandapurāṇa
   [Reprint of Veṅkaṭeśvara Steam Press edition].

Haribhaktivilāsā
   Śrīśrīharibhaktivilāsāh saṃkhaḥ mahāmahopādhyāya paramabhāgavata
   śrīgopālahaṭṭa samgrhiṭṭaḥ ... śrīyuktamuktārāma vidyāvāgīśena śodhitaḥ.
   Kālikāṭā: Pūrṇacandrodayantra, 1845. [Digital copy of this Bengali-script edition downloaded from the Deutsche Digitale Bibliothek on November 29, 2015]
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ättaśāntā's ज्ञानार्तमानवली (C12th). From Madras GOML R 14898 (=M1, pp. 202ff) and Mysore ORI ms. P 3801 (=M2), a palm-leaf ms. in Nandināgarī. (Also, for first verse only, NGMPP A 49/7 (=N.).)

śrīcolaḍesasambhūtahūṣureṇa46 tapodhinā
śrīmaṭjñānaśivenāyaṃ47 paviṭrakavidhitṛ kṛtaḥ48

svacchandaḥbhairave tantre bhairova damanāḥ smṛtaḥ49
ratiḥprītyaśrusaṁsiktaṁrahasmahabhaḥvah kvači50 1
siddhānte nādaraś tasya51 praśyaścittasayair api52
tathāḥpāpa śāmāṇyaṃ53 puspādhyaḥśu kṛtānāt54 2
pūrvačāryoditavaca tadvipānaṃ tu55 kathyate

46 śrīcolaḍesasambhūtaśa M2; colaḍesasamudbhūtā N; śrīcolaḍesasambhūtā M1
47 śīvenāyaṃ] M1; śīvena M2 (unmetrical)
48 There follows in M1: śrīmahāgaṇapatiye namaḥ; in M2: śrīmatkāverikapilaśṭaradakkisarovara-
49 bhairavo damanāḥ smṛtaḥ] em.; bhairavoditamantrataḥ M1; bhairavo damana
50 ratipriṭyāśrusaṁsiktaṁrasmahabhaḥvah kvači] conj.; iti prītyaśrusaṁsikta-
51 nādaraś tasya] M1; nāradas tasya M2
52 śayair api] conj.; śṛutair api M1; śrśayair api (?) M2
53 tathāḥpāpa śāmāṇyaṃ] em.; tathāḥ bhāvaśāmāṇyaḥ M1; tathāḥ pāpa śāmāṇyaṃ M2
54 puspādhyaḥśu kṛtānāt] em.; puspādhyaḥśu kṛtānāt M1; puspādhyaḥye prakṛtānāt M2 pucaḥ; puspādhyaḥye prakṛtānām M2 ac
saptamāṃ vā\textsuperscript{56} trayodāṣyāṃ caite māsi dvipāksayoh\textsuperscript{3} kṛtāṁnikas tu śayāne gatvā damanakāntikam\textsuperscript{57} samproksyāstrenā samśodhya pūjyayat samhitānubhiḥ\textsuperscript{4} gandhapuspapatrādyāh dhūpapādīpādibhiḥ sudhīḥ prayānya ca yathāśāstraṃ dāmam āmāntrayet tadā\textsuperscript{58} 5 om haraprasādasyaṃ śambhūta tvam atra sannidhiḥbha\textsuperscript{59} śivakāryaṃ samuddīṣya netavyo ’si śivājaṇaya\textsuperscript{69} 6 punās cābhāyarcyayaṃ samrakṣyayat upātīya\textsuperscript{61} svagṛham nayet yadi dūrāṃ tad āṇītam\textsuperscript{62} samāropya samāpataḥ 7 tatpūrṇapāṭreṇāropyaṃ grhe ’py āmāntrapūrvava\textsuperscript{63} yāgāṃ pārvoktavat kṛtvā pavitrāṇiva śodhayat\textsuperscript{64} 8 phalaṃ\textsuperscript{65} pūṣpaṃ ca patram ca mālam nālam tadudbhavam\textsuperscript{66} 9 gavyaṃgham dantakāṣṭhaṃ ca bhasmahṛṛddhātaṅkāpalam iśānādyyuttattāntasū dikṣā\textsuperscript{67} pātreṣu vinyaset 10 gandhāṃ damanam āropyāḥ\textsuperscript{68} śuryādīnāṃ anukramāt devan damanakair īṣṭvā paṅcāṅgair avikhaṇḍitaḥ 11 sāṅgam damanakāṃ dhūpam\textsuperscript{69} dūrvāpūspākṣaṭāṇvitam vidhāyāṅjaṃdhyāstham\textsuperscript{70} idam āmāntrānaṃ vadeṣu 12 āmāntrito\textsuperscript{71} ’si deśeṣa prātaḥkāle mayā prabhō\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{55} tu] M\textsuperscript{1}; ca M\textsuperscript{Y}
\textsuperscript{56} saptamāṃ vā] M\textsuperscript{1}; saptamāyāṃ M\textsuperscript{Y}
\textsuperscript{57} gatvā damanakāntikam] em.; kṛtvā damanakāntikam M\textsuperscript{1}; gatvā damanikāntikam M\textsuperscript{Y}. Cf. SP2, 2.6 (of which 3c–4 in Jñānasambhu’s text seem to be an expanded version): saptamāṃ vā trayodāṣyāṃ gatvā damanakāntikam śodhayīvāstryāntrenā pūjyayat samhitānubhiḥ]
\textsuperscript{58} dāmam āmāntrayet tadā]\ M\textsuperscript{1}; damāmāntrenā tadyathā M\textsuperscript{Y}
\textsuperscript{59} "sambhūta tvamatra sannidhiḥ\textsuperscript{2} em.; "sambhūta atra sannihito M\textsuperscript{Y}; sambhūtā tvamatra sannidhiḥ M\textsuperscript{1}
\textsuperscript{60} netavyo ‘si] em.; tenavyosi M\textsuperscript{Y}; netavyāsi M\textsuperscript{1}
\textsuperscript{61} upātīya svagṛham] M\textsuperscript{1}; yamādāyai svagṛham M\textsuperscript{Y}
\textsuperscript{62} tad āṇītam] M\textsuperscript{Y}; tathāṇītam M\textsuperscript{1}
\textsuperscript{63} ‘nāropya grhe ‘py āmāntrā] conj.; vāropya grhe vyāmānra M\textsuperscript{1}; māropya grhe pyāmāstra M\textsuperscript{Y}
\textsuperscript{64} śodhayat] M\textsuperscript{Y}; śodhayet M\textsuperscript{1}
\textsuperscript{65} phalaṃ] M\textsuperscript{1}; phala M\textsuperscript{Y}
\textsuperscript{66} mālam nālam tadudbhavam] M\textsuperscript{Y}; mṛṇālam tattadubhavam M\textsuperscript{1}
\textsuperscript{67} "tarāntāsū dikṣā]\ M\textsuperscript{Y}; "tarāntāsāya triṣu M\textsuperscript{1}
\textsuperscript{68} gandhāṃ damanam āropya] M\textsuperscript{Y}; gandhāṁ damanam āropya M\textsuperscript{Y}; pc; gandhādamanam āropya M\textsuperscript{1}
\textsuperscript{69} sāṅgāṃ damanakāṃ dhūpam] M\textsuperscript{Y}; sāṅgamanakandhūpam M\textsuperscript{1}
\textsuperscript{70} "madhyastham]\ M\textsuperscript{1}; "madhyasthaḥ M\textsuperscript{Y}
kartavyaṃ tu yathākālaṃ dāmaparva tavaiṇāyā 13
atra sadyodhivāsaṣ cer sadyahkāle bhuyadīryatāṃ
dīvāntāṃ mūlaṃ uccārya śaṅgāyesāya diyatāṃ
dhūpadipādinaivedyais toṣayitvā puroktavat
dattvāṅgaye ca taccheṣaṃ kumbhābdhaṣṭāt puroktavat
avaśiṣṭaṃ ca nirvartya rātrau jāgarayed iti
adhiśvāsavidihī khyātaḥ prātur nityād anantaram 16
sādambaram yajed īṣaṃ dvāradīkapagḥāṭāḍībhīṃ
puspadīρvāśkatai dhūpaiḥ kṛtvā dāmanakāṇḍajalim 17
ātmavidyāśivais tattvair mūlaōṣyā śiṣvāntakaḥ namontais tryaṇjalinī dattvā caturdīhaṇjalīnāversey 18
om haṃ makheśvarāya makhām pūravaḥ pūravā śūlapāṇaye tām dāmanakaṃ namāḥ
angēbhyaṣaḥ ca śiṃgaṇeḥ ca dattvā kṛtvā balidvayaṃ
dīṣaṃ pūrvavat atrāpi kṛtvā gatva śiṃvantikam 19
om bhagavann atiriktaṃ vā hiṇaṃ vā yan mañā kṛtaṃ sarvaṃ tad astu sampūrṇam parva dāmanakaṃ mama 20

71 āmāntritāḥ M1; om āmāntrito MY
72 prabho] M1; vibho MY
73 yathākālaṃ M1; yathālābham MY
74 vāsaṣ cer] MY; vasam cer M1
75 śiṃvāntaḥ M1; śiṃvānta M1
76 śaṅgāyesāya diyatāṃ M1; sāṃgēśayamūddīryatāṃ MY
77 jāgarayed iti] conj.; jāgaṇaṃ kuryāt iti M1 (unmetrical); jāgaṇaṃdīti M1
78 sādambaram M1; sāśambare M1
79 dvāradīkapagḥāṭāḍībhīṃ M1; dvāradīkapagḥatā bhī M1; dvāradī Xkṣu?X k pa kpa ghaṭāṇubhiḥ M1 (The capital X's here bracket an uncertain cancelled syllable.)
80 puspadīρvāśkatai M1; dīṛyaρpūdānai M1
81 ātmavidyāśivais tattvair M1; ōvidyāni śiņastadvaɪ M1
82 kaiḥ M1; spaiḥ M1
83 namontais tryaṇjalinī dattvā M1; nomnaistryaṇjalinirdattvā M1 (unmetrical)
84 makheśvarāya makhām pūravaḥ pūravā] conj.; makheśvarāya makhaṃ pūravaḥ pūravaḥ M1
85 mahāṇeśvarāya mahāṃ pūravaḥ pūravaḥ M1
86 śiṃgaṇeḥ ca dattvā M1; śīṃgē X?X ś ca kṛtvā M1
87 śiṃgaṇeḥ ca dattvā M1; śīṃgē X?X ś ca kṛtvā M1
88 śiṃgē X?X ś ca kṛtvā M1
89 śiṃgē X?X ś ca kṛtvā M1
90 makhām pūravaḥ pūravā] conj.; makhāṃ pūravaḥ pūravaḥ M1
91 mahāṃ pūravā mahāṃ pūravā M1
92 makhām pūravaḥ pūravā] conj.; makhāṃ pūravaḥ pūravā M1
93 mahāṃ pūravaḥ pūravā] conj.; makhāṃ pūravaḥ pūravā M1
94 mahāṃ pūravaḥ pūravā] conj.; makhāṃ pūravaḥ pūravā M1
95 makhām pūravaḥ pūravā] conj.; makhāṃ pūravaḥ pūravā M1
96 makhām pūravaḥ pūravā] conj.; makhāṃ pūravaḥ pūravā M1
97 makhām pūravaḥ pūravā] conj.; makhāṃ pūravaḥ pūravā M1
98 makhām pūravaḥ pūravā] conj.; makhāṃ pūravaḥ pūravā M1
99 makhām pūravaḥ pūravā] conj.; makhāṃ pūravaḥ pūravā M1
100 makhām pūravaḥ pūravā] conj.; makhāṃ pūravaḥ pūravā M1

This verse (20), with this emendation, is the same as verse 25 of the dāmanapūjāvidhi of the Somasaṃbhupaddhati.
iti vijñāpya deveṣe kārmāṇaṃ samarpya ca
yāgaṃ visṛjya candesṭiṃ90 kṛtvāḥavabhrhaṃ91 caret 21
sarvayajñesa yat punyaṃ tapahsarvesu yat phalam
tat phalam koṭigunitam abhiṣekād avāpyate 22
atra śrīsomāsaṃbhumādair92 yo viṣeṣaḥ
evam dāmaṇḍham93 kṛtvā kurvīta gurupūjanam
pariṣoṣakaraṃ94 paścād dvijādin āpi tarpayet 23
gṛhaṣṭho brahmaṇaṃ vai ya imaṃ kurute vidhim95
japapūjādikan96 tasya saphalam caitramāsajam97 24
iti
golakīvaṃṣajātena śrīmatā jñānaṃsaṃbhunā
kṛpāvatā munīndrenā98 dāmaparvaśīmhiṃ kṛtah 25

Appendix II

Transcription of part of NGMPP A 49/7 (ff. 20r–21r), an apparently complete palm-leaf Nepalese manuscript of 24 folios, numbered 1–24, whose index-card gives it the title Pavitravidhi (Diwakar Acharya kindly drew this manuscript to my attention):

coladeśasamudbhūtabhūṣureṇa kṛpāvatā
śrīmaṇaṃśaśivivāyam pavitravidhiṃ kṛtah
murāmāṃśi vaca kuṣṭhaṃ śaileyaṁ rajanīdvayaṁ
śaṭṭhi cāmpakamaṃsath ca sarvaśuṣadhiṃnaṃ sūryaḥ99

90 candesṭiṃ] M1; samdeśṇīṃ M Y
91 kṛtvāḥavabhrthaṃ] em.; kṛtvāḥavabhrtaṃ M1; kṛtvādāvabhrthāṇ M1
92 śrīsoma] M Y; śrīsambhusoma M1
93 dāma] M1; dāna M Y
94 karaṇ] M1; gurum M Y
95 vā ya imaṃ kurute vidhim] em.; vā ya imaṃ kurute vidhim M Y; vā u te vidhi M1
96 japapūjādikam] em.; japahomādikam M Y; japam pūjādikam M1
97 saphalam caitramāsajam] M Y; sa cālam caitramāsānaṃ M1. This verse (24) is reproduced from the Somaśambhupaddhati: only the words gṛhaṣṭho and brahmacārī are interchanged in Brunner’s edition (SP2, 2.26–27).
98 munīndrenā] M1; vinītena M1. With this verse (25), cf. SP2, 2.28: paropakāraśīlana śrīmatā somaśambhuṇā | kriyākāndakramāvalīyan dāmapūjāvidhiṃ kṛtah ||
99 This is a corrupt version of a verse of the Mohacugottara that is quoted, e.g., in Nirmalamaṇji’s commentary on the Kriyākramadyotikā:
tathā śrīmannohāśūrottare
murāmāṃśi vaca kuṣṭhaṃ śaileyaṃ rajanīdvayaṃ |
atha damanakavidhiḥ| caitraśuklakṛṣṇapakṣayōḥ| saptamyāṁ| trayo-

dasyāṁ| vā| kṛtāṁni| kādyāḥ| san| damanakāntikāṁ| gatvā| astra-

mantreṇa| sa-

mśodhya| śādangya| sampiṣya| śivākyena| damanakam| abhimantrayet|

haraprasādasambhāta| tvam| a(f. 20v)| tra| sannidhiḥbhava| śiva| kāryam| samuddhāya| netavyo| si| śivājñāya| [=verse 6 of Appendix I]

anenaḥbhimantraḥ| kavacāśrābhyāṁ| saṃrakṣyāṁ| svagṛham| yāyāt. 100| dūraṁ| cet,

samālam| mṛtyikāśahitaṁ| damanakam| ānīya| mṛtpūrṇapātre| niksipyāḥ| astra-

mantreṇa| vārinī| saṃsicya| pūrvavat| grhe| py| āmantrya| sāyāhnaśamaye| yāga-

manḍapam| alaṃkṛtya| pavitrakavidhiṣvad| adhivāsanaṁ| kṛtvā| dvāralokapāla-

vāstvadhipatibrahmamahālakṣmi|mokapālalakaḷaśavardhanyādīn| sampūrya| vi-

dhivad| vistareṇa| pāṇcāṁrātīdbhīḥ| paramēśvaram| sampiṣya| kūndasamśkāra-
ndipūrṇāntam| karma| kṛtvā| vahnihrdaye| vidhivac| chivaṁ| pūjya| mūlenāṣottat-

taraṇam| huvā| pūrṇāh| ca| dattvā| mantratarpanadāpānaṁ| vidhāya| pavitra-

kavidhiṣvat| damanakam| catuḥsamśkāraśuddham| sampā-

tāhuti(f. 21r)| sōdhi-

taṁ| kṛtvā| devasya| pasćime| mydānitvā| damanakamūlaṁ| sadyojātena| hṛdā|

vā| dadyāḥ| tannālam| āmalakaphalaṁ| vāmena| śirasā| vā| uttaret| tatpadraṁ|

bhasma| cāghoreṇa| sikhayā| vā| daksinē| tatpuṣpaṇaḥ| dantakā-ṣṭham 101| tatpuru-

ṣena 102| kavacena| vā| pṛācyāṁ| tatphalasandhiḥ(?)| paṇcagavyayāṁ| aśānyāṁ| mū-

lena| gāyatrīvā| dadyāḥ| tadaṇu| ādityādvāradikpālakumabhavardhanikāsū|

gandhadamanakam| dattvā| dvāradikpālājanaguruvādiṣu| gandhadamanak-

am 103| nivedya| paṇcāṅgair| damanakaṁ| śivaṁ| sampiṣya| dūrvāpuṣṇaḥkṣatā-

nitaṁ| gandhadhāpayutāṁ| paṇcāṅgadamanakam| anjaliṃadhyaṣthāṁ| kṛ-

tvā 104| devam| viṇāpayet 105

āmantritro| si| deveśa| prātah| kāle| mayā| prabho|

kartavyoṁ| tu| yathālābham| dāmaparva| tāvājñāyaḥ| [=v. 13 of Appendix I] 106

iti| viṇāpya| …

musaḷī| caiva| mustaṁ| ca| sarvaṣadadhiganaḥ| smṛtaḥ|

It also appears in the preceding chapter of the JñānaratnaVALI, on the pavitra-

kavidhi. 100| yāyāḥ| conj.;| yāī| ms.

dantaḥ 101| ms.pc.;| tatāś 100| ms.ac

tatpurṣena 102| em.;| tatpurūṣe| ms.

guruvādiṣu| gandhaḥ 103| conj.;| guruvānmasu| gandhaṁ| ms.

kṛtvā 104| conj.;| krś 105| ms.

The immediately preceding prose corresponds to verses 11 and 12 in Appendix I.

Note that it is also the same formula as that given in SP2, 2.16.
Text of a goddess-related account transcribed from an unidentified work, parts of which are transmitted by an apparently complete Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript of ten folios numbered 1–10, namely NGMPP A 49/5, whose index card titles it Damanārohana-pūjā (Diwakar Acharya kindly drew this manuscript to my attention). Much further work would be required to make an edition of this text, for there are many doubts about which of its many anomalies of grammar and sense are authorial and which transmissional. I have silently corrected a number of dental sibilants to palatal ones and vice versa.

[siddham] om namaḥ śivāya
pranāmya pārvatīnāthaṃ pārvatīṃ śaṅkarapriyāṃ¹⁰⁷||
procyate dāmanāṃ parva yad uktaṃ pārameśvare|| 1||
śāstroktam api sāmāyam aduṣṭa[m?] parikṛttaṃ||
prakṛṣṭam tyajyate sadbhīḥ sūdhasiddhāntakāribhīḥ|| 2||
kimarthaṃ kriyate devi vidhyaktam kena hetunā||
ity ādiṣṭam mahēṣena gaurīṃ vākyam abravī|| 3||
śṛṇu deva jagannātha damanotpattim uttamām||
yāṃ vai śrutvā kathāṃ divyāṃ¹⁰⁸ prāpyate padam aksayām|| 4||
adhibhuvanam ākramya samsthitaḥ¹⁰⁹ kālasamjñakah||
tasmā te anga va śaktir damano nāma viśrutā|| 5||
āśīt tatra¹¹⁰ pure ramye krīḍate saha yogibhiḥ||
asurānāṃ pure divye ramate muditāmanā¹¹¹|| 6||
divyadānavagandharvai rakṣoyakṣorageśvaiḥ||
kinnarāmaraṃsiddhāḥ krīḍānandasaṃdheśvaiḥ|| 7||
nityaṃ pramuditādbhīṣ ca madāścaryakāribhīḥ(?)|
divyakrīḍāvinodena divyamalāpakotsavaiḥ¹¹²|| 8||
tasmā[r] kāryā purā jāto bhīṣaṇo bhīmavikramaḥ||
krāntās tena surāḥ sarve¹¹³ dānavāh prthiṁtale|| 9||
bahukālāvyatī(f. 2r)tena darpeṇāṭivasamyutāḥ¹¹⁴|

¹⁰⁷ śaṅkara° ms.; saṅkara° em.;
¹⁰⁸ yāṃ vai śrutvā kathāṃ divyāṃ] conj.; yāvai śrutvā kathāṃ divyā ms.
¹⁰⁹ samsthitaḥ] conj.; samsthita ms.
¹¹⁰ āśīt tatra] conj.; āśīatra ms.
¹¹¹ muditāmanā] conj.; suditāmanā ms.
¹¹² °tsavaiḥ] ms.pc; °tsavai ms.ac
¹¹³ surāḥ sarve] em.; surā sarvve ms.
pātāla mathitaṁ sarvaṁ brūvan vākyam yaḍecchayā|| 10||
sa nāsti matsamo loke trailoky e sacarācare

purāṁ grhnāmy aśeṣam[115] hi brahmaviṣṇendra kā kathā|| 11||
martyalokam samudithāya catuḥṣāgaramekhalam|

bhavāmi tīrthasamsevi[116] saṃkrīḍāmi yathecchayā|| 12||
yāvad evaṁ vaded dhṛṣṭaḥ prthivyāṁ ko mamādhikāḥ|
trailoky e kah pumāṁ tiṣṭhet saṃagedāyataḥ punah?|| 13||
krīḍāyā tatpurāṁ gatvā duṣṭāmakanmumyaṁ kilaḥ(?)|
devisvācanaṁ śrutvā rauso 'sau damanāsuraḥ|| 14||
tataḥ kopaparādhīnaḥ khalo daityah[117] pratāpavān
pātayami na saṃdehaḥ carvayāmi na samśayah|| 15||
tato yuddham ativāśiḥ devyasurayōś bahuḥ[118]
damanāsuraḥ[119] samkruddhaḥ prayayau hantum ambikām|| 16||
vistāravatanā[120] devi jihvālalanabhīśanā

sopaiti[121] raktaṇayanā nādenākrāṇtādigmukhā|| 17||
devyā saha tato yuddham ghoraṁ rudhirakardamam
samjātaṁ vataśārdhedhena tadalāu patito bhuvi|| 18||
śūlam[122] nipātya taprṣya[123] hūmkāroccaiḥ samēhatam
asṛgviśiptā bhū( f. 2v)mayah patito 'yam mahiṭale|| 19||[124]
tasmād vrṣāḥ samutpannāḥ puspapāpaḥ sugandhīnaḥ|

114 darpenā°] em.; darpenā° ms.
115 aśeṣam] conj.; aśeṣā ms.
116 °sevī] em.; °sevī ms.
119 damanāsuraḥ] conj. (unmetrical); damanāsura° ms. Alternatively one could retain the transmitted reading and treat it as a metrically constrained use of the prati-padika for a nominative. Cf. Durgāśaptasatā 9.15: tasmin nipatite bhūmau niśumbhe bhīmavikrame | bhrātary ativa samkruddhaḥ prayayau yoddhum ambikāṃ.
121 sopaiti] em.; sopeti ms.
122 śūlam] conj.; sūram ms.
123 taprṣya] conj.; ta prṣte ms.
124 The syntax is irregular, but the verse can perhaps be interpreted (without further repairs) to mean: “Once she had driven down her trident onto his back – [the back of] him who had been struck down by shrill cries of hūm – the ground-surfaces were smeared with blood [there where] he fell down on the earth.”
ato devī susaṃtusūṭā varaṃ dātuṃ samudyatā∥ 20∥
yāvad vai tiṣṭhate candro yāvad devo divākaraḥ∥ 21∥
tātāḥ prasādenādiṣṭo martyam gaccha tarur bhava 22∥
pauṣpiyatanutanāṃ prāpya mama bhogyo bhaviṣyasi∥ 23∥
arcaviṣyanti ye martyā damanāṅgasamudbhavāḥ∥ 24∥
yāṣyanti te paraṃ sthānaṃ yatra devo maheśvaraḥ∥ 25∥
pālayanti na ye parvva dāmanāṃ nāma mānavāḥ∥ 26∥
tṛṣṭaṃ punyādikāṃ dattaṃ mayā te vai nu māśikam∥ 27∥
kṛtāṃ tasyotsaṇam pūrvam caitraparvanisambhavāḥ∥
prokta vai devadevena damanasya mahāmanāḥ∥ 28∥
damanāḥbhāṇjanāṃ pūrvam saṃkṣiptam vidhivistaram∥ 29∥
sāmpratam procyate devi yāgapūrvādhiḥvāsanam∥ 30∥
caitrasya śuklapakṣe tu trayodasyāṃ saṃhitāḥ∥
jalasānādikāṃ śuddho niyāhnikakriyāparah∥ 31∥
aparāhnikavidhi kṛtvā yāyan nārusāmāpakam∥
kedārīke suvītīrme upaviṣya tataḥ punah∥ 32∥
vikṣanādīsvi(f.3r)śuddham āmanto kādāśānubhiḥ(?)∥
taroḥ sambodhanam kuryāt śivavākyena mantrināḥ∥ 33∥
devyāḥ prasādasampūrṇam māmārthe saṃnīdhiḥbhave∥
harayaṇāṃ samuddiśya grhnāmi∥ 34∥
…}

125 Once again, the phrasing could be clearer, but we may understand as follows: “From him/there, blossoming fragrant shrubs sprang up. Thereupon the goddess, being pleased, began to give [this] boon.”
126 This is hypermetrical, unless we emend damanaka to damana. The meaning appears to be: “For as long as the moon and the sun-god remain, you, O Damana, will be upon the earth [for the sake of] worship of Śiva.”
127 tataḥ prasādenādiṣṭo martyam gaccha tarurbhava] conj.; tataḥ prasādenādiṣṭo martyam gaccha XpoṇaX tarur bhava ms. “And so, being ordered out of [my] grace, go to [the world] of mortal[es] and become a tree.”
128 “Once you have become flowery-bodied, you will be a means for my enjoyment.”
129 °vistaram] conj.; °vistaran ms.
130 samuddiśya grhnāmi] em.; samuddiśya grhnāmi ms.
Hanumān worship under the kings of the late Malla period in Nepal

Gudrun Bühnemann

In the late Malla period (1482–1768 CE), the Kathmandu Valley was divided into the three independent kingdoms of Kathmandu, Patan, and Bhaktapur. The rulers of these kingdoms mainly worshipped the goddess Taleju. But the list of titles of many of these kings characterised them not only as Taleju’s foremost servants but also as hanumaddhvaja (“with Hanumān in their banner”). That this title, which attests to the importance of the divinity at that time, was no mere flourish is borne witness to by surviving royal banners with an image of Hanumān on them, such as the one (Fig. 1) preserved in the National Museum of Nepal, Kathmandu. It features a fierce-looking, two-armed Hanumān in militant stance.

A painting completed in 1704 shows the standard of a king surmounted by a figure of a two-armed Hanumān standing in militant stance with his arms spread out (Figs. 2a-b). The standard featuring the hero Hanumān is well-suited for a king, since it promises victory in battle. Hanumān banners have a fairly long history: the twelfth-century Narapatijayacaryāsvarodaya (chapter 5, stanzas 138–191), for example, describes rituals for Hanumān which involve the making of a banner (patākā) featuring Hanumān’s image and mantra, for purposes of protection and the destruction of an enemy’s army. The Pāṇḍava Arjuna is also known by the epithet “monkey-banne[d]”

---

1 I would like to thank Kashinath Tamot for help with reading the inscriptive material. I would further like to thank Gerd Mevissen, Manik Bajracharya, Iain Sinclair, Philip Pierce, Purushottam Lochan Shrestha, Alexis Sanderson, Péter-Dániel Szántó, Suresh Man Lakhe, Doris Jinhuang and Ulrich von Schroeder for helpful suggestions and/or for providing photographs. I also thank Dr. Claudio Cicuzza and the Lumbini International Research Institute for their support.

2 See REGMI 1965–1966, part 2: 395 for more information on the titles used by the kings of the late Malla period of Nepal.

3 The painting is reproduced here from PAL 2003: 85. It is described in PAL 2003: 84, and the text inscribed on it is transcribed, translated, and commented on in PAL 2003: 283.
Fig. 1 A Hanumān banner preserved in the National Museum of Nepal, Kathmandu. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
Fig. 2a  A painting showing a royal standard surmounted by a figure of Hanumān in the upper left corner. After PAL 2003: 85.
Tantric Communities in Context

This epithet is found, for example, in Bhagavadgītā 1.20. The Pāṇḍava standard with a figure of Hanumān is also depicted in art. It can be seen, for example, in a painting in a sixteenth-century illustrated Nepalese manuscript (kalāpustaka) illustrating scenes from the Mahābhārata. The manuscript is preserved in the University Library, Cambridge (Add. 864; see PAL 1970: 98 with Fig. 65). On beliefs associated with the kapidihvaja, see THAPLIYAL 1983: 71.

See LUTGENDORF 2007: 61 for more information. LUTGENDORF (2007: 84) also refers to the use of Hanumān standards by the Dadu Panthi Nagas in the second half of the eighteenth century.

The chronicle Nepālikabhāpavamśāvalī (vol. 1: 106) refers to the columns collectively as koṭidhvajas. The passage reads: “Since Kaviṇḍra (Pratāpa Malla) was accomplished in all the teachings, he, following the Śāstras, collected four crores of wealth, buried them under Mohana Coka, that he had built according to the Vāstucaakra, and secured it with four koṭidhvajas. He invoked Hanumān, Matsya, Garuḍa, and a lion in the koṭidhvajas in order to pacify the small-pox deity and to prevent accidents, and various misfortunes and dangers from various ghosts.” The expression koṭidhvajas may be derived from the fact that the dhvajas were set up after the performance of a ritual termed koṭyāhutiṣṭayājñā, which involved the offering of ten million (koṭi) oblations (āhuti) into the fire and took more than one week to complete.

The date of the setting up of the columns surmounted by the figure of Hanumān and a fish is recorded as the thirteenth day of the dark half of the month of mārga in N.S. 775 (see inscriptions no. 23 and 24 in VAJRĀCĀRYA 1976: 212). It is equivalent to Tuesday, January 5, 1655.

The column surmounted by a figure of Hanumān is termed hanūma<d>dhvaja (see inscription no. 23 in VAJRĀCĀRYA 1976: 212) and referred to as hanumanta-dhvaja in manuscripts of the later ritual text in the Newari language titled Mohana-
a Garuḍa, and a lion and can still be seen on the palace roof. (However, the two shorter columns surmounted one each by a four-armed Hanumān and a fish, which are installed on either side of the Hanumāṇḍhokā palace, right behind the statues of two lions mounted one each by Śiva and Pārvatī, are likely much later, possibly nineteenth-century additions to the palace design.) Small figures of a four-armed Hanumān (Figs. 3a–3b) surmount the metal banners set up on either side of the three finials (gajura) on the roof of the Golden Gate (sunḍhokā) of the Bhaktapur Palace, constructed (or rather embellished) by King Raṇa-jitamalla in 1754. It is uncertain whether these banners were part of the original design. It is possible that the two figures of the five-headed Hanumān (Figs. 16–17) commissioned by King Bhūpatindramalla and his son, Raṇa-jitamalla, discussed below were once installed here.

It is very likely that the Hanumān figures on the roofs of the royal palaces of Kathmandu and Bhaktapur were meant to serve an apotropaic purpose. The Hanumān statue (Fig. 4a–b) placed on the roof of the (former) royal palace in Patan must have functioned in a similar capacity. Oral tradition, however, associates the statue with a different purpose. It is said that King Bhūpatindramalla of Bhaktapur (r. 1696–1722) pretended to offer his help with the restoration and improvement of buildings of the royal palace in Patan, where King Yoganarendra-cukayā hitiyāta busādhanaṇa āhuti biya vidhi.

---

8 We do not know whether the statue was originally placed on a column or metal banner. A photograph taken by Kurt Boeck in 1899 and exhibited in Gallery H (Historic Views of Nepal) of the Patan Museum shows the sculpture without a pedestal in its current position on the palace roof.

9 For this account, see HAGMÜLLER 2003: 31.
Fig. 3a The Golden Gate of the Bhaktapur Palace. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
Fig. 3b  Detail: The figures of a four-armed Hanumān surmounting the metal banners on either side of the three finials on the roof of the Golden Gate of the Bhaktapur Palace. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
Fig. 4a The royal palace in Patan with the Golden Window, Golden Gate, and the Hanumān statue on the roof. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
Fig. 4b Detail: The Hanumān statue on the roof.
malla (r. 1684–1705) ruled. Allegedly, he presented Yoganarendramalla
with the gilt image of Hanumān, which he arranged to have placed on the
upper ridge of the west wing of the Patan palace above the king’s bedroom
for destructive purposes. It was believed that this statue actually represent-
ed the heavenly body Saturn (śani) and thus functioned as a source of ill
fortune.\footnote{HAGMÜLLER (2003: 31) asserts that “[a]s its restoration revealed, the statue is
held upright with a bar of iron and iron indeed represents the planet Saturn.”}

It is evident from these examples that Hanumān banners and standards
were popular in the late Malla period both in mobile form and as installa-
tions on the roofs of palaces for protective purposes. With the same goal in
mind, the Malla kings set up two- or four-armed Hanumān statues near the
entrances of their palaces and placed sculptures of the Tantric five-headed
form of the deity on lintels of entranceways and at the apex of tympana.

The aforementioned King Pratāpamalla of Kathmandu, a Tantric practi-
tioner and great patron of the arts, set up two statues of Hanumān close
to his palace in 1672. One of these statues is found at the left side of a gate
(Fig. 5a-b). At a later time, the royal palace was named after this gate
dhokā) with the Hanumān figure and so came to be known as the
Hanumānḍhokā Royal Palace. For ritual purposes, however, another gate
marked by two lions (the lion gate [simhadhokā]), which leads to the Taleju
Temple, is used.

The Hanumān statue next to the palace gate\footnote{The inscription on the statue’s pedestal (see no. 33 in VAJRĀCARYA 1976: 224–
225) specifies the date of installation as the eleventh/twelfth day in the dark half of
the month of vaisākha in N.S. 792. This date is equivalent to Monday, May 23, 1672.
The inscription is covered by the deity’s long robe. A part of it is reproduced in a
photograph published in ARYĀL 2014: 17, but details cannot be discerned.}
is placed atop a column of
about two meters in height. Layers of vermilion paste are regularly applied
to it, as is customary in popular worship, making it difficult to discern the
iconographic features (Fig. 5a). An older photograph of the statue\footnote{The photograph – which circulated on a postcard and is also reproduced in
ARYĀL 2014: 16 – was taken in 1908 (ARYĀL 2014: 15).}
(Fig. 5b) shows the statue’s facial features more clearly. In this location close
to the gate, Hanumān was considered a powerful guardian deity, a function
well-attested in earlier times.\footnote{For a brief discussion of Hanumān’s role as a gatekeeper, see LUTGENDORF
2007: 41 and 60.} The nineteenth-century chronicle Nepālikabhūpaṃśavali (vol. 1: 106) specifies that the statue of Vajaraṅga (Hanumān)
Fig. 5a  The Hanumān statue near the gate of the Hanumāndhokā Royal Palace in Kathmandu. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
had been installed at the gate “in order to prevent all the dangers.” The inscription on the statue’s pedestal summarises as the three objectives of Hanumāṇ worship the destruction of the enemy, victory in battle, and domestic protection when it states: “In frightful wars [he] brings destruction on the enemy and victory to us and defends the home.” The same inscription (with one minor varia lectio) is also found on the pedestal of the second statue of Hanumāṇ (Fig. 6a-b), which was installed by King Pratāpamalla on the southwestern side of the palace, opposite the Big Bell, on the same day. Currently the statue’s pedestal is not visible (Fig. 6a), but

Fig. 5b A photograph of the Hanumāṇ statue near the gate of the Hanumāṇḍhokā Royal Palace in Kathmandu taken in 1908. Photograph: Private collection.


16 See also the discussion of the inscription in PANT 1964: 26.
the inscription can clearly be discerned in an older photograph (Fig. 6b).

In addition to Hanumān, Pratāpamalla installed yet another deity for protection close to the palace gate in 1673. The king set up a statue of Narasimha (Fig. 7), which is now found immediately to the left after passing through the gate and entering Nāsalcok. Narasimha is shown in fierce form in the act of disembowelling the demon Hiranyakāśipu. An inscription on the pedestal states that the king had participated in a dance-drama. At that time Narasimha entered the king’s dance costume and did not leave. For this reason (i.e., to dismiss the deity) the stone sculpture was installed. However, it is likely that the king had also intended to install the sculpture to function as a gatekeeper. The Hanumān statue at the palace gate and the Narasimha in Nāsalcok must have originally formed a pair of guardian deities before the palace gate was relocated when the palace was renovated. Statues of Narasimha and Gaṇeṣa guarded the entrance to the royal palace of Patan. A figure of Hanumān (Fig. 8) was added later, following the example of King Pratāpamalla of Kathmandu (RAU 1984: 259). It is a simple two-armed Hanumān, kneeling on one knee and displaying the gestures of protection and wish-granting. Old photographs show Narasimha and Gaṇeṣa, placed on pedestals of about the same height, flanking the palace entrance. Next to the statue of Gaṇeṣa, the sculpture of Hanumān, which is obviously a later addition, is installed on a pedestal of a different height and design. Since then, possibly after the 1934 earthquake, the sculptures were rearranged and the Hanumān statue was placed between Narasimha and Gaṇeṣa, which is the arrangement we see today.

---

17 The date of installation is recorded in the inscription on the pedestal (see no. 36 in Vajrācārya 1976: 230–231) as the eighth day of the dark half of the month of āśāḍha in N.S. 793. The date corresponds to Friday, July 7, 1673.
18 See the photograph taken by Ganesha Man Chitrakar around 1900 and exhibited in the Patan Museum and the photograph taken by Dirgha Man Chitrakar around 1920, reproduced in Heide 1997: 34.
19 The statues of Gaṇeṣa and Hanumān can also be seen in an old photograph in Lebon 1893: Fig. 388.
Fig. 6a The Hanumān statue opposite the Big Bell near the Hanumāndhokā Royal Palace in Kathmandu (2015). Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
Fig. 6b An older photograph of the Hanumān statue opposite the Big Bell near the Hanumāṇḍhokā Royal Palace in Kathmandu. Photograph courtesy of the Department of Archaeology, Kathmandu.
**Fig. 7** The Narasimha statue at the entrance to Nāsalcok of the Hanumāndhokā Royal Palace in Kathmandu. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
King Bhūpatīndramalla of Bhaktapur also set up sculptures of Hanumān and Narasimha (Fig. 9a) at the entrance to his palace. The year of the installation, recorded in a stone inscription, is equivalent to 1698.\(^{20}\) The iconography of the Hanumān sculpture (Fig. 9b) is more complex than that of the sculptures installed at the entrances to the royal palaces of Kathmandu and Patan. The four-armed, fierce-looking deity, endowed with sharp teeth, is standing in militant stance on an animated corpse whose position of the arms and curls of hair are reminiscent of Garuḍa. (Copies of the two statues were installed at the entrance gate to Bhaktapur’s Tekhā Pokhari in circa 2012. Here the head of the Hanumān statue’s mount resembles that of an animated corpse rather than that of a Garuḍa.) The stone inscription records

---

\(^{20}\) The exact date of the stone inscription corresponds to February 9, 1698 (Vaidya & Shrestha 2002: 91 and 152–158 [inscription 6 in the Appendix]). The inscription is translated in part in the chronicle Nepālikabhūpavansāvalī (vol. 1: 93–95).
details of the regular worship of the two statues that Bhūpatīndramalla instituted. In association with Ugramalla, he made a land grant to a newly formed trust or guthi. Such guthis, defined as “association[s] of Newārs of the same caste for the performance of an agreed religious or social act” (CLARK 1957: 176), have played an important role in the social life of the Newar community. From the annual proceeds the guthi was obligated to purchase the material needed for the regular worship of the deities and remunerate the priest and his assistants. The services to be performed include the application of a fixed quantity of oil on the sculptures of Hanumān and Narasimha. Such detailed prescriptions are of great interest, since they provide a window onto the religious practices of the Newar community at this time.

*Fig. 9a* The statues of Hanumān and Narasimha in front of the (former) Mālatīcok of the Bhaktapur royal palace. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
Fig. 9b  Detail: The sculpture of Hanumān. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
In addition to setting up statues of two- or four-armed images of Hanumān as gatekeepers in front of the entrances of their royal palaces, the Malla kings placed the Tantric five-headed form of the deity on lintels of entrances leading to the temple of the goddess Taleju and at the apex of tympana above the doors of the temples of the goddess.

A small sculpture of the five-headed Hanumān is carved on the lintel below the wooden arched gateway (torāṇa) leading to the temple of the goddess Taleju in Mūlcok of the (former) Bhaktapur royal palace (Fig. 10a-b). The torāṇa was made by King Jitāmitramalla in 1694.21 Some details of the iconography cannot be clearly discerned and the iconography of the five-headed Hanumān will be discussed later.

A small wooden image of Hanumān (Fig. 11b) is found in the unusual position above the tympanum of the lion gate (simhadhokā) (Fig. 11a) of the Hanumāṇḍhokā Royal Palace in Kathmandu, which is the entrance leading to the Taleju Temple. This image is a replacement of an older image which replaced yet older images. I assume that, as in Bhaktapur, the original image was placed on the lintel of the lion gate but was moved to its current location during renovation efforts. This image has only eight arms and four heads, which is likely the result of a mistake of the artist who was commissioned to prepare a replacement on the basis of a defective sculpture which had lost two arms and one of its five heads. VAJRĀCARYA (1976: 83) assumed the figure to be Kumāra. However, a close examination shows that the central head is that of a monkey and the other heads are those of Garuḍa, Narasimha, and Varāha. Above the Hanumān figure a kīrtimukha is seen. It is hard to assign a date to this Hanumān since the figure has been painted and is likely to have been replaced more than once in the course of renovations.

The Tantric five-headed Hanumān images in the important position on lintels of entranceways to the temples of the goddess Taleju in the palaces of Bhaktapur and Kathmandu appear to function as protectors of the goddess. They functioned in the same capacity when placed at the apex of tympana above the doors of Taleju temples.

21 The exact date of the tympanum is recorded as Saturday, the ninth day of the dark half of the month of mārga in N.S. 815 (see VAIDYA & SHRÉSTA 2002: 164, inscription 13). This date corresponds to Saturday, December 11, 1694.
Fig. 10a The tympanum and lintel of a door leading to the Taleju Temple in Bhaktapur’s Mulchok. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
Thus, the five-headed Hanumān is featured at the apex of the tympanum (Fig. 12a) of the eastern door of the Taleju Temple in Mūl courtyard of the Hanūmāṇḍhokā Royal Palace. The figure (Fig. 12b) has ten arms (two of them are hardly discernible) and treads on an animated corpse (preta/vetāla). The five heads are those of a monkey (main head), an eagle (Garuḍa, left), a boar (Varāha, right) and topped by that of a lion (for Narasimha) and surmounted by what seems to be a horse’s (or Hayagrīva’s) head. A comparison with other images shows that the heads of the five-headed form of Hanumān can be arranged in one, two, or three tiers, and one head may also be positioned at the back. The iconography of this composite form suggests an integration of Viṣṇu’s Garuḍa mount and three of Viṣṇu’s avatāras with the figure of Hanumān. While this five-headed

---

22 The location of the image is indicated in DHANAŚAMŠER 1979: 157 and the entire tympanum depicted in plate 135.
Fig. 11a The lion gate of the Hanūmāṇḍhokā Royal Palace in Kathmandu. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
Fig. 11b  Detail: The four-headed and eight-armed Hanumān above the tympanum of the lion gate of the Hanumāṇḍhokā Royal Palace in Kathmandu. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
Fig. 12a The tympanum of the eastern door of the Taleju Temple, Hanumāndhokā Royal Palace, Kathmandu. Photograph courtesy of the Department of Archaeology, Kathmandu.
Fig. 12b  Detail: The five-headed Hanumān. Photograph courtesy of the Department of Archaeology, Kathmandu.
form with the topmost head of a horse (*haya*) is recorded in descriptions in printed texts.\(^{23}\) Unedited texts in manuscript form from Nepal reveal a variant of this iconography according to which the top head is that of a donkey (*khara*).\(^{24}\) More manuscript material would need to be examined to deter-

\(^{23}\) For a detailed iconographic description, see the following passage attributed to the *Hanumadgaṇhvāra* in *Śrīvidyāraṇava* on *Śrītattvanidhi*, vol. 2, p. 766, 15–24:

\[
saṃcakrayaṃ mahābhūmaṃ tṛipāṇaṃbhayanārṇair yutam ||
\]

\[
bāhubhir daśāhir yuktam sarvākṣaṃyārṇhasiddhīdam ||
\]

\[
pūrvaṃ tu vānaraṃ vaktraṃ koṭiśūryasamaprabham ||
\]

\[
daṃśārakārāvadanam bhrūkuṣukūṭileśkanam ||
\]

\[
atraiva dāksīnām vaktraṃ nārasimham mahādbhutam ||
\]

\[
ayugratovypusam bhīṣanām bhayanāśanam ||
\]

\[
pāścimāṃ gārūḍaṃ vaktrom vajrāntuṇḍaṃ mahābalaṃ ||
\]

\[
sarvārogaprasāmanam viśarogavāraṇam ||
\]

\[
uttaraṃ saukaraṃ vaktrom krṣṇam diptam nabhonibham ||
\]

\[
pātālaśilabhetārām jvaroṣaṃkṛttanam ||
\]

\[
ārdhvaṃ hayānanaṃ ghoran dānavaṅtakaram param ||
\]

\[
ekaṃvṛtṛaṃ vipravṛtṛaṃ tārkādhyam mahābalaṃ ||
\]

\[
kurvanāṃ saraṇaṃ tasya sarvaśatruharaṃ param ||
\]

\[
khadgamaṃ triśūlaṃ khaṭvāṅgaṃ pāśaṃ ankuśaparvataṃ ||
\]

\[
dhruvatātvdvadhāmam daśāhir munipūṅgava ||
\]

\[
etāṇy āyudhajaḍānā dhūravyantam yajāmahe ||
\]

\[
pṛtāsanopaviṣṭaṃ tare kṛpaḥbhāranabhūṣitaṃ ||
\]

The same passage, with some variants, is found in the *Śrītattvanidhi*, where it is ascribed to the *ŚudarśanaSaṃhitā*; see *Śrītattvanidhi* 1 (*ViṣṇuSaṃhitā*, no. 72 [p. 59]) and *Śrītattvanidhi* 2 (*ViṣṇuSaṃhitā*; stanzas 188–195; no. 114; p. 36 [text], pp. 104–105 [translation]; fol. 85A/3 [manuscript painting]). NAGAR (2004, vol. 1: 307) cites a part of this description (with variants) from a manuscript of the *Paṇcamaṃkha-hanumakaṇkava* (manuscript no. 5035 in the Ranabiresvara Library, Jammu); the manuscript is reproduced in NAGAR 2004: vol. 2: 493–494.

\(^{24}\) See the *Hanūbhairavadevārcaṇavādhi* ascribed to the *Vaihāyana Saṃhitā*. This text describes the performance of a fire ritual (*homa*) involving offerings of different kinds of meat and liquor for each of the five heads of the deity. I would like to thank Péter-Daniel Szántó for sending me a transcript of the manuscript. The donkey head instead of the horse head is also specified in the description of the five-headed Hanumān in the manuscript *Navarātrapūṣṭādhi*, which describes the Hanūbhairava-panic (fols. 26v11–29v5) as embedded in the Kaumārīpūjā of Navarātra. I would like to thank Alexis Sanderson for providing a copy of the manuscript. VAIKĀRĀYA (1976: 98) also mentions an unpublished manuscript in a private collection according to which the topmost head of the five-headed Hanumān is a donkey’s.
mine how widespread this iconography was and whether it is limited to specific ritual contexts; this is, however, beyond the scope of the present paper. Moreover, in works of art, a horse’s head cannot be distinguished easily from a donkey’s head. I assume that the horse head became a standard in the iconography of this deity because it is more auspicious and was already a familiar iconographic feature of Hayagrīva. Similarly, Rāvaṇa’s tenth head is either described or depicted as that of a horse or of a donkey.

A metal figure of the five-headed Hanumān is also seen at the apex of the tympanum (Fig. 13a) of the Golden Door of the Taleju shrine in Mūlōcok of Patan’s royal palace. The tympanum was made by KingRDDhanaśramahalā (r. 1715–1717) in 1716.25 The figure of Hanumān (Fig. 13b) is a replacement prepared around December 2012 on the basis of an older photograph,26 in which the position of the figure on the tympanum can be discerned clearly, but not all of the iconographic details. The original image—along with the others on the central panel of the tympanum—was stolen in the 1970s.

The five-headed Hanumān is also found among the sculptures in the sunken stepped fountain (hiiti) built by Pratapamalla in 1652 in the (Man)mohan courtyard, the residential courtyard of the Malla kings (Fig. 14a). It is, however, possible that the sculpture was not part of the original group of deities installed in the fountain but was brought here later from another location. The sculpture is damaged but the missing details may be gleaned from a line drawing (Fig. 14b) in a circa nineteenth-century concertina-type manuscript catalogued as Nānastotracitrasamgraha, which either copies this sculpture or shows a similar iconographic type. This is clearly a fierce (ugra) form, as indicated by the garland of severed heads. The sculpture is framed by a rim of skulls and one of flames.

The same king built a special temple for the deity (Fig. 15) in his palace in Kathmandu in circa 1655.27 This temple (which is only accessible to the

25 An inscription on the base of the torana (see REGMI 1965–1966, part 4: 263, no. 122) records the dedication of the golden tympanum by King RDDnatasimhamalla to his iṣṭadevatā on the first day of the bright half of the month of āśvina in N.S. 836. This date corresponds to Wednesday, September 16, 1716.

26 The photograph, taken by N.R. Banerjea between 1966 and 1972, is exhibited in the Patan Museum.

27 See VAJRĀCĀRYA 1976: 97. The exact date of the construction of the temple is unknown.
Fig. 13a The tympanum of the Golden Door of the Taleju shrine, Mulcok, Patan Palace. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
Fig. 13b  Detail: The five-headed Hanumān at the apex of the tympanum. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
Fig. 14a The sculpture of the five-headed Hanumān in the stepped fountain in Mohancok in the Hanumāndhokā Royal Palace, Kathmandu. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
Fig. 14b A line drawing of the five-headed Hanumān in a circa nineteenth-century concertina-type manuscript catalogued as Nāṇāstrotacitraśrāvaḥ. Photograph courtesy of Rajan Shrestha.
Fig. 15 The five roofs of the Pañcamukhahanumān Temple, Hanūmāndhokā Royal Palace in Kathmandu. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
officiating priest) stands out because of its circular structure with five superimposed roofs.

A beautifully carved stone sculpture of the five-headed Hanumān was noticed inside Kumāricok, a courtyard of the Bhaktapur Palace which is inaccessible to the public.

Three important inscribed and dated copper-gilt figures of the five-headed Hanumān are also associated with the kings of Bhaktapur. The first one (Fig. 16a) was recently auctioned at Bonhams. The inscription records that King Bhūpatīndramalla dedicated the sculpture on the occasion of a specific ritual, the siddhāgni-kotyāhuti-yajña, in 1702. A ritual manual confirms the date of the performance of a siddhāgni-kotyāhuti sacrifice (yajña) on the occasion of the consecration of the Nyatapola Temple at Taumadhi Tole in Bhaktapur. The ritual, which entails the offering of ten million oblations into the fire, started on Sunday, the ninth day of the bright half of the month of jyeṣṭha (the date also specified in the inscription of the Hanumān statue) and continued for 48 days (Vaidya 1990: 76).

The second one (Fig. 16b) was previously on sale at Sotheby’s but its current whereabouts are unknown. According to the description in the cata-

---

28 See the detailed description in Deva 1984: 61 and the mention in Vaidya & Shrestha 2002: 45 and 89. Vaidya & Shrestha (2002: 89) note that the sculpture is located on the northwestern side of the open verandah (dalān).

Deva (1984: 66 and 67) also describes two four-armed (apparently one-headed) Hanumān figures in the Kumaricok. Three four-armed Hanumān statues are found in the Mahādeva Temple in Sundaricok of the Hanūmāṇdhokā Royal Palace, Kathmandu; a photograph of one of them is reproduced in Aryal 2014: 16.

29 The sculpture was purchased by William O. Thweatt in Kathmandu between 1958 and 1962. It was auctioned by Sotheby’s New York on September 24, 2004 (lot 74) and subsequently became part of the collection of Dr. Helga Wall-Apelt, Florida. It was again auctioned by James D. Julia Auctioneers, Maine, on March 23, 2015 (lot 184) and by Bonham’s on March 13, 2017 (lot 3049). For an image, see also Himalayan Art Resources, item no. 2351 (http://www.himalayanart.org/items/2351; accessed July 20, 2017).

30 The text inscribed on the shaft reads: (siddhi sign) svasti || śrīśrījayabhūpatīndramalladevasana siddhāgni kotyāhuti yajñayātaṃ dayakā || samvat 822 jyeṣṭha sudi 9 śubha ||

“Hail! (This sculpture) was made by the Twice-Blessed victorious King Bhūpatīndramalla on the ninth (day) of the bright (half of the month) of jyeṣṭha in samvat 822 for (the occasion of) the siddhāgni-kotyāhuti-yajña. Let it be well.”

31 The five-headed Hanumān statue was offered for sale at Sotheby’s London on April 4, 1990, lot 57. It had previously been offered at Sotheby’s New York on December 18, 1981, lot 209.
logue, the inscription on the long shaft of the sculpture records the dedication of this statue in the temple of the Goddess Taleju in Bhaktapur by King Bhūpaṭindramalla in 1706.32

The inscription33 on the third sculpture (Fig. 17), which is now in the Patan Museum,34 records that King Bhūpaṭindramalla’s son, Raṇajitamalla, set up the sculpture on the Golden Gate of the Bhaktapur Palace in 1754. The year 1754 is also commonly assumed to be the year in which Raṇajitamalla constructed (or rather, embellished) the Golden Gate. The Hanumān figure appears to be a copy of the sculpture commissioned by his father. Both sculptures wear a garland of severed human heads and are treading on an animated corpse. It is possible that these two Hanumān figures with their long shafts were placed on the roof the Golden Gate, possibly in place of the two four-armed Hanumān statues referred to in the beginning of this paper.

32 Only a part of the inscription can be discerned in the photograph published in Sotheby’s catalogue. It reads: (Bhūpaṭindrama)llasana dayakā, saṃ 826 jyeṣṭha krṣṇa catu(rdsā) (misread in the text of the catalogue as āśādha krṣṇa ...). The date was erroneously converted to 1708 in Sotheby Parke Bernet Inc [1981], no. 209. “(This sculpture) was made by King (Bhūpaṭindrama)lla on the four(teen)th (day) of the dark (half of the month) of jyeṣṭha in (N.)S. 826.”

The description in the catalogue erroneously specifies the eighth day of the dark half of the fifth month of the year N.S. 826 as the date of the consecration of the sculpture. The correct date is likely the fifth day of the dark half of the month of jyeṣṭha in the year 826, which is equivalent to Wednesday, June 30, 1706. The eighth day of the dark half of the month of jyeṣṭha of the same year would be equivalent to July 3, 1706.

33 The inscription reads: (siddhi sign) svasti || śrī 3. sveṣṭadevataḥ prādha dhvākāsa gajuli chāna koṭayāhuti yajña yānāva | śrīśrīśrīyaṛaṇajitamalladevasana dūtā || saṃ 874 pau va 6 śubham ||

“Hail! Out of love for his Thrice-Blessed favourite deity (sveṣṭadevataḥ), the Twice-Blessed King Raṇajitamalla set up (this sculpture), after performing a sacrifice with ten million oblations at the time of (the ritual) offering of the finial of Pāḍhvākā (i.e., the Golden Gate). (Dated N.S.) 874, the sixth (day) of the dark (half) of (the month of) pauṣa. Let it be auspicious.” The date converts to January 14, 1754.

34 The sculpture was assigned the accession no. 598 (see SLUSSER 2002: 120). SLUSSER (ibid.) assumed that the sculpture was “installed as a guardian on a Bhaktapur rooftop.”
Fig. 16a  A five-headed Hanumān (Bonhams, March 13, 2017, lot 3049). Dated to N.S. 822 [1702 CE]. Photograph courtesy of Bonhams.
Fig. 16b A five-headed Hanumān (Sotheby's London, April 4, 1990, lot 57). Dated to N.S. 826 [1706 CE]. Reproduced from the catalogue.
Fig. 17 A five-headed Hanumān, Patan Museum. Photograph: Gudrun Bühnemann.
It is said\(^ {35}\) that the mural of the cosmic form (viśvarūpa) of Śiva in the Fifty-five Windows Palace on Bhaktapur’s Darbar Square, which is actually a hidden portrait of King Bhūpatindramalla (r. 1696–1722) and his wife completed between 1702 and 1722, features in one of several rows of heads that of the five-headed Hanumān. However, such detail is difficult to discern in the painting.

The Tantric five-headed Hanumān was obviously considered an important form of Hanumān by the Malla kings. The many extant representations from Nepal\(^ {36}\) and the proliferation of devotional texts\(^ {37}\) dedicated to the deity indicate the popularity of this form in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Nepal.

The five-headed Hanumān is also known as Hanūp-Bhairava, as attested by inscriptions on paintings and line drawings and in devotional and other texts. The name Hanūp-Bhairava is inscribed, for example, on a painting (Fig. 18) in a scroll from Nepal, commissioned under King Jayaprakāśamalla of Kathmandu (r. 1735–1768) and dating from 1765, and in line drawings.\(^ {38}\)

---

\(^{35}\) Oral information provided by Purushottam Lochan Shrestha on July 19, 2015.

\(^{36}\) For other sculptures of this form of Hanumān from Nepal not discussed in this paper, see, for example, DEVĀ 1984, plate 30A (erroneously labelled Narasiṃha), MISHRA 2014: 59, SLUSser 2002: 118, 120–121, SINGH 1968: 214 (misidentified as a “manifestation of Vishnu” in the caption and on p. 223), Christie’s New York 12/1/1982, lot 123 (erroneously labelled as a Tantric form of Mahājūrī), and Christie’s New York 3/20/2012, sale 2640, lot 106 (previously in the Doris Wiener Gallery, New York). The stone sculpture of the five-headed Hanumān installed in a roadside shrine in Pulcok, Patan, which is still an object of worship (MISHRA 2014: 59), is very similar to the one depicted in DEVĀ 1984, plate 30A; minor details, however, vary. Both representations are without a vāhana. A roadside shrine with a statue of a five-headed Ganeśa is located next to the shrine of the five-headed Hanumān in Pulcok. For a painting of the five-headed Hanumān, see NAGAR 2004, vol. 3: 128, plate 140.

\(^{37}\) See the online title list of the Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project (NGMCP) for more information on the large number of devotional and ritual texts in manuscript form, including such titles as Hanū(mady)bhairavapūjāvidhi, Hanū-bhairavastotra, Hanūbhairavakavaca, and Pañcamukhivīrahanūbhairavastotra.

\(^{38}\) For a line drawing inscribed Hanūpbhairava (“Hanūpbhairava”), see, for example, BLOM 1989: 21, Fig. 22 and BÜHNEMANN 2013: 471, Fig. 17. Note that in the drawing the topmost head is labelled sarā (for salā, Newari: horse) and not “snake” as noted in BLOM 1989: 22.
One of three copperplate inscriptions\(^{39}\) at the Tathunāṣaḥ (also called Nāsadyo) Temple in Bhaktapur’s Kvāṭhaṃdau area records the dedication of a wooden tympanum to Hanūbhairava in 1713. In the context of religious ritual, the worship of the five-headed Hanūbhairava (hanūbhairava-pūjā) became an integral part of the Tantric Navarātra rituals, being embedded in the Kaumārīpūjā.\(^{40}\)

The name Hanūbhairava indicates that in Nepal Hanumān began to be considered a Bhairava and underwent a transformation similar to that of the epic hero Bhīmasena who became known as Bhīmabhairava in seventeenth-century Nepal.\(^{41}\)

In this paper I focused mainly on the Hanumān worship under royal patronage in mid-seventeenth- to mid-eighteenth-century Nepal. The visual

---

\(^{39}\) The text of the inscription is published in RĀJA 1999: 15, no. 26 and is also referred to in GUTSCHOW 2011, vol. 1: 73 in his description of the temple. The inscription records as the date of the tympanum Sunday, the full-moon day of the bright (half of the month of) śrāvana in N.S. 833, which converts to Sunday, August 6, 1713. This tympanum is no longer extant.

\(^{40}\) I would like to thank Alexis Sanderson for this reference (e-mail message dated February 23, 2015). See also n. 23.

\(^{41}\) I have discussed Bhīmasena’s transformation into Bhīmabhairava in BÜHNEMANN 2013.
and textual material from this time provides a window onto the socio-religious milieu in the late Malla period. There is clear evidence that Hanumān had gained considerable importance as a guardian deity. The amalgamation of the five-headed form of Hanumān and Bhairava as Hanūbhairava is a specific Nepalese development of this time.

Artistic representations of the five-headed Hanumān are also found in India, where a few specimens have been dated to the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.42 However, more research is needed to confirm the dating of the material. The representations from India usually do not exhibit the fierce (ugra) traits of the Nepalese manifestation. A prominent devotee of the benevolent five-headed form of Hanumān was the South Indian Madhva saint Rāghavendra Svāmī (1595–1671), a contemporary of King Pratāpamalla of Kathmandu.

In recent decades Hanumān has evolved into a widely worshipped deity in India, and some popular god-posters and monumental statues of him also feature the Tantric five-headed form.43 The Indian diaspora opened the first temple of the five-headed Hanumān outside South Asia in leased premises in Torrance, California, in 2012. The influence of this trend can also be seen in Nepal, where a seven-foot-tall statue of a benevolent five-headed Hanumān was set up in the village of Chhaling on the Telkot-Changu Road a few years ago.
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BEYOND TANTRIC COMMUNITIES:
The INTERFACE with LAY COMMUNITIES
“Rudras on Earth” on the eve of the Tantric Age: The Śivadharmaśāstra and the making of Śaiva lay and initiatory communities

Nina Mirnig

Introduction: Religious and historical context

The fifth to seventh centuries of the Common Era see the beginning of the production of Sanskrit Śaiva religious literature, reflecting the increasing popularity of the Śaiva religion – also on a religio-political level – across the Indic world.\(^1\) One of the products of this time is the Śivadharmaśāstra (ŚDh), a popular and widely transmitted work\(^3\) that was composed sometime in the sixth or seventh century,\(^4\) probably in the North of the subcon-

---

\(^1\) I am very grateful to Peter Bisschop and Timothy Lubin for carefully reading through my paper and their invaluable suggestions and corrections.

\(^2\) For works addressing these larger developments within the Śaiva world at this time, see, for instance, SANDERSON 2009, BISSCHOP 2010, and BAKKER 2014.

\(^3\) The ŚDh and Śivadharmottara (ŚDhU) have been transmitted in manuscripts from Nepal, Kashmir, Bengal as well as in South India. See SANDERSON 2012–2013: 86, especially n. 220 and n. 221. For references to the recitation of the ŚDh in epigraphical material, see HAZRA 1952: 14 and 16, DE SIMINI 2016b, and SANDERSON 2012–2013: 85.

\(^4\) The dating of the ŚDh and ŚDhU is problematic and remains subject to debate. The first scholar to advance a hypothesis was HAZRA (1952), who proposed a date of composition sometime between 200 and 500 CE. He arrived at this estimation by, firstly, placing the text before the composition of Śaiva Tantras on the grounds that the ŚDh is free of any Tantric influence, and, secondly, he argues that the kind of astrological and astronomical terminology employed in the ŚDh is indicative for a date between the composition of the Yājñavalkyasūtra as the terminus post quem and the Brhatasamhitā of Varāhamihira as the terminus ante quem. However, evidence collected by Bisschop has demonstrated that such an early date is unlikely for the ŚDh, or at least for the entire text as it has been preserved. In his study of Caṇḍesa and other deities in early Śaivism, BISSCHOP (2010: 244) discusses material of the sixth chapter of the ŚDh and draws attention to the fact that the deity Gaṇeśa/Vināyaka is described as Śiva’s son, a relationship that came to be well-
TANTRIC COMMUNITIES IN CONTEXT

The ŚDh is amongst the earliest extant texts to systematise and canonise Śaiva devotional activities centred on the practices of the lay householder. These include various forms of liṅga and idol worship, religious observances (vrata) as well as the many ways in which the Śaiva devotees can support religious institutions through offering their services and donating land grants, valuables, or money for religious infrastructure.

It is amongst the earliest extant texts to systematise and canonise Śaiva devotional activities centred on the practices of the lay householder. These include various forms of liṅga and idol worship, religious observances (vrata) as well as the many ways in which the Śaiva devotees can support religious institutions through offering their services and donating land grants, valuables, or money for religious infrastructure.

Known but was popularised only relatively late, being even entirely absent in demonstrably early Purāṇas such as the Vāyu-purāṇa and the original Skanda-purāṇa, which contains the earliest systematisation of Śiva mythology (Törzsök 2004: 19). The Skanda-purāṇa, in turn, has been suggested to date to sometime between 550 and 650 (Adriaensen et al. 1998 and Yokochi 2013). If this dating is correct and the close relationship of both texts is applicable, this would indicate that it is unlikely that the ŚDh has reached its final form before the sixth century, and perhaps even as late as the seventh century.

5 See Hazra 1952: 16–17. However, the issue of provenance remains to be further investigated. So far, Hazra’s assessment from the 50ies has not been improved upon. He ascribes the work to the North on the basis of the sacred sites featured therein (ibid.). He even more specifically hypothesises that it was conceived either in Southern Kashmir or Northern Punjab due to the mention of the “Devikā, a small river in Southern Kashmir, and of the Chandrabhāga” in the Nepalese manuscripts. A full evaluation of such specific claims, however, will need to wait for the critical edition of the chapter in question (chapter 12).

6 Other texts of this period that concern the forms of lay Śaivism are the following: (1) First, the ŚDhU, a work closely related to the ŚDh and often transmitted together. The ŚDh and the ŚDhU constitute a closely-knit network of information on early Śaiva devotional activities and institutions. Composed in the sixth or seventh century, the two works cover the wealth of Śaiva devotional practices carried out by lay devotees, in particular the worship of the śivaliṅga, particular observances (vrata), and meditative practices as well as rituals to target the king as a client. While the first two are covered mainly in the ŚDh, the latter two feature as topics of the ŚDhU (see De Simini 2016). Given the complementarity of these two works, the hypothesis has developed amongst Śivadharma scholars that both texts were composed close in time, if not even at the same time. Personally, I currently assume that there is a sequence in their composition, with the ŚDh having been put together first, since many of the theological conceptions and strategies developed in the ŚDhU appear to be a continuous afterthought and build on it. (2) Second, the old Skanda-purāṇa, the earliest extant systematisation of Śiva-mythology. (3) And third, the Niṣvāsamukha, which itself is part of the earliest extant Tantric corpus but contains chapters on the various forms of concurrent Śaivism, including the form of lay Śaivism as we find it propagated in the ŚDh (for an edition and translation, see Kaple 2015).

A brief overview of the ŚDh’s topics is found in Hazra 1952.
Regarding the socio-religious milieu around the ŚDh, with its date of composition the work falls within a period in which the Brahmanical socio-religious order (varṇāśramadharma) was firmly established under royal patronage across the subcontinent, paired with an increase of religious systems favouring devotion to a deity (bhakti) over Vedic ritualism. At this time, it was in particular the Vaiṣṇava devotional movement – centred on the worship of the god Viṣṇu – which enjoyed a long-standing popularity in the royal sphere as well as amongst the mainstream, a circumstance recorded in literature, inscriptions, and iconography. These Vaiṣṇava groups were the Śaiva’s main competitors for royal patronage and support from the mainstream within the Brahmanical fold. Outside this Brahmanical fold, Buddhist communities also counted amongst their competitors. By the time of the sixth century, Buddhism in its manifold manifestations had already been a major religious force on the subcontinent for many centuries, with its religious life structured around monastic networks and with support from the royal sphere.

As for the Śaiva world at the time, there is plenty of material evidence for Śaiva lay devotional practices – such as liṅga shrines – from as early as the beginning of the Common Era, as well as inscriptions attesting to these activities as early as the fourth century. Thus, material and epigraphical evidence for Śaiva modes of worship predate the ŚDh by some centuries, but are only marginally visible in earlier religious literature (see below, p. 490). Leading up to and including the ŚDh’s date of composition, two major developments within Śaiva circles took place: First, members of some Śaiva ascetic groups that were originally at the margins of society had started to increasingly appear in public and institutionalised religious life as temple priests and recipients of religious donations in epigraphical records. Second, Tantrism emerged as a larger phenomenon in both Śaiva and Buddhist circles, and propagators of this new religious trend gradually stepped out from the purely esoteric sphere into the public domain.

---

8 See, e.g., SANDERSON 2013 for epigraphic references to the king’s duty to maintain the varṇāśramadharma.
9 See, e.g., BAKKER 2014.
10 See, e.g., SANDERSON 2013.
11 SANDERSON 2013: 225.
12 See GOODALL and ISAACSON 2016.
13 SANDERSON 2009.
It is against the backdrop of these developments that we can attempt to interpret the literary activities of the ŚDh’s redactors and try to determine its role within early Śaiva history. Responding to this religious milieu, we can identify two agendas at work: First, the ŚDh offers a normative model for a Śaiva community that synthesises Śaiva practices with the Brahmanical socio-religious substratum, recasting the varṇāśrama-dharma into their devotional framework – a development addressed by Lubin. Second, there is the contemporaneous attempt to create a socio-religious model that has the potential to transcend this Brahmanical order by seemingly foregrounding devotion over caste status. As is typical with this kind of work, there is no single thread that ties all expressed soteriological and spiritual concepts together into a coherent whole, and we are probably confronted with a work that aimed to synthesise several agendas relating to different Śaiva groups. Overall, we will see that the advocated ideals oscillate between a conformity to and the transcendence of Brahmanical norms, just as they do between those of the ascetic and the householder.

In this contribution, it will be argued that a cornerstone of the dual agenda characteristic of this newly emerging Śaiva socio-religious order propagated in the ŚDh is the divinisation of the Śaiva devotee (śivabhakta), a novel feature specific to the time of the ŚDh that anticipates similar discourses on divine embodiment by the devotee in popular Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava devotional movements centuries later. It will be shown how this link between devotion and divinisation of the śivabhakta acts as a strategic device to advocate the spiritual superiority of the community of practitioners. As such, it will be argued that in addition to recruiting the Brahmanical base into the Śaiva devotional fold, the socio-religious model advocated by the ŚDh also plays a critical role in the spread of the Śaiva teaching into new areas and in creating a socio-religious environ that eventually facilitates the participation of Śaiva initiatory traditions in public religious life on the eve of the “Śaiva Age.” In this context, also the relationship between the ŚDh and the initiatory traditions will be investigated: on the one hand, it will be traced how certain practices and concepts of the ascetic Atimārgic traditions are adapted for the householder milieu, despite their

---

14 See, for instance LUBIN’S unpublished paper “On feeding Śivabhaktas and other rules of Śivāśrama-Dharma” (AOS 2017) (LUBIN forthcoming). I thank Prof. Lubin for sharing his paper with me prior to publication.

15 E.g., see PRENTISS 2000 and HOLDREGE 2015.

16 The expression “Śaiva Age” alludes to SANDERSON’S monumental work (2009) on the rise of Śaiva Tantric groups throughout the early medieval period.
originally esoteric and eccentric nature. On the other, it will be addressed how certain notions of the ŚDh continue into the newly emerging Tantric traditions, the so-called Mantramārga,\textsuperscript{17} suggesting that some ideals advocated in the ŚDh may also have influenced the formation of Tantric practices.

The Śivadharmaśāstra’s new concept of śivabhaktas as divine beings on earth

Prior to the composition of the ŚDh, discourses on the devotee were already well-known in the milieu of Vaiṣṇava devotionalism as, for instance, expounded upon in the Bhagavadgītā (BhG) in the early centuries of the Common Era.\textsuperscript{18} Here, the conceptualisation of the bhakta tends to revolve around the deep bond between the devotee and Viṣṇu,\textsuperscript{19} sometimes expressed in terms of mutual love and dependence on each other, and the devotee serving the deity.\textsuperscript{20} The community of worshippers is thus defined by their shared love and longing for Viṣṇu. Their socio-religious duty is to carry out their svadharma, that is to say, the duties incumbent on the devotee according to their inherent socio-religious status related to the varṇāśrama system.\textsuperscript{21} The directive is that these duties must be carried out permeated by the love for the deity and without attachment to the fruits of the action.\textsuperscript{22} In this way, the devotional framework is synchronised with the Brahmanical socio-religious order, which the devotee must maintain.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{17} For the emic distinction between the Śaiva Atimārga, referring to the early initiatory ascetic Śaiva traditions, and the Mantramārga, the traditions now commonly referred to as Tantric, see SANDERSON 2013: 212–215.

\textsuperscript{18} The dating of the BhG is still subject to debate, moving between the fourth century BCE and the fourth century CE (MALINAR 2007: 14). MALINAR herself estimates that the text in its final redaction dates to the first century CE (ibid.: 15). On the various views regarding the date of the BhG, its textual layers, and the question whether it is to be considered as a separate work or part of the Mbh’s narrative, see MALINAR 2007: 29–34.

\textsuperscript{19} See, e.g., MALINAR 2007: 9.

\textsuperscript{20} See, e.g., MALINAR 2007: 11–12, discussing the subordination of the bhakta to the deity in the royal context.

\textsuperscript{21} For an overview of the development and principles of the varṇāśrama system, see OLIVELLE 1993.

\textsuperscript{22} Cf., e.g., EDGERTON 1997 (1944\textsuperscript{1}): 161 and 175–176.

\textsuperscript{23} See also the large sections on those outside this system, the pāṣaṇḍas, in Vaiṣṇava Dharma literature. Cf. GRÜNENDAHL 1983: 44–45 on the prominence of discourses on pāṣaṇḍas in the Viṣṇudharma.
Accordingly, the spectrum of worshippers stretches from the householders of the various varṇas to the Brahmancal renouncer, for each of whom different ways to reach liberation channelled through devotion (bhakti) are offered, all consolidated into a single system famously propounded by the BhG. The centrality of the dharma and the socio-religious structures implicit in the concept of these forms of Vaiṣṇava devotionalism is also emphasised through the often-used trope that Viṣṇu incarneres on earth as the saviour to reestablish the dharma at its decline. Similar sentiments of conformity to the varṇāśrama system are further expounded upon in the works closer in time to the ŚDh, such as the Viṣṇudharma,24 the Kashmirian Vaiṣṇavadharmaśāstra, also known as Viṣṇusmrī,25 as well as another Vaiṣṇavadharmaśāstra26 transmitted as part of the Mahābhārata in the southern recensions.

There is evidence that certain well-established tenets of Vaiṣṇava devotionalism as expressed in Sanskrit literature continue into the ŚDh. For instance, the theme of mutual dependency between God and the devotee as taught in the BhG is paralleled in the first chapter of the ŚDh.27 However,
in addition to such well-established notions, the ŚDh also introduced aspects to the conceptualisation of the bhakta and his spiritual status that were novel within the Brahmanical sphere. First of all, unlike the contemporaneous Sanskrit Vaiṣṇava sources, the ŚDh does not stress adherence to the Brahmanical order nor includes discourses on the devotee’s svadharma or the fate of heretics (pāṣaṇḍa) (see n. 23 and p. 492). Instead, Śaiva devotion is foregrounded, even to the extent that in some passages on this topic Brahmanical norms are openly challenged. The most radical statement to this effect is found in the opening chapter of the ŚDh. Here, in an often-quoted passage, it is stated that through devotion even those who are considered the most extreme kinds of social outsiders according to the Brahmanical order attain a spiritual status equal to a learned Brahmin:

Even a foreigner (mleccha), in whom this eightfold devotion exists, is [equal to] the foremost of learned Brahmins, a glorious sage, an ascetic, and a scholar. I do not care that someone knows the four Vedas; if he is devoted to me, even if he is a dog-eater, to him should be given, for he should be worshiped just as I am.

Vaiṣṇava devotional literature features similar sentiments, but the subtle difference in framing on this point becomes evident when comparing the above verses with the following passage of the BhG:

for him I always remain in [his] soul and he always remains in me.”).

28 This eightfold devotion is explained just prior to these verses and features the cornerstones of Śaiva bhakti. It is specified as (1) affection towards Śiva’s devotees, (2) rejoicing in the worship others offer Śiva, (3) worshipping Śiva with devotion, (4) carrying out physical work for Śiva, (5) listening to the recitals of Śiva’s deeds, (6) being visibly affected by the devotion to Śiva (e.g., trembling), (7) thinking of Śiva at all times, and (8) not living off his revenue; ŚDh 1.26–27: madbhaktajanavātsalyam pūjyāś cānumodanam | svayam abhyarcaṇaḥ bhaktīyā manārthe cāṅgaceṣṭītam || matkathāsvraye bhaktīḥ svaranetraṅgavikriyā | mamānusmaraṇaṁ nityaṁ yaś ca māṁ upaṭīvat ||. This passage and the one quoted in the next note will become frequently quoted, sometimes in modified form, in both Śaiva- and Vaiṣṇava-centred literature, cf., e.g., Śivapurāṇa 7.2.10.68–71, Gāruḍapurāṇa 1.227.6b–11, and Hariḥkavilāśa 11.616–619.

29 ŚDh 1.28–29: bhaktir āstavīrdhāḥ hy esaḥ yasmin mlecche ’pi vartate | sa vipreṇḍro munīṁ śrīmān sa yatīṁ sa ca paṇḍitaḥ || na me priyaś caturvedo madbhaktaḥ śvapaco ’pi yaḥ | tasmai deyaṁ tato grāhyam sa ca pūjyo yathā hy aham ||. Note that ŚDh 1.29 is frequently quoted, e.g., Abhinavagupta ad Tantraloka 4.203.
Even if a very evil doer reveres me with single devotion, he must be regarded as the righteous in spite of all; for he has the right resolution. Quickly his soul becomes righteous, and he goes to eternal peace. Son of Kunti, make sure of this: no devotee of mine is lost. For if they take refuge in Me, son of Prthū, even those who may be of base origin, women, men of the artisan caste, and serfs too, even they go to the highest goal. How much more virtuous brahmans, and devout royal seers, too!

Here too, devotion is foregrounded so that even someone of lower social standing or a person who has carried out misdeeds can attain the highest spiritual goals through this path. However, the BhG’s focus rests on social groups within the varna system and does not explicitly feature outsiders such as the foreigner (mleccha) or the outcaste (e.g., the dog-eater). Nor is there a sentiment in the BhG that those of lower castes rise to the status of a Brahmin through their devotional practice and may be worshipped like a god. Rather, the passage states that the religion is also accessible to those of lower social standing. In contrast, we have seen that the ŚDh explicitly, and perhaps provocatively, features the epitomes of social outsiders and goes as far as to propose that through Śaiva devotion they themselves become worthy of worship, a position reserved for Brahmins in the Brahmanical religion. The ŚDh’s view expressed in the above verse is thus more radical in its approach towards the Brahmanical socio-religious system at the time of its composition, and it is only subsequently that we see similar sentiments adopted in other Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava works. However, it must be kept in mind that such principles as the ones expressed in the ŚDh did not necessarily translate fully into the practiced religion. Nor does the ŚDh propose to completely dismantle the Brahmanical socio-religious structures. Quite the contrary, other parts of the work foreground alignment with the Brahmanical socio-religious system.


31 See also MALINAR 2007: 9. MALINAR (ibid.: 13) argues even further that the Bhakti tradition as described in the BhG is not to be regarded as a form of religion associated with “folk” religion or lower strata of society, but rather as a form of esoteric knowledge targeting also for higher classes of society.

32 See above, n. 28 and n. 29.
cal system and the promotion of the Śaiva Brahmin devotee, aspects, which, as
mentioned above, also form part of the strategies to establish the Śaiva religion
and its institutions in broader society, as discussed by Lubin (see also p. 491).

Nevertheless, the ŚDh seemingly pushes multiple agendas, and passages
such as the one quoted above undeniably signal that the propagators sought
to create ways of potentially including the social outsider and elevate him
on the spiritual hierarchy. The ŚDh goes even further in its rhetoric of spir-
itual superiority, and throughout the work we find passages that promote
the devotees not only as comparable to God but as actual divine beings on
earth, as we see here in a passage from the opening chapter:

Those calm-minded Śiva devotees who have as their goal Śiva and
worship the supreme dharma, they are Rudras, there is no doubt.

Those who meditate on Virūpākṣa once, twice, three times, or al-
ways, they are Gaṇeśvaras.34

Here, intense devotion to Śiva is considered as indicative of the devotee’s
divine status in this world as a Rudra, that is to say, as a divine being com-
parable to Śiva in his manifestation as Rudra. Less often, such devotees
are also portrayed as Gaṇeśvaras, the divine chief attendants of Śiva.

33 See LUBIN forthcoming. Thus, as we will see below, we also find that despite
the claim of bhakti transcending caste-boundaries and introducing social equality, the
lay devotee Śūdra is still differentiated from the rest in terms of practice and status.
34 ŚDh 1.13–14: yair ayuṃ sāntacetasakaiḥ śivabhaktaiḥ śivārthbibhiḥ | sāṃsevyate
paro dharman te rudrā nāra śaṃsārayaḥ || ekakālaṃ dvikālaṃ vā trikālaṃ niyam eva
vā | ye smaranṭi virūpākṣam viṣṇeyās te ganeśvarāḥ ||. For further examples of the
promotion of the devotee as a divine being, see ŚDh 3.76c–77b: kusāpsu taraṇḍave vā
apy aṅgulyāpi (corr. aṅgulyaśi?) yo likhet || krāḍayā sāyutaṃ kalpaṃ bhavet so ‘pi
ganeśvarāḥ ||. “Even if someone draws [a liṅga] with the finger on kuśa water or on a
tree wall, or playfully makes a suitable resemblance with half-melted butter, he too is a
Gaṇeśvara.” ŚDh 12.2 (T32, p. 142 and T72a, p. 141): kvacid gacchan yadā ‘paśvet
(T32, paśyaṃ T72a) śivaliṅgam *apujitaṃ (T72a, prapujitaṃ T32) | *tadā (T72a,
sadā T32) *sampaṭya (T32a, tat pāṭya T72a) yo gacchet sa rudro nāra saṃsārayaḥ ||.
“When going anywhere, he who sees a śivaliṅga that is not worshipped [and] then only
proceeds after having worshipped it, that [person] is a Rudra, there is no doubt.”

35 This would potentially result in the existence of multiple Rudras: this under-
standing may build on earlier beliefs and myths of Rudras being followers of Rudra,
already found in Vedic literature (e.g., Śatārūdrīya), which appears to have been a
common perception at the time (note the reference to this concept even in BhG 10.23).
The ŚDh offers several approaches on explaining this divine nature of Śaiva devotees on earth. The first is associated with the then well-established trope that on account of their meritorious activities on earth, the worshippers will achieve divine existence in heaven. In the case of Śaiva devotees, the ŚDh specifies that they become Rudras in Rudra’s heaven (rudraloka) due to their acts of Śaiva devotion. The concept of the divine devotee implies that after having exhausted all their merit, they return to earth, not only in the form of some auspicious rebirth but also while retaining their divine identity. Thus, continuing the passage quoted above, the ŚDh teaches the following:

Those who always worship Rudra are not ordinary men [but] Rudras descended (paribhraṣṭa) from Rudraloka. They are Rudras, there is no doubt.

This theme of descending from Rudra’s heaven upon earth is often encountered throughout the work, at times paired with the idea that the devotee

36 Note that in the 11th/12th-century Vāyavīyasamhitā of the Śivapurāṇa, we find the same sentiment of Rudras descending to earth, but here it is linked with the idea that they do so out of compassion, almost reminiscent of Buddhist Bodhisattva ideals; Vāyavīyasamhitā 7.2.11.32: madbhaktāṇāṁ hitāryāya mānuṣaṁ bhāvaṁ āśrītāḥ | rudralokāḥ paribhraṣṭās te rudrā nātra saṁśayaḥ ||. “They are Rudras, who have come down from Rudraloka and taken on a human existence for the benefit of my devotees, there is no doubt.”

37 ŚDh. 1.16: ye ‘rcayanti sadā rudraṁ na te prakṛtimānuṣāḥ | rudralokāḥ paribhraṣṭās te rudrā nātra saṁśayaḥ ||. The same sentiment, but with the specification that the devotees are Gaṇeśvaras, is found in ŚDh 7.1: ye smaranti sadākālam iśāṇam pāyayanti vā | rudralokaparibhraṣṭā vijñeyās te gaṇeśvarāḥ ||. “Those who meditate or worship the Lord at all times, they should be known as Gaṇeśvaras, who have come down from Rudra’s world.” Cf. ŚDh 1.13–14 above (n. 34).

38 The term paribhraṣṭa usually has a negative connotation in brahmanical literature and implies failure of practice or losing one casts (e.g. Viṣṇudharma 57.3: yas tu vipratvam utsṛjya kṣatriyaṁ nīṣvate | brāhmaṇyāt sa paribhraṣṭaṁ kṣatravyāṁ prasīyate ||. “He who abandons the status of a Brahmin and becomes a Kṣatriya, he has fallen from the status of being a Brahmin and is born in the womb of a Kṣatriya.”). However, given the context of divine descent on earth, the term appears to have also a positive connotation in the ŚDh. The ambiguity in phrasing may be inspired by a concept in the BhG, according to which a yogin who has failed in his practice (yogabhraṣṭa) is not punished for trying but rather – due to his already elevated spiritual status – only “falls” in as much as that he reaches the heavenly worlds after death and thereafter obtains an auspicious rebirth, in which he can continue his
passes through several inferior heavens before an auspicious rebirth. This essentially suggests that the devotee is divine because prior to his current

quest for perfection, see BhG 6.41–43: prāpya puyayakṛtāṁ lokān uṣītvā śāśvatīḥ samāh | śucīnām śriṃatāṁ gehe yogabhrāṣṭo bhijāyate || athavā yoginīn eva kule bhavati dhīmaṇāḥ | etat dhi durlabhatarāṇaṁ loke janna yad īdṛṣaṁ || tatra taṁ budhāḥ samāyogāṃ labhate paurvadehikam | yatate ca tato bhūyaḥ samsiddhau kuru-nandana ||. “Someone who has failed in his yogic practice (yogabhrāṣṭo) reaches the heavens for meritorious people [and] after dwelling [there] for a long time (lit. eternally) is reborn in a house of pure and noble people. Alternatively, he is even born in a family of wise yogins; but a rebirth of such kind is difficult to obtain. There, [once reborn], he [re]gains knowledge/understanding of his previous life and then strives again for complete perfection, O descendant of Kuru.” It may be that the ŚDh’s notion of descended Rudras developed from similar concepts and is, in fact, a reworking of the BhG’s teaching; similar to the yogins, the Śaiva devotees in question are already far advanced on their spiritual path but require another rebirth to strive for complete perfection. Passages as the following might support this, see ŚDh 8.36: rudralokāḥ pari-bhrāṣṭo bhavej jātismaro naraḥ | pūrvābhyāṣena tenaiva punaḥ śivapadāṁ bha-jet ||. “Having descended from Rudra’s heaven, [that] man remembers his [previous] birth, and through [his] previous practices he again enjoys the state of Śiva.” I am grateful to Timothy Lubin for pointing the important passage in the BhG out to me.

For more on the theme of descending from Rudra’s world in the ŚDh, see n. 39 below.

39 For a similar example, see, e.g., ŚDh 8.21: samyak sampreṣayaṁ kṛtvā rudralokam avāṃpyaṁ | surūpah subhagah śrīmān pari-bhrāṣṭas tu jāyate ||. “[He who] performs in the proper manner a spectacle [along with his liṅga worship (described in the verses preceding this)] attains Rudra’s world [and] [after having] descended [from it] is reborn with a handsome look, with riches, and possessing luck.” For an example of a gradual descent from Rudra’s heaven as part of the spiritual path, see, e.g., ŚDh 10.100–109 (edition in preparation by Nirajan Kafle), which teaches an observance called the umāmaheśvaravrata for female devotees, as a result of which a woman first enjoys some time in Rudraloka with the Rudras and then gradually descends through the various heavens, spending further time in each of them until she is reborn on earth and obtains a young king as a husband. A similar notion to the gradual descent from Rudra’s heaven is also found in the portrayal of lay religion in the Niśvāsamukha 1.108c–110b; here the devotee descends from Rudraloka via Vāyu-loka and Agni-loka and is reborn on earth as king or Brahmī. Incidentally, we can note that in the contemporaneous Vaiṣṇava sources, such as the VDh, commonly either a general heaven (svarga), Brahmā-loka, and/or Viṣṇu-loka (examples are endless, but see, e.g., VDh 7.23 for svargaloka, VDh 47.5 for brahma-loke, and VDh 3.42 for viṣṇuloka) are found as the spiritual destinations of the devotee, as opposed to the multitude of heavens – topped with Rudraloka – in the ŚDh.

We can also note that the VDh does not incorporate any heaven of Śiva/Rudra. This may be one indication for a relative chronology of these works, with the ŚDh being composed after the VDh.
rebirth he already enjoyed a divine status in heaven, which is indicative of the fact that the devotee had already advanced far on his spiritual path in previous births and therefore already holds a much higher spiritual status than ordinary men, potentially also being close to obtaining the highest spiritual goal of liberation. While it is likely that this rationalization was rather a doctrinal attempt to provide some sort of cosmological structure for explaining the proposed divine status of Śaiva devotees on earth, rather than a wide-spread belief in practiced religion, some passages suggest that the concept of the divine devotee is not merely to be understood figuratively. To this effect, we find statements that emphasise the corporeal reality of a Rudra on earth, the most explicit image being that of the devotee being a Rudra bound in human skin:

He who in this way keeps the vow for as long as he lives, he is a Rudra bound in human skin, there is no doubt.

This sentiment of tangible manifestation of divinity ties in with the second approach to account for the divine nature of the devotee on earth, namely through linking it to the performance of certain ritual activities and the adoption of certain characteristic features reminiscent of Śiva’s iconography. Thus, in the following passage a devotee carrying rudrākṣa-beads is declared to be Rudra both in this world and thereafter:

How wonderful is it that one becomes Rudra through the gift of rudrākṣa-beads! [He who carries] his rosary in his hand at all times is a Rudra walking on earth. The rudrākṣa-beads themselves are Rudra, and so are those who carry the rudrākṣas. By carrying the rudrākṣas one is Rudra in this world and the next.

---

40 Cf. n. 38 above for the possibility that this rationalization is a reworking of the BhG’s concept of spiritually advanced yogins, who need another rebirth to attain complete perfection (BhG 6.41–43).

41 ŚDh 3.48: evaṃ nirvahate yas tu yāvajīvaṃ pratijñayā | māṇusyaacarmanā buddhah sa rudro nātra samśayah ||. This verse features at the end of a longer discourse on the importance of worshipping the linga and Śiva, to the extent that it is better to commit suicide or cut off one’s head than to eat without previously worshipping Śiva (ŚDh 3.47: varaṃ prānaparītyāgah śiraṃ vāpi chedanam | na tv evāpiṣvya bhūṣjita bhagavantam trilocanam ||).

42 ŚDh 12.103–104 (T32, p. 152): rudro rudrākṣadānena bhavātī kim adbhutam | tanmālayā sadā haste rudraś ca kramate kṣītau || rudrākṣāni svayaṃ rudro ye ca
Further, the divine embodiment of the devotee is also emphasised in the following verse, linking it to the practice of ash-bathing:

Therefore he who takes the fiery Śiva-bath (i.e., the ash-bath) is a Rudra with this very body, there is no doubt.\(^{43}\)

In another passage containing a long list of characteristics a śivabhakta should have (see p. 489), the ŚDh further depicts the devotee as consisting of Rudra (rudrātman), as well as being part of the supreme Rudra (rudrāṃśa), the latter being a slightly different notion to the former:\(^{44}\)

They consist of Rudra, they are intent on Rudra, they are in part Rudra, they feel devotion to Rudra; [these] are men on earth endowed with such conducts.\(^{45}\)

Based on this paradigm shift to divinise the devotee, the ŚDh further propagates the idea that this divine identity is central to the devotee’s performance of devotional activities. One can worship the deity only as a Rudra:

A non-Rudra does not think of Rudra, a non-Rudra does not worship Rudra, a non-Rudra does not praise Rudra, a non-Rudra does not obtain Rudra.\(^{46}\)

As we will see below (p. 501), this imperative to identify with the divine in order to worship the divine is a notion that will continue into the Tantric

\[\text{rudrāksadhārakāḥ | rudrāksadhārāṣāt tasmād iha rudrāḥ paratra ca |.}\]

\(^{43}\) ŚDh 11.30: tasmād etac chivasnānam āgneyaṃ yaḥ samācarent | anenaiva śarīreṇa sa rudra nātra samāsayah ||. Note that descriptions of ascetics smeared in ashes are also reported in the Chinese travel records, testifying to the social reality of such practices. See, e.g., BEAL 2004 (1884): 55 and 114.

\(^{44}\) Note the term rudrāṃśa has a complex history within Śaiva literature, ranging from denoting a practitioner considered to be a partial incarnation of Rudra to simply being a devotee of Rudra; see Mirnig’s forthcoming entry in TAK 4.

\(^{45}\) ŚDh 4.9: rudrāṃśo rudraparā rudrāṃśā rudrabhāvanāḥ | ityācārasamāyuktāh bhavanti bhūvi mānasvāh ||.

\(^{46}\) ŚDh 1.24: nārudraḥ sansmared rudraṃ nārudro rudram arcayet | nārudraḥ kīrttayed rudraṃ nārudro rudram āpñuyāt ||.
sphere, where, in an extended form, it becomes a core feature of Tantric ritual ideology.

The novelty of the concept of the divine Rudra-nature of the devotee also becomes apparent when we compare the ŚDh with other sources within the Śaiva sphere. Contemporaneous works dating to about the sixth or seventh century that describe the same religious milieu of the Śaiva lay householder – the Skandapurāṇa and sections of the Nīśvāsamukha (see n. 6) – do not conceptualise the devotee in the same manner. While they too teach that divine existence in heaven is the spiritual goal of pious devotees, the nature of this heavenly existence often remains unspecified, and if it is specified, devotees are portrayed as a chief of Śiva’s divine attendants (gaṇas), namely a Gaṇeśvara (“chief of attendants”), but never as a Rudra. Nor do we find the trope of the divine Rudra-devotee on earth in these early sources but only in those postdating the ŚDh. Even in an episode of the Skandapurāṇa, which alludes to the specific practice of the ash bath by relating how gods diving into a heap of ashes next to Śiva were identified as devotees, they are only referred to as raudras, i.e. “followers of Rudra”.

---

47 We may note here that the Śaiva sources differ from the contemporaneous Vaiṣṇava texts on this point, in which the devotee is granted entry into heaven rather than given a specific divine identity (see, for instance, the examples of the VDh given in n. 39).

48 E.g., LP 2.21.81: ekakālaṃ dvikālaṃ vā trikālaṃ nityam eva vā | ye ’rcayanti mahādevaṃ te rudrā nātra saṃśayaḥ || (almost parallel to ŚDh 1.14) and LP 2.21.82, parallel to ŚDh 1.24 (see n. 46), Haracaritacintāmaiṇi 10.217c–218b: ye śrīmadvi-jayeśānam arcayam yathāvidhi || rudralokāvatīrṇaś te rudrā eva mahītale ||. “Those who worship the venerable Lord of Victory (i.e., Śiva) according to the rules, they certainly are Rudras on earth, having descended from Rudra’s heaven.” Śivopanisad 7.138–139: ye śrāvayantya satata śivadharmaṃ *śivārtham (conj.; śivārthiṃ cod.) | te rudrās te munindrās ca te namasyāḥ svabhaktitāḥ || ye samāthāyā śrṇvantya śivadharman Hun dine | te rudrā rudralokeśā na te prakṛtimūṇāḥ ||. “Those who are longing for Śiva [and] always proclaim the Śivadharma, they are Rudras, and they are the best of sages, to be worshipped through one’s own devotion. Those who get up and listen to the Śivadharma every day, they are Rudras, the Lords of Rudra’s heaven, they are no ordinary men.”

49 SP 32.209ab: raudrāḥ paśava ete hi praveśāḥ bhasmahāḥ dhunā ||. See also SP (Bh) 180.2c–4b.
Points of influence in the Śivadharma’s conceptualisation of the divine devotee

While the ŚDh introduces many concepts that are novel compared to other contemporaneous literature, such texts were certainly not produced in isolation. As products of their time, they reflect and respond to existing practices and also feature direct influences or inspirations of earlier or concurrent traditions. As we would expect, this is also the case with the conceptualisation of the devotee, in which certain elements can be linked with preceding or contemporaneous motives or practices, even if they were pieced together differently to propagate a new model. The following identifies such aspects from three strands of influence, namely the Brahmanical tradition, old Śaiva ascetic initiatory groups, and early Buddhist traditions.

The Brahmanical milieu: of Brahmins and kings as divine embodiments on earth

The trope of the divine walking the earth in human form, as we have seen in the passages above, is not in itself a novel feature of the ŚDh. We find this motive already in the Brahmanical literature, but there it is restricted to the political and religious elites of the system, namely kings and Brahmins. Thus, in classical literature we find that kings are often described as God incarnate on earth, analogous to the mythical kings Rāma and Daśaratha, who are considered as incarnations of Viṣṇu.\(^{50}\) As for Brahmins, it is a well-known idiom that they are divine beings on earth,\(^{51}\) which is how their prerogative of receiving offerings on behalf of the deity is explained. As will also be discussed below, encroaching on this privileged space of the Vedic Brahmin was one of the strategies of the propagators of the ŚDh. This agenda may be a contributing factor to the development of the trope of worshippers as divine Rudras on earth, mirroring the Brahmanical concept

\(^{50}\) For Rāma as an incarnation of Viṣṇu walking the earth, see, e.g., Mbh 3.147.28:  
atha dāśarathir vīrō rāmo nāma mahābalah | viṣṇur mānuṣarūpena cacāra va-sudhām imāṁ ||. “Then the son of Daśaratha, the hero of great strength named Rāma, was Viṣṇu walking this earth in human form.” A similar example with Āditya can be found at Mbh 2.11.2. See also VdhU 1.36.12.

\(^{51}\) Cf. VDh chapter 50 outlined in GRÜNENDAHL 1984: 15–16.
of the divine identity of exceptional practitioners and extending it to the entire community of Śiva worshippers regardless of social level.

_Ascetic practices transposed into the householder ritual milieu_

Another point of influence appears to come more directly from the Śaiva milieu. As we have seen, divine identity is also linked with the bearing of the characteristic marks of Śaiva devotees, such as the _rudrākṣa_-beads and ashes. These go back to the sectarian marks and eccentric practices pertaining to the Śaiva ascetic groups of the Atimārga (see n. 17), in particular the Pāśupatas, for whom the wearing of such marks of devotion form part of the soteriological path. In part, these marks are worn in order to imitate Śiva in his ascetic cremation-ground manifestation. In the formation of a new model for conceptualising the devotee community, Śaiva propagators may thus also have been inspired by these well-known ascetic practices aimed at imitating the divinity, while conceptually shifting from imitation of the deity to adopting a divine identity – from _raudra_ to _rudra_, as it were.

While the authors may in fact have originally envisaged the ascetic practitioners when speaking of these characteristics, they – at least theoretically – extended these practices to the householder devotee, who now is also recommended to carry _rudrākṣa_-beads or smear himself with ashes. Thus, aspects that are considered core elements of the antinomian practices on the Pāśupata’s soteriological path also form part of the practices of lay householders in the context of the ŚDh.

A paradigmatic example for this is the _śivalingamahāvrata_ taught for lay devotees in the ninth chapter, “the great observance of the _śivalinga_,” a term directly alluding to the sectarian _mahāvrata_. This is an ascetic

---

52 For instance, bathing in and sleeping on ashes constitute the first injunctions for the ascetic Pāśupata practitioner in the tradition’s authoritative scripture, the _Pāśupatāsūtra_. Thus, see _Pāśupatāsūtra_ 1.2–3: _bhasmanā triṣavaṇaṃ snāyīta || bhasmanī śayīta ||_. “One must bath in ashes three times a day [i.e., at dawn, noon, and sunset]. One must lie in ashes [for sleeping].” See also _Kaundinya’s_ commentary thereon. On the significance of ashes in the Pāśupata context, see _Hara_ 2003, and for literary descriptions of Pāśupatas wearing ashes outside the tradition’s prescriptive literature, see _Hara_ 2002b: 150–151, n. 29.

53 See, e.g., _Bakker_ 2010 and _Acharya_ 2013: 127.

54 A critical edition and study of this chapter is currently under preparation by the author.

55 See Bisschop’s forthcoming entry on _mahāvrata_ in TAK 4.
observance that consists of imitating the deity’s expiatory observance after cutting off Brahman’s head by walking around smeared with ashes and with a skull bowl. Not only does the terminology of the śivalingamahāvrata call into mind this practice, but also the observance itself as described in the ŚDh contains ritual elements that are particular to Pāṣupata practice. These include, for instance, a specific set of offerings (upahāra) that the adherent is to present to Śiva, consisting of eccentric elements such as mad dancing, laughter, and making the ominous “mouth-sound” (mukhavādyā).56

Also the conceptualisation of the spiritual goal of ultimate liberation appears at times to be inspired by Pāṣupata terminology in the ŚDh. In some passages the spiritual goal is described as the state in which merit (dharma) and demerit (adharma) no longer affect the soul, a dictum frequently used to describe the final liberated state of the Pāṣupata ascetic practitioner.57 Here we encounter the by this time common transposition of spiritual goals associated with ascetic practice into the householder context: liberation is no longer the result of austere practices classically associated with the soteriological path, but it is promised along with worldly desires to the householder as the result of devotional ritual activities, which here also contain elements of Śaiva ascetic practices. This synthesis of both value systems – the one of the ascetic and the one of the householder – that characterises many parts of the ŚDh is epitomised in passages such as the following, in which the devotee obtains Rudra’s world through liṅga worship and may choose between bhukti (enjoyments) and mukti (liberation) once his heavenly existence comes to an end:

56 See, e.g., ŚDh 5.8–9, 129 and 158. For these upahāras, see Pāṣupatasūtra 1.8. The exact nature of the mukhavādyā sound is still subject to debate; probably it consists of making sounds by hitting the mouth. See BISSLING & GRIFFITHS 2007: 34, n. 155.
57 For instance, dharmādharmaivivarjita, “free of merit and demerit,” in ŚDh 3.53. Cf. the description of the final liberated state of the Pāṣupata yogic practitioner in Kaṇḍinya’s commentary on Pāṣupatasūtra 5.38–39: ekaḥ kṣemā san vītisokah | apramādi gacched duhhānām antam iṣaprasādāt |. “Alone, secure, existing [without action], free from sorrow, mindful he will reach the end of suffering from the grace of the master.” (Transl. HARA 1966): atra dharmādharmanyor vṛtyor uparame avasitaprayojanatvāt pakhvaphalavat sarpakaṃcukavad gatapraśevu kāryakaraṇeṣu rudre sthitacitto niskala eka ity abhidhiyate. “When merit and demerit cease their activities and the effect [body] and the instruments [sense-organs] have almost departed since they have accomplished their object like a ripened fruit or like the slough of a serpent, the aspirant with his mind fixed upon Rudra and without material components is called alone.” (Transl. HARA ibid.).
He who establishes one liṅga, following the prescriptions, together with gifts [such as the ritual fee] attains ten million times ten million of the amount of merit arising from all religious traditions. Having rescued twenty-one generations from the mother’s side and the father’s side, and the wife he has married, he is celebrated in the heaven of Rudra. After having enjoyed plenty of pleasures [in heaven], at the time of cosmic dissolution, he reaches union [characterised by ultimate, liberating] knowledge (jñānayoga) and is liberated right there. Alternatively, if he desires a kingdom, he will be born in another life as a powerful king over the earth with its seven continents and oceans.

_Buddhist themes_

In several aspects of the conceptualisation of the devotee in the ŚDh we can sense themes and influences that were already well-established within the Buddhist sphere, even if we cannot trace specific textual influences. Given the spatial proximity of Buddhist and Brahmanical groups and their competition for the same resources and patronage of kings, it would, however, not be surprising to see similar aspects and strategies in these emerging Śaiva works and practices. For instance, the ŚDh’s stance that the degree of devotion can supersede caste-boundaries in terms of spiritual status and the absence of any emphasis on the concept of svadharma calls into mind the Buddhists’ fundamental rejection of the Brahmanical socio-religious system, with discourses on the insignificance of caste and class already long present at the time. Already in the Pali canon we find the concept of the “true Brahmin,” whose superiority is defined through his morals and actions rather than his birth status. Eltschinger has demonstrated how Buddhist thinkers as early as the fourth to sixth centuries even provided sub-

---

58 ŚDh 3.59–62: _yo liṅgaṃ sthāpayed ekam vidhipūryaṃ sadakaṣṇam | sarvāgamoditaṃ punyaṃ kūṭikṣigataṃ labhet || mātrāṃ piṭrajā caiva yāṃś caiva dvahate striyam | kulaikavimśaṃ uttārya rudraloke mahīyate || bhuktvā ca vipulāṃ bhogān pralaye samupasthite | jñānayogam samāśāyā sa tatāvīa vimiśantiti || athavā rajyam ākāṃkṣej jāvate sa bhavāntare | saptadvāśamasāṃdhravāḥ śṣiter adhipatiṃ vasi ||_. Similarly, ŚDh 3.38: _yas tu pūjyate nityāṃ liṅgaṃ tribhuvanesvaram | sa svargamokṣarājyāṇāṁ kṣiprāṁ bhavati bhājanam_. “He who constantly worships the liṅga that is the Lord of the three worlds (i.e., Śiva) quickly attains heaven, liberation, or a kingdom.”

stantial philosophical arguments to refute the ontological reality of caste status and argued that it is merely a matter of convention rather than an innate quality.  

Buddhism is also a precursor regarding the idea of developing ways to reach the highest spiritual goal of nirvāṇa through devotional practices rather than exclusively through gnostic, meditative and ascetic methods. For instance, in his study on early Mahāyāna inscriptions dating to the beginning of the first millennium, Schopen has demonstrated how lay as well as monastic practitioners donated images with the hope of accumulating merit that would lead them to nirvāṇa, despite the imperative to pursue gnostic methods in authoritative scriptures. Similarly, in the ŚDh the establishment of Śaiva cult images – in particular the śivaliṅga – are presented to the householder as a way to attain liberation, surpassing the common Purānic goals of heavenly existence and auspicious rebirth.

Descriptions of the characteristics of a lay devotee in the ŚDh also appear to mirror principles and characteristics of the Buddhist lay disciple, the upāsaka and focus exclusively on moral qualities. Characteristics that are specific to the Brahmanical sphere, such as knowledge of the Veda and Vedic ritual as well as the common physical qualities of proper Brahmān priests are conspicuously absent. Thus, the fourth chapter of the ŚDh opens with the following passage:

Śiva worshippers, who employ great effort, are completely devoted to the worship of Śiva, self-controlled, [and] endowed with dharma, they achieve all goals. [They are] free of all opposites, with eternally zealous minds, completely devoted to serving others, intent on serving the guru, honest, gentle, content, agreeable, speaking good words, not proud, possessing intellect, having abandoned envy, without desire, calm, with a smiling face, gracious, always pronouncing welcomes, of concise speech, speaking little, valiant, experienced in giving, perfected through pure conduct, completely focused on compassion and kindness, free of deceit and jealousy, speaking in accordance with the truth, intent on sharing, wise, and also honest and unpreachable, and also not attached to any sense objects, just like the lotus leaf [is not stained] by water, not distressed, nor tainted, nor

---

60 ELTSCHINGER 2012 (2000),
61 SCHOPEN 1997.
62 See MIRNIG 2016 for Nepalese epigraphical evidence for such practices contemporaneous to the ŚDh.
subject to disease, they have their selves focused, have faith, and are
honoured by good people. [These] wise men, being free of all pass-
ions, they are not unsteady regarding their feet, hands, mouth, eyes,
ears, genitals, and stomach. They consist of Rudra, they are intent on
Rudra, they are in part Rudra, they feel devotion to Rudra; [these] are
men on earth endowed with such conducts. Resorting to exclusive
devotion [for only Śiva], they abide in these good qualities. [They
should] eternally worship Śiva for attaining lower and higher powers.63

The divinisation of the devotee: strategy and impact
on socio-religious structures

To what extent is this conceptualisation of the divine worshipper on earth
relevant for forming an understanding of the community of worshippers
envisaged by the text? Considering the religio-political landscape at the
time of the composition of the ŚDh, we know that prior to this period Śaiva
devotional practices were not very visible in Sanskrit normative literature
or the epics,64 although archaeological and epigraphical evidence demons-
trates that forms of Śiva worship were already present in the population
for some centuries prior, as alluded to earlier.65 Some signs that suggest the
presence of linga worship are also mentioned in the epics; however, as

63 ŚDh 4.1–10: śivabhaktā mahotsāhāḥ śivārcanaparāyaṇāḥ | sanāyatā dharmasampannāḥ sarvārthān sādhayanti te || sarvadvandvavinirmuktā nityam udvyuktasatāḥ | paropakāraṇiratā guruṣuṣrīṣitaṃ ratāḥ || ārjavā mrdavaḥ svasthā
anukūlāḥ priyamvadāḥ | amānino buddhimanāḥ tyaktasparhitā gataśprāhā || śaṃtāḥ
smitamukhāḥ bhadrānāḥ nityam svāgatavādīkāh | alpavāc ca pavaktāraḥ śūrāḥ tyāga-
viśāradāḥ || šauccācāreṇa sampannā dayādākṣiyatapatārāḥ | dambhamātasa-
ryanirmuktāḥ yathātathyaaprabhāṣīṇāḥ || samvībhāgaporāḥ prajñāsaṭhāś cāpy aki-
sitāḥ || viṣayasy eva nirlepāḥ padnapatram ivāmbhāsa || na dinā na pītī malinā na ca
rógavasāṅugāḥ || bhavanti bhavitātmānāḥ śradhāh śādhuniṣevitāḥ || na pāda-
pāṇīvākecaśuṣrīṣitaṃroṣiṣnaṇadāre budāḥ || capalyāṃ naiva kurvanti sarvavyasanava-
ri-tāḥ || rudrātmānā rudraparā rudrāmysa rudrabhāvanāḥ | ityācāramanvāyuktaḥ bhava-
nti bhuvī mānavāḥ || ekāntabhaktiṃ āsthāya guṇeṣy eva ṛtu varante || pūjanīyaḥ śiva
nityam parāparivibhūtaye ||

64 For the discrepancy between early archaeological evidence of Śiva worship

65 See SANDERSON 2013. A well-known example is, for instance, the production of śivaliṅgas in Mathurā starting from the third century onwards. On the development
and dating of the iconographical scheme around the production of śivaliṅgas in
Mathurā, see KREISEL 1986.
Bakker argues, they are there associated with the practices of certain kinds of demonic beings (rakṣa), thereby suggesting that this mode of worship was associated with more inferior social groups from the orthodox Brahmanical point of view.66 These facts indicate that although this level of devotional practices was present, it was sidelined by the religious elite, unlike devotion directed to Viṣṇu, which is widely emphasised in the epics and normative literature as well as in the iconography of kings leading up to this period.67 With the sixth century, it thus seems that works such as the ŚDh were produced to elevate this level of practice by producing a Sanskrit corpus that provided scriptural authority. In this religio-historical context, the device of divine identity of the devotee community can also be seen as a tool to transgress existing social norms and generally elevate the status of Śaiva worshippers in a religious world dominated by a Brahmanical religious elite, which favoured Vaiṣṇavism over Śaivism and promoted the spiritual superiority of the Vedic Brahmin. By introducing such strong notions of the Śaiva devotee’s spiritual superiority, the ŚDh was able to promote the śivabhakta as a worthy receptacle for offerings – a crucial position within the socio-religious framework and a prerogative originally reserved for the community of Brahmins. As discussed earlier, Brahmins were also described with the same trope of being the divine walking the earth.68 The parallelism between the divine śivabhakta and the divine Brahmin is striking, and in fact – as Lubin shows69 – one of the agendas found in the ŚDh includes the substitution of ordinary Brahmins by śivabhakta Brahmins as a receptacle for offerings (pātra). Lubin argues that this is part of the larger agenda to subsume and recast the Brahmanical social order within a Śaiva devotional framework, redefining each of the life stages of the varnāśrama system as a śivāśrama in the ŚDh’s eleventh chapter, and teaching that each of these stages is enhanced through Śaiva devotion. Thus, as alluded to earlier, despite the radical statements of superiority over the Brahmanical system, we see that the work neither rejects adherence to the traditional system nor suggests that it should be abandoned, an inclusivistic attitude that will remain central to the success of Śaiva traditions.70

68 See p. 485.
69 Lubin forthcoming.
70 See Sanderson 2013 on the adherence of Śaiva initiatory groups to the Brahmanical socio-religious order.
At the same time, the ŚDh also promotes Śaiva ascetics as suitable receptacles for offerings, as will be discussed below (see p. 494). Further, throughout the ŚDh this adherence to the Brahmanical socio-religious order is never explicitly made an imperative. In fact, as was alluded to earlier, key terms and discourses present in the contemporaneous Vaiṣṇava works to promote adherence to the Brahmanical order are absent in the ŚDh. Thus, the term svadharma does not feature a single time, nor do we find any treatments of heretics (pāṣāṇḍa), both of which are important topics in Vaiṣṇava literature and make up large parts of works such as the Viṣṇudharma. Further, with the exception of the Brahmin and a single verse about the Śūdra (see below), the categories of varṇa are not mentioned outside the śivāśrama chapter. On the contrary, we have seen that in the opening chapter even the ultimate social outsiders according to Brahmanical norms, the dog-eaters and foreigners, are considered better than a Brahmin if only they are Śaiva devotees. Nor is the quality of knowing the Vedas ever mentioned as a requirement, as we have seen earlier.

The re-definition of the spiritual status not according to concurrent orthodox norms but through one’s divine nature as a śivabhakta thus introduced a paradigm shift that opened the door to the participation of groups considered inferior or outside the social system as well as religious professionals from lower classes. Within the Brahmanical system this concerns particularly the Śūdras, who in the ŚDh are explicitly included as participants in institutionalised religious life, as servants to yoga masters, and as living on the temple grounds and tending to the temple gardens. In this context, we may note that the Śūdra devotee is referred to as gana, a divine attendant.

---

71 See GRÜNENDAHL (1983: 64) who points to the frequent discourses on pāṣāṇḍas and how they threaten the Brahmanical socio-religious order in the Viṣṇudharma; e.g., chapter 25 and 44. The topic of the pāṣāṇḍas in the VDh will be further explored by LUBIN forthcoming.

72 Cf. ŚDh 4.1–10 on pp. 489f.

73 ŚDh 11.42–44. Incidentally, we find that in Tantric works such as Trilocaṇaśiva’s Prāyaścītisamuccaya the Śūdra lay devotee also features in the list of communities for which purificatory rituals are prescribed. There, the Śūdra lay devotee is associated with the practice of wearing ashes and rudrākṣa-beads. See Prāyaścītisamuccaya 584: ye ca māheśvarāḥ śūdrāḥ bhasmarudrāksadharināḥ | teṣām pañcadaśāhena śūdrāḥ sītuṁ nṛtyān api ||. “As for lay-devotees of Śiva who are Śūdras and who wear ash and rudrākṣas, they are purified after fifteen days, both in the case of birth and death.” (Transl. SATHYANARAYAN 2015: 303).
thus again giving the devotee an elevated divine status, albeit one inferior to the Rudra.\textsuperscript{74}

This potential to include lower social groups or even those outside the varṇa system may have been a contributing factor to why the text became particularly popular in the South, where the society featured several groups that were not considered part of the orthodox Brahmanical varṇa system. We know that bhakti movements grew to constitute an important religious force in the South Indian religious landscape. In fact, the ŚDh only slightly precedes, if at all, the vernacular devotional literature, such as the Tēvāram, a collection of Śaiva devotional poetry dating to the seventh to eighth centuries. In her analysis of bhakti in the South, Prentiss points out that in the hymns of one of the Śaiva saints named Appar Tirunāvukkaracu Nāyaṇār (seventh century) “the sameness of the bhaktas through the shared essence of kinship and partaking of Śiva’s nature” is emphasised. She argues that through this rhetoric of shared identity the practitioners did not only promote the bhaktas as superior in the spiritual hierarchy but also derived a divine ethnic legitimation, since “Śiva is the Lord of the Tamil lands and language, the bhaktas share their Tamilness with each other and with Śiva.”\textsuperscript{75}

The promotion of the Śaiva yogin: “calal/jaṅgama liṅgas”

Aside from – at least theoretically – making the religion thus available for social outsiders, the ŚDh follows another significant agenda alluded to above, namely the promotion of Śaiva ascetic yogins. Especially in the twelfth chapter we find a broad range of recommended donations to such

\textsuperscript{74} Note that in subsequent Tantric circles initiation names given to Śūdras – who in this context were also not excluded from participation – were, in fact, names ending in -gaṇa. See GOODALL’s entry on gaṇa in TANTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOSĀ 3. While we do not have explicit reference to Śaiva initiations for Śūdras in the ŚDh, note that there are two passages, which enjoin that Śūdras without a śivasamskāra, i.e. to some Śaiva purificatory ritual or even initiation, may not drink milk from a Kapilā cow, whose milk is considered particularly sacred for brahmanical ritual activities, namely ŚDh 5.14: käpiḷyam yaḥ pibec chūdraḥ śivasamskāravārjitaḥ | pacyate sa mahāghore suciraḥ narakārnave ||; and ŚDh 8.50: kapilām yaḥ pivec chūdraḥ śivasamskāravārjitaḥ | sa prayāti mahāghoram narakam nātra saṃsārayaḥ ||. These verses could be interpreted both ways: either that there is a possibility to receive śivasamskāra for Śūdras and if they do so they obtain the ritual privilege to drink the milk from a Kapilā cow; or the verses may imply that Śūdras cannot receive śivasamskāra and are therefore unable to drink the sacred milk.

\textsuperscript{75} PRENTISS 2000: 68.
śīvayogins, including valuables, practical items, and housing. Further, we find that such śīvayogins are even recommended as suitable receptacles for food during śrāddha offerings.76 Offering housing and making śīvayogins part of core religious rites suggests that the ŚDh thus also envisaged an increasing institutionalisation of such ascetic groups, supported by the laity, reminiscent of the ways in which Buddhist monastic circles looked for support from the sphere of lay practitioners.77

In this respect, the content and history of the following passage of the ŚDh is particularly interesting. In the third chapter, which is dedicated to the origin myth of liṅga worship and discusses various types of liṅgas and how to worship them, a passage classifies the liṅga into mobile (cara) and immobile (acara) forms, with the former possibly referring to the ascetic practitioner:

There are two liṅgas enumerated, namely the mobile and the immobile. The mobile is known as prāṇī [i.e., the living being]; the immobile [consists of those materials] such as earth. Maheśvara, being

76 Timothy Lubin, in a series of conference presentations provides various sources of evidence to show that more generally the śrāddha feeding of Brahmins was itself encouraged as a response to institutionalized feeding of Buddhist monks and other ascetics (e.g. “Feeding Monks, Feeding Brahmins: Competing Idioms of Religious Semiotics in Early India”, 45th Annual Conference on South Asia, Madison, 20–23 October 2016), thus making this move to promote śīvayogins as recipients of śrāddha offerings part of a larger development (see also Lubin’s paper on On Feeding Śiva bhaktas and Other Rules of Śivāśrama-Dharma,” paper for a panel on “Śivadharma and the Formation of Lay Śaivism” at the 227th Meeting of the American Oriental Society, Los Angeles, 17–20 March 2017.)

Note that feeding Śaiva ascetics features also in later Tantric ritual śrāddha practices. See, e.g., MIRNI 2019.

77 BISSCHOP 2010.

78 The constitution of the text is uncertain and corrupted at this point in most manuscripts. This translation is based on the marginal corrections of the Nepalese palm-leaf ms. Add 1645 (Cambridge) and ms. G3852 (Calcutta). Other readings, however, appear to support this reading: prāṇeti in ms. G4077 (Calcutta), prāṭīti in the post correctionem reading of A1082-3 (NAK) and in the Pondicherry transcript IFP 514, prāṭīti in the ac reading of A1082-3 (NAK) and post correctionem reading of G3852 (Calcutta), and prāṇi in the ante correctionem reading of Add 1645 (Cambridge); Bod. Or. B 125 (Oxford) reads vrāṭī, i.e., “the vow-holder,” suggesting that the scribe also thought it suitable to explicitly mention the ascetic and thus further supporting the interpretation. The full apparatus will be available in the author’s forthcoming edition of this chapter.
pleased, resides at all times in the moving [liṅga]. The unmoving [liṅga] is prepared with mantras. Both are eternal and forever auspicious. By disrespecting the moving [liṅga]/the ascetic, the fixed [liṅga] becomes fruitless. Therefore the wise man should never disrespect either liṅga. \(^{79}\)

While in this passage the mobile liṅga can also be interpreted to refer to a small liṅga carried by the practitioner, it may also denote a practitioner that is considered as a moving liṅga, that is to say Śiva, a conceptualisation that closely corresponds to the concept of the divine on earth. This interpretation of the mobile liṅga denoting a Śaiva practitioner and more particularly an ascetic is not only suggested by the readings of the manuscripts, but also by a later addition to the text in the southern recension. Here, one transcript defines the mobile (jaṅgama) liṅga explicitly as an initiate, and another as the worshipper. \(^{80}\) While this cannot completely clarify whether this was originally intended at the time of the ŚDh’s composition, the interpretation of the ascetic or worshipper as a mobile form of the deity appears in subsequent sources. For instance, we have a close parallel example in a later Vaiṣṇava text on ascetics, namely the Yatidharmaprakāśa, where the mobile form of the deity is explicitly named to be the renouncer, the saṃnyāsin. \(^{81}\) Further, we find that in the Vīraśaiva tradition, whose authoritative scriptures often draw on the ŚDh, \(^{82}\) precisely the above quoted passage is frequently drawn upon to demonstrate that Vīraśaiva ascetics are to

\(^{79}\) ŚDh 3.54–56: liṅgadvayaḥ samākhyātaḥ sacarācaram eva ca | caraṃ prūṇīti vikhyātām acaraṃ pārthivādaḥ | care sadā vasaty eva prūṇyukto meheśvaroḥ | acaro mantrasamskāro dvayaṃ nityaṃ sadāśivam || jaṅgamsaṃpadamāṇena sthāvaro nisphalo bhavet | tasmāl liṅgadvayaṃ prūṇītaḥ nāvamanayeta jātucit ||.

\(^{80}\) Insertion by T 32 and T 514 after verse ŚDh 3.55: sthāvaram jaṅgamaṃ caiva dvividhāṃ liṅgam *ucyate (T 514, isyate T 32) | sthāvaram *sthāpitaṃ liṅgām jaṅgamaṃ dīkṣaṇāṃ viduḥ (T 32, liṅgām ity āhuḥ jaṅgamaṃ tasya pūjakam T 514) ||.

“The liṅga is said to be of two kinds, namely an immobile and mobile one. *They know the immobile liṅga to be the one that has been established [through a consecration ritual and] the mobile [liṅga] to be an initiated [person] (T32, T 514: They call the immobile one the liṅga, and the immobile one the worshipper).”

\(^{81}\) Yatidharmaprakāśa 53.18: vāsudevasya dve rūpe calam cācalam eva ca | samnyāśi tu calam rūpam acalam pratimāmākam ||. “There are two forms of Vāsudeva: the mobile and the immobile. The mobile form is the renouncer, while the immobile consists of images.” (Text and transl. from OLIVELLE 2011: 235–236).

\(^{82}\) A paper on this topic is currently being prepared by Jonathan Duquette and Nina Mirnig.
be perceived as mobile liṅgas, i.e., mobile manifestations of the deity. Further, southern epigraphical material of the Kālāmukhas frequently features the same notion of the jaṅgamaliṅga denoting the Śaiva ascetic. We also find another example of this concept in the South Indian Śaiva Tantric tradition, more particularly the prominent Śaiva Siddhānta, where in the twelfth century Aghoraśiva, a famous author of ritual manuals and philosophical treatises, describes in a passage on ritual processions that the Śaiva Tantric priest is sometimes referred to as the mobile version of Śiva. Thus, we see that here too, the conception of the divine deity on earth in the form of the practitioner – here in terms of the liṅga – becomes an important and influential trope in the perception of this particular religious group and its professionals.

The ŚDh and the Śaiva initiatory traditions

With the various strategies contained in the ŚDh, the work lends itself to the promotion of Śaiva cults within the mainstream and in new territories. This raises the question of which specific organised Śaiva groups were behind its production or may have subsequently taken advantage of it. Given the religious landscape at the time, it is tempting to link the production of the work to some of the Śaiva initiatory groups that had formed by the sixth century and were looking to expand their reach. However, if we try to link the ŚDh to specific Śaiva initiatory groups that may have been involved in its composition, we are faced with the problem that the work contains no explicit sectarian references. Even in the case of the śivayogin

---

84 DAVIS 2010: 38: “Priests even invoke Śiva into a bowl of moist paste that is smeared on the liṅga, the icons, and the devotees just before the great chariot procession on the seventh day. Some Āgamas describe the priest himself as a form of Śiva, a ‘mobile liṅga’ (calaliṅga). It is as if the festival were designed to offer a practical demonstration of Śiva’s ubiquity.”
85 Some speculations on this topic have already been voiced. Thus, while HAZRA remains silent on this issue regarding the ŚDh (HAZRA 1952), he claims that the ŚDhU is a Pāśupata text because it mentions terminology originating in these circles (HAZRA 1956). In the same line of argument, the SP, probably contemporaneous with the ŚDh, has been suggested to be a Pāśupata text. See ADRIAENSEN & BAKKER & ISAACS 1998: 4 and, in particular, BISSCHOP 2006: 38–50. However, these exclusive claims of Pāśupata authorship cannot be regarded as certain, as will be demonstrated below.
no sectarian affiliations are specified. This question of sectarian affiliation is also further complicated by the range of different socio-religious agendas at play. On the one hand, the strong promotion of Śaiva Brahmins could be interpreted as an indication that precisely such groups originating from the Brahmanical elite, rather than from Śaiva ascetic circles, were involved in the composition of the text. On the other, we see that another central agenda is to promote the transcendence of the Brahmanical socio-religious order as well as to further the institutionalisation of Śaiva ascetic practitioners, who originally largely adopted antinomian practices that would not be acceptable in an orthodox Brahmanical context. The single unifying factor is the notion of the elevated divine identity of the Śaiva devotee. Essentially an egalitarian ideal is promoted, so that within this community any kind of śivabhakta is spiritually equal. This strategy makes the ŚDh’s socio-religious model highly flexible and adaptive, serving a multitude of agendas and allowing for both the participation of religious officiants that do not conform to Brahmanical norms as well as the compliance with Brahmanical ritual life, which is considered enhanced by Śaiva devotion. I would like to argue that it is through this dual agenda that the ŚDh canonised a Śaiva social order that facilitated the rise of the integration of Śaiva initiatory traditions into public life, thus creating the religious milieu that contributed to their success. After all, the composition of the ŚDh follows an increased presence of public expressions of adherence to Śaiva faith and Śaiva devotional activities amongst the mainstream in the epigraphic records as well as the appearance of members of ascetic groups, such as the Pāşupatas, in public life. And it is from this period onwards that Tantrism became an important religious force within the Śaiva world, further highlighting the pivotal moment for Śaiva history which is also characterised through the composition of the ŚDh. In the following, continuities from the existing initiatory traditions into the ŚDh and continuities from the ŚDh into the newly emerging Tantric ideology will be traced to further investigate this point.

**The Śivadharma and the Atimārga**

At the time of the composition of the ŚDh, Śaiva initiatory groups consisted of ascetic groups, subsequently grouped by the Śaiva tradition under the umbrella term Atimārga (see n. 17). Amongst these it was in particular the

---

86 See, e.g., SANDERSON 2013: 225. For more on early epigraphical evidence for Śaivism in this period, see also the contribution in BOSMA & MIRNIG 2013.
Pāśupatas who emerged as officiating priests, recipients of donations, and administrators of temple assets in epigraphical records,\textsuperscript{87} despite the fact that their prescriptive sources prohibit precisely this kind of interaction with public life.\textsuperscript{88} It is those Pāśupatas that are commonly put forward as key players in the production of the ŚDh, a proposition first made by Hazra (see n. 85). As we have seen, there are several aspects which suggest that Pāśupata propagators indeed formed part of the religious milieu from which the ŚDh emerged: First, the emphasis on ash-bathing, which is also central to the Pāśupata practice.\textsuperscript{89} Second, certain technical terms and phrases associated with Pāśupata teachings appear in the ŚDh, such as forms of Pāśupata worship and the description of the liberated state.\textsuperscript{90} From a societal point of view, given the eccentric and antinomian practices associated with the Pāśupatas and designed to provoke the mainstream,\textsuperscript{91} they constitute precisely the kind of group that would have seemed objectionable in an orthodox Brahmanical setting. In the ŚDh, however, we have already seen that the ritual and visual features originating from this scene were not only integrated into the range of recommended practices, but they were also directly linked with the divine nature of the devotee on earth. By featuring such eccentric practices, the ŚDh thus clearly demonstrates an attitude of openness towards even controversial forms of Śaiva devotion, making it not only acceptable but commendable. This would have also promoted the participation of priests from this sphere—evidenced in plenty of inscriptions\textsuperscript{92}—even if they may at first have seemed objectionable to orthodox society. To demonstrate the case in point, the Nepalese epigraphical material provides an example in which we can trace this process in society. Here, while protection of the Brahmanical varnāśramadharma was clearly

\textsuperscript{87} For an overview, see SANDERSON 2013. For case studies, see, e.g., RAMESH & TIWARI 1990 for Pāśupatas in Bagh and MİRNIĞ 2016 for Pāśupatas in the Kathmandu Valley.

\textsuperscript{88} See SANDERSON 2013.

\textsuperscript{89} See above and, e.g., Pāśupatasūtra 1.2. bhāmasnāna. Cf., e.g., HARA 2002a: 61–62 for the centrality of ashes to Pāśupata ritual and the purifying nature they are believed to have.

\textsuperscript{90} E.g., ŚDh 3.53cd: śivatvam yānti vai kṣipraṃ dharma�harmavivarjitaḥ ||. “[These Śaiva religious practitioners] quickly attain Śiva-nature and become free of dharma and adharma.” See p. 487, n. 57.

\textsuperscript{91} One of the stages of Pāśupata practice famously constitutes imitating mad behaviour in order to induce a merit transfer from those wrongly judging the practitioner. See, e.g., HARA 2002b: 105ff. and INGALLS 1962.

\textsuperscript{92} See SANDERSON 2013.
expressed as a duty of the king, we find an upsurge of Śaiva donative records starting with the fifth century, suggesting the increase of Śaiva devotion amongst the elite. Initially there are no specific religious officiants linked to these activities, aside from a single reference to Brahmins, but with the beginning of the seventh century we see the appearance of Pāśupata priests in leading roles, not only as recipients of donations but also as administrators and agents in the establishment of infrastructure. Further, the location initially linked with their activities, the Pashupatinath Temple, emerges as the national shrine around the same time, suggesting a strong link to the ruling elite.

While the Pāśupatas were the most prominent Śaiva ascetic and initiatory group at the time, there are also others that have largely disappeared from our textual records, but whose presence remains known from epigraphical material and occasional references in belletristic and Tantric literature, such as the Kālāmukhas and Lākulas (SANDERSON 2013: 229–232). These few references indicate that their appearance and practice must have been based on premises similar to those of the Pāśupatas. Of those groups, we have a more prominent epigraphical record for the Kālāmukhas, namely in the area of present-day Karnataka, where they feature in inscriptions as being in charge of temples and supported by the royalty. Significant for the present context is that the Kālāmukhas thus represent another ascetic group that would have profited from the kind of socio-religious environ created by the ŚDh’s model as the Pāśupatas. In fact, as alluded to above, we know that the ŚDh was popular in this area, partly from epigraphical references as well as through the wide circulation of the text we find in the South. Further, the ŚDh and many of the notions expressed in the text can be shown to have carried into and strongly impacted the formation of the scriptural corpus of the local Vīraśaivas/Liṅgāyats. These groups followed precisely the same agenda of including social outsiders into a socio-religious framework that transcends Brahmanical norms and yet remains rooted in the Veda, reminiscent of the ŚDh’s model.

---

93 Cf. SANDERSON 2009: 41, in particular n. 1.
94 MIRNIG 2016.
95 This also often leads to the conflation of the various Atimārgic ascetic groups in belletristic literature, as discussed by FERSTL in this volume.
97 A paper on this topic is currently under preparation by Jonathan Duquette and Nina Mirnig.
Nevertheless, it has to be kept in mind that – beyond the shared practices alluded to above – the ŚDh specifically refers to neither the Pāśupatas nor the Kālamukhas. The śivayogin is never specified beyond the fact that he practices yoga and wears ashes, rudrākṣa-beads, and the triṇḍra, all of which are features that could apply to many of the ascetic groups. It may be precisely this vagueness and flexibility that made the ŚDh’s model so attractive in providing a framework that aligned a potential mainstream householder society – within and outside the Brahmanical order – with the presence and participation of unorthodox and nonconformist Śaiva initiatory groups, potentially collectively subsumed under the nebulous śivayogin.

**Continuities into the Tantric milieu**

Around the time of composition of the ŚDh, Tantric initiatory traditions emerge on the scene in both Śaiva and Buddhist circles.98 Tantric communities were initially a marginal phenomenon on the periphery of society, as demonstrated by studies of the Niśvāsa, the earliest extant Śaiva Tantra.99 However, at the same time we know that these Tantric communities very quickly transformed into dominant players on the socio-religious scene of early medieval India.100 The transformation from the Atimārga to the Mantramārga is still subject to some speculation, since there is little evidence available for the period between the earliest signs of the Atimārgic tradition in the fourth century and the first firm testimonies of Tantric Śaivism.101

---

98 For an account of the shared features of ritual syntax of the newly emerging Tantric systems in both Śaivism and Buddhism, see Isaacson & Goodall 2015.

99 See Goodall 2015. On the Niśvāsa being the oldest surviving Śaiva Tantra, see also Sanderson 2006 (particularly pp. 153–154), Goodall & Isaacson 2007, Goodall 2009, and Goodall & Isaacson 2016. That the Niśvāsa represents an early stage within the corpus of Tantric literature is also suggested by the fact that the text does not refer to different schools in the Mantramārga and may well predate a split into the various schools of Tantric Śaivism, i.e., the Śaiva Siddhānta and the various non-Saidhdāntika traditions (Goodall 2014: 29).

100 Sanderson 2009.

101 The earliest evidence of the Pāśupata Pāncaṭhika tradition is found in a Mathura pillar inscription dated 380 CE (Bhandarkar 1931 and Sanderson 2006: 148). Evidence for Mantramārga or Āgāmic/Tantric Śaivism can be traced back to ninth-century Nepalese manuscripts preserving some of the early Śaiva scriptural corpus that may go back as early as the fifth century, references by tenth-century Kashmir commentators, and references to practices based on Śaiva scriptures in inscriptions in Cambodia of King Rājendravarman (r. 944–968), which refer to a
However, a major discovery in this respect has been the aforementioned *Niśvāsa*, which, as Sanderson points out, “shows a greater awareness of pre-Āgamic Śaivism than other texts of this tradition” and contains evidence of the transition from the Atimārga to the Mantramārga. On the basis of this account, Sanderson establishes that there were certain links between the Atimārgic and Mantramārgic ritual world, which he traces through the structural and functional similarities of the initiation rituals of the Atimārgic Lākulas and in Tantric traditions.

In addition, I would like to suggest that a further intermediate space within this development is occupied by the ritualistic and socio-religious world envisaged in the Śivadharma literature. In fact, the set of values advocated by the ŚDh may in itself have played an important role in the formation of Tantric ideology and the ways in which it was embedded in society. This is suggested by the fact that several features found in the ŚDh appear as part of the new Tantric ideology and practice. These include in particular the following notions.

The first point relates to the issue of the divinisation of the Śaiva devotee in the ŚDh. As we have seen, this divine identity is also declared central to the performance of the devotional practices, in the sense that it is only as a Rudra that one can worship, meditate upon, and be devoted to Rudra. This is reminiscent of the core principle of Tantric ritual worship, namely the self-identification with the deity before its worship, as expressed in *Śaiva ācārya* who died in ca. 890 and was employed to perform sacrifices for the king (SANDERSON 2001: 7, n. 5). This evidence is outlined in SANDERSON’s monumental work “History through textual criticism” (2001), in particular pp. 2–7, and it is also found in the details concerning the scriptural corpus of the Śaiva Siddhānta listed in GOODALL 2004: xviii–xxxiii.


See SANDERSON 2006. The issue in question concerns the new conception of the initiation ritual within Tantric ritual, where it not only serves to grant access to the religion and its scriptures but also has a transformative function to the extent that through initiation the soul can be directly liberated. Sanderson has shown that passages on the Lākula’s initiation ritual in the *Niśvāsa’s Mukhasūtra* reveal that such groups already practiced some form of transformative initiation ritual of this kind. See *Niśvāsamukha* 4.88d–98. An edition, annotated translation, and study of the *Niśvāsamukha* is KAFLE 2015.

This observation was first made by Dominic Goodall during a joint reading session of the author’s critical edition of ŚDh, chapter 3, during a research stay at the EFEO, Pondicherry, in January 2016. I would like to thank Dominic Goodall for his input and exchange of ideas at the time.
the common dictum śīvaṃ bhutvā śīvaṃ yajet, one must identify with Śiva in order to worship Śiva. While this is usually considered one of the specifically novel Tantric features of ritual technology, the ŠDh already anticipates this in its conceptualisation of the devotee and his practices. Related to this, there is also another concept that is expressed in the ŠDh and that Tantric circles will include in their dictum, namely the terminology of being “a part of Rudra” (rudrāṃśa). In the Tantric world, this term will be used as a designation for either a kind of sādhaka – a Tantric practitioner who aims at attaining supernatural powers (siddhi) – a lower-level initiate (the samayin), or a lay devotee.

Secondly, we have seen how one of the main ritual and spiritual strategies of the ŠDh is to extend practices and values from the ascetic milieu to the domain of the householder. The attainment of liberation or spiritual benefits were now accessible through ritual and no longer required engagement in arduous ascetic or yogic practices, and among spiritual goals the practitioner could choose between enjoyments (bhukti) or liberation (mukti). Precisely the same mechanisms are promoted in Tantric traditions, albeit with an enhanced Tantric ritual technology, and the same duality of bhukti and mukti is promoted as goals unrestrictedly available to the householder practitioner.

Thirdly, as alluded to earlier, Sanderson has shown that part of the success of the Śaiva Tantric traditions was their ability to maintain adherence to the Brahmanical socio-religious order while at the same time transcending it. As we have seen above, precisely this aspect is also characteristic of the ŠDh. Here too, it is possible to maintain one’s socio-religious status according to the Brahmanical order while at the same time enhancing one’s spiritual status by additionally adopting modes of Śaiva worship.

105 See Davies 1991, chapter 2, where he argues that through this ritual identification with Śiva the worshipper continually enacts his liberated state in preparation of his final liberation (e.g., Davies 1991: 83).
106 See Mirnig forthcoming. The term thus features in the pre-tenth-century Saiddhāntika Tantric scripture Kirana and is frequently referred to in Saiddhāntika ritual manual literature from the eleventh century onwards.
107 Some formulations, such as parāparavibhūti (ŠDh 4.10, see above), are paradigmatic to this effect.
Conclusion: the Śivadharma’s socio-religious model and the success of Tantric groups

The new normative model the ŚDh canonised and promoted laid the socio-religious foundations that were conducive to these new players. We have seen how early Tantric groups built on some of the core features of the ŚDh’ teachings, including the notion of embodying the divine in order to worship the divine. As such, the ŚDh’s socio-religious model may constitute an important piece of the puzzle in the formation of Tantric traditions. While evidence from the Niśvāsa suggests that Tantric communities first formed from Atimārgic ascetic circles, it may be that some of the notions in the ŚDh formed important aspects of the emerging Tantric ideology in these early stages, especially in relation to the householder practitioner. Further, we have seen that the ŚDh’s socio-religious model lays the foundations for the participation of officiants pertaining to the Śaivite initiatory traditions in public life, who until then had appeared as rather antinomian groups at the fringes of society. Eventually, it was through the same structures that Tantric groups were successful in taking up important positions in the religio-political landscape of early medieval South Asia. While alignment with the Brahmanical socio-religious order was possible both in the model of the ŚDh and that of Tantric groups, theoretically the social order promoted in those texts could even exist independently of an established Brahmanical substratum. Such ideas would be of potential importance when considering the introduction or adaptation of this religious order in new territories of different socio-religious constitution. We know that the Śaiva religion expanded beyond South Asia into South-East Asia, and in the context of Śaiva Tantric traditions Sanderson has identified the ability to offer socio-religious structures for such new territories as one of the aspects that have led to their success in putting down firm roots throughout the early medieval period (Sanderson 2013). The same potential holds true for the ŚDh with its flexible and adaptable socio-religious model. The ŚDh and its teachings may well have been part of the literary

108 Concrete examples for the interface between Tantric and lay communities are, for instance, found in prescriptions for Tantric postmortem ancestor worship (śrāddha). Here, explicit references show how Tantric priests extended their services to perform śrāddha rituals to lay communities. The prescriptions in the ŚDh, which promote Śaiva Brahmins as well as Śaiva Yogins as suitable receptacles for śrāddha offerings instead of the ordinary Brahmin, as we have seen above, would thus play into the hands of these new Tantric funerary priests.
package, as it were, that travelled with Śaiva propagators who sought to reach into new territories. After all, epigraphical evidence has been identified that suggests that the ŚDh was known in the Khmer kingdom¹⁰⁹ and Campā,¹¹⁰ bearing testimony to the presence of the work as far east as present-day Cambodia and Vietnam.
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Inclusivism revisited:
The worship of other gods in the Śivadharmaśāstra, the Skandapurāṇa, and the Niśvāsamukha

Peter Bisschop

Inclusivism has been famously described by Paul Hacker as a “typically Indian thought form,” defined as “claiming for, and thus including in, one’s own religion what really belongs to an alien sect” (HACKER 1995: 244).\(^1\) The term was used by Hacker in particular, though not exclusively, to characterise certain tendencies of modern Hinduism and to criticise a perceived Hindu rhetoric of tolerance towards other religions. Hacker further added that the inclusivist method “was employed especially by such religious groups as felt themselves inferior to their environment” (HACKER 1995: 245). In his contribution to the volume “Inklusivismus: Eine indische Denkform” (1983), Albrecht Wezler has argued that it may rather reflect a struggle for power between a new and an old form of religion, giving expression to an inversion of power relationships.\(^2\) Such an understanding of inclusivism would make sense in the case of Śaivism, since it appears com-

---

1 See also HACKER 1983: 12: “Inklusivismus bedeutet, daß man erklärt, eine zentrale Vorstellung einer fremden religiösen oder weltanschaulichen Gruppe sei identisch mit dieser oder jener zentralen Vorstellung der Gruppe, zu der man selber gehört. Meistens gehört zum Inklusivismus ausgesprochen oder unausgesprochen die Behauptung, daß das Fremde, in irgendeiner Weise ihm untergeordnet oder unterlegen sei. Ferner wird ein Beweis dafür, daß das Fremde mit dem Eigenen identisch sei, meist nicht unternommen.” For a critical, highly subjective and downright distortive review of Hacker’s scholarship and all scholars following in his wake, see BAGCHEE and ADLURI 2014, who argue that it is contaminated by Hacker’s personal underlying Evangelical motivations.

2 See WEZLER 1983: 90: “(...) daß der ‘Inklusivismus’ als Versuch der Legitimierung wesenhaft darin besteht, daß sich die Minderheit einer ‘neuen’ Glaubensgemeinschaft der Übermacht der etablierten Traditionen dadurch zu erwehren trachtet, daß sie die real gegebenen Machtverhältnisse umkehrt, d.h. für sich selbst den Anspruch auf Höherwertigkeit erhebt und das ‘Alte’ in sich ‘hineinnimmt.’”
paratively late on the scene and as such, perhaps more than others, had to secure itself a position among the dominant religious traditions of the time.

The inclusivist tendencies of Śaivism have been noted by Alexis Sanderson in particular with reference to the Mantramārga:

It elaborated an inclusivist model of revelation that ranked other religious systems as stages of an ascent to liberation in Śaivism, the religion of the king manifest in his initiation, his consecration, and his royal temples, thus mirroring and validating the incorporative structure of the state’s power.\(^3\)

An inclusivist attitude has also been recognised by Judit Törzsök in her article “Icons of Inclusivism” (TÖRZSÖK 2003), in which she identifies an inclusivist model in the manḍalas of early Śaiva Tantras, elaborating on the findings presented in an earlier article by SANDERSON (1986) on the inclusivist manḍalas of the Trika school of Śaivism. These studies use the term inclusivism in a neutral manner, without the ideological connotations of Hacker’s use of the term.

While inclusivist tendencies have been clearly identified in the case of Tantric Śaivism, the traditions of lay Śaivism have received less attention so far.\(^4\) The present paper proposes to examine, through three examples representative of the lay, non-Tantric Śaiva perspective, whether the inclusivist model is limited to Mantramārga Śaivism alone or is in fact representative of a broader line of thinking in Śaivism. It does so by looking at the representation of the worship of other gods than Śiva in three early Śaiva texts: the Śivadharmaśāstra, the Skandapurāṇa, and the Niśvāsamukha.

---

4 Hacker has studied the incorporation of Vaiṣṇava mythology in the Śaiva Purāṇas in his study of Prahlāda (HACKER 1959). On this basis Hacker writes: “Aber immerhin ist mir in denjenigen Stellen śivaitischer Purāṇen, die Gegenstand meiner Untersuchung waren, aufgefallen, daß hier offensichtlich der Śivaismus die unterlegene Religion ist. Wie ich schon sagte, ist der Inklusivismus ein Mittel des Unterlegenen oder des noch Schwachen, des noch in Entwicklung Begriffenen, sich durchzusetzen, sich Geltung zu verschaffen. Die śivaitischen Purāṇen, die ich gesehen habe, machen das deutlich, in manchen Fällen sogar überdeutlich. Die viṣṇuitischen sind ganz anders, sie sind weder inklusivistisch noch tolerant.” (HACKER 1983: 17). This conclusion needs to be reconsidered given that Hacker mainly based himself on Śaiva Purāṇas that can be safely dated to early medieval times, that is to say, a period in Indian history during which Śaivism was actually the dominant party (see SANDERSON 2009).
In varying degrees, the approaches towards other gods in these three texts may be regarded as inclusivist, in the sense that they recognise and teach the worship and existence of other gods but that they do so from a hierarchical perspective, in which the true and ultimate master is Śiva and their power derives from him. The inclusivist stance of early Śaivism may tell us something about the position from which Śaivism started and thus add to a study of Śaivism, and by extension Tantra, in its socio-historical context.

The Śivadharmaśāstra

The Śivadharmaśāstra is the first of what grew to be a corpus of eight texts in total, collectively known as the Śivadharma and transmitted as such in a number of palm-leaf and paper manuscripts from Nepal: 1. Śivadharmaśāstra, 2. Śivadharmottara, 3. Śivadharmasamgraha, 4. Śivopaniṣad, 5. Umāmaheśvarasamvāda, 6. Uttarottaramahāsamvāda, 7. Vṛṣasārasamgraha, and 8. Dharmaputrikā.5 The Śivadharmaśāstra is most probably a product of North India and may be tentatively dated to about the sixth to seventh centuries CE.6 The work consists of twelve chapters in total and is addressed to a community of lay Śiva worshippers, betraying no influence of Tantric teachings. It is specifically concerned with the methods for installing and worshipping Śiva in the form of the līṅga. A characteristic feature of the Śivadharmaśāstra’s teachings is its notion that those who are exclusively devoted to Rudra are veritable Rudras on earth:7

They who always worship Rudra, are no ordinary men (prakṛti-mānuṣa). They are Rudras descended from Rudraloka. There is no doubt about it.8

5 Manuscripts of the first two works also survive outside of Nepal. The transmission of a Śivadharma corpus consisting of eight works appears to be limited to Nepal. For more details, see DE SIMINI 2013: 157–161, who proposes to understand the Nepalese manuscripts as “corpus-organizers.”
6 See BISSCHOP 2014: 139, n. 13, for references regarding different dates that have been suggested for the composition of different parts of the text.
7 On this, see MIRNIG in this volume.
8 ŚiDhŚ 1.16:

\[\text{ye 'rcayanti sadā rudraṃ na te prakṛtimānuṣāḥ |} \\
\text{rudralokāt parihraṣṭāṃ te rudrā nātra samśayaḥ || 16 ||}\]

16ad ] Omitted in P2 • 16a ye 'rcayanti ] C K1 K2 N Ś, arcayanti P1 ; sadā rudraṃ ] C K1 N P1, mahārudra K2, mahārudram Ś • 16c rudralokāt ] C K1 N P1 Ś, rudraloka° K2 • 16d nātra ] K1 K2 N P1 Ś, nānātra C (unmetr.).
We come across references to other gods in the text, but these are as a rule placed in a relation of strict dependence on Śiva. Thus we are taught in two passages that the gods acquired their position as god through worship of different types of liṅgas. The first passage follows after the famous myth about the origin of the liṅga, in which Brahmā and Viṣṇu attempt to find its end, but do not succeed in locating it. After several verses teaching that everything ultimately rests in the liṅga and that by installing a liṅga one installs everything, we are informed of the following:

All quotations of the Śivadharmaśāstra in this article are from my own draft edition of the text. For this I have used six manuscripts and the “edition” of the Śivadharma corpus by NARAHARINATH (1998), which appears to be a transcript of a Nepalese manuscript. I have not referred to the most recent edition by JUGNU & SHARMA (2014), since its readings are practically all identical to my manuscript P1. The manuscripts come from different parts of the Indian subcontinent and thus give us some insight into the transmission of the text, but they reflect only a limited sample of the actual surviving manuscripts. As a general policy I have given preference to the readings of K1, an eleventh-century Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript in good condition written by a careful scribe. I am very grateful to Florinda De Simini for having provided me with colour photographs of K1 and Ś. The list of sigla can be found at the end of this article.

9 For a study and translation of the Liṅgodbhava story of the Śivadharmaśāstra, see KAFLE 2013.

One verse in this section (ŚDhŚ 3.17) deserves special attention because it is quoted in the Buddhist Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra:

ākāśaṁ liṅgam ity āhuḥ prthivī tasya pīṭhikā |
ālayaḥ sarvabhitānāṁ liyānāl liṅgam ucyate || 17 ||

The verse is missing in P2 and Ś due to loss of several pādas in this part of the text. In the Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra the verse is quoted in connection with Mahēśvara’s appearance from Avalokiteśvara’s forehead. Avalokiteśvara predicts that Mahēśvara will be active in the Kali age (text and translation of KVSū 265, 4–6 as given by ELTSCHINGER 2014: 84, n. 198):

bhāvasyasi tvam mahēśvara kaliyuge pratipanne | kaṣṭasattvadātusamutpanna ādideva ākhyāyase svaṁ kārtāram | te sarvasattva bodhimārgena viprahīṇā bhāvyantar Yoga thidgajanesu sattvesu sāṅkhyāṃ kurvanti || ākāśaṁ liṅgam ity āhuḥ prthivī tasya pīṭhikā | ālayaḥ sarvabhitānāṁ liyānāl liṅgam ucyate ||

O Mahēśvara, you will be [active] when the Kaliyuga arrives. Born as the foremost of the gods in the realm of suffering beings, you will be called the creator and the agent [of the world]. All beings who hold the following discourse to/among ordinary people will be deprived of the path to enlightenment: “It is said that space is [Mahēśvara’s] liṅga, [and that] the earth is [his] pedestal; it is the receptacle of all beings, [and it is] because [they] merge/fuse [into it that it] is called liṅga.”
• Brahmā acquired the state of Brahmā by worshipping a stone (śailamaya) liṅga.
• Indra acquired the state of Indra by worshipping a crystal (manimaya) liṅga.
• Dhanada (Kubera) acquired the state of Dhanada by worshipping a golden (hemamaya) liṅga.
• The Viṣṇudevas acquired the state of Viṣṇudevas (viśvatva) by worshipping a silver (raupya) liṅga.
• Vāyu acquired the state of Vāyu by worshipping a brass (pittalasambhava) liṅga.
• Viṣṇu acquired the state of Viṣṇu by worshipping a sapphire (indranilamaya) liṅga.
• The Vasus acquired the state of Vasus by worshipping a bell-metal (kāmsika) liṅga.
• The two Aśvins acquired the state of Aśvins by worshipping an earthern (pārthiva) liṅga.

Following a lead by DANIELLOU (1960: 352), who quotes the verse and attributes it to “the Skandapurāṇa,” REGAMEY (1971: 431, n. 49) and STUDHOLME (2002: 28–29) searched in vain in editions of the Skandapurāṇa to trace it. We can now safely say that the Kāraṇḍavyūha most probably quotes it from the Śivadharmaśāstra, whose main teaching is, after all, liṅga worship. This quotation then would have implications for the dating of the text and attest to the work’s impact on non-Śaiva communities. ELTSCHINGER observes that this passage is not represented in the Gilgit manuscripts of the Kāraṇḍavyūha, because of lack of folios, but he argues that “considering that the only known significant divergence between the Nepali and the Gilgit version concerns a very neatly delineated section (Sarvanivaṇaviṣkambhīn’s quest for the śaḍaḵṣaṇī vidyā), I see no compelling reason to doubt the presence of this passage in the textual tradition reflected in the Gilgit manuscripts” (ELTSCHINGER 2014: 84, n. 198). This would give us an ante quem date of 630 CE for this verse, as the two Gilgit manuscripts are dated to before 630 CE (METTE 1997: 7, following the dating of von Hinüber). It would then most probably have been in existence by the end of the sixth century, if not earlier. Interestingly, the Kāraṇḍavyūha adopts a strong inclusivist approach to the “Hindu” gods (Candra, Āditya, Mahēśvara, Brahmā, Nārāyaṇa, Sarasvatī, Vāyu (?), Dharaṇī (= Prthivī), and Varuṇa), presenting them as having originated from different body parts of Avalokiteśvara: cakṣuṣoṣ candraďitīyām utpannaun lalāṭīn maheśvarah, skandhebhīyo brahmādayah, hṛdayān nārāyanaḥ, dāṃstrābhyām sarasvatī, mukhato vāyavo jātāḥ, dharaṇī pādābhīyāṁ, varuṇaḥ codarāt (KVSii 265, 1–3). STUDHOLME (2002: 37–41), following the suggestion by REGAMEY (1971: 429), argues that this idea was modelled on the Ṛgvedic “Puruṣasūkta.”
• Varuṇa acquired the state of Varuṇa by worshipping a quartz (ṣphāṭika) liṅga.
• Agni acquired the state of Agni by worshipping a jewel (ratnamaya) liṅga.
• Sūrya acquired the state of Sūrya by worshipping a copper (tāmra) liṅga.
• The Buddha acquired the state of Buddha by worshipping a golden (jambūnādamaṇya) liṅga.
• The Arhat acquired the state of Arhat by worshipping a flower liṅga (puspaliṅga).
• Soma acquired the state of Soma by worshipping a pearl (muktāphala) liṅga.11

11 ŚiDiḥṣ 3.20–33:
brahmā pājaya nityaṃ liṅgaṃ śailamayaṃ śubham || 20 ||
tasya sampājaṇāt tena prāptaṃ brahmaṇavam uttamam || 20 ||
śakro ’pi devarājendro liṅgaṃ maṇimayaṃ śubham || 21 ||
bhaktyā pājaya nityaṃ tenendratvam avāpa saḥ || 21 ||
liṅgaṃ hemamayaṃ kāntaṃ dhanado ’rcayate saḍā || 22 ||
tenāsau dhanado devo dhanadatvam avāptavān || 22 ||
vīṣve devā mahāmāno raupyaṃ liṅgaṃ manoharam || 23 ||
yajanti vidhivad bhaktyā tena viśvatvam āpnuvan || 23 ||
vāyuḥ pājaya bhaktyā liṅgaṃ pittalasamḥavam || 24 ||
vāyuṭaṃ prāptavān tena anaupamyagunānvitam || 24 ||
indraṇīmayaṃ liṅgaṃ viṣṇur arcayate saḍā || 25 ||
viṣṇutvam prāptavān tena adhutaikasanaṇānam || 25 ||
vāsuḥ kāṃśikāṃ liṅgaṃ pājantyā svahā || 25 ||
prāptāḥ tena mahāmāno vasuṃ vam sumahodayam || 26 ||
asvinau pārthivam liṅgaṃ pājayaṇau vīdhānataḥ || 27 ||
tena tāv aśvinau devau divyadehamgatāv ubhau || 27 ||
ṣphāṭikāṃ nirmalaṃ liṅgaṃ varuṇo ’rcayate saḍā || 28 ||
varuṇatvam hi samprāptaṃ tena vṛddhīvalānvitam || 28 ||
liṅgaṃ ratnamayaṃ puṇyam agnir yajati bhāvitaḥ || 28 ||
agnitvam prāptavān tena tejorūpaṃ aninditam || 29 ||
tāmrāliṅgāṃ sadākālaṃ bhaktyā devo devvākaraḥ || 29 ||
trisākālayanatā tena prāptaṃ sūryatvam uttamam || 30 ||
buddhenāpy arcitam liṅgaṃ jambūnādamaṇyaṃ śubham || 30 ||
tenā buddhatvam āpnoti sadāśāntam avasthitam || 31 ||
ārhatas tu sadākālaṃ puspaliṅgācanaṇāḥ param || 32 ||
tenārhatvam avāpnoti yogam cāpi sudurlabham || 32 ||
mukṭāphalaṃyaṃ liṅgaṃ somāḥ pājaya te sadā || 33 ||
tenā somo ’pi samprāptaḥ somatvāṃ satatojjvalam || 33 ||
20ab J These and the previous pādas are omitted in Ś • 20c sampuṇaṁ tena J Ś • 21c bhaktā pūjayaṁ nityaṃ ] C K1 K2 N, apāya yadā bhaktāḥ Ś, keśvā pūjayaṁ nityaṃ P1, – tyā pūjayaṁ nityaṃ P2 • 21d tenendratram avāpa saḥ ] C K1 K2o, tenendram avāpa saḥ K2o (unmetr.), tenendratram avāpa sa N, tadā sakratram āpnuvāḥ Ś, tena sakratram āpṇavāḥ P1 P2 • 22a hema* ] Ś, hainā P2 • 22b dhanado ‘ṛcchate sadā Ś, dhanadoṛcchate sadā Y Ş • 22d avāpavāḥ ] C K1 K2 N P1, avāpavyāyā Ś, – – pataṁ P2 • 23b raṇyaḥ ] Ś, mano- haram ] C K1 K2 P2, mano-haramam N Ş • 23c yajanti vidhivat bhakteśaḥ ] C K1 N, apājaya yadā bhaktāḥ Ś, yajante vidhivat tena P1, yajante vidhivat bhakteśaḥ P2 • 23d tena visvavatām āpṇavāḥ ] K1 K2 N, tena visvavatām āpṇavāḥ C, visvavedatram āpṇavāḥ P1 Ś, tena visvavatām – – P2 • 24a vāyuḥ pūjayaṁ bhakteśaḥ ] C K1 K2c N P1, vāyuḥ pūjayaṁ bhakteśaḥ K2c, apāya yadā vāyuṛ Ś, – – pūjayaṁ bhakteśaḥ P2 • 24b ṽambhavam ] Ś, ‘jam subham P1 • 24c prāptaṁ tena ] C K1 N, tena sampratāṁ K2 ṽ P1 P2 • 24d nauṇyamguṇānvītaṁ ] C K1 N, nauṇyagunavīvaham K2, nauṇyagunavīvaham ṽ, nauṇyagunavīvaham P1 P2 • 25a–d J This verse occurs after 21 in P1 • 25b visuṇ vīrarcayate sadā ] C K1 K2 N, visuṇ yat samapuṇaṁ ṃat Ś, vṛṣuḥ pūjayaṁ sadā P1 P2 • 25c visuṇatvam prāptaṁ tena ] Ś, samāsāsāda visuṇatvam Ś • 25d abdhutaikasanaṁtanam ] C K1, arcitena sanātanam K2 N, abdhutaikasanaṁtanam Ś, so ‘adhutaikasanaṁtanam P1, so tihutaikasanaṁtanam P2 • 26a vasaṇāḥ ] Ś, vasubhiḥ Ś ; kāṃṣikam liṅgām ] C K2 P2, kāṃṣikam liṅgām K1, kāṃṣikam liṅgām N, kāṃṣyaṁ liṅgāṁ tu Ś, kṣaṇikam liṅgāṁ P1 • 26b pūjayaṁ vidhānaṁ Ś, pūjitam samvidhānaṁ Ś • 26cd ] C K1 K2 N P1, mahāṁabhāsī tataḥ prāptaṁ vasubhiḥ tair mahodayaṁ Ś, prāptaṁ tena mahāṁabho vasuṁvat ca mahodayaṁ P2 • 27a aśvinā ] Ś, aśvībhāyaṁ Ś • 27b pujyaṁtuyā ] C N P1 P2, pujyaṁtuyā K1, pujyaṁtuyā K2, pujyaṁtuyāś P2 • 27d divyadehaṁgapādāv ] K1 N, divyadehaṁgapādāv K2, divyadehaṁgapādāv C, divyadehaṁgapādāv P1 Ś, divyām dehaṁgapādāv P2 • 28a sphaṭikām ] Ś, sphaṭikām N : nirmalam liṅgām ] Ś, siddhaṁliṅgām tu Ś • 28b varṇaṁ ‘ṛcchate sadā ] Ś, varṇaṁ ‘ṛcchate sadā P2 • 28c varṇaṁvat harm prāptaṁ ] C K1 K2 N P1, varṇaṁvat tadā prāptaṁ Ś, tena tad varṇaṁvat harm P2 • 28d tena vṛdhiḥalāṅvītaṁ ] C K1 K2 N, teneha vibhāvīnaḥ ś, tena rdhyā samanvītaṁ P1, prāptaṁ rdhyā samanvītaṁ P2 • 29a liṅgāṁ ratnaṁvayam puyagam ] C K1 K2 N, bhāvīnāṁgīnaṁ liṅgāṁ Ś, liṅgāṁ annamvayam puyagam P1 P2 • 30b agnir yajati bhāvītaḥ ] C K1 K2 N P1, piṣṭam annamvayam yadā ś, agnir abhyarca bhāvītaḥ P2 • 29c–32d Omitted in P2 • 32c prāptaṁ tena ] C K1 K2 N P1, tena sampratāṁ Ś • 29d tejorāpam aninditam ] C K1 N, tejorāpam samanvītaṁ K2 P1 ṽ • 30a tāmra*- ] C K1 K2 N P1, tāmram Ś • 30c triṣkālayaṇāṁtena ] C K1, triṣkālayaṇāṁtena C*, triṣkālaṁ iṣṭaṁ tena C*, arcanaṁ sadākāḷam K2, triṣkālaṁ iṣṭaṁ tena P1, triṣkālaṁ iṣṭayate tena P1, atantyānaḥ ca sadā Ś • 31–32 ] Omitted in P1, while Ś has these verses after 33 • 31a buddhaṁvyāṁcīrtam ] C K1 N, buddhaṁvyāṁcīrtam Ś • 31b jambu* ] C K1 K2 Ś, jambu* ] C K1 N, jambu* ] C K1 N, buddhaṁvyāṁpāṇas K2, buddhaṁvyāṁpāṇas Ś • 31d avasītaṁ ] C K1 N, manahṣṭhitam Ś • 32a ārhatas tu sadākālaṁ ] K1 N, ārhatas tu sadākālaṁ C, aharntas ca sadākālaṁ K2, arhadbhis sarvadā bhaktāḥ Ś •
The text continues to state that the Nāgas, the Rākṣasas, the Piśācas, the Guhyakas, and the Mātrṣ each attained the highest position by worshipping liṅgas made of different materials as well (Śivadharmaśāstra 3.34–39). It is noteworthy that the two verses on the Buddha and Arhat are missing in the manuscript from Pondicherry (P1), while the Srinagar manuscript (Ś) has them after Śūrya and Soma. Whether this is due to accidental loss of text or in fact represents an early addition in the transmission of the text cannot be said with certainty at this state of research, but it attests to the perceived boundaries of Brahmanical religion, which would not normally include the spiritual masters of the Buddhist and Jaina communities. This is no isolated case, for, as will be discussed below, there is another instance in the Śivadharmaśāstra where references to the Buddha and the Arhat appear to have been added in the transmission of the text.

I have referred to this list in all its repetitiveness because it reflects, in my opinion, a clear strategy to drive home the idea of the utter dependence of all the gods on the worship of the liṅga. A second passage expressing a similar idea occurs in chapter 9, following a description of the worship of the liṅga:

By this precept (vidhi) all the gods reached the state of godhead (devatva). Devī acquired the state of Devī, Guha acquired the state of Skanda, Brahmā acquired the state of Brahī, Viṣṇu acquired the state of Viṣṇu, Indra acquired the state of Devarāja, the Gaṇas

---

32b puspaliṅgārcanāḥ | C K1 K2 N, puspār liṅgārcanaṃ Ś • 32c tenārhatvam avāpnoti | C K1 N, tenārhatatvasamprāpto K2, tenārhatvam samāsādyya Ś • 32d yogam cāpi sudurlabham | C K1 K2 N, yogah śāntah sudurlabhaḥ Ś • 33cd tena somo ‘pi samprāptah somatvaḥ | C K1 N P1 P2, tenāsau so pi somatvaṃ prāptavān K2, tena sampiṣṭenāptam somatvaḥ Ś • 33d satatojjvalam | Ś, mahad uttamam Ś.

12 Note that the formulations relating to the worship by the Buddha and the Arhat are also slightly different. While the text tends to use present tense to refer to the continuous worship by the gods and past participle or perfect to refer to the acquiring of their respective positions, for the Buddha and the Arhat we find past tense used to refer to their worship (indicating that they are no longer alive?) and present tense to refer to the acquiring of their respective positions.

13 It would require more research into the surviving manuscripts and a proper understanding of their transmission.
acquired the state of Gaṇa, the sages obtained liberation, and the Mothers Motherhood.\textsuperscript{14}

While these passages convey the idea that all the gods obtained their respective position by worship of the linga, they do not teach the worship of the gods themselves. One can, however, infer their relatively high status at the time of composition of the text from the fact that they need to be mentioned at all. A different case is chapter 6 of the text.

This chapter is the lengthiest of the entire text, covering more than 250 verses, and consists of a long invocation of all cosmic powers and deities for appeasement (śāntī). The extensive mantra takes us from the inner circle around Mahēśvara, which includes Nandiṣa, Vināyaka, Mahākāla, Ambikā, Mahāmahishāmadanī, Bhrīgiriṇī, and Caṇḍēśvara, to Brahmā and Viṣṇu, followed by the Mothers, to a host of other deities and powers.\textsuperscript{15} It is a veritable inventory of cosmic power and gives a good impression of the pantheon of gods at the time. Each god is invoked in his or her own sphere and their worship is recognised with a standard formula asking for peace. Similar invocations are known from other sources, such as the Brhatsaṃhitā (BrŚ 48.55–70) and the Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa (ViDhP 2.22), but what distinguishes this mahāśānti-mantra from others is not only its wealth of detail, but in particular a tendency conforming to what we

\textsuperscript{14} ŚiDḥŚ 9.16–17:

\begin{verbatim}
anena vidhinā devāḥ sarvē devatvam āgatāḥ |
   devī devī vam āpamnā guhāḥ skandatvam āgatāḥ || 16 ||
brahmā brahmvatvam āpamno viṣṇur viṣṇatvam āgatāḥ |
   indraś ca devarājaḥvam ganyāś ca gaṇaṭām gatāḥ |
   munayo mokṣam āpamnā mātaro mārṭinī tathā || 17 ||
\end{verbatim}

16a devāḥ ] K1 N P1 P2 Š, sammyak C, sammyak K2 • 16b sarvē devatvam āgatāḥ ] K1 K2 N P1 P2, sarvadevatvam āgatāḥ C, sarvadevatvam āgatāḥ Š • 16cd–17ef ] These eight pādas are omitted in K2 • 16cd ] These two pādas are omitted in Š • 16d guhāḥ ] K1 N P1 P2, guhāya C ; āgatāḥ ] K1 N P1 P2, āgatāḥ C • 17b viṣṇur ] K1 N Š, harir C P1 P2 ; āgatāḥ ] C N P1 P2 Š, āgatāḥ K1 • After this P1 repeats 16ab • 17c indraś ca devarājaḥvam ] K1 N P1 P2 Š, indroś ca devarājaḥvam C • 17d ganyāś ca gaṇaṭām gatāḥ ] C K1 N P1 P2, ganeśasi ca gaṇeśatāṁ Š • 17ef ] These two pādas are omitted in C, P1 and P2, while Š has instead: nandī caiva viḍhīm kṛtvā nanditvam samupāgatāḥ • 17f tathā ] K1, gatāḥ N.

\textsuperscript{15} For an introduction to this chapter and an overview of the various gods invoked, see Bisschop 2014. See now also Bisschop 2019, for an edition, translation and study of the chapter.
have already identified so far. Almost each and every deity is invoked, at
the end of their invocation, with one or more adjective expressing their
devotion to Śiva or Rudra. A significant exception concerns the gods that
belong to the inner circle. Among these, only Nandīśa and Bhṛṅgiṇī re-
ceive such an adjective. Thus Nandīśa is described as “constantly devoted
to the worship of Śiva, solely intent upon contemplation of Śiva” (ŚiDhŚ
6.14ab: śivārcananarparo niyam śivadhyaṇaikatatparah),\(^{16}\) while Bhṛṅgiṇī is
said to be “the son of Rudra, a great hero, whose mind is solely given to
Rudra” (ŚiDhŚ 6.25ab: rudrāmaṇo mahāvīrō rudraikāhitamānasah).\(^{17}\)

The absence of these adjectives in the case of the other members of
Śiva’s inner circle suggests that they were held to be so close to Śiva that
there was no need to make their devotion to Śiva explicit.\(^{18}\) The moment
the mantra turns to other deities in the pantheon, however, the use of ad-
jectives expressing their devotion is fairly consistent and conspicuous. Two
examples may suffice: Brahmā, who is described as “seated on a lotus,
resembling a lotus, with four lotus-heads, bearing a water-jar, fortunate,
worshipped by gods and Gandharvas,” is said to be “solely intent upon
contemplation of Śiva” (śivadhyaṇaikatatpara) and “steeped in the reality
of Śiva” (śivasadbhāvabhaṅvita),\(^{19}\) while Viṣṇu, who is “seated on Garuḍa,

\(^{16}\) This is the reading of K1, K2 and N. P1 has: śivadhyaṇaikaparāmaṇa śivabhā-
kitīparāiyanaḥ. These two pādas are missing in C, P2, and Š.

\(^{17}\) 25a rudrāmaṇo | \(\Sigma\), rudrāmaṇa C : mahāvīrō | C K1 N Š, rudrabhakto P1 •
25b rudraikāhita° | K1 N, rudraikagato° C K2 P1 P2 Š.

\(^{18}\) Some adjectives express a family relation: Kārttikeya (kṛttikomāgni-
rudrāṇgasiṣkomudbhiṣah surācitaḥ, ŚiDhŚ 6.11cd); Vināyaka (rudrasya tanayo devo
nāyako 'tha vināyakah, ŚiDhŚ 6.17cd). On the significance of these epithets expres-
sing a family relation of Vināyaka and Bhṛṅgiṇī, see BISSCHOP 2010: 243–246.

\(^{19}\) ŚiDhŚ 6.28–29:

padmāsanah padmanībhaś catvaradanapanśkapakah |
kaṇḍuludharah śrīmān devagandharvapūjitah || 28 ||
śivadhyaṇaikaparāmaṇa śivasadbhāvabhavītah |
brahmāśabdena divyena brahmā śaṁtiṃ karotu me || 29 ||

28a padmāsanah padmanībhaś | C K1 K2° N P1 P2, padmāsana padmanībhaś
K2° (unmetr.), padmāsan mahāpadmaś Š • 28b paṇkajah | \(\Sigma\), paṇkajā C • 28c
dharam C • 28d deva° | \(\Sigma\), siddha° P2 • 29a śiva° | \(\Sigma\), śive N ;
parāmaṇa | C K1 K2 N, nirataḥ Š P1 P2 • 29b śivasadbhāvabhavītah | K1 K2 N Š
P1, śivaṃ saṁbhāvabhavīnāḥ C, śivasadbhāvakovīdaḥ P2 • 29c divyena | \(\Sigma\), davye-
na C • 29d brahma | K1 Š P1 P2, brāhma° C, brahma K2 N ; śaṁtiṃ | \(\Sigma\), śaṁti C.
with four arms, bearing conch, discus, and maze, dark, dressed in yellow clothes, of great power and strength,” is said to be “endowed with the favour of Śiva” (śivaprasādasamppana) and “engaged in contemplation of Śiva” (śivadhyānaparāyāṇa). While this remains a consistent feature of the mantra, the author has introduced a great variety of adjectives to express the same idea, which again illustrates that this was central to the mantra’s composition. I have drawn up the following inventory, organised around different names of Śiva, just to give the general idea.

- Śiva: śivabhakta (104c, 106c, 107c, 114c, 184c, 204a, 211a, 214c), śive bhakta (108c, 118c), śivabhaktipara (67c, 136a), śivabha-ktiparāyaṇa (148f), śivabhaktisamanvita (80b), śivabhaktisamutsuka (89d), śivācanarata (40a, 117c), śivācanapara (14a, 147c, 156c), śivapūjapara (119c, 198c) śivapūjāparāyaṇa (34b, 148d, 204b), śivapūjāsamudyukta (69c, 71c, 75c, 86c), śivapūjāsamutsuka (211b), śivapūjārcane rata (111d, 211d), śivapūjājapodyukta (83c), śivadhyānaparāyaṇa (31b), śivadhyānaikatapara (14b), śivadhyānaikaparama (29a), śivadhyānaikamānas (147d, 190d), śivadhyānena sampanna (80a), śivadhyānārcanodyukta (155c),

---

20 ŚiDhŚ 6.30–32:
	tārksīyāsanaś caturbāhuḥ śaṅkhacakra gadādharah |
	śyāmāḥ pīṭāmbaradharo mahābālaparākramah || 30 ||
	yaṁdehottamo devo mādhavo madhusūdanah |
	śivaprasādasampannaś śivadhyānaparāyaṇaḥ || 31 ||
	sarvapāpapramāthahakaḥ sarvāsurānikṛntakah |
sarvadā śaṁtabhōvena viśnuḥ śaṁtiḥ karotu me || 32 ||

30a tārksīyāsanaḥ | C K1 K2 P1 P2, tārksīsanaś N, tārksyārūḍhaḥ Ś • 30b
gadādharah | Σ, “gajādharo C • 30c “radharo | Σ, “rādhāro C • 30d mahābala- |
parākramah | K1 K2 N Ś, mahābālaparākramāṃ C, vanamālāvibhūṣiṇaḥ P1 P2 • 31a
dehottamo | K1 K2 N Ś, “devottamo C P1 P2 • 31c “prasadāsapampanaḥ | K1 K2 N Ś |
P2, “prasādasampannaḥ C, “prānānaparāmāḥ P1 • 31d “dhyānaparāyaṇah | Σ, |
dhīyaṇaṭatpataḥ P1 • 32a sarvapāpapramāthahakaḥ | K1, sarvapāpapramastāhōno C, |
sarvapāpapramāthakah N, sarvapāpaprasamah K2 Ś, śivācanaparo nityaṁ P1, |
sīvācanaṣīrāṃ P2 • 32bc Omitted in C K2 P1 P2 Ś • 32d viṣṇu | Σ, viṣṇu |
K2 ; śaṁtiḥ | Σ, śaṁti C.

21 Reference is made to the stem ending of the adjectives. The verse numbers and readings refer to my draft edition of Śivadharmasāstra 6. I do not report variants in this list.
śivadhyātr (204a), śivapadārcanapara (150c), śivapāḍārcane rata (167b, 190b), śivapāḍābjiṣṭapāja (179b), śivaikāḥitaṁānasa (40b, 92b), śivapranāmaparama (80c), śivasmaranabhāvita (83d), śivasadbhāvabhāvita (29b, 162b, 187d), śivaprasādasampanna (31a, 152c, 204c), śivadharmaparāyaṇa (86b), śivatejaḥsāmyuktaka (126e), śivājñānuvidhāya (132f, 136b, 151f, 235b), śivacodita (142d).

- Rudra: rudrabhakta (38a, 52a), rudrabhaktiyuta (206d), rudrārcanapara (105c, 192c), rudrārcanarata (38b, 57a, 89b), rudrārcanasāmyukta (206c), rudrārcāḥitaṁānasa (52b), rudrārcanaparodyukta (196c), rudrapūjāpara (169b, 208c, 215c), rudrapūjārcane rata (220b), rudraprānāmāmanasa (59c), rudraprāṇānārata (220a), rudrapranāmaparama (206c), rudraparāyaṇa (217d), rudraikāḥitacetaskā (61c, 220c), rudraikāḥitāmānamasa (25b), rudrapradhānānirata (63c), rudrapāḍārcane saktā (183b).

- Other names: haraparāyaṇa (181b), harapāḍārca (202c), harapāḍārcane rata (98b, 175b, 194b), harapāḍānanatottama (194d), haradhyānaikaparama (194c), harārcanapara (200c), mahādevārcane saktā (136a), mahādevānubhāvita (136b), maheśvaraparā (158a), maheśapāḍāpāja (158b), maheśārcanabhāvita (122b), paramesārccanarata (65c), paramēsvarabhāvita (95b), īśānārca-natapara (115d), paśupater nata (177b).

- Special constructions: arcayanti sadā śivam (44b), śivaṃ sampūjya yatnena (67c), arcayanti sadākālam devam tribhuvaneśvaram (141cd), īśānāṃ pūjayanty etāḥ sarvakālam subhāvītāḥ (145ab), pūjāyataḥ sadā śivam (149d), pūjāyanti sadākālaṃ rudraṃ bhuvānāyakam (151cd), hājaśkeśvarādevasya nityāṃ pūjāparāyaṇaḥ (160cd), bhāveṇa ca parenāśu yajante sarvadā śivam (164ab), sarvābhūta-patīṁ devaṃ parameśaṃ maheśvaram, pūjāyanti sadā nadyaḥ (187ac).

This list of adjectives clearly reflects a hierarchical and inclusivist model, in which all and everything is dependent upon Śiva. The chapter ends with a jaya invocation to Śiva (ŚīDhŚ 6.236–242). The final epithet in this section once again reminds us that he is the object of praise of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Indra (ŚīDhŚ 6.242c brahmavīṣṇuvindravandāyā). The hierarchical
model underlying this mantra perfectly mirrors that of early medieval kingship, which involves many types of sāmantas all empowered by their loyalty and devotion to the supreme ruler. This shared model, as Sanderson has argued, may well have been one of the keys to the success of Śaivism and its popularity among early medieval rulers (SANDERSON 2009). It comes as no surprise to encounter it here in the context of a sāntī invocation that played a prominent role in ritual kingship.

As before, some manuscripts expand the pantheon to include also the heads of Buddhism and Jainism. In these manuscripts we come across a couple of verses that invoke the Arhat and the Buddha, again followed by heads of Buddhism and Jainism. In these manuscripts we come across a no surprise to encounter it here in the context of a its popularity among early medieval rulers (argued, may well have been one of the keys to the success of Śaivism and its popularity among early medieval rulers (SANDERSON 2009). It comes as no surprise to encounter it here in the context of a sāntī invocation that played a prominent role in ritual kingship.

These verses are followed in N and Ś by two more additional invocations, to Vi-jāyā and cows:

\[
\text{piñavarṇena dehena hārena suvicitrinā} \\
\text{sarvāṅgasundarī devī vijayā jayakārinī} \\
\text{sīvārcanarātā nityam śivapījaparāyaṇā} \\
\text{dharitrī lokamātā ca nityam rakṣām karotu me} \\
\text{kṣrodād utthītā gāvo lokām hitakāmyā} \\
\text{piṇayanti sadā devān viprāmś caiva viśesatah} \\
\text{nityam tu devatāmānaḥ kurvantu mama sāntikam} \\
\text{5c devī} \] Ś, devī N \text{• 5d} \] N, jayā vijayakānksīnī \[Ś \text{• 6a pājā} \] Ś, jāpya N \text{• 7a utthītā} \] Ś, utthito N \text{• 7d viprāṃś} \] N, viprāŚ \text{• 7e tu} \] N, ca Ś.

---

22 After ŚīDhŚ 6.32d (in N and Ś, but not in C, K1, K2, P1, and P2):

\[
\text{arhaṇ devaḥ sāntarāpi piñchakaṇḍukapānīkaḥ} \\
\text{digvāśa malapakasā ca saumyacittā samāhitā} \] 1 \|
\text{śāyataḥ śivajñānaikacintakah} \\
\text{sāntim karotu me sāntah śivayogena bhāvitaḥ} \] 2 \|
\text{jitendriyaḥ samādhiṣṭaḥ pātračivaśabāḥṣṭaḥ} \\
\text{varadābhayapāniś ca jñānādhyānanarātah sadā} \] 3 \|
\text{ṣaṭṣirasamāyuktah śivajñānapārayaḥ} \\
\text{sāntim karotu me buddhaḥ sarvasattvahite rataḥ} \] 4 \|
\text{1aḥ} \] Ś, ārhaṇaḥ sāntacetasadvīśāman viśayātaḥ N \text{• 1c digvāśa malapakasā} \] N, digvāśaḥ krttivāsā Ś \text{• 1d cittaḥ} \] Ś, citta N \text{• 2a samyṛtā} \] Ś, samvartta\text{°} N \text{• 2d “yogena bhāvitaḥ} \] N, jñānaikatāṁviṣṭā Ś \text{• 3b “bhāṣṭitaḥ} \] Ś, “bhāṣṭitaḥ N \text{• 4a “ṣaṭṣirasamāyuktah} \] Ś, “ṣaṭṣiḥ sadāyuktah N \text{• 4b “jñānapārayaḥ} \] Ś, “jñānaḥ bhāvitaḥ N \text{• 4c buddhaḥ} \] conj., deva N, baudhāḥ Ś.

These verses are followed in N and Ś by two more additional invocations, to Vi-jāyā and cows:
these additions were made. They express a more overarching inclusivist model that also incorporates Buddhism and Jainism into the fold.

The Skandapurāṇa

The early Skandapurāṇa, although it likewise addresses the Śaiva laity, is a text with a very different character.23 It is a Purāṇa, whose main framework of narratives is mythological, and it is as such within the narration of myth cycles that we come across references to other gods. The Skandapurāṇa has less to say on their actual worship, although a number of myths clearly indicate an attempt to take up position against another religious tradition, most notably Vaiṣṇavism. There are no references to Buddhism or Jainism in the text.

A good example expressing the competition between Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism is the myth of Kṣupā and Dadhīca (SP 31). It starts with a dispute between Kṣupa, a devotee of Viṣṇu, and Dadhīca, a devotee of Śiva, about whether the Kṣattra or the Brahman is supreme. A battle ensues, in which Dadhīca proves victorious, even when he comes under the attack of Viṣṇu himself. He is after all protected by Śiva. As so often in the Skandapurāṇa, the story is told to extoll the holiness of a particular sacred site, in this case the Śaiva site of Sthāneśvara (Thanesar), said to be the place where the enmity between Kṣupa and Dadhīca was stopped (sthita).24 Stories such as this may well reflect actual, historical struggles between different religious communities. Rather than inclusivist, this myth suggests an antagonistic agenda of worship of Śiva to the exclusion of all other gods. However, we come across several passages in the text that indicate a more inclusivist model. Thus it is said that Śiva granted half of his body to Viṣṇu, creating the Hari-Hara or Viṣṇu-Śaṃkara form, and that one who

23 For a recent historical study of the Skandapurāṇa, situating the text in sixth-to-seventh century North India, see Bakker 2014.

24 SP 31.105–106:

dadhīca uvāca

yasmāt sthitam idam vairam varadānāt tava prabho |

ihā tasmāt tava sthānam nāmnaitena bhavaty aja || 105 ||

deva uvāca

sthāneśvaram iti khyātam nāmnaitat sthānam uttamam |

bhavit kroṣaparyantam nānāpuṣpalatākulaṃ || 106 ||

See Bakker 2007 for the historical connections between Sthāneśvara (= Thanesar) and Pāṣupata Śaivism.
worships Śiva-Viṣṇu will reach the highest goal.25 The hierarchical model is obvious: it is Śiva who grants Viṣṇu half of his body and not the other way around.

Another case concerned with Śiva’s relation to Viṣṇu within a geographically defined area is the conclusion of the myth about the destruction of Dakṣa’s sacrifice, which ends in a unique manner in the Skandapurāṇa. After Dakṣa’s sacrifice has been destroyed, Śiva proceeds to Mount Mandara and is followed by Viṣṇu and Brahmā. Not far from Bhadresvāra,26 the place where he sets off, he tells Viṣṇu to stop. Viṣṇu does so, while bowing to the lord’s feet and hanging onto the branch of a mango tree (āmra). The place where this event took place is called Kubjā.27 The site can be identified at the confluence of the Candrabhāgā and Gaṅgā rivers in Rishikesh and still has an old Viṣṇu temple (the Bharata Mandir). The tradition about Kubjā is also known from local sources and hints at an old centre of Viṣṇu worship.

---

25 SP121.20–21:  
\textit{tasya devah svayaṁ śūlī tuṣṭaḥ prekṣya tathāvidhām} |  
\textit{śārīrārdhaṁ dadau tasmāi tad abhūd viṣṇuoṣṭhakaram} || 20 ||  
\textit{ya imāṁ śūlīyaṁ martyaḥ sadā parvasu parvasu} |  
\textit{arcaṁ varcya chivaṁśnuṁ ca sa gacchet paramāṁ gatīṁ} || 21 ||  
See also SP 21.37ab (in a hymn of praise): \textit{viṣṇor dehārdhadattāya tasyaiva va-radāya ca} .

26 Bhadresvara is the place from where Śiva and Pārvatī were watching the destruction of Śiva’s sacrifice by Haribhadra, Bhadrakāli, and the Gaṇas, also referred to as the hermitage of Raibhya (Raibhyāśrama). For more details see Bakker 2014: 174–181, who identifies it with the archaeological site “Viśrabhadra,” “on the high bank of the Rambhā, near its confluence with the Gaṅgā […] 20 km northeast of the Dakṣeśvara temple, i.e. Kanakhala, the spot where Dakṣa’s sacrifice is supposed to have taken place” (Bakker 2014: 178).

27 SP 32.143–147:  
\textit{evam astv iti sa procya mandaram cārupandaram} |  
\textit{jagāma bhagavāṁ charvaḥ soma gaṇaśatair vṛtāḥ} || 143 ||  
\textit{devāpi raññā sahitās tasmin sthāne yathāsukham} |  
\textit{tasihur brahmā ca viṣṇuḥ ca jagmatur devapṛṣṭhataḥ} || 144 ||  
\textit{sa gatvā stokam adhivānām ubhābhḤyōṁ sahitāḥ prabhuḥ} |  
\textit{nātiṣtāre tataḥ prāha tiṣṭha viṣṇo mahābala} || 145 ||  
\textit{yasmād āṁram samālambya tasmin deve śtīto hariḥ} |  
\textit{nirikṣaṁśaṁ deveśaṁ deśas tasmād abhūd asau} || 146 ||  
\textit{kubjāmāra iti khyāto viṣṇoḥ kṣetraṁ samṛddhitam} |  
\textit{puṣyaṁ nivartanāṁ aṣṭau gosahasraphalapradam} || 147 ||
The *Skandapurāṇa* appears to acknowledge this, but explains its existence through reference to the destruction of Dakṣa’s sacrifice and thus incorporates a contemporary local site of Viṣṇu worship within its own inclusivist narrative.28

Throughout the text, the other gods are depicted in a position of complete dependence upon Śiva. This is expressed for example in several cases in the narrative, where they form part of or are incorporated in Śiva’s body. And while the existence of Viṣṇu’s *avatāra* is acknowledged, Phyllis Granoff has shown that the *avatāra* accounts in the *Skandapurāṇa* come with a new and inclusivist message: “it is Śiva who gives Viṣṇu the task of slaying demons; it is also Śiva who releases Viṣṇu from his animal form so that he will be ready to assume another form when required” (Granoff 2004: 124). The inclusion of Viṣṇu’s *avatāra* stories, which originally be-

28 The *Skandapurāṇa* attests to good knowledge of the local geography of the area. Another site in the vicinity is explained with reference to the same narrative mentioned above. When Brahmadeva continues to follow him after Viṣṇu has stopped at Kubjāmraka, Śiva tells him to turn back and himself enters the sky. Brahmadeva thereupon makes a circumambulation. The spot is called Brahmadeva and described as a holy place, where, upon dying, one reaches Brahmaloka (SP 32.149–152):

\[
\begin{align*}
nātīdūrāṃ tato gatvā bhūyo devaḥ pitāmaham & | \text{(149)} \\
nivartey abravīd vyāsā gaganāṃ ca samāviṣat & | \text{(150)} \\
tasmin viyadgate deve brahmā prāṇijalir unmukhaḥ & | \text{(151)} \\
pradaksīṇam saṁvṛtya pranamyā prayayau tataḥ & | \text{(152)} \\
yasmā tatra haraṇaḥ tena kurvatā vai pradaksīṇam & | \\
āvartaḥ svasārīrasya prakṛtaḥ punyakarmanāḥ & \\
tasmā sa deśo vikhyāto brahmāvartetī sōbhanaḥ & | \text{(153)} \\
aśvamedhaphalaṃ tatra snātah prāṇamāt mānavaḥ & \\
sādhayitvā carum cātra bhajayitvā tathā dvijam & \\
prāṇān parītyayaya tato brahmālokaṃ avāpṇayār & | \text{(154)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Bakker has suggested the possibility that this Brahmadeva may be identical with “the early historical mount at Shyampur Garhi, ca. 6 km west of VBA [Vīrabhadra] on the Golapani (Goila Nala), a small tributary of the Ganges” (Bakker 2014: 184). The story seems to attest to the integration of a site originally connected to the worship of Brahmadeva. After the events relating to the coming into being of Kubjāmraka and Brahmadeva are over, Viṣṇu and Brahmadeva go back and Brahmadeva installs a līṅga dedicated to Paśupati at Bhadreshvara, performs pūjā there, and bathes in the Bhadra-kamhrada, after which he returns to heaven (SP 32.153–154):

\[
\begin{align*}
tato 'bhṛtyena suraḥ śārīrhaṃ brahmāḥ viṣṇu-prapāḥsraṃ & | \text{(154)} \\
bhadreshvare paśupate mahīmaṁ athākaraṇaḥ & | \text{(155)} \\
sa līṅgaṃ tatra samsthūpya pūjāṃ kṛtvātiḥbhāsvaram & \\
bhadra-kamhrade snātāṃ saha devaḥ laiva śubhaḥ & | \text{(156)} \\
\end{align*}
\]
longed to Vaiṣṇava circles, reflects a deliberate narrative strategy of the authors of the text, aimed at integrating other cults and traditions under the broad umbrella of Śaivism.

Two chapters in the text deal with more mundane matters and give rules for the actual worship of Śiva. Chapters 27 and 28 contain material that shows, if not actual textual parallels, great correspondences in style and content to the literature of the Śivadharma. Again we encounter the model of including all other gods within Śiva, for example in SP 27.42, where all holy places and temples (presumably of all deities) are said to rest in Śiva’s two feet. ²⁹ Most relevant for the present purposes is SP 28.20–23. While this passage occurs within a section that deals with Śiva worship, the text allows for and incorporates the worship of other gods as well:

Now, for the sake of the respectful offering (argha) in [rites] for the gods or for the ancestors, he satisfies the ancestors, as well as the sages and all the gods, for thirty thousand years, by [offering oblations of] white mustard seeds, and obtains a magnificent form, and is worshipped by cowgirls in the Cow-world for one Manu-period. For all the gods, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, and the sages, make [themselves] present in [this] oblation: know that it has come forth from them! One who knows this great secret, O Devī, he is a great ascetic. Due to its miraculous power one is born rich, with a pleasing appearance, provided with the qualities of intelligence and beauty, for a million years. ³⁰

²⁹ SP 27.42 (Śiva speaking):
yāṇi lokesu tīrthāṇi devaṁyatanaṇī ca |
pādayos tāṁ suśrūṇi sadā samnihitāṁ me || 42 ||

³⁰ SP 28.20–23:
siddhārthakair athārgārthāṁ daive pitreye ’thavā punah |
trīṃśad varṣasahrasāṁi tarpayet sa pīṭhān api || 20 ||
ṛṣīṇāś ca sarvadevaṁś ca rūpaṁ cāpnoti puṣkalam |
manvantaraṁ ca goloke gokanyābhīṁ sa pūjyate || 21 ||
sarve devāṁ tathā viṣṇur brahmā ṛṣaya eva ca |
kurvanyt arghe hi sāṃnidhyāṁ tebhyaś tad viḍḍhī niḥṣṛtam || 22 ||
guhyam etat paraṁ devi yo vetti sa mahātāpaḥ |
tasya prabhāvāj jāyeta dhanavāṁ priyadarśanaḥ |
prajñārāpaṁguṇaṁ yuktāṁ saṁvatsarāśatāyutam || 23 ||
Aside from this one passage, however, we come across few other rituals that involve any other god but Śiva. Overall, we can conclude that the primary teaching of the Skandapurāṇa is Śiva devotion, at the expense of everything else. It is a staunch Śaiva text. The only other deities whose worship is expressly acknowledged are Devī and the Gaṇas, but they are worshipped as, respectively, wife and servants of Śiva.

The Niśvāsamukha

The Niśvāsamukha is again a very different type of text, but it attests to similar notions as the Śivadharma and has much to say on matters of lay religion. The Niśvāsamukha stands at the threshold of Tantric literature. It forms the introduction to the Niśvāsatattvasamhitā and introduces the Mantramārga teachings of the main work by presenting it as the revelation of Śiva’s fifth face. The Niśvāsamukha addresses the relation between the Tantra teaching of the Mantramārga and other forms of religion by introducing a model in which Śiva emits five streams of knowledge from his five faces. The inclusivist model is most apparent here: all religious practice derives from the teachings of Śiva in the end. The western face teaches the Laukika or mundane religion, the northern face the Vaidika or Brahmanical religion, the southern face the Ādhyātmika or system of knowledge of the self, and the eastern face the Atimārga or Pāśupata doctrine and practice. The upper,Īśāna face, however, teaches the ultimate knowledge, that of the Mantramārga.

31 A rare exception is SP 28.9, which prescribes offering foods to the gods and ancestors for a year:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{sanvatsaraṁ tu yo bhuṅkte niyam eva hy atandritam |} \\
\text{nivedya pūrdevebhyaḥ prthivyāṁ ekarāḥ bhaveti} \\
\end{array}
\]

32 For the Niśvāsatattvasamhitā, see GOODALL 2015, which presents a critical edition with annotated translation of the Mūlasūtra, Uttarasūtra, and Nayasūtra. Not yet included in this edition is the extensive Guhyasūtra. The Niśvāsamukha is the subject of the PhD thesis by Nirajan Kafle at Leiden University (KAFLÉ 2015). All citations are from Kafle’s edition.

33 NiMukh 3:196cd: paścimenaiva vaktreṇa laukikam gāditaṁ sadā; NiMukh 4:41: vedadharmano mayā praktaḥ svarganaiśreyasah paraḥ | uttareṇaiva vaktreṇa vyākhyaś ca samāśataḥ || ; NiMukh 4:42: ādhyātmikam pravakyāṁi daksināśyena kṛttitam | sāmādhyaḥ caiva mahājnānam yogā cāpi mahāvrate || ; NiMukh 4:131ad: atimārggaṁ samādhyaḥ dvīhpakārāṁ varānane | pūrveṇaiva tu vaktreṇa sarahaśyaṁ prakṛttitam || ; NiMukh 4:135: paścimenaiva vaktreṇa Īśānena dvijottamaḥ | mantrākhyāṁ kathayāsyāṁ devyāya gāditaṁ purā ||. For this model of the five
The largest part of the Niśvāsamukha is reserved for the Laukika religion, covering the first three out of the total of four chapters of the text. It includes various religious practices, such as digging wells and setting up parks, pilgrimage, fasting, following observances, and religious suicide, under this heading. Although the Laukika religion described in the text primarily relates to the worship of Śiva, the category is in fact broader and also includes the worship of other deities. Thus we find in the section on pilgrimage not only reference to many important Śaiva centres, but also to pilgrimage sites dedicated to Viṣṇu, such as Śālagrāma and Mathurā (NiMukh 3.31–32).

Most interesting for the present purposes is an elaborate passage that promotes fasting on different days of the year (NiMukh 3.60–195). Each tithi is associated with a particular deity as follows: Brahmā (first), Agni (second), Kubera (third), Gaṇeṣa (fourth), Nāgas (fifth), Skanda (sixth), Āditya (seventh), Śiva (eighth), Mahādevī (ninth), Yama (tenth), Dharma (eleventh), Viṣṇu (twelfth), Anaṅga (thirteenth), Parameśvara (fourteenth), Pitr (full and new moon).34 The text prescribes fasting and worship of the deity, accompanied by the invocation of twelve names of the deity, on the days in question for a year. Thus, for example, Viṣṇu should be worshipped for a year on the twelfth tithi of both halves of the month with the names: 1. Keśava, 2. Nārāyaṇa, 3. Mādhava, 4. Govinda, 5. Viṣṇu, 6. Madhusūdana, 7. Trivikrama, 8. Vāmana, 9. Śrīdvara, 10. Hṛṣikeśa, 11. Padmanābha, and 12. Dāmodara.35 Various fruits of this worship are listed, depending on the gradation and kind of worshipper. By worshipping Viṣṇu with these names for a lifetime, accompanied by the gift of various substances and objects, one reaches the world of Viṣṇu.36 In the same manner, worshipping Agni with his twelve names for a lifetime will get one to the world of Agni, worshipping Skanda will get one to the world of Skanda, etc.

34 For a useful survey of the tithis and their presiding deities in Brahmanical literature, see Eino 2005.
35 NiMukh 3.126c–138b.
36 NiMukh 3.139c–141b:
   yāvaiṣvāgam samabhyaarcya puspair ggandhaiḥ sugandhakaiḥ || 139 ||
   bhakṣyabhoyaiṣa ca dhūpaiṣa ca cchatradhvajavitānakaiḥ |
   hemajair bhūṣaṇair ddiyyair mmaniraṇavicitrakaiḥ || 140 ||
   vastraiḥ pājām vicitrāṇ ca kṛtvā viṣṇupadaṁ vrajet |
Now, for most of the gods mentioned, the text does not provide guidance specific to each different month of the year. The only exceptions concern Śiva, who is associated with the eighth and the fourteenth day of each half of the month, and Viṣṇu, associated with the twelfth day of each half of the month. In their case, for each month specific instructions are given, along with the mention of the reward of the fast and the worship at each individual month. In other words, these two deities are treated on a different level from the other gods mentioned. While it is not surprising that this should be the case for Śiva in a Śaiva text, it is quite revealing that Viṣṇu gets special treatment as well. This no doubt reflects the prominent position of Viṣṇu worship at the time, but it may also be due to the origin of the practice. In fact, the only parallel that I am aware of for this practice of the worship of a god with twelve names on set days of each month, with the exception of Śiva, concerns Viṣṇu. For we find the same notion in the Viṣṇudharma and several Vaiṣṇava passages in other texts as well. It appears then that the recitation of twelve names originally belonged to the worship of Viṣṇu alone and was subsequently expanded, as attested in the Niśvāsamukha, to include other gods as well. Overall we can conclude that, of the three texts discussed, the Niśvāsamukha’s attitude is the most open

37 NiMukh 3.92–106b and NiMukh 3.146–150. The twelve names to be used on the eighth tithi are: Śaṅkara, Devadeva, Tryambaka, Sthāṇu, Hara, Śiva, Bhava, Nīlakaṇṭha, Piṅgala, Rudra, Iśāna, and Rudra. The twelve names to be used on the fourteenth tithi are: Hara, Śarva, Bhava, Tryakṣa, Śambhu, Vibhu, Śiva, Sthāṇu, Paśupati, Rudra, Iśāna, and Śaṅkara. Specific instructions relating to each month are only given for the eighth day of the month.

38 NiMukh 3.126c–138b.

39 ŚiDhŚ 10 has a similar passage on fasting and worshipping Śiva with different names in twelve successive months on the eighth and fourteenth day. The list of names for the eighth day of the month is given as follows: Śaṅkara, Śambhu, Maheśvara, Mahādeva, Sthāṇu, Śiva, Paśupati, Ugra, Śarva, Tryambaka, Iśvara, and Rudra (ŚiDhŚ 10.17–31). Note that the list is different from the one in the Niśvāsamukha, suggesting that this was not yet a standard practice. No list of names is given for the fourteenth day of the month.

40 The same set of twelve names of Viṣṇu with reference to the twelve months from Mārgaśīra to Kārttika occurs in ViDh 5.23–26, MBh 13 App. I. no. 12 and MBh 14 App. I. no. 4, ll. 2998ff., BrS 105.14–16 (the two MBh passages in particular show close correspondence).

See also GONDA 1970: 71–72, referring to Śatapathabrāhmaṇa 14.2.2.12 (on twelve names and the fullness of the year). The observance of a fast on the twelfth day, while worshipping Viṣṇu with his respective name, on twelve successive months is referred to as nakṣatrapuruṣavrata in several Purāṇas. See SHASTRI 1969: 188, n. 1.
Conclusion

In this brief survey of three early sources on lay Śaiva religion, I have focussed on those passages that address the worship or existence of other gods than Śiva. The passages attest to an inclusivist model that allows for the worship of other gods, but with the underlying message that their power and position ultimately stems from Śiva. This is the case for the Śiva-dharmaśāstra, which teaches that the gods obtained their position as gods from the worship of the liṅga. The model of cosmic power, as expressed in particular in the text’s śāntimantra, mirrors the earthly model of early medieval kingship with its system of sāmantas, mahāsāmantas, and mahārājas. The Skandapurāṇa, by contrast, shows a more antagonistic attitude, with many stories revolving around the opposition between Śiva and the other gods. This may well reflect a moment in time when Śaivism moved from a position on the sides to a position in the centre, but it may also be characteristic of narrative literature in general. Its inclusivism is more aggressive, as it first of all involves the denigration of the other gods before they are reinstated in their respective domain. If we are looking for a parallel from Indian kingship, it brings to mind the model of the digvijaya, as famously expressed in Samudragupta’s Allahabad Pillar Inscription and chapter 4 of the Raghuvamśa, with its image of defeat and subsequent reinstatement of regional kings, following the conquest by a new and more powerful ruler on the scene. Finally, the Niśvāsamukha provides the most perfect inclusivist model, with its concept of Śiva’s five faces teaching the five different streams of religion, where the highest stream, that of the Mantramārga, is reserved for the upper, fifth face. It forms the introduction to the earliest surviving Śaiva Tantra, the Niśvāsatattvasamhitā, and as such provides the transition from the previous religious traditions to the new ritual system for centuries to come. There is no antagonistic attitude here, it rather reflects a strong belief in the supremacy of the lord Śiva who himself happily teaches the worship of other gods to Devī.

Finally, when talking about inclusivism, it should not be forgotten that there is always an exclusivist aspect involved as well. This aspect gets little notice in Hacker’s work. This exclusivism may not always be addressed explicitly, but it is there nonetheless. Thus it is noteworthy that all three texts do not engage with the non-Brahmanical religions of Jainism and
Buddhism. They reflect a common shared Brahmanical model of religion which had integrated local forms of religion such as goddess and Nāga worship, but whose pantheon does not include Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, Tīrthaṅkaras, or Arhats. As such, this is not inclusivism in Hacker’s limited use of the term, since the deities involved in fact all form part of a well-established Brahmanical tradition, to which Śaivism aligns itself. The inclusivism encountered here is not a case of “claiming, what really belongs to an alien sect,” but rather seems to reflect a more general Brahmanical perspective on what constitutes religion. The only exception that in

---

41 The situation appears to be different in the case of Vaiṣṇavism, where, for example, the Viṣṇupurāṇa tells of Viṣṇu’s production of a heresiarch called Māyāmohā, who deludes the Asuras with his heretic doctrines, first disguising himself as a Jaina ascetic and then as a Buddhist monk. Subsequently the Buddha was integrated into the standard list of Viṣṇu’s avatāras. The Viṣṇupurāṇa, as Vincent Eltschinger has observed, gives much attention to the denigration of the pāṣaṇḍas, who are seen as a sign of the Kali age (Eltschinger 2014: 57–66). This attitude is shared by the Viṣṇudharma, which is full of statements on avoiding contact with pāṣaṇḍas (in particular ViDh 25), who, as ViDh 105.37–40 makes quite clear, are none other than Buddhists, Jains, and the like:

\[
pāṣaṇḍabhūtaṃ atyartham jaśad etad asatkṛtam |
bhavisyati tadā bhūpa vṛthāpravrajito tākratam || 37 ||
\]
\[
na tu dvijāṭuṣṭroṣāṃ na svadharmaṇupālanaṃ |
kariṣyanti tadā śūdrāḥ pravrajyājñino vṛthā || 38 ||
\]
\[
uktocāḥ saugatāḥ caiva mahāvānaratāḥ tathā |
bhavisyanty atha pāṣaṇḍāḥ kapilā bhikṣavas tathā || 39 ||
\]
\[
vṛddhāḥ śrāvakaniṁgāntāḥ śiddhāpūtraḥ tathāpāre |
bhavisyanti durātmānaḥ śūdrāḥ kaliyuge nṛpa || 40 ||
\]

Also noteworthy is Varāhamihira’s Brhatasthānītī, which includes descriptions of the Buddha and the “god of the Arhats” in the section on the iconography of deities (BrS 58.44–45):

\[
padmāṅkita karacaraṇaḥ prasannamārītiḥ sunīcaceśaṣ ca |
padamānopaśitaḥ piteva jagato bhavati buddhāḥ || 44 ||
\]
\[
ājñānavamabhaṁ ā śrīvatsānākāḥ praśāntamārītiṣ ca |
digvīśas taraṇo rūpavāṁs ca kāryo ‘rhatāṁ devaḥ || 45 ||
\]

42 Similar criticism has been voiced by Wezler regarding the usage of the term “inclusivism” to describe the interactions between Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism: “Ist die Annahme, daß die Mythenüberlieferungen beider zu irgendeinem Zeitpunkt, ‘ursprünglich’, in dem Sinne strikt sivaitisch bzw. viṣṇuitisch waren, daß der Gott des konkurrierenden Glaubens in ihnen nicht nur keine Rolle spielte, sondern auch gar nicht vorkam? Muß nicht angesichts der letztlich vedischen Herkunft beider Traditionsströme vielmehr davon ausgegangen werden, daß die zentrale göttliche Gestalt des einen von Anfang an auch in dem anderen nicht nur vorkam, sondern auch eine
fact proves the rule are the two passages about the Buddha and Arhat in the Śivadharmaśāstra for which the manuscript evidence is ambiguous. Most revealing, however, is a short line in the Niśvāsamukha, where Śiva tells Devī that he has taught five paths only and that “those different from them are following the wrong path” (NiMukh 1.56d: ato 'nye kupathe sthitāḥ). What these wrong paths are the text does not say, but it is not difficult to imagine.
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Māṭṛtantra texts of South India with special reference to the worship of Rurujit in Kerala and to three different communities associated with this worship

S.A.S. Sarma

Māṭṛtantras of South India

There exist a few hitherto unpublished South Indian texts that describe the rituals of the female deities collectively known as the Seven Mothers, and it is in these Māṭṛtantra texts that we see the deity Bhadrakālī emerging as the principal deity of the Tantric cult. In this tradition Bhadrakālī is worshipped, either on her own or as Cāmunḍā, as one of the Seven Mothers, accompanied by Virabhadra and Gāṇeśa.

We find in these texts the description of the regular worship to be performed in temples of Bhadrakālī, usually patronised by royal families and established for the sake of victory over their enemies, while in the northern Māṭṛtantra tradition we see the description of the worship as performed by individual initiates for their own purposes. Works that may, as we now know, be included in the southern Māṭṛtantra tradition are the two southern Brahmayāmalas, the Māṭrśadbhāva, the Śeṣasamuccaya (chapters 7, 8, and 9) and certain other minor texts that deal with the installation of, and rituals related to, Bhadrakālī.

Two southern Brahmayāmalas

In his thesis on the Brahmayāmala, a pre-ninth-century Śaiva Tantric scripture, Hatley (2007: 4–5) mentions five other later texts that bear the label “Brahmayāmala”1 and belong to the Māṭṛtantra tradition. Among these

---

1 See Hatley 2007: 3–5: “(…) a South Indian text connected with the cult of Bhadrakālī, in which some traces of the older BraYā are discernable; another South Indian Brahmayāmala related to this of which only a few chapters survive; a short text preserved in a Bengali manuscript expounding a series of ritual diagrams (cakras or yantras), with no discernable relation to the older BraYā; a text of the cult of Tārā
five, two are from South India, the *Brahmayāmala [Brahmayāmalamātrpratiṣṭhātantra]*, available in the French Institute (ms. T. 522), and another *Brahmayāmala [Brahmayāmalapratishṭhātantra]* for which there is an incomplete manuscript available in the Trivandrum Manuscript Library (ms. T. 982). As SANDERSON (2014: 40–41) observes:

These [texts] claim to be part of the *Brahmayāmala* and indeed are derived from it to the extent that they share its core pantheon and a number of other formal features; but they differ from it radically in that they prescribe a regular cult of Čāmuṇḍā/BhadraKālī and the Seven Mothers to be conducted before the fixed idols in temples by non-Brahmin priests of the pāraśava caste for the protection of the state and its subjects and the enhancement of royal power.2

We also see that the Bhadrakālī in these texts is attended by the same four goddesses, namely Raktā, Karāḷī, Caṇḍākṣī, and Mahocchiṣṭā, as Caṇḍā Kāpālinī, the supreme goddess in the northern *Brahmayāmala*, though Mahocchuṣmā, the fourth, appears under the variant name Mahocchiṣṭā:

The one named Raktā should be installed in the eastern direction; Karāḷī should be installed in the south, Caṇḍākṣī should be installed in the west, [and] Mohocchiṣṭā should be installed in the north.3

And:

Raktā, Karāḷī, Caṇḍākṣī, [and] Mohocchiṣṭā [should be installed] separately.4

On the cult of Bhadrakālī and the worship that the southern *Brahmayāmala* texts introduce, SANDERSON (2007a: 277–278) further observes that it “is indeed fully Tantric, it is much more integrated into the civic dimension of

---

2 See also SANDERSON 2007a: 277–278.


religion than are the early North Indian Śākta traditions exemplified by the Trika and Kālūkula. [...] and the principal purpose of this worship is said to be to foster the victory of the monarch over his enemies, as in the Orissan cult of Bhadra-kāśi, and, more generally, to protect the kingdom from danger (deśaśāntih, rāṣṭraśāntih), such temple being, at least in main, royal foundations and recipients of royal patronage.” We also see that these southern Yāmala texts embedded the Tantric mantras from the Kālūkula.5

The Brahmayāmala (IFP, Pondicherry)
The incomplete southern text of the Brahmayāmala, available in the French Institute of Pondicherry, contains approximately 1,900 verses in anuṣṭubh metre in 49 chapters. This text has the format of a ritual manual (paddhati) and contains details of the installation of the Seven Mothers,6 the daily rituals performed for them, festivals, and special rituals such as the mātrānti and the kujavārābali. Chapter 19 of the text gives a complete description of the animal sacrifice (paśuyāga) to be performed in a temple of the Seven Mothers. The forty-ninth and final chapter, on rules regarding impurity (āśaucavidhi), is incomplete. This transcript was prepared based on a manuscript available from Candraśekhara Gurukkal of Tirukkalukkunram. Though we have no information on the author of the text, it contains evidence that he was a Tamil speaker, whose native language occasionally left unintended traces on his composition.7

We also see that certain rituals and musical instruments described in the text are known in Tamil Nadu as well as in Kerala, which further confirms

---

5 For the details of the mantras that are imported, see SANDERSON 2007a: 278–279.
6 Their names are given, for example, in the following list: Cf. BYIFP, p. 15: brāhmī māheśivarī caiva kumārī vaiśnavī tathā | vārāhī caiva māhendrī bhadra-kāśi tathaiva ca ||.
7 Cf. Cox 2016: 249, n. 92. Cox gives the following evidence: “(e.g. epenthetic ya-śruti [as in 6.25d: tasmiad yetāni varjayer] or hypercorrections [e.g. 5.12cd tad-arthaṁ kanyaavistāraṁ tadarthaṁ bilam ucyate, in both cases for correct tadardhaṁ]) see e.g. 6.5ab āgneyayamayor madhye pitarasthānam uttamam, ‘the best shrine to the ancestors is located in the south-southeast’ [thematisation of Skt. pīr to pītara, cf. MTL pitarar] 6.27a, nallamallasamākīrṇam, ‘[the village picked for a temple-site should be] filled with good wrestlers’ [nalla-, cf. Tamil nagmai, adj. stem nalla-, ‘fine, good’] and 7.23cd: śikhāyān tu śikhāṁ nyasya kavacaṁ tanaṁastake, ‘placing the crest [-mantra] on the Goddess’ crest, [place] the armor [-mantra] on her head,’ understanding tana- to be a thematisation influenced by the Tamil reflexive pronominal base tag; the correct form and sandhi (*tanaṁastakam) would break the metre.”
the southern origin of this text. For example, the text lists the musical instruments to be played during the installation of the trident (śūla), mentioning drums, namely the karaṭī and timilā, as well as the māṛghoṣa, a particular voiced sound intoned by women, all of which is peculiar to the South:

[Making] auspicious proclamations (svastivācakavākyam), the sound of Vedic recitation (brahmaghoṣam), and [sounds of the instruments known as] paṭaha, maddala, tāla, karaṭī, timilā, and ululation (māṛghoṣa) along with [sounds of the] conch and kāhala.⁸

The text also mentions a particular dance, the mudrānṛttta, performed before the bali offering described in the Māṭrśāntiṇṭa, the chapter on the propitiatory rites for the Mother-goddess to avert evil or calamity,¹⁰ and another one by an oracle (veliccapāḍ)¹¹ before the bali offering known as bhūtabali, also performed in the Piśārikāvī Temple of Kollam, Kerala.¹²

At the time of circumambulation, one should perform the dance involving mudrāś (mudrānṛttta).¹³

---

⁸ I was unable to locate any references so far regarding the music instrument karaṭī. Though studies on the musical instruments of Kerala, such as the Temple Musical Instruments of Kerala (RAJAGOPALAN 2010), describe the instruments that are listed here, they remain silent on karaṭī.

⁹ BYIFP, p. 159: svastivācakavāyaṇ ca brahmagoṣaṇaḥ tathaiva ca | paṇṭaham maddalaṁ tālam karaṭītimilāḥ tathā | śamkhāhalaśaṃyuṭaṃ māṛghoṣaṇaḥ tathaiva ca | (śamkhāhalaśaṃyuṭaṃ) conj. śamkhāhalasamāyuṭaṃ ms.)

¹⁰ Cf. BYIFP, pp. 75–83. This is an eight-day bali festival, and each festival day is dedicated to one Mother-goddess. Rice mixed with different substances is offered, and on the eighth day the animal sacrifice (paṣubali) takes place. The text also mentions that other divinities should be invited during the festival: “May these [divinities], [namely] the Kūśmāṇḍas, Guhyakas, Nāgas, Siddhās, Yaksās, Marudgaṇas, Vidyādharas, and Gandharvas come [to this] festival.” kūśmāṇḍa-guhyakānāgāsi-dhāvaksāmarudgānāḥ | vidyādharāḥ ca gandharvā āgacchantu mahotsavaḥ || (mahotsavaḥ) conj.; mahotsavam ms.; IFP T. 522, p. 75).

¹¹ The veliccapāḍ, or oracle, is considered a representation of the deity in a temple. He is dressed in red with ornaments and garlands and carries hooked swords. Once in trance, accompanied by the beatings of drums, he dances and grants the devotees blessings and predictions.

¹² Though I am not sure of its practice in Tamil Nadu, in Kerala such dances are performed, namely, one by a Kuruppū and one by a veliccapāḍ. A kurupp belongs to the ambalavāṣi or “temple servants” group; see also CALDWELL 1999: 97.

¹³ BYIFP, p. 78: paribhramanavavelāyāṃ mudrānṛtttaṃ samācāre |
The dance involving mudrās (mudrāṇṛttam) should be performed along with laughing and playing. Especially the dance involving mudrās should be performed with every effort.\(^\text{14}\)

According to this *Brahmāyāmala*, the priests who are eligible to perform the worship of the Seven Mothers must be non-Brahmins, termed pāraśava, who are the offspring of a Brahmin father and Śūdra mother:\(^\text{15}\)

One born of a Brahmin man and a Śūdra woman in conformity of the rules is considered to be a pāraśava. [Should they] resort to Bhadrakāli for their livelihood, they are held to be [her] priests.\(^\text{16}\)

As *SANDERSON* (2007a: 277) observes, the Śaiva character of this priest is also “expressed by the transformation of pāraśavaḥ into pāraśavīvaḥ as the title of those who have been initiated and consecrated as officiants of this cult”:

At first the pāraśavas are invariably worshippers\(^\text{17}\) of the goddess. [Once] initiated, these pāraśavīvas are particularly qualified for rituals.\(^\text{18}\)

---

\(^\text{14}\) *BY*IFP*, p. 79; *mudrāṇṛttam tu kartavyam hāsanakṛīdanādibhiḥ | mudrāṇṛttam viśeṣena kārayet sarvayatnatah |* (krīdanādibhiḥ) conj; kri danādiśet ms.).

\(^\text{15}\) In the Dharmaśāstra texts, pāraśava is defined as the offspring of a Brahmin man and Śūdra mother: *yaṃ brāhmaṇas tu śūḍrāyām kāmād utpādayet sutam | sa pārayan eva śavas tuśmāt pāraśavah smṛtaḥ ||* (Manusmṛti 9.178), “When a Brahmin fathers a son by a Śūdra woman out of lust, tradition calls him a pāraśava, because while still able (pārayān) he is a corpse (śava)” (translation *OLIVELLE* 2005: 159). See also *Brahmāyāmala* *IFP*, p. 88 (= *SANDERSON* 2007a: 277): *ādau pāraśavās caiva nityam devyās tu pūjakāḥ | dīkṣitāḥ karmayogyās te pāraśavīvā viṣesataḥ ||*. *Vaikhānasadharmasūtra* (143.1–2) also mentions the pāraśava as the priests of Bhadrakāli. The pāraśavas are known as *uvaccaḥ* and defined as “Members of a caste of temple drummers and Pūjāris of Kāli” (*Tamil Lexicon s.v.* *uvacaḥ*). See also *PILLAY* 1953: 220–248 and *SHULMAN* 1980: 219–220.

\(^\text{16}\) *BY*IFP*, p. 146, edition by *SANDERSON* 2007a: 277, n. 142: *śūḍrāyāṃ vidhinā viprāj jātah pāraśavo mataḥ | bhadra kālīṁ samāśritya jīveth pūjakāḥ smṛtāḥ |*. Even though the term pūjaka denotes a “priest” here, in general it could also refer to a worshipper.

\(^\text{17}\) *BY*IFP*, p. 88, edition by *SANDERSON* 2007a: 277, n. 142: *ādau pāraśavās caiva nityam devyās tu pūjakāḥ | dīkṣitāḥ karmayogyās te pāraśavīvā viṣesataḥ |*.
The establishment of a temple devoted to the Seven Mothers as well as the worship that is described in this manual is said to favour the victory of the monarch over his enemies (śatrunāśa) as well as to protect the kingdom from danger (devaśānti, rāṣṭraśānti):

Bhadrakālī [who is] Cāmuṇḍī always causes victory to prosper. [She] is proclaimed to have arisen from Śiva in the Kaliyuga for the destruction of enemies. Four embodiments [of her] are to be known. She invariably creates peace (śāntikārī). One should worship her four embodiments with all efforts. [They] restore peace to the nation; [through them] victory arises for kings, [it] destroys all sins, [brings about] peace, and is invariably the source of victory.9 One should worship the Mothers according to [the manner enjoined for] their four embodiments.20

[It] is taught to be the cause for peace and prosperity of the nation [that comes about through] the installation [of Bhadrakālī].21

... The fire offering for Devī, ending with [the pronunciation of] svāhā, increases the well-being of a city.22

Unfortunately, we have been able to locate only a single transcript of this text in the French Institute Library and it is badly corrupted.

---

9 The translation of this sentence is uncertain as no grammatical agent is indicated.
The Brahmayāmala (ORI, Trivandrum)

The other incomplete southern Brahmayāmala text, available in the Trivandrum Manuscript Library, is in the form of a conversation between Brahmā and Īśvara:

[I] heard the Great Mother Tantra, an extremely long method.

... 

Now I would like to listen to the method (sādhanam) [that is the] essence of all [attainments], short in length, great in meaning, adorned with various [ritual] injunctions, called an “installation-scripture” (pratiṣṭhātantram), a new settled account drawn from the Yāmala [scripture].

This work claims to teach the rituals based on the Yāmala corpus and breaks off in its fifth chapter. While its first chapter introduces the worship of the Mothers, its second chapter enumerates the details of two types of installation, namely ekabera and bahubera, and the procedures for them. The third chapter provides the location and places where the Mothers are to be installed. The fourth chapter provides a detailed description of the eligibility of the worshipper, and the fifth describes the qualifications of a teacher (ācāryalaksana) and preliminary preparations for the initiation and then breaks off. The first four chapters end with a colophon which indicates that the text belongs to the brahmayāmala-vidyāpiṭha.

As mentioned above, the text describes two types of installation, namely the ekabera and bahubera. In the case of ekabera, Bhadrakāli alone is worshipped, while in case of the bahubera she is worshipped along with the Mothers:

The [installation of] Mothers are of two kinds: with numerous icons and with just one icon. Where Durgā alone is present, who is the

---

23 BYTriv. p. 1: śrutiḥ mātrmahātantram ativistārasādhanam | ... | idānīṁ śrotum icchāmi sāram sarvasvaśādhanam | alpaganṛtham mahārtham ca nānāvidhivibhāṣitam | pratiṣṭhātantram itvākhyam yāmalānavaṁānītayam |.

24 BYTriv. p. 26: yāmalokavidhānena nītyam āmārcanam śvrtam. See also: sarvayāmalatanaṇaja nītyam pūjārataḥ śucih (BYTriv. p. 2–3, p. 28); evaṁ tu yāmalacāryah kathitaḥ karmasiddhayeh (BYTriv. p. 2–3, p. 28).

25 For example: iti brahmayāmale sapādālakṣe vidyāpiḥhāvatārite pratiṣṭhāntre ekāśītividhānāṅge prathamodhyāyāḥ (BYTriv p. 2–3).
goddess keeping the highest position (kūṭasthā) [and] being not manifested through the Mother-powers, she is known as Bhadrakālī. [...] Where Bhadrakālī is [alone], this is known as the single-icon [type].

She is alone in the single-icon [installation] (ekabere); [and she] is known as Bhadrakālī. Alternatively, [she is known] everywhere as “Mothers” when sevenfold in a multiple-icon [installation].

The single-icon [installation] is praised for victory over and destruction of enemies. The multiple-icon type is declared for peace and prosperity.

Similar to the IFP Brahmayāmala, this text too authorises the pāraśava to perform the temple rituals of Bhadrakālī:

[One who has] undergone the sequence of the “initiation [into the cult of] the Mothers” (mātrākṣā) and [one who has the knowledge] of the tradition of worship of the four [forms of the goddess] is called a priest (pājakah) among the pāraśavas. Such people are recommended for [the performance of] all rites, and they live from the worship of the Mothers.

Though presently we have no knowledge of the existence of any other manuscripts of these two southern Brahmayāmala texts, a study of the manuscripts presently available to us clearly demonstrates their southern origin, which is further supported by the correlation of the iconography of

---

26 BY Triv., p. 3: bahuberaikabereti ucyante mātaro dvidhā | kūṭasthā yā bhaved devī avyaktā mātrāktibhiḥ | durgā bhavati yatraiva bhadrakālī tu viṣrutā | [...] yatraiva bhadrakālī syād ekaberaṁ iti smṛtam |

27 BY Triv., p. 3: kevalā caikabere tu bhadrakālīti viṣrutā | saptadhā bahubere vā mātaraś āty sarvataḥ | Jayārthāḥ satrunāśārtham ekabraṁ praśaṁsitam | śānti-puṣṭikarārthāṁ tu bahuberaṁ udāḥrām |

Cf. SANDERSON 2007a: 278: “When Bhadrakālī is isolated (kūṭasthā, ekabere), the cult is for victory and the destruction of enemies. When she is worshipped together with the Mothers (bahubera) the cult’s purpose is the quelling of dangers and the restoration of well-being.”

28 BY Triv., p. 27: mātrākṣākramopetaṁ caturyāgvidhāgamam | pājakas tv iti vikhyātaṁ samjñā (sic) pāraśavaśāmanāṁ | praśaṁtāḥ sarvakāryāṇāṁ mātrājōpajāvākāḥ |
the goddess described in these manuscripts with the surviving South Indian images of Bhadrakālli. We also noticed that these two southern Brahmayāmalas prescribe the installation and worship of the Mothers for the monarch’s victory over his enemies (satrunāśa) and the protection of his kingdom from danger, which indeed must have encouraged monarchs to establish temples devoted to the Mothers. Among these temples, the Kolārammā Temple in the Noḷam-bavādi of Karnataka merits special attention, since here we find two Tamil inscriptions containing indications of rituals to be performed in the temple that are discussed in the Brahmayāmala text of Pondicherry.

The Kolārammā Temple of Kōlār and the southern Brahmayāmala texts

The Kolārammā Temple must have been in existence at least from the time of the Colas, as can be seen from its inscriptions dating from 1030 CE. Among the several Tamil inscriptions found in the Kolārammā Temple, two inscriptions (Epigraphia Carnatica 10, KI 108 and 106d) are dated29 in the second regnal year of Kō-Rājakesaravarman (alias Rājendracoladeva), the Cola king Kulottuṅga I (1071/1072 CE). These give the provisions for the funding of the Kolārammā Temple of the goddess, detailing the yearly allowances for the staff, including a teacher of grammar and of “Yāmala,” the offerings for the deities, and the various ceremonies.30 As we see in the inscription, there is a teacher appointed to teach the Yāmala texts. This constitutes evidence that the Yāmala texts were known in this area and encourages us to assume that the southern Yāmala text that we now know might have been composed in this area. Moreover, as SANDERSON (2007a: 277, n. 140) observes,31 this detailed inscription accords precisely with the texts of the southern Brahmayāmala. We find in it details of the temple ceremonies that were performed in the Kolārammā Temple, including the special rituals, such as the kujavārabali (BYIFP pp. 100–102), mātrśānti (BYIFP pp. 75–83), and yoginīyogesvarapūjā. Also the offering of an alcoholic drink (matiyapāna) and of a goat during the kujavārabali, both spe-

29 In fact, only the first one is dated, but the second seems to be a continuation of the first.
30 See also SANDERSON 2014: 41 and 2007a: 277.
31 See also COX 2016.
cific to the Yāmala text preserved in Pondicherry, are some of the rituals mentioned by the inscription.

**The Māṭṛtantra texts that are produced in Kerala**

Though we are only aware of two southern *Brahmāyāmala* texts – one in Pondicherry and the other one in Kerala, both incomplete – there are texts produced in Kerala that treat the worship of the Mothers and are based on the southern Yāmala texts we have discussed, especially the *Māṭṛsadbhāva* and the three chapters of the *Śeṣasamuccaya*. Of these two, the *Māṭṛsadbhāva* merits special attention, since it is a ritual manual entirely devoted to the worship of the Mothers.

**The Māṭṛsadbhāva**

The *Māṭṛsadbhāva*, a Kerala text, is, as described by its author, a summary of the rituals found in the various Yāmala texts. It provides a detailed South Indian tradition of temple-based Yāmala worship and presents a complete and properly organised account of the cult of Mothers.

Having offered obeisance to my guru, Gaṇeśa, Durgā, and the Kṣetrapāla, I shall declare this Tantra under the name Māṭṛsadbhāva. I have examined the Yāmalas and will now, as far as I am able, make a summary of their essentials for the benefit of mankind. Even Brahmā is not able to understand these [texts] that have come forth in various forms from the lotus that is the mouth of Śiva. How much less can such as I?

32 There are two palm-leaf manuscripts of the *Māṭṛsadbhāva* in Malayalam script bearing the nos. 1017-A and 1017-B as well as a transcript in Devanāgarī script bearing no. T. 792 (copy of ms. 1017A?) in the Trivandrum Manuscripts Library. There is a paper manuscript (ms. MT 5126) in Grantha script in the Government Oriental Manuscript Library in Chennai. See also *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, vol. XX (DASH 2011: 59).

33 MSBhTy, p. 1: praṇaṃya ca guruḥ vighnaṃ durgāṃ ca kṣetrapālakam | māṭṛsadbhāvanāmā ca tantram etat pravakṣyate | yāmalāṁ samālocaḥ svasāmarthyānurūpataḥ | jagaddhitāya cāsmābhīḥ kriyate sarasamgraḥaḥ | tānīvara-mukhāmbhojasamudgrāṇāḥ anekadhāḥ | brahmaṇāpi na śakyāni jñātum kimuta māḍrśaiḥ |, translation SANDERSON 2014: 51.
The author of the *Mātrṣadbhāva* also informs us that there is no text that provides a complete and properly organised account of the cult of the Mothers:

Śiva did not teach [all] the rituals for the worship of the Mothers in those Tantras in one [place]. The reason for this I do not know. Therefore †...† I shall teach them in summarised form in their proper order.34

Like other Paddhati texts of Kerala,35 the *Mātrṣadbhāva* follows the tradition of arranging the chapters beginning with the qualifications of the ācārya and concluding with the jīrnoddhāra, the removal of a cult-image that is old and used.36 However, the manuscripts we now have of the *Mātrṣadbhāva* breaks off while describing the jīrnoddhāra.

The text deals with the following topics:

Those learned in Tantras teach the following as the order [of the topics]: qualities of the teacher, purification of the ground, the sequence of [rites making up] the incubation †...†, the manner of performing the worship of the site (vāstuyāga), then the characteristics of temples, the placing of the [first] brick, thereafter the placing of consecration-deposits (garbhādhānam), the characteristics of images, then the rules for initiation, the rules for the planting of [prognosticatory] germinated seeds, bali, and the worship in that place itself, the steeping of the idols in water and the cleaning of them, and also the sequence of [rites making up] the incubation of the idols, the depositing of precious stones, the characteristics of an installation, the rules for worship, bathing, and the sequence for [the performance of] festivals, the procession for the bath at a sacred site, then the bathing and the removal [and replacement] of worn idols.37

---

34 MSBhTriv. p. 1–2, edition by SANDERSON 2007a: 278, n. 143: *naikatra teṣu samprok-ktāḥ kriyās tāntreṣu śambhuṇāḥ | māryāgam samuddiśya na janūmo 'tra kāraṇām | ta- snād 'tāpaya tāh kartuṃ kriyā lokeṣu naisṭikāḥ † | anukramaṇa vakṣyante samgrahaṇa yathāvidhi [ ].

35 Such as the Śaivāgamanibandhana and the Prayogamaṅjarī.

36 MSBhTriv. p. 2: *ācāryalakṣaṇādyān tu jīrnoddhārāvavasāṇakam | anukramam iti prāhur asmin tantro vicakṣaṇāḥ †. “The sequence [of topics] in this Tantra, the experts say, begins with the qualities of a teacher and ends with the replacement of a worn-out [idol].”

The above-mentioned topics are discussed in 28 chapters; the final chapter is the one on the jīrṇoddhāra and is, as mentioned, incomplete. Nevertheless perhaps not much has been lost, since the above summary of topics provided by the author clearly shows that we are missing only a part of the final chapter on the jīrṇoddhāra.

The Mātrṣadbhāva in its fifth chapter provides a detailed description of the installation of the Mothers as well as of Bhadrakāli and mentions that the installation procedures are prescribed according to the Brahmayāmala:

Now, [I] will succinctly describe the ekavīrī icon as taught by the Supreme Lord in the Brahmayāmala.\(^{38}\)

Among the other topics discussed in the text, the procedure for initiation is provided in chapter 6. Like the other Kerala texts, the Mātrṣadbhāva indicates the importance of initiation as a qualification for performing an installation:

[The ācārya] should perform an initiation (dīksāṃ) with due efforts for the authority to use mantras, [to perform] the installation of images of gods, especially for the removal [and replacement] of worn [idols].\(^{39}\)

Chapter 18 provides a detailed account of the pājā of the Mothers, separately giving the details of the deities surrounding (āvaraṇa) the Seven Mothers, Gaṇeśa and Virabhadra. Chapter 19 narrates the installation of the trident and goes on to give the details of the war fought between goddesses and Ruru.

\(^{38}\) MS Bh Triv., p. 26: athaikavīrīṃ pratīmāṃ pravaksyāmi samāsataḥ | brahmayā- malatantuṃ yathoktaṃ paramesṭhinā |.

\(^{39}\) MS Bh Triv., p. 45: devahimbapratīṣṭhāyāṃ jīrṇoddhāre viśeṣataḥ | mantrādhikā- re ca tathā dīksāṃ kuryāti prayatnataḥ |.
As Sanderson observes "the Mātrṣadbhāva differs primarily not only in its lucid and generally correct Sanskrit but also in its extensive expurgation of most of the strongly Kāpālikā elements of this tradition while in spite of this recalling the tradition’s roots in Atimārga III, by, for example, describing the officiant as 'one who has mastered the Somasiddhānta.'"\(^{40}\) We also see that this text "relates the myth of the conquest of the Dāitya enemies of the gods by Cāmunḍā/Kaṃamoṭī and the other Mothers at Koṭivarṣa in the far north of Bengal, that of the origin of that site’s sacred Pool of the Trident (Śūlakuṇḍa) and the drinking of its water, the granting of the boon to the Mothers as the reward for their victory that those who worship them with devotion will attain whatever siddhi they desire and salvation at death, and the presence there with the Mothers of Śiva as Hetukeśvara."\(^{41}\) We also see the reference to Koṭivarṣa in the ritual process that is described in the Mātrṣadbhāva, such as in the context of the ablutions (abhiṣeka) of the deity to be performed on the fourth day after its installation, where the text prescribes to install pots filled with water that represent the sacred sites including the Koṭivarṣa.

Even though in its ritual prescriptions we do not find the name of Ruru-jit ("conqueror of Ruru") as the primary deity, the text does speak of the Dānava Ruru (or Rurutva) being defeated by the goddess and as beneath her foot, pieced by her trident.\(^{42}\)

Certain rituals prescribed in the Mātrṣadbhāva seem to be similar to those that are performed in the Bhadrakālī temples in Kerala, for example, the bali offerings in the Piṣārikāvu and in the Kodungallur Temple. Kāvuṇḍal, a famous public ritual unique to the Kodungallur Temple, which we will discuss shortly, may carry an echo of the propitiatory oblations prescribed in the Mātrṣadbhāva that are offered in the nearby village of a temple (grāmabali).\(^{43}\)

This text must have been composed before the fifteenth century since it is referred to as the principal authority for the worship of Ruru-jit-Cāmunḍā and the Mothers by Śaṅkaran Nampūtiri, commentator of the Śeṣa-samuccaya, another ritual manual which we will discuss below.

---

40 Sanderson 2014: 51.
41 Sanderson 2014: 51–52; see also MSBhTIV p. 138–149. For a detailed description of the myth of the conquest of the Dāitya enemies of the gods by Cāmunḍā/Kaṃamoṭī, see SKKB 171.78–137.
42 Cf. MSBhTIV, pp. 28–29.
43 Cf. MSBhTIV, p. 178.
The Šeṣasamuccaya

Among the southern texts based on the Brahmâyâmala, the Šeṣasamuccaya attributed to Śaṅkara\(^4\) occupies a prominent place. It is in the Šeṣasamuccaya that Bhadrakāli in the form of Rurujit seems to have been introduced as a principal deity, while in its source, the Mātrṣadbhāva, as we have discussed, she is not mentioned as the principal deity.

The Šeṣasamuccaya provides rituals pertaining to deities such as Brahmā, Āditya, Kubera, Śrīkṛṣṇa, Sarasvatī, Lakṣmī, Gaurī, Jyeṣṭhā, Bhadrakāli, the Māṇḍarī, Kṣetrapāla, Brahmā, and Indra as well as other lords of the quarters:

Let these pleased deities --- such as Brahmā, Arka, Vaiśravaṇa, Kṛṣṇa, Sarasvatī, Śrī, Gaurī, Jyeṣṭhā, also Kali [and] the Mothers, Kṣetradhipa, then such forms as Rurujit and Girīṣa, [and] also Indra and the other [guardian deities of directions] --- bestow upon me, who bows down [before them], what I desire.\(^3\)

---

\(^4\) While some of the historians of Kerala, such as RĀJARĀJAVARMA (\(^2\)1997: III.486–487), attribute the authorship of the Šeṣasamuccaya to one Kṛṣṇasarma, pupil of Cenns Narayanam Namputiri, others such as PARAMEŚVARA IYER (\(^2\)1990: II.73–74), NARAYANA PILLAI (1951: iii–v), and MADHAVAN (n.d.: 26) confirm that Śaṅkara, son of the author of the Kerala ritual manual, the Tantrasamuccaya, is the author of the Šeṣasamuccaya.

\(^3\) SS 1.1: brahmākavaiśravanakṛṣṇasarasvatīṣṭhīryagaurīdhipagrajā, kṛṣṇa prasiddhā, arkaḥ sūryaḥ, vaiśravaṇas sa eva, kṛṣṇo gośālasthāḥ, sarasvatīṣṭhīryagaurīḥ prasiddhāḥ, agrajā jyeṣṭhāḥ, kālī bhadrakālī, mātaro virabhadraṁapatisahītim prasiddhā eva, kṣetradhipaḥ kṣetrapālāḥ, apiśabdaḥ samuccayārthaḥ, atha rurujit giṇiṣṭhīṣṭiḥ, rurujit iti rūrùnāmo dairtyasāya hantṛ bhadrakālī, giṇiṣṭhī pravatāḥ, ādīśabdena tatrāyā mātaroḥ kṣetrapālaḥ ca tadrūpamā daivatānī.indrādayāḥ svapradhāṇaṁvaśāpamāḥ lokapālāḥ, apiśabdo 'trāpi samuccayārthaḥ, atra bhadrāvādikṣetrapālāntānām tantrānār Śaxadībhī paṭalāraḥ abhidhyā saaptamādīpatalārayuṣjādādānām tantrānān vākṣyāmīti madhyāsthasāsabdesvarārthaḥ. ‘[The text] tells us which deities these are – brahmākavaiśravanakṛṣṇasarasvatīṣṭhīryagaurīdhipagrajā: Brahmā is the well-known [deity of that name]; Arka is the sun; Vaiśravaṇa is himself [Kubera]; Kṛṣṇa is the Dark One who resides in a cow-pen; Sarasvatī, Śrī, and Gaurī are the well-known [deities of those names]; Agrajā is Jyeṣṭhā; Kālī is Bhadrakāli; the Mothers are the well-known [Seven Goddesses], along with Virabhadra and Gaṇapati; Kṣetradhipa is [Bhairava as] the protector of
Chapters 7, 8, and 9 of the Śeṣasamuccaya are devoted to distinctive rituals of the rare cult of the goddess Rurujit. The principal authority used by the author of the Śeṣasamuccaya to describe the rituals of Rurujit is the Mātrsadbhāva, as is indicated by Śaṅkaran in his commentary on the Śeṣasamuccaya:

Explaining the ritual procedure taught in such scriptures as the Mātrsadbhāva in order to show how Śiva, Ekaberī [Bhadra-kāli/Cāmuṇḍā], the Mothers, and the Kṣetrapāla are to be installed simultaneously in a single temple (...).46

Some scholars47 claim that the ritual procedures followed for the worship of Rurujit (rurujidvidhāna) embodies the Kashmirian concepts of Kālasamkārśini and the Mahārtha (Krama) tradition of Kāli worship. But a detailed study of the rurujidvidhāna in the Śeṣasamuccaya makes it clear that there are no traces of Kālasamkārśini and the Mahārtha in the Śeṣasamuccaya.48

Other texts on rurujidvidhāna

The Rurujidvidhānapūjāpaddhati, a prose text in Sanskrit available in the Government Oriental Manuscript Library (GOML), Chennai (ms. R 3365),

the sacred site; the word api is used in the sense of addition (samuccayārthah); then (atha) such forms as Rurujit and Girīśa. Rurujit is the conqueror of the demon called Ruru, i.e., Bhadrakāli; Girīśa is Śiva; the expression ‘and others’ (ādiśabdāna) denotes the Mothers that are there, as well as Kṣetrapāla and other divinities that have such forms; Indra and others (indrādayaḥ) are the protectors of the eight directions, to be installed in accordance with their [respective direction of] dominance; here too the word api is used as [a conjunction] expressing addition. The word atha placed in the middle expresses the [following] idea: ‘here, having spoken about the teachings relating to the deities beginning with Brahmā and going up to Kṣetrapāla in six paṭalas, I will speak about the teachings of Rurujit and others from the seventh onwards.’”

47 Cf. VAMANAN (n.d.), Introduction to ŚeṣasamuccayaTV (p. 7), and JAYASHANKAR 2001: 28.
48 See also SARMA 2009: 335.
might be a prose version of the chapters on Rurujit of the Śeṣasamuccaya, but a close study of the text will be required to ascertain this.

There is also a ritual manual in Malayalam that was recently published by the Tantravidyāpīṭha of Kerala, a prose version of the chapters on Rurujit from the Śeṣasamuccaya, entitled Rurujīdvidhānavaṃ bahubera-vidhānavaṃ, “Regulations for the worship of Rurujit and also [that of Rurujit] with many idols.” It is also worth mentioning here that the Shripuram Tantra Research Center, Trichur District, Kerala, is working on a detailed ritual manual on Rurujit, which is expected to be published soon.

Apart from these texts, there are several minor ones that describe the installation of and rituals pertaining to Bhadrakāli. Though these works might not have been based on the southern Brahmayāmala texts, in these ritual manuals we see a continuity of the Brahmayāmala tradition.

### Worship of Rurujit

As we have seen, it is in the Śeṣasamuccaya that Bhadrakāli in the form of Rurujit seems to have been introduced as a principal deity, while in its source, the Mātrṣadbhāva, she is not mentioned as the principal deity. But the Mātrṣadbhāva describes how Dānava Ruru, or Rurutva, was defeated by the goddess and lies under her foot pierced by her trident:

> Having this form, the Mother of the Universe (jadgaddhiro), after felling the demon Ruru and piercing his heart with the trident, fixed her gaze on his face. […] As if touching the demon with the tip of her left foot.\(^{49}\)

> Seeing the [other] demons slain, the Ruru (rurutvaḥ) puffed up with pride over his strength (baladarpitaḥ), turned his face to her and fought fiercely. […] This great demon Ruru (rurutvaḥ) pierced the earth and went below.\(^{50}\)

The Śeṣasamuccaya in its seventh chapter prescribes how the temple of Rurujit should be constructed:

\(^{49}\) MSBhTr, p. 28: evamṛūpā jagaddhiro nipātya rurudāṇavaṃ | bhūtvā sūlena hrdayam mukhe tasyārpletkaṃ | […] vāmapādāgrabhāgena sprāntum īva dāṇavaṃ |.

\(^{50}\) MSBhTr, p. 143: asurūṃ ghatitān dṛṣṭvā ruruṭvo baladarpitāḥ | tasyās tva abhimukho bhūtvā yodhayām āśa dāruṇam | […] ruruṭvo ’sau mahādaiya bhūmiṃ bhūtvā hy adho gataḥ |.
Here, [in the worship of Rurujit], an independent [temple of] Śiva (smarajit) will face east; in front [of him] to the south Cāmuṇḍā, separate (bhinnā), will be facing the west. Alternatively, [Cāmuṇḍā] will face east (namuciripudigāsyā) without accompanying deities (niraṅgā). To the south of Lord [Śiva] or to that of [Cāmuṇḍā], there may be [Seven] Mothers facing north, along with accompanying deities. Alternatively, she may be placed, according to this system (iha), to the east of the [Seven Mothers], together with attendants (sāṅgā), or all the [Seven] Mothers [together with Cāmuṇḍā] may be placed separately to the south-east [of Śiva].

In the temples that are devoted to Rurujit, such as the Kodungallur Temple in the Trichur District and the Kollam Piṣārikāvu in the Calicut District of Kerala, we see a slightly different arrangement: Śiva is installed facing east; on the southern side facing north or east is Rurujit; on the eastern side of Rurujit facing north are the Seven Mothers, Virabhadra and Ganeśa; and on the north-eastern corner, Kṣetrapāla. In some temples Rurujit is also installed along with the Mothers.

The seventh chapter of the Śeṣasamuccaya discusses in detail the consecration rituals that pertain to a temple for Rurujit, and its eighth chapter describes at length the daily rituals that are to be performed. This chapter includes the visualisation of Rurujit:

---

51 See Vimarśinī ad ŚS 7.2: athavā tatraiva namuciripudigāsyā pūrvābhimukhā niraṅgā syāt.

52 Śeṣasamuccaya 7.2: syāt prāgāsyāḥ svantaṇrah smarajid iha puro daksīna paścimāsyāḥ | cāmuṇḍā syāc ca bhinnā namuciripudigāsyā niraṅgaiva vātha | devasyāyās tu vā yāmyadiśi śāśidigāsyā jananyo ’pi sāṅgā | tatprāk sā vēha sāṅgānaśādiśi nikāla māṭaro vēha bhimāḥ |. In comparison, in the Mātraśadbhāva (MSBhṇā v. 55) we see three types of installations prescribed for Bhadrakāli, namely, sāṅga (Bhadrakāli facing north), niraṅgā (Bhadrakāli facing east), and bhinnā (Bhadrakāli facing west). The Śeṣasamuccaya prescribes two additional options, namely, the north facing Bhadrakāli together with the Seven Mothers and Bhadrakāli together with the Mothers placed in the southeast of Śiva.

53 According to the Brahmayāmala (BYpy p. 28), Bhadrakāli is visualised as having several hands that hold respectively a skull, a trident, a staff with a skull at the top (khadvānga), a shield, a bell, a sacred drum (damaru), and a noose. Ajithan (2015: 11) points out that the Mūssads (cf. p. 546 below) of the Vaḷayannāṭu temple visualise Bhadrakāli as it is described in the Bhadrakālīmantravidhiprakarana (Sanderson 2007a: 266–268) of the Paippalādins, holding [on the right] a trident, an elephant-goad, an arrow, and a sword and [on the left] a vessel filled with blood, a
May she always protect you, [she] who stands on [the corpse of] Śiva, who is radiant with a diadem on her head that coruscates with a fragment of the emblem that is the moon, who holds in her lotus-hands a noose and hook, a trident and a skull, who is decorated with a garland of fresh heads, who has three eyes, who wears red unguents and clothes, who is bright with all [manner of] ornaments, [and] who is dark in colour, [namely] Śivā [= Bhadrakāli].

The Śesasamuccaya also gives another option for the visualisation as an alternative to the above, and we find the same visualisation in the Mātrṣadbhāva (MS BhTr., pp. 26-27):

I venerate Mahābhairavi, who at once wove a garland with the blood-dripping skins of the heads of demons who had come to battle [with her] and carefully (sādaram) arranges it as an upper garment, and who holds in her hands a shield, a skull, a snake, a great bell, the head of the Asura (subhaṃkārikā), a skull-topped staff (khaṭvāṅga), a trident (triśikhā), a sword (anasi).

This is the form we mostly see in Rurujit temples in Kerala. In this form, she uses her hands, smeared with the demon’s blood, to put on the garland made of the heads of demons, which then resembles her upper garment; she holds in her hands a shield (kheḍa), a skull (kapāla), a snake (pannaga), a bell (mahāghaṇṭā), the head of the Asura (subhaṃkārikā), a staff with a skull at the top (khaḍvāṅga), a trident (triśikhā), and a sword (anasi).

In its eighth chapter, the Śesasamuccaya introduces the samayavidyā for the recitation once all the nyāsas – the emplacement of the mantras on the

---

54 SŚ 8.50: śambhusthā śaśalakṣmakhaṇḍavilasat koṭīraṇīdēojvalā | bibhrānā karpaṇikajair guṇasṛṇī śīlam kapālam tathā | muṇḍasrakparimāṇḍitā trinayanaś raktāṅgarāgamśukā | sarvānkaṇaṇgājvalā śītinibhā vaḥ pāṭu nītasam śivā. The Vimarśinī on SŚ 8.50 reads thus: sambhusthā śambhurūpapretasamastā guṇasṛṇi pāṣam anūṣaṇam ca muṇḍasrakparimāṇḍitā uttamāṅgarūpābhīṁ mālābhīṁ parito maṇḍitā śītinibhā śyānavarna.

55 SŚ 8.51: sadyah sankarasamgatāsurasirahērinīḥ āśrolbanair | ābadhyā srajam uttarīyam anayā sambhihraṁ sādāram | dorbhīṁ khetakapālapanagnāmahāghaṇṭāsuhbaṃkārikā | khaṭvāṅgātriśikhānasīṁ ca dadhatīṁ vande mahābhairavīṁ. The Vimarśinī on SŚ 8.51 reads thus: sadyah saṅgaretī. sadya eva yuddhāya samāgaṇāṁ asūrāṇāṁ sironivahaiḥ rudhirodgahaiḥ srajam ābadhyānayā sādāram uttarīyam bibhṛatīṁ.
body – are completed and also for certain other occasions, though the mantra described seems to be incomplete.\(^5\) In the ninth chapter of the Śesasamuccaya, we find a detailed description of the festivals that are to be conducted in the temple of Rurujit.

Even though offerings of meat are prescribed in the rituals by the Śesasamuccaya, in practice only symbolic meat is offered. For example, while giving the details of the rice to be offered to the Mothers, the text mentions māṃsaudana for Vārāhī, which the Malayalam commentator of the Śesasamuccaya explains as an offering representing the meat (māṃsa): “For Vārāhi, rice mixed with meat - [rice] mixed with sweet pudding (vatsan) that represents the meat […].”,\(^5\) meaning a rice cake mixed with jaggery.

**Kerala temple priests**

The Nampūtiri Brahmins are mostly found in Kerala temples as the officiating priests for the daily rituals as well as the tantras or chief-priests, who are in control of the performance of special rituals such as festivals, consecrations, etc.\(^5\) Even though these Nampūtiris also perform rituals in the Bhadrakālī temples, in certain selected temples of Rurujit, we find members of a non-Nampūtiri communities as priests. It may be worth noting here that according to the southern Brahmayāmala texts the priests of a Bhadrakālī temple must be non-Brahmins, known as pārśava.\(^5\)

Even though the Kerala Mārtantra texts, the Mātsadhāvā or Śesasamuccaya, do not mention non-Brahmin priests carrying out the worship of Bhadrakālī or Rurujit, we see that there are three particular non-Nampūtiri communities that are involved in the worship of Rurujit.


\(^5\) ŚSTV p. 247: vārāhikku māṃsodanam-māṃsa pratinidhiyāya 'vatsanițat […].

\(^5\) While the early ritual manuals of Kerala, such as the Śaivāgamani-bandhana and the Prayogamānjara, insist that a Tantric initiation be undergone if a priest is to be qualified to perform temple rituals and also prescribe the initiation (dīkṣā), the latter ritual manuals, such as the Tantrasamuccaya, minimise the initiation (dīkṣā) rituals, prescribing merely an instruction of the principal (mūla) mantra (mantropadeśa). For a detailed discussion on this topic, see Sarma 2010.

\(^5\) See n. 15 above.
The three different communities associated with the worship of Rurujit

There are thirteen known temples in Kerala devoted to Rurujit. Among these, in certain selected temples members belonging to three specific communities perform rituals. While the priests of the Kollam Piṣārikāvu and Vaḷayanāṭukāvu in the Calicut District are of a Mūssad community, the priests of the Māṭāyikāvu in the Kannur District and Mannampurattukāvu in Nilesvaram are of a Piṭāra community. In the famous Kodungallur Temple in the Trichur District of Kerala, the Aṭikal are entitled to perform the rituals. It is to be noted here that these three groups of communities are considered as pārasāvas and nowadays often referred to as degraded Brahmins.

The Mūssads

It is believed that a group of Vaiśyas who moved from South Kerala during the period of Mārtāṇḍavarma of the Travancore Kingdom (1706–1758) reached Kollam in the Koyilandi area of North Kerala and installed the Piṣārikāvu Temple devoted to Rurujit. At present, there are eight Vaiśya families who administer this temple. It is said that Vaiśyas initially performed rituals here, but they appointed a Nampūtiri Brahmin for an improved performance of the rituals. Thus, the rituals that had been performed by the Vaiśyas underwent some changes, and especially the offering of liquor and meat was abandoned. Yet, the rituals performed by the Nampūtiri Brahmin made the goddess fiercer and more powerful, and it became difficult for the devotees to bear this. Hence, the Vaiśyas decided to replace the Nampūtiri priest, and they engaged the Mūssad community to perform the temple rituals of the Piṣārikāvu.

The Mūssads are also the priests in the Vaḷayanāṭukāvu in Calicut District. These two temples feature the installation of Rurujit as prescribed in the Śeṣasamuccaya ritual manual. The Mūssads who perform rituals in these temples also perform a public ritual known as śākteyapūjā in their homes for the benefit of devotees, where they sacrifice a chicken and offer it to the deity along with liquor.

---

60 Girishkumar (2012: 3) mentions 13 temples of Rurujit in Kerala. However, other scholars list even more temples, for instance, Bhat (2013: 18) provides a list of 15 temples, and in a recent paper Ajithan (2015: 2–3) gives a list of 16 such temples.

61 For a detailed study of the rituals in this temple, see Ajithan 2015: 5–9.

62 According to Ajithan (2015: 5), the system of worship of “Mūssad-s is a blend
The Piṭāras

This community is well-known as worshippers of Bhadrakālī, and the Māṭāyikāvu Temple of Kannur District, where they perform worship, is one of the more famous temples of Kerala. It is interesting to note that in Tamil Nadu the fierce goddess is known as Piṭāri.

The Aṭikāḷ

The Aṭikāḷ are a small community and the following is their orally transmitted origin myth: One day, while they were accompanying the great philosopher Śaṅkara, the latter drank liquor to test the fidelity of his followers. They thought if the ācārya could drink, they could too, and so they drank the liquor. Śaṅkara then entered a foundry and drank molten metal. After this he challenged them, saying, “Now, see if you can do all that I can do.” They apologised to him and were degraded to slaves (atiyāl).

The priests at Kodungallur come from a family at Pallipuram, more than 50 miles north-east of Kodungallur. According to custom, only the men alone, without their womenfolk, are allowed to come to Kodungallur, and men from Aṭikāḷ families marry girls of the local Nayar (non-Brahmin) families and settle in Kodungallur.

There is also a story behind the settlement of the Aṭikāḷ around the Kodungallur Temple. It is said that there were 101 houses of Nampūtiri Brahmins in the vicinity of the Kodungallur Temple. Once, a poor Brahmin of Krama systems of Kashmir and South Indian Brahmayāmala traditions. What is to be noted here is that there seems to be two dimensions, i.e. inner and outer, with regard to the worship of Mūssads. The inner dimension consists of worship of their cultic deities viz., Śrīvidyā, Kālasaṅkarṣṭṭi and Parā. The outer realm consists of worship of Bhadrakālī or Caṇḍakapālinī and Māṭṛs along with Virabhadra and Gaṇapati.” However, in order to relate the ritual systems that are followed by Mūssads to the Krama system, the textual materials that are used by Mūssads would need to be studied, which I have not yet located. SANDERSON (2007a: 277–278) observes that it is only certain Tantric mantras of Kālīkula that are embedded in the southern Brahmayāmala texts.

63 INDUCHUDAN (1969: 118) observes thus on the Aṭikāḷ: “They are a very small community in Kerala. In the division of castes they come as a sub-division of what are called Antaralas, with Dvijas or twice-born, i.e. Brahmins and Kshatriyas coming first. They are presumed to be degraded Brahmins, the degradation being the result of service of meat and liquor or their substitutes in the temples. They officiate as priests in some shrines.”
approached these houses at night for food, and he was sent from house to house until finally those living next to the temple suggested he should go and beg at the doors of the adjacent house, that being the abode of the goddess. Unaware that it was a temple, the poor Brahmin asked for alms. While the goddess provided him with food, she was angry with the Nāmpūṭiri Brahmins who refused to offer the Brahmin food, and so she burned all the Nāmpūṭiri houses there. Even today there are no houses of Nāmpūṭiri Brahmins near the temple. Since there were no Nāmpūṭiri Brahmins left to perform the temple rituals, the king of that time brought the Aṭikal from Pallipuram, north-east of Kodungallur. At present, the Aṭikal have the right to perform rituals in the Kodungallur Temple, but they appoint Nāmpūṭiri Brahmins for the regular services of the temple rituals. The Aṭikal themselves perform specific rituals only during the festival.

Kodungallur Temple of Rurujit and particular private and public rituals that take place in this temple

It is said that the Cēra King Ceṅkuṭṭuvaṇ, after listening to the story of Kaṅňaki, established a temple in his capital to commemorate her martyrdom. It is also considered that Īḷāṅko Aṭikal, the younger brother of Ceṅkuṭṭuvaṇ, authored the Cilappatikāram at a place close to Kodungallur town. According to some scholars, when that area was later inhabited by Buddhist monks, it became a Buddhist temple but then returned to the Hindus during the period of Sāmutiris, the rulers of the medieval kingdom of Kozhikode.

The Kodungallur Temple exhibits some very specific structural features. A long hall built from granite and divided into three chambers is found on the inside of the inner complex. Its central chamber is the sanctum sanctorum in which Bhadrakāli in the form of Rurujit is installed facing the northern entrance. In the western chamber, the Seven Mothers along with Vīrabhadra and Gaṇapati are installed facing north. The most eastern chamber is very small, without doors or windows, and known as a secret

---

64 INDUCHUDAN (1969: 287) observes the following: “Nambudiris had practically no hold in the Kodungallur temple. ... The Atikal who manages the whole affairs and the Nambudiri priest only acts on his behalf. A Nambudiri priest, as soon as he comes to Kodungallur, should take technical instructions from the Atikal on the nature of rituals. ... The Nambudiri has only what is called general practices as his own.”

65 Cf. INDUCHUDAN 1969: 16–17; see also MENON 1924: IV.331–332.

chamber in which a śrīcakra is installed. It is believed that this śrīcakra was installed by Śaṅkara himself. This chamber has a subterranean passage that leads towards the east and opens to the ground after about 100 yards. There is also a separate sanctum for Śiva, who faces east, and one for Kṣetrapāla. The structure of a temple described in the Mātrṣadbhāva and Šeṣasamuccaya for Bhadrakāli along with the Seven Mothers closely corresponds to the structure of the Kodungallur Temple, with the exception of its particular secret chamber.

The idol of Bhadrakāli in a sitting posture in the Kodungallur Temple is made of jackfruit tree wood, about six feet high, and has eight hands, holding on the right side (top to bottom) a trident, a skull staff (khaṭvāṅga), a sword, and the severed head of Dāruka and on the left a snake, an anklet, a shield, and a bell. Her left ear features an elephant earring and the right one a lion earring.

The festival rituals in this temple too are unique and complicated. It is not only the structure that accords well with the southern Brahmayāmala texts, especially the Mātrṣadbhāva, but also certain rituals that are performed in this temple and form part of its unique character. Among these, a secret ritual known as treccandanapoticārttal, or “smearing the idol with holy sandal powder,” and a public ritual known as kāviṭāṇṭal, or “polluting the Kāvu or temple,” are considered of special importance.

In the course of the treccandanapoticārttal ritual, or “the smearing the sandal paste,” everyone is sent out of the inner temple complex while three senior members of the Aṭikaḷ community, belonging to three families, enter the sanctum and perform rituals that run for several hours. The details of these are unknown, and according to the tradition only those who perform the ritual know how it is to be done. The details of the ritual will be passed on to a new member only when required. This means when the representative of one family dies, his place will be taken by the next member of the family, and it is only then that this newcomer will learn the ritual. It is obviously believed that the Goddess was wounded after the war and required special medication, so the “smearing the sandal paste” is considered a treatment of the wounds.

---


68 This fact was also mentioned to me by a senior member of one of the three families who participate in the Kodungallur temple rituals and whom I was able to meet in November 2014.
This ritual is followed by the *kāvutīṇṭal* ritual, or “the polluting of the temple,” in which thousands of members of several communities participate, including lower castes but no Brahmins. It is worthy of note that cocks are sacrificed for almost a week prior to this ritual, and there are symbolic offerings of cocks following the *kāvutīṇṭal* ritual as well. As soon as the ritual of “smearing the sandal paste” is completed, everyone within the inner precincts leaves, and the doors all around are locked. The *valiya* or “senior” royal member of Kodungallur then mounts the eastern portico of the temple and spreads out a green coloured umbrella. The moment the green umbrella is spread, the crowd, consisting of the oracle (*vefficappāḍ*) who carries swords and the devotees who carry small sticks, runs around the temple and pollutes it by touching it. In the meanwhile, the devotees dance and sing obscene songs, known as *bharanipāṭṭu*.

These are a set of songs, some of which have an explicit sexual content while others praise every aspect of the Goddess, especially her sexuality. This is followed by purification rituals before the regular daily rituals begins. In this *kāvutīṇṭal* ritual, we see that the communities that include the higher royal family members as well as lower castes are involved.

Even though it may not be easy to explain why such a ritual is performed, we see an echo of the above-mentioned practices during the *bali* offering that is described in the *Mātrṣadbhāva*. During this *bali* procession, the devotees are asked to carry small sticks and the men are asked to partic-

---


70 According to Radhakrishnan (2013: 205–206), “the [*kāvutīṇṭal*] festival features Nairs and members from the royal family, it is largely a festival that is celebrated by the lower castes. The main castes that participate are the Vannans, the Mannans, the Pulayas and the Thiyas.”

71 Some observe that this ritual was performed to get rid of the Buddhist nuns who had taken control of the temple once upon a time. Radhakrishnan (2013: 208) notes “the [Kodungallur] temple could have been a Buddhist shrine to begin with. ... Buddhists in Kerala did not build too many stupas or other structures. They choose to conduct several of their meetings in the open air, in small groves, or *kavus*. The Kodungallur temple is also known as the *Sri Kurumba Kavu*. The *kavu teendal* ceremony at the *Bharani* then may have originated as a brahminical move to usurp the Buddhist shrine.” Radhakrishnan (2013: 208) also points to observations of Sadasivan (2000) and Gentes (1992), and he states that “they believed the Hindus in the area [Kodungallur] threw meat and alcohol into the Buddhist monasteries to desecrate the sacred space of Buddhist shrines and also harassed the Buddhist monks and nuns by hurling sexually explicit abuses at them.”
ipate well-dressed and ornamented, resembling the practice that is presently followed in the contexts of the kāvutinṭal ritual in the Kodungallur Temple:

Prominent men who are vigilant should be placed in front, [each] holding a bamboo stick that is straight, long, light and firm, and also at the sides, for protection, especially during the bali offering. Outside of them on all sides (paritah) guards should process (gaccheyuh) while playing about (krīḍantah); [these should be] youth who are fearless and strong, specially dressed, well-trained, with swords in their hands.  

The text further instructs to send away Brahmins, women, and children during the bali offering, and it also prescribes ways to behave while participating in the procession:

Brahmins as well as women and especially the children should be removed [from that area] since they would be conducive to faults (dosa). […]

Along with the great noise of the crowd (janašabdena) and the mixed sound produced by the instruments [and also] with different auspicious materials, [the crowd] while playing and waving (the arms) and gaping †…†

A more detailed study of the rituals that are performed in the Kodungallur Temple will be necessary in the future to compare these with the rituals that are prescribed in the southern Māttantra texts.

Can a Brahmin perform bali? Ritual beyond ritual manuals

We have seen that according to the southern Brahmayāmala texts, the priests of the Bhadrakālī temple must be non-Brahmins. But now let us turn

---

72 MSBhTivr p. 178: pradhānapuruṣān agre kalpayed apramādinaḥ | veṇu-dānāmsṛjum dīrgham prayṛhyā ca laghum drdham | pārśvadvaye ca raksārtham balidaṇe viśesataḥ | tadbhāye raksakās tatra yuvāno bhayavarjitaḥ | alanikṛtā viśeṣena khadgahastās suśikṣitaḥ | gaccheyuh paritaḥ tatra krīḍanto balasanyutāḥ |.

73 MSBhTivr p. 178: brāhmaṇānāṁnathā śrīnāṁ śiśunāṁ ca viśeṣataḥ | niśkritāṁ kārayet teṣaṁ yathā dosānurūpataḥ | and MSBhTivr p. 180: mahatā janaśabdena ṭkṣelāḥ spiloṣanajrmbhitaiḥ | nānātyavimśiraiś ca nānāśobhāsamanvitam |.
to a public ritual conducted in a Durgā temple that differs from what is taught in ritual manuals, a case in which the bali offering is performed by a Brahmin.

There is a temple of Durgā situated in the fort area of Trivandrum, Kerala, close to the Śrī Padmanābhasvāmī Temple. This temple is patronised by the Travancore royal family and is unique with respect to several features when compared to other Kerala temples. It neither has a flag-mast nor does it host any annual temple festival. While the daily rituals are performed by a Nampūtiri Brahmin according to the Kerala ritual manual Tantra-samuccaya, the right to hold the position of the chief priest (or tantri) rests with a Tamil Brahmin family who claims it as a hereditary right. It is worth noting that the fort area of Trivandrum is inhabited by several Tamil Brahmin families, most of whom have migrated from the Tirunelveli and Nagar Kovil areas, which were once part of the Travancore kingdom.

A three-day public ritual is conducted in this temple every year during the month of māgha (February–March), and the rituals are organised and performed by Tamil Brahmins who have settled around the fort area. Our main interest here is the bali offering that takes place on the third day of this ritual sequence. In this ritual, at night a group of Tamil Brahmins sings songs in Tamil in praise of Bhadrakālī. The one designated to perform the bali ritual becomes possessed, receives the sword from the temple, and leaves the temple in a procession together with drum players to walk around a 15-kilometer radius of the temple and make bali offerings in eight directions, with the principal bali being offered in a cremation ground. Early the next day, the procession reaches the pond of the Śrī Padmanābhasvāmī Temple, takes an auspicious bath (maṅgalsanāna), and then returns to the temple. While we have previously seen that the Mātrsadbhāva states to send away the Brahmins from the area of bali offerings, here a bali is offered by a Brahmin and takes place in a cremation ground.

The ritual that goes beyond communities:
Āttukāl Poṅgāla, a ritual that takes place in a Bhadrakālī Temple in Trivandrum

In Trivandrum, the capital city of Kerala, there is a temple of Bhadrakālī, known there as Attukal Amma (Mother). In this temple, the Goddess in the form of Bhadrakālī, the primary deity, is installed facing north and Śiva facing west. This temple is well-known today, although it might not have a long history. During its annual festival on the ninth day of the month
māgha, more than four million women of several communities and classes line the streets with pots to cook porridge as their offering. This offering in the form of a public ritual is known as poṅgāla. While the daily rituals of the temple are conducted either by Nampūtiri Brahmins or by Karnatakā Tulu Brahmins, its special rituals are conducted by the tantrī, or chief priest, associated with the Cennas Nampūtiri family, the family of the author of the Kerala ritual manual, the Tantrasamuccaya. In the temples of Kerala, where Brahmins are the officiating priests, usually the cooked food prepared outside the temple complex is not used for offerings. But in this temple, on the day of poṅgāla women prepare the offering themselves and it is offered to the deity. It is worth noting that every woman belonging to any community may participate in this offering. In this poṅgāla ritual, in the late morning the chief priest (tantri) lights the stove in the temple kitchen, while the melśānti, the priest who conducts the daily rituals, lights a stove that the temple administration keeps outside the temple, and then the fire from this stove is used to light the stoves that are kept ready around the seven-kilometre radius of the temple where the women prepare the offering. In the early evening, the temple priests go around the temple and offer the porridge that has been cooked and kept ready by the female devotees. Even though it is also performed in several other temples in Kerala and Tamil Nadu, the poṅgāla ritual is unique to Attukal since it involves the participation of a great number of devotees and thus acts as an example of a public ritual for which no community eligibility is prescribed.

Conclusion

While Alexis Sanderson, Shaman Hatley, and Csaba Kiss have brought to our knowledge the Brahmayāmala tradition of the North through their editions and studies, its southern tradition is still little known and hardly studied. As we have seen, the southern Brahmayāmala texts, too, could be considered part of the Brahmayāmala corpus.

While the southern Brahmayāmala text (IFP, Pondicherry) proposes that non-Brahmin priests perform the worship of Bhadrakālī, the Māṛṣadbhāva, which uses the southern Brahmayāmala materials as its source, does not mention non-Brahmins as priests and prohibits the participation of Brahmins in certain rituals. We see that in Kerala, especially in the temples of Rurujit, non-Brahmins as well as Nampūtiri Brahmins perform the worship,

---

74 For a detailed study on the poṅgāla ritual, see JENETT 1999 and 2005.
both claiming to follow the Śesasamuccaya manual for the Rurujit rituals. It is sad to note, however, that in most of the temples the rituals for Rurujit are not followed as prescribed by the Śesasamuccaya. The Mātrṣadbhāva as well as the Śesasamuccaya mention the offering of meat, but when the rituals are performed by Brahmans, only a substitute is offered. When the rituals are performed by non-Brahmins, meat is offered.

Even though the author of the Mātrṣadbhāva mentions that he used Yāmala materials for his work, it seems as though he adopted them in a way that would fit in with the Kerala temple ritual system, turning a non-Brahmanical ritual into a Brahmanical one, and this adaptation was then followed by the later authors of ritual manuals of Kerala, such as the Śesasamuccaya.

The two rituals that we discussed above, that is, a bali ritual performed by a Brahmin and the poṅgāla ritual that is performed in the Trivandrum Attukal Temple without any community bar, clearly demonstrates that these rituals do not strictly follow the ritual manuals but are adapted and modified according to necessity.
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Further Mahāpratisarā fragments from Gilgit

Gergely Hidas

Until recently the Gilgit collection was considered to preserve five incomplete manuscripts of the Mahāpratisarā-Mahāvidyārājñī (MPMVR), “The Great Amulet, Great Queen of Spells.” Thanks to new inspections, identifications of seven shorter fragments of the same text were communicated in 2014. The present paper examines the contents of these further pieces and places them within the whole Mahāpratisarā corpus from Gilgit and thus serves as an update and supplement to the edition published in HIDAS 2012, where the five manuscripts of the text, registered already decades ago, were published for the first time. It also investigates why so many copies of the same scripture were likely to be kept in one collection and what this could tell about the ritual practices of the Buddhist community in the area around the middle of the first millennium CE.

Introduction

The MPMVR is a magical-ritualistic scripture of Dhāraṇī literature, a genre centred around spells, their benefits, and instructions for use. This text is likely to have emerged in North India between the third and sixth centuries CE, and its first chapter (kalpa) directly refers to the Mahāyāna as a Bud-

---

1 Many thanks to the editors Prof. Vincent Eltschinger, Dr. Marion Rastelli, and Dr. Nina Mirnig for the invitation to write this article and to the Austrian Science Fund FWF VISCOM SFB Project for financial support. I am indebted to Dr. Klaus Wille for his kind help and advice and for comments on a final draft of this paper. I owe Dr. Csaba Kiss thanks for spotting a few inconsistencies.

2 Von Hinüber 2014, Kudo 2014. Three pieces were identified by Dr. Klaus Wille, one simultaneously by Dr. Klaus Wille and Prof. Noriyuki Kudo, two by Prof. Noriyuki Kudo, and one by Prof. Oskar von Hinüber.

3 The dating of this scripture involves a terminus post quem (3rd c. CE), the likely beginning of the appearance of Dīnāra coins mentioned in the text, and a terminus ante quem (early 7th c. CE), the possible date of the Gilgit manuscripts of this scripture based on donors’ names belonging to the Patola Shahi dynasty.
dhist sectarian denomination. As for further classification, the MPMVR contains some vajra-vocabulary\(^4\) as well as further notable links to the Vajrayāna displayed by its elaborate (and most likely reworked) setting that introduces the place of teaching and the audience (nidāna). The relation of this scripture to esoteric Buddhism is also strengthened by the mention of samaya (vow), maṇḍala(ka) (ritual space/circle), abhiṣeka (consecration), and mudrā (ritual hand gesture) – all characteristic terms of Tantric traditions.\(^5\)

The earliest manuscripts of the MPMVR were found near Gilgit.\(^6\) This collection was discovered in the 1930s, in the ruins of a building which may have been the residence of a small community of monks and served as a library, scriptorium, or genizah, perhaps simultaneously. On the basis of ruler names in colophons, the collection developed from ca. the sixth to the eight centuries, and it is important to note that this is the only extant library from ancient South Asia.\(^7\) The Gilgit finds were deposited in various places, with the New Delhi and Srinagar collections being the most diverse.\(^8\) A facsimile edition of the Delhi folios, the largest group, was published by Raghu VIRA & Lokesh CHANDRA (1959–1974),\(^9\) and it is recent good news that a high-quality colour reproduction of the same pieces is being printed in a new book series.\(^10\) Some private photos of the Srinagar folios were taken in the 1980s, but so far only a few pieces have been published.\(^11\)

\(^4\) In the formation of Buddhist ritual texts over time, there is a tendency towards an increased appearance of words and phrases elaborated by the term vajra (thunderbolt/diamond). On this process of ‘vajra-isation,’ see TRIBE 2000: 217–222.


\(^6\) As for later witnesses, the MPMVR survives in a few palm-leaf manuscripts from Eastern India dated to the eleventh to thirteenth centuries and in more than 300 palm-leaf and paper codices from Nepal from the period between the eleventh and twentieth centuries.

\(^7\) For recent overviews of the Gilgit collection, see VON HINÜBER 2014, 2018 and his preface to CLARKE 2014. On the topic of Buddhist genizah, see SALOMON 2009.

\(^8\) Further collections include the one in Ujjain, the Shah collection acquired by Giuseppe Tucci, and the Stein collection in the British Library. For details and a bibliography, see WILLE 1990 and VON HINÜBER 2014.

\(^9\) This was reprinted in a compact form in 1995.

\(^10\) For the first two volumes, see CLARKE 2014 and KARASHIMA et al. 2016.

The earlier identified Gilgit *Mahāpratisarā* manuscripts amount to 81 folios. Ms. no. 6, GBMFE 1080-1129 preserves 50 folios, no. 14. GBMFE 1130-1138, no. 15. GBMFE 1139-1156, and no. 17. GBMFE 1157-1165 nine folios each, and finally no. 56. GBMFE 3328-3335 preserves four folios.

The recently identified Gilgit *Mahāpratisarā* fragments add up to nine folios. Ms. no. 47. GBMFE 3119-3120, no. 51. GBMFE 3264, no. 51. GBMFE 3279-3280, no. 52. GBMFE 3320 and 3322 preserve one folio each, while no. 51. GBMFE 3266-3267 and no. 60. GBMFE 3352-3355 preserve two folios respectively.

These nine folios appear to belong to five, six, or seven different manuscripts, one of which is the already published ms. no. 6., GBMFE 1080-1129. Ms. no. 52. GBMFE 3320 may also be a missing part of this manuscript. Ms. no. 51. GBMFE 3264 may be a part of no. 17., GBMFE 1157-1165. Thus the number of newly identified manuscripts amount to four, five, or six pieces. It should also be noted that ms. A55 of a single folio in the Srinagar collection, identified by Chandrabhal Tripathi as a *Mahāpratisarā* fragment, does not transmit the text of the MPMVR.

In light of the above, we can now see a 9% increase of Gilgit folios of the MPMVR. Approximately 50% of the new identifications contain textual parts considered lost beforehand, thus there is a ca. 5% growth of *Mahāpratisarā* sources from Gilgit. It is reassuring that the editorial policies and the list of the Eastern Indian and Nepalese manuscripts which preserve earlier, Gilgit-related variants presented in Hidas 2012 have been on the whole confirmed.

With these new identifications the ranking of Gilgit texts has also changed. So far manuscripts of the following scriptures were most numerous: *Saṃghātāsūtra* (13 mss.), *Saddharmapundarīka* (9 mss.), *Prajñā-pāramitā* (8 mss.), *Ekottarikāgama* (7 mss.), *Sumāgadhāvadāna* (6 mss.), *Mahāpratisarā* (5 mss.), and *Bhaiṣajyaguru* (5 mss.). Now the *Mahāpratisarā* has become the second highest ranking text in Gilgit with nine, ten, or eleven manuscripts. This positioning, however, is not at all conclusive. It should be remembered that some of the Gilgit manuscripts vanished from sight in the 1930s, so what is currently available is only a part of a part of a collection. A verified listing of the items in the Srinagar group,

---

12 Siglum G₁ in Hidas 2012.
13 Siglum G₄ in Hidas 2012.
14 I am grateful to Dr. Klaus Wille for sending me his unpublished transcription.
which appears to contain 28 Mahāmāyūrī and 47 medical text fragments, will also reveal more.

As for social settings, the five earlier identified and longer Mahāpratisarā manuscripts all contain donors’ names inserted into the dhāraṇīs, with two of them being queens of the Patola Shahi dynasty. These five manuscripts are both “ready-made” and “tailor-made” ones as it has been noted, i.e., in the former case empty spaces are left out for the donor’s name to be subsequently inserted, whereas in the latter the sponsor’s name is written together with the whole text. None of the new fragments, however, contain donors’ names since no dhāraṇī parts survive. Nevertheless, the high number (nine, ten or eleven) of MPMVR manuscripts, along with the presence of “ready-made” ones, reflects extensive production, and we should not forget the previously mentioned 28 Mahāmāyūrī fragments either, which belong to the same type of Rakṣā literature. Drawing on later, better documented practices, it appears that such protective incantation texts were produced for members of the saṅgha for donations. These often personalised apotropaic objects, i.e., the manuscripts, were meant to be kept in the donor’s home, and it seems that persons of various rank, but especially from more affluent segments of society, took advantage of such monastic services. At the moment it appears that Dhāraṇī and Vidyā texts constitute the most numerous category in the Gilgit library with ca. 25 pieces (the second one is Avadāna with ca. 15 texts), and with the Srinagar collection spells amount to 53, medical texts to 47, and avadāna legends to 24 pieces. This reflects marked preferences for protection, healing, and storytelling (and thus proselytising) – activities that most likely served the strengthening of Buddhism from the side of monastics and demonstrate considerable lay receptivity in the area.

16 See, e.g., Hidas 2012: 30–33.
An edition of the recently identified *Mahāpratisarā*
fragments

Abbreviations, symbols, paragraphs, sigla, normalisations, and punctuation follow HIDAS 2012:

( ) – unclear or uncertain reading
[ ] – restoration of damaged or partly visible *aṅgas*
{...3...} – lacuna with the approximate number of missing *aṅgas*
(...) – a longer lacuna
< > – GBMFE folio numbers after Raghu Vira & Lokesh Chandra 1959-1974
corr. – correction
em. – emendation
conj. – conjectural emendation

Silent orthographical normalisations

*avagrahas* are not used in the mss. and have been supplied.
Consonant geminations before *r* have been normalised.
*r* sometimes written as *ṛ* and vice versa have been normalised.
Medial *anuvāra* have been changed to homorganic nasals and homorgan-
ic nasals to *anuvāras* when needed. Final *anuvāras* before vowels and at
the end of sentences or verses have been changed to *m*.

Punctuation

A single dot used in the original folios has been written as a single *daṇḍa* while a double *daṇḍa* has been preserved in its original form. A single dot and a double *daṇḍa* has been indicated with three *daṇḍas*. In the case of a
double dot (*visarga*), a *daṇḍa* has been given in the edition and the double
dot has been indicated in the apparatus. All punctuation marks have been
placed according to the original folios.
G_1 : Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts Facsimile Edition. Śata-piṭaka Vol. 10. Part 10. Ser. no. 52. 3320, 3322. Fragment 3322 is a missing piece of Vol. 10. Part 6. Ser. no. 6. 1109. Fragment 3320 may also be a surviving piece of a missing folio of the same manuscript from between 1104 and 1105.

- Birch bark leaves. Two folios with two or three remaining lines. All sides of the folios are broken off. No reference to the real size of the folios is given in the GBMFE. The number of surviving akṣaras in a line varies between three and seven. Originally there must have been approximately 20–28 akṣaras in a line.
- Round, earlier Gilgit-script. Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I. Appears to be the same hand.
- Ca. first half of the seventh century
- Incomplete
- Continuous text
- No interlinear or marginal corrections
- Foliation: no foliation survives
- The original folios are kept in the National Archives, New Delhi
- Identification by Noriyuki Kudo

Contains parts of paragraphs [26] = Fifth narrative: merchant Vimalaśāṅkha’s ship is saved from seamonsters and a sea-storm; and [29] = Sixth narrative: King Prasāritapāṇi is granted a son.

[26] <G_1 3320a> mīṅgilaḥ pota{...13...}[ś](a)bdaṃ kartum ārabdhā <G_1 3320b> [a]ḥam[v] mo{...12...} [r]ato dhīrama[n][...]

[29] <G_1 3322b> kim iti {...16...}gadhaviṣa <G_1 3322a> k[v] babhūva {...16...}[ena]rā[ṅţā][...]


- Birch bark leaf. A single folio with eight lines. All sides of the folio are broken off in different degrees. No reference to the real size of
the folio is given in the GBMFE. The number of surviving akṣaras in a line varies between 5 and 18. Originally there must have been approximately 22–28 akṣaras in a line.

- Round, earlier Gilgit-script. Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I.\(^{17}\)
- Ca. first half of the seventh century
- Incomplete
- Continuous text
- No interlinear or marginal corrections
- Filiation: no foliation survives\(^{18}\)
- The original folio is kept in the National Archives, New Delhi
- Identification by Klaus Wille, Noriyuki Kudo


[13] <G\(_6\) 3120> śayāḥ
śakras\(^{20}\) ca tridaśāṭīḥ sā[rham]{...10...} kayaṃ ca mahākālaṃ nandikeśvaram kā{...9...} [ndi]kesvaram sarve mātrgaṇā tasya tathānye mārakā{...9...} jā devā caiva mahardhikā te sarve raksām kari{...10...} vai \(^{21}\) buddhā\(^{22}\) caiva mahātmāno vidyādevyo mahā{...3...} [kī bhrkut](i) tārāṅkuṣī] vajraśaṁkalā [śve]{...9...} supāśī vajrapā{...21...} takuṇḍalī [a]{...26...} <G\(_6\) 3119>kunḍalī]

---

\(^{17}\) KUDO 2014: 517 and 2015: 258 classify the script as Type II.

\(^{18}\) VON HINÜBER 2014: 106 remarks that this is folio no. 114. I have been unable to trace this foliation.

\(^{19}\) The text is not identified here.

\(^{20}\) śakra] cor.; śakṣa G\(_6\)

\(^{21}\) vai [] cor.; vaiḥ G\(_6\)

\(^{22}\) buddhā] conj.; buddhā G\(_6\)

puspa{...16...}
[ā]ḷ[ṛ]ā tathā dhanyā vidyumā{...12...}
tathā buddhā kṣiṣitanāmnā ca
kāpālinī va{...12...}
(pī) bahuvidhās tathā |
te sarve tasya rākṣa{nī} {...9...}gatā bhavet
hārītī pāńcikaś caiva saṁ[kh]{...12...}
sarasvati nityānubaddhā rākṣārthe
pratisarā{...15...}
[dy]ārājā mahābalā ṭ23
sarvasiddhi sadā{...13...}
[r]ḥhāni vardhante sukhaṃ prasī[ya]{...}


- Birch bark leaf. A single folio with six and seven lines. The sides of the folio are somewhat broken off. No reference to the real size of the folio is given in the GBMFE. The number of surviving akṣaras in a line varies between 15 and 17. Originally there must have been approximately 25–27 akṣaras in a line.
- Round, earlier Gilgit-script. Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I.
- Ca. first half of the seventh century
- Incomplete
- Continuous text
- No interlinear or marginal corrections
- Foliation: no foliation survives
- The original folio is kept in the National Archives, New Delhi
- Identification by Klaus Wille
- Listed in VON HINÜBER 2014: 107 (no. 51b.2)

23 mahābalā || corr.: mahābalāḥ G6
24 This leaf may be a missing folio of Vol. 10. Part 6. Ser. no. 17 (siglum G4 in HIDAS 2012) as the sequence of the text and the size of the lacuna suggest between GBMFE 3264 and 1157. Paleographically, however, it appears that this leaf and those of no. 17. are written by a different hand (cf. especially the punctuation marks) and the shape of the folios are dissimilar, too.

[13] <G₇ 3264a>śah ||
yah kaścid dhārayate vidyā kaṇṭhe [b]{...10...}
kāryāṇi siddhyante nātra saṃśayah |

nityam raksanī de{ve}{...10...}
dhisatvā mahāvīryā buddhā pratyekā nāyakāḥ
 {...10...}devyo mahardhikā

raksān kurvanti satataṁ prati{...8...}
pāniś ca yaksendra rājānaś caturas tathā |
tas{ya} {...9...}śayah

śa{kra]ś ca tri[daśai]h sārdham brahmā vi{...5...}
<G₇ 3264b> key(a) ca {...5...}ndikeśvaraṃ

sarve mātrga{...10...}kā |

ṛṣayaś ca mahātejā deva²⁵ caiva mahardhikā
 {...10...}[[t]sarādhārakāya vai²⁶

buddhā²⁷ caiva mahātmāno vi{...9...}][l(a)parākramā |

māmakī bhṛkuṭī tārāṅkuśi{...10...}

mahākālī eva ca | dūtyā vajradūtyā²⁸ ca
s{u} {...10...}ānir mahābalā

vajramālā mahāvidyā ta{...10...}

mahādevi kālakarṇī mahāvīrya

tathā dha{...}


• Birch bark leaves. Two folios with six lines. All sides of folio 3266 and the left side of 3267 are broken off. No reference to the real size of the folios is given in the GBMFE. The number of surviving aksaras in a line varies between 9 and 19. Originally there must have been approximately 22–26 aksaras in a line.

²⁵ devā] corr.: tevā G₇
²⁶ vai ] corr.: vaiḥ G₇
²⁷ buddhā] em.; boddhā G₇
²⁸ vajradūtyā] corr.; vajradūpyā G₇
- Round, earlier Gilgit-script. Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I. Appears to be the same hand.
- Ca. first half of the seventh century
- Incomplete
- Continuous text
- No interlinear or marginal corrections
- Filiation: no foliation survives
- The original folios are kept in the National Archives, New Delhi
- Identification by Klaus Wille
- Listed in VON HINÜBER 2014: 107 (no. 51b.4)

Contains parts of paragraphs [42] = Ritual instructions: how to prepare the amulet; and [44] = Various benefits of this protection. Enumeration of the deities who safeguard its user.

[42] <G₈ 3266a> [sukhi]to bhonti mucyante karma[ś]{...9...}
[kṣārtham] strīnām garbhasamudbhavaṃ |
bha[vi]{...8...}[dr]yavraṇarohana |
upavāsoṣito bhū[ṭv]{...7...}te
buddhapājāpāreṇa ca | bodhīcittam {...8...}
[ce]tasā ]
snātvā candana²⁹ karpūrakāstūryo{...10...}
vṛtya mahādhūpanadhūpitā |
[tā] {...4...} <G₈ 3266b> {...5...} samanvitam |
pūrṇakumbhātra ca[tvā]{...7...}
[pa]dhūpāṃś ca gandhāś ca dātavyātra mahā{...7...}
spṛkkāṃ ca turuskā pāṇcaśārkārā |
dātavy{...7...}kālaṃ yathārtum³⁰ |
sarvapuspapha[l]{...8...}
[ta]māksikadudghabhāḥ pāyasādibhiḥ
{...12...}[nādhhyāṃ] praśasyante
supūritaṃ {...}

[44] <G₈ 3267a> [dha]nam
rakṣayāṃ tasya yāvaj jīvam bhaviṣyati |
puruṣā{...5...}m [yu]ddhasamgrāmabhairave |

²⁹ candana] corr.; dandana G₈
³⁰ Note the lack of sandhi here.
anena varadā yā[...7...][ni]ścitāḥ
atha pāpavināśarthaṃ likhita[...8...]
gatā vilokenti bodhisatvāḥ tathaiva[...9...]
m āyuṣ ca vardhate |
dhanadhānyasa[...10...]
kham svapati medhāvī sukham
<G8 3267b> {...15...}nāṃ sarvabhūta garanāpi
 {...13...}[ni]tyaśāḥ
vidyāyā sādhyamā[...12...]
kham vā sadhayē vidyā avighne nā[...9...]
sarvakalpāśya praviśṭī sarvamaṇḍale |
 {...7...} bhavet sarvatra jātiṣu |
vaśvāsiko bhavet ta{...5...}[hya]dhārane |
sarvamaṅgalasampūrṇa sarvāśāsyā ma{...}


- Birch bark leaf. A single folio with five and six lines. The right side of the folio is somewhat broken off. No reference to the real size of the folio is given in the GBMFE. The number of surviving aksaras in a line varies between 28 and 34. Originally there must have been approximately 32–36 aksaras in a line.
- Round, earlier Gilgit-script. Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I.
- Ca. first half of the seventh century
- Incomplete
- Continuous text
- No interlinear or marginal corrections
- Foliation: numeral on the mid-left margin of recto side: GBMFE 3279-3280 equalling folio 2131
- The original folio is kept in the National Archives, New Delhi
- Identification by Oskar von Hinüber
- Listed in VON HINÜBER 2014: 108 (no. 51d)

---

31 This folio number fits well the proposal put forward in HIDAS 2012: 14 that originally there had been an earlier and shorter nidāna which later on was transformed into a longer, more detailed one.
Contains parts of paragraphs [30]–[31] = Sub-narrative: merchant Dhamamati and his poor servant. Sixth narrative ends.

[30] <G₉ 3279>ṣṭhino-m-idad abravīt aham āryasya niveśane bhṛ[ti]{{...2...}}| karmam karisyāmi | dharma[ṇ] ca [ṣr]{{...1...}}mi | yadā mat kimcid bhavisyati | tadāhāṃ dharman puṇayisyāmi | tasya grhavyā- pāram<sup>32</sup> kurvata dha{{...2...}} śṛnvata | apareṇa samayena tena śreṣṭhinī tasya puruṣasya<sup>33</sup>-m-ekāṁ dīnā{{...3...}} tena sarvasatvaparitrānārtham bodhicittam utpādyā sarvasatvasādharanam kṛtvā ma{{...3...}} sararatne nīrīyāta | evaṃ ca prāṇidhānam kṛtam anena dānamahāphalena mama {{...2...}} <G₉ 3280>satvānāṃ ca dārīdrey<sup>34</sup> samucccheda sāyī tena kāra-ṇena tad<sup>35</sup> dānam pariśayaṃ<sup>36</sup> na gacchati |

[31] e[vaṃ] {{...1...}} huvīdham anekavidham api puṇyābhisamskāram<sup>37</sup> kṛta | devatāni ca pūjita vandana yā{{...4...}} gavantaḥ pūjītāḥ tadā śuddhāvāsakābhir devatābhīḥ<sup>38</sup> svapnarāsanaṃ dattam | e{{...2...}} cā-bhīhitam | bho mahārāja samantajvālāmālā<sup>39</sup> viśuddhisphuritacintā- {{...2...}} mūḍrāhrdayāparājitā mahādhārāni vidyārājñā mahāpratisarā nāma yathā{{...2...}} dhīnālīkhyā yathāvidhi kalpābhīhitam upavā-sōṣītā{{...}}

G<sub>10</sub> : Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts Facsimile Edition. Śata-piṭaka Vol. 10. Part 10. Ser. no. 60. 3352-3355

- Birch bark leaves. Two folios with six lines. The upper and lower sides of the folios are somewhat broken off. No reference to the real size of the folios is given in the GBMFE. The number of surviving aksaras in a line varies between 8 and 24. Originally there must have been approximately 22–24 aksaras in a line.

<sup>32</sup> "vyāpāram" corr.; "vyāvāram" G₉
<sup>33</sup> puruṣasya conj.; puruṣya G₉
<sup>34</sup> dārīdrey<sup>9</sup> em.; dārīdrey<sup>7</sup> G₉
<sup>35</sup> tad corr.; ta G₉
<sup>36</sup> pariśayaṃ corr.; pariśayaṃ G₉
<sup>37</sup> puṇyābhisamskāram conj.; puṇyābhīskāram G₉
<sup>38</sup> devatābhīḥ corr.; devatābhīḥ G₉
<sup>39</sup> "mālā" corr.; "māla" G₉
Round, earlier Gilgit-script. Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I. Appears to be the same hand.
Ca. first half of the seventh century
Incomplete
Continuous text
No interlinear or marginal corrections
Foliation: numeral on the mid-left margin of recto side: GBMFE 3352-3353 equalling folio 18 and GBMFE 3354-3355 equalling folio 56
The original folios are kept in the National Archives, New Delhi
Identification by Klaus Wille
Listed in VON HÜMBER 2014: 111 (no. 60a)


[26] <G<sub>10</sub> 3352> vidyolkām tām ca vajrāśinīm taiś ca timiṅgilaḥ potam avastabdham dṛ[ṣ]tvā mahāntam utkroṣanāśadman kartum ārabdhāḥ<br><br>paritṛṣayasva mahāsatva mocayāśmān mahābhayāt ||<br>a[...3... ] sa mahāśarhavāho dṛṣṭhaṅcito mahā[ma][...6... ]<br><br>[49] <G<sub>10</sub> 3354> hy ayam vidyā sarvarogopāśāntaye |

---

40 ārabdhāḥ] em.; ābdhāḥ G<sub>10</sub>
41 brūḥ] corr.; brūhi brūhi G<sub>10</sub>
42 kathyatāṁ] corr.; kathyatāṁ G<sub>10</sub>
bhūyo sapta vărā vai [43] balikunbham sumanritam |
pacī nivedayen mantra balipuṣpaṃ yathālābham yathāvidham |
sūtrakām vānisaktavām padumamisritā [44]
ity eva daksine pārśve ksipeta sapta-m-eva tu |
pacimāyām ca saptāiva uttarāyām diśi s-tathā |
ārdhvaṃ pāḥtamatāreṇa kṛtā rakṣā a{...13...} 
{duḥkhāḥ}t pramucyate |
esa ra<G_{10} 3355> {...13...} 
[nā]sty asya [para]to kaści ra[kṣā]vidyā tribhave vidyate kvaci[t]

[50] [na ta]sya mṛtyur na jara na rogo 
na cāpriyaṃ nāpi ca viprayoga |
yadvasya vidyāṃ hi subhāvitāṃā 
bhaviṣyate mṛtyuṇenā puṣitaḥ 
yamo 'pi tasya varadharājā 
kariṣyate mṛtyuṇenā puṣitaḥ [45]
kathaviṣyatā devapuraḥ hi gaccha 
ksanikaṃ mameha[46] narakapurāṃ kariṣyasi |
tato vimānehi bahuprakā{...}

Conclusion

As we have seen, these recently identified fragments of the Mahāpratisāgarā from Gilgit contain various parts of this scripture. This shows that the entire text was copied in considerable numbers, being much valued in the local Buddhist community. This esteem stems from the belief that such apotropaic works were supposed to provide protection for manuscript owners from practically any sort of danger and illness and were trusted to grant everything good and auspicious unceasingly.

43 vai [ ] corr.; vaṭṭh G_{10}
44 Note that this line is not transmitted in the later Eastern Indian and Nepalese manuscripts edited in HĪDAS 2012.
45 mṛtyuṇenā puṣitaḥ seems to be mistakenly repeated and written instead of a likely puṣaṃ sagauraveṇa, the reading attested in all the Eastern Indian and Nepalese manuscripts
46 mameha] conj.; maheha G_{10}
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