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I must apologize to the contributors that it has taken more than three years to publish the proceedings of the workshop. I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Ryugen Tanemura who has kindly worked to prepare the final version of this volume by TeX compiler.

Tokyo
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Shingo EINO0
Introduction

The Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project has recently made available many new manuscripts for the use of Indologists, and this has contributed to significant progress in Tantric studies. The articles introduced below, with the exception to that of Einoo, have to a greater or lesser extent made use of these materials. In this sense, this volume can claim to represent the newest research on the subject.

The first article in the collection is entitled “From kāmas to siddhis: tendencies in the development of ritual towards Tantrism” (Shingo Einoo) Vedic rituals are generally performed to obtain certain desires, and were, for the people of ancient India, a reliable way to fulfill their objectives. Some Tantric rites too claim to bring about the attainment of wishes. The objectives of such rites are usually referred to as siddhis or supernatural powers and belong rather to the category of supernatural phenomena. Thus they seem to be considerably different from the types of wish people expected to gain from the Vedic rituals that still remained within the sphere of everyday life. In his article Einoo attempts to trace changes in the selection of objectives in Vedic rituals, and in the selection of siddhis in Tantric rites by examining some Vedic and post-Vedic texts. First, he analyses the Rgvidhāna in order to discover what purposes and effects were expected and then the Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa. After that he compares the results obtained from the analysis of these two vidhāna texts with the kāmya rites given in the Gobhilagṛhyasūtra. Among the Tantric ritual texts he has selected the Viṇāśikhatantra as an example of a Hindu Tantric text and the Amoghapāśakalparāja as a text of Buddhist Tantrism to take an overview of the tendency towards a development from obtaining desires (kāmas) in the Vedic texts to getting supernatural powers (siddhis) in the Tantric texts.

The second article is “The Śaiva age: an explanation of the rise and dominance of Śaivism during the early medieval period” (Alexis Sanderson). To describe it, I would like to draw upon the author’s excellent summary provided for the workshop, which I reproduce here with slight changes. “The early medieval period, from the sixth to the thirteenth centuries, saw a decline in the role played by the Vaidikas in general and the Atharvavedins in particular in the religious ceremonies sponsored by the court. Kings continued to make land-grants to Vaidika brahmins in order to promote agricultural expansion and the cultural penetration of new territory, and they continued to impose and uphold the brahmanical social order, but their personal devotion shifted to the deities of
the initiatory religions that integrated the brahmanical tradition but claimed to rise beyond it, or to Mahāyāna Buddhism, especially in its Tantric development. Among these alternatives Śaivism was the most widely favoured. In the declarations of religious adherence included with the titles attached in inscriptions to the names of rulers the epithet paramamāheśvarah ‘supremely devoted to Śiva’ is much the most frequent in this period, and of the many surviving temples established by rulers throughout the subcontinent and Southeast Asia from the late sixth century onwards those dedicated to the worship of Śiva are much the most numerous. The dominance of Śaivism is also manifest in the fact that the other main bidders for royal patronage, Buddhism, Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇavism, and Jainism, as well as the earlier forms of Śaivism itself, were fundamentally revised or expanded along the lines of the Śaiva Mantramārga as they sought to maintain their hold on the sources of patronage. As for the other two cults that held the allegiance of kings during this period, those of the Goddess and the Sun-God, the former was progressively subsumed within Śaivism, and the latter, though once equipped with its own canon of scriptures, suffered a similar fate.”

In his article Sanderson argues from ample textual and epigraphic evidence that Śaivism rose to its position of dominance by expanding and adapting its repertoire to contain a body of rituals and normative prescriptions that legitimated, empowered, or promoted the key elements of the social, political and economic process that in its various regional adaptations characterized the working of the state in the early medieval period.

Dominic Goodall presents the third article “Who is Caṇḍeṣa?” Caṇḍeṣa is referred to variously as Caṇḍeṣvara, Caṇḍikeṣvara, Caṇḍiṣa, Caṇḍa and, in Tamil sources, as Caṇṭi and Taṇṭi and he is treated as a guardian to Śiva shrines, as a warrior leader of gaṇas, as the consumer of offerings that have been made to Śiva, as the punisher of the transgressions of Śaiva initiates, as Śiva’s agent in property transactions, as the transmitter of Śaiva knowledge and as a super-bhakta who severed his own father’s legs because of his father’s impiety. Some evidence suggests that Caṇḍeṣvara is a form of Śiva or a manifestation of his anger, but other evidence presents him as a gaṇa, as Śiva’s chief devotee or as his principal servant. Goodall admits that this figure emerges as a rather jumbled picture. He minutely discusses these various identities and concludes that Caṇḍa was at one time and for certain groups a form of Śiva himself and not originally Saiddhāntika. It is true that Caṇḍeṣa occurs only rarely in non-Saiddhāntika tantric material. Caṇḍeṣa was, however, represented elsewhere and such representations have either been destroyed or have not been recognized because their iconographies were so different. The many undatable but early free-standing Caṇḍeṣas that are found in South India are independent of the Śaiva Siddhānta.
Canḍeśa has thus been incorporated into the Siddhānta from an existing tradition. His association with the Siddhānta today might well be the result of the Siddhānta’s attempt to gradually appropriate to itself the role of decreeing how temple worship should be conducted in South India and the nirṃālya-bearing Canḍeśa in turn was from the first a Saiddhāntika figure, because food offerings to the linga became invested with terrible power and had therefore to be consumed by an especially fierce form of Śiva himself. His flourishing in the South was in part a consequence of the popularity of the legend known to Tamil sources as the transformation of the shepherd Vicārāśarman into the nirṃālya-receiving Canḍeśa, the first servant of the Lord and the archetype of the Māheśvara devotee. Goodall’s discussion is corroborated not only by textual evidence but also forty-four photographs of Canḍeśa taken from various parts of India. These pictures, mostly in colour, are collected in the beginning of this volume.

The fourth article “Nāgabodhi’s Śrī-guhyasamāja- maṇḍalopāyikā-vimśatīvidhi: The Sanskrit text restored from the Vajrācāryanayottama” (Kimiaki Tanaka) is concerned with the Śrī-guhyasamājamaṇḍalopāyikā-vimśatīvidhi, attributed to Nāgabodhi, who belonged to the Ārya school of interpretation of the Guhyasamājatantra. It is a ritual manual for the thirty-two-deity maṇḍala of the Guhyasamājatantra with Aksobhyavajra in its centre and is one of the basic texts for maṇḍala rites in late Tantric Buddhism. This important text has been long missing but Tanaka has found that the Vajrācāryanayottama includes a work combining this text with explanatory comments. He has already published all the chapters of the Vimśatīvidhi recovered from the Vajrācāryanayottama in various other publications, and is now preparing to combine these separate chapters into a monograph with the present paper serving as a general introduction to the text. He states that this text can be dated to the period from the middle of the 8th century to the early 9th century, when Tantric Buddhism was introduced to Tibet for the first time.

The fifth article “The laud of the chosen deity, the first chapter of the Hevajratantrapiṇḍārthaṭīkā by Vajragarbha” (Francesco Sferra) is a new edition and English translation of the text, one of the first works of the Kālacakra tradition. This chapter describes the characteristics of the true interpreter of the scriptures, establishes the hermeneutical criteria for their interpretation and gives an important role to the Ādibuddha, which is believed to be the mūla text of the Laghukālacakratantra. This chapter is therefore fundamental for an understanding of the founding strategies of the Kālacakra system and of its early masters.

The sixth article is entitled “Superiority of Vajrayāna, Part I: some remarks on the *Vajrayānāntadvayanirākaraṇa (rDo rje theg pa’i mtha’ gñis sel ba) as-
cried to Jñānaśrī" (Taiken Kyuma). In late Indian Buddhism one and the same author sometimes wrote both Tantric and non-Tantric works. In such cases it is not always clear how the author estimated Tantric and non-Tantric Buddhism. The text discussed by Kyuma offers a good example to clarify this problem, because it is ascribed to Jñānaśrī, an author of works both on Tantric and non-Tantric Buddhism, and it teaches the superiority of Tantric Buddhism over non-Tantric Buddhism. In order to show how the author proves the superiority of Tantric Buddhism Kyuma gives a rather detailed synopsis of the text, largely devoted to an explanation of the eleven means characteristic of Tantric Buddhism alone. Then he discusses in detail the identification of Jñānaśrī, because both Jñānaśrīmitra and Jñānaśrībhadra are known simply as Jñānaśrī; he concludes that the author of this text is certainly Jñānaśrīmitra.

The *Vajrayānāntadvyanirākarana demonstrated the superiority of Tantric Buddhism over non-Tantric Buddhism through the eleven kinds of skillful means, of which the eleventh insists that the Tantric practice is superior because it rejects the three wrong practices: (1) practices which weaken the faculties of the practitioner, (2) practices which distract the mind of the practitioner, and (3) practices which produce the cognition that things are real and exist. In this way Jñānaśrī justifies the following three points: (1) Tantric Buddhism takes a negative attitude toward traditional Buddhist asceticism, (2) it distances itself from adherence to external religious acts such as the worship of a stūpa and the recitation of a scripture, and (3) Tantric practice involves consumption of impure substances. These assertions can be found also in earlier scriptures and other scholastic treatises. By examining these statements and comparing them with the opinions of Jñānaśrī, Ryugen Tanemura attempts in his article, the seventh, “Superiority of Vajrayāna, Part II: superiority of the tantric practice taught in the *Vajrayānāntadvyanirākarana (rDo rje theg pa’i mtha’ gñis sel ba)”, to ascertain the position of Jñānaśrī among discussions of Tantric practices.

The last article, “The structure and traditions of the systems of holy sites in Buddhist Saṃvara cycle and its related scriptural cycles in early medieval South Asia: the geography of esoteric Buddhism in the eyes of the compilers of the scriptures” (Tsunehiko Sugiki), discusses the post-Gupta era Buddhist development of an orthodox system of eight great sites closely related with eight great deeds performed by the Buddha, and the later introduction by esoteric Buddhism of new systems of holy sites seemingly from outside. The Saṃvara cycle, on which his article focuses, contains many scriptures and scholastic works and each of them describes the system of holy sites from various perspectives. Sugiki analyses the complicated materials by first classifying the descriptions of
holy sites into four typological traditions: (1) twenty-four holy sites systematized on the basis of ten categories introduced from the Śaiva text Tantrasadbhāva into the Cakrasaṃvaratantra, (2) twenty-four holy sites systematized on the basis of twelve categories introduced into the Hevajratantra and adopted into the Śamvara cycle, partly related with the Kaula and Śākta tradition, (3) twenty-four holy sites without systematization introduced from the Kubjikāmatatantra into the Vajradākatantra, and (4) seventy-two holy sites as residing places of seventy-two magical female beings introduced into the Dākārṇavaśatana and found also in the Kālacakratantra. According to his analysis these systems of holy sites have two levels and the first level, i.e. the system of practice, has three dimensions, namely (1) holy sites as geographical locations, (2) holy sites as a maṇḍala to be drawn or to be visualized, and (3) holy sites as an internal maṇḍala identical with the structure of the practitioner’s body. On the other hand the second level consists of the aetiological myth of the twenty-four holy sites. Sugiki clarifies how the Śamvara cycle in its various texts developed the systems of holy sites which had been introduced from outside into its particular esoteric Buddhist version by the involvement of the orthodox Mahāyana Buddhist doctrines and the internalization of external practices.

As Sanderson’s contribution clearly shows, many of the articles in this volume take into consideration both Hindu Tantrism and Buddhist Tantrism. Tantric studies have taken a new turn, where relationships and parallelism between different trends of Tantrism are examined extensively. The relationship between Hindu and Buddhist Tantrism will be the subject of a special panel organized by Goodall and Einoo at the 14th World Sanskrit Conference to be held in Kyoto September 1–5, 2009. It is hoped that the new tendencies brought into the Tantric studies in this volume will bear even richer fruit at this conference.
From kāmas to siddhis
— Tendencies in the Development of Ritual towards Tantrism —
Shingo EINOO

1 Introductory remarks

Vedic rituals are generally performed to obtain certain desires, of which the most common are the prosperity of progeny (prajā) and cattle (paśu).¹ There is a certain group of Vedic rituals which are referred to as “kāmya”. Those which are performed following the basic pattern of the new and full-moon sacrifice are called kāmyeṣṭi² and those performed according to the basic pattern of animal sacrifice are called kāmyapaśu.³ According to the analysis of W. Caland, the objectives expected of the kāmyeṣṭis are: progeny, cattle, prosperity (puṣṭi), dignity of the Brahmin (brahmavarcasa), gold, the position of royal chaplain (purodhā), well-being (bhūti), village, to conquer rivals (bhṛṭṛvya), sorcery (abhicāra), concord, for one who is cursed, for a dethroned king, to win a battle, longevity, against possession by demons, eyesight (cakṣus), against consumption (rājavyakṣma), rain, expiation of ritual defects (pṛayaścitta), etc. (Caland 1908: VI–VII).

There is a Vedic sacrifice called cāturmāṣya, a ritual complex that consists of the vaiśvadeva performed in spring, the vaṇuṇapraghāṣa performed in the rainy season and the sākamedha performed in autumn (Einoo 1988). In a previous article I explored what purpose each constituent rite performed at the different seasons aimed at and came to the conclusion that “The vaiśvadeva, the first rite of the cāturmāṣya, assures that progeny and cattle are born safely and constantly and that they will grow well by means of ample food. But the life of human beings is never without danger; the god Varuṇa punishes the transgressions one commits, one must overcome conflict with rivals (bhṛṭṛvya) and Rudra sends damage to human beings and cattle, frequently without any cause. So the sacrificer appeases Varuṇa by performing the vaṇuṇapraghāṣa, overcomes his rivals

¹ In the Brāhmaṇas the expression prajayā paśubhiḥ prajāyate “progeny and cattle are born constantly” and other similar expressions occur very often. For a collection of such expressions, see Oertel 1994 (1943): 1552–1565.
² For the kāmyeṣṭis, see Caland 1908 (1968).
by means of the sākamedha and calms the anger of Rudra by the tryambaka rite, which forms part of the sākamedha. For human beings death is unavoidable but they seek to escape an untimely death. The mahāpitryajña, which also belongs to the sākamedha, helps one live for one’s full life span. Thus, the people of ancient India expected from the Vedic rituals that they might live as peacefully as possible within nature, which could be both mild and unruly.’ (Einoo 1986: 1066)

I assumed that the Vedic rituals were a reliable way for the people of ancient India to fulfill their objectives, so eagerly desired. But Tantric rites too claim to bring about the attainment of wishes. J. Törzsök, for example, analyzes the rites described in the Siddhayogeśvarīmata and classifies the objectives of the rites as siddhis in the following way:

1. sāttvika siddhi-s: well-being / being well-fed (puṣṭi / āpyāyana); expiation / pacification (śāntī); [saving things] in case some disaster occurs (upasarge samut-panne); conquering death (mṛtyuṃjaya); eloquence / poetic talent (kavitva); the ability to be infinitely small, big etc. (anīmādīguṇāḥ); final release (mokṣa).
2. rājasa siddhi-s: subjugating people to one’s will (vaśyā); attracting people (esp. women, ākaraṇa); going to the underworld (pāṭakecaratvam); flying (khecaratvam); disappearing (antardhānam); “pill-siddhi” (a pill, put in the mouth, is said to make one invisible, gulikāsiddhi); and a siddhi with a magic wand and a bowl (siddhakāśṭhakamaṇḍalau).
3. tāmasa siddhi-s, twelve kinds of black magic (abhicāra-s) listed in chapter 24: murder (māraṇa), expelling someone (uccāṭana), annihilation (jambhana), paralysing (stambhana), benumbing (mohana), “nailing down” (kilana), taking away someone’s speech (vācāpahāra), making someone dumb (mūkatva), deaf (bādhirya), blind (andhana), impotent (sāṇḍhikaraṇa), and changing one’s form (rūpasya parivartanam) (Törzsök 2000: 138–139).

In the Siddhayogēśvarīmata, the objectives of the rites which J. Törzsök lists as siddhis (or supernatural powers), especially the rājasa and the tāmasa siddhis, belong to the category of supernatural phenomena and seem to be considerably different from the types of wish people expected to gain from the Vedic rituals that still remained within the sphere of everyday life.

In this article I attempt to trace changes in the selection of objectives in Vedic rituals, and in the selection of the siddhis in Tantric rites by examining some Vedic and post-Vedic texts. First, I analyse the Ṛgvidhāna, which prescribes a great number of rites performed by magically using the hymns and verses of the Ṛgveda, in order to discover what purposes and effects were expected of them. I then examine the Śamavidhānabrāhmaṇa, which likewise enjoins the magical use of the sāmans. After that I compare the results obtained from the analysis of these two vidhāna texts with a short description of kāmya rites given in the
Gobhilagrhyasūtra, a Vedic domestic ritual text. Among the Tantric ritual texts I have selected the Viṇāśikhatantra as an example of a Hindu Tantric text and the Amoghapāśakalparāja as a text of Buddhist Tantrism, and make an overview of the tendency towards a development from obtaining desires (kāmas) in the Vedic texts to getting supernatural powers (siddhis) in the Tantric texts.

2 Analysis of the rites of the Rgvidhāna

The Rgvidhāna consists of four chapters. Rgvidh 1.1–78 forms the introductory part; descriptions of rites using RV 1.1 and so on begin from Rgvidh 1.79. Most of the rites are simple japas or recitations of certain hymns or verses of the RV, and homas or offerings of butter in fire. From time to time we come across pūjās or the worship of deities peculiar to the post-Vedic ritual texts (Bhat 1987: 87–94). The prescriptions of the rites are usually mingled with statements about their effects and purposes:

\[
\text{tān japa prayato nityam istān kāmānt samaśnute /1.84cd/}
\]
\[
\text{medhākāmo japaṃ nityam juhuyāḥ cāyam etayā /1.85cd/}
\]

“One who, being pure, always mutters these verses obtains the desires he wishes.”

“One who desires intellect should murmur it or should offer butter with it.”

Rgvidh 1.84cd and 1.85cd are statements concerning the effect of using RV 1.2–3 and RV 1.18.6 respectively. In most cases one effect is assigned to one ritual act, but sometimes one performance claims more than one result as the following example shows:

\[
\text{sauparnāni pavitrāni sūktāny ekādaśābhhyaset / vānchan putrān paśūn vittam su-
\text{vargam āyur anandhatām /1.106/ “One who wishes sons, cattle, wealth, heaven,
\text{longevity, and not being blind should repeat the eleven purifying sauparnā hymns
(RVKh 1.2–12).”}
\]

In this case we can consider that six kinds of effects are mentioned. In this way we are able to collect 413 statements about the effects of the rites from 652 verses in four chapters of the Rgvidhāna and classify them as follows:

1-1-0 to live a full life span (āyuṣya): 34

\[\text{In this article I use Bhat, M.S., 1987, Vedic Tantrism: A Study of Rgvidhāna of}
\]
\[\text{Śaunaka with Text and Translation, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass as the text of the}
\]
\[\text{Rgvidhāna. In Bhat’s text, the verses of each chapter are numbered differently from}
\]
\[\text{the numbers of verses given in the text of Rudolf Meyer, 1877, Rgvidhānam,}
\]
\[\text{Berolini: Typis A. W. Schadi. However, as Bhat also gives the numbers of sections}
\]
\[\text{which almost correspond to those of Meyer’s edition, it is not difficult to find the old}
\]
\[\text{numberings of Meyer’s edition.}
\]
\[\text{The number given after : in each item refers to the number of occurrences of the}
\]

---

4 In this article I use Bhat, M.S., 1987, *Vedic Tantrism: A Study of Rgvidhāna of Śaunaka with Text and Translation*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass as the text of the *Rgvidhāna*. In Bhat’s text, the verses of each chapter are numbered differently from the numbers of verses given in the text of Rudolf Meyer, 1877, *Rgvidhānam*, Berolini: Typis A. W. Schadi. However, as Bhat also gives the numbers of sections which almost correspond to those of Meyer’s edition, it is not difficult to find the old numberings of Meyer’s edition.

5 The number given after : in each item refers to the number of occurrences of the
To obtain a full life span (āyus): 11, to obtain long life (dīrgha āyus): 4, to live long (jyog jīvet): 1, to live for a hundred years: 3, no fear from the god of death: 2⁶, not to become sick: 13
1-1-1 to obtain eyesight (cakṣus): 3
1-1-2 to conquer death: 6⁷
1-2-0 to remedy disease (bhaisajya): 9
1-2-1 to remedy consumption (yakṣman): 3
1-2-2 improvement of digestion: 3
1-2-3 to remedy poison: 3
1-2-4 to obtain a medicinal herb: 1
2-0 prosperity (pauṣṭika) or for various desires (kāmya): 112
to obtain desires (kāma): 20, to obtain wealth (śrī): 10, to obtain well-being, etc. (bhūti, rddhi, sukhā): 6, to obtain one thousand (sahasra): 2, to obtain possessions (vitta): 4, to obtain riches (dhana): 16, to steal riches by killing an enemy: 2, to obtain other wealth (draviṇa, ratna): 2, to obtain gold: 4, to obtain a house (grha), a dwelling place (niveśa): 2, to obtain clothes: 3, to obtain food: 8, to obtain progeny: 6, to obtain a son: 9, to obtain a thousand followers (anucāra) or warriors (vīra): 4, to obtain speech (vāc): 4, to obtain intelligence (medhā) or knowledge (jñāna, vidyā): 7, to obtain fame (yaśas, varcas): 4, to become handsome (rūpavat): 1, to obtain success/supernatural power (siddhi): 6,⁸ to obtain concentration of mind (samādhi), sacrifice (makhā), truth

⁶ Rgvidh 3.38d = Rgvidh 3.76d (yamāya saganāyaiva) tadbhayaṁ na sa vindati “One (who offers to Yama and his retinue) does not have fear from them.” See also 3-2-1 absence of fear (abhaya).

⁷ Rgvidh 1.108cd mumārsur api ... sarvam āyur avāpnuyāt “Even one who is about to die may obtain a full life span.” Rgvidh 2.40b apamṛtyum vyapohati “He expels death.” Rgvidh 1.130cd chittvā sarvān mṛtyupāsāṁ jīved ... “After cutting off all nooses of death he may live.” Rgvidh 1.167a pūrne māsi jayen mṛtyum “After one month he may conquer death.” Rgvidh 3.13d ghorāṁ mṛtyubhayam jayet “He may conquer a dreadful fear of death.” Rgvidh 3.42c evam yukto jayen mṛtyum “Thus practicing he may conquer death.” For mṛyunjaya, see Einoo 2005.

⁸ In the following four cases the word siddhi can be interpreted as success: Rgvidh 1.157a, b ... labhate ... siddhim anuttamām ‘he obtains unsurpassed success’; Rgvidh 2.43d parām siddhim avāpnuyāt ‘he may reach the highest success’; Rgvidh 2.106d parām siddham niyacchati ‘he secures the highest success’; Rgvidh 2.167d arthasiddhiḥ parā bhavet ‘there may be the highest accomplishment of object’. Rgvidh 2.57c svadehe sidhyate jantuh ‘a person attains perfection in his very body (Bhat 1987: 324).’ For a similar idea, see Amoghapāśakalparāja 21a, 3 and Mañjuśrīmukalakaḷpa 55 [691,3–6]. On the other hand, Rgvidh 3.47cd–48 ‘He sees the divine gandharvas, he sees siddhas and cāranas. He hides himself from this world. He becomes one who goes in the air. He sees from a distance, like Paramēṣṭhin’ clearly points to the supernatural powers.
From kāmas to siddhis

(sattva): 3
2-1 rites for rain: 5
2-2 domestic rules: 3
   Rules for taking food: 2, levirate marriage 1
2-3 rites for agriculture: 4
2-4 rites for pasturage: 11
2-5 grace or intervention of the gods: 9

3-1-0 peacefulness (svastyayana): 9
3-1-1 safety on a journey: 18
3-1-2 safety when one crosses a river: 4
3-2-0 pacification (śanti): 12
   Pacification of women, men and cows (nārīnaragośānti): 1, when a dove sits down in one's house: 1, pacification of the house: 2, of the planets: 1, of a horse: 1, of bad dreams: 6, to calm dissension among relatives (jñātibheda): 1, to calm down hatred: 1
3-2-1 absence from fear (abhaya): 4
3-2-2 for one who wishes purification (śuddhikāma), or for purification: 3
3-2-3 release from various evil conditions: 42
   For one who is accused (abhiśasta): 3, release from Varuṇa’s noose: 2, one who is bound (baddha): 2, release from falsehood (anṛta): 1, release from bad luck (alakṣmī, aśrī): 4, from misfortune (duḥkha), from various evil conditions such as añhas: 1, āpad: 3, kalmaṣa: 1, kilbiṣa: 1, kṛcchra: 1, pāpa: 9, rapas: 1, ripra: 3, other cases: 2
3-3 atonement for one's sins (prāyaścitta): 19

---

9 I assign RgVidh 2.54, 64, 65, 78–79, 92cd–95, 179cd–180ab, 180cd–181ab, 3.5cd–6, 34–37, 4.130cd–131ab to the item ‘grace or intervention of gods’. In RgVidh 2.54d sa tasya varado bhavati ‘the deity becomes a boon-giver to him,’ and RgVidh 2.92cd ya icched varadām devīṃ śriyam nityam kule sthitām ‘one who wishes that the boon-giving goddess Śrī will always stay in one’s family’ the word varada appears. According to Böhtlingk-Roth’s Sanskrit Wörterbuch, it is only in TĀ 10.34 and ŚvetUp 4.11 that the word varada otherwise occurs. From this we can surmise the idea of being given a boon by a god belongs to the latest period of Vedic literature.

10 RgVidh 1.118cd–119ab rājakārye śvayāthe vā abhiśasto ‘py anekadhā /118/ aṣāyke pratibhākārye bhaye prāṇāntike ‘pi vā ‘Either in royal service, or among a troop of dogs, even when one has repeatedly been infamous, (when engaged) in a deed of audacity which cannot be executed, or even in peril of life’ (Gonda 1951: 28) is classified as ‘other cases’. RgVidh 2.121ab yasya naṣṭam bhavet kiṇ cid dravyaṃ gaur duipadaṃ dhanam ‘When something like goods, a cow, a man or riches go lost for one’ is also grouped into this category, because it deals with the bad situation that one loses something. The RgVidh here uses RV 6.54 to find lost things and ĀsvGS 3.7.9 prescribes a rite using the same sūkta to find lost things, too. See also KauŚS 37.4–6, 52.12–14 for rites for the same purpose.
4 rites for women: 12

To get a maiden (kanyā): 1, to get a husband: 1, marriage: 1, conception: 1, to beget a son: 1, to abort a dead fetus: 1, to prevent a miscarriage: 2, for a safe delivery: 1, to cause to sleep: 1, to expel another wife of the husband: 1, to increase virility: 1

5-1 royal rites: 9

Royal consecration (rājābhiseka): 1, to obtain kingship (rājya, aśvarya): 5, taking the bath of a king: 1, to make an amulet for a king: 1, pacification of royal paraphernalia: 1

5-2 rites for the battle: 8

6 victory over a rival: 17

To win a dice game: 1, to win a dispute: 1, to defeat the enemy (śatru, dviṣant, sapatna, ari, ripu): 15

7 sorcery (abhicāra): 26

To make someone sick: 1, to burn: 1, to expel someone from the country: 1, to cause dissension: 3, to control someone through one’s will: 9, to kill: 6, counter magic: 5

8-1 blessed condition after death/liberation: 21

---

11 The abhicāras mentioned hitherto are described in Rgvidh 2.48cd; 1.79–82; 2.49ab; 1.100, 102–203ab, 2.49cd.

12 Among the abhicāras of this kind, Rgvidh 3.84cd–87 and 3.108–109 aim at one’s kindred or friends. In Rgvidh 3.100cd–107 an effigy of boiled rice is made and this sorcery is performed to attract women; it is noted that this rite should not be done in relation to a married woman, a female ascetic (sādhvi) or a chaste woman (dharma-vratāśīla). According to Rgvidh 2.48ab all things (sarvam) are brought under one’s control, Rgvidh 2.182cd–183ab claims to subdue the world (jagat) and the sorcery described in 3.95cd–96ab has a king or a country or a town as its victim. Rgvidh 3.79–84ab prescribes a rite in which an effigy made of clay is used and according to the number of days of the performance, either a rich merchant or a kṣatriya or a king or a brahmin or an ascetic is brought under one’s control. In 3.88–92ab an effigy made of clay mixed either with ghee or sesame oil or mustard oil is used to subdue a brahmin, a kṣatriya, and a merchant respectively. According to Rgvidh 2.42, after one hundred thousand offerings of ashes into water, the sorcery (kṛtyā) itself appears from the water.

13 Rites to kill an enemy are prescribed in Rgvidh 1.105, 2.16–20, 47, 63, 176cd–177ab, 3.92cd–95ab. Among them, an effigy of the enemy is used in 2.16–20 and 3.92cd–95ab. Also in the battle rite in Rgvidh 2.87cd–89ab, an effigy made of clay is used. Examples of counter magic are found in 4.30–33, 36–37, 40–42, 115–116.

14 The item concerning a blessed condition after death/liberation is based on descriptions in the Rgvidh 3.17cd–18ab, 1.106, 3.70cd, 1.107, 136–137, 2.44, 3.18cd–19ab (this passage is grouped into two subcategories: to obtain the highest place and to obtain immortality), 4.127cd–129ab, 1.111cd–112, 4.19cd–20ab, 1.158d–159a,
From kāmas to siddhis

To reach the desired goal (istā gati): 1, to obtain heaven (svarga): 2, to obtain the highest place (para dhāman, para sthāna): 4, to obtain immortality (amṛtatva): 2, to obtain the same realm (salokatā) with the moon: 1, to be present with all the gods: 1, to go to the world of Indra: 1, to obtain intimate union (sāyojya) with Prajāpati: 1, to go to the highest place of Viṣṇu: 1, to go to the world of Brahman: 3, to obtain brahmanirvāṇa: 1, not to be born again: 2, to obtain memory of previous lives (jātismara): 1

8-2 blessed condition of the ancestors: 3

The results of rites the performer undertakes are generally classified as follows: he maintains a good condition and seeks for a better condition, but when a bad condition happens, he tries to recover from it. Among the items given above, the maintaining of a good condition corresponds to 3-1 peacefulness (svastayana). The seeking of a better condition is, generally speaking, item 2 prosperity (pauṣṭika), and when the better condition is concerned with life, it is a matter of item 1-1 to live a full life span (āyuṣya). Recovering from a bad condition is 3-2 pacification (śānti), and if the bad condition is disease, item 1-2 remedy for a disease deals with it, while in the case of a transgression of social rules, 3-3 atonement for one’s sins (prāyaścitta) is measured against it. Item 6 victory over a rival can be, broadly speaking, likened to recovering from a bad condition, the rival being representative of the bad condition.

M. Bloomfield classifies the ritual hymns into nine classes: 1) Charms to cure diseases and possession by demons (bhaisajyāni), 2) Prayers for long life and health (āyuṣyāni), 3) Imprecations against demons, sorcerers, and enemies (ābhicārikāni and kṛtyāpratiharanāni), 4) Charms pertaining to women (strīkarmāni), 5) Charms to secure harmony, influence in the assembly, and the like (sāmmanasyāni, etc.), 6) Charms pertaining to royalty (rājakarmāni), 7) Prayers and imprecations in the interest of Brahmans, 8) Charms to secure prosperity and freedom from danger (pauṣṭikāni), and 9) Charms in expiation of sin and defilement (prāyaścittāni) (Bloomfield 1899: 57). Taking Bloomfield’s classification into consideration, I add further item 4 rites for women, item 5

---

4.44cd–45ab, 3.137, 2.67, 3.2cd–5ab, 3.75. Brahmanirvāṇa is mentioned as one of the results of a very long rite for the worship of and meditation on Viṣṇu Nārāyaṇa by using the Purusasūkta (RV 10.90): 3.149cd munayaḥ sarve brahmanirvānām āpnyuh ‘all sages may reach the brahmanirvāṇa’. There are two rites so that one will not be born again: a short version in 2.186cd and a long one in 4.20cd–28, the latter using the Rātrisūkta (RV 10.127) which corresponds to Sāmavidh 3.8.1–5 (Gonda 1951: 103). The result of remembering previous lives is mentioned in Rgvidh 2.45cd, and Sāmavidh 3.7.1 also promises the same result. See also Rgvidh 3.36cd. The next item 8-2 'blessed condition of the ancestors' is based on the descriptions in Rgvidh 1.109, 3.8ab, 4.129cd–130ab.
royal rites, and item 7 for sorcery (abhicāra). Item 8, the blessed condition after death, is a new article I have introduced for the Rgvidhāna.

3 Analysis of the rites of the Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa

The Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa has three chapters. At first glance the contents of the text seem to be arranged systematically. Sāmavidh 1.1.1–7 describes the creation of the world, 1.1.8–18 praises the Vedic melodies (sāmans), 1.2.1–12 prescribes three kinds of penances (krcchra) and 1.3–4 is dedicated to the study of the sāmans (svādhyāya). Then in 1.5–8 various kinds of atonements for different sins are discussed, through to the end of the first chapter. The second and third chapters are divided into sections introduced by the phrase ‘and from now’ (athātaḥ) and the contents are summarized, for example, 2.1.1 athātaḥ kāmyānām // ⋯ 2.1.3 āyuṣyāṇaḥ eva prathamam // “And from now on the rites for special desires. ⋯ At first rites for longevity (will be prescribed).” In the description of the section on rites for longevity there are naturally prescribed many rites for this purpose as well as similar rites but we can also find other types of rites there as well. The situation is also the same with other sections dealing with other kinds of rites.

Now follows an analysis of rites in the Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa; the scheme of analysis is the same as that used for the Rgvidhāna.

1-1-0 to live a full life span (āyuṣya): 4

To live long: 2.1.10; 11, to live for a hundred years: 2.1.5; 2.2.1
1-1-2 to conquer death: 3

---

15 I use the following edition of the Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa: Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa with Vedārthapraṅkāsa of Sāyaṇa and Padārthamātravivṛti of Bharatasvāmin, critically edited by Dr. B. R. Sharma, Tirupati: Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, 1964.

16 See further Sāmavidh 2.6.1 athātaḥ saubhāgyānām (on the rites for nuptial happiness), 2.6.17 athāto yaśasyānām (on the rites for fame), 2.7.1 athāto brhamavarcasyānām (on the rites for holy luster), 2.8.1 athātaḥ putriyānām (on the rites for obtaining sons), 3.1.1 athāto dhanyānām (on the rites for becoming wealthy), 3.3.6 athāto vāstuśamanām (on the pacification of the dwelling place), 3.4.1 athāto drṣṭadarśanānām (on the rites to see invisible things).

17 For example, Sāmavidh 2.1.5 and 2.2.1 rites to live for one hundred years, 2.1.10, 11 rites to live long, 2.4.9 a rite to ward off old age and death, 2.3.7, 8, 10, 11 rites not to die accidentally.

18 For example, Sāmavidh 2.1.7 an atonement for when one receives too much, 2.4.8 blessings when going to sleep and when getting up, 2.5.1–4, 6–7 rites for the subjugation of various beings, 2.5.5 a rite for killing one’s enemy.

19 As the number of cases in this text is much less in comparison with those in the Rgvidhāna, the place in the text is given for each case. Some items mentioned in the analysis of the Rgvidhāna are skipped due to the lack of passages dealing with them.
Not to die of thirst: 2.3.7, not to die in the water: 2.3.8, to expel decrepitude and death: 2.4.9

1-2-0 remedy for disease (*bhaiṣajya*): 3

When one becomes ill: 2.2.3, when a part of the body aches: 2.3.1; 2

1-2-1 remedy for consumption (*yaksmaṇa*): 1 (2.3.9)

1-2-3 remedy for poison: 2 (2.3.10; 11)

2-0 prosperity (*pausāti*ka) or for various desires (*kāmya*): 47

To obtain wealth (*śrī*): 3.1.3; 4; 3.2.6, to obtain a thousand (*sahasra*): 3.1.10; 11; 13; 3.2.1, to become wealthy (*dhanya*): 3.1.2, to obtain food: 2.3.5; 6, to obtain gold: 3.1.8; 3.3.3, to obtain gold or silver: 3.1.12, to obtain a village: 3.2.4, to obtain a son who is handsome and long-lived: 2.8.2; 3; 4; 5, to obtain a hundred retainers: 2.8.6, to obtain fame: 2.6.16; 18, to obtain glory of the brahmin: 2.7.1; 3, to obtain trust: 2.7.2, to speak of what has been heard (*śrutanigadin*): 2.7.4–11, to be good at talking (*kathāsv śreyas*): 2.7.12, to speak against the king: 2.7.13, to become fortunate: 2.6.2–5, to be liked by all: 2.6.6, to obtain divine prosperity (*daiva poṣa*): 3.3.4, to obtain prosperity of the *āsuras* (*āśura poṣa*): 3.3.5, to obtain all human desires (*mānuṣa kāma*): 3.9.3, to obtain all divine desires (*daiva kāma*): 3.9.4, to obtain the position of the lord of the three worlds: 3.9.5, a rite in which, by each *sāman* of a set of eight *sāmans*, one obtains gold, corn, cattle, son, village, fame, glory of the brahmin, and heaven respectively: 3.2.5, a rite in which according to the depth of water in which one sinks to sing a *sāman*, one obtains wealth (*lakṣmaṇa*), corn, cattle, son, village, and a thousand respectively: 3.2.7–12.

Supernatural powers (*siddhi*)

To see what is hidden: 3.4.2–5, divination of success (*siddhi*): 3.4.6; 7; 9, divination of a good crop: 3.4.8, divination of a victory: 3.4.10, divination of longevity: 3.4.11, to see the ancestors: 3.7.4, to see *gandharvas* and *apsaras*: 3.7.5, to see the gods: 3.7.6, to find a hidden treasure (*nīḍha*): 3.7.7–8, to see demons (*bhūta*) and receive money from them: 3.7.9, to walk in the air: 3.9.1, to move as swift as thought: 3.9.2

2-3 rites for agriculture: 2: to obtain crops: 3.1.9, 3.2.3

---

20 We find similar results in the Hemaśādhanapaṭaṇa: Mañjuśrīmulakalpa 55 [697.10–11] *rājakule cottaśaravādi bhavati* ‘and he becomes one who defends himself in the royal house,’ [690.16–17] *rājakuleśottaravādi bhavati*. See further [679.13–15], [695.2–3], [690.17–18], [690.15–16], [680.11–14], [695.2–3], [699.14], [707.25–26], [710.8–9], [719.15–16].

21 We can find specifications about how deep one sinks in water: for example in GobhGS 4.5.26, AVPS 36.26.1–3, Mañjuśrīmulakalpa 55 [672.7–10], [672.22–24], [673.19–21], [678.24–26], [691.8–9], Amoghapāśakalparāja 44b, 1–2 [59.17–23].
2-4 rites for pasturage: 3: to obtain cows: 3.2.2; 3.3.1, to obtain a number of cattle: 3.3.2

3-1-0 peacefulness (svastayayana): blessings at the time of sleeping and waking: 2.4.8
3-1-1 safety on a journey: 2.4.1–7
3-2-0 pacification (śānti): 2
   Pacification of the house: 3.3.6–7, pacification of omens: 3.5.5
3-2-1 absence of fear (abhaya): 2
   To avert fear of snakes: 2.3.3, to avert fears from weapons: 2.3.4
3-2-2 purification: to become purified (pūta): 2.1.6
3-2-3 release from various evil conditions: 5
   From bad luck (alaks. mī): 3.1.5; 6; 7, from obstruction (saṃbāda): 2.1.9, from rakṣas: 2.2.2

4 rites for women: 2
   Taking a bath before sexual intercourse: 2.6.12, to wed one’s daughter: 2.6.14–15

5-1 royal rites: royal consecration (rājabhiṣeka): 3.5.1–4
5-2 rites for the battle: 3.6.1–7; 8; 9; 11

7 sorcery (abhicāra):
   To burn: 3.7.2, to allure a woman: 2.6.7; 11, to subdue a woman: 2.6.8; 9; 10, to attract courtesans (veśasthā) and female ascetics (pravrājikā): 2.6.13, to win over either a brahmin or a kṣatriya or a vaiśya or a śūdra: 2.5.1–4, to win over various beings according to a period of the performance of the rite (for one night: the family, for two nights: retinues of the king, for three nights: the king, for four nights: a village, for five nights: a town, for six nights: a country, for seven nights: asuras and rakṣas, for eight nights: the ancestors and piśācas, for nine nights: yakṣas, for ten nights: gandharvas and apsaras, for a half month: Vaiśravaṇa, for a month: Indra, for four months: Prajāpati, for a year: the whole world): 2.5.2, to subdue piśācas: 3.7.3, jambhakas grant all desires: 3.7.10, to kill: 3.6.10; 12; 13
   counter-sorcery: 3.5.6; 7; 8

---

22 In Sāmavidh 1.5–8 various kinds of atonements for different sins are discussed and at the end of the passages the pacifications of some omens are described (Gampert 1939: 5): 1.8.7: bad dreams, 1.8.8; 12: some indefinite omens, 1.8.9: fire burning, 1.8.10: damage caused by mice, 1.8.11: when a seat (kūrca) is broken, 1.8.13–15 describes pacifications of various disasters (abhivāta) among men or cows or horses.
8-1 blessed condition after death/liberation
To go to the world of Brahmā: 2.1.8; not to be born again: 3.8.1–5, to obtain the memory of previous lives (jātismara): 3.7.1

When we compare the items of the Rāgvidhāna and the Sāmavidhāna, item 2-0 ‘prosperity (pauṣṭika) or various desires (kāmya)’ is the most numerous in the Rāgvidhāna. As regards the siddhis or supernatural powers, the Rāgvidhāna gives only one example, namely Rāgvidh 3.47cd–48, which I refer to in note 8. Passages dealing with the supernatural powers in the Sāmavidhāna are collected at the end of item 2-0, where the examples amount to fourteen in number. Rites to obtain siddhis in the Sāmavidhāna are therefore much greater in number than in the Rāgvidhāna. The same thing can be said about the rites for sorcery that comprise item number 7. I have listed 26 rites for the Rāgvidhāna, but only 17 for the Sāmavidhāna. But in terms of percentage, those in the Rāgvidhāna amount to only 6.3 percent, while those in the Sāmavidhāna amount to 17 percent. Item number 2-5 ‘grace or intervention of the gods’ does not appear in the Sāmavidhāna, while item number 3-2-3 ‘release from various evil conditions’ and item number 8-1 ‘blessed condition after death’ clearly show a decrease in that text. From this we can say that the Sāmavidhāna shows more interest in things supernatural and magical while at the same time paying sufficient attention to mundane matters.

4 Analysis of the rites of the Gobhilagrhyasūtra (4.5–9)

Now I turn to an analysis of the Gobhilagrhyasūtra (4.5–9), which belongs to the tradition of the Sāmaveda. The Gobhilagrhyasūtra, book 4, chapters 5 to 9 provides a comparatively systematic description of rites performed for the obtainment of different desires. As the opening sūtra GobhGS 4.5.1 suggests that the rites which follow are clearly defined as kāmya (kāmyeṣu ata urydhvam ‘in the rites for the obtainment of definite desires, which will be described from now on’). The result of the analysis is as follows.

1-1-0 to live a full life span (āyuṣya): for one who desires a full life span: 4.8.11–13
1-1-2 to conquer death: to avoid an undesirable death: 4.6.1

---

23 The Khādiragrhyasūtra (4.1.1–4.4.4) describes corresponding rites to fulfill various desires, but the analysis is based mainly on the description of the Gobhilagrhyasūtra. As GobhGS 4.7 is a detailed description of the construction of a house, this chapter is left out of consideration.
1-2-0 remedy for disease (*bhaisajya*): 24
  To make clean the place where there are worms (*krimi*): 25 4.9.18
1-2-3 remedy for poison: for one who has been bitten by a venomous animal: 26 4.9.15

2-0 prosperity (*pauṣṭika*) or for various desires (*kāmya*):
  For one who desires enjoyment (*bhogakāma*): 4.5.28, for one who desires to obtain a hundred cart-loads or a thousand cart-loads: 4.6.13; 4.9.11, for one who desires that his means of livelihood may not be exhausted: 4.8.19; 4.9.11, offering of a part of the articles of trade (*paṇyahoma*): 27 4.8.20–22, to obtain property on the earth (*pārthiva*): 28 4.5.21–26, to obtain a village: 4.8.14–18, for one who desires sons and cattle: 4.5.15–16, for one who desires companions (*sahāyakāma*): 4.8.23-25, for one who desires the glory of a brahmin: 4.5.14, for one who desires fame: 4.6.10; 4.8.23–25, to obtain the favor of a person: 4.5.18–20; 4.8.8–10

2-4 rites for pasturage: 29
  For one who desires cattle: 4.5.15–16; 4.9.6; 12; 13, for one who desires safety of cattle: 4.5.17; 29; 30, against worms of cattle: 4.9.19–20, when the cow-stable is burnt: 4.9.7 30

3-1-0 peacefulness (*svastyayana*): 31
  A *balihaṇa* is performed at the end of the śravaṇā and āgraḥaṇa at a cross-road to the northeast of the village for the sake of *svastyayana*: 4.8.1–7, for the *svastyayana* of the *snātaka*: 4.9.16–17

---

25 Besides KhādGS 4.4.3–4, KauśS 27.14–20 and KauśS 29.20–26 describe rites to cure worms (Bloomfield 1899: 61).
26 For rites to cure snakebite and similar accidents, see KhādGS 4.4.1, and KauśS 29.1–14, 29.28–29, 31.26, 32.5–7, 32.20–25. ŚāṅkhŚŚ 16.13.3–4 is counted in this group (Zysk 1992: 105).
27 See also KhādGS 4.3.7. ĀpGS 8.23.5; HirGS 1.4.14.8–15.1; KauśS 41.8–9; 50.12–16; 59.6 describe rites to pray for success in business. ĀśvGS 3.7.8; GobhGS 4.5.33; ĀpGS 3.9.2; KauśS 42.1–5; KauśS 50.12–16 are rites for success of a journey for business.
28 Bhattachārjyana, a commentator, comments on GobhGS 4.5.22 as follows: *prthivyartham kriyata iti pārthivam grāmākṣetraitrādiśatrāhīrham* ‘In that it is performed for the sake of the earth it is called *pārthiva*, namely in order to obtain a village, field and so on.’
30 GobhGS 4.9.6–7 *gaśthe paśūkāmāh /6/ vidūyāmāne cīvaram /7/ ‘6. One who desires cattle (performs it) in the cow-stable. 7. If (the cow-stable) is damaged by fire, (he should offer) a monk’s robe.’ For the interpretation of this rite, see Knauer 1884: 208 and Oldenberg 1892: 127.
32 GobhGS 3.7.1–23 and GobhGS 3.9.1–21 describe the śravaṇā and āgraḥaṇā respectively.
From kāmas to siddhis

3-1-1 safety on a journey: 4.5.31; 32; 4.9.8–10
3-2-1 absence of fear (abhaya): 4.6.2
3-2-3 release from various evil conditions: to expel misfortune (alakṣmi): 4.6.3–9

5-1 royal rites: for one who desires the position of the lord of the people (puṟu-śādhipatyakāma): 4.9.1–5

7 sorcery (abhicāra): for one who desires killing (vadhakāma): 4.8.11–13

As the opening sūtra suggests, the rites described here are kāmya; therefore, among the items of the Gobhilagrhyasūtra item number 2-0 ‘prosperity (pauṣṭika) or for various desires (kāmya)’ is the most numerous. Desires concerning fields, villages, sons and cattle, the prestige of a brahmin and fame are regarded as the traditional topics of the Vedic kāmyeśīs. A rite to obtain the favor of a person can be counted as an Atharvavedic interest in securing harmony (sāmmanasya) (Bloomfield 1899: 72–73). The rite of offering a part of the articles of trade for the sake of success in business is similar to rites in other Grhyasūtras, as pointed out in note 27. It is remarkable that rites for long life and to remedy disease, which appeared in great numbers in the Ṛgvidhāna can hardly be found in the Gobhilagrhyasūtra. The reason that the number of rites for long life is so low may be due to the fact that many of the rites of the Grhyasūtras, especially those performed at the different stages of life, such as the rite of a new-born child, have as their very important aim the prayer for the long life of a growing child. The Grhyasūtras indeed have many occasions to pray for the long life of a person, so it was not necessary to collect rites for this purpose in particular (Bloomfield 1899: 64).

Rites to remedy disease are collectively described in the Kauśikasūtra 25.1–32.27 and it seems as if medical rites were the monopoly of the Atharvavedic tradition. Only a limited number of rites for remedies were treated in other Grhyasūtras proper (see note 24). It may be natural therefore that the number of such rites in the Gobhilagrhyasūtra should be very few. Even the Ṛgvidhāna and the Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa describe a few agricultural rites, so it is remarkable that the Gobhilagrhyasūtra does not mention any at all here, but treats them in another place, namely in GobhGS 4.4.27–34. The Gobhilagrhyasūtra, on the other hand, enjoins some rites for pasturage or cattle breeding in the collection of kāmya rites, but, as in the case of agricultural rites, this Grhyasūtra also prescribes rites for pasturage in another context, namely, in GobhGS 3.6.1–15. The svastyayana in general, and especially safety on a journey, were matters of concern from Vedic times. In item number 3-2-1, namely absence of fear, I mention
absence of fear from serious diseases and sorcery. Absence of fear from serious diseases can be grouped into the item āyuṣya and the latter can be classified under “sorcery”, because it is a kind of a counter magic. There are also some hymns and rites in the Vedic texts regarding absence from fear (see note 34), thus this item is again traditionally Vedic. As for item number 3-2-3, a rite to expel misfortune, I could find only one example in a sister sūtra, Khādiragrhyasūtra 4.1.20–21, but it seems that during the marriage ceremony, a certain rite was performed to expel alakṣmī from the bride, as I mention in note 35.

I would thus like to maintain that the kāmya rites of the Gobhilagrhyasūtra, a Vedic text, aim at attaining the various desires well-known in the Vedic texts. The items of the Ṛgvidhāna vary widely but most can be assumed to belong to the traditional objectives of desires. Among the items in the Ṛgvidhāna, the following may indicate a new tendency. As I mentioned in note 9 concerning item number 2-5, namely grace or intervention of the gods, the gods become varada or boon-givers. As the examples given in note 12 on item 7 sorcery show, the various rites to control someone are almost the same as rites of subjugation (vaśikaraṇa) that appear in the tantric six acts (ṣāṭkarmāṇi). In notes 12 and 13, I referred to several cases in which an effigy is used in the rite of sorcery. Even though it has already been pointed out that the use of an effigy in a magical act was already known in the Atharvaveda (Gonda 1980: 255), and the Kauśikasūtra gives several cases of it (see KauŚ 35.28, 36.14, 47.54), the usage of the effigy in sorcery tends to be more popular in tantric magic; according to Böhtlingk and Roth’s Sanskrit Wörterbuch the word jātismara or remembering of one’s former life appears from the Mahābhārata onward. There is only one case in the Ṛgvidhāna (see note 14), but this may represent a new tendency.

The Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa also generally gives the traditional desires, but the following indicate new tendencies. Mentioned among the various desires is divine prosperity (daiva poṣa), prosperity of the asuras and divine desires (daiva kāma), as is obtaining the position of lord of the three worlds. Most notable though are the statements enumerated under the headings of supernatural power: seeing what is hidden seems to be peculiar to the Sāmavidhāna. I have mentioned several kinds of divination. Divination itself was already known in the Vedic texts (Thite 1978) and the examples given there are not something new, but the ensuing examples of siddhi, namely to see ancestors, gandharvas and apsaras, gods, demons and hidden treasure (nidhi) have so far been found in the broadest sense among Vedic texts only in the Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa (see item 2.0), Ṛgvidhāna (see note 8) and Atharvavedaparīśīṭa. Rites of sorcery are mentioned in the Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa (item number seven, sorcery) and this too is an indication of the new tendency. As I have mentioned in note 12, the
targets of subjugation appearing in the Ṛgvidhāna are at most king and country, but in the Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa, supernatural beings such as demons and gods are brought under the control of the practitioner.

The Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa, chapter 35 āsurīkalpa (Magoun 1899) and chapter 36 ucchusmakalpa (Bisschop, P. and A. Griffiths 2007), describe a number of rites of subjugation and Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa 36.2.9 claims to subjugate even the Īśvara. According to AVPS 36.25.1–4, an excellent woman or a woman granting desires (varastrī) appears as the result of the rite and grants whatever the performer desires. Thus, in texts complementary to the Grhyasūtras such as the Ṛgvidhāna, Sāmavidhāna and Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa we can find many new types of the rites clearly exhibiting magical elements, and those rites are presumed to link with tantric rites.

5 Analysis of the Viñāśikhatantra (151–224 and 264–300)

The Viñāśikhatantra36 is one of the early Śaivatantras from the north of India (Goudriaan 1985: 4). In this text a deity called Tumburu and his four saktis or sisters, Jayā, Vijayā, Ājitā and Aparājitā, play a central role.37 Viñāśikhatantra 151–136ab teaches their bijamantras38 and Viñāśikhatantra 151–224 and 264–300 prescribes a variety of mainly magical rites, whose analysis follows:

1-2-0 remedy for disease (bhaisajya): 183–184ab; 184cd

2-0 prosperity (pauṣṭika) or for various desires (kāmya):

What one uses becomes inexhaustible: 185,39 to be liked by all: 186,40 for one who desires welfare (śrīkāma): 187–188ab, for one who desires all (sarvakāma):41 188cd–1901b; 218–224ab; 289cd–291, an immediate elevation of

---


37 For Tumburu and his four sisters, see Goudriaan 1973 and Goudriaan 1985: 18–30, 47–48. For the fact that Tumburu was known in South East Asia, see Goudriaan 1985: 24 and Sanderson 2001: 8 and for the fact that he was also known in Chinese Esoteric Buddhism, see Sanderson 2001: 8.

38 For their different bijamantras, see Goudriaan 1973: 50.

39 We find similar rites in GobhGS 4.8.19 and 4.9.14 for one who desires that his means of livelihood may not be exhausted.

40 A similar rite is found in Sāmavidh 2.6.6. AV 19.62.1 conveys a similar idea. This kind of rite seemed to be very popular among the Buddhists. See, for example, Amoghasākalparāja 33a.1 and the following places in the Hemaśādhana: Maṇjuśrīmukalpa 55 [714.26–27]; [671.28]; [673.14–15]; [686.25–28]; [698.18–19]; [707.4]; [714.24–26]; [716.2]; [716.5–6].

41 Many passages among the twenty passages listed at the beginning of item 2-0 of the Ṛgvidhāna, namely ‘to obtain desires (kāma)’ are for one who desires all (sar-
one’s position (sadyotkarṣaṇa).\textsuperscript{42} 162

3-2-0 pacification (śānti): śānti and puṣṭi are reached: 181–182

4 rites for women:

To make someone impotent: 277–278, to increase virility: 282–283\textsuperscript{ab}

7 sorcery

To attract a woman: 151–154; 194–196, to attract someone: 201\textsuperscript{cd}–206, 266\textsuperscript{cd}–268\textsuperscript{ab}, to revive a dead person who grants a desire: 190\textsuperscript{cd}–193,\textsuperscript{43} how to prepare a magic ointment (aṅjana) to make someone as charming as the god of love: 279–281,\textsuperscript{44} to bring someone under control (vaśikaraṇa): 268\textsuperscript{cd}–269; 274\textsuperscript{cd}–276; 283\textsuperscript{cd}–286; 286\textsuperscript{cd}–289\textsuperscript{ab}, vaśikaraṇa of the enemy:

vakāma) and in order to obtain all desires: Rgviḍh 1.144; 124\textsuperscript{ab}; 160\textsuperscript{cd}–161\textsuperscript{ab}; 2.43; 2.44; 2.45\textsuperscript{ab}; 2.165–166; 2.178\textsuperscript{cd}–179\textsuperscript{ab}; 3.46–48; 3.138–142; 4.7\textsuperscript{cd}; 4.29. KauśŚ 59.19–20 already describes a rite for a sarvakāma.

\textsuperscript{42} Goudriaan 1985: 39 finds the meaning of utkarsaṇa to be unclear, but on p. 114 he translates it ‘total uprooting [of the enemy]’ and considers it to be a synonym for uccātaṇa. Viṇāśīkh 162 reads as follows: grhitvā tu mahāmāṃsāṃ dadhi-madhvāja-gaṣṭaḥsahasreṇa sadyotkarṣaṇam uttamam // ‘Having collected human flesh together with sour milk, honey and clarified butter, an immediate elevation of one’s position is obtained by offering them a thousand and eight times.’ A rite called uccātaṇa is known in the Viṇāśīkhatantra, because it uses the word in Viṇāśīkh 165a. The association of utkarsaṇa with uccātaṇa may have been caused by the use of human flesh (mahāmāṃsa); a rite which uses human flesh must be of a cruel character. There are another two cases in the Viṇāśīkhatantra in which human flesh is used. In Viṇāśīkh 189\textsuperscript{cd}–190\textsuperscript{ab} there is a rite for one who desires all, in which human flesh (naramāṃsa) and the flesh of goats are offered one hundred thousand times. Viṇāśīkh 190\textsuperscript{cd}–193 describes a magical rite to revive a dead person who then grants one of the performer’s desires. As these two other cases involving the use of human flesh belong to the rite to fulfill desires, it is not unlikely that utkarsaṇa can mean the elevation of one’s position.

\textsuperscript{43} As mentioned in note 42 a dead person revives and grants one of the practitioner’s desires. There are similar rites in other texts. In Rgviḍh 2.42, when one offers ashes one hundred thousand times in water, the personified sorcery (kṛtyā) appears from the water. According to Śāmavīḍh 3.6.12–13, when mustard oil is offered a thousand times at a crossroad on the fourteenth night of the waning half month, a person having a sword in his hand appears and when he is ordered to kill someone, he does so. In AVPŚ 36.25.1–4 an excellent woman or a woman granting desires (varastrī) appears and says that she will fulfill whatever the performer desires. See Goudriaan 1978: 294–298, for similar rites in the later Tantric texts.

\textsuperscript{44} For the magical ointment applied to the eyes (aṅjana or āṅjana), see Gonda 1980: 150–152 and Goudriaan 1978: 317–318. Goudriaan 1978: 317 refers to AVPŚ 35.2.2, but the following 35.2.2\textsuperscript{cd}–3\textsuperscript{ab} and 35.2.3\textsuperscript{cd}–4\textsuperscript{ab} teach the preparation of two kinds of aṅjana. By applying the first, everybody becomes one’s servant (kinkara) while the second is called the origin of good fortune of all beings (sarvabhūtānaṃ saubhāgyasya tu kāraṇaṃ). Śāmavīḍh 2.6.5 teaches a sāman for the aṅjana to become happy.
From kāmas to siddhis


In the Viṇāśikhatantra the variety of rites is extremely limited. Most of them are grouped into the rite of sorcery, and some other rites seemingly belong to the fantastic imagination such as those prescribed in verses 185 and 186 (see item 2-0). The situation is rather similar to the rājasa and the tāmasa siddhis described in the Siddhayogeśvarīmata mentioned above (p. 18).

6 Analysis of the Amoghapāśakalparāja (43b.6–44a.7)46

The Amoghapāśakalparāja 43b.6–44a.7 makes up an independent chapter and deals with homa rituals (Kimura 2005). The contents of this short chapter are analysed as follows:

2-0 prosperity (pauṣṭika) or for various desires (kāmya):

To obtain the highest prosperity: 44b,3–4 [60.2–4], to obtain one hundred dīnāras: 44a.2–3 [58.6–10]; 44b.1 [59.13–15],47 to attract a yaksini who gives

45 Goudriaan 1978: 299–300 refers to “attraction of the threefold inhabited world” (trailokyākarsana) and Bühnemann 2000: 28–29 mentions a cakra which deludes the threefold world (trailokymohanacakra).


47 AVPS 36.26.1–3 prescribes a rite to obtain one hundred dīnāras and one hundred cows. In the Amoghapāśakalparāja I can find only one rite to obtain one thousand dīnāras (Amoghapāśa 30a.7). In the Hemaśādhana in the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa it seems that the obtaining of various amounts of dīnāras is a highly favorite pur-
five thousand rūpakas: 44a.3–4 [58.12–16],\(^{48}\) to obtain one thousand gold: 44b.1 [59.15–17],\(^{49}\) to obtain a great amount of treasure (ratna) from a miraculous girl who appears from a river: 44b.1–2 [59.17–23],\(^{50}\) to obtain one thousand villages: 44a.2 [58.5–6],\(^{51}\) to obtain supernatural powers (siddhi), to find hidden treasure (nidhana): 44a.6–7 [58.26–59.4],\(^{52}\) the magical practice of a

\(^{48}\) The Hemasādhana again hands down several rites to obtain many rūpakas: [673.25–27], [678.27–679.2]: one hundred rūpakas; [677.4–5], [678.16–19]: one thousand rūpakas; [692.8–10]: seven thousand rūpakas. As a yaksini appears in this rite, it can be classified as a rite for attraction (ākarsana).

\(^{49}\) A rite to obtain one thousand gold is found in AVPŚ 35.2.6ab. The Hemasādhana teaches similar rites in the following places: [671.22–23], [672.7–10], [672.15–16], [684.15–16], [684.18–19], [684.26], etc. Amoghapāśa 44b.1 [59.16–17] says that after obtaining gold one should worship the three treasures, distribute some part of it, and take the rest of it. In Amoghapāśa 44a.4–6 [58.16–26] a yaksini appears and becomes the female servant of the practitioner, and this rite too is performed on the bank of a river running to the sea. The Hemasādhana describes several rites which are to be performed at the same place: [669.15], [672.8], [672.10], [672.22], [674.7], [674.16], [677.8], [678.6], [683.18], [686.13].

\(^{50}\) As in this case a miraculous girl appears from a river, we can classify it as ākarsana. Incidentally, this rite is performed on the bank of a river which flows down to the sea (samudragāminī nadi). According to the rite in Amoghapāśa 44a.4–6 [58.16–26] a yaksini appears and becomes the female servant of the practitioner, and this rite too is performed on the bank of a river running to the sea. The Hemasādhana describes several rites which are to be performed at the same place: [669.15], [672.8], [672.10], [672.22], [674.7], [674.16], [677.8], [678.6], [683.18], [686.13].

\(^{51}\) I do not know of any other rites to obtain as many as one thousand villages. In many cases the village is singular and one obtains one village. The villages that can be obtained by a rite in Sāmavidh 3.2.5 are plural but the number is not expressed. When the number of the villages is expressed, it is rather moderate; KauśŚ 22.7 describes a rite to obtain seven villages. According to GobhGS 4.8.15–18 one gets seven villages, if one succeeds, but one can get at least three villages. The Hemasādhana also teaches several rites to obtain various numbers of villages: three villages in [716.18], five villages in [677.9–11], [712.14–15], and [718.13–14], eight villages in [696.3], ten villages in [672.11–13], and twelve villages in [704.25–27]. For the idea in the Vedic texts to wish to obtain a village, see Kulke 1991.

\(^{52}\) As Goudriaan 1978: 307 has already mentioned, Sāmavidh 3.7.7 and 8 and AVPŚ 35.2.4 enjoin similar rites. As regards the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, T. Goudriaan says
From *kāmas to siddhis*

cave (*bilasādhana*): 44b.5 [60.13], to open all doors of a cave: 44b.5 [60.14], to enter a forest and to attract all goods (*dravya*) and medical herbs: 44b.5–6 [60.15–17]53

2-1 rite for rain: 44b.4 [60.6–8]54

3-2-0 pacification (*śānti*):

Protection of the house (*grharaṅkaśa*): 55 43b.7–44a.1 [57.15–26], great pacification (*mahāśānti*): 44a.1–2 [57.26–58.1]; 44b,3 [60.1–2], to stop excessive

that in this text this kind of rite appears repeatedly and he refers, for example, to Vol. II, p. 299 and Vol. III, p. 671. The latter example may be Hemaśādh [671.23–24]. The Hemaśādana indeed prescribes a number of rites to find hidden treasure: [672.20–22], [674.6–8], [677.25–29], [683.1–7], [683.16–18], [683.18–19], [684.8–10], [684.17–18], [686.10–11], [689.11–13], [702.28–703.1], [710.2–3], [718.10–12].

53 When the performer enters a forest, all goods (*dravya*) and medicinal herbs stand before him (*sarvadravyaus. adhaya svar ¯ upen. a tis. t.hanti*). Amoghapāśa 22b.4 and 28b.3 describe two rites which bring about almost the same results. In the long chapter of Amoghapāśa 21b.5–23a.2 there is described a magical practice concerning the prescription of a forest (*vanavidhisādhana*), through the performance of which the practitioner opens the door of a forest and goes to the world of the nāgas. According to Hemaśād [695.5–8] entering a cave (*bilapraveśa*) and entering a forest (*vanapraveśa*) are referred to as the results of the recitation of a certain mantra. In Rājarantarini 3.465–470 King Rāṇādiya obtained a mantra called Hāṭakesvara and entered a cave where he enjoyed the love of the daitya women (Stein 1900: 113–114).

54 Proper rainfall was of the greatest concern for people from the time of the Veda (Rau 1957: 90–92). RV 10.98 is a hymn praying to Brhaspati for rain for the sake of King Śantanu. RV 7.103 , known as the frog-hymn, is also a hymn to pray for rain (Kajihara 2002: 29). AV 4.15, 6.22, and 7.18 also serve the same purpose (Bloomefield 1899: 80). For a ritual to pray for rain among the kāmyeśi, see Caland 1908: 13, 38, 129–134. PB 6.10.15–18 is a kāmyasoma for obtaining rainfall. In the Brāhmaṇa literature we find sporadic statements that certain ritual actions are devices to cause to rain or to prevent rain falling, for example, in KS 26.6 [128.19], 27.1 [138.13–15], MS 3.9.4 [118.14–16], 4.5.5 [71.6–9], 4.6.9 [92.9–11], TŚ 2.1.7.3–4, 6.3.4.6, 6.4.5.5–6, SB 13.1.9.10, JB 1.117 [50.14–21], 1.184 [76.30] and so on. These are surely only a small portion of such statements. For rites for rain described in the Gṛhyasūtras and auxiliary texts, see Gonda 1980: 44, 398–399. We can add the following passages: Kauś 41.14, AğnGS 2.5.11 [90.17–91.23], AVPS 30b.1.17, 65.3.8, Śantiṣkala 2.17.2 (*aindrīśānti*), Rgvidh 2.155–156. From the Purāṇas I collected only two cases: Devbhāgavata Purāṇa 11.24.57–58 and Bhavisya Purāṇa 4.139.41–42ab. The Amoghapāśa mentions rites for rain also in 19a.1 and 28b.2. Only Hemaśād 55 [684.11–12] and 55 [719.8] describe rites for rain. We are left with the impression that compared with rites to get dināras, this text pays very little attention to rainfall.

55 Amoghapāśakalparāja 48b.6–7 [23.6–8] also prescribes a rite for the protection of the house. Rgvidhāna 4.131cd–135 is a rite for the pacification of a dwelling place (*vāstuśāmanama*) (see above, p. 5) and Śāmavidhāna 3.3.6–7 also teaches the same rite (see above, p. 10). These rites have been already dealt with in the Gṛhyasūtras: see, for instance, Kauś 23.1–8, JaimGS 2.6 [31.10–32.1], GobhGS 3.9.4, MāṅGS 2.11.7, BodhGS 3.4.1–21, BhārGS 2.4–6 [34.8–37.15], HirGS 1.8.12–15, AğnGS
rain (atiurṣṭi):\textsuperscript{56} 44b.4–5 [60.8–10], to stop wind, cloud and lightning:\textsuperscript{57} 44b.5 [60.11–12]

3-2-1 absence of fear (abhaya):
Great magic boundary (mahāśīmābandha):\textsuperscript{58} 44b.5 [60.10]

3-2-3 release from various evil conditions:
From all sins such as obstruction (pāpāvaraṇa)\textsuperscript{59} and from all diseases and all enemies: 44b.2–3 [59.23–28], from all vināyakas: 44a.3 [58.10–12]

5-2 rites for battle:
Immobilization of an army (sainyastambhana): 44b.5 [60.12], smashing a hostile army (paracakranidhāpana): 44b.5 [60.12–13]

7 sorcery (abhicāra):
\textit{abhicāraka}: 44b.4 [60.4–5], attraction of a yakṣakanyā/yakṣinī: 44a.4–6 [58.16–26], attraction of Śakra, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Maheśvara, etc.: 44b.6 [60.17–19], attraction of the moon and the sun: 44b.6 [60.19–21], subjugation of a woman, a man, a boy or a girl: 44a.7 [59.7–9], subjugation of a king, a minister, a village, a town, etc.: 44a.2 [58.1–4], subjugation of a king and all that belongs to him: 44a.7 [59.4–7], subjugation of a mahārāja with his harem and family: 44b.6–7 [60.21–25], subjugation of the peoples of the four castes (cāturvāna loka): 44a.7–44b.1 [59.1–3], suppression (nigraha) of all bhūtas, grahas, yakṣas and rākṣasas: 44b.6 [60.25–28]

As in the case of the Viṇāśikhatantra, the variety of the rites here are also very limited and the results of these rites are in many cases exaggerated and of a supernatural character. It seems as if the tendency from kāmas to siddhis reaches its climax in the Amoghapāśakalparāja.

\textsuperscript{56} The Amoghapāśakalparāja also hands down the same rite in other places, such as 19a.1, 19a.2–3, 28b.2 and 29b.5. KauśŚ 38.7 is a rite against heavy rain. Arthaśāstra 9.7.84 refers to a similar rite.
\textsuperscript{57} Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa 55 [692.2–3] teaches also a similar rite to stop wind and cloud.
\textsuperscript{58} The rite for making a magic sphere to have been a very well-known rite in esoteric Buddhist texts as one of the preparatory acts, see e.g. Amoghapāśakalparāja 3b.3–4, 3b.5, 6b.6–7, 19a.3, 31a.6, 46a.3–4, 48a.6–7, 48b.2–3, 50b.4, 65b.3–4, Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa 55 [693.16–18], [691.27–692.1], [695.5–8], [710.15–16]. See also Suvarnaprabhāsottamaśūtra, Sarasvatīparivarta 106.5–107.3 and Susiddhikara Śūtra 18 (Giebel 2001: 201–202).
\textsuperscript{59} Similar rites for diminishing obstructions caused by previous acts (karmāvaraṇa) are laid down in Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa 55 [673.8–9] and [694.24–29].
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The early medieval period, from about the fifth century to the thirteenth, saw a decline in the role of Śrāuta sacrifice in the religious ceremonies undertaken by Indian rulers. But it was not that kings turned aside from the brahmanical tradition in a fundamental sense. They continued to uphold the brahmanical social order of the castes and disciplines (*varṇāśramadharmaḥ*) and they were commonly commended in inscriptions from the fifth to the eighth centuries for having rigorously imposed it on their subjects. We see this in the case of the Maukhari Harivarman in the fifth century, the Mahārājādhirāja Gopacandra of Vanga and the Parivrājaka Mahārāja Saṃkṣobha of Daḥbālarājya in the sixth, the Puṣyabhūti Prabhākara-varadhana of Kanyakubja, Bhaṣkara-varman of Prāg-jyotiṣa, the Maitraka Kharagraha II Dharmāditya of Valabhi, the Gūrjara Dadda III of Bharukaccha in the seventh, and the Licchavi Śivadeva of Nepal at the turn of the seventh and eighth.\(^1\) The same claim is seen in the account of the

\(^1\) CII 3, pp. 220, ll. 1–2: *varṇāśramavyavasthāpanapravṛttacakrah* [Harivarman], who set in motion the establishing of the distinctions between the caste-classes and disciplines; RAJAGURU 1962, ll. 6–9: *varṇāśramavyavasthāhetuḥ *sāksād (corr. RAJAGURU: sāksad Ep.) *dharma *ivopātajamā (corr.: ivopātajamā RAJAGURU) ...*paramamāheśvāro mahārājādhirājaśrigopacandra- *Mahārājādhirāja Gopacandra, entirely devoted to Śiva, who caused the distinctions between the caste-classes and disciplines to be established, as though he were Dharma incarnate*; EI 8:28, ll. 11–12: *varṇāśramadharmaśthāpanāḥhiratena (Saṃkṣobha); EI 4:29, l. 3: *varṇāśramavyavasthāpanapravṛttacakrah (Prabhākara-varadhana); EI 12:13, ll. 34–35: bhagavatā kamalasambhavenāvakīrnavarnāśramadharmapravi-bhāgāya nirmito bhuvanapatir 'King [Bhāskaravarman], created by Brahamā himself to separate the caste-classes and disciplines that had abandoned their duties*; CII 3, pp. 173ff., ll. 43–44: sāksād dharma iva samyagvyavasthāpitavarnāśramācāraḥ [Kharagraha II Dharmāditya], who established the observances of the the caste-classes and disciplines, as though he were Dharma in visible form; CII 4i:21, ll. 7–9: mahāmunimanupraṇītapravacanādhitramavivekasvadharmānusthāna*pravino (em. MIRASHI: pravāṇi Ep.) *varṇāśramavyavasthonmūlitasakalakalikālavalega<h> 'Dadda III, who uprooted all the taints of this [degenerate] age of Kali by establishing the separation of the caste-classes and disciplines, well-versed in the execution of his duty [as the king] through discriminat-ing understanding of the teachings authored by the great sages Manu'; LKA 140, ll. 1–2: suvhiṭavarnāśramasthitir licchavikulaketuṛ ...mahārājādhirājaśriśivadevaḥ *Mahārājādhirāja Śivadeva, war-banner of the Licchavi dynasty, who correctly established the system of the caste-classes and disciplines*; LKA 143, l. 1: *samyagviraśirasakalavarṇāśramavyavasthāḥ* [Śivadeva], who correctly fashioned the system of the distinct castes and disciplines'.
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history of Kashmir before the advent of the Kārkotā dynasty in the seventh century given in the twelfth by the Kashmirian historian Kalhana. His chronology for this early phase of his country’s history is confused, but it is likely that we should assign to the fifth or sixth century the king Gopāditya whom he commends for having restored the first and perfect Age through his regard for the castes and brahmanical disciplines. He also reports a popular belief of his time that in order to promote the orthodox brahmanical social order the Hephthalite Mihirakula, who ruled Kashmir in the early sixth century, had settled natives of Āryadeśa in his kingdom, which was then, we are told, devoid of the true religion (dharmah), being overrun by Dards and Tibetans.

Seeing these claims of the royal imposition of the varṇāśramadharma one thinks of the non-geographical definition of territory fit for brahmanical rites (yajñīyo desah) formulated by Manu’s commentator Medhatithi during the ninth or tenth century, namely that it is any land in which a conquering brahmanical king settles the four caste-classes and imposes on the rest of the population the status of untouchables (caṇḍalāh). This definition served, I propose, to accommodate the fact of the territorial expansion of brahmanical society into new regions that was one of salient features of the early medieval period.

---

2 Rājatarāṇī 1.339: jugopa gopādityo ‘tha ksmāṃ sadvipāṃ tadātmajah | varṇāśramapratayavekṣādarśitādyugodayaḥ ‘Next his son Gopāditya protected the earth and its continents, causing men to experience the arising of a [new] First Age through his attention to [the maintenance of] the caste-classes and disciplines’. 

3 Rājatarāṇī 1.312–313b: ākrānte dāradair bhauṭṭair mlecchāir aṣucikarmabhiḥ | vināsthadharme desē smin *punyācārapravartante (conj.: pravartanam Ed.) | āryadesyān sa samsthāpayā vyatanod dārunam tapah | *In order to (conj.) promote pious observance in this land that had been overrun by barbarians of impure conduct, Dards and Tibetans, and [so] had lost the [brahmanical] Dharma, he settled [brahmins] of Āryadeśa. Thereafter he performed a terrible penance’. STEIN (1979, p. 46), no doubt faithfully reproducing the reading of the codex archetypus, gives punyācārapravartanam rather than punyācārapravartane and this leaves him no alternative other than to take not only dārunam tapah but also this as the object of the verb: “he performed a terrible penance, and re-established pious observances”. But the reading is unacceptable. For even if one can believe, as I cannot, that punyācārapravartanam vyatanot is not too inelegant an expression for an author of Kalhana’s calibre, there remains the fact that it requires us to believe also that vyatanot governs two objects even though the conjunction necessary for this interpretation is lacking. I have therefore emended to punyācārapravartane, which, taken as an instance of the use of the locative of purpose (nimittasaptami), yields an entirely appropriate meaning and supposes a scribal error that is readily explained by the ease with which readers of the Kashmirian script can mistake -e for -am, the common substitute for -am. Furthermore, STEIN’s rendering of āryadesyān samsthāpaya as “after killing the inhabitants of Āryadeśa” is, in my view, much less probable than the alternative adopted here, which is to take the verb form samsthāpaya in its contextually more appropriate meaning, namely ‘having settled’.

4 See SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 400–401, citing Medhatithi, Manusmrītbhāṣya p. 80,
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Thus the first centuries of this period are presented in our sources as marked not by the decline of brahmanism but rather by its imposition, reinforcement, and expansion. Moreover, there is abundant epigraphical evidence of kings throughout this time bringing Vaidika brahmins into their kingdoms by making them grants of tax-exempt land, thereby extending the penetration of brahmanical culture while facilitating the administration of their territories and promoting agricultural development.

Nonetheless, while kings continued to accept their role as the guardians of the brahmanical order (varṇāśramaguruḥ), their personal religious commitment generally took the form of Buddhism, Jainism, or, more commonly, devotion to Śiva, Viṣṇu, the Sun-God (Sūrya/Āditya), or the Goddess (Bhagavati), the deities of the new initiatory religions, allegiances that were commonly declared in their inscriptions by the inclusion amid their royal titles of epithets that mean 'entirely

---

5 On the duty of the king to donate [tax-free] land and other valuables to learned Vaidika brahmins (vīpṛāḥ, śrotiṇyāḥ) see, e.g., Yājñavālakyaṁśrī 1.315–320; 1.323: nāṭaḥ parataro dharmo nrpañāṁ yad raṇājīram vīpṛbhiko dīyate dvrayam ... ‘There is no higher religious obligation for kings than that of bestowing the wealth they acquire through war on learned Vaidika brahmins ... ’; Viṣṇusmrī 3.81–82: brāhmaṇebhyās ca bhuvam pratipādayet ... ‘He should bestow land on brahmins’. On the king’s duty not to tax learned Vaidikas see Manusmrī 7.133ab: mriyāmānō ‘py ādādīta na rājā śrotiṇyāt karam ‘Even though dying [through poverty] a king may not levy a tax from a learned Vaidika’. The giving of land to learned brahmins is already advocated at length as the king’s religious duty in the Mahābhārata (Anuśāsanaparvan, Adhyāya 61); and that passage includes an injunction that it should be read to the king immediately after his consecration (13.61.36: abhiśicayāvaiḥ nrpaṁ śrāvayed imam āgamam).

6 For a study of land-grants to brahmins (brahmadeyam, agrahārāḥ, śāsanam) during our period in a particular region, Orissa and northern Andhra Pradesh, see SINGH 1994, pp. 123–243. For the same in the Far South in Pallava and Cola times see KARASHIMA 1984, especially pp. 3, 36–40, and 129; and STEIN 1994, especially pp. 63–89 and 141–172. The migration of groups of north-Indian Vaidika brahmins as recipients of royal grants is the subject of Datta 1989. See also DUTTA 1995, pp. 97–118 on the practice and implications of land-grants to brahmins in northern India c. 400–700.
devoted’ to the founder or deity of whichever of these religions they favoured.

THE DOMINANCE OF ŚAIVISM

Among these alternatives devotion to Śiva was the most commonly adopted. During this period the epithet paramāheśvararha ‘entirely devoted to Śiva’ is the most frequently encountered in declarations of the religious adherence of rulers; and of the many temples surviving or reported in inscriptions that were established by rulers and other notables from the late sixth century onwards in the subcontinent, the Khmer realm, the Cham kingdoms of Indo-China, and the kingdoms of Java and Bali, those dedicated to the worship of this god are much the most numerous.

The preponderance of Śaivism during this period is also revealed by evidence that all the other religious traditions competing for patronage were colonized or

---

7 The royal epithet paramāheśvararha first appears in the epigraphical record in the fourth century in Andhra, in an inscription of the Śālankaiyana Mahārāja Devavarman of Vengi pura (EI 9:7, ll. 1–7), probably the earliest of the Śālankaiyanas in our records since this inscription alone is in Prakrit: sirivijaya vengipura bhangavato cittarathasāmipādānunjihātassā bappabhaṭṭārakapādabhattachya paramāheśsarassa sālankaiyanassā asamedhayājino mahārājasirivijayadevavammassa vayañeṇa . . . ‘From victorious Vengi pura: by the command of the Śālankaiyana, who has performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice, the venerable Mahārāja Vijayadevarvarman, favoured by [his kuladevatā, the Śiva] Citrarathasvāmin, loyal to [his] venerable father, entirely devoted to Śiva . . .’. It is mostly found in inscriptions but occasionally appears on coinage. Thus the coins of Kṛṣṇarāja, the Kalacuri king of Māhiṣmatī, who ruled c. 550–575, have on their reverse, (with corrected orthography): paramāheśvarar mataipitipādānudhyāta śriṅkṣṇarāja (MIRASHI, CII 4i p. cxxxi). This is the standard term, as is confirmed by its use in literary sources. But we also find the synonym atyantamāheśvararha (e.g. CII 5:3, l. 8: Vākātaka Pythivisenā I, late fourth century), and, though very rarely and not to my knowledge in any inscription, paramasāvah (PETECH 1984, pp. 57 and 61: the twelfth-century Nepalese kings Indradeva and Ānandadeva in the colophons of manuscripts). That the Taddhita māheśvararha is to be understood as formed from the name Maheśvara in the meaning ‘devoted to Maheśvara’ (maheśvarabhbaktāh), i.e. ‘devoted to Śiva’, is proved beyond doubt by the occurrence in inscriptions of analytic renderings of parallel terms. Thus where the affiliation is with Viṣṇu (/Bhagavat) we see not only paramabhbhbavatah but also param bhagavadbhaktāḥ and in the case of the Sun-god (Śūrya/Āditya) we see both paramasaurah and paramādityabhaktāḥ. And there are some cases in which the name of the deity precludes any but the analytic form. Thus where the deity is the Goddess or Mahābhairava we see param bhagavatibhbaktāḥ and atyantasmāmābhairavabhābhaktāḥ. For all these epithets see MIRASHI CII 3, pp. 253–254, n. 3.

8 This can readily be observed by perusing the published volumes of EITA. On the pre-eminence of Śaivism among the Khmers up to the fall of Angkor see SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 402–421. For the situation in Karnataka, where Śaiva foundations greatly outnumbered others throughout the period from the fifth to fourteenth centuries see p. 298. For Kashmir see p. 298, and for Andhra see p. 300.
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profoundly influenced by it. In the first part of this study I shall present this
evidence for each religion in turn, but with particular attention to Buddhism. In
the second I shall attempt to explain the factors that enabled Saivism to attain
this dominant position.

THE INCORPORATION OF ŠĀKTISM

The worship of the Goddess was progressively subsumed within Šaivism,
being promoted by its adherents as a higher form of that religion.9 The Šaiva
mainstream was, as one might expect, focused on Śiva. This is so in the
earliest forms of the religion, which later Šaivas would call the Atimārga,
practised by such Šaiva ascetics as the Pāncārthikas, Lākulas, and So-
masiddhāntins, and it continued to be so in the Siddhānta, the core tradition of
the Mantramārga that emerged out of the Atimārga from about the fifth century
onwards, first in the corpus of Niśvāsa scriptures10 and then in a number of
others, notable among which are the Pārameśvara (Pauśkarapārameśvara), the
Śvāyambhuvasūtrasamgraha, the Rauravasūtrasamgraha, the Mataṅgapārameśvara, the Sarvajñānottottara, the Kālottara in a number of redactions, the
Kīrāṇa, the Parākhya, the Mṛgendra, the Brhatkālottara, the Mayasamgraha,
the Devyāmata, and the Mohacīḍottara, the last three representing a sub-corpus
of texts of more restricted application concerned with the rituals of the installa-
tion of images and the consecration of temples, an area in which officiants of the
Siddhānta were the dominant operatives. But as this Saiddhāntika core grew
it was progressively surrounded by a diverse array of related liturgical systems
for the propitiation of various forms of the ferocious deity Bhairava, seen by
his devotees as a higher, more esoteric manifestation of Śiva, and of forms of
the Goddess seen as embodiments of Śiva’s divine power (śaktih). The Šaiva
scriptures devoted to the cult of Bhairava came to be known collectively as the
Mantrapīṭha or Mantra Corpus, headed by the Svacchandatantra, which teaches
the cult of Svachandabhairava and his consort Aghoreśvarī, and the earlier
among those devoted to cults of Goddesses as the Vidyāpīṭha or Vidyā Corpus,11

---

10 On the transitional character of the Niśvāsa between the Lākula Atimārga and
the mature Siddhānta see SANDERSON 2006, and 2001, pp. 29–31, fn. 32. On the
probable date of its earliest part see GOODALL and ISAACSON 2007.
11 For the use of the term pitham in this context in the meaning ‘corpus’ or ‘collec-
tion’ see Tantrāloka 37.18c–19c1, quoting or paraphrasing the lost Anandasāstra:
śrimadānandaśāstrādau proktam bhagavatā kila || samūhaḥ pitham etac ca dvidhā
dakṣinavāmataḥ | mantro vidyeti The Lord has taught in such scriptures as the
Ananda that pitham [here means] the corpus [of the non-Saidhāntika Šaiva scrip-
tures]. It is divided into two, to the right and left [respectively], namely the

– 45 –
Genesis and Development of Tantrism

headed by (1) the *Jayadrathayāmala*, also known as the *Śīraścheda*, consisting of four parts called hexads (*sāṭkam*) because each is approximately six thousand verses in length, which teaches the cult of Kālasamkāraṇī or Kāli in the first and those of numerous goddesses worshipped as her esoteric embodiments in the remaining three parts, evidently added at a later date—closely related to parts of this huge corpus are the scriptures of the Kālikula, *Kālikulakrama-sadbhāva*, *Kālikulapañcasaataka* and others, that were the scriptural basis of the Kālikula Kāli cult known as the Krama, Mahānaya, or Mahārtha—, (2) the *Siddhayogeśvarimata*, which teaches the cult of the goddesses Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā, to which the *Mālinīvijayottara* is related, the scripture taken as the foundation of the Trika variant of Śākta Śaivism expounded in the *Tantrāloka* of the great Kashmirian Śaiva Abhinavagupta (*fl. c. 975–1025*), (3) the *Picumata* or *Brahmayāmala*, which teaches the cult of the goddess Canda Kāpālinī and numerous related Kalpas, and (4) the texts of the *vāmasrotah*, of which only the *Viṇāśikha* has come down to us intact, which teach the cult of the four goddesses Jayā, Vijayā, Jayanti/Ajitā, and Aparājitā, the sisters of the god Tumburu, venerated as an aspect of Śiva.  

---

12 The distinction in terms of left and right between the two Piṭhas in the passage of the *Ānanda* cited in the preceding footnote must not be confused with that between the right current (*dakṣiṇasrotah*) and the left current (*vāmasrotah*) of the Śaiva scriptures, which derives from the fact that these are thought to have emerged from the right and left faces of the five-faced composite Śadāśiva, those of Aghora (Bhairava) and the feminine Vāmadeva respectively. For of the texts of the two Piṭhas only those of the cult of the four sisters are assigned to the latter. The *Siddhayogeśvarimata* and the *Picumata* are both assigned to the former, while according to itself the first *Śaṭka* of the *Jayadrathayāmala* is a hybrid of both (*ubhayātmakam*); see SANDERSON 2002, pp. 1–2. Of the other three faces the front and rear, the faces of Tatpuruṣa and Sadyojāta, are seen as the source of the Gāruḍatāntras and Bhūtatantras, texts concerned respectively with procedures for the curing of the effects of poisons and demonic possession, while the upper face, that of Īśāna, is seen as the source of the scriptures of the Siddhānta, revealing that this, unlike the distinction between the two Piṭhas, is a Siddhānta-centric system of classification. It is adapted by the non-Saiddhāntika Abhinavagupta as the basis of his esoteric account of the nature of the Śaiva canon in the *Mālinīvijayavārtika* but only by adding a sixth, upper-upper current (*ūrdhvordhvastrotah*) above the Siddhānta as the source of the non-dualistic Kaula (Śākta) revelation that he takes to be the ultimate ground of the entire canon. *Mālinīvijayavārtika* 1.160–163b: 

`prakṛtam brūmahe devīvisṛṣṭās citrasamvidah | yāvat tāvat tad ārdhvordhidhuyam sroto yad bhedavarjitaṁ | 161 saurabhargasikkhādīni tatāh sāstrāṇī tenire | uktam bhargasikkhāyam ca devena parameṣṭhinā | 162 ārdhvversedodbhavan jīnānam idaṁ tat paramaṁ priye | paramadvhaninordhvothhasaṁvidrūpābhidhāyinā |`
To these we may add the scriptures of two later Śākta cults, those of the goddesses Kubjikā and Tripurasundarī. The scriptures of the former, the Ku-
bjikāmata and related texts such as the Śaṭsāhasra, do not claim to be part of the Vidyāpīṭha. But they are closely related to, and draw heavily on, the sub-
corpus of texts within the Vidyāpīṭha that is headed by the Siddhayogēśvarimata and is associated with the Śākta system that would be developed under the name of the Trika: the Siddhayogēśvarimata itself, the [Trika]kularatnamālā, the Tantrasadbhāva, the Devyāyāmala, and the Triśīrobhairava. Also allied in character is the Nityāsodāsiṅkārṇava or Vāmakeśvarimata, the fundamental scripture of the cult of the goddess Tripurasundarī. This, which became the most widely established of India’s Śākta cults, has no direct antecedents in the Vidyāpīṭha literature, but is rather an independent development out of an earlier Śākta tradition of the propitiation of goddesses known as the Nityās in which rites for success in love predominated.  

13 This early cult was eclipsed by its
much more successful successor. But nonetheless evidence of it has survived, attesting two forms. One is taught in the Nityākauṭa, of which a single, incomplete manuscript has come down to us in Nepal. Here the goddess Tripūrā is surrounded by a circle of twelve deities comprising eleven Nityā goddesses and Kāmadeva, the Indian Cupid.\(^{14}\) The other has been preserved in the eclectic Manthānabhairava, whose Siddhakhanda contains detailed manual-like instructions for a Śākta cult of Tripūrā and nine Nityās with Kāmadeva as her consort.\(^ {15}\) The earlier prominence of the Nityā cult is indicated by the fact that a syncretistic text of the cult of Kubjikā, the *Cinčinmatasārasamuccaya*, contains a section drawn from the Nityākauṭa, or from some lost text closely related to it, in which it sets out this cult as the ‘teaching of the southern or-

mastering the eight Pramāṇa scriptures, and for [those, the Pañcarthikapāśupatas, who engage] in the Pāsupata observance, it is [the Tatva] of Iśvara. For those versed in the scriptural tradition of the Nine Nityās it is Śivatattva. Above that is Bhairava, transcending [all] the five Causes: Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra, Iśvara, and Sadāśiva. This, eternal bliss, is the final destination of the Tāntrikas of the Tantras of the eight [Bhairavas] [v. 132: the Niṣkā-Svacchandabhairava, the Sakala-Svacchandabhairava, the Bahurupabhairava, the Aghorabhairava, the Vyādhbhaksabhairava, the Candragarbhabhairava, the Vijñānabhairava, the Tumburabhairava (perhaps =the Vināśikha), and the Amṛteśvarabhairava (=Netratantra)]. It is beyond the [universe] that culminates in Samanā and is established in [the two divisions of the Bhairavatantras, those of] the left [current (vāmasrotaḥ)] and [those of] the right [daksināsrotaḥ]. The truth—there is no [room for] doubt in this matter—is that liberation is [attained in each these systems but] in the manner of ascending a ladder. Above that are the six ascending [divisions of the scriptures] of Parā. The first division is the Śaḍardha (=Malinīvijaya, vv. 125a and 133cd), the second the Bhairavalkula (=Klīnṇāvayayoga, v. 134a), the third the Virāvali (=Vīrāvalikulāmnāya, v. 134c), and the fourth the Kālikula [scriptures] (=Kālikākrama, v. 134d). Above this is the Ādyāvatāra [of the Paścimānāyan], and above that the Anāhata [revelation] called Kulālikāmnāya\(^{14}\). It is striking that this passage omits the Saiddhāntikas. It is therefore likely that the text has lost a line or verse here. This suspicion is strengthened by the verses that follow. For in these the order of systems is repeated with saivism, i.e. the Siddhānta’s scriptures, between the pāṣupatam and the eight Bhairavatantras (v. 128bcd: tathā pāṣupatam mahat | saivam tasya viśeṣam tu bhairavāstakānirṇayam). Since the passage also omits Saḍāśivatattva it is probable that it was this level that was assigned to the Saiddhāntika system in the lost line or verse. To assign the Saiddhāntikas to Saḍāśivatattva would, of course, be to disdain their claim that their paraṇ padam is in fact Śivatattva.

\(^{14}\) The eleven Nityās of this text are Ḫṛlekha, Kledini, Nandā, Kṣobhanī, Madanāṭurā, Niraṇjanā, Rāgavatī, Madanavatī, Khekalī, Drāvaṇī and Vegavatī; see Nityākauṭa, f. 2r7–2v1.

\(^{15}\) Manthānabhairava, Siddhakhanda, ff. 186v–231r1. The nine Nityās are Kulavidya, Vajreśvari, Tvaritā, Kurukullā, Lalitā, Bherunā, Nilapatākā, Mangalā and Vymavāyāmī. The section on Tripūrā continues to f. 252v and includes the text of the Nityāsodasikārṇava. The folio numbers are those of a palm-leaf manuscript in private hands, to which I have had access through digital images kindly provided by my former pupil and present colleague Dr. Somdev Vasudeva.
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der’ (dakṣiṇagharāmnāyāḥ), grouping it with the cult of Kubjikā, the cult of Kāli (Kālikula) in a form attested in the Jayadrathayāmala and the related corpus of the scriptures of the Krama or Mahānaya, and a form of Śākta worship agreeing closely with that found in the Trika, calling these the teachings of the western, northern, and eastern orders respectively (Paścimagharāmnāya, Utтарagharāmnāya, and Pūrvagharāmnāya).

The Śāktism of this tetradic schema of the directional Āmnāyas can be distinguished broadly from the earlier Śāktism of the Vidyāpīṭha by a marked tendency to expurgate one of the most conspicuous features of the latter, namely its embeddedness in the intensely transgressive tradition of Kāpālika asceticism whose roots lie in the Somasiddhāntin division of the Atimārga. Since the Śāktism of the Āmnāyas refers to itself as Kaula we may use this term to designate these post-Kāpālika developments. However, like most terms applied to traditions subject to change through time it serves at best to indicate a tendency rather than an absolute distinction. For while the cults of Tripurasundarī and Kubjikā adhered to this mode of self-definition and the Trika that developed out of the Siddhayogesvarimata also came to do so,16 the cult of Kāli that came to constitute the Kaulas’ Northern Teaching (uttarāmnāyāḥ) remained both Kaula in its self-definition and firmly Kāpālika in its practise.17

---

16 On the anti-Kāpālika stance of the mature Trika see SANDERSON 2005c, pp. 118–119, fn. 74.  
17 For the Kāpālika/Mahāvratin asceticism of practitioners of the Uttarāmnāya, that is to say of the Kālikula and Krama/Mahānaya, see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 293–294 (Cakrabhānu, Īśāni, and Jaiyaka), 323 (Cakrapāṇinātha, author of the Bhāvopahārasotra). Concerning the date of Cakrapāṇinātha I was able to say in 2007a (p. 417) only that he was earlier than his commentator Ramyadeva, who was later than Kṣemarāja, which is to say, next to nothing. However, since then I have read a Nepalese manuscript, NGMPP C114/22, which contains his Bhāvopahārasotra under the title Bhāvopahārapījā, and this enables us to include him among relatively early authors, since the manuscript is dated in 1158/9. To the Kashmirian exponents of the Krama identified as followers of the Kāpālika observance in 2007a I now propose to add one more. According to a manuscript of the Chummāsaṁketapraṅkāśa that I had not seen at that time, which contains the final verses of the work that are lacking in the one manuscript that I had seen then, the redactor of this text attributed to Niskriyānanda was one Anantaśakti. He is described there as mudrādharā (A, f. 11r7–9): saṃsāraśāmbhramacayapraśīhāgabandhasambandhasamksaya“gatir (em. : gater Cod.) avikalpamūrtīḥ | sākṣād anābiladihiḥ laghuvākkrameṇa mudrādharas tu vidadhe tad anantaḥsaktiḥ. This expression I take to have the same meaning as pañcamudrādharā ‘wearer of the five sect marks [of the Kāpālika/Mahāvratin]; see, e.g., Svāyambhuvasūtrasangraha, Paṭala 14 (saṃsāmayabhedah), one of the chapters that is not part of the original work of this name, vv. 19–20: caturdasaprāmāṇena yuktaṁ kāpālem ucayate | kāpale ca vratam mukhyam sarvapāpaniṣṭhān | tasmin vratam cared yas tu saṁmāśan mu-ktrim āpnyāt | pañcamudrādharā śaṅtah samayācārapālakah; and Kubjikāmata
In general we may say that these non-Saiddhāntika texts with their strongly Śāktta orientation emerged after the Siddhānta or at least after the emergence of its earliest scriptures. Thus, for example, it is clear in my view that the Svacchandatantra was redacted after the formation of the Saiddhāntika Niśvāsa corpus, the Tantrasadbhāva after the Svacchanda, the Kubjikāmata after the Tantrasadbhāva,\(^{18}\) the first hexad of the Jayadraṭhayāmala after the Kubjikāmata,\(^{19}\) and the remaining three hexads after the first.\(^{20}\) However, I see no reason to conclude that all that is found in the non-Saiddhāntika corpus is post-Saiddhāntika and some grounds for thinking that some elements may be as old or older. This may be the case with the cult of the four sisters of Tumburu. For that is known to the Buddhist Dharmakīrtti (fl. c. 550–650),\(^{21}\) and the first two folios of a post-scriptural text on this cult, the *Devītantrasadbhāvasāra*, written in learned style in the Ārya metre, have survived among the Buddhist manuscripts uncovered in Gilgit in 1931. They may be assigned on palaeographical grounds to around the middle of the sixth century.\(^{22}\) A second area

\(^{18}\) See the evidence for this sequence in SANDERSON 2001, pp. 20–35.


\(^{21}\) See SANDERSON 2001, pp. 11–13, fn. 10.

\(^{22}\) No title appears in the surviving fragment of this text. The title assigned here is a guess based on the unknown author’s description of his work in verses 3 and 4. There he says that he is extracting the fundamentals (sāraḥ) of the Essence of the Tantras (tantrasadbhāvah) of the [four] Goddesses (devinām) that had been received from Śiva by a sage identified only as the ornament of the lineage of Atri: 3 ātyeyavāṇasatilakenktm śarvād avāpya yat pūrvaṃ | suramuni-narāsūrānāṃ devinām tantrasadbhāvāṃ || 4 tasmād aham apy adhunā vakoṣye samhṛtya sāram āryābhīḥ Śpatsuṭarākṣaraṇaṃktibhir avīśādaḥyām *prabodhāya (em. : prvadhāta Cod.) *The Essence of the Tantras of the Goddesses* was received of old from Śiva by the ornament of the lineage of Atri and taught to the gods, sages, men, and titans. I in turn have summarized its fundamentals and shall now declare them in Ārya verses whose lines of syllables will be completely clear in meaning, for the instruction of those of modest intellect. The script is the stage of proto-Śarada that Prof. Lore SANDER has called Gilgit/Bamiyan type 2 and also Sonderschrift 1. I stumbled upon the first folio (3221–3222) while searching the facsimiles of the Gilgit manuscripts for proto-Tantric Buddhist materials and communicated this unexpected discovery to SomdevVASUDEV, then my student, who promptly located the second folio (3340–3341) and presented convincing palaeographical arguments for the date of the manuscript proposed here (email of 7.12.2000), pointing to the presence of the archaic tripartite *ya* ligature, the occurrence of the old style of *hr*, and the Gupta style *ru*. The text teaches the Mantras of the four Devīs, who, it says, were made manifest at the beginning of creation so that men could attain supernat-
of the non-Saiddhāntika canon that is likely to be very early in origin is that of the Yāmala tantras assigned to the Vidyāpītha, represented in our surviving manuscripts by the Picumata, also called the Brahmayāmala. For the Skandapūrṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa, whose earliest surviving manuscript was completed in 810, lists seven Yāmala texts, beginning with the Brahmayāmala, as Tantras of the Mother Goddesses (mātratāntraḥ). The date of the text itself is still a matter of debate; but it is unlikely to have been composed later than the end of the seventh century or earlier than the sixth. It is certainly

ural accomplishments and liberation (v. 11cd: prādurbhūtā devaḥ siddhyartham muktyaḥ caiva), their ancillaries (āngamantrāḥ), their retinue of [four] Dūtis and [four] Kīnkaras (v. 16bc: dūtyas sakīnkarāḥ <ḥ>), Tumburu (v. 17ab: pranavaṃ tumburusahitam sārthavahāḥ +), and the Ankuśa (v. 18bc: sapraṇavaṃ HŪM-PHAT-vinivyuktam ankusam etat). The Viṇāśikha, our only complete surviving Tantra of the vāmasrotaḥ, teaches the four Devis (vv. 30c–32b), Tumburu (vv. 29c–30b), and the Ankuśa (v. 41d etc.), but not the Dūtis or Kīnkaras. For the fuller pantheon see, e.g., Devyāmata, f. 40r1: jayā ca vijayā caiva jayantī cāparājītā | dūtiḥḥ kīnkaraiḥ sārdham samṛtaḥ *tumburuḥ (corr: *tumburuḥ) sthitah; Netratantra 11.1–27; and Śāradātilaka 19.87–105b and Tantrasārasamgraha 23.37–52 (with the four Dūtis but without the Kīnkaras). The expression sārthavahāḥ ‘the [international] trader’ in v. 17b (v. 17ab: pranavaṃ tumburusahitam sārthavahāḥ +) no doubt refers to Tumburu, who is so described in the Buddhist version of this cult taught in the Maṇjuśrīyamūlakalpa (47.29b, 52a, 54c, p. 413, l. 12, etc.). According to that source the four sisters and Tumburu are to be depicted sailing in a ship with Tumburu at the helm (47.24: nauyānasamārūdhāḥ <ḥ> sabhrātrṣahapaṇcāmāḥ | karṇadhāro *ṛthacit (tentative conj.: ‘ṛthacit Ed.) tāsāṃ *tumburuḥsāmaṃjñītaḥ (em.: tumbuḥur nāma samjñītaḥ Ed.). See also here p. 130. This depiction is also prescribed in the Śaiva Pingalāmata, f. 28v5–6 (Citrādhikāra, v. 35): jayādyās ca kacragas tadvat panktistah vā likhet kramast nāvārādhāḥ ca vā likhyās tumbruḥ karnadhārakāḥ ‘He should depict Jayā, Vijayā, Jayantī, and [Apārajītā] forming a circle or in a line. Alternatively he may depict them on board a ship with Tumburu as the helmsman’. For the early date of this cult see also here p. 129.

23 See SANDERSON 2001, pp. 6–7, fn. 4 and here p. 229 (171.127–130b) and a discussion of the titles it contains. The oldest manuscript is dated in the year 234. For this date and its equivalence to A.D. 810 see ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER and ISAACSON, p. 326. That the era of the date is that of the Licchavi Mānadeva (=Āmśuvarma) was first proposed by WITZEL (1986, p. 256, n. 9). The date of the commencement of this unnamed era which is seen in Nepalese inscriptions that begin during the reign of the Nepalese king Mānadeva was determined to fall in A.D. 576 on the basis of Tibetan evidence by Luciano PÈTECH (1961). Previously it had been assumed that the era was that of Harṣa (A.D. 606).

24 Yuko YOKOCHI has observed (1999a, pp. 81–82) that the icon of the goddess Mahiśāsura-mardini seen in texts of the sixth and seventh centuries gives way to a new iconic type around the beginning of the eighth century and that this text belongs with the earlier sources in this regard. The same scholar has shown (1999b, pp. 68–75) that the description of Mahiśāsura-mardini in 68.10–23 of the text corresponds most closely to the image of Mahiśāsura-mardini from Siddhi-ki-Guphā at Deogarh, an example of her Gupta subtype B2. She argues that this was carved in the middle of the sixth century or, at the latest, at its the end (pp. 74–75). So, she concludes, “the possibility that the text belongs to the same century can no longer
striking in this regard that it betrays no knowledge of the Siddhānta, its Śaivism being Atimārgic, a circumstance which supports the hypothesis that the polarity seen in the Mantramārga between Śaivism and Śākta Śaivism was already present in some form when the former was still in the Atimārga stage. Royal devotion to Bhairava certainly goes back before the Siddhānta’s emergence, being attributed in Vākāṭaka inscriptions to Rudrasena I, who ruled c. 335–c. 360, and a copperplate decree issued by Mahārāja Bhuluṇḍa in 376 from Bagh (Valkhā) in Madhya Pradesh records a grant made to support the worship of the Mothers in a temple of those deities established by an officiant of the Atimārga, the Pāśupatācārya Bhagavat Lokodadhi.

In the light of this evidence that Śāktism was extensively incorporated into and developed within Śaivism it should not be surprising to discover that in spite of the prevalence of the worship of the Goddess in early medieval India kings identified in inscriptions as devotees of the Goddess (bhagavatībhaktah) rather than Śiva are very rare. At present I am aware only of Nāgabhaṭa, Bhoja, and his successor Mahipāla I in the ninth century among the Gūrjara-Pratihāras of Kanyakubja.

Royal devotion to a goddess, typically as a dynasty’s lineage deity (kuladevī, vamsadevī, gotradevī), was very common during our period, and such deities are often declared in inscriptions to be the source of a king’s sovereignty and martial might. But this was not sufficient to mark out kings who worshipped such goddesses as Śāktas. For such worship was common regardless of a king’s reli-

---

be repudiated” (p. 75). The Gupta type, in one subtype or another, was popular from the 5th century to the 8th.

25 The Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa is not a text of the Atimārga in the sense that it was written for initiates in one of its systems. For since it is a Purāṇa its target audience is the uninitiated laity. However, the Śaivism that it draws on is Pāśupata rather than Mantramārgic. This Atimārgic background is conspicuous throughout the text; but see particularly Adhyāyas 174–183.

26 Hypothesis first proposed in SANDERSON 1988, p. 667.

27 See, e.g., the Tirodī plates of Pravarasena II, r. c. 400–c. 450, CII 5:11, ll. 3–6: atyantasvāvimahābhairavabhaktasya . . . mahārājaśirīrudrasenasasya. The same formula appears in all the other surviving copper-plates of this king that are complete at this point (CII 5:1, 4, 6–7, 10, 13–14, 18). For these approximate regnal dates of Rudrasena I I am following BAKKER 1997, p. 169.


29 EI 14:13, ll. 6, 7, 7–8: param bhagavatībhaktō mahārājaśrīnāgabhaṭadevas . . . param bhagavatībhaktō mahārājaśrībhoidadevas . . . param bhagavatībhaktō mahārājaśrīmahendarāladevas . . .

30 For some examples see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 288–290.
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gious affiliation, and it was in any case inconstant, coming to the fore only on certain occasions, particularly during the autumnal Navaratra festival that inaugurates the season of military activity, when they and associated goddesses received large-scale animal sacrifices;31 and when this cult was particularly emphasized through the forging of connections with a higher domain of non-periodic, exclusive devotion, then this domain was that of the esoteric goddesses of the Saiva Vidyapitha.32

THE ETIOLATION AND SUBSUMPTION OF THE CULT OF THE SUN-GOD

As for the cult of the Sun, kings who have been declared in inscriptions to be devotees of this god (paramasaurah, paramadityabhaktah, and the like) are also few and they are mostly confined to the sixth and seventh centuries. We have Dharmaraja of Padmakholi in the Ganjam District of Orissa, Dharapataka, the Maitraka of Valabhī, Rājyavardhana, Ādityavardhana, and Prabhākaravardhana, the three successive predecessors of King Harṣa of Kanyakubja, in the sixth century, and from c. 570 to c. 665 the Gūrjara feud-

31 On Navarātra see SANDERSON 2005a, p. 371 (fn. 64); 2005b, pp. 255–257; 2007b, pp. 263–277 and 294 (fn. 196). For an example of the scale of such annual sacrifices see p. 247 below.

32 In general we may say that the Śaivism of the Mantramārga holds itself aloof from the domain of calendrical religion, seeing the recurrent festivals of that domain as commemorations of mythic events and therefore as operating on a level of mundane belief that initiates must transcend. That is the territory of Purānic religion, which guarantees various rewards but not the liberation or supernatural effects and powers promised to observant initiates into the Mantramārga. Śaiva initiates were merely required to track the Purānic calendar by intensifying their own regular cult on days when uninitiated devotees were celebrating Śiva’s or the Goddess’ activities in the domain of myth-based devotion; see, e.g., Tantra lokaviveka on 28.6d–7b. Nonetheless, we see a distinct tendency for the Mantramārga to seep downwards into this domain providing Śaiva or Śaktā Śaiva versions of the Purānic rituals that mark such major annual festivals as Śivarātri and Navarātra. A Śaktā Śaiva procedure for the celebration of Śivarātri was current in Kashmir, as can be seen from the prescriptions set out in the Nityādisamgraha of Rājānaka Takṣakavarta (ff. 71v–72v15) from the lost Dūtīdāmara and in the 31st chapter of the Haracaritacintāmani of Rājānaka Jayadratha in the thirteenth century, drawing on this and the Anantabhāskara. The same can be seen in various regions in the case of the Navarātra, also known as the Durgotsava. Among the Newars of the Kathmandu valley, the goddess is worshipped in this festival in a Tantric form as Ugracandā in Paddhatisan that incorporate her among such Mantramārgic Śaktā deities as Siddhilakṣmī and Kubjikā; see the Newari Navarātrātrapājvidhi manuscripts A and B in the bibliography. For her Tantric worship in this context in the tradition of the Paippaladin Atharvavedins of Orissa see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 263–276. In Bengal, where Navarātra was and is much emphasized, we see a Smārta procedure but one that has been strongly Tantricized in the Durgāpūjā prayogatattva section of the Durgāpūjātattva of Raghunandana in the 16th century.
tories of Bharukaccha (Broach). This is explicitly stated in the case of Dadda I (r. c. 570–595), and Dadda II (r. c. 620–645); and it is probable in the case of Jayabhaṭa II (r. c. 645–665), since it is very likely that the temple of the Sun-god Jayāditya at Koṭipura near Kāvī in the Broach District was founded by him with his name (Jaya-). It is also probable in the case of Jayabhaṭa I (r. c. 595–620), since this was the religion not only of his predecessor and successor but also of his brother Raṇagrāha. After Jayabhaṭa II the next three kings of this dynasty, Dadda III (c. 665–690), Jayabhaṭa III (c. 690–715), and Ahirola (c. 715–720), turned to Śaivism, declaring themselves paramāheśvaraḥ. In the ninth century we have royal devotees of the Sun in Rāmabhadra, the immediate predecessor of the Gūrjara-Pratihāra Bhōjadeva I of Kanyakubja, and Vināyakapāla, the latter’s grandson, and, in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, in the Sena kings of Bengal Lakṣmaṇasena and Viśvarūpasena, though the former also appears in his inscriptions as a Vaiśṇava (paramāvaisṇavaḥ) and, more specifically, as a devotee of Narasiṃha (paramānārasiṃhaḥ).

It appears that the Sauras, the initiated devotees of the Sun-god, possessed their own canon of scriptures, known, like those of the Śaivas and the Vaiśṇavas, as Saṁhitās. A list of eighty-five such texts is given in an account of brahmanical, Pāncarātra (Vaiśṇava), Saura, and Śaiva scriptural authorities, contained in the Śaiva scripture Śrīkaṇṭhiyaśaṁhitā. No manuscript of this text, which was known to Kṣemarāja (fl. c. 1000–1050) and probably to Abhinavagupta (fl. c. 975–1025), has come down to us; but I have located its long section dealing with the canons of scripture in the Nityādisamgraha of Rājānaka Taṅkakavarta, a Kashmirian digest of scriptural passages bearing on the duties of initiated Śaivas, compiled at some time after the eleventh century.34

33 EI 28:16: sahasrasaṁśīmadabdahkto (Dharmarāja); EI 31:39B, l. 8: paramādityabhaktah (Dharaṇaṭṭa); EI 4:29, l. 1–3: paramādityabhaktah (the predecessors of Harsa); CII 4i:16, l. 4: dinakaracaraṇakamalapraṇāmāpanītāśeṣaduritanivaha- (Dadda I); ibid., l. 52: dinakaracaraṇārcanaratasya (Dadda II); CII 4i:18, l. 9: dinakaracaraṇābhṭyarcanaratasya (Raṇagraha); CII 4i:21, l. 13: paramāmāheśvaraḥ (Dadda III); ibid., l. 16–17: paramāmāheśvaraḥ (Jayabhaṭa III); CII 4i:24, ll. 20–11: paramāmāheśvaraḥ (Ahirola); EI 5:24, l. 5: paramādityabhakto (Rāmabhadra); EI 14:13, l. 6: paramādityabhaktos (Vināyakapāla); SIRCAR 1983a:27, ll. 35–38: para-masaurah (Lakṣmaṇasena); paramasaurah (Viśvarūpasena); EI 12:3, ll. 23–25: para-māvaisṇavaḥ (Lakṣmaṇasena); and SIRCAR 1983a:26, ll. 32–33: -paramānārasi-mha- (Lakṣmaṇasena). For the attribution of the temple of Jayāditya at Koṭipura to Jayabhaṭa II see MIRASHI, CII 4i, p. liv.

34 The list of the Saura Saṁhitās in the Nityādisamgraha is to be found on ff. 4v11–5r6 of the codex unicus. A lightly edited transcript of the whole excerpt on the scriptural canons has been published as it appears in an apograph contained among the Stein manuscripts of Oxford’s Bodleian Library by Jürgen HANNEDER (1998, pp. 237–268). The verses on the Saura canon are 74–88 in his edition. On the date of the compilation of the Nityādisamgraha see SANDERSON 2007a, p. 422.
Unfortunately, no manuscript of any one of these Saura scriptures has surfaced; and the decline of Saurism as a distinct tradition, of which this is the consequence and evidence, is probably to be attributed, at least in part, to a failure to continue to attract patronage and so maintain its separate identity as Śaivism became more influential and encroached upon its territory.

Thus a Saurasaṃhītā of our period sets out the procedure for the worship of the Sun and no doubt drew on the Saura tradition. But it assigns itself to the canon of the Śaiva scripture Vāthula/Kālottara, a text on which it silently draws, gives a Śaiva account of the place of the Sun in the birth of the universe, deriving it through emergence from Śiva expressed in a phrase found elsewhere in the Śaiva scriptures, and insists that Śiva and the Sun are in essence a single deity. Moreover, the worship of the Sun taught in this text was included by the Saiddhāntika Śaivas as a compulsory preliminary (aṅgām) of the regular worship of Śiva himself, appearing first in the sources known to me in the Siddhāntasārapaddhatī of Mahārajādhirāja Bhojadeva of Dhārā (r.c. 1018–1060) and then soon afterwards, in dependence on that text, in the...
Somaśambhupaddhati, composed towards the end of the eleventh century.⁴⁰ The Sāmbapurāṇa, which teaches the worship of the Sun-god, is also a product, at least in its later portions, of a Śaiva environment.⁴¹

Traces of some form of the vanished tradition of the Sauras may have survived in the Śākta Śaiva literature. For Kashmirian sources know of a Śākta cult whose deity was the Sun under the name Vīra or Vireśvara accompanied by the goddess Bhargaśikhā, citing as its scripture the Kaula Bhargaśikhā, also called Saurabhargaśikhā, a work for knowledge of whose content we now have only a few comments in the Kashmirian literature and a few verses quoted in the same, one of which has also been quoted by the east-Indian Buddhist Rāmapāla in his Sekanirdesapaṇḍjīka, a fact that demonstrates that this was not a merely a local, Kashmirian tradition.⁴² The probability that this cult reflects a non-

---

⁴⁰ See Abhinavagupta, H 41 Somaśambhupaddhati 40.
⁴² See Ahbinaagupta, Mālinīślokavārtika 1.161–162b (160c–161b: yāvat tāvad tad ārdhvordhavam sroto yad bhedavarjātām || saurabhargaśikhādīni tataḥ sāstrāni tenire); Tantrāloka 4.255 and 15.280; 32.62: virabhairavasamjñeyam khecari bodhavardhini | aṣṭadhetham varṇitā śrībhargāṣṭakāśikhākule; Keemarājā, Sāmbaraścīkāṭikā on brahma prathamam atanu in v.10a: prathamam adāv atanu asārīrām śrībhargāśikhādīstānya akāraparāmarśātma vireśvarākhyām brahma brhad brhmhaṃ ca paramā śaktaṃ dhamā and on v.21: śrībhargāśikhāyām api “naisa varṇo na vā sadbho na caivaśyam kalāmakaḥ | kevalaḥ paramāṃvado viro nityodito raviḥ || nāstam eti na codeti na sānto na vikāravān | sarvabhūtāntaracaro bhānur bharga iti smṛta” iti; Svachhandad- dyota, vol.4 (Paṭala 9), p.55, l.l.15–16; and Rāmapāla, Sekanirdesapaṇḍjīka, f.10v2–3: tad uktaṃ bhargāśikhāyāṃ śākte ye tante na san na cāsat sadasan.
Śaiva tradition otherwise lost to us is made somewhat greater by the fact that the names Vīraśvara and Bhargaśikhā are applied in Kashmirian sources, both Śaiva and Smarta, to the Sun-god and his consort at Mārtān (modern Maṭan), where King Lalitāditya built his majestic temple of the Sun in the mid-eighth century, a site that has been a major pilgrimage site with its own special rites for the dead, the Bhargaśrāddha and Sūryabali, down to modern times. However, it is possible that the application of these names merely reflects the pervasive influence of Śaiva esotericism in the wider Kashmirian community in later times.

There are also strong elements of a solar esotericism in the Kālikula of the Jayadrathayāmala and the Krama. It is possible that these too may have been

na tan nobhayojjhitam | durvijñeyā hi sāvasthā kim apy etad anuttamam | (the verse has been silently incorporated by Abhinavagupta as Tantrāloka 2.28 [with anuttaram not anuttamam]): Jayaratha identifies this as a quotation from the Bhargaśikhā in his commentary: śrībhargaśikhāṁ sanvādayati (-viveka, vol. 1, Áhnika 2, p. 22).

43 Rājataranginī 4.192; Krishna Deva in EITA, vol. 2, part 1, pp. 363–66; plates 710–721; AIISPL, Accession numbers 20738–20789 and 60003–60051. The Mārtānādāmāhātmya, the praise-text of this site, refers to Sūrya here as Vīraśvara (Bṛṛṅgīśasamhitā, p. 15: esa vīraśvara devaḥ paraḥ paramakāraṇam; p. 63: vīraśaya nāmas tubhyam; p. 66: nāmō virādhīvīrēśa) and makes Bhargaśikhā the first of his Śaktis (ibid., p. 12, listing Bhargaśikhā, Bhīmā, Bhāsvati and Bhānavi). The Sun is also invoked as Vīraśvara in the worship of the Grahas that occurs among the preliminaries in Śaiva rituals in Kashmir; see Kalādiśāpadhāti B f. 4v9–10: tadbahir grahāḥ. tatrdau madhye sūryah Oṁ RAṂ AGNAYE Oṁ HRĀM HṚṂ SAḤ VĪREŚVARAYA NAMAḤ Oṁ HṚṂ HṚṂ SAḤ VĪRALAKŚMYAI NAMAḤ. The Bijas Hṛṃ Hṛṃ Saḥ are Sūryā’s. His consort is invoked as Viralakṣmī here rather than as Bhargaśikhā because in the context of the ritual the pair are superimposed on the principal deities Amrāteśvara[bhairava] and his consort Amrātalakṣmī.

44 For the Paddhati of these rituals see Karmākānda, vol. 4, pp. 140–205. Here too the Sun is invoked as Vira/Vīraśvara (p. 196): vīra vīreśa devesā nāmas te ‘stu tridhātāmakā | mahāmārtanda varada saraḥbhaṇayarapradā ....

45 See, e.g., Jayadrathayāmala 4.4.8–17: sa raviḥ bhāsūrādharā tadādhārā hi kālīkā | ṣaḍāre vipulādhārāṣaḍādāyoṭasamangiriḥ | 9 spuhradvamanaśaṃgrāsaraśāhīkī | srṣṭikārikā | sa raviḥ devatākāro raviḥ eka<s> | tadākṛtiḥ | 10 raviḥ pradipakāloke sūryamadhyāt samuttithah | raver antargato bhānur bhāsavyatāh khaḷam jagat | 11 bhānavi kaulini yā sā tatpūnjaḥbhārītam jagat | tatrotpannā mahāmaṇtrā bhairavābāṣṭāyatanyonah | 12 na prakāśa na cākāśa nobhayo nobhayojjhitē | sarvāvaranānirnuōkō sarvāgo bhāti bhāskaraḥ | 13 amṛṇā prārvam yena ricitam ca kulūkum | sa raviḥ sūryatūntyante bhṛjāte raudrudāmaraḥ | 14 svasaṃvītparāmādītyayoditaraticībhiḥ | bhacakraṃ bhāsītām yena sa vai kālāndo bhavat; Cūcinīmasārasamuccaya, ff. 30v7–21r4 (7.166–172 [Uttaragharāmnāya (Kālikula) section]): 166 raviḥ pradipakāloke sūryamadbhād vinirgataḥ | raver antargato bhānur bhāsavyatāh khaḷam jagat | 167 bhānavi kaulini yā sā tatpūnjaḥbhārītam jagat | tatrotpannā mahāmaṇtrā bhairavābāṣṭāyatanyonah | 168 raviḥbhānunmai devī kaulēśī kulaṅgravāri | kṣobhāṇandavāvīrāme tu paśyate kulasamutam | 169 mahāvīyomārvāve saive bhānaviṇḍamadhyadhatā | tatra prālīnāḥ sarve te bhairavābāṣṭāyatanyonah | 170 bhānaviṇḍamadhyadhye
constructed on the basis of Saura notions. But it is also possible that they are an independent development internal to Śaivism. In the absence of properly Saura literature it is impossible to be sure.

The cult of the Sun-god, then, appears to have survived in India after the rise of the Śaivism only in heavily Śaivized Purānic reflexes or subordinated in a Śaivized form within the Saiddhāntika cult of Śiva, and, perhaps, in some elements within the Śākta Śaiva tradition. Only in the Majapahit kingdom of East Java do we hear of the survival of adherents of a distinct Saura denomination. There a royal charter of c. 1350 tells us that a board of six learned men appointed to adjudicate law suits included two adherents of this tradition.\footnote{On Śaivism and Vaiśṇavism among the Vākātakas of Nandivardhana and the influence of the Vaiśṇava Prabhāvatīgupta on the religion of this dynasty see \textsc{Bakker} 1997.}

\section*{The Decline of Vaiśṇavism and the Rise of the Tantric Pañcarātra Following Śaiva Models}

Royal preference for Vaiśṇavism, expressed in inscriptions by the epithets \textit{atyantabhagavadbhaktah}, \textit{paramabhāgavataḥ}, or \textit{paramavaiśṇavaḥ}, all meaning ‘entirely devoted to Viṣṇu’, is mostly confined to the period from the fourth century to the seventh. The Bhāgavata faith was adopted and promoted by the Guptas from the first half of the fourth century through to the end of the fifth,\footnote{See here p. 120.} and it was probably under their influence that it gained a foothold in the fifth century among the Śaiva Vākātaka rulers of Nandivardhana in eastern Vidarbha, through the marriage in the last decade of the fourth century of the Vākātaka Rudrasena II to Prabhāvatīgupta, the daughter of the \textit{paramabhāgavataḥ} Gupta emperor Candragupta II (c. 380–474).\footnote{\textsc{CII} 3:8, ll. 1–2: \textit{paramabhāgavatamahārājādhirājaśrīkumāragupta}; ll. 20–23: \textit{paramabhāgavato mahārājādhirājaśrīkumāraguptas tasya puttras tatpādānuddhyatāḥ mahādevyāṃ dhruvadevyāṃ utpannḥ paramabhāgavato mahārājādhirājaśrīkumāraguptas tasya puttras tatpādānuddhyatāḥ paramabhāgavato mahārājādhirājaśrīkumāraguptas}.} Gupta influence may also explain the appearance of the Bhāgavata faith at the end of the fourth cen-
tury among the Śaṅkāryan kings of Vengīpura in Andhra. The earlier kings of this dynasty were devotees of Śiva in keeping with the norm in this region. But Nandivarman II, a younger contemporary of Candragupta II, is styled paramabhāgavataḥ.⁴⁹ Other early Vaiṣṇava kings are the Mātharas of Kaliṅga,⁵⁰ the Traikūṭakas of Nashik, Konkaṇa, and Lāṭa,⁵¹ the Śarabhapurīyas of Daksīṇa Kosalā,⁵² and the Parivṛjaka Mahārājas of Daḥāla in the fifth and sixth centuries,⁵³ perhaps the early Maukhari of Kanyakubja before the reign of Īśānavarman (c. 550–76),⁵⁴ the Nalas of western Orissa (c. 450–700),⁵⁵ the early Cālukyas of Vātāpi (Bādāmi) in the sixth and early seventh century,⁵⁶ and the early Pallavas of Kāncī up to and including Śimhavisṇu II (c. 550–610).⁵⁷ After Pulakesin II and Śimhaviṣṇu both the Cālukyas and Pallavas were Śaivas,⁵⁸ as

---

⁴⁹ E1 42:11, ll. 7–9: bhagavaccitra<rathasvāmya>nuddhyāto...paramabhāgavata<s śālāṅkāryanavamsaprabhavo vijayavarmmā. For this hypothesis of Gupta influence, which rests on slenderer evidence than that of Gupta influence on the Vākāṭakas, see S. Sankaranarayanan in E1 42:11, p. 92.
⁵¹ Mirashi, CII 4i, p. xliv; CII 4i:8, ll. 1–2: bhagavatpādakarmmakaro...mahārājadahrasena<h>; CII 4i:9, ll. 1–2, 7–8: bhagavatpādakarmmakarah...mahārājavyāghrasena<h>.
⁵² E1 31:35, ll. 1–2; E1 22:6, ll. 3–4; E1 31:18, l. 3.
⁵³ Ei 8:28.
⁵⁴ Of his predecessors Harivarman, Ādityavarman, and Īśavaravarman, we know that the second at least was paramabhāgavataḥ.
⁵⁵ E1 21:24 (Poḍāghad inscription of the Nala Sandavarman, fifth century) and E1 26:3 (Rājim stome inscription of the Nala Vilāsatuṅga, c. 700); Singh 1994, pp. 89–90.
⁵⁶ Kirtivarman I (r. 566–597) completed the Viṣṇu cave-temple at Vātāpi. His successor Mangalīśvara-Raṇavikrānta (r. 597–608) is styled paramabhāgavataḥ in an inscription in the Viṣṇu cave 3 at Bādāmi recording the completion of the temple, the installation of the Viṣṇu, and the granting of a village (Fleet in Burgess 1877, p. 363, ll. 5–10; and Fleet 1881 [lithograph]): śrīmangalīśvararāṇavikrāntaḥ...paramabhāgavato*layanam.(corr. Fleet:layano Ep.) mahāviṣṇugṛham...kṛtvā... On the Vaiṣṇavism of the early Cālukyas before Vikramādiyī I (654–c. 681) see Bolon 1979, pp. 254–256.
⁵⁸ For the Śaivism of Cālukya Pulakesin II’s successors Vikramādiyī I (654–c. 681), Vinayādiyī I (681–696), Vijayādiyī (696–733), Vikramādiyī II (733–744), and
were the later Maukharis.\textsuperscript{59}

After the seventh century royal Vaisnavism is sporadic, with the prominent exception of the Kārkotās of Kashmir (c. 625–855/6). The conclusion that this dynasty was Vaiśnava is not derived from our study of inscriptions, because extremely few have survived the centuries of Islamic rule in Kashmir, which began in 1339 and ended in 1819. It rests primarily on the testimony of the \textit{Rājatarangini} of the Kashmirian historian Kalhana, who did have access to, and did utilize, the local epigraphic record of religious foundations and dynastic history.\textsuperscript{60} From this work we can see that when a king of this dynasty established and enshrined a deity, generally with his own name (svanāmnā), it was always a Viṣṇu (-svāmin, -keśava), though sometimes images of the Sun-god or the Buddha were enshrined in addition. These royal Viṣṇus are the Durlabhavāsāṁ (4.6) of Durlabhavaradhana (r.c. 626–662), the Tribhuvanavāsāṁ (4.78) of Candrāpiḍa (r.c. 712-720/1), the Muktasvāṁ (4.188) of Lalitāditya-Muktāpiḍa (725-761/2), his silver Parihāsakeśava at his new town Parihāsapūra (4.195, 202), his golden Muktākeśava (4.196, 201), and a Viṣṇu at his new town Darpitapūra (4.183), the Vipulakeśava (4.484) of Jayāpiḍa (r.c. 773/4-804/5), and his Caturatmakeśava and Anantaśayana Viṣṇu at his new town Jayapūra (4.508), the Amratakēśava established after his death by his mother Amrataprabhā to secure the rescue from hell that the sins of his later life had made his certain destiny (4.659), and the Viṣṇus established by each of the five uncles of Cippatājāyāpiḍa, who ran the country for thirty-seven years during the reign of the puppet king Ajiṭāpiḍa (r.c. 813/4–850/1): Utpalavāṁ

\textsuperscript{59} On the Śaiva affiliation of the Maukharis Īśānavarman, Śarvavarman, and Avantivarman see Bakker and Isaacson 2004, pp. 32–33; Thaplyal 1985: B 2, ll. 19–20; B 3, ll. 7–8; B 5, ll. 7–8. Another lineage that may have been Vaiśnava up to the early seventh century before turning to Śaivism is that of the Varmans of Prāgyotiṣa. Bhūtivarman of that line was \textit{paramabhāgavataḥ} according to his Badagāṇgā rock inscription of 553/4 (EI 27.5, ll. 1–2): \textit{sṛi paramaṅvataparamabhāgavatāmābhāvārājagyājāśvamedhajājin[ām] sṛībhūtivarmadeva[pādānām].} But his great-great-grandson, Bhāskaravarman (r.c. 600–50), has been described in his Dūbī copper-plate inscription as having revived Śaivism; see Sircar 1983a:1, ll. 109–110): \textit{lakṣmiḥ kṣibavīlāsa[nī]laivī[nī] saṃskṛtyā ca svikṛtā bhūyo yena ma-kesvarāśrayanayah sphāyiprātpārścīsā.}

\textsuperscript{60} \textit{Rājatarangini} 1.15: \textit{drṣṭaśi ca pūrvabhbhārthapratiśthāḥvāstusāsanaiḥ} (conj.:\textit{vāstusāsanaiḥ} Ed.) | \textit{prāṣistiṣṭaśiḥ sāstraśi ca sānto śeṣabhramaklaṁaḥ} ‘I have removed all the troublesome errors [of my predecessors] by consulting in person the charters that record the [temples and other] edifices founded and consecrated (\textit{pratiṣṭhāvāstu}) by the kings of the past, [their] panegyric donative inscriptions, and works of scholarship’. 

---

\textsuperscript{59} Kirtivarman II (744–c. 753/757) and their construction of the Śiva temples at Paṭṭadakal and Alampur see EI 32:21, ARE 159 of 1959–60, EI 35:16 and 3:1; and the excellent overview in Dagens 1984, vol. 1, pp. 20–24.

\textsuperscript{60} \textit{Rājatarangini} 1.15: \textit{drṣṭaśi ca pūrvabhbhaḥthapratiśthāḥvāstusāsanaiḥ (conj.:\textit{vāstusāsanaiḥ} Ed.) | \textit{prāṣastiṣṭaśiḥ sāstraśi ca sānto śeṣabhramaklāṁaḥ}} 'I have removed all the troublesome errors [of my predecessors] by consulting in person the charters that record the [temples and other] edifices founded and consecrated (\textit{pratiṣṭhāvāstu}) by the kings of the past, [their] panegyric donative inscriptions, and works of scholarship'.
(4.695ab), Padmasvāmin (4.695cd), Dharmasvāmin (4.697ab), Kalyāṇasvāmin (6.697cd), and Mammasvāmin (4.698–699).

Kalhaṇa reports only one Śaiva foundation by a king of this dynasty, and this is a special case. For it was not the creation of a new Śiva with the king's name, but merely the building by Lalitāditya of a new stone temple to house the ancient Śiva Jyeṣṭhēśvara at the site of Śiva Bhūteśvara (4.190) in the context of offerings to clear his debt to the latter incurred when he had appropriated the wealth of this temple to finance his military campaigns (4.189). Devotion to Viṣṇu was also the preference of Avantivarman (r. 855/6–883), the first king of the next dynasty, and in keeping with his personal faith he installed an Avantisvāmin before his consecration. But thereafter he showed himself a Śaiva in unison with the faith of his powerful minister Śūra, establishing a Śiva Avantīśvara and making donations to the Śivas of the national Śiva-temples, confessing to Śūra his long-hidden devotion to Viṣṇu only at death's door (5.43, 123–125).

Vaiṣṇavism gained ground again only towards the end of our period, and in subsequent centuries. Before that happened, while it remained in the shadow of Śaivism, it gave rise to a new literature of scriptural texts known collectively as the Pañcarātra, that was probably composed in and around Kashmir. A form of Vaiṣṇavism bearing this name is already mentioned in the Mahābhārata. It is very probable, therefore, that it was in existence well before the Śaiva Mantramārga. However, there is no evidence that this early Pañcarātra had a Tantric ritual system of the kind that characterizes the Saṁhitās of the surviving corpus of Pāñcarātrīka scripture. It is highly probable in my view that those texts are rather the product of a thorough reformation in which Vaiṣṇavas followed the example of the already flourishing Śaiva Mantramārga in order to provide themselves with a substantially new ritual system that would enable them to compete more effectively with their rivals.

61 For the remains of Avantivarman's Avantisvāmin and Avantīśvara temples, both built at Avantipura, see Krishna Deva in EITA vol. 2, pt. 1, pp. 368–373; plates 734–738 and 740–757.

62 Vaiṣṇavas who left their mark in the domains of the major Śāstras, belles-lettres, and literary theory are few during our centuries. The shift in the fortunes of Vaiṣṇavism is marked by the emergence of such influential religious leaders as Rāmānuja (d. 1137), Madhva (probably 1238–1317), Nimbārka (thirteenth century), Viṣṇusvāmin (thirteenth century?), Vallabha, and Caitanya (both late fifteenth century). For an excellent survey of the history of these Vaiṣṇava traditions see COLAS 2003.


64 It was this tradition that was subsequently adapted in South India as the basis of texts such as the Īsvarasamhitā, Pādmasamhitā, and Pāramesvarasamhitā, whose purpose, absent in the earlier Saṁhitās, was to provide scriptural authority for a Pāñcarātrīka system of temple-worship.
I am led to this conclusion by the convergence of various considerations. Firstly, the ritual system prescribed in the Pañcarātra scriptures is remarkably close to that of the Śaiva Mantramārga in its repertoire, consisting principally of Maṇḍala initiation (dīkṣā), regular worship comprising Nyāsa, Pūjā, Japa and Homa, the periodic ritual of pavitrāropana, special rites of Mantrapropitiation (mantrarādhanam), and image-installation (pratiṣṭhā); and this proximity extends into the minute details of the procedures of these rituals and even to the production of Vaiṣṇava versions of such eminently Śaiva rites as the vetālasādhanam.65

Secondly, I see no evidence that any of the surviving Pañcarātra texts goes back as far the Śaiva texts that they so closely resemble. Seven can be shown to be relatively old because they have been cited by authors of the tenth century or have come down to us in early Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts. These are the Svāyambhuvapañcarātra, the Devāmrtrapañcarātra, the Vāsudevakalpa of the Mahālakṣmisamhitā, the Jayottara, the Jayākhyā, the Śātvata, and the Pauskara. Now, of these, three, namely the Jayottara, the Jayākhyā, and the Śātvata, are very unlikely to have been produced before the ninth century, that is to say, at a time when the Śaiva Mantramārga had been flourishing under widespread royal patronage for at least two centuries and had been existence in some form by a time no later than the middle of the sixth and perhaps as early as the middle of the fifth. For all three focus on the worship of a form of Vāsudeva, called Vaikuṇṭha in the Jayākhyā and Jayottara and Śaktyātman or Śaktiśa in the Śātvatasamhitā, in which the principal anthropomorphic face is flanked by the faces of Narasimha and Varāha, with a fourth face, that of the sage Kapila, at the rear.66 Surviving stone and bronze images of this deity are numerous, but they are three-faced, lacking the face of Kapila at the rear, until the ninth century.67

Thirdly, these early Pañcarātra texts show clear signs of having drawn on Śaiva sources. This is particularly obvious in the Svāyambhuvapañcarātra, to which we have access in a single, incomplete Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript bearing a date of transcription that falls in A.D. 1026.68 The principal Mantra of

---

65 A vetālasādhanam is taught in Jayottara 8.23–26b.
66 Jayākhyasamhitā 6.73c–64 (JS) (=Jayottara 1.20 [J]): dhāyayec caturbhujam *vipra* (JS: devam J) śaṅkhacakraṇagadādharam || caturvaktraṁ sunayanam sukhānandpānīnām | vaikuṇṭhaṁ *narasiṃhasyaṁ* (JS:nāraśimham ca J) vārahaṁ kapilānānām; Śātvatasamhitā 19.12, 14c–15: saktiśo ’py atha saṁcintyaiḥ puṇḍarikānibhekṣānāḥ | icchārupadharaś caiva saumyaḥ prahastītaṁ anānāh ||...nāraśimhaṁ vaktreṇa bhavabhītivighatākṛt | puṣnātā sarvabhūtānī vārahaṇāmṛttāmanāḥ | kurute paśicṣamasthena kāpilaṇopasamhitāṁ.
68 Svāyambhuvapañcarātra, exposure 11b3: samvat 147 aśādhasukla ekādaśīyam
this text, which may well be the oldest of the seven, is the well-known Vaiṣṇava Dvādaśākṣara Oṃ NAMO BHAGAVATE VĀSUDEVĀYA NAMAḥ. But the principal among its ancillary Mantras are five that it calls the Brahmas. These are maṇi-
dvādaśākṣara
among its ancillary Mantras are five that it calls the Brahmas. These are mani-

The five Vaiṣṇava Brahmas are as follows (Śvāyambhuvapaścarātra, exposure 10a1–2): Oṃ NAREṆARENARANṆĀTHA NARA YASMĀṆ NAROTTAMA prathamabrahmāḥ | Oṃ YAJṆĀYA NAMO YĀṆĀYA DHARMĀYA NAMAḥ *PUNYĀYA (corr.: PUNYĀYA Cod.) NAMAḥ | VRATĀṆA NAMAḥ | NIYAMĀYA NAMAḥ | MĀṆUSARĪṆE NAMAḥ dviṭiya-brahmāḥ | Oṃ KĀLEBHYO *THA KĀLEBHYAḥ (corr.: THA KĀLEBHYA Cod.) KĀLAKĀṆṬAREBHYAŚ CA SARVVAṬA [+ + + +] NAMAS TE RUDRARUDREBHYAḤ trīṭya brahmāḥ | Oṃ TATSAṆṆ YOGĀYA VIDMAHE HṚŚĪKESĀYA *DHĪMAHI (corr.: DHĪMAHI Cod.) TAN NO *VIṢṆUḤ (corr.: VIṢṆU Cod.) PRACODAYAṬ catuṛṭhabrahmāḥ | RODHAKA SARVVAVIDYĀṆĀṆ DEVĀDĀṆAṆHIPATI MAHĀPURIṢA NAMO STU TE pāṇca <ma>brahmāḥ. The four Brahmas after the first are evidently modelled on the Śvāyambhaha Brahmas in the order (1) Vāmadeva (VĀMADEVĀYA NAMO JYEŚṬHĀYA NAMO RUDRĀYA NAMAḥ KĀLĀYA NAMAḥ KALAVIKARAṆĀYA NAMO BALAVIKARAṆĀYA NAMO BALAPRAMUṆYĀM), (2) Aghora (AGHOREBHYO *THA GHOREBHYO GHORAGHORATREBHYAŚ CA SARVVAṬA ŚARVA SARVEBHYAŚ NAMAS TE RUDRARUPEBHYAḤ), (3) Tatpuruṣa (TATPURUṢĀYA VIDMAHE MAHĀDEVĀYA DHIṂMAHI TAN NO RUDRAḤ PRACODAYAṬ), and (4) Isāna (ĪŚĀṆA SARVAVAVIDYĀṆĀṆ ĪŚVARAṆ SARVABAṆṬĀṆĀṆ BRAHMAṆO 'DHIPATIR BRAHMA ŚIVO ME 'STU SADĀ ŚIVAḤ). The first Brahma has nothing in common with the remaining Śaiva Brahma, that of Śadyojāta.

69 The five Vaiṣṇava Brahmas are as follows (Śvāyambhuvapaścarātra, exposure 10a1–2): Oṃ NAREṆARENARANṆĀTHA NARA YASMĀṆ NAROTTAMA prathamabrahmāḥ | Oṃ YAJṆĀYA NAMO YĀṆĀYA DHARMĀYA NAMAḥ *PUNYĀYA (corr.: PUNYĀYA Cod.) NAMAḥ | VRATĀṆA NAMAḥ | NIYAMĀYA NAMAḥ | MĀṆUSARĪṆE NAMAḥ dviṭiya-brahmāḥ | Oṃ KĀLEBHYO *THA KĀLEBHYAḥ (corr.: THA KĀLEBHYA Cod.) KĀLAKĀṆṬAREBHYAŚ CA SARVVAṬA [+ + + +] NAMAS TE RUDRARUDREBHYAḤ trīṭya brahmāḥ | Oṃ TATSAṆṆ YOGĀYA VIDMAHE HṚŚĪKESĀYA *DHĪMAHI (corr.: DHĪMAHI Cod.) TAN NO *VIṢṆUḤ (corr.: VIṢṆU Cod.) PRACODAYAṬ catuṛṭhabrahmāḥ | RODHAKA SARVVAVIDYĀṆĀṆ DEVĀDĀṆAṆHIPATI MAHĀPURIṢA NAMO STU TE pāṇca <ma>brahmāḥ. The four Brahmas after the first are evidently modelled on the Śvāyambhaha Brahmas in the order (1) Vāmadeva (VĀMADEVĀYA NAMO JYEŚṬHĀYA NAMO RUDRĀYA NAMAḥ KĀLĀYA NAMAḥ KALAVIKARAṆĀYA NAMO BALAVIKARAṆĀYA NAMO BALAPRAṆAYĀ NAMAH SARVABHŪTADAMANĀYA NAMO MANONMANĀYA NAMAH), (2) Aghora (AGHOREBHYO 'THA GHOREBHYO GHORAGHORATREBHYAŚ CA SARVVAṬA ŚARVA SARVEBHYAŚ NAMAS TE RUDRARUPEBHYAḤ), (3) Tatpuruṣa (TATPURUṢĀYA VIDMAHE MAHĀDEVĀYA DHIṂMAHI TAN NO RUDRAḤ PRACODAYAṬ), and (4) Isāna (ĪŚĀṆA SARVAVAVIDYĀṆĀṆ ĪŚVARAṆ SARVABHŪTĀṆĀṆ BRAHMAṆO 'DHIPATIR BRAHMA ŚIVO ME 'STU SADĀ ŚIVAḤ). The first Brahma has nothing in common with the remaining Śaiva Brahma, that of Śadyojāta.
The Śaiva prototypes are already found in the Atimārga of the Pāncārthika Pāśupatas. Indeed they constitute the whole Mantra-system of that tradition. However, it is clear that the Śvāyambhuva pañcarātra has drawn them from the later tradition of the Mantramārga, because it goes on to teach the imposition on to the worshipper’s body of the thirty-eight parts of these Mantras (kalānyāsah), a Mantramārgic feature, and under names specific to one Mantramārgic tradition, that of the Svacchandatantra, the principal scripture of the Mantrapīṭha.\footnote{Ibid., exposure 10a3–5: kalānyāsām caturthan tu | śṛṣṭi vṛddhi mati lakṣmī medhā kānti svadhā sthitā | rajo rakṣā rati pāyā kāmā trṣṇā mati jiāyā | āvidhi kāya tāta ca bhrāmaṇī mohāni tathā | + + + + + + sthāḥ kṣudhā mṛtyu jvarabhayā | nirvituḥ ca pratiṣṭhāḥ ca | śānti vidyā tathaiva ca | tārā sutārā taraṇī tārayanti svatāraṇi | aṣṭaṭrīnśa*kalopeta (em. : kalāpetah Cod.) ācāryaḥ *samudāḥṛtaḥ (corr.: samudāḥṛtaḥ Cod.). Cf., to emend the names, Svacchandatantra 1.53–59b (/Svacchandalalitabhairava IFI T. 507, p. 6; NAK MS 1–224, f.3v4–4r1, the latter with different kālāḥ of Īsana) and Netranātra 22.26–34.}

The Śvāyambhuva pañcarātra survives only in this Nepalese manuscript. One might object, therefore, that it may be no more than a local oddity unrepresentative of the mainstream tradition. That it is not can be argued, of course, only through evidence that the text was more widely known in the form of references to it, citations from it, or accounts of its contents in other works. This is a difficult test to apply in the case of the early Pāncarātrikā literature, since in stark contrast to the case of the Śaiva scriptures, Pāncarātrikā commentarial works in which we could seek such evidence are almost completely absent until a much later period among the Śrīvaisṇavas of the South, when the range of relevant sources had changed greatly. The only exception is the Spandapradīpikā of the Kashmirian Bhāgavatotpala, probably of the tenth century.\footnote{I am aware of no reference to the Spandapradīpikā or its author in any dated work. It is not possible, therefore, to fix a date before which this work must have been written, at least not a date earlier than that of its manuscripts. However, the fact that it quotes extensively from the Śākta Śaiva literature current in Kashmir up to and including the Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā of Utpaladeva (fl. c. 925–975) but not from any of the works of Abhinavagupta (fl. c. 975–1025) makes it unlikely that its author wrote after the latter.}

But that, though it cites a number of early Pāncarātrikā scriptural sources, does not cite this. However, there is evidence in a Śaiva source that this Pāncarātrikā text was known and followed outside Nepal. For I propose that it is identical with the Svayambhūpañcarātra that Somaśambhu cites as his authority in his account of the procedures for the installation of an image of Viṣṇu in the Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī,\footnote{Verse 4.12ab in BRUNNER’s edition (Somaśambhupaddhati, Pt. 4, p. 297) (B), = verse 1668cd in the KSTS edition (Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī) (K), and folio 71v2–3 in the Cambridge MS (Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī) (C); svayambhū*pañcarātre (NK: pāñcarātre B) ca sarvam etad udīritaṃ.} the highly influential work on the Saiddhāntika Śaiva
rituals\textsuperscript{73} that he composed in the eleventh century, probably in 1073,\textsuperscript{74} while he held the office of abbot in the kingdom of the Kalacuris of Tripuri at the illustrious Saiddhāntika monastery of Golağī (\textit{golagīmaṭṭhaḥ}), in the Rewa District of Madhya Pradesh.\textsuperscript{75}

My conclusion that Somaśambhu was referring to our \textit{Svāyambhūvapaṇcarātra} does not rest solely on the synonymity of the titles, both meaning ‘The Pañcarātra taught to Brahmā’, but also on the fact that the brief but detailed account of the ritual that Somaśambhu attributes to the \textit{Svayambhūpaṇcarātra} corresponds in its particulars to the coverage of the same topic found in the seventh Adhyāya of the text in our manuscript. I cannot demonstrate this in full detail here. But it should suffice to point out that the system that Somaśambhu attributes to his \textit{Svayambhūpaṇcarātra} features an unusual arrangement of three circuits of Mantra-deities that agrees exactly with that of our \textit{Svāyambhūvapaṇcarātra} manuscript: nine on a lotus with eight petals (one at the centre and one on each of the petals), twelve in a circle with that lotus at its centre, and eight forming a circuit enclosing the whole. The twelve are the Viṣṇumūrtis, embodying each of the twelve syllables of the root-Mantra (\textit{mūlamantrah}); the outer eight are the eight weapons (\textit{astrāṇi}) held by the presiding deity; and the nine of the innermost circuit (\textit{garbhāvaraṇaḥ}) are a set of ancillary Mantras: the Hṛdaya at the centre surrounded by the Śiras (E), the Śikhā (S), the Kavaca (W), the Astra (N), the Gāyatrī (SE), the Sāvitrī (NE), the Netra (SW), and the Pingalāstra (NW).\textsuperscript{76} Since this arrangement is highly

\textsuperscript{73} Of the various Paddhatis on the Saiddhāntika rituals that have come down to us Somaśambhu’s was probably the most influential. Its impact can be seen in the major later works of this type, such as the \textit{Kriyākramadyotika} of Aghoraśiva, the \textit{Jñānaratnāvali} of Jñānaśiva, and the \textit{Siddhāntaśekhara} of Viśvanātha, and in the fact that manuscripts of the text have survived throughout the subcontinent, in Kashmir, Nepal, and the South. There is also the fact that it alone achieved the distinction of being stripped of its human authorship to be passed off as scripture. For it was incorporated almost in its entirety in the \textit{Agni purāṇa} (\textsc{sander}son in \textsc{brunner} 1998, p. lix, fn. 81); and much of it was taken over in the late south-Indian Saiddhāntika scriptures \textit{Cintyavisāvasādākhyā} and \textit{Uttarakāmika} (\textsc{brunner} 1998, p. lviii–lix).

\textsuperscript{74} For a discussion of the date of Somaśambhu’s Paddhati see \textsc{sander}son 2007a, pp. 420–421, footnote 640.

\textsuperscript{75} For the name Golağī and the location of the monastery see here p. 264.

\textsuperscript{76} The relevant passage in the \textit{Svāyambhūvapaṇcarātra} (exposure 5b3–5a2) is as follows (with some restorations and emendations following the readings of a closely related passage in the eleventh Adhyāya of the \textit{Devāmṛtaṇḍaṇcarātra} [\textsc{d}]): *yajanam (em. \textsc{d} and here, exposure 8a3: ++ nam \textsc{cod.}) sampravakṣyāmi *divyaṁ (\textsc{d}: devaṁ \textsc{cod.}) nārāyanasya *tu (\textsc{d}: tuḥ \textsc{cod.}) | tribhir āvaraṇaḥ *kāryaṁ (em.: kāya \textsc{cod.}: kāra \textsc{d}) durlabhāṁ *tu suraśurāṁ (\textsc{d}: sasurāsaṁ \textsc{cod.}) | madhye cakraṁ *pratiṣṭhāpyaṁ (em.: pratiṣṭhāyaṁ \textsc{cod.}: pratiṣṭhāpya \textsc{d}) *dvādasāśraṁ (corr. [\textsc{d}: arai<\textsubscript{r}> dvādaśabhir yutam]: dvādaśāna \textsc{cod.}) | susobhanam | tanmadhye ka-
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unalusual, especially in its set of nine ancillaries, it is extremely unlikely that Somaśambhu’s Svayambhūpañcarātra is not the Svayambhuvapañcarātra of the Nepalese manuscript. Since Somaśambhu was a major figure and writing far from Nepal for a pan-Indian audience there are no grounds for considering this tradition to be a Nepalese aberration.

Furthermore, while the ritual systems taught in the scriptures of the Pañcarātra are generally coherent, no less so than those of the Śaivas, the texts retain elements that make sense in the Śaiva world but not in the Vaiṣṇava;

---

malam proktam patrāṣṭakasakarnikam | sarvātmā *sakalo (em.: sakalā Cod.) *devo (corr.: deva Cod.) *dviyamalāsasanavitaḥ (conj.: divyamālāsanātanaḥ Cod.) | śriyā madhaye tu hṛdayam hūmkāreṇa tu pūjayet | śīrṣa<−> pūrvadale *dadyād dakṣine tu śīkham (D: da + + + + + + m Cod.) nyaset | paścime kavacanm *dadyād (corr.: dadyāv Cod.) astraṇi caivottareṇa tu | gāyatre āgneyadīgāḥbhāgā (corr.: bhāga Cod.) | sāvitrīṃ iśvare svayam | *netraṇi (corr.: netrān Cod.) caiva tu *nairṛtyām (corr.: nairītyaḥ Cod.) pīṅgalāstraṃ tu *vāyave (corr.: vāyavet Cod.) | guhyād guhyāram guhyam garbhāvaranam uttānam | *dviyām (corr.: dviyātām Cod.) *sampravakṣyāmi (corr.: sampravakṣyāmiḥ Cod.) viṣṇu *murtiḥ (corr.: murtītī Cod.) prapajjeyat | dvāḍaśāre tathā cakre nyase<d> dvāḍaśā mārttayaḥ | *keśavam tu are pūrve omkāreṇa (D: ke ++++++++ reṇa Cod.) tu pūjayet | dviyīṇan tu nākāreṇa *pūjya (conj.: jñeyam Cod.) nārayanam *tathā (corr.: tathāḥ Cod.) | tṛtiyam mādāvam *pūjya (em.: pūjyaṃ Cod.) mokāreṇa *mahātmanām (D: mahātmanāḥ Cod.) | bhakārākṣaraadaveṇa govindam tu *caturthakham (D: caturthakaiḥ Cod.) | paṇcāmanam tu gakāreṇa viṣṇu<m> caiva prapajjeyat | vakārākṣaraadaveṇa saṣṭhe vai madhusūdanam | saṁtame vāmanan *caiva (corr.: caivaḥ Cod.) tekāreṇa tu pūjayet]

* * prapajjeyat | trāṣṭakam caiva prapajjeyat (corr.: trāṣṭakam Cod.) | śrīdharan navamaṇi caiva sukhāreṇa tu pūjayet | daśame tu hṛṣīkeṣām dekāreṇa tu pūjayet | ekādaśe tu *vākāre (conj.: vākāra Cod.) padmanābham | prabhūm (corr. prabhū Cod.) viduḥ | dvāḍaśe <tu> bhakāreṇa nāmā dāmodaram smṛtam | *dviyāvaranam khyātām (D: dviyāvaranama khyātām Cod.) | tṛtiyē strāṇi (D: tṛtiyena strāṇi Cod.) vinayaset | śāṅkha<m> caiva nyaset<t> *pūrve (em.: pūrvam Cod.) *āgneyām tu gadām nyaset (D: āgneyā ++++ Cod.) | *dakṣiṇena (corr.: + kṣiṇena Cod.) bhave<>< cakrama khaḍgaṃ *nairṛtyagocare (corr.: nairṛtyagocare Cod.) | padma<m> paścimato vidyā<d> vāyavyaṃ tu hala<m> nyaset | musala<m> *cottarato (em. in spite of the metre: cottato Cod.) | dadyād iśānayā<m> *sāranga (corr.: sāranga Cod.) vinayaset | etad guhyātarataṃ *yāgaṃ (corr.: yāgam Cod.) durlabhāṃ paraṃ padaṃ. Somaśambhu sets out the same material in his Paddhati in 4.27c–33 of BRUNNER’s edition, =vv. 1681c–1686 in the Kashmirian edition, and f. 72r2–7 in the Cambridge manuscript (the last two sources offer no significant variants but only minor errors and corruptions that I have not recorded here): vinayasya cādītaḥ cakrāṃ dvāḍaśāraṃ subhāsvaram | 28 tasya madhye punar deyam padmaṃ aṣṭadalaṃ tataḥ | hrnamatraṃ karṇikāyam ca sīrhaṃ pūrvadale tataḥ | 29 śīkham ca dakṣine patre paścime kavacanm nyaset | astraṃ uttarato nyasya gāyātrim agnīpatrake | 30 sāvitrīṃ iśapatre ca netraṃ ca nairṛte dale | tataḥ ca vāyupatre ca pīṅgalāstraṃ vinikṣipet | 31 garbhāvaranam ity uktam adhunāvaranāntaraṃ | dvāḍaśāre ca cakre ‘śmin keśāvyādyaṃ yathākramam | 32 pranavādyaiḥ yathākāram uktapūrvaiḥ svaṇāmahbhīḥ | prāgādītaḥ ca vinayasya khaḍgaṃ gadām anantarantam | 33 cakrama śāṅkham ca padmaṃ ca halaṃ ca musalāṃ tataḥ | sārṅgaṃ ca vinayased evam tṛtiyāvaranam bhavet.
and in some cases we find a degree of awkwardness that is consistent only with a clumsy attempt to adapt Śaiva materials to their new context.

A striking example of this can be seen in the Jayākhyā. When detailing the process of initiation it describes the pāsasūtram, the cord which is ritually transformed into a substitute of the subtle body of the candidate, containing all the reality-levels along its length, to be used in the process of rendering the past actions that bind his soul incapable of giving rise to future consequences at any of these levels. In the course of this description we find some elements alien to the Vaiṣṇava tradition that derive, with minimal distortion, from the Śaiva doctrinal context. Thus it speaks of this cord as embodying kalā, avidyā, and rāgaḥ, and, shortly afterwards, as coloured by rāgaḥ, illuminated by avidyā, circumscribed by kālah, and rendered non-pervasive by niyatī.77 Now the first three of these factors (rāgaḥ, avidyā, and kalā) are the Śaiva Mantramārga’s three ‘shrouds’

77 The only edition of the Jayākhyā (Ed.), that of KRISHNAMACHARYYA, was based on south-Indian manuscripts of relatively recent date. I re-edit the text of the passage to which I am referring, 16.128c–134 [numeration of Ed.], with the help of the testimony of a Nepalese paper manuscript of 1454/5 (N), ff. 35v–36r, and a lemma in a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript of 1187/8 of the Jñanalaks.āmī of Śādhaka Candradatta, pupil of Ekāyanācārya Nārāyanagarbha (C): susitam sūtram ādāya lāksālaktakahāvītām || 129 sammukham cothitaṃ ṣiṣyam *samapāḍaśīrodhāram (corr. [=C]: samapāḍaśīrodhāram N: samapāḍaśīronnataṃ Ed.) || kṛtvānguṣṭhadvayasyāgrātā samārabhyā *dvijottama (Ed.: dvijottamaḥ N) || 130 yāvac chīkhaṇaṇāṃ tu sūṭrā*mānaṃ (Ed.: māna) samāhaṛet | kuryād *ekaguṇaṃ (Ed.: vegaguṇaṃ N) tad *vai (Ed.: ve N) deviγuṇaṃ triguṇaṃ tu vā || 131 *tris tris tad (conj.: tristrismad N: tristrīthā Ed.) gunītaṃ vātha *pāncavisvatisādhāvahā (N: pāncavisvati cāḍhāvā Ed.) | avyaktalingasūtram tu *tad rāgavidyaikalātmaṃ (em.: tādadragrāvidyaikalātmaṃ N: prāgavidyaikalātmaṃ Ed.) || 132 *nityaṃ jadaṃ (Ed.: nityajade N) vyāpakam ca tasmin viśvam pratiṣṭhitam | *tatraivāstam vrajed (corr.: tatraivāstam vrajed N: tatrāstāṃ ayate Ed.: tatrāstāṃ ayate conj. KRISHNAMACHARYYA) bhūyas tasmād eva pravartate || 133 tatraivāstam ciṃtayet sarvām abhinnāṃ tattvapaddhatim | *tattvodbhavās (N: tatrodbhavās Ed.) tu ye vipra *pāśā (em.: pāśā Ed.: teśam Ed.) bandhātmakā drḍhāḥ || 134 rāgena raṇjītāḥ *citrā (Ed.: címā N) avidyāsampradīpitaḥ | viçchinnāś caito kāleṇā *niyatāvāyāpakās (conj.: niyatāvāyāpakās N Ed.) tathā: ‘O best of brahmans, after taking up a perfectly white cord soaked [red] with lac and making the candidate stand facing him with his feet together and his head upright, he should measure out [a length of] the cord from the tip of his two big toes to his hair-tuft. He may make [the cord of this length] single, double, triple, thrice triple, or twenty-fivefold. He should meditate upon the entire sequence of Tattvas as residing undivided therein. This thread, [which embodies] the subtle body [of the candidate], comprises Rāga, Avidyā, and Kalā (rāgavidyaikalātmacam). It is eternal, unconscious, and pervasive. The whole universe is grounded in it. Into it it disappears again and from it alone it comes forth. These binding cords are the firm fetters [of the soul]. They arise, O brahmin, from the Tattvas. They are coloured because they have been dyed with [the redness of] Rāga. They are illuminated by Avidyā, circumscribed by Kāla, and made non-pervasive by Niyatī’.
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(kañcukānī), except that there the second is generally termed vidyā rather than avidyā; and the other two factors, kālaḥ and niyatiḥ join these three to form the group of five reality-levels (tattvāni) ranked immediately below māyātattvam, the upper limit and source of the ‘impure cosmos’ (asuddha ‘dhvā), and immediately above the individual soul (puruṣaḥ), constituting the factors that enable the soul to undergo embodiment in that impure world. Even the substitution of avidyā for the Šaivas’ vidyā does nothing to dilute the obviously Šaiva character of the set, since vidyā in that context is indeed a form of nescience (avidyā), being understood as the limited power of knowledge that characterizes bound souls, enabling them to cognize the objects presented by the faculties, as opposed to the pure, all-encompassing knowledge (śuddhavidyā) that operates above māyātattvam; and this understanding is maintained in the passage in the Jayākhyā, because it speaks of the bonds as being ‘illuminated’ by avidyā. Indeed the line in which the bonds are said to be ‘coloured by rāgaḥ and illuminated by avidyā’ unmistakeably echoes loci classici on the functions of rāgaḥ and vidyā in the Mantramārga’s scriptures.

The Sātvata and the Pauškara are probably the latest of these early texts. They are certainly the most polished and the most sophisticated in language. Unsurprisingly, these more mature products of the tradition contain no glaringly obvious examples that I can see of imperfectly assimilated Šaiva material. Nonetheless, there are parallels in which the Šaiva version seems more likely to have been the model of the Pāñcarātrika than vice versa. Thus the nineteenth chapter of the Pauškara teaches as the text’s major initiation Man.ḍalal (mahāyāgaḥ) an arrangement of eight lotuses around a central ninth, calling it the navapītha maṇḍalam, navābja maṇḍalam, or navanābha maṇḍalam, and a

---

78 For rāgaḥ, vidyā, and kalā as the three ‘shrouds’ (kañcukatrayam) of the Šaivas see, e.g., Matanga-pārāmēsvara, Vidyāpāda 11.33: rāgavidyākalākhyena kañcukkātritayena vai; and Rauravasūtrasamgraha 1.3–4: rāgavidyākalāvyaktagona-buddhisamudbhavam, where they are the three ‘shrouds’ (kañcukānī) of the bound soul. For the addition of kālaḥ and niyatiḥ seen in the last verse of the Jayākhyā passage (16.134) see, e.g., Matanga-pārāmēsvara, Vidyāpāda 14.2: kañcukkātritayāviddham kālēna kalitam ‘sanaih niyatyā niyayati yati pumabhāvenātmavartinaḥ; and Tantrāloka 9.204: māyā kalā rāgavidye kālo niyatir eva ca kañcukāni sad uktāni.


80 Pauškarasamhitā 1.24ab: yady ekaṁ tu mahāyāgaṁ navanābhamaṁ samudyaṭ; 10.34cd: navapiṭhe mahāyāge tam ca kṛtsoṇam vadāmi te; 19.26: yair uddiṣṭam mahāyāge navābe.
long invocatory Mantra consisting of eighty-one units distributed one by one on the centre (nabhiḥ) and eight petals of each of the nine lotuses. This arrangement and correlation, which, to my knowledge, is found in the Pāncarātrika literature only in the Pauskara, is central to the Śaiva tradition of the Mantramarga, being the hallmark of a number of its earlier scriptures, where the Maṇḍala is taught under the same names,81 and the Mantra with which it is correlated is the well-known Śaiva Vyomavyāpimantra of eighty-one units. In the Śaiva case the nine lotus-thrones (piṭhāḥ) of the Maṇḍala are equated with nine Tattvas: Śiva, Sadāśiva, Īśvara, Vidyā, Māyā, Kāla, Niyati, Puruṣa, and Aavyakta (Prakṛti). In the Pauskara that element has been dropped, no Vaiśnava set of nine Tattvas being available for this purpose and the Śaiva set being unassimilable because it includes unmistakeably Śaiva elements such as Sadāśiva and Īśvara. Nonetheless the text contains a sign that the redactor was after all working with a Śaiva exemplar. For he calls his fourth ‘the lotus of Māyā’.82 Māyā is a Śaiva not a Pāncarātrika Tattva.

Furthermore, in the Pauskara, the Sātvana, and the Vāsudevakalpa of the Mahālaksmisamhitā we find the term spandaḥ ‘vibrancy’ in the sense it has in the Śākta Śaiva Jayadrathayāmala and the Spandākārikā of Kallaṭa in the second half of the ninth century. However, I do not exclude the possibility that in this case it may be the Śaiva sources that are indebted to the Vaiśnava.


83 See Pauskarasamhitā 27.274–276: śaṃtasaṃvitsvarūpasya spandaṇanda-mayaṭmanāḥ | tavacyuṭam hi citspaṇdham syaṃya parinatam smaret || 275 sahasroṣaisūryaṁ prabhāyā prajñālom sthiram | maricicakrasampūrṇaṁgarbham sarvatomukham || 276 cidambarāntarāvastham susāntam bhagavatpadam; Sātvatasamhitā 3.15cd: evam jñātva sṛhitim brāhmaṁ svāṇandaspandaṅkṣaṇām (conj.: svāṇandah spandaṅkṣaṇām Ed.); also 5.99–101b: lolibhūtām abhedāḥ smaret turyātmanā purāḥ | nityōdātām ca supade sthitam aspaṇdākṣaṇām || 100 athārcitum yam ichet tu visēṣayaktilekṣaṇam | saṃkalpya tu svabuddhyā tu tatkalāsamanantaram || 101 dhruvā śāmarthasyāsaktir vai spandaṇām eti ca syaṃya; Vāsudevakalpa at 165ab: cichektau tu layāṃ krtvā svāṇandaspandaṅgocare; 238–241b: mānasena tu *yāgena (conj.: yogena draft Ed.) dravyaiḥ saṃkalpa-paiḥ suḥṣhaiḥ | hṛdbhavapare turye *cidbhāṣārūpam (corr.: cidbhāṣā rūpam draft Ed.) uttamam || 239 kadambagolakākaraṁ
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Nor was the influence of the Śaivism of the Mantramārga confined to the formative period of the Tantric Pāñcarātra. For, as I have shown elsewhere, the Lakṣmītantra and Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā, works composed in the South, derive their distinctive doctrinal character from the assimilation of the dynamic nondualism of the works of the Kashmirian Śākta Śaivas from Utpaladeva (fl. c. A.D. 925–975) to Kṣemarāja (fl. c. 1000–1050).\(^{84}\)

**ROYAL PATRONAGE OF BUDDHISM**

Buddhism enjoyed widespread royal support during this period, notably from the Viśnukundis of Andhra in the fifth and sixth centuries, from the Maitrakas of Valabhi in Saurāṣṭra in the sixth and seventh, from the Kārkotās of Kashmir in the eighth, and throughout our period from the Licchavi and ‘Ṭhākuri’ kings of Nepal and various dynasties of eastern India, most notably the Pālas (r. c. 750–1200).

*The Viśnukundis of Andhra*

Among the eight successive Viśnukundis (r. c. 375–612) known to us from inscriptions three of the last six are known to have been patrons of Buddhism: the third, Govindavarman I (r. c. 422–462), the fifth, Vikramendravarman I (r. c. 502–527), and the seventh, Vikramendravarman II (r. c. 555–572). In the Tummala-\(gud\).em plates (Set I) issued by Mahārāja Govindavarman I he is described as having beautified his kingdom with many temples and Buddhist monasteries, as having given generously to brahmans and Buddhist monks, as having resolved to attain the Great Awakening for the salvation of all living beings, and as having donated two villages—the charter’s object is to record this grant—to fund the

\(^{84}\) For the evidence see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 35–38. For some other Śaiva features in Pāñcarātrika texts see RASTELLI 2007, pp. 209, 214, and 224–225.
expenses of a Buddhist monastery founded by his chief queen Paramadevi.\textsuperscript{85} A second set of plates discovered at Tummalagud contains a charter issued by Vikramendravarman II which records his granting a village for the support of the Buddhist community at this monastery. The founder’s husband Govindavarman I is described as having beautified the whole of the Deccan with splendid Stūpas and monasteries, and Vikramendravarman I, his grandson and the grandfather of Vikramendravarman II, is identified as paramasaugataḥ ‘entirely devoted to the Buddha’.\textsuperscript{86} However, in a charter issued by Vikramendravarman II in the previous year, recording a grant of a village to a Śaiva temple, he is referred to

\textsuperscript{85} SANKARANARAYANAN 1977:1, ll. 8–24: anekadevāyanavihārasabhaḥprapātađako- 
dapānārāmāpratisamskārāpūrvakaranānāmkrtaśakalaśidantarenā bhikṣu- 
dvipāṇābhāyaśaśāhduṣiḥdiśaśikṣadīśadīśatapaśaśāhduṣiḥdīśapāsaśāhduṣiḥ 
dhanasamudayanāsakr asakr svasarvasvavyāginā ...sakalasattvadāhātutrāṇa- 
yotpādītāmahābodhiścittena mahārājaśrigovindavarmanā ...svasyā agramahīṣyāh 
paramadevyā vihārasya dipadhūpagandhapaspadhvajapānabhoojaśanāyānaśana- 
glānābhaiśajyakaḥpaśuḥtiśiranāsamskārādikūlaśamūlaśucchedātthām dovā 
ermadālaprenkaparṇyānāmādhiyau grāmāu udakādānapūrvkām atīśṣātu ‘In 
order that his roots of merit should not be cut off, through [the provision of funds 
for] such [expenses] as lamps, incense, scents, flowers, banners, drinking water, 
food, beds, seats, medicines for sick [monks], and repairs to whatever is broken, 
cracked, and delapidated, the two villages named Ermadāla and Prenkaparu 
have been donated to the monastery of his chief queen Paramadevi with the [due] 
pouring of water [into the hand of the recipient] by Mahārāja Govindavarman, 
who has adorned all parts [of his kingdom] through his unprecedented provision 
of numerous temples, Buddhist monasteries, meeting halls, fountains, reservoirs, 
wells, and gardens, all of whose great wealth, lawfully acquired, is being enjoyed by 
Buddhist monks, brahmīns, the unprotected, suppliants, the sick, the wretched, 
and the poor, who has [in this way] repeatedly given away all his property, and who 
has generated the intention to attain the Great Awakening for the salvation of all 
living beings’.

\textsuperscript{86} SANKARANARAYANAN 1977:8, ll. 10–18: paramasaugatasya mahārājaśrivikrame- 
drasyā sūnō ...śri-indrabhaṭṭārakavarmanāḥ priyasūnō ...śriṃśāṃ vikrama- 
drabhaṭṭārakavarmanā ...ittham avabodhayati ‘Vikramendrabhaṭṭārakavarman, 
beloved son of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, the son of paramasaugatasya Mahārāja 
Vikramendra informs you as follows’; ll. 24–33: atibahuprakaramanaramo- 
darākarmābhutastūpavihāracūlāmanibhir alāṃkṛtasaśakaladaśināpāthasya 
...śrīgo[vi]ndarājasya mūrtiṃatiṃ śriyō praty avīṣayikṛtmanarathāyā para- 
maḥbhaṭṭārākāmāhādevyā śrīmadindrapuraṃ uccair alaṃkrtukāmyayaṃ prati- 
sthāpīte śrīmati paramabhāṭṭārākāmahāvīhāre ‘smābhī[ḥ] ...cāturdaśāvavara- 
bhikṣusamghaparībhogāya ...irudoro nāma grāmo datṭāḥ ‘I have donated the 
village called Irudora for the use of the community of excellent monks of the 
four directions in the venerable Paramabhāṭṭārākāmahāvīhāra that was founded 
by Paramabhāṭṭārākāmahādevī as though desiring to bestow great beauty on 
Indrapura, fulfilling [thereby] the desire for embodied [royal] splendour of [her 
husband] King Govinda, who adorned the whole of the Deccan with splendid Stūpas 
and monasteries that were marvelous in their most various, charming, and noble 
workmanship’.
as \textit{paramamāheśvaraḥ}, as is his father Indrabhaṭṭāraṇakavarman,\footnote{The Chikkula plates of Vikramendravarman (SANKARANARAYANAN 1977:7), ll. 15–19: \textit{parama[mā]heśvarasya mahārājasya śrī-indrabhaṭṭāraṇakavarmaṇ[ah] priyaje-sthaputo ...paramamāheśvaro mahārāja[h] śrīmān vikramendravarmā evam ā-jñāpayati.}} drawing to our attention that if a king supported Buddhism he did not necessarily cease to support other faiths or abandon his own.

\textit{The Maitrakas of Valabhi}

Of the land-grant documents of the Maitrakas of Valabhi three quarters are records of grants to brahmins, but the remaining quarter report grants made by these kings to Buddhist institutions.\footnote{Schmiedchen 2007, p. 360.} Guhasena (r. c. 553–569) has the epithet \textit{paramopāsakaḥ} ‘devout lay Buddhist’,\footnote{Schmiedchen 1993, p. 84.} Śilāditya I Dharmāditya (r. c. 595–612) is praised for his support of Buddhism in the east-Indian \textit{Rājayākaraṇa} of the Buddhist Tantric \textit{Maṇjuśrīyamulakalpa}\footnote{\textit{Maṇjuśrīyamulakalpa} 53.537d–540: \textit{samudra-tiraparyantaṁ lāḍānāṁ jana-pade tathā || 38 sīlāhvo nāma nṛpatiḥ buddhānāṁ śāśane rataḥ | purīṁ valabhya samprāpto dharmanāṭā bhaviṣyati || 39 vihārāṁ dhātuvarāṁ citrān *śreyase (em.:śreyasām Ed.)| prāniṁāṁs tathā | kāryaṁvā icyati yuktātmā bhūpatir dharmavatsalaḥ || 40 pūjāṁ ca vividhākārāṁ jinaṁbimbāṁ manorāmāṁ | pūjayed dhātuvarāṁ agryāṁ lokaṁāthebhīvo yaśasviṣu | nāsau mantrasiddhas tu kevalāṁ karmajottamaḥ ‘In the land of the Lāṭas up to the shore of the [western] ocean a king called Śila, devoted to the teaching of the Buddhas, will become a Dharma-rāja in the city of Valabhi. That royal friend of Buddhism, of well-disciplined mind, will build monasteries and beautiful relic Stūpas for the welfare of living beings. [He will establish] the manifold worship of beautiful images of the Buddha; and he will venerate the most excellent of the relics of the renowned Buddhas. He will not achieve success through [the Buddhist Way of] Mantras, but will excel simply through acts of [lay] piety’. For the east-Indian origin of the text see \textit{Maṇjuśrīyamulakalpa} 53.627a: \textit{gaūḍadeśe śmin}; and 53.810a: \textit{prācyadeśe śmin.}} and by the Chinese Huili in his account of the Indian travels of Xuanzang,\footnote{Beal 1914, p. 148.} and the latter, who visited the kingdom of Valabhi in the 630s, when the Maitraka Dhruvasena II was on the throne, reports that the king had recently developed a sincere faith in Buddhism and become a generous donor to the monastic community.\footnote{Xiyu ji, vol. 2, pp. 267–268. For a detailed account and analysis of religious patronage under the Maitrakas during the sixth and seventh centuries see NJAMMASCH 2001, pp. 199–278.} Moreover, Valabhi became a major centre of Mahāyana Buddhist scholarship during this period, producing such eminent figures as Sthiramati (fl. c. 510–570), for whom a monastery was established in Valabhi during the reign of Guhasena.\footnote{On the dates of Sthiramati and the evidence that a monastery was established for him see Frauwallner 1961, pp. 136 ff.} In their inscriptions, how-


88 Schmiedchen 2007, p. 360.

89 Schmiedchen 1993, p. 84.

90 \textit{Maṇjuśrīyamulakalpa} 53.537d–540: \textit{samudratiraparyantaṁ lāḍānāṁ jana-pade tathā || 38 sīlāhvo nāma nṛpatiḥ buddhānāṁ śāśane rataḥ | purīṁ valabhya samprāpto dharmanāṭā bhaviṣyati || 39 vihārāṁ dhātuvarāṁ citrān *śreyase (em.:śreyasām Ed.)| prāniṁāṁs tathā | kāryaṁvā icyati yuktātmā bhūpatir dharmavatsalaḥ || 40 pūjāṁ ca vividhākārāṁ jinaṁbimbāṁ manorāmāṁ | pūjayed dhātuvarāṁ agryāṁ lokaṁāthebhīvo yaśasviṣu | nāsau mantrasiddhas tu kevalāṁ karmajottamaḥ ‘In the land of the Lāṭas up to the shore of the [western] ocean a king called Śila, devoted to the teaching of the Buddhas, will become a Dharma-rāja in the city of Valabhi. That royal friend of Buddhism, of well-disciplined mind, will build monasteries and beautiful relic Stūpas for the welfare of living beings. [He will establish] the manifold worship of beautiful images of the Buddha; and he will venerate the most excellent of the relics of the renowned Buddhas. He will not achieve success through [the Buddhist Way of] Mantras, but will excel simply through acts of [lay] piety’. For the east-Indian origin of the text see \textit{Maṇjuśrīyamulakalpa} 53.627a: \textit{gaūḍadeśe śmin}; and 53.810a: \textit{prācyadeśe śmin.}

91 Beal 1914, p. 148.

92 Xiyu ji, vol. 2, pp. 267–268. For a detailed account and analysis of religious patronage under the Maitrakas during the sixth and seventh centuries see NJAMMASCH 2001, pp. 199–278.

93 On the dates of Sthiramati and the evidence that a monastery was established for him see Frauwallner 1961, pp. 136 ff.
ever, Śilāditya I Dharmāditya, Dhruvasena II, and generally Guhasena too, appear like almost all the other Maitrakas with the epithet *paramamāheśvaraḥ*.  

### The Kārhoṭas of Kashmir

No inscriptions have survived from the reigns of the kings of the Kārhoṭa dynasty of Kashmir. But from the account of this dynasty given by the Kashmirian historian Kalhaṇa we learn that although, as we have seen, the temples they established with their names were Viṣṇus, they or those closely associated with them also established several Buddhist foundations: the Anantabhavanavihāra founded by the queen of Durlabhavardhana (r. c. 626–662); the Prakāśikāvihāra founded by Prakāśadevi, queen of Candrāpiṇḍa (r. c. 712–720/1); the Rājāvihāra ‘The King’s Monastery’ founded and richly endowed by Lalitāditya (r. c. 725–761/2) with a large Caitya and a huge Buddha image at his new capital Parihāsapura; the Kayyavihāra, founded during the rule of the same by Kayya, a king of Lāṭa; a Vihāra, a Stūpa, and golden Buddha images established at Parihāsapura by Lalitāditya’s Central Asian chief minister Caṅkunā; a Vihāra and a Caitya established by the same in the capital; and a large monastery and three Buddha images established by Jayāpiṇḍa (r. c. 773/4–804/5) in his new capital Jayapura.

---

94 See, e.g., the Alīnā copper-plate inscription of Śilāditya VII of A.D. 766/7, CII:39. There all the kings listed are said to be *paramamāheśvaraḥ*: the general Bhaṭārka, the founder of the dynasty, followed, after an unspecified number of generations, by Guhasena, Dharasena (II), Śilāditya (I), Kharagraha (I), Dharasena (III), Dhruvasena (II), Dharasena (IV), Dhruvasena (III), Kharagraha (II), Śilāditya (II), Śilāditya (III), Śilāditya (IV), Śilāditya (V), and Śilāditya (VI). In the Māliyā copper-plate inscription of Dharasena II, A.D. 571/2, we are given the names of the Maitrakas who ruled between the founder Bhaṭārka and Dharasena II. They are Dharasena I, Dronasimha, Dhruvasena I, and Dharapatṭa. Of these the first two have the epithet *paramamāheśvaraḥ*; Dhruvasena is here a Vaiṣṇava (*paramabhaṅgavataḥ*) rather than a Buddhist (*paramopāsakah*); and Dharapatṭa is a devotee of the Sun-God (*paramādityabhaktah*). It seems that in the later years of the Maitraka dynasty, when Śaivism had become firmly established as the religion of this dynasty, there was a desire to forget those early rulers, Dhruvasena and Dharapatṭa, whose religious preference had deviated. This practice of beginning the account of lineage with Bhaṭārka and then jumping to Guhasena and his successors, so that all the kings have the epithet *paramamāheśvaraḥ*, is already seen in the Dana plates of Dhruvasena II issued in 634/5 (EI 42:15).

95 See here, p. 60.

96 Rājatarāṇiṇī 4.3 (Anāṅgabhavana); 4.79 (Prakāśikāvihāra); 4.200–205 (Rājāvihāra etc.); 4. 210 (Kayyavihāra); 4.211 and 215 (the foundations of Caṅkunā); and 4.507 (the foundations of Jayāpiṇḍa). For the vestiges of Lalitāditya’s Rājāvihāra, his Caitya, and Caṅkunā’s Stūpa at Parihāsapura (Paraspor) see Krishna DEVA in EITA vol.2, pt. 1, pp. 366–367; plates 722–727. Caṅkunā is evidently a rendering of the Chinese military title jiangjun ‘General’ rather than a name.
In the Kathmandu valley the inscriptions of kings throughout our period show their devotion to Śiva. But here too, where Buddhism and Śaivism co-existed among the Newars down to the present, there is ample evidence of royal support for the former. The Licchavi Vṛṣadeva is described in an inscription of his eighth-century descendant Jayadeva as having inclined towards Buddhism, a view confirmed by a local chronicle, which attributes to him the establishing of Buddhist images; and in the first half of the seventh century Xuanzang claims that the king of Nepal was a sincere believer.99 The Gopālarājjavamsāvali, the earliest of the local chronicles, compiled during the reign of Jayasthitimalla (1382–1395), claims that the Cauya at Guṃvihāra and a monastery, the Mānavihāra, were established by Mānadeva, the Cauya of the Sinagu-vihāra (the Svayambhūnāth Cauya) by Vṛṣadeva, the Dharmaevacaiiya (the Cābahi Cauya) by Dharmaevada, a monastery and the Khasaucaitya (the Bodhnāth Cauya) by Śivadeva, the Phutovihāra and a Cauya by Campadeva, the Rājavihāra by Amśuvamarman, the Devalavihāra by Devaladeva, and a monastery at Nandiśālā by Śivadeva. To Narendradeva and his Buddhist preceptor Bandhudatta it attributes the instituting of the annual chariot festival (yātrā) of the popular Newar Buddhist deity Bugmalokeśvara.

97 LKA 148, l. 9: sugataśāsanapakṣapāti.
100 The Gopālarājjavamsāvali, preserved in a single, palm-leaf manuscript that has lost the first sixteen of its folios, consists of three originally separate parts. The first (ff. 17r–30v) covers the period down to 1386. Its coverage of the period before the reign of Anantamalla (1274–1307) (ff. 17r–26r) consists of little more than a list of kings, the lengths of their reigns, in some cases a record of their religious foundations and a few contemporary events such as plagues and famines and rituals undertaken to avert them. From f. 26v to f. 29r it is a little more forthcoming. The last event it records is dated in 1379. Up to this point the text is in a low register of Sanskrit. The remainder of the first part, f. 29v–30v, is written in Old Newari in a more annalistic style and extends the account down to 1386. The second text (ff. 30v–36r), in Old Newari mixed with Sanskrit, covers the years 1056/7 to 1275/6. It consists for the most part of chronological genealogy, giving dates of birth, length of reign, and age at death. The third (ff. 36v–63v + another f. 50), in Old Newari, is an annalistic chronicle whose main concern is to record religious foundations, with entries extending from 1258/9 to 1388/9. See PETECH 1984, p. 6.

101 The manuscript gives the name Viśvadeva here, but as the editors propose, this is surely an error for Vṛṣadeva (f. 20r2–3): rājā śrīviśvadeva varṣa 100 tena kṛta sinaguvihāra caityabhātārike pratiṣṭhita sampūrṇa kṛtam. The identification of this with the famous Svayambhūnāth Cauya is evident from the name Sinagu, which corresponds to Syangu, its modern Newari name.

102 This identification follows from the fact that the Bodhnath Stūpa is known as Khasa Cauya in Newari. On these early Nepalese Cauyas—this term rather than Stūpa is the normal uage in Nepal—see GUTSCHOW 1997, pp. 85–99.
Unsurprisingly, the Amarāvatī-mahāvihāra (Būga Bāhā) at Bungamati, the home of Bugmalokeśvara, claims to have been founded by him.104

Mānadeva’s dated inscriptions range in date from 459 to 505/6,105 and we know from his Cāṅgunarāyaṇa inscription that Vṛṣadeva was his great-grandfather and Dharmadeva his father.106 The claim that he founded a monastery with his own name, the Mānavihāra, is confirmed by its mention in an undated inscription assigned to his reign.107 The epigraphical dates of Śivadeva range from 590/1 to 604/5.108 There is another Licchavi with the same name, with inscriptions ranging from 694 to 705,109 but it is unlikely that it is the second that is intended, since grants of villages to the Śivadevavihāra have been mentioned in two inscriptions dated in 679, during the reign of his predecessor.110 The inscriptions of Amśuvarman range from 593 to 615,111 and

103 Gopālārājavamśāvalī f.20v5: Caitya at Gumvihāra; f.21r1: Mānavihāra; f.20v2–3: Caitya at Swayambhū; f.21r3: Dharmadevacaitya; f.21v1: Khasaucaitya; f.21v2: Phuṭoviśāra and Caitya; f.22v1: Amśuvarman’s Rājavihāra; f.22v: Devalavihāra; f.22v5: Śivadeva’s monastery; and ff. 22v5–23r1 (the festival of Būgadyah): śrī narendradeva varṣa 35 tasya ācāryabandhuddattadvayena śribugmalokeśvarabhaṭṭarākasya jātā kṛtā bhavati ‘Narendradeva: [reigned for] 35 years. Jointly with his Ācārya Bandhudatta he established the festival of Lord Bugmalokesvara’. On the festival of Būgadyah, also known (in Nepali) as Rāto (‘Red’) Matsyendranāth, which is still a major event in the Kathmandu valley, see LOCKE 1980, pp. 244–280.

104 See the tabulated list of the eighteen principal monasteries of Patan and their founders in LOCKE 1980, pp. 32–33. He includes the Būga Bāhā at its end, noting that it stands apart, not being counted among the principal monasteries of either Patan or Kathmandu.

105 In the Licchavi inscriptions of LKA the earliest date is 464/5 (no. 2) and the latest 505/6 (no. 19). An earlier inscription, dated in Vaiśākha 381 (=A.D. 459), which came to light during renovation work at the Paśupati temple, has been published (DHAKAL 1990). The earliest Licchavi dates are in the Śaka era, which was used until the time of Amśuvarman, the last recorded Śaka date being 526 (A.D. 604/5) in LKA 69 and 70. Thereafter the inscriptions are dated in a new era, often called Amśuvarman’s, which commenced in A.D. 576, and continued in use until the introduction of a new era in Kārtika 879, which has remained in use down to modern times.

106 LKA 2, side 1, l.8–side 2, l.3: rājāḥūḥ vṛṣadevaḥ ... yasyāḥbūt tanayah ... rājā śankaradeva ity anupam[ol] ... devi rājyavat tu tasya nrpater bhārya ... yasyām jāta ... śrimānadevo nrpaḥ.

107 LKA 18, l. 18: kṣetraṁ cākṣayaṁ dattaṁ [śrī]mānavihāre.

108 LKA 54 and 70.

109 LKA 138 and 143.

110 LKA 133, ll. 4–11 and 134, ll. 4–12: ayam grāmo ... śrīśivadevavihā[re] catur-disācāryabhikṣusanghāyāsamābhir atiṣṭhah ‘I have given this village to the congregation of noble monks of the four directions at the Śivadevavihāra’.

111 LKA 59 and 85.
the Rājavihāra attributed to him by the chronicle is mentioned in one of these, dated in 608. It also mentions the Mānavihāra and the Gumvihāra, showing the accuracy of the report of the chronicle that these three monasteries are ancient Licchavi foundations. Moreover, it does so in a context that enables us to gauge their relative importance. For it fixes cash allowances from the court (rājakulam) to a large number of religious foundations and these are ranked into two groups. The upper comprises the temple of Bhagavat Paśupati, the national Śiva, to whom all Nepalese kings from the time of Aṃśuvarman onwards have declared their allegiance,112 Dolāśikharasvāmin (Cāngunārāyaṇa), the principal Viṣṇu of Nepal, then these three Buddhist monasteries, and two others not mentioned by the chronicle, the Kharjūrikavihāra and the Madhyamavihāra. All of these are to receive the same allowance; and this is twice that to be received by the institutions listed in the lower group. That comprises “the ordinary monasteries” and the temples of various other deities, most of whom are Śivas, including Māneśvara, evidently the temple of a Liṅga installed by Mānadeva with his name.113 Narendra, whom the chronicle reports to have instituted the annual chariot festival of Bugmalokeśvara, has dated inscriptions from 643 to 679.114 The last two, issued in 679 and mentioned above for their reference to the Śivadevavihāra, record the granting of villages to that monastery; and the Chinese envoy Wang Xuan-ce reported that when he had an audience with

---

112 See ANDERSON 2005a, p. 417, fn. 254.
113 LKA 77, ll. 6–15: bhagavataḥ paśupateḥ pu 6 pa 2 dolāśikharasvāmināḥ pu 6 pa 2 +++ gumvihārasya pu 6 pa 2 śrīmānavihārasya pu 6 pa 2 śrīrājavihārasya pu 6 pa 2 kharjūrikāvihārasya pu 6 pa 2 mādhyamavihārasya pu 6 pa 2 sāmānyavihārānāṃ pu 3 pa 1 rāmeśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 hamsagṛheśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 māneśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 sāmānāpayasya pu 3 pa 1 vāgmatipārādevasya pu 3 pa 1 dhārāmāneśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 parvatesavasya pu 3 pa 1 narasimhadevasya pu 3 pa 1 kailāśeśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 bhumbhukkikājalaśayanasya pu 3 pa 1 tadanyadevakulānāṃ pu 2 pa 2 . . . 'six Pu[rāṇas] and 2 Pa[ṇas] each for Bhagavat Paśupati, Dolāśikharasvāmin (=Cāngunārāyaṇa), the Gumvihāra, the Mānavihāra, the Rājavihāra, the Kharjūrikavihāra, and the Madhyamavihāra; 3 Pu[rāṇas] and 1 Pa[ṇa] each for the ordinary Vihāras, and [the temples of Śiva] Rāmeśvara, the Lord of the Hamsagrha (=Viṣṇu Lokapālaśvamin), [Śiva] Māneśvara, Sāmab Śiva, Vāgmatipārādeva [Śiva], [Śiva] Dhārāmāneśvara, [Śiva] Parvatesvara, Narasimhadeva, [Śiva] Kailāśeśvara, and the [Viṣṇu] Jalaśayana of Bhumbhukkikā (=the Viṣṇu of Budhanīkanth); 2 Pu[rāṇas] and 2 Pa[ṇas] for the temples other than these . . . '. The Kharjūrikavihāra calls to mind the Stūpa which the Buddha predicts in the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya will be built by the Kuśāna emperor Kaniṣka at Kharjūrikā four hundred years after his Parinirvāṇa (Gilgit Manuscripts, vol. 3, pt. 1, pp. 1, l. 20–2, l. 5: bhagavān kharjūrikām anuprāptaḥ | . . . esa caturvārsaśataparinirṛtasya mama vajrapāne kaniṣko nāma rāja bhaviṣyati | so 'smin pradēse stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayati | tasya kaniṣkastūpa iti samjñā bhaviṣyati.
114 LKA 123–134.
Narendradeva in 643 the king’s belt was adorned with a Buddha.\textsuperscript{115} But here too we see that the support of Buddhism in Nepal as elsewhere was not a sign that a king had changed his religious allegiance in any radical sense. For in both of those inscriptions Narendradeva has the epithet \textit{paramamāheśvarah}.\textsuperscript{116}

\textbf{The Thākuri Kings of Nepal}

Between the Licchavis, who last appear in the epigraphical record in 737, and the Malla kings, who ruled from 1200–1768, lies the relatively obscure period of the so-called Thākuri kings. These too, though predominantly Śaiva, supported Buddhist institutions. Only one, Simhadeva (r. 1110–1126), has been declared \textit{paramasaugataḥ};\textsuperscript{117} but several of the monasteries of the Kathmandu valley are attributed to kings of this period in inscriptions, palm-leaf deeds, manuscript colophons, or their own tradition: the Padmacakramahāvihāra to Guṇakāmadeva I,\textsuperscript{118} the Jyotirmahāvihāra (Jyo Bāhāh) and Dattamahāvihāra

\textsuperscript{115} The report of this encounter has been incorporated in chapter 221 of the \textit{Jiu Tangshu} (Old History of the Tang Dynasty), covering the years 618–906 and compiled in 940–945. In a translation of this passage published by Sylvain LÉVI (1894, p. 67) we read “Leur roi Na-ling ti-po (Narendra Deva) . . . a . . . des breloques à sa ceinture, ornées d’un Fou-tou (Buddha?)”. In a footnote he explains the question mark, saying that the use of \textit{fou-tou} for ‘Buddha’ in the seventh century is problematic. But when he re-published his translation (1905a, vol. 1, p. 164) he removed the question mark.

\textsuperscript{116} LKA 133, l.l. 1–3: \textit{bhagavatpaspapatibhaṭṭārakapāḍānugṛhitō bappāpāḍānudhyāto ličchavikutaketūḥ paramamāheśvaraparamabhaṭṭarakamahārājādhirājaśriṃaṃ dengevahusali guļanangrāmanivāsinaḥ pradhānapuraharsarān sarvakutummbināḥ samājñāpayati ‘Favoured by the venerable lord Paṣupati, devoted to his venerable father, the banner of the Licchavi dynasty, entirely devoted to Śiva, the supreme Lord, the paramount king Narendradeva greets the elders and all the other householders who live in Guļaṅgan village and commands them [as follows]’. The same formula is seen in 134, l.l. 1–4. Only the name of the village differs.

The historicity of Campādeva and Devaladeva, the remaining two kings mentioned by the \textit{Gopālarājavamsāvali} as the founders of monasteries, is doubtful. They appear nowhere in the corpus of known Licchavi inscriptions, and in the local chronicles only in the \textit{Gopālarājavamsāvali}, which places the first between Śivadeva and Narendradeva and the second before Dhruvavarman—another name found only in this source—and Bhimājunadeva.

\textsuperscript{117} Colophon of ASB MS 9973 (\textit{Śhāstri} 1917, pp. 4–5): \textit{paramasaugataśrimatsiṃhadevasya vijayarājye}.

\textsuperscript{118} \textsc{PETECH} (1984, p. 40) quotes the following colophon of an \textit{Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā MS} (NAK 3-359) that he wrongly reports as \textit{Catuspiṭhanibandha}: \textit{samvat 100 60 5 śrāvanasūklandasāmyām śukradine | rājye śrībhāsakaradevasya | śrīguṇaṅkāmadesvākārite śrīpadmacakramahāvihāre sthitasākyabhiṣukumāracandrena likhitam ‘Copied by Śākyabhiṣuka Kumāracandra, resident of the Padmacakramahāvihāra founded by Guṇakāmadeva, on Friday, the bright tenth of Śrāvaṇa, in the year 165 during the reign of Bhāskaradeva’. The date of copying is 26 July 1045 (\textsc{PETECH}, loc. cit.).
Genesis and Development of Tantrism

(Dau Bāhāh) to Rudradeva I (c. 1007–1018) or Rudradeva II (1167–1175), the Hiranyavarṇamahāvihāra (Kvā Bāhāh) and the Pārāvatamahāvihāra (Itūm Bāhāh) to Bhāskaradeva (1039–1048), the Mayūravarṇamahāvihāra (Bhīchē Bāhāh) to Śaṅkaradeva (1069–1082), the Rudravarṇamahāvihāra / Uṇkulīmahāvihāra (Co Bāhāh) to Indradeva (1126–1136), the Cakravarṇamahāvihāra (Bhīchē Bāhāh) to Sañkaradeva (1069–1082), the Śrīvatsavihāra (Atha Bāhāh) to Śivadeva (1098–1126), the Jayamanoharavarṇamahāvihāra (Su Bāhāh) and Śrīvatsavihāra, also called Kacchapālagirimahāvihāra (Co Bāhāh) to Narendradeva (1140–1147), and the Śrīvatsavihāra to Narendradeva (1140–1147), and the Śrīvatsavihāra, Śivadeva, Mānadeva, and Narendradeva, that the attribution intended was to their Licchavi namesakes.

We have very little evidence for the reigns of these Thākurīs, but what there is suffices to remove any suspicion that they were Buddhists to the exclusion of Śaivism. According to the local chronicles Gunakāmadeva made lavish donations to the temple of Paśupati, śaṅkaradeva established a temple of a Śiva with his name (Śaṅkareśvara), and Śivadeva gilded the roof of the temple of Paśupati,

119 For these monasteries and the names of the kings by whom they are said to have been founded (saṁskārita-, kārita-) see Locke 1980, pp. 32–33, and 1985, pp. 29, 42, 74, 79, 82, 91, 95, 133, 140, 148. The dates of the reigns of these kings are as determined by Petech 1984. 120 Kaiser library Vamsāvali fragment (Petech 1984, Appendix), p. 2: "rājā śrīguṇa-kāmadeva varṣa 85 māsa 6 || tena śrīpaśupatibhaṭṭārakāya ekādaśakoṣaṁ pratattām tatraiva iśānesvarabhāṭṭārakāya vāsukibaṭṭārakāsya tāmrasaṃsālīcchādānaṁ kṛtya tatraiva *dīrga*copārhiṁ (conj. : copātriṁk Ed.) kṛtya tatraiva suvarṇanapānāli kōtiḥomaṁ kṛtaṁ caeti || rājā śrī udayadeva varṣa 6 || rājā śrīnirbhaya-deva varṣa 5 "King Gunakāmadeva: 85 years and 6 months. He donated eleven [metal Liṅga] sheaths to Lord Paśupati. At the same place he covered [the roofs of the shrines] of Lord Īṣānesvara and [the Nāga] Lord Vāsuki with copper *sheets (?)*, built a long rest-house and a golden water conduit, and performed a fire-sacrifice with ten million oblations'. King Udayadeva: 6 years; King Nirbhaya-deva 5 years || . . . '; cf. Gopālarājavamsāvali i. 23v1–2: "rājā śrīguṇakāmadeva varṣa 85 mā 6 tena śrīpaśupatibhaṭṭārakāya ekādaśa koṣa sampradattā | tatraiva-m iśānyeśvarabhāṭṭārakāya tāmrasaṃkhalāsamsāchādānaṁ kṛtā | tatraiva dīrgacopā<111>hī kṛtāḥ tatraiva suvarṇanapānāli kṛtyā kōtiḥomaṁ pūrṇa kṛtām. The word saṃsāli (=saṃkhalī or saṃkhalā) is evidently for Skt. śrīnkhalī, śrīnkhalā 'chain'. I have conjectured the meaning 'sheet' considering the design of the Paśupati temple, whose roof is covered with interlocking metallic plates. panāli = pranāliṁk. With *copārhi (conj.) cf. Classical Newari capārha (Modern Newari capāḥ) 'rest-house' (Tamot et. al. 2000, s.v.). 121 Kaiser library Vamsāvali fragment (Petech 1984, Appendix), p. 4: "rājā śrīśaṅkaradeva varṣa 17 | tena hi nandisālayāṁ saṁk<ar>reśvarabhāṭṭārakāya pratiṣṭhītā devakulaṁ ca pūrṇaṁ kṛtya rāṭrāṣāntikā + + + + vihāras ca prára<bh><a>ta 'King Śaṅkaradeva: 17 years. He established [a Liṅga] for Lord Śaṅkareśvara and completed a temple [for him]. He also undertook the con-
replaced the god's silver lotus, and donated a golden image of Śiva. Both Indrādeva and Ānandadeva have the epithet paramaśaiva- attached to their names in the colophons of manuscripts copied during their reigns; and an inscription of 1143/4 records that Ānandadeva, while he was the heir apparent (Yuvarāja), received Śaiva initiation from the Saiddhāntika Guru Rudraśiva of Benares, together with the princes Vasantadeva, Someśvara, Yāsomalla, and Arjunadeva.

structure of the . . . monastery in order to avert danger from the kingdom' (I conjecture rāśtraśaṅkikārānāt for rāśtraśaṅkikā + + ); cf. Gopālavamsāvali f. 24r1–2: rājā śrī saṅkaradeva varṣa 15 tena ca namdīśālāyām saṅkareśvarabhaṭṭāraka pratiṣṭhitam tāṃrasaṃchannā kṛtam devalam || puna bhagavati manahara bhaṭārikā pratiṣṭhitā || rāśtrasānti bhavatiḥ 'King Śaṅkaradeva: 15 years. He established [a Linga of Śaṅkareśvarabhaṭṭāraka at Nandiśālā and covered the temple with a copper roof. He also established Bhagavati Manahara. This brought about the averter of danger from the kingdom'.


123 PETECH 1984, p. 57, colophon of a manuscript of the Candraśyākaraṇaṛttī in Tibet: śrīmadājīdhirājarpaṃsvararaparambhaṭṭārakaparamaśaiva-indrādevasya śrī-indrādevasya vijayarājye; and PETECH 1984, p. 61, colophon of an Anśtasāhasrikā Prajnāpāramitā manuscript: ++ + paramabhaṭṭārakaparamaśaivama- hārājādhirājasṛimadāṇandadevapraṇavarddhamānakalāyāmavijayarājye. The scribal date of completion falls in 1134 in the first case and in 1166 in the second.

124 Vv. 23–25: asyaśṛṛagṛhvamāṃsamauktikaśmanir jāto janānandanaḥ (ACHARYA: maṇi . . . dataḥ REGMI) sāndraś candra ivāvito 'timadhurair ānanda-devaḥ karaḥ | uccaḥ śāktidharaḥ kumārāpadaviniḥ pṛapto 'pi tair (ACHARYA: pṛa- ptoctait REGMI) *dikṣito [dāntāḥ siddhim avarṣa]ṇyamahimāḥ (ACHARYA: dikṣita ... ya mahimā REGMI) *pṛapati parām aśvarīm (ACHARYA: pṛāpā ... tayaśvarīm REGMI) || 24 *saurye 'ṛjunasamah (ACHARYA: saurye 'ṛṃ na sama REGMI) *prekṣya guṇāṃ teṣu guṇapriyaḥ (ACHARYA : prekṣagunāṇas te pragnaṇapriyaḥ REGMI) | bhaktim *ārjunadevo 'pi vidadhe vibudhēṣu iva (ACHARYA: bhaktim ārju- nam datvā ... vah) REGMI) 25 vasantadevo viṭṇāṇī *dhiṃān (ACHARYA: śrīmān REGMI) someśvaras tathāḥ | yaṃsomalāḥ s ca (ACHARYA : śiva REGMI) tair eva kumārā dikṣitā amī. The plural pronouns here, tair dikṣito in 23c, guṇāṃ teṣu in 24b, and tair eva in 25d, are plurals of respect (ādare bahuvacanam) and refer to Rudraśiva, who is also referred to in the plural in v. 12: sīyā bahbhūvīr tha rudraśīvā iti, as is his Guru Mūrtiśiva in v. 8: bhaṭṭārakā uditamūrtiśīvāḥbhidhānāḥ. This record that contains these verses, a stone inscription now in the Government Museum in Kathmandu, has been published by REGMI (1965–1966, pt. 3, pp. 13–16) and, in a more complete and accurate form, by ACHARYA (1997) with an annotated Nepali translation. It was subsequently published by TANĐAN (1999, part 2, pp. 114–123), adopting only some of ACHARYA's improvements. ACHARYA understands the number 64 in the damaged penultimate line (...caṭṭhaṇāṭi ...yāta sa ...) to be the last two digits of the inscription's date. The full number he conjectures to have been 264, which corresponds to A.D. 1143/4. He is surely right, since this is the only +64 date that fits the persons mentioned. Moreover, falling four years before Ānandadeva became king the date accords with the information that he was still
In this [city] was born Anandadeva, a jewel in the pearl-necklace of the lineage of Raghu, delighting the people like a gentle moon with its most charming rays. Being self-controlled and of indescribable greatness, though he had achieved the status of prince (kumāra-) of great power (though he had achieved the status [only] of Kumāra who brandishes the javelin), he achieved when initiated by [Rudraśiva] the ultimate attainment of Śiva[hood]. Likewise Arjunadeva, Arjuna’s equal in martial valour and a lover of virtues, conceived as great a devotion to this [Rudraśiva] as to the gods, when he had seen his virtues. As for the learned Vasantadeva, the wise Someśvara, and Yasomalla, those princes too were initiated by the same [Guru].

Neither Arjunadeva nor Yasomalla are otherwise known from this ill-documented phase of Nepalese history. But we do have records of both a Vasantadeva, who was born in 1112 and died in 1163 but did not rule, and of a Someśvaradeva, who was born in 1119, died in 1182, and ruled from 1178 to 1183/5.125

The Bhauma-Karas of Orissa

But it was in the region of the modern territories of Bihar, West Bengal, Bangladesh, and Orissa that Buddhism enjoyed its most spectacular success in these centuries. It is only there that we find dynasties whose commitment to Buddhism was such that it was commonly signalled in their inscriptions through the use of such epithets as paramasaugataḥ and paramatāthāgataḥ ‘entirely devoted to the Buddha’. Notable among these are the early Bhauma-Karas of Orissa (r. c. 825–950),126 the early Candras of southeast Bengal (r. c. 850–1050), and, above all, the Pāla emperors of Gauḍa (r. c. 750–1199), who at the height of their power extended their authority throughout eastern India and beyond.127

---

126 The name Bhauma-Kara is Indological. The early inscriptions speak of these rulers as Bhaumas and the later as Karas, evidently after the -kara that ends most of their names.
127 The Pālas and their successors, the Senas, are regularly described as kings of Gauḍa (gaudeśavarah, gaudendrah, gaudarājah, gaudāḍhipah, gaudapatiḥ, etc.); see, e.g., SIRCAR 1983a:26, l. 33 (Lakṣmaṇasena); here pp. 108 (Nayapāla) and 109 (Palaṇḍa, Mahipāla); Saduktikarnāṁṛta 1449, 1496. The name Gauḍa in its narrow sense refers to a territory covering parts of West Bengal, being distinguished from Magadhā, Vanga, and Anga. But with expansion of the power of its rulers it came to denote a much larger territory. Thus Campā in modern Bihar, the capital of ancient Anga, is described as the capital of Gauḍa in the Anargharāgaha (Act 7, prose before v. 124: campā nāma gauḍanāṁ . . . rājadhānī), and Kauśāmibi, about 35 miles south-west of Allahabad, is said to be in it in the Hitopadeśa (Mitrālābha, Kathā 5, p. 19: asti gauḍaviśaye kauśāmibī nāma nagārī).
The Śaiva Age

Of the early Bhauma-Kara kings of Orissa Kṣemaṅkara, who probably reigned around the beginning of the ninth century, is described in inscriptions as a paramopāsakaḥ ‘a dedicated lay Buddhist’, his son and successor Śivakara I as paramatāthāgataḥ, his son and successor Śubhākara I, as paramasaugataḥ and paramopāsakaḥ, his son and successor Śivakara II as śrīsugataśrayaḥ ‘having the venerable Buddha as his refuge’, and his son Śubhākaradeva II, who reigned after his father’s brother Śāntikara I alias Gayāḍa, as paramasaugataḥ.128 A copper-plate of Tribhuvanamahādevī, the Vaiṣṇava (paramavaiṣṇavi) wife of Śāntikara I, who occupied the throne as queen after the reign of her son Śubhākara III alias Kusumahāra, records that Śubhākara (I), her husband’s father, built a lofty Buddhist monastery;129 another issued by her records that the earlier kings of her line had adorned the land with many Mathas, Buddhist monasteries, and temples;130 and a third issued c. 980 by the paramamāheśvarah Śivakara III alias Lalitahāra, the son of her grandson Śivakara II, records the granting of a village in favour of a temple of the Buddha in Uttaratosalī made through him by his vassal Rāṇaka Vinītatuṅga.131

This epigraphical record is meagre, but it is very likely that it was the pa-

128 EI 15:1 (the Neulpur grant of Śubhākara I), ll. 2–5, and EI 28:36 (the Terunḍiā plate of Śubhākara II), ll. 4–13. The religious affiliation of Śāntikara I and of five of the subsequent twelve rulers of this dynasty is not recorded. Among the remainder are two Śaiva kings, Śubhākara IV and his brother and successor Śivakara III, two Vaiṣṇava queens (paramavaiṣṇavi), namely Tribhuvanamahādevī I, wife of Śāntikara I, and Tribhuvanamahādevī II, wife of Śubhākara IV, and three Śaiva queens (paramamāheśvari), Daṇḍimahādevī, daughter of Gaurimahādevī, wife and successor of Śubhākara V, Vakulamahādevī, another wife of Śubhākara V, and Dharmamahādevī, her successor and the wife of Śāntikara III. For the approximate dating of these rulers I follow D.C. SircaR’s position (1953; EI 29:26, pp. 183–184 and 189–191 [note 2]; Salomon 1998, pp. 190–191) that the Bhauma-Kara era began c. 831. The Neulpur grant of Śubhākara I was issued in year 8 of this era (EI 15:1, l. 30), i.e. c. 838, and the Terunḍiā plate of Śubhākara II in year 100 (EI 28:36, l. 22), i.e. c. 931. The last recorded date is 204 in the reign of Vakulamahādevī, i.e. c. 1035.

129 EI 29:30, Baud plate A of Tribhuvanamahādevī, ll. 5–6: sutottamas tasya samāśrayaḥ| śrīyāḥ praśasad iṛvim śuśubhe śubhākaraḥ | kaler alaṅghyaṃ suktāśrayayaḥ yo vihāram ucceir vidadhe śilāmayam ‘His superlative son Śubhākara, the resort of good fortune, [next] excelled ruling the land. To embody his merit he built a lofty monastery of stone which the degenerate age could not enter.’

130 Shastri 1916:G, ll. 7–9: nirantaraviracitavividhamathavihāraprāśadaprabandhaiḥ purandarapurārohanasopānabandhair iva maṇḍitamaḥmaṇḍalesv ākhandalaprabhavoṣu mahārājaṃ vyatiteṣu ‘After the passing of those Mahārājas, mighty as Indra, who adorned the land with the manifold sequences of Mathas, Vihāras, and temples that they constructed without interruption as though with stairways for ascending to the heaven of Indra ...’.

tronage of these kings that enabled Mahāyāna Buddhism to grow and prosper as it did in Orissa, with the Tantric forms of that religion coming to the fore from the eighth century.\textsuperscript{132} This efflorescence is attested by both archaeology and textual evidence. Excavations of the Ratnagirimahāvihāra in the Cuttack district, not far from Guheśvarapāṭaka, the Bhauma-Kara capital at or near the modern Jājpur, have revealed that this foundation underwent phenomenal expansion up to the twelfth century,\textsuperscript{133} and this is only the foremost of several Buddhist sites in Orissa in which Tantric Buddhism is evident in the surviving statuary.\textsuperscript{134} The extremely high quality of Ratnagiri’s stone-work renders it improbable that it was not a royal foundation. We have at least one Tantric text that reports that it was written here: the \textit{Samvarodayā nāma Maṇḍalopāyiṅa} of Bhūvācārya, which survives in a Nepalese manuscript copied in 1050 in the Mānadevamahāvihāra (Chuka Bāhā;\textsuperscript{135} and a manuscript of the \textit{Vimalaprabhā}, the great commentary on the \textit{Kālacakra- tantra}, penned in the early decades of the twelfth century, in the thirty-ninth year of the reign of Harivarman, has a postscript in another hand added seven years later which locates the manuscript not far from Ratnagiri near the Benga river.\textsuperscript{136} Indeed Ratnagiri had a particularly close association with the propagation of that Tantra according to the Tibetan account of the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[132] MITRA 1981, pp. 20–21. Xuanzang reports in the early seventh century that Buddhism was the principal faith of the region, with some 100 monasteries and 10,000 monks, all following the Mahāyāna; Xiyu ji, p. 204.
\item[135] \textit{Samvarodayā} f. 56v3–4: \textit{sri}madratnagirau \textit{sth}itvā sarvasattvārthaḥetunā | kṛte-\textit{yaṁ} maṇḍalopāyiṅa bhūvācā<\textit{r}>-yena dhiṁmatā | \textit{sri}samvarodayā nāma maṇḍalo-\textit{pāyiṅa} *\textit{samāptā} (corr. : \textit{samāptah} Cod.) || *\textit{samvat a cū} *\textit{proṣthapadakṛṣṇacatu-\textit{turthyāṁ} (proṣthapada conj. : pretipada Cod.) rājādhirāja\textit{p}a\{\textit{ram}\}esvaraparama-bhaṭṭarakaśriβaladeva + + vijayarāj<\textit{y}>e likhitam | \textit{śrīmaṇdevamahā}∗\textit{vihārīyaśā- kyabhikṣusādhuśrūdevasya (vihārīya conj. : vihāre Cod.) pustakam *<\textit{c}yr ad yatra punyam tad bhavatu} (diagn. conj.) \textit{mātāpitṛgurūpādhyāyasakalasattvārāse<\textit{r}> anuttara-jiñāna-phala*prāpta\textit{ya iti} (conj. : prāpnoti Cod.).}
\item[136] SHASTRI 1917, pp. 79–80 (ASB MS 10766). The manuscript is dated by the scribe in year 39 of the reign of Mahārajādhirāja Harivarman, on whom see MAJUMDAR 1971, pp. 209–210. Colophon: mahārajādhirājaśrimentharivarmande\textit{vāpādyasamvat} 39 | sūryagatā āsāhādine 39. The postscript: saha\textit{c}avāriṁ\textit{ṣ}atigate vatsare harivarmanaḥ | māhāṣya kṛṣṇasaptamyaṁ ekādaśadine gate | mṛtyayā cu\textit{c}icadukya-\textit{yā gaurya svapnena dṛṣṭya} | \textit{kaniṣṭhāṅgulim} aḍyā *pr\textit{ṣ}ṭayedam (corr. : pr\textit{ṣ}ṭhay\textit{edam} SHASTRI) udīritam | pūr\textit{vottare dīsobhāge beṃganadāyās tathā kule | \textit{pacca-}\textit{tvam bhāsitvātaḥ} satpa\textit{sanvatsarar} iti.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
history of the transmission of its teachings maintained in the lineage that descends from Rva chos rab in the early twelfth century. For that relates that the Vimalaprabhā was transmitted by an emanation of Mañjuśrī to Panḍita Cilu, a native of Orissa trained at the Ratnagiri monastery, and reached Rva chos rab after being passed on through five intermediaries in Bengal and Bihar.\textsuperscript{137} A tradition that Cilu studied the Kālacra\textit{ṭ}antra in the Ratnagirimahāvihāra before seeking the Vimalaprabhā is recorded by Gzhon nu dpal.\textsuperscript{138}

\textbf{The Candras of South-East Bengal}

As for the Candras, they used the wheel of the Buddha’s teaching (\textit{dharma-cakram}) as the seal-symbol on their charters; the Paścimbhāg copper-plate grant of Śrīcandra I (r. c. 925–75) describes both this king and his predecessor Trailokyacandra as \textit{paramasaugatah},\textsuperscript{139} and his Rāmpāl and Madanpur copper-plate grants describe Suvarnācandra, the predecessor of Trailokyacandra (r. c. 900–925), as a \textit{bauddhah} ‘a follower of the Buddha’s teachings’.\textsuperscript{140} After Trailokyacandra came Śrīcandra (II), Kalyāṇacandra, Laḍahacandra, and Govindacandra. The Maināmatī plates of Laḍahacandra and Govindacandra (r. c. 1000–1020 and c. 1020–1045) provide these names and reveal that the last two were \textit{paramasaugatah}.\textsuperscript{141}

\textbf{The Khadgas of Samatāṭa}

We have epigraphical evidence of three successive generations of kings of the Khadga line ruling the Samatāṭa region of southeast Bengal from about 625 into

\begin{footnotes}
\item[137] Orofino 1994, pp. 17–23; Blue Annals, p. 755.
\item[138] Blue Annals, p. 755.
\item[139] \textit{EI} 37:51, ll. 25–26.
\item[140] \textit{EI} 12:18, l. 6; \textit{EI} 28:9, l. 8; and Majumdar 1971, p. 201.
\item[141] \textit{EI} 38:35, no. 1, ll. 35–36; no. 2, ll. 6–7; no. 3, ll. 33–34. As for Pūrṇacandra (r. c. 850–875), there is no explicit evidence of his religious persuasion. Majumdar (1971, p. 201) argues that since it is said in the Rāmpāl copper-plate that Suvarṇacandra, his son, “became a follower of the Buddha” (\textit{EI} 12:18, ll. 5–7) it is probable that before him the family was non-Buddhist. This is not accurate, since the text says not that he \textit{became} a Buddhist but only that he was one: \textit{bauddhasya yah śāsaka-\textit{jātakam ankasamsthām bhaktāvāḥ bhāhāriti} | \textit{candrasya tasya kulājāta iti\textit{vā bauddha[h] putrah śruto jagati tasya suvarṇacandraḥ} ‘His son was Suvarṇacandra, famed in the world, a Buddhist as though [simply] because he was born in the lineage of the Moon (\textit{the Candra lineage}, which out of devotion to the Buddha displays his incarnation as a hare in its markings’. The allusion here is to the story exemplifying the Buddhist Perfection of Generosity (\textit{dānapāramītā}) that the Buddha gave away his own body as food when he was a hare in a former life, the \textit{śāsaka-\textit{jātakam}}. The immediately preceding verse, which is devoted to Pūrṇacandra, says nothing substantive about him but only that his name is found as that of the first of the kings of this dynasty in Praśastis and other inscriptions.
\end{footnotes}
the early years of the eighth century. Though the inscriptions do not include the epithet paramasaugataḥ they do speak of these rulers in equivalent terms. The first, Khadgodyama, is described in an inscription of his great-grandson Rājarāja as having conquered the earth after declaring his intense devotion to the Three Jewels: the Buddha, his teachings, and the Saṅgha. The same inscription tells us that Rājarāja gave land to these three; and another that Devakhadga, the father of Rājarāja, made a donation to the same for the longevity of his son. We have no evidence of any support given to Śaivism by these kings themselves. But a pedestal inscription on an image of the Śaiva Goddess records that it was gilded out of devotion by Prabhāvatī, Devakhadga’s queen.

*The Candras of Arakan and Miscellaneous Other Buddhist Kings of Eastern India*

That there were Buddhists among the Candras of Arakan is evident from the Mrohaung pillar inscription of Ānandacandra, which has been dated around the end of the third decade of the eighth century. This gives a list of the names and reign-durations of the kings who preceded him from c. 380 onwards with an interruption of unspecified length. After this interruption come the rulers of the Candra dynasty down to Ānandacandra himself, spanning in this second

---

142 Ashrafpur plate B (LASKAR 1907), ll. 2–4: *trailokyakyātakārtau bhagavati sugate sarvalok[e] + + + taddharme sāntarūpe bhavavibhavabhidām yoginām yoga*gamye (corr. : gamya Ed.) | *tatsanghe cāprameyevividhaugunanidhau bhaktim āvedya gurvīṁ śrīmatahādyamena kṣitir iyam abhīto nirjītā yena ‘Khadgodyama, who conquered this earth in all directions after declaring his intense devotion to the Lord Buddha, whose glory has been declared throughout the three worlds, among all men . . . , to his tranquil teachings that can be realized by Yogins who [thereby] break the power of [transmigratory] existence, and to his numberless Saṅgha, the repository of manifold virtues’.*

143 Ashrafpur plate B (LASKAR 1907), ll. 6–7: *tatsuto rājarājaḥ dattāṁ ratnātrayāṁ tribhavabhaya*bhida (conj. : bhidā Ed.) yena dānaṁ svabhūmeh ‘His [Devakhadga’s] son, who made a gift of his land to the Three Jewels that eliminate the fear of the three worlds’. To give to the Three Jewels is, I surmise, to make a grant to be divided between the Buddha for the building or maintenance of Buddhist shrines (*gandhakut.ī*) and Stūpas, the Dharma for the copying and teaching of sacred texts, and to the Saṅgha for its sustenance and comfort.*

144 Ashrafpur plate A (LASKAR 1907).

145 EI 17:24.4, ll. 1–2: *tadāṁmaṇā dānapatīḥ pratāpi śridevakhaḍgo vijjārikhaḍgaḥ | rājñās tasya mahādevē mahiṣī śrīprabhāvaṭī | śarvāṇiprātimām bhaktā hemalipātim ākārayat ‘His son was the majestic donor (dānapatīḥ) Devakhadga, whose sword had defeated his enemies. The chief consort of that king, Mahādevē Prabhāvatī, had [this] image of Śarvāṇi gilded’. The word dānapatīḥ is the standard Buddhist term for one who gives to monks, the Dharma, or the Buddha. The image (HUNTINGTON 1984, fig. 26) was found in the village of Deulbādi, near Comilla, together with a Sūrya and small Līngas, all of brass.

sequence a total of three hundred and fifty years. For most of his ancestors we are given no information other than their names and the lengths of their reigns, but the record is more forthcoming as it approaches the time of Ānandacandra himself. Vajraśakti (r. c. 649–665) is said to have died and gone to the world of the gods endowed with [the Buddhist perfections (pāramitāḥ) of] generosity, morality and the rest, and his successor Dharmavijaya (665–701) is said to gone to the same, this time defined as the Buddhist Tuṣita heaven, as a result of his firm commitment to the Three Jewels.  

Two short inscriptions from Vesālī of the time of his ancestors Niticandra (r. c. 520–575) and Viracandra (r. c. 575–578) tell us that the wife of the former, queen Sāvitāṃ-Candraśrī, was a lay Buddhist (paramopāsikā) and that the latter established a hundred Stūpas.  

As for Ānandacandra, he calls himself a lay Buddhist and devotes nine verses to detailing his works of Buddhist piety, which included building many monasteries with his own name, establishing precious images of Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, and such [Mahāyānist] goddesses as Cundā, having hundreds of Buddhist scriptures copied, and giving to many monks from various lands, which is to say, that he fulfilled to the best of his ability his duty to honour each of the Three Jewels.  

Yet even this devoted patron of his faith did not neglect to extend his support to the followers of other religions in his realm. He tells us that although he is a Buddhist he desires the good of all beings, lest his cultivation of the Buddhist Perfection of Generosity (dānapāramitā) be incomplete, and so has established four Maṭhas for the housing of fifty brahmins, providing them with land and workers, and two others, the Ānandeśvaramathā and the Ānandamādhavamathā, whose names reveal that they were associated with a Śiva and a Viṣṇu established with his name.  

Moreover, a fragmentary copper-plate inscription (EI 37:13) from a

---

147 Inscription of the western face of the pillar at the Shittaung Pagoda, Mrohaung, Arakan (JOHNSTON 1944:A), vv. 37c–40: vajraśaktis tata<h> [khływōtō rājā devā-

148 nyayodbhavah || pratipālya jagat sarvam rājyam śoḍaśavatsaram | dānaśilādi-
samyukto devalokam sa yatavān || śrīdharmanjoyasamyukto lokānugrahatal-

149 parah | tatpāścād abhava dhīraḥ śrīdharmanjoyo nrpeḥ || śatrimśad abdāny 

150 upabhujya rājyam dharmeṇa nītīya ca jayena caiva | ratnātrayānusmaranābhi-
yogāt sa devalokā tuṣītaṃ prayātah. 

148 EI 32:11, no. 1, ll. 3–4: devisāvītam-candraśrīyā nāma parenopāsikasya; EI 32:11, 

149 no. 2, ll. 1, 3–4: satyadharmanārājena kṛṇaṃ svārthena bhūbhūjā ...śrīvīra-

150 candradeveṇa mahiṃḍalamanḍanaṃ | dharmāddhigatārāyena buddhastūpa-

śatam kṛṇaṃ.

149 JOHNSTON 1944:A, vv. 46–54.

150 JOHNSTON 1944:A, vv. 55–56: paṇcāsādbrāhmanāvāsāṃ kṣetrabhrtyasamāṅvatīm 

| vādyavādakasamyuktam kārītaṃ mathecatuṣṭayam | somatīrthadvijñāsīśe 

matāsāṃ cānandamādhavah | ānandesvārānāmāpi naulakk[el ca matha<h> smṛtah. 

The practice of establishing a Viṣṇu with the founder's name followed by -mādhava (as an alternative to the standard -svāmin) is in accordance with textual pre-

scription; see Somaśambhu, BRUNNER 1998, p. 311 (v. 48), =Kriyākāṇḍadharmāvalī,
site near Mrohaung recording a donation by queen Kimmājuvdevī of a village to a Buddhist monastery founded by herself begins by relating six generations of the ascendants of her husband the king. Unfortunately the names of this king and his ancestors have been lost through the scissoring off of strips from the top and right hand side of the plate. However, what remains conveys the unexpected information that all these kings were paramamāheśvarah. The editor of the inscription assigns it to the sixth century on the grounds of its close palaeographic similarity to the grants of Nīticandra and Viracandra, and argues that if the first of the six kings was, as is likely, Dveṅcandra, the founder of the Candra dynasty, then the king in question was Nīticandra’s father Bhūticandra (r. c. 496–520).\textsuperscript{151} Viracandra, he argues, is excluded by the fact that one of the two Vesāli inscriptions records his patronage of Buddhism. However, that a king should give to Buddhism and at the same time be declared a paramamāheśvarah in documents issued by the royal chancellery is quite within the bounds of possibility, as we have seen.

Other royals of eastern India who are identified as paramasaugatah in our period—apart from the imperial Pālas, to whom I shall turn presently—are Bhavadeva of Devaparvata in Samatāta (r. c. 765–780), the founder of the Buddhist monastery Bhavadevamahāvihāra at Paṭṭikera, modern Maināmati, Rājyapāla of the Kāmboja dynasty of Priyaṅgupura in the tenth, Madhusena, the Sena king of Gauḍa, in the thirteenth, and, in Orissa, Udayavarāha of the Mayūravaṃśa at some time in the tenth to twelfth, the Nandodbhava Dhruvānanda of Jayapura, the successor of the paramamāheśvarah Devānanda II, in the late tenth, and Kāntideva of Harikela in the ninth.\textsuperscript{152} The inscription that tells us that the last was paramasaugatah also conveys that Buddhism was the faith of his grandfather Bhadradatta. After a benedictory verse in praise of the Buddha it begins the eulogy of the donor’s forebears with this king, saying that his devotion to the Buddha had intensified his power and that he had [thereby] conquered all his enemies. His son Dhanadatta, the donor’s father, is

\textsuperscript{151} D.C. Sircar, \textit{EI} 37:13, p. 64.

\textsuperscript{152} Sircar 1983a, Supplement:3, ll. 42–43 (Bhavadeva); Mitra 1971, p. 245 (Bhavadevamahāvihāra). \textit{EI} 41:22, ll. 19–20 (Rājyapāla); the final colophon of ASB, MS 40785 dated in 1289; see Shastri 1917, p. 117 (Madhusena). Shastri 1920, p. 243, ll. 2–3, 6 (Udayavarāha). Tripathy 1930, p. 466, l. 24 (Dhruvānanda). \textit{EI} 29:26, ll. 25–26 (Devānanda). \textit{EI} 26:45, l. 14 (Kāntideva). The exact location of Harikela is uncertain, but it may be placed with some confidence in the area of Chittagong, that is to say, near Samatāta in the direction of Arakan.
praised only for his learning in poetry, the Epics, and the Purāṇas. Mention is made not of his religion but of that of his wife Bindurati, who is said to have been a devotee of Śiva.153

The Pāla Emperors and the Great Monasteries of Eastern India

With the Pāla emperors we come to what appears to be the most robustly Buddhist of all the dynasties of our period. Like the Candras of southeast Bengal they chose the wheel of the Buddha’s teaching (dharmacakram) as the seal-symbol on their charters; they began their inscriptions with obseisance to the Buddha; and the following among them appear with the epithet paramasaugataḥ in the lacunose record of inscriptions and manuscript colophons: Dharmapāla (r.c. 775–812), Devapāla (r.c. 812–850), Mahendrapāla (850–865+), Nārāyaṇapāla (r.c. 865+–917), Vigrahapāla II (r.c. 972–977), Mahipāla I (r.c. 977–1027), Nayapāla (r.c. 1027–1043), Vigrahapāla III (r.c. 1043–1070), Rāmapāla (r.c. 1072–1126), and Madanapāla (r.c. 1143–1161).154

Under these rulers eastern India witnessed an extraordinary development

153 EI 26:45, ll.3–: ...jātay udāro durvāramāravisarasya jāyī jinendrah || tad-bhaktibalitāsaktir bhujadvayārjīvijitairipudarpay || sa jātay dharmakarataḥ khyātah śrībhadraratto yah || tasya subhāṣītabhāratapurāṇarāmāṇārthavītan tanayah || nāmnā śrīdhanaaddattah prakāṣitamahimānāvayo yo 'bhūt || tasya gaurī mahābhūḥṛṣutrū ṉuddhagurustrutrū || patnī bindurāṭi nāma yā babhūva śivapriyā 'Victorious is the foremost of the Jinas, the exalted one who conquered the multitude of Māras so hard to ward off. His power intensified by devotion to him, the pride of his enemies overcome by the strength of his two arms, solely devoted to the Dharma, victorious is the famous Bhadradatta. His son was Dhanadatta. He understood the meaning of elegant poetry, the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas, and the Rāmāyaṇa, and his uninterrupted greatness was made manifest [to all]. His wife was Bindumati, the fair-skinned daughter of a great king, praised by the learned and her elders, a devotee of Śiva'.

Genesis and Development of Tantrism

of Mahāyāna Buddhism in all its branches, particularly in the Tantric Way of Mantras (Mantranaya),\(^{155}\) which if not entirely the product of this region was very largely so; and this immense creativity, whose products formed in due course the basis of the Buddhism of Inner Asia, was nurtured and refined in a number of major monasteries, of which the most eminent were those of Nālandā, Vikramaśila, Somapura, Trikaṭuka, Uddanḍapura, and Jagaddala.\(^{156}\) That the

---

\(^{155}\) The Derge edition of the Tripitaka contains 486 works (Toh. 360–845) in the section of the Kanjur devoted to scriptural Tantric works and 2606 (Toh. 1180–3785) in the section of the Tenjur devoted to works of Tantric scholarship, comprising commentaries on the Buddhist Tantras and works setting out observances (Sādhana, Bali, Pratiṣṭhā etc.) based on them. All claim to be translations of Sanskrit originals and this claim is true in the great majority of cases. In addition there are numerous works surviving whole or in citation in Sanskrit that appear not to have been translated into Tibetan; and some of these, such as the Gūḍhapadā of Advayavajra, the Mandalopāyikā of Padmaśrīmitra, the Vajravāhikā of Anandagarbha, the Vajraṇāgarāhaka, the Sarvadevasamāgama, and the Herukasādhana of Kālayānagarbha, have been used in this study.

\(^{156}\) The Nālandāmahāvihāra was located in Bihar about 55 miles southeast of Patna, with the Uddanḍapuramahāvihāra close by. The Vikramaśilamahāvihāra was very probably at Antichak in the Bhāgalpur District of Bihar about 19 miles from Bhāgalpur town. No evidence conclusively establishes this. But the huge size of the monastery excavated at Antichak severely narrows the field of known possibilities; and there is suggestive archaeological evidence: a copper seal was uncovered in the ruins of the monastery with the legend vikramasya (IAR, 1973–4, p. 9) and a damaged inscription on a Stūpa there contains the syllables vikrama... (HUNTINGTON 1984, pp. 125–126). The use of Vikrama for Vikramaśila is seen in Anupamavajra’s Ādikarmapradīpa; see here p.91. That the name of the monastery was Vikramaśila rather than Vikramaśīlā, as it appears in some secondary sources, is clear from, e.g., the scribal colophon of a manuscript of Vajragarbha’s Hevajratantraprāṇātipītakā that was penned there: śrīnadaviṃśatamahāvihāre lekhāpitam. The Somapuramahāvihāra was at Pāhāpur about 29 miles northwest of Mahāśāman (ancient Puṇḍravardhana) in Varendrī, the region of northern Bengal between the arms of the Ganges and Karatoṭā rivers (Rāmacarita 3.10ab: api abhiṣīka gāṅgākaratoyānarghaprayāhānapuṇyatāmām. The Jagaddalāmahāvihāra too was in this region; see Rāmacarita 3.7: ... jagaddalāmahāvihāravacitarāgām | dadhatim lokesam api mahattārodiritorumahimānam ‘[the land (of Varendrī)], whose beauty was heightened by the Jagaddalāmahāvihāra, which was home to Lokeśvara, its extensive glory proclaimed by [a] great [image of] Tārā'. Its site has been tentatively identified as the mound at modern Jagdal in the Dhamoirhat Upazila of the Naogaon District of the Rajshahi Division of Bangladesh. A one-season, small-scale excavation of this mound was undertaken by Bangladesh’s Department of Archaeology in the winter of 1996. Though it revealed evidence of the presence of a Buddhist monastery and unearthed a fine statue of Heruka and his consort, most of the site was left untouched and nothing has been reported that raises to certainty the high probability that this was the Jagaddalāmahāvihāra. See ZAKARIA 1994 and MAIHY 1997/8. The location of the Trikaṭukavihāra is as yet unknown, but Tāranātha relates a myth that on instructions from Mahākāla king Devapāla unearthed this monastery beneath a sand dune when he was crossing Rārā (=Rādhā) (HBI, p. 267; MAJUMDAR 1971, p. 525), the region of Bengal south of Varendrī and west of the Bhagirāthī river, divided into Uttararādhā, covering part of Birbhum District and
Pālas’ devotion to the Buddha was expressed, as we might expect, in the creation and support of these great monastic universities is shown by terracotta seals found amid their remains, and by the *Rgya gar chos ’byung* (‘The Arising of the Dharma in India’), a Tibetan account of the history of Indian Buddhism written in 1608.

Tāranātha, the author of this work, tells us that he wrote it on the basis of three Sanskrit sources that are now lost or inaccessible. The first is an unnamed work in 2,000 verses by a scholar of Magadha named Sa dbang bzang po, that is to say, Kṣmendrabhadra or a synonym such as Dharanīṇḍrabhadra. This covered the history of the religion up to the time of the Pāla king Rāmapāla (r.c. 1072–1126). The second is the *Buddhapurāṇa*, a work by Dbang pos sbyin (Indradatta) in 1,200 verses, which went beyond Rāmapāla to cover the successor dynasty of the Senas of Gauḍa. It may therefore be supposed to have been composed in that part of India, like the work of Kṣmendrabhadra. The third is a work of similar length covering the succession of Ācāryas and written by a brahmin scholar whom Tāranātha calls Bhaṭāgaḥaṭī. This name is implausible as it stands. If, as is probable, it is is deformation of Vandyaghaṭīya, then it identifies him as a member of a well-known Rādhīya brahmin lineage of Bengal (> Bandopādhyāya, Banerjee).

Tāranātha claims to have relied primarily on the first of these three works, that is to say, for his account up to the time of Rāmapāla, since that source went no further. For the period of the Senas, who succeeded the Pālas, he must have relied on Indradatta alone. As for Vandyaghaṭīya’s account of the succession of Ācāryas, it is probable that it consisted of, or extended to, an account of the succession of the Tantric Ācāryas of Vikramaśīla from its foundation in the eighth century to its destruction around 1200 by the forces of Muḥammad Bakhtyār Khaljī. For he adds a section in the manner of a supplement on the Ācāryas of Vikramaśīla after his treatment of the periods covered by his first two sources. His work, then, derives from Indian tradition, and while his sources were evidently inaccurate for the early history of Buddhism, we might expect them, particularly the work of Kṣmendrabhadra,

---

157 In the eulogy of Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva, the learned minister of Harivarman (c. 1090+), in a stone inscription from Bhubaneswar, Bhavadeva’s mother Sāṅgokā is said to be the daughter of a Vandyaghaṭīya brahmin (*EI* 6:17B, v. 13). Other Vandyaghaṭīyas are the Sarvānanda who in 1159 wrote a commentary *Ṭikāśarvasva* on the *Lingānuśāsana* of Amarasimha, the great 16th-century Dharmaśāstrin Raghunandana, author of the *Smṛtitattva* (*P ringingee* 1994, p. 341), Nārāyaṇa (*fl. c. 1681*), author of the *Smṛtisarvasva* or *Smṛtitattva* (*P ringingee* 1994, p. 181), and Dvija Laksmana, who translated the *Adikāṇḍa* of the *Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa* into Bengali.

158 *Rgya gar chos ’byung*, pp. 215, l. 22–214, l.10; *HBI*, p. 350.
to be more reliable in their account of what for them was recent history. The *Rgya garchos/byung* therefore deserves close attention.

Tāranātha attributes to Dharmapāla the building of the monastery of Vikramaśīla and to Devapāla the building of the monasteries of Somapura and Trikaṭuṇḍa.\(^{160}\) In this, however, he or his sources are confused. The claim that the monastery at Somapura was founded by Devapāla is contradicted by a terracotta seal found at the site bearing the legend śrīsomapūre śridharmmapāladeva-mahāvihāre ‘in the Mahāvihāra of Dharmapāladeva at Somapura’,\(^{161}\) thereby indicating that it was founded not by Devapāla but by his father Dharmapāla. Evidence also contradicts Tāranātha’s claim that it was Devapāla that built the Trikaṭuṇḍa monastery. For Haribhadra reports at the end of his *Abhisamaye-laṃkārāloka*, his great commentary on the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, that he composed it in this monastery during the reign of Dharmapāla and under his patronage.\(^{162}\)

---

159 After his account of the Tantric Ācāryas who held office successively at Vikramaśīla Tāranātha offers brief treatments of various topics not covered by these sources. Buddhism in mainland Southeast Asia and in maritime Southeast Asia, Sri Lanka and the South is covered in ch. 39 and 40 respectively. On these topics, he says, he has seen no comprehensive work. Ch. 41 treats the spread of Buddhism in the Deccan following another lost work, the *Flower-Garland*, by a brahmin Manomati, which, he says, contained a brief account of this subject. Ch. 42 covers the divisions of the main Nikāyas, evidently on the basis of such Indian treatments of the topic as the *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* of Vīṇāṭadeva; ch. 43 examines what he rightly considers to be the muddled theories of the origin of the Mantranaya; and ch. 44 gives some notes on the various Indian schools of image-makers. This is followed by the account of his use of his sources. He notes that he has no written sources for the later events in his account that were not covered in those works. For these events he has relied on what he judged to be trustworthy oral reports.

160 See *Rgya garchos/byung*, p. 160, ll. 9–10 (Somapuravihāra); p. 161, l. 11 (*dpal tsha ba gsum gtsug lag khang* [Trikatuṇḍavihāra]; cf. p. 167, ll. 7–8: *tri ka* *ṭu* [corr. : *ta Ed.]* ka tsha ba gsum kyi gtsug lag khang); p. 165, l. 17 (Vikramaśīlavihāra); *HBI*, p. 266, p. 267, pp. 274–275.


162 Abhisamaye-laṃkārāloka, p. 994, vv. 6–7: *khyātō yo bhūvi puṇyākārtinacayo vidvajjanālāṃkṛtaś tasmin sarvagunākare trikaṭuṇḍarāmavihāre śubhe | ḍaṇḍal labāh-mahodayasya karunādevasya dharmātmānāḥ sānāthyaṇa sukhapadhanānīlaye sthitā vivekāspade || krudhyātthukaṇṭhajaraṃbhapūrṇahadalanavyāsaṅkaśaktayātmānaḥ puṇyābhāṣaktībhīyogavāsāt sampatsamādāyināḥ | rājye rājyābhāṣādvampā-patitasrīdharmapālasya vai tattvālokhāvihāyinī viracitā satpāṃjīkeyaṃ mayā ‘I have composed this excellent commentary that illuminates reality after taking up residence in the splendid Trikaṭuṇḍavihāra that is famed throughout the world, the site of a mass of sacred edifices, adorned by learned men, a store of all the virtues, where [all] the means of happiness are to be found, a place of insight, through the support of the compassionate king Dharma[pālā], who by means of donation has achieved pre-eminence; and I have done so] during the reign of this king, who born in the dynasty that descends from Rājyabhaṭa, full of power devoted to the rending
In the case of the Somapura monastery it has been argued that we may salvage Tārānātha’s credibility by concluding that Devapāla did found this monastery, as Tārānātha claims, and that he gave it his father’s name rather than his own out of filial piety.\(^{163}\) This is indeed a practice of which there are other examples, its purpose being to transfer to the person named the religious merit generated by the creation and use of the foundation; but it is much more probable that Tārānātha is in error here, as he clearly is in the case of the Trikaṭuka monastery. For his history commits the fundamental error of reversing the true sequence of the two reigns, placing that of Devapāla before that of Dharmapāla.\(^{164}\) His attribution of the founding of Somapura and Trikaṭuka to Devapāla rather than Dharmapāla can, then, readily be explained as the result of this reversal. We may therefore suspect that his attribution of the founding of Vikramaśīla to Dharmapāla suffers from the same dislocation and that its true founder was his son Devapāla. That this suspicion is correct is confirmed by the Ādikarmapradīpa of Anupamavajra. For in its conclusion he tells us that he compiled the work following the instruction of Dharmākara, a monk whom he describes as “residing in the monastery called Vikrama constructed by king Devapāla”.\(^{165}\) Vikrama here is evidently a bhūmavat contraction for Vikramaśīla.\(^{166}\) However, we may not conclude that everything that Tārānātha attributes to Dharmapāla was Devapāla’s doing, and vice versa. He reports, for

\(^{163}\) N.G. Majumdar in EI 21:16, p. 98, fn. 5.

\(^{164}\) Rgya gar chos 'byung, chapters 29 (Devapāla) and 30 (Dharmapāla). Tārānātha gives the order Gopāla > Devapāla > Rāsapāla > Dharmapāla; see Rgya gar chos 'byung, pp. 163–164: rgyal po de wa pā las lo bzhi bcu brgyad du rgyal srid byas | de'i rjes su sras rā sa pā la rgyal srid lo bcu gnis byas ‘King Devapāla ruled for forty-eight years. After him his son Rāsapāla ruled for twelve’. No Rāsapāla appears in the accounts of the dynasty given in the Pālas’ inscriptions. The name is perhaps a deformation of Rajyapāla (r. c. 917-952), the successor of Nārāyanapāla.


\(^{166}\) On Vikrama for Vikramaśīla see here p. 88.
example, Dharmapāla’s particular reverence for Haribhadra, a relationship that, as we have seen, Haribhadra himself attests. He also claims that Dharmapāla created about fifty religious foundations (dharmadhihikārāḥ), and that the majority, thirty-five, were for the study of the Prajñāpāramitā texts. It is at least probable that this bias was due to the influence of Haribhadra, given the latter’s close relationship with Dharmapāla and the fact that he was the pre-eminent scholar of his age in the exegesis of this literature.

As for the monastery of Uddanḍapura, which was located near the more ancient monastery of Nālandā, Bu ston, in his history of Buddhism in India and Tibet, completed in 1322, attributes its foundation to Dharmapāla, and the

167 Rgya gar chos ’byung, p. 167, ll. 7–9: de nas mi ring bar rgyal po dha rma pā las spyan drangs ste | tri ka *tu (corr. : ta Ed.) ka tsha ba gsum kyi gtsug lag khang du bzhugs nas | sher phyin nyan pa stong phrag mang po la chos ston cing | brygyad stong ’grel chen la sogs pa bstan 'boos kyang mang du mdzad ‘Not long after this [Haribhadra] was invited by King Dharmapāla. He stayed in the Trikatukavihāra and taught the Prajñāpāramitā to many thousands of hearers. He also composed [his] detailed commentary on the Aṣṭasāhasrikā, and many other learned works’; HBI, p. 277.

168 Rgya gar chos ’byung, p. 165, ll. 14–17: rgyal srid du ’khod ma thag nas shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa ’chad pa po rnams spyan drangs | slob dpon seng ge bzang po la khyad par du mos | rgyal po ’dis spyirchos gzhi lnga bu tsam btsug pa las | sher phyin ’chad pa’i chos bzhi sum cu so lnga yod ‘As soon as [Dharmapāla] was reigning he invited teachers of the Prajñāpāramitā. He had particular faith in Ācārya Haribhadra. This king set up about fifty religious foundations (dharmadhihikārāḥ) and thirty-five of them were for the exegesis of the Prajñāpāramitā’; HBI p. 274. For evidence that chos gzhi renders Sanskrit dharmadhihikāraḥ and that the latter means ‘a religious foundation’ rather than ‘a centre for the Doctrine’, as it is translated in HBI p. 274 see here p. 104.

169 Obermiller 1986, p. 156–157. For the proximity to Nālandā of the monastery of Uddanḍapura, which in Tibetan sources is known as Otantapuri, see Rgya gar chos ’byung, p. 156, l. 19: o ta nta pu ri dang nye ba na nā le ndra zhes bya ba’i gtsug lag khang zhib zhengs ‘He built the Nālandā monastery near Otantapuri’; HBI, p. 258. I use Uddanḍapura because this is what we find in a pedestal inscription found at Bihār Sharīf in the Patna District (Choudhary 1958, p. 65; Huntington 1984, p. 213, no. 19): deyadharmmo yam śrīnārāyanapurānepaladevarāyja’ samvat 54 5ṛī-uddanḍapuravāstavayārānaka-uccaputraḥārūkasya ‘This is the pious gift of Thāruka, son of Ucha, resident at the Great Monastery of Uddanḍapura, in year 54 of the reign of Nārāyanapurādeva’. Bihār Sharīf is indeed near Nālandā. The form Uddanḍapura also occurs in an inscription of the reign of Śūrapāla recording the installation of a Buddha image in the monastery there by a monk Pūrṇapāda (Choudhary 1958, p. 54). As for the Nālandāmahāvihāra, it long predates the Pālas. Faxian (d. before 423) describes the major Buddhist edifices in this area but is silent about Nālandā, which implies that if it existed it was certainly not an institution likely to have been home to the great names of the early Mahāyāna. The Da Tang Da Ciensi sanzang fashi zhuan, the biography of Xuanzang (ordained between 609 and 617; left for India in 627 or 629; studied at Nālandā; d. 664) written by his disciple Huili and later continued and edited by Yancong in 688, contains an account of the history of Nālandā (BEAL 1914, pp. 110–113), from which
probability that this report is accurate is increased by the fact that he, unlike Tāranātha, knew that Dharmanāla came before not after Devanāla. Tāranātha assigns it to Devanāla, probably in consequence of the aforesaid confusion, though he also reports a tradition that it was founded by Dharmanāla’s father Gopāla, the first of the Pālas.\(^{170}\)

Tāranātha reports that Dharmanāla adopted two persons as his preceptors: Haribhadra and his pupil Buddhajñāna. While the former was a master of the Prajñāpāramitā, the latter was a renowned authority on the Tantric system taught in the Guhyasamāja.\(^{171}\) We are told that he performed the rituals for the consecration of the Vikramaśīla monastery and was appointed as its Vajrācārya. We also learn that, having seen omens of the future ruin of the dynasty under Dharmanāla’s grandson, he persuaded the king to institute a regular fire-sacrifice (homaḥ) to be performed under his guidance by the Tantric officiants of this monastery with the purpose of ensuring that the dynasty would be long-lived and consequently that Buddhism would be widely disseminated. It was performed, we are told, for many years at huge expense.\(^{172}\) Further evidence of

---

\(^{170}\) Rgya gar chos ’byung, p. 158, ll. 7–8: rgyal po go pā la ’di ’am de wa pā la ’i mtshams su dpal o ta nta pūr ’i gtsug lag khang bzhes ’The Otantapurī monastery was built in the period of this king Gopāla or that of Devanāla’; HBI, p. 262.

\(^{171}\) Rgya gar chos ’byung, p. 165, ll. 10–12: seng bzang yes shes zhab bla mar bsten | shes byin dang | dpal gsang ba ’dus pas phyogs thams cad gang bar mdzad | gsang ba ’dus pa dang ’He served Haribhadra and [Buddha]jñānapāda as his preceptors, and filled all the directions with the Prajñāpāramitā and the Guhyasamāja’; HBI, p. 274. See also Rgya gar chos ’byung, p. 195, ll. 12–14: bi kra ma shi lar sngags kyi rdo rje slob dpon chen po sangs rgyas ye shes zhabz dang | der rjes mar me mdzad bsang pos bstan pa bskyangs ’At Vikramaśīla [first] the Mantra-Vajrācārya Mahāpandita Buddhajñānapāda and then Dipānkarahabhadra protected the teaching [of the Buddha]; HBI, p. 325. This figure, known variously as Jñānapāda (Ye shes zhabz), Buddhajñāna (Sangs rgyas ye shes), and Buddhaśrījñāna (Sangs rgyas dpal ye shes), is a crucial figure in the history of the Mantranaya, being the source of the “Jñānapāda” school of Guhyasamāja exegesis and practice that was introduced into Tibet by Rin chen bsang po. See Blue Annals, pp. 367–374 for an account of his life and works, and their transmission to and in Tibet. Notable among his writings are the Samantabhadrasādhana (Tōh. 1856) and his commentary on the Guhyasamāja (Tōh. 1852).

\(^{172}\) Rgya gar chos ’byung, p. 168, ll. 6–12: rgyal po dha rma pā la la | khyod kyi tsha bo ’i dus nas rgyal srid ’jig pa ’i mtshans ma yod pas | sbyin sreg gi cho ga chen po zhig byas na yun ring du srid zin cing | chos kyang dar bar ’gyur gsungs pas | des kyang dngul to la ’bum phrag dgu dang nyis stong gi yo byad phul bas | slob dpon
Dharmapāla’s commitment to Buddhism is found in the Nesārikā grant of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda III issued in 805, since that reveals that the ensign depicted on his war banner was the Buddhist goddess Tārā.\(^{173}\)

As for Gopāla (r. c. 750–775), the father of Dharmapāla, whom all our sources make the first of the Pālas, there is no evidence in the inscriptions that he too was a Buddhist, unless it be his having been referred to in inscriptions of Nārāyaṇapāla (r. c. 860–917) and Vigrahapāla III (r. c. 1043–1070) as a second Buddha.\(^{174}\) However, the Rājavyākaraṇa claims him for the faith, saying that after a dissolute youth he converted to Buddhism and constructed various monasteries, Caityas, and temples.\(^{175}\) Tāranātha likewise claims that he served the cause of Buddhism by founding many monasteries, both in Bengal, which he ruled in the first part of his career, and Magadha, when he had added that great province to his kingdom through conquest.\(^{176}\) He also recounts a legend accord-
ing to which Gopāla, when not yet king, found a jewel and used it as the fee for Tantric consecration from an Ācārya. He then successfully propitiated the Buddhist goddess Cundā following his instructions, and went to the monastery of Khasarpaṇa Avalokiteśvara, and successfully prayed to him for kingship, which the deity promised he would obtain if he moved east.

In his account of Buddhism under the successors of Gopāla, Dharmapaṇa, and Devapaṇa, Tāranātha gives us one more report of royal monastery building. But unfortunately his sources seem to have been so misinformed in their presentation of the order and identity of these subsequent kings that it is no easy task to discern the reign to which this building activity should be assigned. He tells us that Mahipaṇa, whom he claims to have been the son and successor of Mahipaṇa, built the Uruvāsa monastery, described as a branch of the monastery at Uddanḍapura, and founded Buddhist establishments at the monasteries of Nālandā, Somapura, and Trikaṭuṭa. Tāranātha has his Mahipaṇa rule for first part of his life he governed Vangāla. In the subsequent part he subjected Magadha. Near Uddanḍapura he built a monastery called Nālandā. By establishing many divisions of the Saṅgha [in monasteries] in these two large regions he greatly honoured the religion [of the Buddha]; HBI, p. 258.

In his account of Buddhism under the successors of Gopāla, Dharmapaṇa, and Devapaṇa, Tāranātha gives us one more report of royal monastery building. But unfortunately his sources seem to have been so misinformed in their presentation of the order and identity of these subsequent kings that it is no easy task to discern the reign to which this building activity should be assigned. He tells us that Mahipaṇa, whom he claims to have been the son and successor of Mahipaṇa, built the Uruvāsa monastery, described as a branch of the monastery at Uddanḍapura, and founded Buddhist establishments at the monasteries of Nālandā, Somapura, and Trikaṭuṭa. Tāranātha has his Mahipaṇa rule for

\[ \text{first part of his life he governed Vangāla. In the subsequent part he subjected Ma-} \]
\[ \text{gadha. Near Uddanḍapura he built a monastery called Nālandā. By establishing} \]
\[ \text{many divisions of the Saṅgha [in monasteries] in these two large regions he greatly} \]
\[ \text{honoured the religion [of the Buddha]; HBI, p. 258.} \]

177 Rgya gar chos 'byung, p. 155, l. 14–156, l. 18; HBI, pp. 257–258. Cundā, though she appears not have been a major constituent of learned Tantric Buddhism, seems to have been popular in the region. Two bronze statues of this goddess have been found in Pāla territory, one from Kurkīhār cast in the reign of Mahipaṇa I, and the other from Nālandā, assigned by Huntington on stylistic grounds to the ninth century (Huntington 1984, pp. 60–61, 226–227, and 144; figs. 61 and 169; wrongly giving the name as Cundā); and there was a temple of Cundā in Paṭṭikera (Maināmati) near Comilla, which is illustrated in a manuscript of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñā-pāramitā (ULC MS Add. 1643, copied in 1015), as one of eighty-five illustrations of Buddhist sacred sites, most in eastern India, with the legend paṭṭikere cundārama-bhavane cundā (Mitra 1971, p. 244). There are images of Cundā from Ratnagiri, Udayagiri, and Achutrajpur in Orissa, Ellora in Maharashtra, Gujarat, and Nepal; see Shaw 2006, pp. 265–274; IAR 2001–02, Plate 114 (Udayagiri).

178 In HBI (p. 257) it appears as “the temple of aryā Khasarpaṇa”. But the Tibetan states that it was a monastery: ‘phags kha sa rpa na'i gtsug lag khang (Rgya gar chos 'byung, p. 155, ll. 20–21). A Khasarpaṇa located in Rādhā is mentioned in the Zhib mo rdo rje of Dmar ston Chos kyi rgyal po (c. 1198–1259) as very famous in the time of ‘Brog mi, who died c. 1064 (Blue Annals, p. 72); see Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 86, §4: rgyar gar shar phyogs ra dā na ‘phags pa spyan ras gzigs dbang phyug ‘khar sa pa ni bzhugs pa de grags pa che pa . . . Perhaps this was the site of the monastery referred to here.

179 Rgya gar chos 'byung, p. 175, l. 2–7: o ta nta pu ri'i gtsug lag khang du nyan thos kyi dge 'dun rnam gs tos bo mchod cing | dge srong lnga byang dang chos ston pa lnga bcu la 'tsho bo sbyar | de yi lan yag tu u ru bā sa zhes bya bā'i gtsug lag khang bzhenga | der yang nyan thos pa se ndāha pa lnga brya la r 'tsho ba sbyor | bi kra ma shi lar sngar gyi srol de ka gzung ste | mchod 'os kyi mthil du mdzad | dpal nā la ndār yang chos gzhi 'ga're btsugs | so ma pu ri dang | nā le ndra dang | tsha ba gsum kyi gtsug lag khang la sogs par yang chos gzhi mang po bsugs [Mahipaṇa] honoured principally the community of Śrāvakas in the Uddanḍapuravihāra and [there] pro-
fifty-two years and says that he died at about the same time as the Tibetan king Khri ral,\textsuperscript{180} that is to say, Khri gtsug lde brtsan also called Ral pa can, who ruled from about 815 to 836; and his son Mahāpāla is assigned a reign of 41 years,\textsuperscript{181} that is to say, up to about 900. Now, there are two Mahāpālas known to us from the epigraphical record, both of whom were much later, the first ruling c. 977–1027 and the second c. 1070–1071; but there is no Mahāpāla. The similarity with the name of his father raises the suspicion that one king Mahāpāla, no doubt Mahāpāla I, the length of his reign agreeing closely with that attributed to Mahāpāla by Tāranātha, has become Mahāpāla and Mahāpāla, and that the resulting two reigns, amounting implausibly to ninety-three years, served to bridge a gulf of ignorance of the period between the great founders of the Pāla empire and Mahāpāla I, who restored the fortunes of the Pālas after a period during which, following Devapāla, they had lapsed into insignificance, losing control of Bengal and retreating into a core territory in Bihar around modern Patna.\textsuperscript{182} It is probable, then, that Tāranātha’s attribution to Mahāpāla of the expansion of Uddanḍapura and the founding of Buddhist establishments at Nālandā, Somapura, and Trikaṭuṅka is a distortion of a record of the pious works of Mahāpāla I. The supposition is somewhat strengthened by the fact that Tāranātha says that the Kālacakratantra was introduced during the latter half of Mahāpāla’s life and that it spread during the reign of Mahāpāla.\textsuperscript{183} For it was during the reign of Mahāpāla I that this new Tantric system emerged.\textsuperscript{184}

\textsuperscript{180} Rgya gar chos ’byung, p. 172, ll. 1–3: de nas rgyal po ba na pā la’i sras ma hi pā la zhes pa byung | rgyal srid lo lnga bcu nga gnyis mdzad | rags rtsis su byas na rgyal po ’di ’das tsam na | bod na btsan po khri ral yang sku ’das pa tsam gyi dus yin no ‘Next, the son of Vanapāla, called Mahāpāla, ruled for fifty-two years. By a rough calculation this king died at the same time as King Khri ral in Tibet’; HBI, p. 289.

\textsuperscript{181} Rgya gar chos ’byung, p. 175, l. 1: de ’i sras ni rgyal po ma hā pā la ste | ’dis rgyal srid lo bzhi bcu zhe gcig mdzad ’His son was King Mahāpāla. He ruled for forty-one years’; HBI, p. 289.

\textsuperscript{182} See SMITH 1962, pp. 412–418; and KULKE in KULKE and ROTHERMUND 1992, p. 118.

\textsuperscript{183} Rgya gar chos ’byung, p. 175, ll. 7–9: rgyal po ma hi pā la’i sku tshe’i snad tsam na | pi ’to a tśa ryas dus kyi ’khor lo’i rgyud spyan drangs te | rgyal po ’di’i dus su dar bar mdzad The Ācārya Piṭo introduced the Kālacakratantra in the second half of the life of King Mahāpāla and disseminated it during the time of this king [Mahāpāla]’; HBI, pp. 289–290. This Piṭo is no doubt the person elsewhere called Piṇḍo (Bsod nyoms); see Blue Annals, p. 756–757, 789; OROFINO 1994, p. 23.

\textsuperscript{184} NEWMAN 1987 and 1998; OROFINO 1994, p. 23.
The Śaiva Age

After Mahīpāla the monastic universities already established continued to flourish, but Pāla fortunes once again went into decline, and it is therefore not surprising that Tāranātha has no major royal benefactions to report during this period. However, during the long reign of Rāmapāla (r. c. 1072–1126), the last major ruler of this dynasty, the kingdom recovered, and we might expect this to be reflected in a renewal of material patronage. It is tempting therefore to accept the claim made by Hara Prasad Shastri in 1910\(^{185}\) and repeated by many since that time\(^{186}\) that the Jagaddalamahāvihāra,\(^{187}\) the one great monastery in the Pāla domains whose founder has not yet been identified, was the creation of this monarch. But there is no evidence that supports this claim\(^{188}\)

Nor is there any that refutes it. In the introduction to the edition of the Subhāṣītaratnakoṣa published by Kosambi and Gokhale the former has asserted on the strength of evidence provided by the latter that Rāmapāla’s coronation took place in this monastery,\(^{189}\) in which case, of course, it could not have been founded by him during his reign. But that too cannot be accepted. The evidence cited is Gokhale’s rendering of the colophonic verse at the end of the *Bhagavatāmṛtyūyānovānasūrīṇī vyākhya, a commentary on the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā which survives in Tibetan translation (Tōh. 3811):\(^{190}\) “This vyākhya was composed by Rāja-jagaddala-nīvāsi [which thus becomes the writer’s name] at the Jagaddala vihāra, which was the place of Rāmapāla’s coronation”.\(^{191}\) But this rendering is wildly inaccurate. The meaning of the Tibetan is: “I, a resident of the venerable Rājajagaddala [monastery], have composed this commentary, a string of pearls (muktavāli) [to be an adornment] of the land protected by King Rāmapāla”.

---

185 Rāmacarita of Sandhyākaranandin, introduction, p. 9.
187 It is referred to as a Mahāvihāra in the colophonic verse of Muniśribhadra’s Pañca-kramaṭipanī (muniśribhadreṇa cirāj jagaddalamahāvihārasadbhikṣunā) and in 3.7 of the Rāmacarita of Sandhyākaranandin (jagaddalamahāvihāracitarāgām).
189 Subhāṣītaratnakosa, p. xxxvii, fn. 8.
190 bCom ldan ’das ma’i man ngag gi rjes su ’brung ba zhes bya ba’i rnam par bshad pa, f. 320r2: mi yi dbang po rā ma pa lā sa skyong mdzad pa’i <gnas kyi [Cone, Peking]> mu tig phreng ba ni | dpal ldan rgyal po dza ga ta la gnas par byed pa bdag gis rnam bshad ’di byas so.
191 Subhāṣītaratnakosa, p. xxxvii, fn. 8.
192 Gokhale seems to have found his “coronation” in the dbang of mi yi dbang po rā ma pa lās. The word is used in Tantric texts as a short form for dbang bskur ‘consecration’ (abhisekāh), as at rGyud spyi, p. 270, l. 1. But in order to reach his understanding of the phrase in which it occurs he has had to forget the mi yi that
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valuable information that the monastery was a royal foundation, since the Tibetan of its name dpal ldan rgyal po dza ga ta la, is evidently a translation of śrīmadrājajagaddala-, a form of the name confirmed by its occurrence in Sanskrit at the end of Mokṣākaraguptā's Tarkabhāṣā, in which he informs us that he too was a resident of this monastery (śrīmadrājajagaddalavihārīya-). But we remain ignorant of the king who founded it. We know that it existed in the time of Rāmapāla, and it is not impossible that it was indeed the work of this last great king of the dynasty; but no evidence of which I am aware precludes its having been created by a predecessor.

Some idea of the scale of the Great Monasteries in the Pāla domains is provided by Tāranātha. He informs us that in the reign of Rāmapāla, even after the decline from the time of the early Pālas, there were one hundred and sixty monks holding posts as Paṇḍītas at Vikramaśīla, and that there were about a thousand monks permanently in residence, both there and at Uddanḍapura, with many more assembling on the occasion of festivals. We also learn that when Vikramaśīla was founded its design incorporated one hundred and eight shrines: a central temple housing a life-size statue of the Great Awakening (Mahābodhi) surrounded by fifty-three small temples dedicated to the inner

---

193 Tarkabhāṣā, p. 39. KAJIYAMA (1998, pp. 6–11) shows that Mokṣākaraguptā was active at some time after c. 1050 and before c. 1292.

194 Rgya gar chos 'byung, p. 189, ll. 13–19: bi kra ma shī lar pa ṇdi ta brgya drug cu tsam re dang | gtan du du bzhugs pa'i dge slong stong re yod cing | mchod pa la sogs pa'i dus su rab byung lnga stong re 'du | rdo rje gdan du rgyal pos tsho ba sbyar ba'i theg chen pa bzhī bcu re dang | nyan thos kyi dge slong nyis brgya re rtag tu bzhugs shing | dus dus su nyan thos kyi dge slong khri phrag re tshog pa byung | o ta nta pu rir yang rtag tu dge slong stong phrag re bzhugs | theg pa chen chung gi ste gnyis char yod cing | dus dus su rab tu byung ba nams 'dus pa stong phrag bcu gnyis re 'byung bar grags 'There were at least 160 Paṇḍītas in Vikramaśīla and 1000 monks who were permanent residents. As many as 5000 renunciate monks gathered there on the occasion of festivals and the like. At Vajrāsana (Bodhgaya) 40 adherents of the Mahāyāna and 200 Śrāvakas monks resided permanently, maintained by the king. From time to time as many as 10,000 Śrāvakas monks congregated there. In Uddanḍapura there were 1000 permanently resident monks, comprising adherents both of the Mahāyāna and of the Hinayāna. From time to time 12,000 renunciate monks gathered there' ; HBI, p. 313.

195 I take this to be an image of Śākyamuni attaining enlightenment seated beneath
deities of the Mantranaya (gsang sngags nang gi lha khang chung ngu) and fifty-four “common” temples (lha khang dkyus ma), that is to say, temples enshrining exoteric, non-Tantric images. The king, we are told, provided generous allowances for the food and clothing of one hundred and eight Panṇḍitas, three Vajrācārya specialists to perform Bali offerings, rituals of image-installation, and fire-sacrifices respectively, and three officials. The first is the ‘Guardian of Duties’ (bya ba bsrong pa), perhaps an official appointed to ensure monks’ adherence to the various roles assigned to them in the running of the monastery. The second is termed mysteriously ‘Guardian of Doves’ (phug ron bsrong pa), and the third is the ‘Supervisor of the Monastery’s Subjects’ (lha ‘bangs kyi gnyer byed pa), these being, perhaps, both the serfs or tenants that worked the monastery’s estates and the servants within the monastery itself. Archaeological excavations have revealed that the cell-lined square court of Vikramaśīla measured 1073 feet on each side, that the entire site was spread over an area of more than one hundred acres, and that Dharmapāla’s monastery at Somapura (Pahārpur) was of similar design and plan and of only slightly smaller size, as was the monastery founded by Bhavadeva of Samatā at Paṭṭikera (Maināmatī). We also have some information concerning the scale of the monastery at Nālandā during the early seventh century when the Chinese scholar Xuanzang was there. According to the account written by his pupil Huili there were as many 10,000

---

196 Rgya gar chos ’byung, p. 165, l. 17–p. 166,5; HBI, p. 275. The three specialists are a gtor ma’i slob dpon, a rab gnas slob dpon, and a sbyin sreg slob dpon, i.e. a balyācārya, a pratiṣṭhācārya, and a homācārya.

197 On the reasons for identifying the monastery at Antichak with the Vikramaśīla-mahāvihāra see p. 88.


199 Dikshit 1938, pp. 18–36. Plate I (general plan). He reports (p. 18) that the outer quadrangle measures 822 feet externally on each side (according to Mitra in EITA, vol. 2, pt. 2, p. 403, it measures 922 by 919 feet) and (p. 34) that the original monastery was designed to accommodate some 600 to 800 monks and that in the eleventh century the number of residents can have been no more than 400. The massive central cruciform shrine-complex measures 386 by 352 feet.

200 This monastery is probably that known as the Sālban Vihāra, consisting like the monasteries of Vikramaśīla and Somapura of a massive cruciform shrine within a square enclosure which though considerably smaller than that of those monasteries was nonetheless of great size, each side being 550 feet in length; see Mitra in EITA, vol. 2, pt. 2, pp. 402–403.
monks there, all Mahāyānists, either as permanent residents or visitors, and over a 1000 learned scholars.\footnote{Beal 1914, p. 112.}

These royal monasteries are likely to have accumulated great wealth. The tax-exempt agricultural lands granted to them at the time of their foundation would have provided them with a substantial initial endowment: Huili reports that Nālandā’s was the revenue of about 100 villages;\footnote{Beal 1914, p. 112.} and the wealth from this source would no doubt have been augmented by subsequent land-grants\footnote{We have a record (EI 17:17: the Nālandā copper-plate of Devapāla) of one such subsequent land-grant in the case of the monastery at Nālandā. This records that in the 35th year of Devapāla, c. 847, five villages were assigned for the support of the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṅgha of a new monastery (vihāra) constructed at this site by Mahārāja Bālaputra-deva, the Śailendra king of Suvarṇadvīpa (Sumatra). That the regnal year is the 35th is the view of Sīcar (1983, p. 79, note 38). Hirananda Shastri read the numerals as 39 (EI 17:17, l. 42).} and would certainly have been augmented by other votive donations, bequests from the estates of deceased laymen,\footnote{The Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya speaks of the validity of written wills in which wealthy laymen transfer their entire estate to the the Saṅgha; see Gilgit Manuscripts vol. 3, pt. 2, p. 140, l. 14–15, l. 1; and Schopen 2004, p. 6. It also sets out rules obliging monks to accept permanent endowments of cash (aṅśayānīvī) (Schopen, loc. cit.).} and the profits of such non-religious activities as banking and the provision of irrigation and other agricultural facilities.\footnote{On the profit-making activities of Buddhist monasteries in the fifth and sixth centuries in India and in China under the Northern Wei (386–534) see Liu 1994, pp. 120–158. As for banking, the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya requires the funds of permanent endowments (aṅśayānīvī) for the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṅgha to be lent out on interest (vṛddhiḥ) (Schopen 2004, pp. 6–7, 47–49, 53). On monastic landlordism and the profitable management of irrigation works, in which local farmers were given access to such facilities in return for a share of their crops as a donation to the Saṅgha see Shaw and Sutcliffe 2003 and Gunawardana 1979.}

No doubt they would also have benefitted from the riches accumulated by individual monks in the form of the rewards (dakṣinā) that they earned by giving initiations, imparting instruction, installing images, consecrating monasteries and temples, reciting sacred texts, and performing rites for protection, funeral ceremonies, and the like.\footnote{For the dakṣinā for the Tantric funeral ceremony see here p. 102.} Tibetan sources record the very large amounts of gold which Indian and Tibetans required for such services. ‘Brog mi agreed to give the Indian Gayadhara 100 gold srang, some 3,750 grams, each year for five years in return for the transmission of the esoteric Lam ′bras teachings;\footnote{Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 90, Blue Annals, p. 207} Zur po che ṣā kya Ḍbyung nas offered ḌBro mi 100;\footnote{Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 92} Rva lo tsā ba gave 100 srang to the Nepalese Guru Bha ro phyag rdum for the Yamāri cycle instructions; Se

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Beal 1914, p. 112.
\item Beal 1914, p. 112.
\item We have a record (EI 17:17: the Nālandā copper-plate of Devapāla) of one such subsequent land-grant in the case of the monastery at Nālandā. This records that in the 35th year of Devapāla, c. 847, five villages were assigned for the support of the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṅgha of a new monastery (vihāra) constructed at this site by Mahārāja Bālaputra-deva, the Śailendra king of Suvarṇadvīpa (Sumatra). That the regnal year is the 35th is the view of Sīcar (1983, p. 79, note 38). Hirananda Shastri read the numerals as 39 (EI 17:17, l. 42).
\item The Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya speaks of the validity of written wills in which wealthy laymen transfer their entire estate to the the Saṅgha; see Gilgit Manuscripts vol. 3, pt. 2, p. 140, l. 14–15, l. 1; and Schopen 2004, p. 6. It also sets out rules obliging monks to accept permanent endowments of cash (aṅśayānīvī) (Schopen, loc. cit.).
\item On the profit-making activities of Buddhist monasteries in the fifth and sixth centuries in India and in China under the Northern Wei (386–534) see Liu 1994, pp. 120–158. As for banking, the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya requires the funds of permanent endowments (aṅśayānīvī) for the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṅgha to be lent out on interest (vṛddhiḥ) (Schopen 2004, pp. 6–7, 47–49, 53). On monastic landlordism and the profitable management of irrigation works, in which local farmers were given access to such facilities in return for a share of their crops as a donation to the Saṅgha see Shaw and Sutcliffe 2003 and Gunawardana 1979.
\item For the dakṣinā for the Tantric funeral ceremony see here p. 102.
\item Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 90, Blue Annals, p. 207
\item Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 92
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
tsha bsod nams rgyal mtshan gave 50 srang to the Nepalese Kāyaśrī for the precepts of the Nam mkha’ skor gsum; Mar pa performed a rite to protect the sons of some wealthy men and charged 10 gold srang for each son; the hagiographies of early Tibetans who travelled to India to acquire initiation and instruction abound in reports of the need to amass large quantities of gold for this purpose.

It would be rash to assume that the fortunes that were garnered in this way by Indian Ācāryas were added directly to the resources of their monasteries. A passage in the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhitantra, a text produced in the seventh century, at the beginning of the history of the Mantranaya as a fully-fledged path within the Mahāyāna, suggests that this was the case:

After the [sāṅktika]homā the Mantrin should request from the disciples a fee (daksīnā) of gold, silver, jewels, a stallion, an elephant, a mare, a cow, a bull, a buffalo, cloth, and whatever else is fitting. At that time the disciples should give the daksīnā to the Guru, respectfully, with faith, generating joy in their minds. Or at any rate they should make the Guru entirely satisfied. After [the Mantrin, that is to say, the Guru] has done this he should do a rite of self-protection and then exhort the excellent disciples as follows: All the Buddhas teach that this is a field for [the sowing of] merit for the benefit of all living beings. Therefore give to the Sangha, [for it is] vast in its pure virtues.

But it is striking that references to the Sangha are not found in this context in later texts, which only specify the goods that should be given. These are much the same as in the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi, though Dipankarabhadra, setting out the procedure for initiation with the Man. d. ala of the Guhyasamāja, adds land

---

209 Blue Annals, pp. 377, 395, and 400.
210 See, for example, pp. 399–401 of the account of the life of Mar pa in the Blue Annals.
211 The earliest certain evidence of the text is its Chinese translation by Subhākarasimha and Yijing registered in A.D. 725 (Taishō 848). But Hodge (2003, pp. 14–15) points out that Yijing’s Xiyuqiu faguosengzhuan (‘Record of Eminent Monks who Sought the Dharma in the West’) reports that the monk Wuxing, his contemporary in India, had died as he was setting out to return to China in 674, that texts he had collected were forwarded to China, and that three important Tantras are listed among these works: the Subhāparipr. cchā, the Susiddhikara, and the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi.
212 rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud, f. 173r4–7: sbyin sreg rjes la sngags pa yis | slob ma rnams la yon bslang ba | gser dang dangul dang rin chen dang | rta dang de bzhin glang po dang | rta mo ba lang ma he gos | gzhang yang dngos po ci yang rung | de tshe slob mas gus par ni | dad pa rab tu ldan pa yis | sens la dga' ba bskyed nas su | bla ma ni yon bdul lo | yang na ci nas bla ma de | rab tu ngu bar 'gyur bar bya | de ltar byas nas bdag bsrong ste | slob ma de pos bsgo ba ni | 'di ni bsod nams zhiung yin zhes | sens can kun gyi don gyi phyir | skyob pa rnams ni kun gyis gsungs | rnam dag yon tan rgyas pa yi | dge 'dun la ni kun gyis byin.
at the head of the list, and the scripture Laghuśamvaratantra goes so far as include a rāṣṭram, which I take to mean [the revenues of] ‘a district’ or ‘sub-district’ of a kingdom and therefore to be envisaging the gift of a monarch. Moreover, the Mūlasarvāstivādinavāyana, which was the predominant code of monastic law in eastern India and was thence adopted in Tibet, recognizes that monks had private property and that there could be great differences of wealth owned by individuals within the Sangha. However, it also insists that such property does not go to the king when a monk dies, as brahmanical law required in the case of those who die without offspring, but remains within the monastic community to which he belongs. Of course, a wealthy Guru could also donate his wealth to

\[\text{Guhyasamājamanḍalavidhi, f. 16v1–2, v. 375c: bhūgajādiśuvarnādau ‘land, an elephant or [other mount], gold, and other [valuables]’. The Mṛtasugatiniyojana of Śūnyasamādhivajīra includes houses, land, and male and female slaves among the gifts that should be given to an officiant who performs the Tantric funerary ceremony (antyesṭiḥ): yojanako ‘pi svavibhavānuṛupam vastrālāmaṇḍhārayanāsasanagṛhakṣetradāsidhādiṇaṃ daksinām acāryāya sādaram dadyat (f. 4r2–3).}
\]

\[\text{Laghuśamvarata f. 4r1–3 (3.11–14b): tatas tu gurave dadyat tathāgatoktadakṣinām nirjāyam suvarṇaṣatasahasram ratnāni vividhāni ca || 3.12 vastrayugmāsātāṃ caiva gaja vā śrīstram eva ca | karnāḥharana kaṭakam ca kaṇṭhikāṅgulikās ca saṃuttamam || 3.13 yajnopavīta sauvarṇam svabhāryāṃ duhiṃtām api | dāsa dāśī bhagnīṃ vāpi pranipatya nivedayet. Then he should give to the Guru the daksinā prescribed by the Tathāgata. After prostrating himself he should give 100,000 [Palas] of the most precious gold, jewels of various kinds, 200 lengths of cloth, an elephant, a horse, and a rāṣṭram, earrings, bracelets, necklaces, rings, and a crown, a golden caste-thread, his wife, his daughter, a male slave, a female slave, or his sister. The use of the term rāṣṭram for ‘a district’ or ‘sub-district’ is seen in inscriptions; see Sīrca 1966, pp. 277–278. My translation of the passage follows the text and interpretation of the commentator Bhavabhāṣṭa. The reading nirjāyam, which he interprets as ‘most precious’, is suspect. The MS (Laghuśamvarata, f. 4r2) reads the much more satisfactory nirṛyāta ‘having given’, as does the commentator Kambalapāda (Sādhannādiḥ, f. 11v4); and this is also the reading seen in f. 54v3–5 of the Saṃvarodayā nāma maṇḍalopāyikā of Bhūvācārya of Ratnagiri in Orissa (see here p. 91), in the Nepalese codex unicus of 1056. See also Catuspīṭhatantra f. 60v1–2 (4.1.46–47), which includes a house, land with rights to mine, and grain: tato gurudakṣinām dadyā śiṣya bhāvena nityaśaḥ | atmāpatisāṃ saputraṃ vā bāndhavaiḥ saha cetikaiḥ | hasti aśva gavādināṃ grha kṣetraś ca go-travān | sauvarṇa rajata tāmraṃ vastrādī vṛihidhānyakaḥ. The Vimalaprabhā on Kālacakraṇattra, Abhiśekapātaḷa v. 198 explains that verse as meaning that the initiate should promise always to give to his Guru one sixth of all his inherited and self-acquired wealth in the form of gold, jewels, grains and the like, and a sixth of all his livestock. It adds that he is required to give his wife to the Guru five times each month (vol. 2, p. 144, ll. 17–22).}

\[\text{The inheritance of the property of deceased monks is treated in the Mūlasarvāstivādinavāyana in the Cūravavāstu (Gilgit Manuscripts vol. 3, pt. 2, pp. 113–148). Particularly relevant in this context is its discussion of the case of the monk Upananda, who died leaving 300,000 in gold (pp. 117–121). King Prasenajit is persuaded that the estate does not belong to the crown and the Buddha rules that it should be} \]
the monasteries during his lifetime by creating religious endowments. We have a striking example of this in the eleventh century. Rva Lo tsā ba, who had become extremely wealthy by charging for instruction in the Tantras—he is said to have established fixed rates for a wide range of texts—, sent 100 srangs of gold to Vikramaśīla to fund the recitation in perpetuity of a copy of the Pañcavimśatisahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā written in gold, two golden copies of the Aṣṭasaahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, and 100 srangs of gold to fund the recitation in perpetuity of eighty-four copies of the Prajñāpāramitāsaṃcaya-pāthā by eighty-four Pañḍitas of the monastery.  

How closely the Pāla emperors and their bureaucracy were involved in the supervision of their Buddhist foundations cannot be determined from the available evidence. But it is almost certain that a Superintendent would have been appointed by the ruler to oversee their administration and that he would have required a substantial staff to enable him to do so. The Ratnāvali, a Mahāyānist work of uncertain authorship written before the sixth century, advises the unknown king to whom it is addressed on the proper administration of his realm distributed among the monks of his monastery: bhājayata yūyaṁ bhikṣava upanandasya bhikṣor nṛtapa-rīṣkāram (p. 119, ll. 13–14). The main concern here is to ensure that the wealth of monks stays within the community, free of the state's interference. For analysis of the treatment of these and related matters in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya see SCHOPEN 2004, pp. 3–6. The private property of a deceased monk was to be divided, directly or after sale, among the members of his community or, where this was not appropriate, as in the case of land, servants, and grain-stores, taken over for the use of the whole community (Gilgit Manuscripts, vol. 3, pt. 2, pp. 141, l. 4–143, l. 1). But when the estate contained precious metals, worked or not, those were to be divided into three shares, one for each of the Three Jewels (Gilgit Manuscripts, vol. 3, pt. 2, pp. 143, l. 10–12: suvarnām ca hiranyam ca yac cāyac ca kṛtākramān trayā bhāgābhāgān kārtavyāṁ | eko buddhasyāṁ | eko dharmsaya trīyāṁ saṅghasya). That for the Buddha should be used for repairs to the monastery's Buddha shrine (gandhakutā) and relic Stūpas, that for the Dharma should fund the copying or enthroning of the Buddha's teachings, and that for the Saṅgha should be divided among the monks (ibid., ll. 12–14). In the case of jewels other than pearls half should go to the Dharma and half to the Saṅgha (ibid., ll. 1–5). Manuscripts of Buddhist texts should be added to the monastery's library and manuscripts of non-Buddhist texts should be sold and the proceeds shared (ibid., ll. 5–7).

216 Blue Annals, p. 377.

217 The work is attributed to the Nāgārjuna of Mūlamadhyamakakārikā fame. I consider this attribution to be doubtful in spite the fact that it is made by such authors of the sixth century and later as Bhāvaviveka, Candrakīrti, Haribhadra, Kamalaśīla, and *Ajitamitra (Mi pham bshes gnyen), who wrote the only known commentary on the text, which has come down to us in a Tibetan translation made by the Bande Dpal brtsegs with the Indian Vidyākaraprabha in the early ninth century. The Ratnāvali itself contains no evidence of its authorship and VETTER (1992) has cast doubt on the traditional attribution through an analysis of its metre and word frequency.
and begins by declaring: “Appoint for all religious foundations a Superintendent of Religion (dharmaṭikṣṭha) who is energetic, without avarice, learned, and virtuous, who will not oppress them”. It goes on to advise him on the qualities he should look for in those whom he appoints as ministers (sacivāḥ), military commanders (daṇḍanāyakāḥ), and superintendents (adhiṭṭhāḥ), telling the king: “Have them submit to you complete monthly accounts of revenues and outgoings and, after hearing these, personally conduct all business pertaining to religious foundations and the rest”. This, of course, is not evidence of what was done in the Pāla realm. But as I read the passage it is the qualities and duties of these various officials that are the subject of injunction, not their existence; and there is certainly nothing exceptional in the office itself, since we have evidence that it was normal in kingdoms throughout the Indic world.

218 Ratnāvalī 4.22: sarvadharmaṭikṣṭaṁ dharmaṭikṣṭaṁ uttītītam | alubdham paṇḍitītam dharmyaṁ kuru tesāṁ abādhakam. The term dharmaṭikṣṭaṁ, which elsewhere is used to refer to the office of the Superintendent, is clearly used here in the meaning ‘religious foundation’, as the Tibetan translation chos kyi gzi agrees, and as it occurrence earlier in the same passage (4.18) confirms: dharmaṭikṣṭā ye cānne pūrvarājapravarṭītāḥ | devadronyādāyas te ‘pi pravartyantāṁ yathā sthitāḥ ‘And you should ensure that temples and other religious foundations created by former kings should continue as they are’. This sense of the word is also found in Licchavi inscriptions; see LKA 71, ll.12; and 81, l.11–12: bhaviṣyadbhir api bhūpatibhiḥ pūrvarājakṛtadharmaṭikṣṭaṁ pūrvaṅgānārdtaṁ bhavitavyam ‘Future kings too must take care to maintain religious foundations created by kings of the past’.

219 Ratnāvalī 4.26: pratimāsaṁ ca tebhyaṁ tvāṁ sarvaṁ āyavyayam śṛṇu | śrutvā *dharmaṭikṣṭādyam kāryaṁ sarvaṁ (Tib. chos gzi sogs kyi don kun nyid) svayam kuru.

220 In the Abhijñānasākuntala of Kālidāsa Duṣyanta, wishing to conceal his identity from Śakuntalā tells us that he has been appointed by the king to the office of Superintendent of Religion and accordingly has come to her hermitage in his official capacity to satisfy himself that they are free of hindrances to the performance of their rites; Act 1, after v.22, p.38: bhavati yah puraṇeva rājā dharmādhikāre niyuktaḥ so ’ham avighnakriyopalambhya dharmāranyam āyatāḥ. The fifth Dāmodarpur copper-plate inscription, of 533/4, recording a formal request for the purchase of land in the Kotāivarsa district to be given to a nearby temple, speaks of it being presented with the full knowledge of the Office of Religion (dharmaṭikṣṭaḥ) (EI 15:7, p.143). A banker Ralhaṇa has the title dharmakārmādhikāri ‘the superintendent of religious activities’ in the Kharod inscription dated in 1181/2 of Ratnadeva III, the Kalacuri of Ratnapura (EI 21:26, l.28: sreṣṭhinā ralhaṇenaśtra dharmakārmādhikārinā). The humorous play Āgamaṇḍambara, composed by the Kashmirian philosopher Jayantabhaṭṭa and set in the Kashmir of his own time, during the reign of Śaṅkaravarman (883–902), has a Śaiva ascetic inform us that a brahmin Saṃkarṣaṇa has been appointed by that king to the dharmarākṣādhikāraḥ, the ‘Office of Superintendent of Religion’ for the whole country (Act 3, Prelude, p.132: sakaḷāye yeve vaśuṃdhalāe dharmalasākṣādhikāle niutte (*sakaḷāyā eva vaśuṃdarāyā dharmarākṣādhikāre niyuktaḥ)). The term dharmaṭikṣṭaḥ occurs in a fifteenth-century inscription from Nilacala, the site of the famous temple
sence of thorough external control of the great monasteries seems all the more unlikely when one considers that apart from the fact that they were such large and wealthy establishments it was not the case that by building, equipping, and endowing a monastery a patron surrendered his ownership entirely. The patron continued to be the owner of the monastery and its contents (mahāvihārasvāmī, vihārasvāmī) in some sense and the monks were obliged to employ all these for the purposes for which they were designated, the return for the owner being the constantly augmenting merit that was generated for him by their repeated use (paribhogānvaṇyāṃ punyam). Only where there was no such use, as in the case of a Caitya, did a donor gain merit once and for all by the simple act of surrendering ownership (tyāgānvaṇyāṃ punyam).221

Moreover, we know that monks who held senior teaching positions in the great monasteries did so by royal appointment,222 and that rituals for state pro-

---

221 On this crucial distinction between paribhogānvaṇyāṃ punyam and tyāgānvaṇyāṃ punyam see Vasubandhu, Abhidharmakośabhāṣya on 4.121a (caitye tyāgānvaṇyāṃ punyam ‘In the case of a Caitya there is merit that accrues from surrender’): caitye sarāgasyaśaṃkarṣhānam dānam ity uktam | tatrāsāty upabhoktārī katham punyam bhavati | duviḍham punyam tyāgānvaṇyāṃ tyāgad eva yad utpadyate paribhogānvaṇyāṃ ca deyadharmaparibhogad yad utpadyate | caitye tyāgānvaṇyāṃ punyam (4.121a) ‘It has been said that a gift to a Caitya made by one who is not free of attachment is for his own benefit. Since there is no enjoyer of the gift in such cases how can there be merit [generated by such a gift]? Merit is of two kinds: tyāgānvaṇyāṃ, which arises only from the surrender [of ownership of what is given], and paribhogānvaṇyāṃ, which arises from the enjoyment of a pious gift [by the recipients]’. One should note that the restrictive particle eva is used here only after tyāgad. Vasubandhu does not state conversely in the case of paribhogānvaṇyāṃ punyam that this kind of merit arises only (eva) from the use of the donation. I infer that merit in such cases was understood to arise both from the act of surrendering possession and from subsequent use. This is confirmed by Candrakirti, who in his Prasannapadā, commenting on paribhogānvaṇyāṃ in Madhyamakakārikā 17.5a, speaks of the goods used as ‘surrendered’ (parityaktasya). See Abhidharmakośabhāṣya on 4.44ab addressing the conundrum of how the Buddha’s doctrine of moral action as intention (cetanā) can be reconciled with this claim of the accretion of further merit (punyavarddhīḥ) whenever a recipient uses something donated whether or not the donor is aware of it; and Sanderson 1995c, pp. 38–40.

222 Rgya gar chos ’byung, p. 179, ll. 13–14: rgyal pos spyan drangs te nā la ndā dang | bi kra ma la shi la’i nub sgo bar bskos shin ‘The king invited [Vāgiśvarakirti]
tection were performed on behalf of the monarch at Vikramāśīla. We have seen above Tāranātha’s report of the fire-ritual performed for the benefit of the dynasty by the Vajrācāryas of that monastery; and two important texts on the ritual of initiation written by two major Tantric authorities under the early Pālas, the Sarvavajrodaya of Ānandagarbha and the Guhyasamājamanḍalavidhi of Dipankarabhadra, the successor of Buddhajñāna at Vikramāśīla, insert ancillary rites specifically for the averting of danger from the monarch. Moreover,
Tāranātha relates several occasions on which Buddhist Tantric masters were believed to have used Tantric rituals to good effect against the enemies of their patrons in times of danger. In some sense, then, these were state monasteries, not unlike the great imperial monasteries of Tang China and Japan, rather

224 Rgya gar chos 'byung, p. 178, ll. 4–7; HBI, p. 294 (the Balyācārya of Vikramaśīla destroys a Turuṣka army invading from Bengal); p. 186, ll. 8–11, HBI, p. 306 (Prajñā-rakṣita makes offerings to Cakrāsanvarṣa when Vikramaśīla monastery is attacked by a Turuṣka army: the army is struck by lightning, which killed their leader and many others, so that they were repelled); p. 197, 1–4, HBI, pp. 326–7 (Lilāvajra, Tantrācārya of Vikramaśīla, defeats the Turuṣkas by drawing the Yamāricakra); and p. 197, l. 22–p. 198, l. 9; HBI p. 328 (Kamalārakṣita drives off a Turuṣka army from Vikramaśīla by throwing enchanted water at them during a Tantric feast [ganacakra]).

225 On the imperial Great Monasteries of China and Japan (Ch. ta si, Jpn. daiji [Skt.
than autonomous, self-governing institutions.

**The Pālas' Engagement with Śaivism**

The Pālas were certainly the most liberal patrons of Buddhist institutions in early medieval India, and it was no doubt largely because of this that the religion was able to develop and flourish so remarkably in their realm. However, it should not be thought that the scale of these rulers' support implies that they at least, unlike the other royal patrons of Buddhism that have been reviewed here, must have turned their backs on Śaivism, starving it of patronage that it might otherwise have received. For there is much evidence to the contrary.

In the ninth century Devapāla is praised in a charter of his son Mahendrapāla for having built two temples of outstanding beauty during his rule, one for the Buddha and the other for the consort of Śiva;²²⁶ and Mahendrapāla is reported to have established a temple for the emaciated goddess Carcā (Carcikā/Cāmunḍā).²²⁷ An eleventh-century Prāsasti from Bāngarh, ancient Koṭivarṣa in Varendri, also called Devikotā and Śonitapura, informs us that Nayapāla had the Saiddhāntika Sarvaśiva as his royal preceptor (gaudarājaguruḥ), and that when Sarvaśiva retired he passed this office to his brother Mūrtiśiva. This implies that Nayapāla received Śaiva initiation, since to initiate the king is fundamental to the Śaiva Rājaguru's role. It also tells us that at the site of this inscription Mahipāla I, Nayapāla's predecessor, had bestowed a Kailāsa-like monastery on Sarvaśiva's predecessor Indraśiva. Mahipāla is described here as a ‘knower of reality’ (tattvavit), which suggests in this Śaiva context that he too had received Śaiva initiation, which suggests in turn that the gift of the monastery was his Guru’s daks.īna. It is probable, therefore, that Indraśiva too, like his successors Sarvaśiva and Mūrtiśiva,

²²⁶ EI 42:2, ll. 12–13: yo nirmame *sugatasadma grhaṁ ca (corr.: sugatasadmagrhaṁ ca Ed.) gauryā yat kautukam ca tilakaṁ ca jagatraye ’pi.

²²⁷ EI 39:7, the Siyān stone slab inscription of Nayapāla, v. 40: mahendra pālacarcā-ya mahendrasadrśodayah | yah saśīṁ vadabhiṁ śaile sopānena sahākarot ‘who, equal in greatness to Mahendra (Viṣṇu), built for Mahendrapāla’s Carcā a stone Vadabhi temple on [her] hill and a flight of steps [leading to it]’. When D.C. Sir-car published this inscription he judged that it is probable that the Mahendrapāla mentioned in this verse is the Gūjara-Pratihāra king of that name (EI 39:7, p. 48), who ruled c. 885–908. In the light of the discovery of Mahendrapāla’s Mālḍā inscription (EI 42:2) we may now safely assume that he was the Pāla of that name. On this goddess see here p. 231. Carcikā, Cāmunḍā, Carṇamunḍā, and Karṇamoṭi are listed as synonymous deity-names in Amarakosā 1.1.46. The name Carcikā appears in place of Cāmunḍā in the Picumata in treatments of the eight Mothers (the seven ending with Carcikā [Māheśvari, Brahmāṇī, Viṣṇavī, Kaumārī, Vaivasvati, Māhendri, Carcikā], with Paramā/Pūraṇī/Aghoreṣī making up the total).
had held the office of royal preceptor.\textsuperscript{228} I know of no direct evidence that Mahipāla's successor Vigrahapāla III had a Saiddhāntika Rājaguru, but it is likely that he did, since in his Âmgâchi copper-plate inscription he is described as ‘devoted to Śiva’s worship’,\textsuperscript{229} and there is evidence which strongly suggests that this tradition was still in place under his successor Rāmapāla. For in the twelfth century the South-Indian Saiddhāntika Trilocanaśiva tells us that his preceptorial line descends from a Dharmaśambhu (Dharmaśiva) who had held office as the royal preceptor of “the king of Gaudā”, a standard expression for the Pāla rulers.\textsuperscript{230} Since three preceptorial generations intervene in that account between Dharmaśambhu and Trilocanaśiva, it is probable that this king was Rāmapāla.\textsuperscript{231}

\textsuperscript{228} The Bāngarh Praśasti of Mūrtiśiva (SIRCAR 1983b), found at Śivavāṭi (mod. Śibbāḍi) in the vicinity of Kotīvara, ll. 8–9: 9 śrīmān indrasivah sphaṭaṃ hariharaprāpryāṃ śivendrārkṛtim bibhrad vāṃśāvibhūṣaṇam samabhavac chisyo ‘śya puṇyātmanaḥ | yasmai kāñcanaupājaṇājuraḥ prāpratādumeruspurathkailāsābhamaṇṭham dadāv iha mahīpālo nrpas tattuvisit: ll. 11–12, reporting that Indraśiva’s successor Sarvaśiva was the royal preceptor of Nayapāla: rājño śrīnayapālaśasya rurus tattvavidāṃ varaḥ | śrīmān sarvaśivas tasya śisyo ‘bhūḍh bhūṣaṇam bhūwaḥ; and ll. 13–14, reporting that Sarvaśiva resigned his office as the Gaudārājaguru in favour of his brother Mūrtiśiva: 14 venāvarjitagaudārājagurutālakṣmīr nijabhāratari śrīmān mūrtiśivake nīveṣyāviśaṃ pasupatier vṛttāṃtambudhitam.

\textsuperscript{229} EI 15:18, ll. 17–19 (v. 12): pīta<h> sajanalocaniḥ smarariṣoḥ pujānuraktaḥ sadā samgrāmā caturo ‘dhikaḥ ca haritaḥ kālāḥ kule vidviṣām | cāturvarṣyasaṃmā śravaḥ sitayāśaḥpuṇjair jagad rāṇjayaṃ śrīmadvighraḥpālādevanṛpatir jajāte tato dhāmabhṛt ‘From [Nayapāla] was born the illustrious king Vigrahapāladeva, who was drunk by the eyes of the virtuous, ever devoted to the worship of Śiva, more skilled in battle than Indra, the god of Death to the families of his foes, support of the four caste-classes, white-washing the world with the multitudes of his stuccoed temples’.

\textsuperscript{230} See, e.g., in a pedestal inscription of the reign of Palapāla (r. c. 1165–1199): śrīgauḍeśivaṇrapaḷapāḷapāḷaṇām (HUNTINGTON 1984, p. 239, no. 59) and the Sārnāth inscription of Mahipāla (HULTZSCH 1885), v. 2: gauḍādhipo mahīpālaḥ.

\textsuperscript{231} Colophonic verses at the end of Trilocanaśiva’s Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā (IFP, MS Transcripts 457 [T1] and 170 [T2]; edition in BRUNNER 1963–1998, Pt. 4. 422–427 [B]): 1 śrīcedirājahwii saivajānakārakāḥṣrīgolakti- yenāvarjitagaudārājagurutālakṣmīr nijabhāratari śrīmān mūrtiśivake nīveṣyāviśaṃ pasupatier vṛttāṃtambudhitam.

\textsuperscript{232} See, e.g., in a pedestal inscription of the reign of Palapāla (r. c. 1165–1199): śrīgauḍeśivaṇrapaḷapāḷaṇām (HUNTINGTON 1984, p. 239, no. 59) and the Sārnāth inscription of Mahipāla (HULTZSCH 1885), v. 2: gauḍādhipo mahīpālaḥ.

\textsuperscript{233} Colophonic verses at the end of Trilocanaśiva’s Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā (IFP, MS Transcripts 457 [T1] and 170 [T2]; edition in BRUNNER 1963–1998, Pt. 4. 422–427 [B]): 1 śrīcedirājahwii saivajānakārakāḥṣrīgolakti- yenāvarjitagaudārājagurutālakṣmīr nijabhāratari śrīmān mūrtiśivake nīveṣyāviśaṃ pasupatier vṛttāṃtambudhitam.

\textsuperscript{234} See, e.g., in a pedestal inscription of the reign of Palapāla (r. c. 1165–1199): śrīgauḍeśivaṇrapaḷapāḷaṇām (HUNTINGTON 1984, p. 239, no. 59) and the Sārnāth inscription of Mahipāla (HULTZSCH 1885), v. 2: gauḍādhipo mahīpālaḥ.

\textsuperscript{235} Colophonic verses at the end of Trilocanaśiva’s Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā (IFP, MS Transcripts 457 [T1] and 170 [T2]; edition in BRUNNER 1963–1998, Pt. 4. 422–427 [B]): 1 śrīcedirājahwii saivajānakārakāḥṣrīgolakti- yenāvarjitagaudārājagurutālakṣmīr nijabhāratari śrīmān mūrtiśivake nīveṣyāviśaṃ pasupatier vṛttāṃtambudhitam.

\textsuperscript{236} See, e.g., in a pedestal inscription of the reign of Palapāla (r. c. 1165–1199): śrīgauḍeśivaṇrapaḷapāḷaṇām (HUNTINGTON 1984, p. 239, no. 59) and the Sārnāth inscription of Mahipāla (HULTZSCH 1885), v. 2: gauḍādhipo mahīpālaḥ.

\textsuperscript{237} Colophonic verses at the end of Trilocanaśiva’s Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā (IFP, MS Transcripts 457 [T1] and 170 [T2]; edition in BRUNNER 1963–1998, Pt. 4. 422–427 [B]): 1 śrīcedirājahwii saivajānakārakāḥṣrīgolakti- yenāvarjitagaudārājagurutālakṣmīr nijabhāratari śrīmān mūrtiśivake nīveṣyāviśaṃ pasupatier vṛttāṃtambudhitam.

\textsuperscript{238} See, e.g., in a pedestal inscription of the reign of Palapāla (r. c. 1165–1199): śrīgauḍeśivaṇrapaḷapāḷaṇām (HUNTINGTON 1984, p. 239, no. 59) and the Sārnāth inscription of Mahipāla (HULTZSCH 1885), v. 2: gauḍādhipo mahīpālaḥ.

\textsuperscript{239} Colophonic verses at the end of Trilocanaśiva’s Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā (IFP, MS Transcripts 457 [T1] and 170 [T2]; edition in BRUNNER 1963–1998, Pt. 4. 422–427 [B]): 1 śrīcedirājahwii saivajānakārakāḥṣrīgolakti- yenāvarjitagaudārājagurutālakṣmīr nijabhāratari śrīmān mūrtiśivake nīveṣyāviśaṃ pasupatier vṛttāṃtambudhitam.

\textsuperscript{240} See, e.g., in a pedestal inscription of the reign of Palapāla (r. c. 1165–1199): śrīgauḍeśivaṇrapaḷapāḷaṇām (HUNTINGTON 1984, p. 239, no. 59) and the Sārnāth inscription of Mahipāla (HULTZSCH 1885), v. 2: gauḍādhipo mahīpālaḥ.

\textsuperscript{241} Colophonic verses at the end of Trilocanaśiva’s Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā (IFP, MS Transcripts 457 [T1] and 170 [T2]; edition in BRUNNER 1963–1998, Pt. 4. 422–427 [B]): 1 śrīcedirājahwii saivajānakārakāḥṣrīgolakti- yenāvarjitagaudārājagurutālakṣmīr nijabhāratari śrīmān mūrtiśivake nīveṣyāviśaṃ pasupatier vṛttāṃtambudhitam.

\textsuperscript{242} See, e.g., in a pedestal inscription of the reign of Palapāla (r. c. 1165–1199): śrīgauḍeśivaṇrapaḷapāḷaṇām (HUNTINGTON 1984, p. 239, no. 59) and the Sārnāth inscription of Mahipāla (HULTZSCH 1885), v. 2: gauḍādhipo mahīpālaḥ.
There is other evidence of these kings’ engagement with Śaivism. The poet Saṃdhyaśākanandin describes king Madanapāla, Rāmapāla’s second son, as a devotee of Śiva;²³² and a pedestal inscription of 1026 recording renovations of Buddhist structures at Sārnāth by two Pāla princes Sthirapāla and Vasantapāla, also tells us that Mahipāla I had engaged them to have hundreds of temples of Śiva, Citraghanta, and other deities built in Benares and that he did so after offering obeisance at the feet of the Guru Vāmarāśi of that city, who, as we can infer from his name in -rāśi, was a Śaiva ascetic of the Atimārga.²³³
Similarly, the Bhāgalpur copper-plate inscription of Nārāyaṇapāla (r. c. 860–917) records his establishing a Śiva and granting a village to it and the association of Pāṣupatācāryas (pāṣupatācāryaparīṣaṭ) attached to the foundation; and though it gives him the epithet paramasaugataḥ it reports that he had been responsible for the building of a vast number of other temples for this deity.\(^{234}\)

We have even more striking evidence of this kind in the case of Nayapāla. His Siyān stone slab inscription (EI 39:7) devotes most of its sixty-five verses (21–63) to detailing an extensive program of royal temple building and image installation undertaken throughout the Pāla realm. Damage to the inscription has removed the name of the king who was responsible for this program, but it is extremely unlikely that it was other than Nayapāla, since the account follows immediately on that of his martial exploits, following those of his predecessors. These pious activities comprise the construction of a temple topped by golden lions and a finial, evidently therefore a Vadabhī temple for a goddess,\(^{235}\) with a temple of Śiva and an attached two-storied monastery (māṭho dvibhūmīḥ) for the accommodation of ascetics to its south (v. 24), a temple with a [golden] finial,
presumably for Śiva, since it was equipped with eleven [subsidiary] shrines in which the eleven Rudras were installed (v. 25), a Vadabhī temple for the Mother Goddess and a series of temples for the Nine Durgās, a lofty temple for Śiva Hetukeśvara at Deviṅkaṭa, a temple of Śiva Kṣemēśvara with a golden

235 Verse 23ab: [su]dhāśubhraṃ kāncanasimhaṃbhāsirasam . . . That a Vađabhī temple housing an image of a goddess should be distinguished from others by being surmounted by [two] lions and a finial, and that Vađabhī temples are principally for the housing of goddesses, is prescribed in the Śaiva Pratīṣṭhātantras, Tantras, that is, which specialize in temple construction and installation. See Mayasamgṛha, f.28r–v (5.86c–89): vasvamśe ṣoḍaśatyaṃ gatuṣaṃvarthitāyatiḥ || 87 caturaṃ purāṇaṃ śiddhaṃ vaṃṣaṃvaṃvartitāyaḥ || 88 vistārāṇaṃ dvigunotṣedhaṃ phāṃsādikṛtaṇaṃvartitih || pāṛṣeṃ simhaṃdvayopeta mudhye kalasābhūṣitaḥ || 89 padaikasārāhābhūtivāpāṇaṃvātāyatiḥ || viśeṣato mābhikādānāṃ saṃniḥditthānaṃ īrītaṃ; ibid., f.29v (vv.119–121): vaḍabhīyāṃ ambikādeyvāḥ kaśārī garudo hareḥ || śriyo dvipo vṛṣaḥ śambhoḥ savītavānaḥ tāvā || tad anvesāṃ ca devānāṃ saṃyukthāmaḥ ṣaḥ hitam prāṇaṃ vishavānuḥ || bhaṭī saṃrātvānaṃ mūrdhñi sa cūḍā gacchitaḥ budhaḥ; f.28v (5.89cd), referring to the Vaḍabhī type of temple: viśeṣato mābhikādānāṃ saṃniḥditthānaṃ īrītaṃ. The sections of this and other unpublished Śaiva works (Bṛhatkālottara, Pingalāmata, Devyāmata, and Mohacūḍottara) that deal with the building and design of the various kinds of temple are being edited, translated, and analyzed in a doctoral thesis being prepared by my pupil Elizabeth Harris.


237 Verse 27: ṣailāṇi mandirāṇy atra mandarāṅkāṇi yāṇi ca || + + + + + + + kṛtā ya nava caṇḍikāḥ 'and here stone temples of the Mandara kind . . . the Nine Caṇḍikās'. The Nine Caṇḍikās are surely the eighteen-armed form of Mahiṣāsūramardini Durgā known as Ugracandra and her eight sixteen-armed ancillaries Rudracandra, Pracandra, Canḍogra, Caṇḍananyikā, Caṇḍa, Caṇḍavatī, Caṇḍarūpā, and Aticāndikā. They are nine to match the nine days of the autumnal Navarātra festival. For these goddesses, also called the Nine Durgās, see Agnipurāṇa 50.7–11 and 185.3–10; and Vidyāpatī, Durgābhaktitaraṅginī, p. 198. That Nayapāla had [nine] temples built for these goddesses is in keeping with the preferred option of Agnipurāṇa 185.3cd: durgā tu navagehasthā ekāgārasthitāḥavā ‘Durgā may be in nine temples or one'. For a Paddhati for the worship of Ugracandra and her ancillaries see Ugracandrāprakaraṇa.

238 Verse 28ab: devikoṭe hetukēsasayā śambhor yah prāśadān šailam uccair akārṣit. For the Hetukēśvara of Deviṅkaṭa/Kotivāra (modern Bāṅgarh) see Sander-son 2001, fn. 4, p. 7; also Picumata f.8r3–4 (3.119c–123), which requires the installation of Hetukēśvara as Bhairava in the northeastern segment of the initiation Mandala: iśāne tu diśābāhe kotivaṃ sarakpayet || 120 vaṭāṃ tatra samālīkya tatra śūladaḥakam likhet || dikṣu caiva vidikṣu ca śīlaprotā likhet tathā || 121 śūla tasyāgṛato likhyā kuṇḍaśayīva mahātāpe || paṭṭīsāṃ pūrvaṭo nyasya vaṭasyādhas tato priye || 122 aṣṭapatram likhet padnam tathaiveha na saṃsārayaḥ || hetukēśvarāṃ ālikhyā saḍāśivanus tathā || 123 karnikāyām mahādevi mahābhāiravarūpinām || rudrāstakasamopetam pūrvavādam devi caḷikhet; and Niśisamēcāra f.17v (4.20–21): kotivaṃṣa karṇamoṭī
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finial and a water reservoir; a temple of Śiva Varākṣeśvara together with a monastery and reservoir; a temple of Viśṇu (v. 33), a temple of Ghaṇṭiśa and of Bhairava surrounded by the sixty-four Mothers 'in his own city', a temple of Śiva Vaṭeśvara at Campā, and a Vadābhī temple on a hill-top with a flight of

mahābalakulodbhavāḥ | sūlahastā sthitā devi sarvayogeśvareśvarī || tasmin kṣetre
sthitā devi vaṭavṛksasamāśritāḥ | kṣetrapālo mahākāyo hetuko nāma nāmataḥ.
The origin myth of the cult of Hetukeśvara, Bahumāṃsā (=Karnamoti/Cāmūnda/Carcikā), and the other Mothers (Mātrs) at Kotivarṣa is narrated in chapter 171 of the early Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa. Śiva promises the Mothers there that he will compose Tantras of the Mothers (mātratantravāyogaśvarayeśvarā́svarā́svarī kalta kṣemavara śvaravāyatanam. kṣema ˙ nkaro grāvamayam. smarāreh. j cakāra yo mūrdhni diptāyatāsatātukumbhakumbham vyadhāt tatra mahāsarasa ca. In a passage describing Varendrī (3.1–27) in the Rāmacarita, completed in the time of Madanapāla (r. c. 1143–1161) but relating events that occurred during the reign of Rāmapāla (r. c. 1072–1126), Saṃdhīyakarannāndin devotes six verses to the deities of the region (3.2–7). There Kṣemēśvarā appears with Hetvā́śvara or with Heteśvara and Candeśvara as one of only two or three deities individualized by a personal name (3.2–5: kurvadbhiḥ. śam devena śrīhetvāśvara devena ca canḍeśvarabhidhāhānena kila kṣemēśvara ca sanāthāḥ || ...sambhavitākalusabhāvām), the others mentioned being generic: the twelve Ādityas, the eleven Rudras, Skanda, Vināyaka, the Vasus, the Viśnudevas, and the Lokapālas. Heteśvara here is surely identical with the Heteśvara of Kotivarṣa mentioned above. As a synonymous form it was probably substituted for metrical convenience. It is not clear from the Sanskrit whether Saṃdhīyakarannāndin intended Candeśvara to be understood as an alias of Kṣemēśvarā or as the name of third local Śiva. I am not aware at present of any external evidence that removes this doubt.

Verse 30: kṣemēśvarasyāyatanam kṣemānkarā grāvamayaḥ smarāreḥ | cakāra yo mūrdhni diptāyatāsatātukumbhakumbham vyadhāt tatra mahāsarasa ca. In a passage describing Varendrī (3.1–27) in the Rāmacarita, completed in the time of Madanapāla (r. c. 1143–1161) but relating events that occurred during the reign of Rāmapāla (r. c. 1072–1126), Saṃdhīyakarannāndin devotes six verses to the deities of the region (3.2–7). There Kṣemēśvarā appears with Hetvā́śvara or with Heteśvara and Candeśvara as one of only two or three deities individualized by a personal name (3.2–5: kurvadbhiḥ. śam devena śrīhetvāśvara devena ca canḍeśvarabhidhāhānena kila kṣemēśvara ca sanāthāḥ || ...sambhavitākalusabhāvām), the others mentioned being generic: the twelve Ādityas, the eleven Rudras, Skanda, Vināyaka, the Vasus, the Viśnudevas, and the Lokapālas. Heteśvara here is surely identical with the Heteśvara of Kotivarṣa mentioned above. As a synonymous form it was probably substituted for metrical convenience. It is not clear from the Sanskrit whether Saṃdhīyakarannāndin intended Candeśvara to be understood as an alias of Kṣemēśvarā or as the name of third local Śiva. I am not aware at present of any external evidence that removes this doubt.

Verse 32: . . . maṭhāmaḥ ca sarasīm ca | dhāma vaṛākṣeśvara iti sambhoro api śailam uttālam.

Verse 35: ghaṇṭiśaṃ yah svanagore nyadhāt kṣemāya dehinām | catuhṣastāya ca māṭṛṇāṃ paritām tatra bhairavam. This Ghaṇṭiśa is perhaps a double of the Mahāghaṇṭēśvara/Mahāghaṇṭa identified by the Picumata (3.77c–83) as the Bhairava of Viraṇā, modern Jajpur in the Cuttack District of Orissa, formerly the capital of the Bhauma-Kara kings: āgneye (em.:āgneyaṃ Cod.) virajāyāṃ tu trikūṭaṃ tatra cāliṅkhet | 78 nānāvṛkṣasamākirṇaṃ ulākīśa caḥ samapadhitam | nandiṇī ca chagalāṃ caiva kumbhakarṇaṃ mahābalam || 79 hetuκaṃ tatra deveśaṃ śmaśānena *samaṃ nyaset (conj:saṃabhyyaset Cod.) tatropari likhec chaktim karaṇjanāṃ ca mahaḍrāmum || 80 tasyāḥdāstāḥ likhet padam aṣṭapatram sakārṇikam | karnikāyāṃ likheḥ devam mahāghaṇṭam tu bhairavam || 81 katiḍēse tathā caiva ghaṇṭēsaptavēbhūsitam | rudrāṣṭakasamopetapam bhairavākārārupībhibhiḥ || 82 rudrāṇāṃ bāhyato devi yoginīḥ śat samālikhet | yamaghaṅṭa karaṇā ca mahājīvā kharānaṇā || 83 karāli dānturā caiva nāmaīś caīṭāḥ prakīrtitāḥ | rudrastakram ca samveṣya ṣadhikṣaḥ ca kramāḥ sthitāḥ; and 3.136cd (f. 8v2–5): āgneye mahāghaṇṭēśvaranāṃ likhet; 30.25cd: āgneyaṃpaṇke caiva mahāghaṇṭēśvaranāṃ nyaset. Ghaṇṭiśa- is evidently Ghanṭeśa- modified by Middle-Indic Sandhi (-a/ā + i > -ī).
steps for the emaciated goddess Carcā (Carcikā) previously established by king Mahendrapāla,\textsuperscript{243} the re-excavation of the step-well (vāpī) of the sage Matanga at Dharmāranya, the building of a lofty temple of Śiva Matāṅgeśvara at that site (v. 43),\textsuperscript{244} the building of a temple of Lakṣmī (v. 44), the erecting of a golden Triśūla at Sāgara (v. 45),\textsuperscript{245} the building of a temple of the Sun-god (v. 46), the provision of a golden cover for [the Liṅga of] Śiva Vaidyanātha,\textsuperscript{246} the installation of a golden finial on the temple of Śiva Aṭṭahāsa (v. 50),\textsuperscript{247} the making of a silver image of Śadāsiva, golden images of Caṇḍikā and Gaṇeśa (v. 53) with golden pedestals, a Moon-god, a Sun-god of silver, a golden lotus engraved with images of the Nine Planets (vv. 54–55)—all these are ancillary deities of Śaiva worship—, and a bejewelled golden Śiva (v. 56), the building of a monastery and the installation in it of an image of Viṣṇu in his [Pāñcarātrika] Vaikuṇṭha form (v. 61), and the building of a high Vaḍabhī temple for the goddess Piṅgalārāya.\textsuperscript{248}

A few other temples and one monastery are mentioned in the inscription (vv. 21–22, 31, 36–37, 39, 41–42, 47, 52, and 59–60), but their affiliation is not stated or has been lost through damage to the stone.\textsuperscript{249}

It is striking that most of these constructions and images are Śaiva or Śākta Śaiva and that not one is Buddhist. It is unlikely, however, that Nayapāla had rejected the Buddhist leanings so marked in this dynasty. For in addition to the evidence of his being called paramasaugataḥ there is the fact that Tāranātha

\begin{footnotes}
\addcontentsline{toc}{footnote}{\textsuperscript{243}Verse 40: mahendrapālacarcāyā mahendrasadrśodayah j yaḥ saṅīm vaḍabhīṃ saile sopānena sahākarot. Carcā/Carcikā is the fearsome emaciated goddess commonly known as Cāmuṇḍā or Karṇamoti; see here p. 231.}
\addcontentsline{toc}{footnote}{\textsuperscript{244}Dharmāranya is at Gayā in southern Bihar. Its Matanga hermitage, its step-well of Matanga, and its temple of Matāṅgeśvara are mentioned in Agnipurāṇa 115.34–36.}
\addcontentsline{toc}{footnote}{\textsuperscript{245}This is probably Gāṅgāsāgara/Gāṅgāsāgarasamgama, where the Ganges flows into the Bay of Bengal, listed in Śaiva sources as one of the Śaiva sacred power sites, e.g., in the list of the siddhiksetrāṇi given in the Niśvāsatattvasamhitā, f. 42r1–3 (Niśvāsaguhyasūtra 1.29–33b).}
\addcontentsline{toc}{footnote}{\textsuperscript{246}Verse 48: kholam akāri rukmaracitaṃ śrīvaidyanāthasya tat. Temples of Śiva Vaidyanātha are found in various parts of the subcontinent. However, SIRCAR is no doubt correct in his annotation of this inscription (EI 39, p. 41) that this is the Vaidyanātha of Deoghar (24°29′ N, 86°42′ E) in Jharkhand, this being revered as one of Śiva’s twelve Jyotirliṅgas.}
\addcontentsline{toc}{footnote}{\textsuperscript{247}Perhaps at Aṭṭahāsa, now Labpur (23°50′ N, 87°49′ E) in the Bhirbhumi District of Bengal. The name of the Śiva at this Śiva and Śākta sacred site is Mahānāda (e.g. Matangapārameśvara, Vidyāpāda 20.53ab: mahānādasya nāthasya cāṭṭahāsākhīyam eva hi | vimalam vimalasyoktāṃ sthānaṃ rudrasya sbohanam); but Aṭṭahāsa being nearly a synonym as well as the name of the site may have been an alias.}
\addcontentsline{toc}{footnote}{\textsuperscript{248}Verse 63cd: iyam api valabhi grāvaabhir uttungā piṅgalārāyaḥ.}
\addcontentsline{toc}{footnote}{\textsuperscript{249}In addition v. 34 records the founding of a hospital (ārogyāśālā), and v. 57 gifts to brahmins.}
\end{footnotes}
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reports that Nayapāla had a Buddhist preceptor in the person of Mahāvajrāsana Puṇyākaraguṇa.\(^{250}\)

*Buddhist Kings of Eastern India and their Commitment to Brahmanism*

Nor is it the case that royal devotion to the Buddha in eastern India during this period weakened in this region the traditional commitment of Indian rulers to the imposition and preservation of the caste-based brahmanical social order in which Śaivism was embedded. For in the Neulpur grant of the Bhaumakara king Śubhākara I his grandfather Kśemaṅkara is described both as a Buddhist and as having ensured that the members of the caste-classes and disciplines observed their prescribed roles;\(^{251}\) in his Terūndiā copper-plate inscription Śubhākara II, the grandson of Śubhākara I, is given the epithet *paramasaugataḥ* yet is also commended for having ‘propagated the system of uncommingled caste-classes and disciplines proper to the [perfect] Kṛta Age following the unexcelled [brahmanical] scriptures’;\(^{252}\) the Pāla Dharmapāla is described in a grant of his son Devapāla both as a *paramasaugataḥ* and as taking measures to ensure that castes that erred were made to adhere to their respective duties, thereby discharging his father’s debt to his deceased ancestors.\(^{253}\) and Vigrahapāla III is

\(^{250}\) *Rgya gar chos ’byung*, p. 185, ll. 7–9: *rgyal po ’dis rdo rje gdan pa chen por grags pa la mchod de | de dge bsnyen gyi dus kyi mtshan pu nyi shri | rab tu byung ba’i mtshan pu nyi’a ka ra gu pta’o* ‘This king [Neyapāla] venerated [the teacher] called Mahāvajrāsana. During his time as a lay Buddhist, his name was Punyaśrī. His ordination name was Punyaṅkaraṇagupta’; *HBI*, p. 305. In Tāranātha’s text the name of the king is given as Neyapāla. But there can be no doubt that it is Nayapāla that is meant. For there is no other Pāla whose name ‘Neyapāla’ approximates, and Tāranātha’s chronology of Neyapāla fits this king’s reign. He relates that his reign began shortly before Dīpaṅkaraśrījñana (Atīśa) left for Tibet, which is not far out, since Nayapāla came to the throne in approximately 1027 and Dipaṅkaraśrījñana set out for Tibet in 1038.

\(^{251}\) *EI* 15:1, l. 2: *svadharmāropitavarnāśramah paramopāsako ... śriśeṅkaṅkara-devah.*

\(^{252}\) *EI* 28:36, ll. 8–10: *paramasaugataḥ ... niratīśayāsāstrāṇusārapravartitakṛtayugocitāsaṅkīrṇavarnāśramayavasthah.*

\(^{253}\) The Mungir copper-plate grant of Devapāla, *KIELHORN 1892*, p. 255, l. 28: *paramasaugataḥ paramesvaraparamabhaṭṭārakamahārājāśrīdharma-pādaleupādānudhīyataḥ paramasaugataḥ paramesvāraḥ <h> paramabhaṭṭārakō mahārājāḥdhīrājaḥ <h> śrīmān devapāladevaḥ <h>; and ll. 8–9 (v. 5): *sāstrārthabhājā calato ‘nuśasya varṇān pratiṣṭhāpayatā svadharme | śriśāṃkrapāleṇa sutena so ‘bhūt svargasthitānām anṛṇāḥ pitṛnām* [Gopāla] became free of his debt to his ancestors in heaven through his son Dharmapāla, who, adhering to the teachings of the [brahmanical] Śastraṇas, after chastising those [members of] caste-classes that stray makes them adhere to their prescribed duties’. Cf. *Viṣṇudharmottara 2.65.55*: *varṇāśramayavasthā tu tathā kārya viśeṣataḥ | svadharmaprācuyutān rājaḥ svadharme viniyojayet* ‘The king must above all establish the castes-classes and disciplines with the proper distinctions between each. He should force those
described in his Āṅgāchī copper-plate as the support of the four caste-classes. Moreover, most of the surviving inscriptions of the Pālas, Candras, and Bhaumakaras record grants which they made in favour of Brahmins. The Rāmpāl copper-plate grant of the Candra Śrīcandra strikingly exhibits the extent to which this double allegiance was unproblematic for such Buddhist donors. Following a practice widely attested in non-Buddhist donative inscriptions the gift of land is said to have been made over to its brahmin recipient after the pouring of water and the performance of a fire-sacrifice, in this case a koṭihomah. This is simply adapted to the donor’s faith by dedicating the offerings to the Buddha rather than to Śiva or Viṣṇu.

It seems, then, that royal patronage, reflecting no doubt the balance of allegiance in the wider population, ensured that Buddhism, for all the liberal support it received from the Pālas, was in no position to oust or diminish Śaivism, even in this region. The monasteries themselves reflect this symbiosis. The excavations at Somapura revealed an abundance of non-Buddhist deities, particularly Śiva, among the stone relief sculptures around the base of the central temple and the very numerous terracotta plaques that decorated its walls.

who fall from their prescribed duties to carry them out’; and the Bhāgalpur plate of Nārāyanapāla, HULTZSCH 1886, v. 2cd: maryādāparipālanaikairatāḥ sauryālayo śmād abhūd dugdhambhdhvilāsahāsamātimā śrīdhammapālo nrpah ‘After him came King Dharmapurā. He was solely dedicated to the maintenance of the boundaries [between the caste-classes and disciplines]; he was the very abode of heroism [in war]; and the glory [of his fame] shone dazzlingly white like the ocean of milk’.


On the brahmanical koṭihomah see SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 382–383.

EI 12:18, ll. 28–29: vidhīvad udakapūrvakaṁ kṛtvā koṭihomam bhagavate bhagavantaṁ buddhabhaṭṭāraṁ uddīṣyā mātāpitro ātmanas ca puyyayasyobhivrddhaye . . . ‘According to rule, after pouring water [upon the hand of the recipient] and after performing a koṭihomah for the Lord and dedicating it to the Lord Buddha, to add to the merit and fame of my parents and myself . . .’. Cf., e.g., EI 21:37 (the Śaktipūr copper-plate of Lākṣmanasena, r. 1179–1206), lines 42–44: vidhīvad udakapūrvakaṁ bhagavantaṁ śrīnārāyanābhaṭṭārakaṁ uddīṣyā mātāpitro ātmanas ca puyyayasyobhivrddhaye; EI 21:28 (the Pālanpur plates of Caulukya Bhimadeva of Gujarāt), A.D. 1063, ll. 5–6: māhesvaram abhyarccya mātāpitro ātmanas ca puyyayasyobhivrddhaye . . . We find a similar case in the Āṅgāchi grant of Vīghrapāla III (EI 15:18, ll. 35–40), but with the omission of the fire-sacrifice: mātāpitro ātmanas ca puyyayasyobhivrddhaye bhagavantaṁ buddhabhaṭṭārakaṁ uddīṣyā . . .

DIKŚHIT 1938, pp. 39, 41–42, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, and 58, commenting (p. 58) that brahmanical and Buddhist gods are equally and promiscuously represented on the terracotta plaques, and that among the brahmanical deities Śiva is the most frequently represented both on those and in the stone relief sculptures. For the forms of Śiva found here see his Plates XXXa–d, XXXIa–e, XXXIXf (Linga), XLI d-2, and XLIV a and e, LVle (Mukhaliṅga), and LVIIIa (Ūmāmaheśvara).
Excavations of the Vikramaśīla monastery also uncovered a mix of Buddhist and predominantly Śaiva non-Buddhist images, the latter Śiva, Umāmaheśvara, Śiva and Pārvatī, Bhairava, Mahiśāsuramardini, Pārvatī, Kaumārī, Cāmuṇḍā, Gaṇeśa, Kārtikeya, the Navagraha, Viṣṇu, and Sūrya.258

Joint Patronage of Buddhism and Śaivism in the Kingdoms of the Khmers, Chams, and Javanese

Much the same phenomenon can be seen in Southeast Asia among the Khmers, the Chams, and the Javanese. Among the first the dominant religion was Śaivism until the rise of the Theravāda that accompanied the decline of Angkor, and Tantric Buddhism, even when it enjoyed short periods of prominence through exceptionally determined royal patronage, found itself bound, as I have shown elsewhere, to accommodate its rival.259

In the kingdoms of the Chams, speakers of an Austronesian language who inhabited the plains along the coast of the South China Sea in what is now the central part of Vietnam, most of the inscriptions that have survived, in Sanskrit and Old Cham, ranging in time from the fourth to the fifteenth centuries, record acts of royal piety to Śiva or to goddesses identified with his consort. There are also a few from the ninth and tenth centuries that record the installation of Tantric Mahāyānist Lokeśvaras, the construction of associated Vihāras, and land-grants to these. But as in eastern India we find in these that single donors supported both religions. Indeed the situation is more striking here because in all but one case each of these inscriptions records a person’s practising both kinds of patronage, Buddhist and Śaiva.260 Thus in the Bakul stele of 829 a Buddhist monk Sthavira Buddhanirvāṇa records that his father Samanta has donated two Vihāras to the Buddha and two temples to Śiva.261 The Dong Duong stele of 875 records that King Jayendavarman alias Lakṣmīndra enshrined a Lakṣmīndra-lokeśvara and an associated Vihāra, yet the bulk of this long inscription is devoted to the praise of the Śiva Bhadreśvara, who, we are told, is the source of this dynasty’s power and prosperity.262 The Nhan-bieu stele records that in 908 Pov

---


259 On the co-existence of Śaivism and Tantric Buddhism in the Khmer kingdom of Angkor see SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 421–435.

260 The exception is the An-thai stele of 902 (HUBER 1911, pp. 277–282), which records that the Buddhist monk Sthavira Nāgapuṣpa, a close associate of Bhadravarman II, installed a Pramuditalokeśvara, and also that this king made a land-grant to the associated monastery (Pramuditalokeśvaravihāra).


262 FINOT 1904a, pp. 84–99.
kleñ Sudañña[vā]sa and his son Pov kleñ Dharmapātha installed a Śiva Deva-
liṅgeśvara and in 911, the year of the inscription, built a Vihāra for a Vṛddha-
lokeśvara, which is to say, a Vihāra associated with a deity Vṛddhalokeśvara,
which was installed there around this time since it is evident from its name that
it was established with the name of their grandmother, princess Lyañ Vṛddha-
kulā, the grandmother of the senior wife of Jayasimhavarman I.263 A stele at
Mi-son of 1092 records that King Jayendravarman (alias Paramabuddhaloka),
described as versed both in the Mahāyāna and in the brahmanical Dharma-
śāstras, established two Buddhist deities, a Buddhalokeśvara and a Jayendra-
lokeśvara, but also two goddesses, a Jayendreśvari, and an Indragaurīśvari, both
probably Śaiva, and between 1085 and the year of the inscription gave to Śiva
Īśānavadhreśvara a Liṅga-sheath of gold and silver alloy adorned with jewels,
an inner shrine of sandalwood, silver, gold, and jewels, various items of gold and
silver, elephants, and male and female slaves, and beautified his temple with
silver and gilded its pinnacles.264

This co-ordination of the two faiths is also evident in eastern Java. The ‘Cal-
cutta’ stone inscription of Airlangga (c. 1010–1050), founder of the kingdom of
Kahuripan, reports in its Old Javanese section that he was consecrated as the
king in 1019/20 by Buddhist (Saugata), Śaiva (Māheśvara), and Mahābrāhmaṇa
dignitaries;265 and much evidence of the simultaneous royal support of both
Śaivism and Buddhism during the Singhasari and Majapahit periods (1222–
1292, 1293–c. 1500) is present in the Old Javanese poem Nāgarakṛtāgama, also
called Desawarnāna, completed in 1365 by Mpu Prapāṇca during the reign of
Hayām Wuruk of Majapahit, consecrated as Rājasanagara (1350–1389). We
learn from this work that both Śaiva and Buddhist priests participated in pe-
riodic ceremonies for the benefit of the realm within the great courtyard in-
side the royal gate of the palace compound,266 that the administrative heads

263 HUBER 1911, pp. 299–311.
264 FINOT 1904b, pp. 970–975.
yan rake halu śrī lokesvaradharma pañna a iraṅga naśantawikramottungadeva-
sangīṇā kāśvan śrī mahārājā, de mpunku so gata maheśvara mahābrāhmaṇa iri-
kang śākakāla 941. Wherefore he was confirmed with blessings by the high digni-
taries of the Buddhists, Śaivas, and Mahābrāhmaṇas under the name of Rake Halu
Lokeśvara Dharmavamsa Airlangga Anantavikramottungadeva in Śaṅka 941’.
266 Nāgarakṛtāgama 8.3–4; PIGEAUD 1960–1963, vol. 4, p. 13. This event is referred
to by PIGEAUD in his translation (1960–63, vol. 3, p. 10) as “purification (cere-
monies)”. The term used here is the Sanskrit prāyaścittam (8.3d: prāyaścitta ri kālaning *srauvana [conj. PIGEAUD : grahana Cod.] phalguna makaphala hay-
waning sabhūwana). The function of the ceremony, therefore, was expiatory: to
cancel the effects of any errors, omissions, or excesses in observances and con-
duct during the period since the last performance. KERN, accepting the reading
(dharmādhyakṣa) of these two communities had official quarters in the east and west to the south of the royal compound,267 and that his sovereign was dedicated

grahaṇa phalguṇa, took the occasion to be an eclipse during the month Phālguna. As Pīgæaud saw, this is implausible. He therefore proposed that grahaṇa is an error for śravaṇa ‘the month Śrāvaṇa’, making this ceremony bi-annual and noting that the resulting timing coincides with that of the two major festivals of the Majapahit court (1960–63, vol. 2, pp. 21–22). A trace of this co-functionality has survived into modern times on the island of Bali, where there are both Śaiva and Buddhist priests (padanda), with the latter now forming a small minority, about 1 in 10 and less than twenty in all (Hooykaas 1973, pp. 5 and 8), which sometimes had a role in state-sponsored rituals (Stuart-Fox 2002, pp. 324 and 326).

267 Nāgarakṛtāgama 12.5; Pīgæaud 1960–1963, vol. 4, p. 25. For a map showing the location of these quarters within the palace compound (kraton) see Hall 1996, p.99. Pīgæaud claims (ibid.) that both are regularly mentioned in the preambles of the royal charters of Majapahit. This is so in the Decree Jaya Song of c. 1350, the Ferry Charter of 1358, and the undated Charter of Batur (Pīgæaud 1960–1963, vol. 1, pp.104–114 [edition]; vol. 3, pp.151–164 [translation]). They are named in the first after the ministers: the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Śaivas (dharmādhyakṣa ring kaśewan), Rājapārakrama, alias Dharma-rāja, and the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Buddhists (dharmādhyakṣa ring kaso-gatan) Āryādhīrāja Kanakamuni, described as a master of the Buddha’s teachings and grammar (bodhasāstrāvayākaraṇaśastrapurakāraṇamāpta). In the second the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Buddhists has become Nādentra, described in the same way (bodhayatpurakāraṇaśastrapurakāraṇamāpta) and we learn that the second name Dharmarāja of the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Śaivas is his nāma puspapāta, that is to say, the name he acquired during his initiation through the casting of a flower (puspapāṭaḥ) in accordance with standard Śaiva procedure (e.g. Svacchanda-tantra 4.62cd: puspapāṭaśaṅk nāma kārayet sādhakasya tu ‘He should name the Śadha in accordance with the casting of the flower’; Bhātakālotāra f. 91v 4: puspapāṭasūkṣmaśāṃjā *tapūrvato [em.: tapūrato Cod.] hitā ‘The [element of the] name before that [such as -śiva which indicates the initiate’s caste] should be [given] in accordance with the casting of the flower’). In the third the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Buddhists is Āryādhīrāja [Kanakamuni], as in the first, described as a master of grammar and the [Buddhist] Tantras (wyakaraṇaśastrapurakāraṇamāpta), and that of the Śaivas is Ārya Harsarāja, described as a master of logic and grammar (nyāyapāṭaśaṅkṣaśastrapurakāraṇamāpta). They are mentioned along with a number of other learned men, six in the first, seven in the second, and five in the third, referred to as “teachers of Law and settlers of law suits” (dharmaprapa-wakta wyawahāraśicchedaka) in the first and second and as “settlers of law suits as valid or not” (nyāyāyāyawahāraśicchedaka) in the third. They are no doubt the officials referred to elsewhere as the Dharmopapattis (see here p.105). In the first they are (1) Śīwanātha, (2) Marmanātha, (3) Smaranātha, (4) Jayasmarā, (5) Agreśwara, and (6) Munindra. In the second they are (1) Śīwanātha, (2) Agreśwara, (3) Jayasmarā, (4) Widyānātha, (5) Śivādhīpa, (6) Śrīghana, and (7) Samatājānāna. In the third they are (1) Marmanātha, (2) Smaranātha, (3) Mahānātha, (4) a second Smaranātha, and (5) Agreśwara. Munindra in the first and Śrīghana and Samatājānāna in the second were Buddhists, a fact already evident from their names but confirmed by the charters’ reports of their fields of expert knowledge. We learn from the first charter that Śīwanātha, Smaranātha, and Agreśwara were adherents of the Bhairava sect (bhairawapakṣa), that is to say, Śākta Śaivas, and that
to the support of both religions (81.1–2). Moreover, in the opening verse of his poem he pays homage to him as Śiva-Buddha in human form.\(^{268}\)

Particularly striking are passages that report the deity-images or temples in which the souls of deceased kings had been installed. Ranggah Rājasā (r. 1222–1227), was enshrined in two temples, one Śaiva and the other Buddhist, in a single temple complex at Kangēnēgan;\(^{269}\) and both Śaiva and Buddhist priests were seated beside king Rājasanagara when he sat in audience after worshipping here.\(^{270}\) Anuśapati (r. 1227–1248) was installed in a Śiva image at Kīḍāl;\(^{271}\) Viṣṇuvardhana (r. 1248–1268) in a Śiva image at Waleri and a Buddha image

Marmanātha and Jayasmara were adherents of the Saura sect (\textit{srorakṣa}), that is to say, Śūrya worshippers (see here p.58). The second and third charters do not specify the sects of the judges listed, so that the affiliations of Widyānātha, Śivādhipa, one of the two Smaranāthas, and Mahānātha are unknown. It is striking that these judicial boards included no Vaishnavas. The absence of a representative of the Rṣi sect, often grouped with those of the Śaivas and Buddhists as one of the three principal denominations in Java (e.g. \textit{Arjunawijaya} 28.1c: ṛṣi śaiva sogata; \textit{Kuṇjarakarna} 22.3c: sang boddhaisavārṣipakṣa), is not surprising. For its followers were forest-dwelling hermits. The \textit{Kuṇjarakarna} associates them with the worship of the [Pāṣupata] \textit{paṇcakauṣṭika}; see 23.1d: lwi glar sogata paṇcabadhā ṛṣi \textit{paṇcakauṣṭika} wiku śaivapaṇcaka; and TEEUW and ROBSON 1981, p.26. See also SANDERSON 2005a, pp.374–376. The creation of the post of a Dharmādhyakṣa of the Buddhists and the inclusion of Buddhists on the judicial board were perhaps recent developments. For the Sarwadharma charter issued in 1269 during the reign of Kṛtanagara (PIGEAUD 1960–1963, vol. 1, pp.99–103 [edition]; vol. 3, pp.143–150) mentions only a Dharmādhyakṣa of the Śaivas (Ācārya Śivanātha Tanutama: \textit{mpungku dharmmadhyakṣa ri kaśewan ḏaṅg ācārya śivanātha mapanji tanutama}) together with a board of five other Ācāryas, Dharmadeva, Smaraḍahana, Smaradewa, another Śivanātha, and Agraja, not one of whom has an obviously Buddhist name (plate 2, recto, ll.4–7).

\(^{268}\) \textit{Nāgarakṛtāgama} 1.1bc: śiva būḍdha sīra sakalaniśkālāmākā | sang śriparavutanāṭātha ‘The Lord of the Mountain, protector of the unprotected, the holy Śiva-Buddha, who is both manifest [in physical form] and transcendent’. The Lord of the Mountain (\textit{śriparavutanāṭātha}) addressed in this verse has been understood, implausibly, as Śiva. I am entirely persuaded by the evidence presented by SUPOMO (1972; 1977, pp.69–82) that it is the king that is intended in this and the opening verse of Mpu Tantular’s \textit{Arjunawijaya}, where the Lord of the Mountain, in this case called Parwatarājadeva, is identified as the physical manifestation of the ultimate reality that is the Buddha (1.1b: sang sāksāt paramārthabuddha).

\(^{269}\) \textit{Nāgarakṛtāgama} 40.5d: sang dinārmadāwaiya ri kaganaṅ gśevasabodād usāna. PIGEAUD translates \textit{dinārmadāwaiya} as ‘a double dharma (religious domain)’ (1960–1963, vol. 3, p.46) and ROBSON (1995, p.5) as ‘a double temple’. I do not see that the expression, which is equivalent to Skt. \textit{dharmadāwan}, conveys anything more than the fact that there were two temples. Cf. SANTOSO 1975, p.54.

\(^{270}\) \textit{Nāgarakṛtāgama} 36.2b: \textit{parā wiku śai sogata āryya nālīgīḥ iniring nirekhi tān adoh}.

\(^{271}\) \textit{Nāgarakṛtāgama} 41.1d: \textit{pradīpa śiwa bimba} (KERN : śimbha PIGEAUD) śobhita rikang sudharma ri kīḍāl.
at Jajaghu;\textsuperscript{272} Kr\text{\-}tanagara, r. 1268–1292, who is depicted as a devout initiated Tantric Buddhist and described after his death as “liberated in the world of Siva-Buddha”,\textsuperscript{273} and was installed in a Siva-Buddha in “his own place” and, with his queen, Vajradevi, in a Buddhist image combining Vairocana and Locana at Sagala.\textsuperscript{274} K\text{\-}rtar\text{\-}jasa Jayavardhana (r. 1293–1309) was installed in a Buddha in the palace and a Siva at Simping,\textsuperscript{275} and Jayan\text{g}ara (r. 1309–1326), who is described as having returned to the world of Vis\text{n}\textus,\textsuperscript{276} in Vis\text{n}\textus in the royal compound, Shil\text{\-}P\text{\-}etak, and Bubat, and in a Buddha in the form of Amoghasiddhi in Sukhalila.\textsuperscript{277} We also learn that there was a temple founded by Kr\text{\-}tanagara at Jajawa, located at the foot of the sacred mountain Kukuwus, which was Siva but had a Buddhist pinnacle and contained a Siva with an image of Aks\text{\-}obhya above its crown, and that both Buddhists and Sivas worshipped in it.\textsuperscript{278} The in-

\textsuperscript{272} N\text{\-}garak\text{\-}t\text{\-}gama 41.4b: \textit{d\text{-}inarma ma ta sire waleri s\text{-}iwawimbha len sugata\text{-}wimbha mung\text{-}ving jajaghu.}

\textsuperscript{273} N\text{\-}garak\text{\-}t\text{\-}gama 43.5c: \textit{sang mokteng s\text{-}iwabuddalo\text{-}kha.} His commitment to Buddhism is indicated in 42.3c (\textit{samaya len brata mapag\text{-}\text{\-}k\text{\-}sa sogata}) and 43.2a (\textit{bhakti ri pada sri \text{\-}sakya\text{\-}sinh\text{\-}h\text{\-}\text{\-}h\text{\-}\text{\-}t\text{\-}t\text{\-}i}). As for his involvement in Tantric Buddhism we learn that he received Buddha consecration (\textit{jin\text{\-}abhis\text{\-}ekah}) and was then given the name J\text{\-}n\text{\-}ana\text{\-}sivavajra (43.2bc: \textit{\text{\-}sr\text{\-}i j\text{\-}n\text{\-}ana\text{\-}sivavajr\text{\-}a\text{\-}ka\text{\-}y\text{\-}a\text{\-}s cittaratnavibh\text{\-}\text{\-}us. an. ah. j\text{\-}j\text{\-}n\text{\-}ana\text{\-}s\text{\-}iv\text{\-}vajra\text{\-}kkh\text{\-}a\text{\-}s sittaratnavibh\text{\-}\text{\-}us. an. ah.}); 19d: \textit{vajraj\text{\-}nana\text{\-}siva + +}). All three forms of the name have the appearance of a Siva-Buddhist hybrid.

\textsuperscript{274} N\text{\-}garak\text{\-}t\text{\-}gama 43.5d: \textit{ri\text{\-}nke st\text{\-}hananir\text{\-}n d. inarmma \text{\-}siwawimbha \text{\-}l\text{\-}en sugata\text{-}wimbha rint\text{\-}t\text{\-}a jinawimbha sireng pur\text{\-}a tampid. pur\text{\-}a pratima wis. n. um \text{\-}urtyy anupama ring sukhal\text{\-}la tang sugata\text{-}wimbha \text{\-}sobh\text{\-}han amoghasiddhi sakala}. His installation in Vis\text{n}\textus is without parallel among the Singhasari-Majapahit kings; see PIGEAUD 1960–1963, vol. 4, p. 141. However, the kings of Kad\text{\-}iri, the principal court of East Java through the twelfth century to c. 1222, were devotees of this god. Most were described as his embodiments (DE CASPARIS and MABBETT 1992, p. 327) and his incarnations are central to the literary epics (\textit{kakawin}) of the Kad\text{\-}iri court (HALL 2005, pp. 2 and 8).

\textsuperscript{278} N\text{\-}garak\text{\-}t\text{\-}gama 56.1b–2c: \textit{k\text{\-}ir\text{\-}tt\text{\-}i s\text{\-}ri k\text{\-}rtan\text{\-}gara prabh\text{\-}u yuyut nare\text{\-}swara sira |
timate co-existence of the two traditions is also apparent in the intertextuality of religious texts in Java, as has been demonstrated for the Śaiva Āśvaghoṣa and the Tantric Buddhist Sang hyang Kamahāyānīkaṇa and Kalpabuddha. It is also seen in the great frequency with which the Mahāyāna-Buddhist concept of emptiness (śūnyatā) is incorporated in Javanese Śaiva sources through the inclusion of the terms śunya and śūnyatā among those used to characterize the highest reality, in the readiness of the redactors of Śaiva liturgies to supplement sets of Śaiva elements with Buddhist elements when they needed to make up a total for the sake of the numerical correspondence, and in the fact that the Kuṇjarakarṇa of the Buddhist Mpu Dusun the supreme Buddhist deity Vairo-


280 See, e.g., Jñānasiddhānta 3.2–3: nādaś ca liyate śuṇye śuṇyam eva tu jāyate | śuṇyac chāñyataran vāpi atyantaśuṇyalaṅkananam || sthūlam sakalatattvam ca sūkṣmam sakalaniskalam | param nīskalasūnyam ca urdhvātyurdhattiśūnyakam; 8.3: sthūlam sabdamayaṃ prōktam sūkṣ maṃ cittamaṃ bhavet | param cittavirahitam cittam tvātvātīśūnyatā; Gaṇapatitattva 2: śuṣo niḥśvasāḥ samyoga ātmatrayam iti smṛtam | trīśivaṃ tripurūṣatvam aikātmya eva śūnyata; 23: hrdayasthāṃ sadāśivaṃ hrdayānte guhyālayam/ śūnyātiśūnyam cintyam param kaivalyam ucyate; Mahājñāna 62: sūryakotisahasrāṃśu hrdayam vimalam śubham | hrdayānte padam śuṇyam paraṃ kaivalyam ucyate; 83: rātriś ca prakṛṭi jñeyā raviś ca puruṣas tathā | dyutis ca vā mahādevaḥ śuṇyam ca paramaḥ śivaḥ. I consider it highly probable that these Sanskrit works are Javanese creations. Some of the verses can be found in Indian Śaiva sources: Wrhaspatitattva 53 and Gaṇapatitattva 3 < Rauravasūtrasamgraha 7.5; Jñānasiddhānta 19.5 and and Gaṇapatitattva 43 < Kiranā 1.23; Wrhaspatitattva 7–10 < Svāyambhuvasūtrasamgraha 4.3–6. But these are surprisingly few, and the works contain several doctrinal elements that are alien to known Indian traditions. Moreover, the deviations from strict Sanskrit usage found in them seem to me not to be characteristic of the registers of the language seen in Indian Śaiva scriptural texts. The same is true of the frequent deviations from the correct form of the Anuṣṭubh in the second and fourth Pādas: e.g. Gaṇapatitattva 1d, 16d, 48d, 49b, 49d, 54b, 54d, 55b, 59b, 59d; Mahājñāna 11d, 37b, 38d, 42b, 61b, 73b, 74b, 78b, 78d, 80d; Wrhaspatitattva 3b, 6b, 6d, 12b, 20d, 23b, 24b, 25b, 63b, 72d. This is extremely rare in Indian Śaiva texts.

281 See the example of this cited in Sanderson 2005a, p. 377.
The Śaiva Age

cana is made to equate the divine pentads of the Śaiva and [Pāśupata] Rṣi sects with the five Tathāgatas, teaching this in the context of an assertion that he is the ultimate reality that assumes the form both of the Buddha and of Śiva, and that it is because the followers of the three sects fail to understand this undifferentiated ground that they dispute with each other for the pre-eminence of their respective Gods. The same idea is seen in the works of the Buddhist Mpu Tantular. In his Arjunawijaya he has the priest of a Buddhist temple-complex (boddhadharma) explain to Arjuna that its central deity Vairocana is one with Sadāśiva, that its four ancillary deities, the directional Tathāgatas Akṣobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha, and Amoghasiddhi, are one with Rudra, Brahmā, Mahādeva, and Viṣṇu respectively, that there is no distinction between the Buddha and Śiva, and that therefore it is the king’s duty to support all three sects, the Buddhists, the Śaivas, and the Rṣis. Later, in his Sutasoma, Mpu Tantular states that the Buddha and Śiva are “different but one” (bhinneka tunggal ika), the famous formula that has been adopted as its official national motto by the modern state of Indonesia, as two manifestations of the ultimate reality of the former.

---

282 Kuṇjarakarṇa 23.1d: lwir glar sogata pañcabuddha rṣi pañcakuśika wiku śaiwa pañcaka ‘As the Buddhists have the five Buddhas, the Rṣis have the pentad of Kuśika and the Śaivas a pentad of their own’; 23.4bcd: ngwang wairocana buddhamūrti śiwmūrti pinakaguru ning jagat kabeh | nāham donku ingaran bhaṭāra guru kaprakasita tēka ring sarāt kabeh | anging byāpaka ring samastabhuwanāku juga warawisesadevatā ‘I, Vairocana, am embodied both as the Buddha and as Śiva, and am accepted as Guru by all. Therefore it is I that am Bhaṭāra Guru, famed among all men, and it is I, as the highest deity, that pervade all the worlds.’

283 Kuṇjarakarṇa 22.3.

284 Arjunawijaya 26.4–27.1

285 Arjunawijaya 27.2abc: ndah kantēnanya haji tan hana bheda sang hyang | hyang buddha rakwa kalawan śiwa rājadewa | kālīh samēka sira sang pinakes. t.idharma.

286 Arjunawijaya 30.1–2.

287 Sutasoma 139.5: hyang buddha tan pahi lawan śiwarājadewa | rwānekadhātu winuwus warabuddhawiśwa | bhinnēki rakwa ring apa n kēna parwanōsēn | mangka ng jinatwa kalawan śiwatattwa tunggal | bhinnēka tunggal ika tan hana dharma mangrwa. This has been translated by SUPOMO (1977, p. 7) as follows: “The god Buddha is not different from Śiwa, the lord of the gods. The excellent Buddha, the all-pervading, is said to be two different dhātu. Yet although these two dhātu are different, how is it possible to differentiate between them at a glance? In the same manner, the reality that is Jina and the reality that is Śiva are one; they are different yet they are one, for there is no duality in the dharma”. Commenting on “the two different dhātu” mentioned in this verse (fn. 9) SUPOMO take them to be the two Maṇḍalas, the Garbhadhātu and the Vajradhātu of the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi and Sarvatathāgatattvatasamgraha respectively. This reading is an error in my view. It does not accord with context, which requires that the two be the realities of the Buddha (jinatwa) and Śiva (śiwatattwa) respectively. As I understand it, the passage is saying that the Lord Buddha is both the Buddha
The Development of Tantric Buddhism Through the Adoption and Adaptation of Śaiva and Śākta Śaiva Models

The Parallel Repertoire of Rituals

Now, this co-existence of Buddhism and Śaivism under royal patronage was surely facilitated by the fact that the form of Buddhism adopted and developed was one that had equipped itself not only with a pantheon of ordered sets of deities that permitted such subsumptive equations but also with a repertoire of Tantric ceremonies that paralleled that of the Śaivas and indeed had modelled itself upon it, offering initiation by introduction before a Maṇḍala in which the central deity of the cult and its retinue of divine emanations have been installed, and a system of regular worship animated by the principle of identification with the deity of initiation (devatāhaṁkārah, devatāgarvah) through the use of Mantras, Mudrās, visualization, and fire-sacrifice (homah); and this was presented not only as a new and more powerful means of attaining Buddha-hood but also, as in the Śaiva case, as enabling the production of supernatural effects (śiddhiḥ) such as the averting of danger (śāntiḥ), the harming of enemies (abhicārah), and the control of the rain (vāraṣṇaṁ and ativṛṣṭidhāraṇaṁ), through symbolically appropriate inflections of the constituents of these procedures. The latter is particularly important from the point of view of Buddhism’s relations with its royal patrons, since such rituals enabled it to match the Śaivas by promising kings more tangible benefits than the mere accumulation of merit through the support of the Buddha, his teaching, and the Saṅgha. We have seen an example of such ritual for the protection of the state in Tāranātha’s report of the programme of Tantric fire-sacrifices performed at Vikramāśila under the direction of Buddhajñāna during the reign of Dharmapaṇa (r. c. 775–812) to ensure the longevity of the Pāla dynasty; we have another example in the case of Kṛtipaṇḍita, a Mahāyāna-Buddhist scholar and Tantric expert who according to the Vat Sīthor stele inscription became the Guru of the Khmer king Jayavarman V (r. 968–1001) and was engaged by him to perform frequent fire-sacrifices in the palace for the protection of the kingdom; and the Javanese Prapaṇca tells us that the purpose of king Kṛtanagara’s adherence to Tantric Buddhism was

and Śiva, whereas SUPOMO’s reading makes Mpu Tantular espouse a doctrine of absolute equality between the two religions within a reality beyond both. This is intrinsically implausible in a Buddhist work. My reading makes his view exactly that expressed by Mpu Dusun in 23.4bcd of the Kuṇjarakarṇa cited and translated above: “I, Vairocana, am embodied both as the Buddha and as Śiva”.

288 See here p.93.
to increase his people’s prosperity and the stability of his realm, and that its reward was the undiminished and undivided sovereignty (ekachakra) of his descendants.\textsuperscript{290}

The adoption of the Śaiva practice of Maṇḍala initiation created a further line of access to patronage and was propagated vigorously, as it was by the Śaivas, as a means of the recruiting of social élites both in the subcontinent and beyond.\textsuperscript{291} Among the Buddhist Tantras at least two major texts teach rituals of initiation, or consecration (abhisekaḥ) as it is called in these sources, in which it is kings in particular and royalty in general that are envisaged as the primary initiands. These are the Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa and the Sarvadurgatipariṣodhanatantra.\textsuperscript{292} In the former this is so for the principal Kalpa of the text. In the latter it is characteristic of initiation into the secondary Maṇḍalas of the four Great Kings and the ten Guardians of the Directions taught in the Uttarakalpa. The sections dealing with these Maṇḍalas specify the king as the principal consecrand, teach little or no required subsequent practice, and promise benefits that apply principally to him, namely the protection of himself and his kingdom and the destruction of the kingdoms of his enemies. The monarch is not mentioned in the treatments of initiation given in the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi and Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha, the two great Tantras that were translated into Chinese in the early eighth century to form the basis of the Way of Mantras there and in the Japanese Shingon and Tendai sects. But the ninth-century Indian authority Ānandagarbha brings this aspect of the religion to the fore in his Sarvavajrodaya, an influential manual that sets out detailed practical guidance for the performance of the initiation ritual taught in the second of those texts but draws heavily on the more detailed treatment in the first. For when he teaches the preparation of the Maṇḍala he prescribes a range of sizes beginning with that appropriate for the initiation of the monarch. In his case each of the sides should measure one hundred or fifty cubits (about 40 and 20 metres), in the case of a feudatory (sāmantaḥ) or major feudatory (mahāsāmantaḥ) fifty or twenty-five, in the case of a wealthy merchant (śresthi) or international trader (sārthavāhaḥ) twenty-five or half of that, and in the case of an ordinary practitioner (sādhakaḥ)

\textsuperscript{290} Nāgarakṛtāgama 42.3d: tumīrva sang atitarāja ring usāna magēhakna wrddining jagat; 43.3c: pūjā yoga samādi pinirhira amriḥ sthityaning rāt kabeḥ; 43.4cd: darmmeṣṭāpagēh ing jinabrata mahotsāheng prayogakriyā nāhan hetuni tusni tusnira padaikaccatra dewaprabhu.

\textsuperscript{291} On the adoption by the Buddhists of the practice of royal initiation and its propagation in India, Tibet, Mongolia, China, Japan, and Southeast Asia see SANDERSON forthcoming\textsuperscript{a}.

\textsuperscript{292} Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa, p. 32, ll. 21, 23, and 28–30; Sarvadurgatipariṣodhanatantra, sections 47b, 48a, and 49a.
twelve or six (about 5 or 2.5 metres).\footnote{Sarvavajrodaya, f. 29r5-29v1: evam kṛtvā pūrvasevām maṇḍalam ālikhet. . . . rājīto hasṭasatam paṇcāsaddhastam vā sāmantaMahāsāmantaṁ paṇcāsat paṇcaviṃśatihastam vā śreṣṭhinaḥ sārthavāhasya vā paṇcaviṃśatiḥ tadarthaṁ vā sādhakānāṁ dvādaśahastam sadghastam vā.}

The Mantranaya also followed the example of the Śaivas by devising Tantric ceremonies for patrons in the public domain: for the consecration (pratiṣṭhā) of temple images (pratimā), paintings of deities on cloth (paṭah), manuscripts of sacred texts (pustakam), monasteries (vihāraḥ), shrines (gandhakuti), Caityas, reservoirs (puṣkarinyyādi), gardens and the like (ārāmādi). It also adapted the Śaiva procedures for funerary initiation to produce a Tantric Buddhist funeral...
rite (antyeṣṭiḥ)\textsuperscript{294} for initiates,\textsuperscript{295} in which, as in the Śaiva case (antyeṣṭidīkṣā), the officiant draws the consciousness (jñānām) of the deceased back into the corpse from the other world, takes it again through the initiatory process of consecration and the rest (abhiṣekādi) before a Maṇḍala,\textsuperscript{296} and then sends it out through the top of the head to ascend to liberation or a pure Buddha-field such as Sukhāvatī.\textsuperscript{297}

reading my remark that I had not yet seen the manuscript very kindly acquired and sent me scans of it.

\textsuperscript{295} According to Padmaśrīmitra the ritual is to be done for Ācāryas and others who have practised the meditation-rite of Vajrasattva or some other Tantric deity; f. 15r8, v. 1: mṛtācāryādīsattvā ye vajrasattvādiyogināḥ | vakṣ<e>cāntasthite<h> krtyaṃ teṣām mārganidarsanāt. It may be done for a man or a woman; f. 15r10–11, v. 9ab: purusatanu<m> nirūpāyāta striyo và samyag eva hi. Śūnyasamādhivajrā does not specify those for whom it is intended. But Jagaddarpana adds a preamble to Śūnyasamādhivajrā’s text in which he restricts it to Vajrācāryas; f. 240v7: adhunā parinirvartavājrayāsairārāşyānteṣṭividhir ucyate.

\textsuperscript{296} Man. d. alopāyikā, f. 15r14, vv. 21c–22b: tato vijñānām ānīya mantramudrānuyogataḥ || anuśuṣṭyāyaiḥ praveṣyātha dādyaṭ sekādikāṃ punaḥ Then having drawn down the consciousness [of the deceased] by means of the Mantras and Mudrās, and having caused it to enter [the corpse] by means of the Mudrās beginning with the Hook, he should again give it the consecrations and the rest’; Mrta-sugatiniyojana, f. 2r3–4: tato nayet suraktavarn. am. (conj. [Tib. mdog dmar gsal ba]: suraktam. svadhām) paralokasam. sthitam. jñānām. dharmamukham. tād viṣṇūnam. nivātanis. kampad. (conj. jñānām. mr. tasya hr. daye praveṣyāt śīrasā Then he should draw down the consciousness [of the deceased] that is in the world beyond, [visualizing it as] bright red in colour or with the shape of the letter A (the dharmamukham), the Ācārya should trace and worship the Maṇḍala, offer a Bali, and then place the corpse at its east gate with its head to the south; f. 15r12–13, vv. 12–13b: same viśuddhabhūhāge gomayenopalepite | maṇḍalam catuṣram vai kārayet tatra samkīret || suklam pītam rajo vāpi tatra padma*dalāsatakam. caiva sam- sādhya maṇḍalam kṛti | sthāpayen maṇḍaladvāri prācyām tu daksīṇāmukham.

\textsuperscript{297} In the Maṇḍalācāryā’s prescription the Ācārya visualizes that the purified consciousness of the deceased is drawn out of the corpse by a multitude of rejoicing deities filling the sky and placed by them in a world such as Sukhāvatī inhabited by Buddhas and Bodhisattvas; f. 15v2–3: 28 saṃbuddhabodhisattvādi-virinīvīrvārnadakaiḥ | siddhagandharvabhujagaiḥ surair vidyādharaī apro || 29 pūraṇa nabhastalam viśṣya *nipatatpavṛṣṭikam (nipatat em. : nipatatāh Cod.) | tad divyadundhubhūnamurajā*mardaladhvani (mardala conj. : mardala Cod.); f. 15r13, vv. 18c–19: uttarābhimukho maṇtri saṃpuṣṭya maṇḍalaṃ balīṃ || dattvārghādikām caiva saṃ- sādhya maṇḍalam kṛti | sthāpayen maṇḍaladvāri prācyām tu daksīṇāmukham.
That this transformation of the Mahāyāna had been achieved by absorbing and adapting non-Buddhist practices was evident from the beginning. For the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi, our first major Buddhist Tantra, later classified as the principal work of the Caryātantra class, was conscious that it would be accused of just this:

> O [Vajrapāṇi,] Lord of the Yakṣas, in time to come there will arise people of inferior understanding and no faith who will not believe this teaching. They will dissent and have many doubts. They will hear it but they will not take it to heart and they will refuse to put it into practice. Being themselves unworthy they will bring others too to ruin. [For] they will say that this is not the teaching of the Buddhas but belongs to the outsiders.
The Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa, another early Buddhist Tantric text, assigned to the lowest class of Mantranaya texts, known as the Kriyātantras, is more explicit in this regard; and it has good reason to be so since it contains in its chapters 47–49 an assimilated version of the cult of Tumburu and his four sisters, that is to say, the cult of the vāmasrotaḥ division of the Śaiva Vidyāpiṭha, describing the Mantras of these deities as the highest and most secret of all the non-Buddhist (laukika-) Mantras. Moreover, it teaches that any of the

---

300 The date of this text is obscure. MATSUNAGA (1985) is of the opinion that the 9th chapter, on applications of the Ekākṣaramantra, was in existence before the Chinese translations T. 1181 of A.D. 702 and T. 1182 of A.D. 703. He also informs us (ibid.) that the first ninety percent of the Chinese translation of the Garudapātalaparivarta (T. 1276), produced at some time between 746 and 774, is identical with the first sixty percent of the 41st chapter of the Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa as edited. The translation is attributed to Amoghavajra (705–774), but MATSUNAGA observes (ibid.) that only the first part of the common text is in keeping with his other translations, the latter part containing elements such as human hair, beef, and skull-cups, which taken together are altogether alien to his Mantranaya. He strengthens the hypothesis that only the first part of this translation is by Amoghavajra with the evidence of the Go-shōrai mokuroku, a catalogue of the Buddhist texts brought from China to Japan by Kūkai in 806, which lists this text as occupying three sheets, a third of the length of T. 1276. The prophetic history of Indian Buddhism, the Rājavyākarana, chapter 53 of the published Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa, cannot be earlier that the late eighth century since it knows of the Pāla king Gopaḷa (r.c. 750–775) (53.628; and 53.816: tataḥ pareṇa “bhūpālo gopaḷo [em.: bhūpālā gopaḷā Ed.] dāsa jīvināḥ | bhavisyati”). Since it does not mention his successor Dharmapāla it is unlikely to be later.

301 Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa, introductory prose before 47.1: sarvalaukikamantrānāṁ saṅrabhūtatamam paramarahasyaṁ. The position within Śaivism assigned by this text to the cult of the four sisters suggests that, though later largely eclipsed by other traditions of the Vidyāpiṭha, it was once pre-eminent; and this is also circumstantial evidence in favour of the hypothesis proposed above (p. 50) that this cult was one of the earliest, perhaps the earliest, of the esoteric Śaiva systems. There is certainly much other evidence of its early centrality. As we have seen, it was known to Dharmakirti (here p. 50), and a 6th-century manuscript of one of its texts survives amid the otherwise Buddhist Gilgit manuscripts (here p. 50). The Viṣṇudharmottara shows knowledge of only two Śaiva deity-systems in its section on iconography: the Saiddhāntika and this (3, Adhyāya 66, teaches the iconography of Tumburu and his sisters). The Advaitin Śaṅkara in his Gitābhāṣya on Bhaṅgavadgitā 9.25, in which it is said that those who worship the Spirits (bhūtejyāḥ) reach the Spirits (bhūtāni yānti) [when they die], glosses bhūtāni as vināyakamātragnacaturbhaginyādini ‘such as Vināyaka, the Mothers, and the Four Sisters’. On his date, probably eighth century, see HARIMOTO 2006. These deities were also incorporated in the traditions of Maṇḍalas of the Nayasūtra and the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi that reached the Far East in the eighth century (see SANDERSON 2001, p. 8, fn. 5). Their cult was the basis of the Śaiva ritual performed to inaugurate the kingdom of Angkor at the beginning of the ninth century (ibid. and 2005a, pp. 355–358); and there too, where the Mantramārga was preserved in an early form, we see only the Siddhānta of its earliest texts and this cult. This co-existence is also evident in the Śaiva liturgies of Java and Bali, which are of Saiddhāntika character but incorporate these deities (see GOUDRIAAN 1973 and
Mantra-procedures taught in the Śaiva and Gāruḍa Tantras will be effective if applied by Buddhists in the Maṇḍala of these converted deities. Thus the Buddhists envisaged by this text have the whole array of Śaiva Mantras at their disposal; and this position, so surprising from the conventional Buddhist standpoint, is justified by the claim that what people have come to refer to as the Śaiva, Gāruḍa, and indeed Vaiṣṇava Tantras are in fact Buddhist, since they were first taught by Mañjuśrī in this “vast Kalpa”, that is to say, in the Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa or, more probably, in a hypothetical proto-text of which the actual text was thought to be an abbreviated redaction:

I have taught this Mantra [of Śiva] which together with the trident Mudrā destroys all demons, out of my desire to benefit living beings. Those living on the earth will say that its ancient Kalpa, that I taught in former times, was taught by Śiva. [But] the various excellent extensive [Kalpas] in the Śaiva Tantras are in fact my teachings.

... The extensive Kalpas that have been related in the Vaiṣṇavas Tantras were taught by Mañjughosa for living beings who could only be trained by [this] device.

... All the extensive Kalpas taught in the Gāruḍa Tantras were taught by me in order to benefit living beings.

... It was I that first taught, in this vast Kalpa, everything that the inhabitants of earth without exception refer to as the teaching of Śiva. It was only later that others taught in the various texts [considered to be taught by him] the Kalpamantras of the wise Śiva Tumburu the Trader.

---

303 Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa 47.98c–99b, 102ab, 103ab: yāvanti śaivatantre 'smim ye tantre cāpi gāruḍe || brahmādyair ṛṣimukhyaiś ca ... pūjitā kalpavistārā viṣṇurudrasavāsavaïḥ | ... tasmin maṇḍale *yojya (conj.: yojyā Ed.) siddhyantiha na samśayaḥ 'All the extensive Kalpas that have been taught in this Śaivaṭantra and, moreover, in the Gāruḍa, and worshipped by Brahmā and others, by the leading Rṣis, ... by Viṣṇu, Rudra, and Indra, will be mastered if applied in this Maṇḍala. Of this there is no doubt.
304 Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa 2.32–34b: eṣa mantra mayā proktah sattvānāṁ hitakāmyayā | śālamudrāsāmayuktaḥ sarvabhūtavināsakaḥ || 33 yan mayā kathitam pārvam kalpam asya purātanaṁ | śaivam iti vaksyante sattvā bhūtalavāṣinaḥ || 34 vividhā guṇavistārāḥ śaivatantre mayoditāḥ.
305 2.31c–32b: ya eva vaiṣṇave tantre kāthitāḥ kalpavistarāḥ || upāyavaineyasattvānāṁ mañjuḥoesaṁ bhāṣitaḥ.
306 2.37: yāvantaḥ gāruḍe tantre kāthitāḥ kalpavistarāḥ | te mayaivoditāḥ sarve sattvānāṁ hitakāranaṁ.
307 47.53–54: sarvān śaivam iti khyātaṁ sarvair bhūtalavāsibhiḥ | mayaiva nigaditaṁ.
If this is so, then the text has disarmed criticism that the Mantra-procedures that are presented as properly Buddhist in this text bear a suspiciously close resemblance to the non-Buddhist in their liturgical morphology. For if the Omniscient has revealed all forms of religion in consideration of the differing mental dispositions of his manifold audiences, then there is no reason at all why he should not in his wisdom have taught Tantric practice for Buddhists as well as for outsiders. The strict division between the Buddhist and the non-Buddhist has dissolved within a higher Buddhist intertextual unity. Indeed this very argument is deployed by *Buddhaguhya in the late eighth century in his commentary on the passage of the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi cited above.308 He argues that what those who attack this Tantra for containing elements proper to the non-Buddhist Tantras fail to realize is that those Tantras too were taught by the omniscient Buddha.309 So it follows that there nothing inherently un-Buddhist in

308 *Buddhaguhya’s teaching in the Kriyā- and Caryā- divisions of the Tantras is said by Gzhon nu dpal (Blue Annals, p. 351) to have been pre-eminent in Tibet during the first transmission of Esoteric Buddhism, from the latter half of the eighth century; and this is confirmed by the Tibetan inventory of Buddhist texts in translation compiled in the Ldan dkar palace in the early ninth century. Its small section of Tantras (gsang sngags kyi rgyud: entries 316–328) consists of nine texts of this class together with commentaries on the last four, of which three are ascribed to our author, those on the Vairocanābhisambodhi, the Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatejorājkalpa, and the Dhyānottara. The entry on the fourth commentary, that on the Subāhu[paripr. cchā], lacks the name of its author, but it is at least probable that it was from the same hand, since no other Indian commentary on this text is known. The loss of the Sanskrit originals of these and other works of early exegesis has left us without the means of confirming that his name, rendered Sangs rgyas gsang ba in Tibetan, was indeed Buddhaguhya, as modern scholarship has generally assumed. The evidence is inconclusive. For when the name appears in Tibetan sources in transcription rather than translation we find sometimes Buddhaguhya and sometimes Buddhagupta. We see the latter in the Ldan dkar inventory (LALOU 1953, p. 326: slob dpon Bu ddba gu pta) and both forms are found in the colophons of the translations of his works in the Tenjur (HODGE 1994, p. 70). The Tenjur contains a letter (Toh. 4194) in which *Buddhaguhya addresses the Tibetan emperor Khri srong lde btsan, who ruled from c. 756 until c. 797 (DOTSON 2007) and officially adopted Buddhism c. 779. From it we learn that he was invited to Tibet by Khri srong lde btsan but declined the invitation on the grounds of failing strength, sending instead his commentary on the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi.

309 rNam par snang mdzad mngon par byang chub pa’i rgyud chen po’i ’grel, f. 158v4–6: de la gsang ba’i bdag po ma ’ongs pa’i dus na sens can blo zhan pa zhes pa nas | de dag gis sngon sens can rnas la phan par dgon gs pa phyir | ’di thams cad bstan par rab tu mi shes so zhes pa bar du la rnam kyi kha dog gang yin pa dkyil ’khor yang de yin pa’i rgyud pa | dbang po dang me’i dkyil ’khor la sogs pa ni | ’jig rten pa’i rgyud la yod kyi | ’jig rten las ’das pa’i rgyud | bya ba’i rgyud dang spyod pa’i rgyud kun las mi ’byung bas na | ’di ni sangs rgyas gsungs
Buddhist Tantric practice, however closely it may resemble the Śaiva; and Buddhists, therefore, once they have understood this fact, may devote themselves with full confidence to the rituals of the Mahāvairocanaḥhisambodi.

The Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha and the First Inroads of Śākta Śaivism: Possession, Goddesses, and the Sacralization of Sex

After the time of this text Tantric Buddhism did not, as one might expect, rest content with the degree of assimilation of Śaivism it had already achieved,
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working only to infuse the new liturgical system with ever more clearly Buddhist purpose and meaning. On the contrary, with the Sarvatathāgatattvamahāvīra, the next major Tantra, which was considered to be the foundational text of the Yogatantra class, which follows the Caryātantras in the ascending hierarchy of the classification of the Mantranyaya, and was in existence in a shorter version by the end of the seventh century and expanded in the course of the eighth, we find the beginning of a process of assimilation of Śākta Śiva language, practices, iconography, and concepts that would become ever more comprehensive throughout the rest of the Mantranyaya's creativity. Here we find for the first time the requirement that candidates enter a state of possession (āvesāḥ) at the time of their initiation. This feature, which is altogether alien to antecedent Buddhism, is the hallmark of initiation in the Śaiva Kaula systems, setting them apart from all others. The Vajrācārya puts the candidate into a state of possession, has

---

311 See, e.g., Tantraloka 29.186c–220; Tantralokaviveka introducing 29.201c–202b: samāvesāḥ sarvasāstresv avigānakenoktaḥ; Sanderson 1985, pp. 200–202; 1986, p. 169 and fn. 2; and Wallis 2008. The centrality of possession in the Śaiva Śaiva domain may derive from its Kāpālika antecedents, since the Saiddhāntika Śaivas report that the Kāpālikas [of the Atimārga] defined liberation as arising from a state of possession (āvesāḥ) by the qualities of the deity, analogous to the state of one who is possessed by a Bhūta (bhūtiavistapuruṣavatsavat Nareśvaraparikṣaprakāsa on 1.61)); see, e.g., Pauskarabhāṣya, p. 232: svayam aviṣyate siddhāḥ puruṣaṁ tu grahair iva ittham caiva tu kāpālās tat sāmyam muktum ūcire; and Śaivaaparibhāṣā, p. 156, ll. 22-24: kāpālikāḥ samāvesena sāmyam upagacchanti; tathā hi yathā grahāḥ puruṣam āvīṣanti tathēva varguṇaṁ muktēśva āvīṣanti. They are distinguished in this context from the two other Atimārgic traditions, those of the Pāṇcārtha Pāśupatas, who defined liberation as the transference of the state of equality with Śiva in the manner in which one lamp is lit from another (sāmyasamkrāntivādah), and the Lākulas, who defined it as the arising of this state (sāmyotpattivādah); see Sanderson 2006, pp. 179–181. This hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that possession by the deity as the goal of practice is a marked feature of the Picumata and Yoginiśamcāra of the Vidyāpītha, texts in which the perpetuation within the Mantramārga of the Kāpālika tradition of the Atimārga is particularly clear. Both describe the goal of their Kāpālika-style asceticism as the entry of the deity propitiated into the person of the propitiator. Picumata f. 101v1–3 (2.114c–117): duṣcaram devagandharvaiś tvaya cīraṁ mahāvratam || 115 varam vareśitaṁ vatsa udāyatā tu braviṁi me | yadi tuṣṭo 'si bhagavan praviśa mama vigrāham || 116 vaktram prasārayaveti praviśa bhagavān prabhuḥ | hṛdaye bhairavo devo guhyakā tu gale sthitāḥ || 117 mātaro hy aṅga-m-aṅgeneṣu yogīnī sandhiṣu sthitāḥ | sākino romakūpeṣu pūtanādyā tathaiva ca 'Bhairava says: You have [now] completed the observance of the [Kāpālika] Mahāvṛata, which is hard [even] for the gods and Gandharvas. Choose whatever boon you desire. Tell me without hesitation [what it is]. [The Śādhaka replies:] If you are pleased, O Lord, enter my body. Telling him to open his mouth the Lord God Bhairava enters his heart. [His principal Śaktis,] the [four] Guhyakās occupy his neck, the Mother goddesses his limbs, the Yoginis his joints, and the Śākīnas, Pūtānas, and others the pores of his skin; cf. f. 335r1–2 (87.126c–128b): bhairavasya mahāmudrā mudrāśānāidhyakārikā || 127 prayuktā tu yādā mudrā laksanena varānane | bhāvātmakavidhānena sadyo
him cast a flower on to the Manḍala to determine from the section on which it falls the Mantra-deity from which he will obtain Siddhi, and then, while he is still in this state, removes his blindfold to reveal the Manḍala. He then consecrates him with scented water from a Mantra-empowered vase, places a Vajra in his hand, and gives him his initiation-name (vajranāma). The immediate effects of the possession are described as follows:

As soon as he becomes possessed supernatural knowledge arises [in him]. Through this knowledge he understands the thoughts of others; he knows all matters past, future and present; his heart becomes firm in the teachings of the Tathāgatas; all his sufferings cease; he is free from all dangers; no being can kill him; all the Tathāgatas enter-and-empower him; all Siddhis approach him; unprecedented joys arise [in him], causing spontaneous delight, pleasure, and happiness. In some these joys give rise to meditation-states, in some to [the mastery of] Dhāraṇīs, in some to the fulfilment of every hope, and in some to the state of identity with all the Tathāgatas.

mantro vijrmbhāti || 128 karoti sādhakāveśaṁ japadhyānavivarjitā ‘O fair-faced one, the Mahāmudrā of Bhairava draws every Mudrā nigh. When it is employed correctly with full subjective immersion the [deity of the] Mantra immediately becomes manifest. [The Mudrā] brings about possession in the Sādhaka without [need of] Mantra-repetition or visualization’. The Yogiṇīsamcāra requires anyone who has gone through its initiation ceremony and then received consecration (abhisekah) to adopt one of three forms of ascetic observance in order to gain mastery over the Vidyā (vidyāvrata): the Bhairavavrata, the Cāmudāvrata, or the Triṣaṭikulavrata, the observance of the sixty-three families [of the Mothers], which it also calls the Kāpālavrata, i.e. the Kāpālika. At the end of the observance, we are told, the Mothers will enter his body: dviṭṭiyam tu vratam vakṣye ghoram kāpālarūpīṇam || 8.41 śīre kapālamukutam śīramālāvibhūṣitam | kare karnau tathā pādu asthikhandair vibhūṣitam || 8.42 vāme kapālam khaṭvāṅgam tathā vai daṅkṣine kare | śmaśāne vicaren maunī triṣaṭiti divasāni tu || 8.43 vratānte tu vāraṅe ṣārīre mātaro dhruvam | viṣante devadevēsi dadante siddhim uttamām ‘[Now] I shall teach [you] a second observance, the grim Kāpālavrata. He should have a skull-crown on his head and be adorned with a garland of heads. His hands, ears, and feet should be adorned with pieces of bone. In his left hand he should hold a skull-bowl and in his right a skull-staff. He should wander in silence in a cremation ground for sixty-three days. It is certain that at the end of this observance the Mothers, O fair-hipped empress of the gods, enter his body and bestow the highest Siddhi’.

312 Sarvatathāgatattvasamgraha, sections 224–234.
313 Sarvatathāgatattvasamgraha, section 226: āviṣṭamātrasya divyaṁ jītānam utpadyate | tena jīnānā paraccittān avabadhyati sarvakāryāṁ cāttānāgatavartamānāṁ jānāti hṛdayāṁ cāsya dr̥̹ ṭhibhavati sarvatathāgatasāsanā sarva-dukhkhāṁ cāsya praṇaśyanti sarvaḥbhaya-vigataś ca bhavaty avadhyāṁ sarvāsva-sveteṣu sarvatathāgataś cācābhīshithanti sarvasiddhayaś cāsyaḥbhīshkhíbhavanti apūrvāṁ cāsya-kāraṇahārṣaratiprītikārāṁ sukhāṁ utpadyante | taṁ suṣkaṁ keṣāṁ cit samādhyo nispyadyante keṣāṁ cit dhārāṇyaj keṣāṁ cit sarvāśa-paripūraya vīvat keṣāṁ cit sarvatathāgataṁ api nispyaṁty iti.
and, after the bindfold has been removed:\footnote{Sarvatathāgatataṭṭvasaṃgraha, \textit{section 231}: \textit{mahāmaṇḍale ca drṣṭāṁitre sarvataṭṭhagatair adhiśhyate vajrasattvaś cāsyā hrdaye tiṣṭhati | nānādyāni ca raśmi-maṇḍaladārsanādindī prātiḥāryacurvitāni paśyati | sarvatathāgatādihiśhitatvāt kādā c id bhagavān mahāvajradharaḥ svarūpeṇa darśanām dadāti tathāgato veti | tataḥ prabhṛti sarvārthāh sarvamanobhirucitākāryāni sarvasiddhīr yāvad vajradhāravam api tathāgatavatvam veti.}}

As soon as he sees the Great Maṇḍala he is entered-and-empowered by all the Tathāgatas and Vajrasattva dwells in his heart. He sees various visions of orbs of light and miraculous transformations. Because he has been entered-and-empowered by all the Tathāgatas sometimes the Lord Vajradhara or the Buddha appears to him in his true form. From that time forth he attains all his goals, every desire of his mind, all Siddhis, up to the state of Vajradhara or the Tathāgatas.

Ānandagarbha gives a detailed account of the means by which the candidate is put into this state of possession in the \textit{Sarvavajrodaya}, his manual on the rites of initiation into the Maṇḍala of this Tantra, and makes it clear that entering this state is, as in the Kaula parallel, an absolute requirement. If the candidate fails to enter it by the standard means, the Vajrācārya is to perform a rite to remove the sins that are assumed to be the cause, and if the candidate still fails to enter the possession state, he may not proceed further:\footnote{Sarvavajrodaya, f. 61r4–v1 (exposures 009a and 008b): \textit{atha pāpaḥahutvād āveśo na bhavati punah pāpasphoṭanamudrayaḥ tasya punah pāpāni spoṭacyāni | samiddhir madhurair agnim prajvālya susamāḥtāḥ | nirdahet sarvapāpāni tilahomena tasya tu | \textit{OM SARVAṆAPADAHANAVAJRĀYA SVĀHĀ.} He should make a simulacrum of those sins with black sesame seeds on the palm of his right hand and visualizing the [wrathful] syllable HŪM in the centre he should offer it into the fire with his index finger and thumb. Then he should imagine that the sin is being incinerated in his body by Vajras wrapped in flames emerging from the fire-pit. [The candidate] will definitely become possessed. If possession does not occur even so, then he must not give him the consecration.}  

If possession does not occur, because [the candidate] has committed [too] many sins, he should proceed to destroy those sins by repeatedly making the Sin-Destruction Mudrā. With concentrated mind he should kindle a fire with sticks of sweet wood and burn all his sins by casting into it oblations of sesame seeds with the Mantra \textit{OM SARVAPĀPAPADAHANAVAJRĀYA SVĀHĀ.} He should make a simulacrum of those sins with black sesame seeds on the palm of his right hand and visualizing the [wrathful] syllable HŪM in the centre he should offer it into the fire with his index finger and thumb. Then he should imagine that the sin is being incinerated in his body by Vajras wrapped in flames emerging from the fire-pit. [The candidate] will definitely become possessed. If possession does not occur even so, then he must not give him the consecration.\footnote{Cf. Tantrāloka 29.29.210–211b: \textit{atha pāpabhūtvād āveśo na bhavati punah pāpasphoṭanamudrayaḥ tasya punah pāpāni spoṭacyāni | samiddhir madhurair agnim prajvālya susamāḥtāḥ | nirdahet sarvapāpāni tilahomena tasya tu | \textit{OM SARVAPĀPAPADAHANAVAJRĀYA SVĀHĀ iti} | dākṣiṇa-hastatale kṛṣṇatilaiḥ pāpillapratikṛtiṁ krtvā hūṃkāraṁmadhyamam vicintya tarjany-anuṣṭhābyām homam kuryāt | tato homakundāṁ nirgatyā jvālāmālākulaṁ vajraśvās tasya sāriṁ pāpaṁ dāhyamāṇoṁ cintayen niyatam avīśati | evam api yasyāveśo na bhavati tasyābhīṣekam na kuryād iti.}
It is certain that the possession intended is not nominal or figurative. For Ānandagarbha tells us that once the Vajrācārya is sure that the candidate is in this state he should use him as an oracle.

Then when the Ācārya has ascertained that the candidate is possessed he should form the Samayamudrā of Vajrasattva and address him with the Mantras:

HE VAJRASATTVA HE VAJRARATNA HE VAJRADHARMA HE VAJRAKARMA and NṛTYA SATTVAr NṛTYA VAJRA (DANCE, O SAṬTVa; DANCE, O VAJRA). If he is indeed possessed he will adopt the Vajrasattvamudrā. Then the Ācārya should show the Mudrā of the Vajra Fist. By this means all the deities beginning with Vajrasattva make themselves present in him. Then he should ask him something that he wishes to ascertain, with the following procedure. He should visualize a Vajra on the tongue of the possessed and say SPEAK, O VAJRA. [The candidate] then tells him everything that he wishes to know.

means he should visualize him being burned both internally and externally by the Power [of the Mantra] taught above. By this means he will fall to the ground. If a person does not achieve [the state of possession] even by this means then in this [system] he must cast him aside like a stone'. Falling to the ground is commonly mentioned in Kaula texts as the consequence of initiatory possession; see, e.g., Matasāra f. 39v2–3: yāvannāṭram vihvalam ca vedhauy pāśapāṇjaram | pāśastobhāt pataty āśu bhūtale nātra sāṃśāyaḥ; Jayadrathyāmala, Śatka 4, bhairavānāvīḍhau bhūmikāpātalāḥ, f. 191v (v. 105ab): saktīśobhāt tādā yogī viddhau patati bhūtale; Devīvyardhaṣaṭikā f. 16v: 197 tatkaṇṭaḥ patate bhūmāu chinnamūla iva drumah; Chummāśaṃkṣetrapākāṣa, first surviving verse: itaḍḍrkapāṭamahodayāt | bhūmāu sampatitaḥ kṣiṇāc chinnamūla iva drumah; Ğr. Viṣṇudahpāpariṣṭ. a section partly translated and partly paraphrased from the Chinese by Strickmann (1996, pp. 222–226), a work that was translated
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into Chinese (T. 895) by Subhakarasimha in 726 and was in the hands of the Chinese monk Wu-xing in 674 (Hodge 2003, p. 18). We also see it in the Su ji li yan mo xi shou luo dian shuo jia lu luo a wei she fa ‘The quickly effective method of possession (āveśaḥ) taught by the god Maheśvara’ (T. 1277). This short scriptural text, whose translation from the Sanskrit is assigned to Bukong (Amoghavajra) and to a date between 746 and 774, claims in its preamble that it is a teaching given by Śiva (Maheśvara) to Nārāyaṇa on Mt. Gandhamadana in answer to the latter’s request. It sets forth a procedure to induce the messenger (Dūta) of Maheśvara to possess a young girl aged seven or eight so that he can then use her while she is in this state to answer any questions he has concerning the future. He should have her fast by eating nothing but pure foods for three or seven days. Then on an auspicious day he bathes her, anoints her with ungents, gives her clean clothes, puts camphor in her mouth, sits facing East, smears a low wooden platform with sandalwood-paste, has the girl stand on it, scatters flowers in front of her, sets up a vessel of Argha water, takes incense, empowers it seven times with the Mahāmudrāmantra, lights the incense and fumigates the girl’s hands with it, takes a red flower, empowers it, places it in her hands, and passes his hands over her face. Then, with his hand forming a Mudrā he touches and thus empowers five parts of his own body and then with the same Mudrā touches the girl’s head, her mouth, his heart, and his navel visualizing in these the symbols of fire, water, earth, and wind respectively. He then empowers his two legs, visualizes Garuḍa, puts the armour-Mantra on the girl’s body, and visualizes himself as Maheśvara, three-eyed, with the digit of the moon on his crown, blue-faced, eighteen-armed, and brandishing various weapons, with a snake as his sacred thread, wearing the bleeding hide of an elephant. He then protects her with recitation, empowers flowers, incense, and Argha water with the Mahāmudrāmantra, and seals the ten directions. Then facing the girl the Sādhaka recites the Mantra of Maheśvara’s Dūta. The girl will start to tremble. This reveals to him that the Dūta has entered her. He then snaps his fingers and recites the Mantra. If she does not fall into the possession trance he should recite a further Mantra to incite the Dūta to enter her. By this means the result is certain. He then interrogates her about good and bad in the future and is told whatever he wishes to know. This account is based on an oral translation of the Chinese text very kindly provided by my colleague Notake Miyako (Leipzig). A French translation of part of the text, without the visualizations, is given in Hōbōgin, p. 7.

Here too the model is Saiva, as the preamble and content of this text suggest. Putting children into a possession-state is already present in the earliest literature of the Saiva Mantramārga, where we find the use of Kṣatriya and brahmin boys for this purpose; see Niśvāsatauttvasaṃhitā f. 82v1–2 (Niśvāsaguhya 10.116–117b): athāveśaṃ kartukā[mah] + + kṣatrakumārakam | snāpayitvā tam ekaṃ tu suddhadehaḥ savāsakam || pūrvāmukham śhāpayitvā hy udakenāveśayet; f. 112v6 (Niśvāsaguhya 17.30): athāveśaṃ kartukāmo brāhmaṇakumārakam + uḍakena snāpaṇa tenaiva tādyamānam āveśayed vācayā moks. ah. The ritual also appears in narrative literature. The Kathāsārītāgāra (70.55–63) tells a story of an ash-smeared ascetic, a pupil of Suddhakirti, who has mastered many Mantras and claims to have done this with a Kṣatriya boy (56cd: śubhalakṣaṇam āsādyā kamcit kṣatrakumārakam), who in his trance revealed the whereabouts of many miraculous herbs and elixirs (57: sa kumāraḥ samāviṣṭaḥ prsto nānāvidhāni me | siddhausadhāirasakṣetrayā uḍiṇyedam athābravīt), and, finally, a palace of the Nāgas in a pollen-covered pond in the jungles of the Vindhya mountains, where, with the help of Viras, he could obtain a sword that would make him lord of the Siddhas. The procedure is referred to there as a svasthāveśaḥ ‘a [rite of caus-
Nor is possession restricted in the \textit{Sarvatathāgatasamgraha} to the context of initiation. The term \textit{āvēsaḥ} is used repeatedly in the text to denote the state that}

\begin{verbatim}
(70.56ab: so 'haṃ kādāpy akravam svasthāvēsaṃ prasāgataḥ), and it appears under this name frequently in the Vidyāpītha, where in accordance with that literature's Śākta character the medium is, as in the \textit{Su ḍi li yan mo xi shou luo dian shuo jia lu luo a wei she fa}, a young girl. We see this in \textit{Jayadrathâyāmala}, \textit{Ṣṭāka} 2, f. 19r–v3 (6.54c–59): kanyāṃ sulaksāṇopetām dhūtavāsām manohārāṃ || 55 svalamkṛtām ataḥ kṛtvā rātrāv eva maheśvārī | dattvā dhūpam tato vidyām āvart'ye<tt> sādhakeśvārah || 56 tāvad āvartayed ghorāṃ yāvad āvēsam āpnyāt || divyābhaumāntariks*ādyam (conj. : ādyā Cod.) āvēsam kurute kṣaṇāt || 57 hastārādam ca kṣitiṃ tyaktvā tiṣṭhate vikrtānānā | tādā mahālīpiśītaiś tarpayet suravandite || 58 prahvaś ca praṇato bhūtvā prchāt sādhaśasattamaḥ | sadāśvādikṣiyante yāvan manasi rocate || 59 tat sarvāṃ kathayed devi yad anyaṃ vā hṛdi sthitam | evam prṣṭvā visarjeta pranāmya parameswāri Then, at night, O Maheśvari, the lord among Sādhakas should adorn a pretty young girl endowed with excellent characteristics and wearing freshly washed clothes, fumigate her with incense, and then begin to repeat [the Vidyā of] Ghorā. He should continue to repeat it until she becomes possessed. Immediately [her understanding] penetrates all that is in the heavens, on the earth, and in the sky. When her face contorted she hovers half a cubit above the ground. Then, O honoured by the gods, he should gratify her with offerings of wine and meat. He should then bow low before her and put his questions to her. O goddess, she will tell him all that he wishes to know in the whole universe, from the level of Sādāśiva down to Earth, and other matters that are concealed in his heart. When he has interrogated her in this way, O Parameswāri, he should prostrate himself in veneration and allow her to leave; and \textit{Jayadrathâyāmala}, \textit{Ṣṭāka} 3, f. 99v2–6 (14.70–76): atha sādhayituṃ vānche<tt> svasthāvēsanam uttamam | tadā kanyāṃ samāṇya sarvalakṣānakāśītam || 71 āsane tāṃ pratiśāhāpya sugupte varamandire || raktakṛṣṇāmbadharām raktaśrakkanthasohhitām || 72 subhāśasasthām tāṃ kuryāt palāiśaripūrītam | avucchinmāṃ daheḥ dhūpaṃ vidyāṃ āvartayed tataḥ || 73 tadā sā kampate kanyā ghūṇate hasate punah | ghanṭām pravādyet tatra mahāmantra*vidhau (conj. : vikai Cod.) stīhāta || 74 tata āvīṣate tārnam devadevi kṛṣodari | tyaktvā bhūmiṃ tiṣṭhate sā tadā *sa (corr. : sā Cod.) pranataḥ punān || 75 tarpayet parameswānīm nānābalyopahārataḥ | tadā sādhaṃamukhyāya vadate *manasepsitam (corr. : manasipṣitam Cod.) || 76 bhūtaṃ bhavaṃ bhavisyāṃ ca kālātrayam atākhilam | brahmaṇḍodarāgā vārtā<tt> sādhaṃkāya vadaty asau 'If he desires to accomplish the supreme rite of \textit{svasthāvēsaḥ} he should bring a young girl who possesses all the necessary characteristics and set her on a seat in an excellent building that is well concealed. Her seat should be of fine quality. She should be dressed in a dark red garment; her neck should be adorned with a garland of red flowers; and her mouth should be filled with wine and meat. He should burn incense without interruption and then repeat the Vidyā again and again. Then the girl begins to tremble, swoon, and laugh. Established in the procedure of the Great Mantra he should ring his bell. The emaciated Goddess will immediately enter [the girl], who will then rise and hover above the ground. The Sādhaka should then prostrate himself before her and gratify the Goddess with the offering of a various Balis. Then [speaking through the girl] she will tell that excellent Sādha whatever he desires to know. She will explain to him [anything he wishes to ascertain in] the three times, past, present, and future], all events within the entire sphere of Brahmā'.
\end{verbatim}
the practitioner must induce in himself in order to accomplish both his Siddhis and his enlightenment, typically in the compound *vajrāveśaḥ* ‘possession by Vajra’. For example:

For by means of possession by [Vajra]sattva enlightenment will quickly be attained.\(^{319}\)

... When he has given rise to *āveśaḥ* in this way whatever form he meditates on as his own will automatically become Buddha in form.\(^{320}\)

... *vajrāveśaḥ* has arisen he should visualize the water as an embodiment of the Vajra. Quickly achieving success he will be able to walk on [that] water.\(^{321}\)

... Once he has generated *vajrāveśaḥ*, if with concentrated mind he makes a slight clap with his palms in the Vajrānjali [gesture] he can subject to his control even a mountain.\(^{322}\)

... Likewise, by virtue of the practice of *āveśaḥ*, if he stretches out [his hands in] the Vajra gesture and strikes together the tips of his fingers he can kill a hundred families.\(^{323}\)

Two other features of this seminal text evidence the influence of Śākta Śaivism. The first is the fact that after teaching the Vajradhātumanḍala in its opening section it goes on to teach the Vajraguhyamaṇḍala, in which the five Tathāgatas are replaced by goddesses: Vairocana at the centre by Vajradhātvariśvarī and, around her in the four directions, Aksobhya by Vajravajrini, Ratnasambhava by Ratnavajrini, Amitāyus by Dharmavajrini, and Amoghasiddhi by Karnavajrini.\(^{324}\) In the preamble Vajrapāṇi makes the following joyous declaration (*udānam*):\(^{325}\)

Ah, how benevolent is the Bodhicitta to all beings! For the Buddhas take on even female form to accord with [the expectations of] their disciples (*vineyavaśāt*).

---

\(^{319}\) *Sarvatathāgatastattvasamgraha*, section 167: *yat sattvāveśayogād dhi kṣiprasya bodhir avāpyata iti*.

\(^{320}\) Section 238: *tathāiva vāsām utpādyā yad rūpaṃ svayam ātmanah* [*bhāvayen* (em. : bhāvayan Ed.) *bhavate tat tu buddhārūpam api svayam*.

\(^{321}\) Section 238: *vajrāveśe samutpanne vajrabimbamayaṃ jalam | bhāvayet kṣiprasiddhas tu jālasyopari caṅkramet*.

\(^{322}\) Section 247: *vajrāveśaṃ samutpādyā tālam dadyāt samāhitah | vajrānjitalalaiḥ sūkṣmaṃ parvato ‘pi vaśaṃ nayet*.

\(^{323}\) Section 247: *tathāiva vāsāvadhīnā vajrabandhe* (conj. : bandha Ed.) *prasārite | agrāṅgulisamāsphotād dhanet kulaśataṃ kṣanāt*.

\(^{324}\) *Sarvatathāgatastattvasamgraha*, sections 319–327.

\(^{325}\) *Sarvatathāgatastattvasamgraha*, section 322: *aho bi bodhicittasya sarvasattva-hitaśītā | yad vineyavaśād virāḥ strīrūpaṃ api kurvate.*
The second is the incorporation of sexual intercourse into the activities of worship as a higher form of practice. This element is not conspicuous because it is not mentioned in the treatments of the principal Mañḍalas taught in the text and it was therefore easily pushed out of view when this text was propagated in China and thence in Japan. It is present nonetheless as an esoteric teaching reiterated many times throughout the text in the form of passages teaching that the pleasure of sexual union and indeed other sensual delights are a means both of worshipping the Buddha and of attaining Siddhis when combined with meditation on one's Buddha nature. For example:

1: If after generating a firm intention to attain enlightenment he meditates on himself as the Buddha and worships himself [as the Buddha] with the pleasure of sexual intercourse he will obtain the joys of the Buddha himself.

... 2: He will quickly become equal to Vajrasattva if he presents the pleasures of embracing the body of any [woman] as offerings to the Buddhas. He will be become equal to Vajraratna if he presents the pleasures of grasping [her] hair in intensely felt love as offerings to the Buddhas. He will become equal to Vajradharma if he presents the exquisite pleasures of kissing while immersed in intense sensual delight as offerings to the Buddhas. He will become the equal of Vajrakarma if during his worship he completely offers up to the Buddhas the pleasures of the union of the two sex organs.

... 3: He will attain success in the Mañḍala by means of the union of the two sex organs while meditating with fully concentrated mind on the meditation state that embodies all things.

... 4: Non-detachment from sensual pleasures: this is the greatest and purest rule of discipline [for an initiate] in the family of the Tathāgatas. It may not be transgressed even by the Buddhas.

... 5: There is no religious duty purer than [the exercise of] sexual desire, the bestower of all joys. This, which brings about Siddhi, is the highest duty in the family of the Tathāgatas.

... 6: During worship with the four prostrations he will quickly attain Siddhi if when exhausted from the exertion of love-making he offers [to the Buddhas] the pleasure which that love-making aroused.

... 7: He will attain Siddhi if while meditating with in-turned mind on the purity of lust he worships the Buddhas with the drops of his semen.\footnote{1 Section 288: bodhicittadyhotpadād buddho 'ham iti cintayan | ratiyā tu pūjā-}
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The Guhyasamāja: copulating deities, sexual initiation rites, and the sacralization of impurity

In the next phase of the Mantranaya, seen in the Guhyasamāja, also a product of the eighth century, this esoteric eroticism has moved to the foreground; and this is apparent from the very beginning of the text. For the place where the Buddha is said to have been residing at the time that he revealed this Tantra, which was expected to be stated in the preamble (nidānāvākyam) of any scripture claiming to be Buddhist, is not one of the familiar sites of revelation such as Rājagrha, Dhānyakaṭaka, or, as in the Sarvatathāgatatauttvasamgraha, the Akaṇḍṭha heaven, but the vaginas of the goddesses Locanā, Māmakī, Pāṇḍaravāsini, and Tārā, that is to say, a timeless, unlocated bliss:327

[I aver that] I once heard the following [teaching]. The Venerable Lord was residing in the vaginas of the Vajra-women of the body, speech, and mind of all the Tathāgatas . . .

and this surprising relocation, no doubt provocatively shocking in its time, became standard in the subsequent literature of the Mantranaya, both in texts closely related to the Guhyasamāja and in the next wave of texts, the Yoginītantras, in which the influence of the Śākta Śaiva tradition became much more intense and pervasive.328

---

327 Guhyasamāja, preamble: evam mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye | bhagavān sarvata-thāgatakāyavākcitthayādayavajrayōṣidbhageṣu vijähāra.

328 This same formula, or a variant, is seen in the Vajramālā (rDo rje phreng ba), f. 208r2–3: bcom ldan ’das de bzhin gshegs pa thams cad kyi sku dang gsung dang thugs kyi sning po rdo rje bitsun mo’i bha ga rnam s la (as in the Guhyasamāja), the Kṛṣṇayamārī (sarvatathāgatakāyavākcitthasarvavajrayōṣidbhageṣu), and in those of the Yoginītantras that have a nidānāvākyam: the Hevajra and Śamputodbbhava (both as in the Guhyasamāja), the Vajrārtha (f. 1v1: sarvatathāgatakāyavākcitthādayavajrāṃṛtaguhyapadmeṣu), Vajrārāli (rDo rje ā ra li, f. 171r2–3: de
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In the Guhyasamāja the male deities, now multi-faced and multi-armed in a fusion of Śaiva and Buddhist iconography, are represented and visualized copulating with their consorts; and both initiation and subsequent practice now involve copulation with a female partner, as in the Śāktism of the Śaivas. A further borrowing from the Vidyāpīṭha is evident in the introduction of a crucial element of what that tradition calls ‘non-dualistic practice’ (advaitācārā) and both traditions call ‘practice free of inhibition’ (niḥśaṅkācāraḥ), namely the offering to the deities of such ‘impure’ substances as urine, faeces, semen, and blood, and their sacramental consumption.

This is the case in both of the major Māṇḍalas based on this Tantra, that of saffron-coloured Vajrasattva-Maṅjuvajra and that of black Aksobhya. For the full iconography of these pantheons see Nispannyogavali A, pp. 1–7; B, pp. 1–12. The principal difference between them is that in the Aksobhyamaṇḍala only Aksobhya, the central deity (cakreṣvarah), and the ten wrathful Krodharājas that form the outer protective circle are represented embracing consorts (sasvābhāprajñāḥ), whereas in the Maṅjuvajramaṇḍala this is also the case with the four Tathāgatas (Vairocana, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha, and Amoghasiddhi) that occupy the four directions around the central deity. All the deities in both Māṇḍalas are three-faced and six-armed and all except the Krodharājas, who stand in the aggressive Pratyālīḍha posture, are seated in the Vajraparyānka posture. None of the deities has any of the Kāpālika attributes that mark the iconography of the Yoginītantras, namely the skull-bowl, skull-staff, bone-ornaments, and coating of ash.

The Guhyasamāja proper (chapters 1–17) gives little detail in its account of initiation and makes no mention of the involvement of a consort, speaking of the necessity of acquiring such a partner only in the context of the post-initiatory practice known as the vidyāvrata; see 16.93: ‘After obtaining a girl of sixteen with a charming face and wide eyes, adorned with every adornment, he should practice the Vidyāvrata [with her]’. The supplementary 18th chapter, however, the Samajottara, gives an account of the initiation involving copulation in its vv. 113–127.

See, e.g., Guhyasamāja 4.21: viṃmutraṣukrākṛtadān devatāṇāṁ nivedayet | evam tuṣyantī sambuddhāḥ bodhisattvāḥ mahāśayāḥ ‘He should offer to the deities such things as urine, faeces, semen, and blood. In this way the noble Buddhas [and] Bodhisattvas are gratified’ (cf. the following in the Guhyasamāja’s satellite Tantra Vajrahrdayālaṃkāra, Paṭala 3 |rDo tje snying po rgyan gyi rgyud f. 39v3–4: bshang gei khu ba khrag rnam ni | dung chen po ru bzhag byas te | lha rnam la ni dbul bar bya ‘He should place faeces, urine, semen, and blood in a human skull [mahāśāṅkhe] and offer them to the deities’; 6.21: viṃmutrahākrtyārthaṁ kuryāḥ śiddhipala-rthināḥ | śidyate ‘nuttaram tattvam bodhicittam anāvīlam ‘If he desires to attain Siddhi he should consume faeces and urine. [By this means] he will master the ultimate reality, the spotless Bodhicitta’; 7.33ab: samayāḥ ksared retaṁ tu vidhinā pibet phalakāṅkṣīṇāḥ ‘In accordance with the rule of the discipline he should ejac-
ulate his semen and drink it if he desires to attain his goal’; 12.47cd: \textit{pañcāmṛta-prayogena vajrasattvatvam āpnyāt} ‘By the use of the Five Nectars he will attain Vajrasattva-hood’; 16.7ab: \textit{prayogena vajrasattvatvam āpnyāt} ‘By the use of the Five Nectars he will attain Vajrasattva-hood’; 16.7ab: \textit{prayogena vajrasattvatvam āpnyāt} ‘By the use of the Five Nectars he will attain Vajrasattva-hood’; 17.47: \textit{vāmāpupṣaṁ puspabandham āstau dravyāṇi kaulike} ‘must especially offer [to the Manḍala] such substances as faeces and urine’; 17.47: \textit{vāmāpupṣaṁ puspabandham āstau dravyāṇi kaulike} ‘must especially offer [to the Manḍala] such substances as faeces and urine’; 18.67c–68b: \textit{guhyam. trivajragnanikau} ‘three Vajras [of body, speech, and mind]’; 18.67c–68b: \textit{guhyam. trivajragnanikau} ‘three Vajras [of body, speech, and mind]’; 1.60: \textit{tayo mañjusāṃ śūnyapade yojya} ‘he must not feel disgust at faeces, urine, semen, and blood’.
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That Tantric Buddhists possessed the specialized knowledge of the Śaiva Mantramārga that would enable them to draw at will on the Śaiva Tantras in this period is placed beyond doubt by an early exegetical work in the tradition of the Guhyasamāja. For this, the Guhayasiddhi of Padmavajra, written in all probability in the eighth century, assumes that any initiate in the practice of this Tantra is not only familiar with the Śaiva scriptures but is able to enact their rituals by assuming the role of a Śaiva Guru, implying thereby that such initiates were typically converts from the Mantramārga with experience both of its texts and of its practices. For it tells the adept of this tradition that in order to acquire the female consort required for his post-initiatory observance he should enter the home of a family of untouchables who are observant devotees of Śiva, reveal to them one of the Saiddhāntika scriptures—the text specifically mentions the Kālottara and the Nīśvāsa—give them Maṇḍala initiation [following this scripture], and then return to them the daksinā that they will give him, taking a girl from them in its place:

He should wander in other lands, in which he is known nowhere. With firm resolve the Śadhaka should enter among untouchables who are devotees of Śiva

---

332 Portions of the Guhayasiddhi have been quoted in the Cāryāmelāpakapradīpa of Āryadeva: Cāryāmelāpakapradīpa, pp. 71–72 (imam evārtham dyotayann āha śriguhyasiddhau:) = Guhayasiddhi 3.71–81, 17.38; p. 77 = 6.2–3; and p. 97 = 6.45–49. Tomabechi (2008, p. 175) has shown that Āryadeva’s work is likely to have been written in the early years of the ninth century.

333 Guhayasiddhi 8.8c–16b: paryat ed antyadesesu (conj. [cf. 8.2cd: praviṣya cānyadesesu]: divyadesesu Ed. [Tib. bzang po’i yul du ’khyam par bya]) yatra na jñāyate kvacit || 9 praviṣya cāntyajātinām madhye (em. [Tib. mthar skyes nang du ’jug par bya]) cāntyajātinām madhye Ed.) ye tripurāntake | bhaktā jānanti naivānyaṃ daivatam paramārthaḥ || 10 siddhāntabhāvītā nityam (em. [Tib. rtag tu rang gi grub mtha’ bsgom (*svasiddhāntabhāvakā nityam*)]; siddhyante bhāvītā nityam Ed.) snānadevārcane ratāḥ | kimcīdadkaramārgena *prasaktāḥ (conj.:prasakte Ed.) śāstradarśane || 11 evam praviṣya tanmadhye sādhaka drḍhanīścayaḥ | candālaganarūpeṇa bhāvayan bodhim uttamām || 12 *dārsayec ca tatas teṣām dhammaṃ siddhāntapūrvaḥ (em. [cf. Tib. chos dang grub mtha’ sngon ’gro ba | de nas de la ston par byed]) :dārsayec ca tatas teṣām dhammaṃ siddhāntapūrvaḥ Ed.) | kālottarādiṃaṃsiddhāntam (em.:samśuddham Ed.) no cen niḥsvāsasambhavam || 13 pātayitum ca viśvāse sarvam tāms tantracoditān | kṛtvā caivatmanah śiṣyāṃ dikṣāmandalapūrvaḥ || 14 tato yat saṃcitam dravyaṃ tair dattam gurupūjāne | tat teṣām arpayivā tu pūrvam vittena saṃyutam || 15 gṛhitā kanyākāṃ teṣām cārvakrāṃ sulocanām | tām kṛtvā mantrasadbhāvabhījāṃ samayasammatām || 16 cared vidyārataṃ dhīmān buddhatvākṛtaniścayaḥ. I have emended antyajātinām to antyajātināṃ with the support of the Tibetan because the -ādi- is inapposite: in 8.7 the Śadhaka is told to enter the home of an untouchable (antyajālayaḥ); and in 8.1 he is told that it is an untouchable girl (antyāja) that he is to acquire. I take dharmam siddhāntapūrvaḥ in 8.12c to mean ‘dharmam preceded by [the word] siddhānta’, i.e. siddhāntadharmam, an example of a not uncommon style of periphrasis.
and recognize no other deity as absolute, who are inspired by the Siddhānta, always attached to [the rituals of] bathing and deity-worship, and dedicated to the doctrines of its scriptures through some slight degree of literacy. After entering among them in the guise of an untouchable votary (caṇḍālaganah), he should, while cultivating insight into the highest wisdom, instruct them in the religion of the Siddhānta established in such scriptures as the Kālottara, or the Niśvāsa;334 and in order to win their trust he should take as his disciples all those who are enjoined by the Tantra after [initiating them before] the Initiation Maṇḍala [of Śiva]. Then he should give back to them all the goods and money that they will previously have gathered and given him as their offering to their Guru and take [instead] a girl of theirs with a beautiful face and eyes. After acquainting her with the essence of the Mantras and making her adhere to the rules of an initiate that wise one should practice the Vidyā observance [with her], after resolving to become a Buddha.335

This is indeed troubling evidence for those who may be reluctant to accept that Buddhists would have had the familiarity with Tantric Śaivism that my thesis of the development of the Mantranaya presupposes.

The Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinījālaśaṁvara: Heruka and his Yoginīs, Kāpālika iconography, the Gaṇaṃaṇḍala, and the beginning of Śaiva-Buddhist intertextuality

With the Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinījālaśaṁvara, another product of this century,336 we see the beginning of the final phase of śāktization. It is still rooted in the liturgical tradition of the Yogatantras,337 as can be seen in the

---

334 Literally “that which has arisen from the outbreath (niḥsvāsah/niśvāsaḥ) [of Śiva]”. Both forms of the name of this scripture, Niśvāsa and Niḥsvāsa, are attested.

335 Padmavajra is elaborating on Guhyasamāja 16.93: saḍaśābdikāṁ ghṛya sarvālāṅkārabhadhīṣṭām | cāruvaktṛāṁ viśālāksīṁ prāpya vidyāvratam caret ‘He should take a girl of sixteen with a beautiful face and wide eyes, adorned with every ornament, and practice the Vidyā observance with her’.

336 It was translated into Tibetan towards the end of the eighth century or early in the ninth, and Amoghavajra (705–774) names it and provides a brief summary of its teachings in his Jin-gang-ding-jing yu-jia shi-ba-hui zhi-gui, Jap. Kongō-chōgyō yuga jūhatte shiiki (T. 869) Key Points of the Eighteen Assemblies of the Yoga of the Vajraśekharasūtra; see TOMABECHI 2007, p. 905. He composed this work in Chinese at some time between 746 and his death in 774, but we can be sure that the text existed in some form, perhaps in an early stage of its development, by c. 740, since his knowledge of it must have been gained between 741 and 746, when he was in Ceylon and perhaps India gathering the Tantric literature whose analysis and translation into Chinese occupied the rest of his life.

337 It is referred to by Āryadeva as a Mahāyogatantra in his Cāryāmelāpaka-pradīpa, p. 82: adhunā praṇaṇatācāraya śrīsarvabuddhasamāgamanayogadākinījālaśaṁvara-mahāyogatantrād avatāryate. This term serves to distinguish it from the Yogatantras, namely the Sarvatathāgatattwamāgraha and its satellites and to
group it with the Guhyasamāja and related texts, though which of the Yogatantras in the broad sense qualified to be considered Mahāyogatantras might be the subject of divergence of opinion. Dipankaraśrījñāna defines this class (rnal 'byor chen po'i rgyud) as comprising the Guhyasamāja and its explanatory Tantras (vyākhyātantrāṇi), which he lists as the Guhyendutilaka, the Krṣṇayamāra, the Paramādya, the Sarvadevasamāgama, the Sarvarahasya, the Vinayāmogha[siddhi], the Vajraśānasamuccaya, the Vairocanamāyājala, the Laghukhasama, the Advaya[sa]matā[vijaya], and the Vajraśekhara (Byang chub lam gyi sgron ma dka’ grel, p. 286: de la rnal ‘byor chen po'i rgyud ni dpal gsang ba ’dus pa bshad rgyud dang bcas pa dang zla gsang thig le dang gshin rje'i gshed nag po dang mchog dang po dang lha thams cad ’dus pa dang thams cad gsang ba dang ba’i don pa dang ye shes rdo kun las btus pa dang rnam par snang mdzad sgyu ‘phrul dang nam mkha’ dang mnyam pa chung ngu dang gnyis med pa rnam par rgyal ba’i rgyud dang rdo rje gtsug tor rgyud la sos pa rgyud sde stong phrag bcu gnyis te rgyas pa byas na grangs pa med do.) An alternative terminology distinguishes these more esoteric Yogatantras as Yogottaratantras, perhaps originally in the meaning ‘Supplementary Tantras (uttaratantrāṇi) of the Yoga [class]’, and refers to the Yoganiruttaratantras, giving the ascending series Kriyātantra, Caryātantra, Yogatantra, Yogottaratantra, and Yoganiruttaratantra; see, e.g., Rāmapāla, Sekanirdesapañjikā, introducing verse 1, describing his teacher Maitreyanātha (Advayavajra) as an unsurpassed master of all of these: iha mahā-panditāvadhūtaśrimaitreyanāthaḥ kriyācaryāyogayogottarayoganiruttaratantrasv anuttaraguruḥ; Ratnakarāśanti, Muktāvali, p. 223, on Hevajra 2.8:10: sarvam iti pañcavidham: kriyācaryāyogayogottarayoginiruttaran. i (em. : niruttarāś ca Cod.) tantrāṇy ucyante. I have seen no occurrence in any Indian source of the term *Anuttarayoga, commonly encountered in secondary sources. It is evidently an incorrect modern translation into Sanskrit of the ambiguous Tibetan rendering of Yoganiruttara (rnal ‘byor bla na med). Early authors attest a less developed hierarchy. Vilāsavajra, an author of the eighth century (TRIBE 1994, pp. 9–23) and the Guru of Buddhajñānānapāda according to Gzhon nu dpal (Blue Annals, p. 367), says that he writes his Nāmanantaravatīka after studying the Pāramitānaya and the Kriyā-, Caryā-, and Yogatantras (A f. 1v1–2: yogacaryākriyātantram tathā pāramitānayam ... vilokya), but the last evidently includes texts such as the Guhyasamāja, Vajrabhairava, and Sarvabuddhasamāyoga, since he quotes these and other related works. *Buddhaguhya (rNam par snang mdzad chen po mgon par byang chub pa’i rgyud chen po ’i grel, ff. 64v7–65r6) speaks of Kriyātantras, which emphasize external ritual practice (phyi’i spyod, bāhyacaryā), giving as examples the Susiddhikara and the Vidyādharaśrītaka, and Yogatantras, which emphasize internal meditation (nang gi sbyor, adhyātmayogā), giving the example of the Sarvatathāgatattattvasamgraha, and says that the Mahā-vairocanābhīṣambodhi, later classified as a Caryātantra, is a Yogatantra in as much as it emphasizes the practices of Method and Wisdom (thabs dang shes rab gtsor gyur sbyor ba’i rgyud), but may also be referred to as a Kriyātantra or as an Ubhayatantra (bya ba’i rgyud dam gnyis ka’i rgyud), that is to say, as a Tantra of both (ubhaya-) classes, because it also teaches external practice for the benefit of those whose commitment is to this. In a parallel treatment in his Piṅḍārtha commentary on the Mahāvairocanābhīṣambodhi he gives the Vajrapānyabhiseka among examples of Kriyātantras (see the translation in HODGE 2003, p. 449). This too was later
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use of that tradition’s system of the four types of Mudrā (Mahāmudrā, Samayamudrā, Dharmamudrā, and Karmanmudrā) in Śadhana texts based on this Tantra, such as the Vajraśālodayā of Anandagarbha and the Herukasādhana of Kalyāṇagarbha.338 But it initiates a new direction that would be followed in the next and final phase of the Mantranaya’s development, that of the Yoginītantras.339

considered to be a Caryātantra. The terms Kriyātantra and Yogatantra are semantically coherent, as Buddhaguhya indicates. But the choice of the term Caryātantra (‘Observance Tantra’) for the intermediate class is puzzling. It is conceivable that it was adopted artificially under the influence of the classification of the subject matter of the Tantras of the Śaiva Mantramarga into kriyā, caryā, yogah, and jñānam or vidyā, perhaps with the notion that the fourth corresponds to the Pāramitānaya.

As far as I am aware, only one other Śadhana text of this Heruka has survived in Sanskrit. This is the anonymous Herukasādhana of Śādhanaṃalā 241. Anandagarbha’s, which appears not to have been translated into Tibetan, is much the most detailed of the three. Apart from these works the only other evidence of this cult in surviving Sanskrit sources of which I am aware is in the eclectic Yoginītantra Sampūtodbhava, which in f. 80v5–81v2, in its eighth Kalpa, the Sarvakriyāsamudayakaḥkalpaṇa, includes the Mantras of this Heruka and his retinue of goddesses. There is also a chapter in the Abhidhānottara of the Cakrasaṃvara corpus (B ff. 121v5–129v1: Paṭala 22) which teaches a hybrid pantheon in which the goddesses of this Heruka’s retinue have been incorporated into that of Heruka and Vajravārāhi, the former taking on the appearance of the Heruka of the Sarvabuddhasamāyoga, being four-faced and eight-armed. This poverty of surviving sources in Sanskrit is probably due to the eclipse of this Tantra after the propagation of the later Yoginītantras, both in India and in Tibet. A striking indication of this eclipse is the fact that its Māndala was not included by Abhayākaragupta in his Vajrāvalī and Nispannayogāvalī in the first quarter of the eleventh century. For the position that the four Mudrās are the distinctive fundamentals of the Śadhana system of the Yogatantras see, e.g., Mkhas Grub rje’s rGyudspyi, pp. 228–248.

It was accordingly classified in the Kanjur (Tōh. 366–367) among the Yoginītantras (Tōh. 360–441). Likewise, Mkhas grub rje (1385–1438) in his rGyud spyi, p. 266: bde mchog kye rdo dus ’khor sgyu thod gdan *bzhi (em.: gsum Ed.) phyag chen thig le sangs rgyas mnyam sbyor sogs ma rgyud yin no ’The Mother Tantras [=Yoginītantras] are such as the Śaṃvara, the Hevajra, the Kālacakra, the [Mahā]māyā, the [Buddha]kapāla, the Catuspītha, the Mahāmudrāṭila, and the [Sarva]buddhasamāyoga’. This recognition of the [proto-]Yoginītantric character of the text is not only Tibetan. It appears in the thirteenth chapter of the Dākinīvajrapaṇjara, where it is referred to in abbreviated form as the *Sarvabuddha- (Sangs rgyas kun) in a list of Yoginītantras that also includes the Vajradāka, Hevajra, Guhyakoṣa, Vajrāṃtra, and Cakrasaṃvara: rdo rje mkha’ ’gro phan rgyud dang | *kye yi rdo rje (T: kye yi rdo rje dkyil ’khor D) sangs rgyas kun | gsang mdzod rdo rje bdu rdz tbyung ba dang | ’khor lo sdom pa gur *gyi (T: dang D) ’byung gnas ni | rnal ’byor ma *rgyud ni (T: rgyud drug tu D) rab tu grags (mKha’ ’gro ma’i dra ba ’i rdo rje gur rgyud, D f. 104v4–5; T p. 369, ll. 5–6), and in Dipaṅkaraśrīrijñāna’s commentary on his Byang chub lam gyi sgron ma’i dka’ grel, where he refers to the texts of this class under their alternative title as Yoganiruttarantrantras (rnal ’byor bla na med pa’i rgyud), p. 286: rnal ’byor bla na med pa’i rgyud ni dpal nam mkha’ dang mnyam pa ’bum pa chen po ’khor lo sdom pa dang rdo rje mkha’ ’gro dang rdo rje gdan bzhi pa dang ma hā mā yā dang sangs rgyas mnyam sbyor
First, it introduces or brings to the fore the cult of the deity Heruka\textsuperscript{340} with an iconography inspired by that of the Bhairavas of the Vidyāpīṭha with their accoutrements and attributes of the cremation-ground dwelling Kāpālika Śaiva ascetic. According to the visualization given by Ānandagarbha he has four faces and eight arms, emerging as the transformation of a dark blue flaming Vajra, itself a transformation of a dark blue syllable \textit{hrīh}. The central face is fierce (\textit{rav-

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{340}The origin of the name Heruka has not been explained in a satisfactory manner. First, it introduces or brings to the fore the cult of the deity Heruka. Brod. \textit{Genesis and Development of Tantrism}, p. 146.

The origin of the name Heruka has not been explained in a satisfactory manner. Indigenous sources explain it only through artificial semantic analyses based on superficial similarities of sound. Thus, for example, we are told that ‘He-’ means ‘uncaus ed’ (\textit{hetuvarjita}), ‘-ru-’ means ‘formless’ (\textit{raṇiṃruttam}), and ‘-ka’ means ‘free of sense-faculties’ (\textit{karanojhitam}); see Vajrapāṇī, \textit{Laghutantraṭīkā}, p. 45; Bhavabhaṭṭa, \textit{Cakrasanvarapāṇiṣṭikā}, p. 5; and the Tibetans, who translated names if they were meaningful, either left this untranslated or substituted a description, namely Khrag ‘thung ‘Blood-drinker’, a meaning that cannot be justified etymologically. So if the name was meaningful at some stage it appears that that meaning has left no trace in the surviving literature. The alternative is that it never was meaningful in this sense, being created on the basis of the unmeaning syllables \textit{he he ru ru kām} that are found in Cakrasanvara’s Mūlamantra: \textit{om śrīvajra he he ru ru kām hūṃ hūṃ phaṭ dākinījālaśaṃvaraṃ svāhā}. Against this it may be said that the name appears without this doubling of the first two syllables in the earlier \textit{Sarvatathāgatatatattvasaṃgraha}, section 794, in the Mantra for the taming of all the Mother goddesses: \textit{om heruka vajraśāraya sarvaduṣṭasamayamudrāprabhaṅjaka hūṃ phaṭ}. It might seem more reasonable, then, to see \textit{he he ru ru kām} as a spell-element built from an already existing name. However, it is striking that we find almost the same element in the Vidyā of Parāpāra, an important Mantra of the Śākta Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha: \textit{om āghore hṛīḥ paramaghore hūṃ ghororūpe hāḥ ghoromukhi bhīma bhīṣane vama pība he ru ru ra ṭaṭ hūṃ hāḥ phaṭ} (\textit{Siddhayogesvarimata} 3.23–39; \textit{Mālinīvijyottara} 3.42–50; \textit{Tantrāloka} 30.20–24b; \textit{Triśūrobhairava} quoted by Jayaratha thereon) and its variant taught in \textit{Kubjikāmata} 18.4-24: \textit{aṁ āghore hṛīḥ hsaḥ paramaghore hūṃ ghororūpe hsaṁ ghoromukhi bhīma bhīṣane vama vama pība haḥ he ru ru ra ra hṛīḥ hūṃ phaṭ}. We may note that the name Hevajra, that of the second major deity of the Yoginītantras, appears to have a similar origin, having been conjured up from the Mantra \textit{he vajra paśyā ‘O Vajra-[being], behold!’} that is uttered when the blindfold is removed from the candidate’s eyes in the presence of the Manḍala (\textit{Sarvatathāgatatatattvasaṃgraha}, section 230). The origin of the Herukas Rigi-ārāli and Vajra-ārāli of the Tantras of those names are also, it seems, the apparently unmeaning syllables of Mantras: \textit{om ārali rīgī pheṃ pheṃ pheṃ bhyo svāhā (\textit{ri gi ā ra li’i rgyud} f. 187v2) and om vajra ārali phaṭ . . . pheṃ pheṃ svāhā (\textit{ri gi ā ra li’i rgyud} f. 187v7)}. The name of the Heruka Buddhakapālā of the Tantra of that name has likewise been conjured out of the feminine vocative \textit{buddhakāpālini/-kāpālini} that appears in its Mantras; see (\textit{Nispannayogāvalī}, p. 31: \textit{om buddhakāpālini āḥ hi hūṃ phaṭ;} \textit{Buddhakapālataṇtra}, e.g., f. 5r1: \textit{om buddhakāpālini maṭa 2 āḥ phaṭ svāhā pusanvedanamantraḥ}).
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dram), those to its right and left expressive of delusion and erotic passion, and that behind open-mouthed to devour. In his two uppermost hands he holds the freshly flayed skin of Bhairava over his back, in the two below a bow and arrows, in the third right in descent he shakes a blazing three-pronged Vajra, and in the fourth a skull-bowl filled with human blood (mahāraktam). In the third left in descent he brandishes the Kapālika’s skull-staff (khaṭvāṅgaḥ), topped with a three-pronged Vajra and adorned with bells, and in the fourth a skull-bowl filled with human flesh (mahāmāṃsam). Or he may be single-faced and two-armed, with a five-pronged Vajra in his right hand raised above his shoulder and a skull-bowl full of human flesh in his left, with a skull-staff resting on his left shoulder and held in the crook of his left arm. He wears a chariot of skulls with the Buddha [Aksobhya] adorning his flaming hair, is surrounded by an aureole of flames, poses with his left foot on the ground and his right leg raised so that the sole of the foot touches his left thigh, has dancing eye-brows knitted in anger, and has round, fire-red darting eyes.  

341 Kalyāṇagarbha, who teaches only the two-armed form, adds that he stands on a sun disc, which rests on a lotus, which rests in turn on a prostrate corpse, is smeared with ashes, wears a garland of freshly severed human heads, and has protruding fangs.  

342 An anonymous Sādhanā text,
which also teaches only that form, gives the further details that he is dark blue
and clad in a garment of human skin, that his garland of heads is strung together
with human entrails, that he is adorned with human bones, that is to say with
the Kāpālika ornaments known as the Mṛdās, and that his posture indicates
that he is dancing.\textsuperscript{343}

He is surrounded in the style of the Vidyāpiṭha by twenty Vajraḍākinīs.\textsuperscript{344}
first, in the innermost circuit the eight Gaurī, Caurī, Pramohā, Vetāli, Pukkasī,
Caṇḍāli, Ghasmāri, and Herukasaṃnīvesā/Herukasaṃnībha; then the four
Cāpadhārīṇī, Kṛtvaṅgadhārīṇī, Cakradhārīṇī, and Citrapatākādārīṇī; then
four offering goddesses: Puṣpā, Dūpā, Ālokā, and Gandhā; and finally four
theriocephalic gate-guardians: Turaṅgamā, Vajramukhī, Vajramāmaki, and
Bhasmapralayavetāli.\textsuperscript{345}

\textsuperscript{343} Sādhanamālā no. 241: \textit{tato hṛiḥkāraṇispannaṁ nilakāralavajraṁ hṛiḥkārādhi-
śhitavatātke dhyātā tattvavaprītaṁ nilam naracarnabhrtaṁ kapālamālā-
kṣobhyaśirāksam jvalāprāptaṁ jvalalakeśam raktavartākṣam antrasaṁgrathita-
muṇḍamāvalambitaṁ nārāṣṭhiracitābharaṇaṁ dīvfhūjaikumukhaṁ damśtrā-
karālavadanām viśvapadmāsūrye vāmapādaṁ tasyai[vorau daksīnacaraṇaṁ
vīṇasya nṛtyaṁ kurvantāṁ herukavīraṁ bhāvayaṁ. There are numerous two-
armed Herukas conforming to the iconographical prescriptions of these Sādhanas
in surviving statuary from eastern India, though this connection with the tradition
of the \textit{Sarvabuddhasamāyoga} has not been recognized to my knowledge. For ex-
amples from Ratnagiri in Orissa, Nālandā, Sārnāth, and Subhapur (in the Comilla
District of Bengal) see \textsc{Linrothe} 1999, pp. 249–260, figs. 175–183, and 185–188,
and \textsc{Huntington} 1984, fig. 215. The last lacks the prostrate corpse.

\textsuperscript{344} Vajrajñoldrayā, f. 176r7–v1: \textit{saṁvam śrīgauryādivaṁva[rādākīniṁ][ganaṁ nirmāya
prajvalitordhvakeśaṁ raktavartākṣaṁ mahāpralayakālograṁ saṁasnāṅgni-
sadṛśaṁ saṁkrudṛśaṁ ekakapāla[ibbhamakutaṁ svacihnadharaṁ yathā-
sthāne nives[yat. The \textit{Sarvabuddhasamāyoga} deploys a complex six-family Manḍala consisting of six
sub-Manḍalas. The six families, each with its own sub-Manḍala, are those Va-
jarasattva, Vairocana, Heruka, Padmanarteśvara, Vajrasūrya, and Paramāṣvā. Two
Manḍala traditions deploy this pantheon. In one Vajrasattva occupies the cen-
tral sub-Manḍala and in the other Heruka. In each sub-Manḍala one of these
six occupies the centre surrounded by twenty goddesses. The last twelve god-
desses are the same in each, namely Śuṣīrā, Nṛtyā/Vinā, Vitāṭa, and Ghanā,
followed by Puṣpā, Dūpā, Ālokā, Gandhā, Turagā, Vajramukhī, Vajramāmaki,
and Bhasmapralayavetāli, the first eight of these being, as their names reveal,
offering-goddesses (pūjādevyaḥ), personifications of offerings, and the last four gate-
guardians, except that in the retinue of Heruka Cāpadhārīṇī, Kṛtvaṅgadhārīṇī,
Cakradhārīṇī, and Citrapatākādārīṇī are substituted for the first four, the mu-
sical offering-goddesses Śuṣīrā, Nṛtyā/Vinā, Vitāṭa, and Ghanā. The first eight
of the twenty, then, stand apart as the retinue specific to each Tathāgata.
The eight from Gaurī to Herukasaṃnīvesā formed the basis of the retinue of Hevajra
in the \textit{Yoginītantra Hevajra}, with the difference that there we see Śabarī rather
than Pramohā and Đombi rather than Herukasaṃnīvesā. See \textsc{Tomabechi} 2007,
pp. 919–921 for a complete tabulation of all one hundred and twenty-six deities and
their seed-syllables as given in the \textit{Sarvabuddhasamāyoga} and the \textit{Paramādyā}.
According to Ānandagarbha Gaurī (E) is fair in colour and tranquil-faced.
Eight-armed, she cuts off each of the four heads of Brahmā by simultaneously firing arrows from four bows.³⁴⁷ Caurī (S) is red and fierce-faced. Wearing a chaplet of skulls she holds a goad-hook (ānkuśah) in her left hand at her heart with a skull-staff in the crook of her left arm resting on her left shoulder, and holds aloft an eight-spoked discuss with the middle finger of her right, pressing down on the three worlds with her left foot. Pramohā (W) is black and four-armed, with the face of Viṣṇu’s boar-incarnation (ādivarāhamukhā). In her first left hand she holds a skull-bowl full of wine and in her first right a Vajra. With her other two hands she imitates the boar-incarnation by raising up the earth.³⁴⁸ Vetāli (N) is white and joyful-faced. With her right hand she pours a stream of the nectar of immortality from a transparent skull-cup and with her left shows the Vajra banner gesture. Pukkasā [E] is multi-coloured (vīśavaṃśa) and dancing in a smoky cremation-ground full of strings of skulls and the like. In her right fist she clasps a five-pronged Vajra and in her left a wind-buffeted tendril from the wish-granting tree of paradise (kalpavṛksalata). Caṇḍāli (S) is dark blue and riding on a whirlwind (vātamaṇḍalikā). In her right fist she clenches a Vajra-topped trident and with her left releases a whirlwind against her victims. Ghasmarī (W), black like Heruka, holds a skull-cup [to her heart] in her left hand, with a skull-staff resting on her left shoulder, and a five-pronged Vajra in her right. Cāpadhārini (SE) is red and, holding a Vajra bow with her left hand, fires Vajra arrows by drawing back the bowstring with her right. Khaṭvāṅgadārini (SW) is ash-white, wearing a chaplet of skulls and the Buddha on her crown, [holding a skull-staff with her left hand and] hurling a blazing fire-pronged Vajra from

³⁴⁷ That Gaurī is eight-armed is not stated by Ānandagarbha, but she could not draw four bows simultaneously with fewer and no other hands are mentioned. His mahāprasyasaḥya- is obscure but evidently it denotes Brahmā since the victim is said here to have four heads (mahāprasyasyāsira<s>-catusṭayam pātayanti<}). Both these inferences are supported by Hūṃkāravajra, who is explicit in both regards in his *Herukasādhana (f. 203v2): zhal bzhī phyag brgyad brjid pa’i stongs | g.yon brkyang gar gyis bzhugs mdzad cing | mda’ bzhī dus gcig bkang ba la | tshangs pa’i mgo bzhī spyangs pa ste.

³⁴⁸ According to Hūṃkāravajra’s Herukasādhana she has two heads, that of a boar above and a red head below. Moreover, he has her raise with her two lower hands a wheel (khor lo) rather than the earth (f. 203v3–5): “pra (em.: bra Cod.) mo dbu gnyis gong ma phag | ’og ma dmar po phyag bzhī pa | g.yas kyi dang pos rdo rje rtse gsum bsnams | g.yon gyi dang pos kham phor ’chang | ’og gnyis khu tshur so sor ’chang | khor lo’ dzin cing bteg pa’i tshul | g.yas brkyang stabs bcas nub phyogs su | rmongs tshul mdog dmar po dma la.
her right. Cakradhārini (NW) is light green and holds aloft an eight-spoked disc on the middle finger of her right hand and threatens [the wicked] with her left fist clenched in anger. Citrapatākadhārini (NE) is golden in colour, holding a multi-coloured banner in her right hand. The four offering-goddesses stand in the directions holding the offerings that they personify: flowers, an incense-burner, a lamp, and fragrant powder; and the four goddesses Turāṅgamā, Vajramukhī, Vajramāmaki/Ālokā, and Bhasmapralayavetālī stand in the four gates of the enclosure to subjugate all hostile deities (*krodhakulam*), with the heads of a horse, a boar, a crow, and a dog, and holding a hook, noose, chain, and bell.349

All this, barring a few specifically Buddhist details such as the Vajras and the offering-goddesses, who are already in the Mantranaya of the *Sarva-

---

349 Ānandagarbha’s text is corrupt and lacunose at this point in the manuscript, omitting Vajramukhī and Vajramāmaki (f. 178r5–v2): vāmamuṣṭīnā ?ghatyā?avasthītā?tryā?āmāṇījālinā puspadhūpadīpagandhichadhārīniyāṇā śvāgogāsābhūti-
samjñītāsattapūjādevi | pūrvadāramidhye turāṅgāsanaḥ vāmahastena padmahastā hayagrīvaharitam aśvamukhaṃ dhārayantī | daksīṇe kare sthitena vajrāṅkuṣena sarvakrodhakulam ākārṣyantī | paścime *dvāra ālokāṃ (corr. : dvāre lokāti Cod.) candrasūryaṃbhamāṃ dhārayet | daksīṇe kare sthitavajrāṅkhanvadānyogena sarvakrodhakulam vaśiкурvanty *avasthitā (corr. : avasthitāḥ Cod.). | *sarvās caitāḥ (corr. : sarvācetāḥ Cod.) pratālyidhāsthānasthāḥ|h> sadṛṣṭibhāvarasānvitā|h>.

A complete but less detailed description of these eight can be seen in the Tibetan translation of the *Herukasādhana* of Hūṃkāravajra, f. 204r4–7. The identity of the non-human heads of the gate-guardians is mentioned in these sources only in the case of the horse-headed Turāṅgamā, by Ānandagarbha and Hūṃkāravajra (f. 204r5: shar sgo rta mgrin ’phang mtho dkar | g.yas na rta gdong g.yon lcags kyu), and Vajramukhī, by Hūṃkāravajra, who names this goddess Phag gdong ‘Boarface’ (Sūkūraśyā) (f. 204r6: lhor sgor phag gdong sngon mo ste | g.yas pas mche ba g.yon zhags ’dzin). According to the tradition of the Ngor Maṇḍalas, the last two door-guardians, Snang ba ma (Ālokā) and Thal byed ma (*Bhasmakāriṇī (?)], are crow-faced and dog-faced (BSOD NAMS RGYA MTSHO 1991, p. 110). These animal-headed guardians exemplify the character of this Tantra as transitional between the Yogatatantras and the Yoginītantras. The animal-headedness is shared with such goddesses in the latter (see here p. 151), but the hand-attributes, namely the hook, noose, chain, and bell, are those of Vajrāṅkuṣa, Vajrapāśa, Vajrasphoṭa, and Vajrāvēsa, the male gate-guardians of the Vajradhātumāṇḍala of the Yogatanaṇṭra *Sarvatathāgatatatattvasamgraha*; see TANAKA 1996, p. 271. For those attributes see the *Herukasādhana* of Hūṃkāravajra, f. 204r5–7 (I have restored the Mantras, which invoke the goddesses as the personifications of these attributes, to their correct Sanskrit form): OṂ *VAJRĀṆKUṢE (corr. BA DZRA AM KU SHA Cod.) JAH | shar sgo rta mgrin ’phang mtho dkar | g.yas na rta gdong g.yon lcags kyu | OṂ VAJRĀPĀṢE HŪṂ | lhor sgor phag gdong sngon mo ste | g.yas pas mche ba g.yon zhags ’dzin | OṂ *VAJRĀŚRŪKHALE (corr. : BA DZRA SHRI KHA LE Cod.) VĀṂ | nub sgor snang byed dmar mo ni | phyag gnyis ngyi zla lcags srgog ’dzin | OṂ *VAJRAGHANṬE (corr. : BA DZRA GA ṇṬE Cod.) HOḤ | byang sgor thal byed mdog ljang du | sang rgyas gzugs dang dril bu’o.

---

The Šaiva Age
tathāgattatattvasaṃgraha,\textsuperscript{350} is very much in the Kāpālika style of the pantheons of Bhairavas and Yoginīs taught in the Vidyāpīṭha.

Second, it is in the tradition of this Tantra that we see for the first time in the Mantranaya the practice of the ganamāṇḍalam, orgiastic worship in an assembly consisting of a male and a group of female adepts (yoginīganāh) personifying the deities of the cult, with a jargon of special terms and gestures known as chommāh to be used in these gatherings.\textsuperscript{351} Both these features, collective orgiastic worship of deity-personifying Yoginīs and the use of chommāh, are distinctive features of the Śākta Śaivism of the Vidyāpīṭha.\textsuperscript{352}

Third, we see here for the first time the complete abandoning of the mixed prose and verse style inherited from the Mahāyānasūtras in favour of one that resembles that of the Śaiva scriptures in consisting entirely of Anusṭubh verse, barring the Mantras, and also the disappearance of the traditional Buddhist preamble maintained up to the time of the Guhyasamāja, stating the occasion and place of the revelation.\textsuperscript{353} It is also in the Sarvakalpasamuccaya, the supple-

\textsuperscript{350} See Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha, sections 165–176 and Nispannayogāvali, p. 46 (Vajradhūpa, Vajrāuspā, Vajrālokā, and Vajrācanḍā).

\textsuperscript{351} The practice and the jargon are outlined by Āryadeva in his Caryāmelāpakaprādipta (pp. 82–60: prapaiciatācaryā) on the authority of this Tantra. The Yoginīs personified here are the twenty that form the retinue of Vajrasattva, the eight peculiar to him being Śāṃvarī, Ahosukhā, Pradīpī, Siṣyā, Buddhahodhi, Dharmacakra, Trailokyā, and Kāmalatā.

\textsuperscript{352} On such worship in Śākta Śaivism see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 280–288; and Tantrāloka 28.6–111, 372c–385b (yoginīmelakah, cakrayāgah, mūrtiyāgah), 29.66, 78–79. On chommāh in these traditions see SANDERSON 2007a, p. 333 and the sources quoted in footnotes 331–332.

\textsuperscript{353} The Tantra begins as follows (Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba, f. 151r1–2: 1.1 sens dpa’ sangs rgyas kun gyi dngos | rdo rje sens dpa’ bde ba’i mchog | gsang ba mchog gi dgyes pa na | thams cad bdag nyid rtag tu gzhugs | 1.2 ’di ni rang byung boos ldan ’das | gcig bu rab tu phyel ba’i la | sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam sbyor ba | mkha’ ’gro sgyu ma bde ba’i mchog (*rahasye parame ramye sarvatmani sadā sthitah | sarvabuddhāyāḥ sattvo vajrasattvah paramā sukham | asau suvayambhūr bhaṅgavān eka evādhīdaitaḥ | sarvabrasamāyogadākinījālaśamvarah). Cf. the opening verses of the Laghusamvaratantra, which are evidently based on it: athātāḥ rahasyaṃ vaktaye samāsāṇa na tu vistārāt | śriherukasanyogam sarvakāmārthasādhaḥkam | 1.2 uttarād api cottaram dākinijālaśamvaram | raḥasye parame ramye sarvatmani sadā sthitah | 1.3 sarvadākininimayaḥ sattvo vajrasattvah paramā sukham | asau hi suvayambhūr bhagavān vīro dākinijālaśamvaram; and the following citation of the Sarvabuddhasamāyoga in the Caryāmelāpaprādipta, p. 82: athātāḥ sampravakṣyāmi sarvato viśvam uttamam | sarvabuddhasamāyogam dākinijālaśamvaram | raḥasye parame ramye sarvatmani sadā sthitah | sarvabuddhāyāḥ śrīmān vajrasattvadayaḥ sukham. These verses are 1–2 of the Kalpa 6 of the Tantra, corresponding to the Tibetan, except that that seems to have had a different version of the first line (f. 159v4–5): de nas gzhan yang thams cad du | rnam pa sna tshogs mchog ‘byung pa’i | sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam sbyor ba | mkha’ ’gro sgyu ma’i
mentary continuation (*uttaratantra*) of this Tantra, that we see the first appearance in the Mantranaya of the Śaiva method of teaching Mantras in encrypted form to be decoded by the process known as *mantroddhāraḥ*; and with this development we encounter what is at present our earliest evidence of Buddhist-Śaiva intertextuality. A passage of seven verses that prescribes for this purpose the drawing of a square with forty-nine cells (*koṣṭhakāni*) and the arranging of the forty-nine letters within them corresponds very closely to one in the *Vināśikha* of the *vāmasrotaḥ* division of the Vidyāpīṭha.\[^{354}\]

The intensification of the Śākta Śaiva character of the Mantranaya evident in this text is accompanied by the implication that this Buddhism is one that has conquered that tradition, transforming it, as it were, from within into a vehicle for Buddhist salvation. For while wrathful Heruka appears with Kāpālika iconography and a retinue of Yoginīs he wears, as we have seen, the freshly flayed skin of Bhairava over his shoulders; and the Tantra relates that its deity in its commitment to purify all beings has violently overpowered Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, and Kāmadeva, and taken their consorts by force for his own enjoyment.\[^{355}\]

\[\textit{bde mchog bshad}.\] For the requirement of a preamble see, e.g., the Mahāyānist *Dharmasamgrhītisūtra* as quoted by Abhayākaraśuṃga in the introduction to his *Abhayapadādhati* f. 1v: *kāla-desādēsaka-paṛṣa-tāmaṁ-hī hi deṣānā-yā niśānan en-āṃ vinā deṣānā-paṭapateḥ. tatra evam mayeti mama dharmāh saṁgātavyaḥ ... ity uktam bhagavatā dharmasamgrhītisūtra* ‘For the preamble that establishes the authenticity of a teaching [comprises] all these factors together, namely the time, place, teacher, and congregation, because without all those it cannot be [accepted as] a teaching. To this effect the Buddha has declared in the *Dharmasamgrhītisūtra* ...: ‘My teachings must be recited with [the opening phrase] “Thus I [. . .]”; and the unnamed *Sūtra* quoted by Tathāgatārakṣita on *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 1.1: *mayi parinirvṛtte bhikṣava evam mayetyādikāyaṁ mama dharmāḥ saṁgātavyaḥ* ‘O monks, after I have been completely extinguished [by death] you should recite my teachings with the words “Thus I . . .”’.\[^{354}\]

\[\textit{bde mchog bshad}.\] For the requirement of a preamble see, e.g., the Mahāyānist *Dharmasamgrhītisūtra* as quoted by Abhayākaraśuṃga in the introduction to his *Abhayapadādhati* f. 1v: *kāla-desādēsaka-paṛṣa-tāmaṁ-hī hi deṣānā-yā niśānan en-āṃ vinā deṣānā-paṭapateḥ. tatra evam mayeti mama dharmāh saṁgātavyaḥ ... ity uktam bhagavatā dharmasamgrhītisūtra* ‘For the preamble that establishes the authenticity of a teaching [comprises] all these factors together, namely the time, place, teacher, and congregation, because without all those it cannot be [accepted as] a teaching. To this effect the Buddha has declared in the *Dharmasamgrhītisūtra* ...: ‘My teachings must be recited with [the opening phrase] “Thus I [. . .]”; and the unnamed *Sūtra* quoted by Tathāgatārakṣita on *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 1.1: *mayi parinirvṛtte bhikṣava evam mayetyādikāyaṁ mama dharmāḥ saṁgātavyaḥ* ‘O monks, after I have been completely extinguished [by death] you should recite my teachings with the words “Thus I . . .”’.\[^{354}\]

This has been demonstrated in TOMABECHI 2007. The Śaiva passage is *Vināśikha* 52–58. That in the *Sarvakalpasamuccaya* is DK, Rgyud b’um, vol. ka, ff. 194v6–195r5.

\[^{354}\] This has been demonstrated in TOMABECHI 2007. The Śaiva passage is *Vināśikha* 52–58. That in the *Sarvakalpasamuccaya* is DK, Rgyud b’um, vol. ka, ff. 194v6–195r5.

\[^{355}\] *Śanvartantra* (= *Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinījālaśamvara*) quoted in *Jñānasiddhi* 18.10–18 (pp. 153–154): *sarva-suddhyadhīmokṣeṇa prasahya balavān adhāḥ | pārākramakramanāt tu sarvalokān pramardayet || anyaṁ tu duṣṭarádurograṁ sattvadhātum anekadhā || pāpaśi corair avasandhaiḥ sarvam eva viśodhayet || cchalaṇa māyāyā caiva prasahya balavān adhāḥ || pāṇcāyudhānibandhaiṣ ca sarvalokān āvekṣayet tadā || vijtitya sakalāṁ siddhiṁ jagat sthāvarajangamam || vicitravinayopāyaṁ svaparān anupālayet || kāminināṁ bhavit kāmo raudrāṇāṁ raudram uttamam || saunyoṇāṁ paramaṁ saunyam haṭṭhānāṁ haṭṭhavikramāṁ || parameśaṁ samākramya prasahya balavān adhāḥ || *umādevinām samākrya ca apabhogāṁ bhunakty asau || nārayanām samākramya prasahya balavān adhāḥ || rūpiniṁ tu samākryaṁ upabhogāṁ bhunakty asau || prajāpatīṁ samākramya prasahya balavān adhāḥ || prasāntadevināṁ āṣādyā upabhogāṁ bhunakty asau || kāmadevaṁ samākramya prasahya balavān adhāḥ || ratiṣṭhitṛdyasvarṇāṁ samākramya bhunakty asau*. This corresponds to
rhetoric of appropriation is reflected in the Mantras of Heruka’s Vajraḍākīnīs. Pramohā, who, as we have seen, has the boar face of Viṣṇu’s Ādivalāha incarnation, is invoked as Vajraṇārayaṇī, Caurī as Vajracaṇḍēśvāri, and Ghasmārī as Vajramāhesvārī.356 Furthermore, Heruka’s first appearance in the Mantranaya is in the Sarvatathāgatatatattvasamgraha, where his name appears in a Mantra for the drawing of all the [Śaiva] Mother-goddesses into Buddhism, and it is that, with the insertion of a single seed syllable, that is adopted as the Mantra of Heruka in the Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākīnījālaśaṃvara.357 The very title of the work alludes to this assimilation, since it is evidently calqued on those of two Vidyāpiṭha scriptures, the Sarvāvīrasamāyoga and the Yoginījālaśaṃvara.358

The Yoginītantras and the Full Appropriation of Vidyāpiṭha Śaivism

With the Yoginītantras proper we reach the final stage of this process of absorption. The principal among the numerous Tantras of this class are the

---

*Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba,* ff. 158v7–159r5, except that there Paramēṣa’s (Śiva’s) consort is Bhimādevi (f. 159r2: *lha mo bhi mo*) and Nārāyaṇa’s (Viṣṇu’s) is Rukmini (f. 159r3: *rgni ni*).

356 Vajrajvālodaya, f. 176v: HUM VAJRAN¯AR¯AYAN JHIR iti (em.: *jhirati* Cod.); ibid.: HUM VAJRACAṆḌĒŚVARI KHAṬVĀNGI MAḤĀVAJRI KAPĀLAMĀLMUKTE RULU RULU HUM iti caurīm. Ghasmārī is invoked as Vajramāhesvārī in the Mantras of the retinue of Heruka given in the Sampuṭodbhava: OṂ VAJRAMĀHEŚVARI HAM HAM HAM HAH RULU RULU BHYO HŪṂ PHAṬ BHAKŚAYA SARVAḌUṬṬĀN NIRMAṬHA HṍḌAYAM HŪṂ PHAṬ SVĀḤĀ | ghasmaryāḥ (f. 81r4–5). There are other examples of the assimilative transformation of non-Buddhist deities in the Mantranaya, marked, as here, by the prefixing of Vajra- to their names. For example, the deities Vajraṇārayaṇa, Vajracaṇḍēśvāra, and Vajrapadmodbhava, that is to say, Vajrayānist transformations of Viṣṇu, Rudra, and Brahmacārayā, together with their consorts Vajraśērī, Vajragaurī, and Vajratārā, join Ākāśagarbha and Khajvirajīn in the retinue of Vajrasatī in the central section of the abridged Maṇḍala (bsduṣ pa’i dkyil ’khor) of the Yogatantra Paramādyā, a text with which the Sarvabuddhasamāyoga is closely related (Tomarechi 2007, p. 904; Tanaka 1996, pp. 271–272). That disposition of deities is taught (see Tanaka 1996, pp. 96–103) in the mChog dang po’i sngags kyi rdog pa’i dum bu (*Śrīparamādyamantrakalpakaṇḍa*) (Tōh. 488) according to Ānandagarbha’s mChog dang po’i rgya cher bshad pa (*Paramādyaḥ*) (Tōh. 2512).

357 *Sarvatathāgatatattvasamgraha,* section 794: OṂ HERUKAṊRAṢAYAMAYA SARVAḌUṬṬASAṆAYAMUḌRĀPRABHAṆJAKA HUM PHAṬ sarvamāṭīṃnām iti; Vajrajvalodaya: OṂ HERUKAṆAYAMA H<ś-r>ĪH SARVAḌUṬṬASAṆAYAMUḌRĀPRABHAṆJAKA HUM PHAṬ iti svamantren śrīherukaṃ nīvēṣayet.

On these two scriptures see Sandersön 2007a, pp.234–236 and footnotes 21–22. The expression sarvāvīrasamāyogadākīnījālaśaṃvarāṃ, without the substitution of -buddha- for -tīra-, is seen in the Yoginītantras of Cakrasaṃvara. It appears in, e.g., Laghusaṃvaratantra, f. 8r3 (8.1) and f. 24v4 (31.13ef): tataḥ sarvāvīrasamāyogadākīnījālaśaṃvarāṃ; and Samvarodaya 3.6cd: sarvāvīrasamāyogadākīnījālaśaṃkhaṃ. In the last sat sukham is a tacit semantic analysis of saṃvārah.
Laghuśaṃvara also called Cakrasaṃvara and Herukābhidhāna, the Hevajra, the Catuspīṭha, the Vajrāṁta, the Buddhakapāla, the Mahāmāya, the Rigyārali, the Vajrārali, the Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa, and the Kālacakra. Two of these texts, the Laghuśaṃvara of the Heruka called Śaṃvara (bDe mchog) or Cakrasaṃvara (Khor lo sdom pa) and the Hevajra of the Heruka Hevajra held centre-stage, a position they later shared with the Kālacakra when that text was propagated towards the end of the tenth century, during the reign of Mahīpāla I (r. c. 977–1027). Their importance is reflected in the sheer quantity of commentaries and other texts devoted to the cult of their deities. The Tenjur contains translations of eleven commentaries on the Hevajra and of eleven on the Laghuśaṃvara, and of about two hundred other explanatory texts related to each. Moreover, they both have a number of satellite Tantras, the Hevajra five and the Laghuśaṃvara over fifty. The principal among these, those that received commentaries, are for the Hevajra the Gātinīvajrapaṇḍjara and the Mahāmudrātilaka, and for the Laghuśaṃvara the Herukābhhyudaya, the Vajradāka, the Abhidhānottara, the Yogiṇīśaṃcāra, the Saṃvarodaya, and the Ṛkārnava. Another major Yogiṇītantra, the Sampūṭodbhava, on which we have an important commentary, the Ṛmnīyamaṇjarī, by Abhayākaragupta (1064–1125), pertains to both cycles.

---

359 On the date of the Kālacakra see here p. 96. On the establishing of this tradition and how it positioned itself in relation to earlier Tantric Buddhism see SFERRA 2005.

360 This large total includes thirty-four texts (Tōh. 383–416), forming a supplementary collection, as it were, of related opera minora, totalling less than 150 pages. Though included in the Kanjur they were classified by Bu ston (1290–1364) as supplementary Tantras whose authenticity, that is to say, Indian origin, was the subject of debate (rgyud yang dag yin min rtso pa can). The great majority are claimed in their colophons to be translations prepared in the early eleventh century by 'Bro mi in collaboration with the Indian Gayadhara. On the lay Tantric Gayadhara, who is mentioned in no Indian source known to me but is the subject of many partly conflicting accounts in Tibet, where he was venerated as the Indian source of the Lam ˈbras tradition and for having collaborated with several Tibetan translators, see STEARNS 2001, pp. 47–55. It is, however, certain that not all these opera minora are of suspect authenticity. For my pupil Péter-Daniel Szántó has recently identified the original Sanskrit of one, the Anāvilatantra, among the contents of a palm-leaf codex preserved in the Tokyo University Library (verbal communication).

361 These dates rest on Tibetan tradition and are consistent with the regnal years of Rāmapāla that Abhayākaragupta has reported as the dates of composition at the end of some of his works; see here p. 126.

362 Thus, though counted as an explanatory Tantra of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle, it is grouped with the Hevajra and Gātinīvajrapaṇḍjara as one of the three Tantras of Hevajra (kye rdo rje rgyud gsun) in the Sa skya tradition of Tibet, and classified because of its mixed character as the Hevajra’s shared explanatory Tantra (thun mong bshad rgyud); see STEARNS 2001, pp. 173–174, n. 28. It also extends into the territories of the Catuspīṭha, the Guhyasamāja, the Vajrabhairava, and, as we
GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF TANTRISM

CHRONOLOGY AND PROVENANCE. All of these Tantras were translated into Tibetan, and all but the latest among them, the Dākārṇava and the Samvarodya, were translated in the first half of the eleventh century, during the opening phase of the later diffusion (phyi dar) of Indian Buddhism to Tibet, as were commentaries on the majority of those named here, most written during the course of the tenth and early eleventh centuries.

The oldest is probably the commentary of Jayabhadra on the Laghuśaṃvara. In chapter 38 of his Rgya gar chos ’byung Tāranātha includes five of our commentators on the Laghuśaṃvara, Jayabhadra, Bhavabhadra/Bhavabhatṭa, Bhavyakīrti, Durjayacandra, and Tathāgatarakṣita, among ten persons whom he holds to have occupied the office of chief Vajrācārya at Vikramaśila in rapid unbroken succession, and claims that Jayabhadra was the first of the ten (Jayabhadra, Śrīdhara, Bhavabhadra (/Bhavabhatṭa), Bhavyakīrti, Lilāvajra, Durjayacandra, Kṛṣṇasamayavajra, Tathāgatarakṣita, Bodhibhadra, and Kamalarakṣita). Moreover, comparison of the commentaries, the Tibetan translation, and the only manuscript of the Laghuśaṃvara accessible to me at present reveals two versions of the text. Tāranātha’s claim that Jayabhadra preceded all the other commentators in his list gains support from the fact that Jayabhadra knew what is evidently the earlier of these two versions. It extends only to 50.19, ending with a passage on fire-sacrifices that may be performed if one wishes to subject another to one’s will (vaśyahomah). In the second, attested by all the other commentators except Bhavyakīrti, by the Tibetan translation, and by

have seen, the Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinijālaśaṃvara.

In Bhavyakīrti’s Cakrasamvarapañjikā the text of the Laghuśaṃvara ends exactly where it does in Jayabhadra’s. It is therefore likely to belong like Jayabhadra’s to the earliest phase of the exegesis of this Tantra. Jayabhadra’s appears to be the older of the two. In 41.8 Bhavyakīrti attests with the later witnesses the interpolation (see here p.199) *oddjīvānājālandharapulliramalayādiśu (bDe mchog nyung ngu, f. 239r2: au ḍya na | ḍzā la ndha ra dang pu li ra ma la ya soṣ), since he comments here (f. 36v6): o ḍyā na du ni ’od ldan ma’o | ḍzā la ndha rar ni gtum mig ma’o | pu līṭ ra ma la ya soṣ, whereas Jayabhadra says that Pulliramala has not been mentioned but must nonetheless be understood to be intended (p. 137: pulliramalayo na nīrīṣṭab sarvapīṭhānām pradhānatvād upadeśād vāvaseyāḥ). It seems probable, then, that Bhavyakīrti follows the reading of a subsequent redaction in which this ‘omission’ had been rectified.

At the beginning of the translation the name of Bhavyakīrti’s commentary is said to be Śūramanjña in Sanskrit and dpa’ bo’i yid du ’ong in Tibetan, i.e. ‘pleasing to heroes’. But the Sanskrit titles given in the Tenjur are so often inaccurate that we can conclude that they do not reach us from the Sanskrit works themselves but are reconstructions from the Tibetan added by the compilers of the Tenjur. The Sanskrit rendered by dPa’ bo’i yid du ’ong can now only be guessed, but its first element was surely Vīra- rather than Śūra-. The Mahāvyutpatti, composed to guide Tibetan translators and no doubt the dictionary used by the compilers of the Tenjur, gives dpa’ bo to render both vīra- and śūra-, both meaning ‘hero’; but though the two
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the manuscript, the fiftieth chapter has eight verses after the last of the shorter text (50.20–27), followed by a fifty-first chapter of twenty-two verses. It is clear that the longer text is the later. For the alternative, that the shorter text arose after the longer by excision of the final thirty verses, is inconceivable, since these have the effect of greatly increasing the plausibility of the whole as a Buddhist work and were no doubt added because it was felt, quite rightly, that 1.1 to 50.19 were inadequate in this regard. The only element of Mahāyāna Buddhist doctrine contained in the text up to 50.19 comprises a section of four verses (10.1–4) stating that success in the pursuit of Siddhis depends on the Śādhaka’s identifying with the three Buddha bodies (Dharmakāya, Saṃbhogakāya, and Nirmānakāya), all other Buddhist elements being little more than a handful of occurrences of the terms Buddha, Tathāgata, and Bodhisattva, and the names of Vajrayānist deities.

Now Tāranātha claims that his ten successive Tantric Ācāryas of Vikramaśila held their positions after the time of Buddhajñānapāda and Dīpankarabhadra, whom he places in the reign of Dharmapāla (c. 775–812); and he reports that each did so for twelve years, implying thereby a form of limited tenure. Thereafter, he says, came the six “Door-keepers”. Among them was Ratnākarasānti, who taught the Tibetan translator ʻBrog mi Šākya ye shes (993–1077?) and the Indian Dīpankarāśrijñāna365 (982–1054), and was a slightly older contemporary of Jñānāṣrimitra, who was active c. 980–1030. From this it would be a simple matter to determine the approximate date of Jayabhadra, the first of the ten, by counting the years from either end, were it not that Tāranātha makes the collective tenure of the ten Ācāryas 120 years, whereas the interval between Dīpankarabhadra and Ratnākaraśānti is almost two centuries. We might be inclined to count back from Ratnākaraśānti rather than forward from Dīpankarabhadra, thinking that a historian’s information is likely to be more reliable the closer he approaches his own time. In that case, if we trust Tāranātha and set the end of the tenure of Kamalarakṣīta in 1000, as the immediate predecessor of the Door-keepers, we will conclude that Jayabhadra’s tenure ran from 880–892.

words are synonymous in ordinary usage, in the tradition of the Yoginītantras it is the former alone that is used in the special sense evidently intended here, that is, as a technical term for the Tantric practitioner. As for the second element, the same dictionary gives manojñā for yid du ʻong. But the result is unattractive by the standards of Sanskrit authors, who generally sought, like authors everywhere, to give their works titles that appealed to the ear. Vīrmanoramarā is synonymous and meets this requirement.

364 Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 84.
365 Blue Annals, p. 380.
However, this chronology can be reconciled with other reports only at a great stretch, at least for the later teachers in Tāranātha’s succession. Thus Dmarston, pupil of Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan (1182–1251) tells us that Durjayacandra, who by this calculation would have held office from 940 to 952, was the teacher of Prajñendra-ruci, also called Vīravajra, and that the latter taught ‘Brog mi Śākya ye shes. Now ‘Brog mi is said to have let Tibet for Nepal and India when Rin chen bzang po was nearly fifty years old, that is to say around 1007 if Rin chen bzang po was born in 958, as his biography claims and Gzhon nu dpal accepts, and then, after spending one year in Nepal with Śāntibhadra and eight at Vikramaśīla with Ratnākaraśānti, to have studied with Prajñendra-ruci for three or four, that is to say, therefore, c. 1016–1020. If we accept that Durjayacandra is unlikely to have held such a senior post as that of the head Vajrācārya of Vikramaśīla in his youth and assume for the sake of argument that he was fifty-five when he began his tenure, then if that tenure began in 940, he would have to have been continuing to teach long after his retirement at sixty-seven in 952, and Prajñendra-ruci, if we take 945 as the latest plausible year of his birth, would have been about seventy when he accepted ‘Brog mi as his pupil.

This scenario is not impossible; but neither is it comfortable. Nor is it helped by the fact that Prajñendra-ruci is reported to have collaborated with ‘Brog mi on translations of texts pertaining to Hevajra and his consort Nairātmyā. This evidence is given in the colophons at the end of these translations and should be considered more reliable than that of hagiographical biographies.

Even more difficult to reconcile is the report in the Chos ’byung of Padma-dkar po (1527–1592) that Durjayacandra taught the Mantranaya at Vikramaśīla to the translator Rin chen bzang po. For Rin chen bzang po is said to have left for India in 975, at the age of seventeen, and to have gone to Vikramaśīla only after a period of some seven years of education in Kashmir, therefore around 982. At that time Durjayacandra would have been nearly a hundred if we hold to the assumption that he began his tenure in 940 when he was fifty-five years of age. It is probable, then, that while we are indeed closer to the truth if

---

368 Blue Annals, p. 68, ll. 3–6.
369 Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 84, ll. 6–10; Blue Annals, p. 205, ll. 32–35.
370 Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 86, l. 10; Blue Annals, p. 206, ll. 18–19.
371 Blue Annals, p. 206, ll. 32–33 (three years); Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 88, ll. 7–8 (four years).
372 Tōh. 1185, 1236, 1251, 1310.
373 TUCCI 1988, p. 35.
we calculate back from the Door-keepers than forward from Buddhajñāna and Dipankarabhadra, Tāranātha has placed the later teachers from Durjayacandra onwards too early.

This suspicion gains further support from what we know of the life of Tathāgataraksīta. If Tāranātha’s report were accurate, provided that we calculate backwards from the six Door-keepers, then he would have held office at Vikramaśila c. 964–976. But we learn from the colophon of the Tibetan translation of his commentary on the Yoganīsaṃcāra that he translated the work himself with the help of the Tibetan Ba ri Lo tsā ba Rin chen grags. This places his activity well into the second half of the eleventh century. For Ba ri Rin chen grags is said by Gzhon nu dpal to have been born in 1040.\(^{375}\)

If Durjayacandra, as now seems probable, was active towards the end of the tenth century, and if Tāranātha is correct that there were no intervals between the tenures of his predecessors Jayabhadra, Śrīdhara, Bhavabhadra, Bhavyakirti, and Lilāvajra, then we shall not be far from the truth if we assign them all these commentators on the Laghuśaṃvara to the tenth century.

Beyond the terminus provided by this tentative dating of the earliest commentators we have no clear knowledge of the date of these Tantras. It has been claimed by Davidson that the Laghuśaṃvara was already in existence in the eighth century since Vilāsavajra cites it several times in his commentary on the Mañjuśrīnāmasamāṃgiti;\(^ {376}\) and this view has recently been repeated by Gray.\(^ {377}\) The latter recognized that most of the former’s claimed citations are actually not of the Laghuśaṃvaratantra but of the Sarvabuddhāsamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara, which Vilāsavajra cites as the Śaṃvaratantra, using the common abbreviation of this unwieldy title. But he argues that the date is established nonetheless by two places in the same commentary in which Vilāsavajra cites a Cakrasaṃvaratantra or Cakraśaṃvaratantra. This Gray takes to be the Laghuśaṃvara under its commonly used alias. Both citations occur in a section of the commentary in which, explaining epithets found in the Mañjuśrīnāmasamāṃgiti, Vilāsavajra follows each with iti and the name of a Tantra in the locative, indicating that the epithet is also found in that source. The first citation, Gray claims, is of Laghuśaṃvara 2.16c (f. 2v6: hasticarmāvaruddham ca ‘and [his back] covered with the hide of an elephant’), and the second of 48.12a (f. 35r6: kaṅkāla mahākaṅkāla). In fact the first passage does not cite Laghuśaṃvara 2.16c, the text quoted being gajacarmaṇaṭārdradhrīk ‘wearing as his upper garment the moist hide of an

\(^{375}\) *Blue Annals*, p. 211.  
\(^{376}\) Davidson 1981, pp. 7–8.  
elephant’, to which Laghuśaṃvara 2.16c corresponds only in sense and then not exactly. As for the second citation, the word kankālaḥ does appear in the Laghuśaṃvara, as the name of one of the twenty-four Vīra consorts of the twenty-four Dākinīs, but as a single word its presence is not enough to establish the identity of Vilāsavajra’s Cakrasaṃvara with the Laghuśaṃvara. On the other hand, the fact that the first epithet attributed to the Cakrasaṃvara does not occur in the Laghuśaṃvara is not sufficient to prove the opposing thesis, that Vilāsavajra was referring to another work. For it is conceivable that he was citing the text not for the exact wording of Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti 69d (gajacarmapāṭārdradhṛk) but only for an expression close to it in meaning. But if this is true it establishes, of course, only that Vilāsavajra may have been referring to Laghuśaṃvara 2.16c, not that he was. To continue to hold to the position that Vilāsavajra must have been referring to our Laghuśaṃvara in spite of these considerations, one has to put one’s trust in the fact that the Laghuśaṃvara is also known as the Cakrasaṃvara and the fact that no other work of this name is cited (unless it be here). One must also remain free of the suspicion that there might have been another, earlier work with this title among the numerous Tantras known in the eighth century that have failed to survive either in Sanskrit or in Tibetan translation. One must also overlook the evidence of the Laghuśaṃvara itself. For that refers to a Cakrasaṃvara in a list of its own predecessors.

378 Vilāsavajra, Nāmamantrārthāvalokini A f. 57r1–2, on Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti 69d (gajacarmapāṭārdradhṛk): gajacarmapāṭārdradhṛg iti śrīcakrasaṃvare | gajasya carma gajacarman paṭaś cāśāv ārdraś ca | gajacarmama paṭārdrah gajacarmapāṭārdrah | tam dhārayatīti gajacarmapāṭārdradhṛk. This error has been pointed out by SÁNTÓ (2008b, p. 217).

379 Vilāsavajra, Nāmamantrārthāvalokini A f. 55v6, on Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti 67cd (damstrākarālaḥ kankālo halāhalah śatānanaḥ): kankāla iti śrīcakrasaṃvare.

380 Laghuśaṃvara f. 35r4–7 (48.9c–12): vajrasattva vairocana padmanarțevaras tathā | śrīvajraherukaḥ caiva āhāsagarbha hayaṅgrīva eva ca || 10 ratnavajra mahābala virūpākṣa bhairavas tathā | vajrabhadra subhadraś caiva <va>jraḥunākram eva ca || 11 mahāvīra vajraṭālīm tu anukurika vajrādeha | vajraprabha amitābhaḥ suravairino viṅkaṭādaṃśtriṇam eva ca || 12 kankāla mahākankāla khanḍakāpālinādi tu caturviṃśatīvirāņaṃ sarvam vyāptām aṅkilaṃ jagat.

381 Such works cited in Vilāsavajra’s commentary are the Krodhendutilaka (A f. 57r5), the Guhyakoṣa (A f. 57v1), the Vajraghanoccaya (B f. 39r6), the Saṭprajñānayaśaṃvara (B f. 40v3), the Sarvatantrasamuccaya (A f. 57r4), and the Va-jraķirīṭī (A f. 56v6). Similarly, in the Tattvasiddhi of Śaṅtarakṣita we find the Sarvadevasamāgama, the Laukikalokottaravajra, and the Vinukitsamudgātana, and in the Caryāmelāpakapradipa of Āryadeva the Vajramukhīmahāyoga and the Vinayāmoghasiddhi.

382 Laghuśaṃvara 27.23–24a as transmitted in Abhidhānottara, Patāla 43, A f. 140r1–2f, B f. 180v3–4: tattvasaṃgrahaḥ yaḥ uktam ca tathoktaṃ cakrasaṃvare...
a possibility that Vilāsavajra knew the *Laghuśaṃvara* and, therefore, that the existence of this Tantra in the eighth century remains unproved.

What we can say with confidence is that the *Laghuśaṃvara* came after the *Paramādya*, the Vajrabhairava, the *Sarvatathāgatasamgraha*, the *Guhyasamāja*, and the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinījālaśaṃvara*, since it names these,\(^{383}\) and tacitly incorporates verses from the last three in its earliest accessible redaction.\(^{384}\) These borrowings do not rule out the possibility that the

---

\( ^{383}\) *Laghuśaṃvara* f. 4v2–3 (3.22): abhiṣikto bhavat tatra sarvanatantraikam uttaram | tattvasamgraha śāṃvare vāpi guhye vā vajrabhairave; and f. 23v7 (30.24): vidyārājacakravarti ayam mantra na bhūyo na bhaviyati | tattvasamgraha paramādya śāṃvare guhye vā vajrabhairave. The Śaṃvara here is the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinījālaśaṃvara*. The title is commonly so abbreviated; see also Indrabhūti’s comment on the first passage (*Khor lo sdom pa’i rgyud kyi ’dus pa ba’i rnam par bshad*, f. 38r7): bde mchog ni sgyu ma bde mchog go ‘The Śaṃvara is the Jālaśaṃvara’. In his *Cakrasamvaraavṛtti* Indrabhūti takes the Guhyasāṃgha to be the *Guhyasamāja* or the Guhyenduṃatilaka/Guhyendutilaka (*Tōh. 477*) (f. 38r7): gsang ba ni ’dus pa ’am sla gsang thig le’i nor bu’i rgyal po’o. In his *Cakrasaṃvaraṭīkā* Devagupta takes it to be “the Guhyasamāja etc.” (f. 80r5): bsdus pa la sogs par. But in his *Cakrasaṃvaraṇapāṇjikā* Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses guhyatantre in 27.23 as guhyakośadau in the *Guhyakośa etc.*’.

\( ^{384}\) (1) *Laghuśaṃvara* (LŚ) f. 1v5 (1.7c–8b): antargatena manasā kāmasiddhim tu bhāvayet | svaretobindubhir buddhān bodhisattvāṃ ca pūjayet < Sarvatathāgata tattvasamgraha, section 2651: antargatena manasā kāmasiddhim tu bhāvayant | svaretobindubhir buddhān pūjayan siddhim āpnyāt, but influenced in the second line by Guhyasamāja 7.26: svavajram. padmasam. yuktam. dvayendriyaprayogatā | svaretobindubhir buddhān vajrastattvāṃ ca pūjayet; (2) bDe mchog nyung ngu, f. 234r5-6 (LŚ 31.1): de nas sha chen thams cad kyi | ’jigs byed rdo rje skyes yin bshad | ’di ni gdug pa thams cad kyi | ’jigs byed mi bsd ur bshad do < Guhyasamāja 5.78: mahāmāṃsena sarvesāṃ nāsanaṃ vajrajāṃ sṛṣṭam | eso hi sarvakūrāṇāṃ nāsako dārunaṃ sṛṣṭam; (3) bDe mchog nyung ngu, f. 234v4 (LŚ 31.12): so ni sphyan zhes bya bar bshad | chu khams mā ma ki ru brjod | me ni gos dkar mor bshad de | rlung ni sgröl man rab tu brjod < Guhyasamāja 17.51: prthivi locana khyātā abhdhātā māmākī sṛṣṭā | pāṇḍarākhā bhavet tejo vāyus tārā prakṛrtitā; (4) LŚ f. 1v (1.1–3) < Sarvatathāgatasamāyogadākinījālaśaṃvara (SBSDSJŚ) 1.1–2 etc. (see here p. 154); (5) LŚ f. 1v5–6 (1.8c–9b): darsanasparsanābhāyām ca śravane smaranaṃ ca | mucyate sarvapāpais tu evam eva na samayah < SBSDSJŚ as quoted in Jñānasiddhi 15.50: darsanasparsanābhāyām ca śravanaśmaranenā ca | sarvapāpiār mimucyante *ṣuyyante (em. : pūjayante Ed.) sarvāsiddhibhiḥ (= Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba f. 152v3 [2.16]); (6) LŚ ff. 1v7–2r1 (1.11c–13b): madhu raktam sakarpāram raktacandanojītam | gaṇamādhye pratiṣṭhān tu [+ sarvocchitaśarasyanam in the earlier redaction incorporated in the Abhidhānottara A f. 146r1–3 (46.3–5b)) sarvavajrānakaḥnadhṛk | anāmāngusthavakrābhāyām lehayed yogavit sadā || somapānavad āśvādyā siddhim āpnoti sāsvatim < Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba f. 158v4–5 (SBSDSJŚ 6.15–17): dmar
Laghuśaṅvara was composed in that century, since none of the works is later than that time. But three considerations suggest a later date. (1) No text of the Cakrāśaṅvara corpus, or any other Yoginītantra, was translated into Tibetan during the earlier diffusion of Buddhism (snga dar) that occurred from the eighth century to the middle of the ninth, during Tibet’s imperial period: this new literature reached the Tibetans only during the later transmission (phyi dar), that began c. 1000. (2) Among the many surviving stone, metalwork, and painted Indian images of Śaṅvara none is demonstrably earlier than the tenth century. Finally (3), there is, as we have seen, no evidence of commentatorial work on the Laghuśaṅvara before c. 900. Of course, none of these facts proves conclusively that the Laghuśaṅvara was not in existence at an earlier date. But they do incline one to consider a later date more probable. This is particularly so in the case of the absence of commentaries. The Laghuśaṅvara is so problematic text from the Buddhist point of view that it is hard to imagine that it could have survived for long without the support of learned exegesis.

Whatever its date, the Laghuśaṅvara is likely to be a product of the first phase of the development of the Yoginītantras, if not the earliest of them all. This surmise rests on the assumption that Yoginītantras that are less sophisticated in the sense that they show a less developed Mahāyāna Buddhist theo-
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385 A Kashmirian Śaṅvara of leaded brass inlaid with copper and silver in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art from the Nasli and Alice Heeramanick Collection appears to have been assigned by PAL to c. 725 in his catalogue of the exhibition ‘The Arts of Kashmir’ (2007, p. 91, fig. 92). However, he has kindly informed me (personal communication, 1 March, 2008) that this surprisingly early date is not his own but that of the museum (for which see http://collectionsonline.lacma.org) recorded on the loan agreement form. The lending museum insisted on this date and it was substituted for his own without consulting him. He had assigned it to “ca. 9th century”. In an earlier publication (1975, p. 173, pls. 64a,b) he had proposed the tenth. REEDY (1997, p. 162, fig. K62) gives ‘9th–10th century’. LINROTHE (1999, p. 289, fig. 211) has found these dates too early and suggests the late tenth or early eleventh century. In the absence of a detailed art-historical demonstration of the date, which I suspect could in any case be no more than tentative given the small population of comparable pieces, I am inclined in the light of the other historical evidence to agree with LINROTHE.
retical framework are likely to be earlier than those in which the level of theoretical assimilation is more advanced. By this criterion the *Hevajra* must be placed after the *Laghuśaṃvara*. This also assumes that the development of the Mantranaya was not unilinear throughout, since if it were we would have to place the *Laghuśaṃvara* before the *Mahāvairocanaḥhisambodhi, Sarvatathā-gataattvasaṃgatraha, Guhyasamāja*, and *Sarvabuddhasaṃayoga*. It assumes, then, that the Yogini-tantras represent a new phase with its own humble beginning, and that it was only later in this phase that the tradition got up to speed, as it were, by fully integrating the new world of practice whose entry marks its commencement by providing it with a thoroughly Buddhist encoding. While it is possible that this assimilation of the text began long after its first redaction it seems more probable in the absence of firm evidence to the contrary that if so problematic a creation were to have remained for long without the benefit of learned exegesis it would be likely to have disappeared without trace.

As for the provenance of the *Laghuśaṃvara*, it was certainly eastern India, the region in which most of the Indian learned exegesis of this Tantric corpus was produced. The Tantra does not state this explicitly. Claiming the status of revelation it would have been averse to doing so. Nonetheless, it reveals its provenance in spite of itself by giving *ba* in its encoding of some of the syllables of Mantras where correct Sanskrit requires *va*. This is evidently an effect of the fact that *va* is pronounced *ba* in the Indo-Aryan vernaculars of this region. Thus 5.4 yields *Bhagabate* rather than *Bhagavate*: *pañcamasya yac caturtham prathamasya tritiyam | trayoviṃśas tathaiva ca caturthasya yah prathamam* (f. 5r3–4) ‘the fourth of the fifth [class of consonants] (*Bha*)’, the third of the first (*Ga*), the twenty-third (*Ba*), and the first of the fourth (*t*)’; and 30.20–21 yields *Bhagabām* rather than *Bhagavām* (*for Bhagavān*): *koṣṭhakād dasamam caiva vilomena tu sādhaakah | koṣṭhakā ekonaviṃśatimaṃ tathā trayoviṃśatikoṣṭhakād | dvitiyakosthasamyuktaṃ bindunā ārdhvaḥsitaṃ* (f. 23v4–5) ‘The Śādhaaka should select the tenth counting backwards from the compartment [of *Ha*] (*Bha*), the nineteenth from that [of *A*] (*Ga*), and the [letter] from the twenty-third box (*B*) together with [the letter in] the second box adorned above with a dot (*ĀM*)’.

Variant readings giving the correct spellings in these cases are found. In 5.4 Jayabhadra and Bhavabhaṭṭa read *ekonnatrīṃśa- (sic)* and *ekonatrimśati* ‘the twenty-ninth’ (*va*) rather than the *trayoviṃśa- ‘the twenty-third’ (*Ba*) seen in the Baroda manuscript; and this reading is also found in the Tibetan translation (*de bzhin nyi shu tsa dgu la [= ekonatrimśaṃ tathaiva ca]*) and the redaction

---

386 This is so in Bihāri, Maithili, Bengali, Kumāuni, Nepāli, Assamese, and Orīyā.
of this passage in Paṭala 54 of the Abhidhānottara (A f. 166r3: ekonatrinśatm tathāviva ca). Likewise in 30.21 we find Jayabhadra giving ekonatrinśati- (VA) in place of the reading trayoviṃśati (BA) attested by the manuscript, but here the ‘incorrect’ reading is also supported by the Tibetan translation and the commentary of Bhavabhaṭṭa. There can be little doubt that the non-standard readings giving BA rather than VA are original. For it is not surprising there should have been attempts to correct an original BA to VA, whereas it would be most unlikely that any redactor would have made the effort to rewrite a reading that gave VA in order to yield BA.\(^{387}\)

Also indicative of the east-Indian provenance and development of this corpus are the form chaṃdoha- in place of saṃdoha-,\(^{388}\) and the pervasive promiscuity of the forms -saṃvara- and -saṃvara- in the names of its deity, in the title of the primary Tantra, and in the compound in which this form is preceded by ḍākinījāla- or yoginījāla-. I use the forms Śaṃvara and Cakrasaṃvara. Laghuśaṃvara and Cakrasaṃvara here in keeping with the usual Tibetan translations, namely bDe mchog and 'Khor Lo sdom pa; and this accords with semantic analyses of these names and titles in the Sanskrit commentators. Thus Bhavabhaṭṭa explains the second element of the second in the sense ‘he who restrains’ from the the verb samvar-, and construes the whole to mean ‘he who by means of the wheel (cakra-) [of the Dharma] restrains [the minds of living beings from the wrong path] (saṃvaraḥ) (*cakreṇa samvarnotīti cakrasaṃvaraḥ*), telling us further that the name is extended to the Tantra because this deity is its subject.\(^{389}\) As for the form Śaṃvara, that too is widely supported.

\(^{387}\) It is not probable that the Laghuśaṃvara was alone among the Yoginītantras in being of east-Indian origin. We see the same tell-tale B- for V- in 1.4.27–28 of the Catuspīṭhā, the Mantra syllables VADEV being encoded there as BADEV. Moreover, it is probable that the Apabhraṃśa seen in some verses of the Hevajra is of the eastern variety. This is suggested by the nom. sg. endings -aho and -aha in kibidaho in 2.4.6 and hutāsanaha in 2.4.67; see Tagare 1987, p. 110–111. An investigation of the language of the Apabhraṃśa verses that are found in such Yoginītantras as the Hevajra, Khasama, Catuspīṭhā, and Dākārṇava, in comparison with that of the Dohā collections of Kāṇha and Saraha, may be expected to shed more light on this question of provenance.

\(^{388}\) See here p. 180.

\(^{389}\) Bhavabhaṭṭa, Cakrasaṃvara paṇijikā, explaining the title with the prefixed honorific Śrī- when it occurs in the final colophon in the words śrīca kraṣaṃvaranāmini mahā-yoginītantra-rāja ‘in the great king among the Yoginītantras called śrīcakraśaṃvara’ in the final colophon: śrīḥ punyajñānasambhārah | cakraṃ dharmacakram | śrīmac cakraṃ śrīcakram | tena kāpathāt sattvānām manah saṁvṛṣṇotītī śrīcakraśaṃvaraḥ śrīherukah | tadabhidhāyītvāt tantram api tathocaye ‘The word Śrī- ‘glory’ denotes the accumulating of [both] merit and gnosis. The word -cakra- ‘wheel’ refers to the wheel of the Dharma. It is prefixed by Śrī to express the fact that it [that is to say, the teaching of the Buddha,] entails this [provisioning with both merit and
Ratnákaraśānti explains it as meaning ‘the Highest (varam) Bliss’ (śam) when analysing its occurrence in the neuter in the compound dākinījālasaṃvaram, and Bhavabhaṭṭa when analysing its occurrence in the masculine gender at the end of the same (dākinījālasaṃvarah) takes it to mean ‘[Heruka,] who protects Bliss (śam vrṇotīti saṃvarah) [by keeping it free of all defects].’ This line of analysis, which applies a meaning of śam that is well-attested in non-sectarian lexicography, is not the invention of these commentators. They draw on the authority of the Sarvabuddhasamāyoga, which refers to its deity Vajrasattva as Śaṃvara and explains that name as meaning ‘[he who has/is the] Highest Bliss’. That the -saṃvara form is not only old but also original is established

gnosis]. Heruka is called Śrīcakraśaṃvara [here] because he restrains [saṃvrṇotīti saṃvarah] by means of this [wheel, in the sense that he restrains] the minds of living beings from the false path. [This] Tantra has the same name because it is that which refers to him.

Ratnákaraśānti, Mahāmāyātiṣṭā on 23d: saṃvaram sukhāvaram mahāsukham {śam means ‘bliss’ and -varam ‘best’. So] saṃvaram means ‘the best bliss’ (sukhāvaram) [, i.e.] ‘the Great Bliss (mahāsukham)’. The same analysis is tacitly given in such parallel expressions as dākinījālasatsukham in Saṃvarodaya 3.6d and 26.10cd; and Vajrādāka 1.1cd: sarvadākinīnayah sattvo vajrādākha param sukhah; 1.12cd, 1.50,1.71cd: sarvadākinisamāyogavajrādākha param sukhah.

Bhavabhaṭṭa, Cakraśaṃvarapaṇjikā on 1.2: dākini śūnyatā. jālam upāyah | jālena hi matsyādbhānasiddhiḥ | upāyena hi klēsāh. niyām. cint-kārah. kriy-ate | tābhyaṃ śaṃ sukham avadyebhyo bahiśkṛtya vrṇotīti dākinījālasaṃvarah [The meaning of the name] Dākinījālasaṃvara [applied to Heruka here] is ‘he who protects (-varah [vrṇotīti varah]) bliss (śam) by means of the Dākinī and the Net (jālam)’. The term Dākini [here] means ‘[Emptiness’, ‘the fact that [all things] are void of [intrinsic reality]’ (śūnyatā); and the term ‘Net’ refers to the method (upāyah) [, namely the compassion (karuṇā) that must accompany awareness of that Emptiness]. It is called a net [metaphorically]. For by using a net one succeeds in catching fish and other creatures. [Likewise] by employing the method [that is compassion] one restrains and so renders incapable of activity the ‘fish and other creatures’ that are the afflictions (klēsāh), namely attachment, hatred and the rest. He protects bliss by means of these two[, emptiness and compassion,] in the sense that through these he protects it from [those] defects.

See, e.g., Hemacadra, Anekārthaśaṃgraha, Pariśīṣṭakāṇḍa 21a: śaṃ kalyāne sukhe ‘tha; Vardhamāna, Gaṇaratnamahadhīvṛtti, p. 39, on 1.15: śaṃ duḥkhopāsame; Yāska, Nīghantaḥpuḥśya, p. 521 (on Rgveda 5.4.5: śaṃ no bhavantu vājinaḥ): sukhāḥ no bhavantu vājinaḥ.

Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba, f. 154r6–7 (1.10): śaṃ zhes bya ba bde bar bshad | saṃs rgyas kun gyi bde chen yin | sgyu ma thams cad rab sbyor ba | mchog tu bde bas bde ba’i mchog (sukhāṃ śaṃ iti vikyātamu sarvabuddhan mahāsukham | sarvajālasamāyogah sukhavareṇa saṃvarah) ‘The word śam means ‘bliss’, the Great Bliss of all the Buddhas. He is Śaṃvara because of [the fact that he possesses] the highest degree of [this] bliss’. The Sanskrit of the first half of this verse is supported by its citation by Viśāvajra while explaining the epithet mahāsukhaḥ in his Nāmanandarāthāvalokini, f. 57v1–2: mahāsukha iti śīrasaṃvara | tatra mahāsukha iti yat tāthāgatam anāsravam sukhaṃ tan mahāsukha ity u-cyate | tatraivoktaṃ sukhaṃ śaṃ iti vikyātamu sarvabuddhan mahāsukham iti.
by evidence outside the Buddhist corpus. For Yoginījālaśaṃvara is found as the name of a Bhairava in one of the secondary Kalpas taught in the Śākta Śaiva Picumata, which, as we shall see, was a major unacknowledged source for the redactor of the Laghuśaṃvara. That the form intended there is - saṃvara-rather than -saṃvara- is certain, because the text provides a semantic analysis that takes the first syllable to mean bliss (sukham). However, these are not the only views. Jayabhadra, commenting on 1.2 of the Laghuśaṃvara, takes the same expression to be Dākinijālasaṃvara, understanding it to refer to the Laghuśaṃvara itself and explaining it as ‘The Concealment of the Array of Dākinīs’, deriving the last element of the compound from saṃvṛ- ‘to envelop’, and while the Tibetans usually render the

---

The first Pāda is also supported by Bhavabhaṭṭa, who quotes it without attribution, when explaining dākinijālasaṃvaram in Laghuśaṃvara 1.2: saṃ sukham iti cākhāyāt iti vacanā. Yoginījālaśaṃvara in this text is a form of Bhairava and the term refers by extension to his Mantra and the associated system of practice (vratam). See Picumata f. 251r5–v1 (56.4c–6b): śṛṇu devi pravakṣyāmi sarvayogiprādhanam | yāgamantrasamopetam yoginījālasaṃvaram | yena vijñātamātrena traṅkoye khecaripadam | āsāyā kṛīḍate mantri kulasiddhisamanvītah ‘Listen, O Devī. I shall teach you about Yoginījālaśaṃvara together with the deities with whom he is to be worshipped (yāga-) and his Mantra, as the means of propitiating the Yogiṇīs. As soon as the Mantra adept has mastered this he will reach the domain of the Khecarīs and move freely through the triple universe, possessing [all] the supernatural powers of the [Yogiṇī] clans’.

Jayabhadra, Cakrasaṃvārapaṇjikā on 1.1–2b (athātā rahasyam vaṃcye samāsān na tu vistarāt | śriherukasamyoṣam sarvakārthāsādhatam | uttarād api cōṭtaram dākinijālasaṃvaram ‘Next I shall teach the secret, in brief rather than at length, the congress of Śriheruka, the accomplisher of all desires, the Dākinijālasaṃvara, higher even than the higher’): uttarād api cōṭtaram iti deśyadesakayor abhedāt | yāṇy uttaratantraṇī samājādini teṣām apy uttaratvād uktām | dākinijālasaṃvaram iti | dākinyāḥ sarvāḥ trīkramayavasthitāḥ | tāṃ śām jālāḥ samāhas tasya saṃvarah | saṃvaranaḥ gopanam ity arthāḥ ‘It is referred to as higher even than the Tantras [of the Yogottara class] headed by the [Guhya]samāja, which are ‘higher’ because the difference between teacher and the taught is absent [in them]. As for [the title] Dākinijālasaṃvara, it means the concealing of the net, that is to say, of the totality of all the Dākinīs that are established
Cakra- name 'Khor lo sdom pa and so support the form Cakrasamvara, we also find 'Khor lo bde mchog in their translations, which supports the alternative Cakraśamvara.\(^{397}\)

The reason for this inconstancy is evidently that śa and sa are both pronounced as śa in Bengali, as they were in the Māgadhī Prakrit of the dramatists.\(^{398}\) Consequently, instead of attempting to decide which form is correct we should recognize that for the east-Indian followers of this tradition there was in effect only one word here (śamvara/saṇvara), which could be understood either as 'the highest (-vara- [Tib. mchog]) bliss (śam [Tib. bde])' or as 'fusion' and the like by derivation from the verbal root vr. preceded by the preverb sam. That this was the case is demonstrated by a passage in the Saṃvarodaya in which the two semantic analyses, explaining śaṇvara- and saṇvara- respectively, are given for one and the same word.\(^{399}\)

Śaṃvara/Vajrarudra and Vajravārāhī: The Transformation of Bhairava and His Consort. What marks the new start seen in the Yogini-tantras is a far more comprehensive adoption of the practices of the Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha texts, to the extent that there is little in the observances of these texts that does not draw on that source. Heruka is now paired with a lustful consort (Vajravārāhī in the Cakrasaṃvara texts and Nairātmyā in those of Hevajra), and in the case of the Cakrasaṃvara tradition, so are the principal Yoginīs of his retinue, a feature that matches the practice of the Vidyāpīṭha’s Picumata (Brahmayāmala). Moreover, in the case of the tradition elaborated on the basis of the Laghusaṃvara the icon of Heruka has several blatantly obvious features of the iconography of Śiva (/Bhairava) in addition to those manifest in

---

\(^{397}\) In the DT 'khor lo sdom pa (caḳraṣaṃvara-) occurs about 250 times and 'khor lo bde mchog (caḳraṣaṃvara-) about 100; see, e.g., DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. cha, f. 242v3 ('khor lo bde mchog gi gzugs can); vol. ja, f. 58v7 ('khor lo bde mchog gi rgyud), and f. 102r7 ('khor lo bde mchog gi sngags).

\(^{398}\) See, for Māgadhī, Vararuci, Prākṛtprakāśa 11.2: śasoh śaḥ 'ś is used in place of both s and s'. Generally in Middle and New Indo-Aryan the three Sanskrit sibilants have been reduced to s. It has been reported that in the Tantric Buddhist Dohā texts, composed in what has been called Eastern Apabhṛṣṭa, ś has been preserved in derivatives of words that have it in Sanskrit (Tagare 1987, p. 77). It is true that a few such forms are found in the manuscripts (Shahidullah 1928, p. 37), but there are many cases in which ś does not appear, such as sун্নa for Skr. sūnya. It is likely that the occasional distinction between ś and s was learned window-dressing and that both consonants were pronounced ś.

\(^{399}\) Saṃvarodaya 3.17c–19b: samvarāṃ sarvabuddhānāṃ evamkāre pratiṣṭhitam || kāyāvākṣetasām karma sarva-vārākārikasamvaram | saṃvarāṃ sukha-varam bodhir avācyam anidarśanam || rahaṣyaṃ sarvabuddhānāṃ milanam saṃvaram varam.
the Heruka of the Sarvabuddhasamāyoga. He is black-bodied, and has twelve arms and four faces, with three eyes in each. He stands in the warrior pose with a Vajra and a Vajra-topped bell in his two principal hands, holding the bleeding hide of a flayed elephant over his back with his two uppermost hands, and in the remaining eight a rattle-drum (damaruḥ), a battle-axe, a chopping knife, and a trident, a skull-topped staff (khatvāngaḥ), a skull-bowl (kapālam) filled with blood, a lasso (pāśaḥ), and the severed head of the god Brahmā, wearing a long garland of fifty bleeding human heads around his neck, adorned with five ornaments of human bone and the ash of cremation-pyres smeared over his limbs—these, the bone ornaments and ash, are the Six Mudrās of the Kāpālikas—, with a tiger skin around his waist, a brahmanical cord in the form of a snake (nāgayajñopavitāḥ), and a chaplet of skulls (kapālamālā) above his forehead, his hair arranged in a high crown-like mass of ascetic’s braids (jaṭāmukutāḥ) adorned at the front with two crossed Vajras (viśvavajram) and the new moon. His consort Vajravarāhī stands before him in sexual union, with Heruka holding her to his chest with the hands that hold the Vajra and the Vajra-bell crossed at the wrists behind her back. She is red, one-faced, and two-armed, naked but for a filigree of fragments of human bone adorning her hips (asthimekhalā), her right arm raised aloft holding a chopping-knife, with her index finger extended in a gesture of threatening the wicked, and her left arm, wrapped around Heruka’s neck, holding to their mouths a skull bowl full of human blood and entrails, wearing a garland of fifty desiccated heads and the five Kāpālika bone-ornaments, laughing, and intoxicated by lust. They are surrounded by a retinue of thirty-six goddesses termed Yogiṇīs, Dākinīs, Vīreśvarīs, or Viriṇīs visualized in the same Kāpālika style, in concentric circuits of four, twenty-four, and eight, the twenty-four embracing Vīra consorts and worshipped as residing in twenty-four sacred sites covering the whole subcontinent, from Udāiyāna in the north to Rāmeśvara at India’s southern tip, from Sindhu in the west to Deviṅṭa in the east. The whole is surrounded by a ring of eight cremation grounds.\textsuperscript{400}

The features of Śiva’s iconography evident here are the trident, the third eye, the new moon on the piled up braids, the tiger-skin lower garment, the multiple faces and arms, the skull-bowl, the skull-staff, the bleeding elephant hide, the severed head of Brahmā, the snake as brahmanical thread, the sharp fangs, the chaplet of skulls, his dwelling in the cremation grounds, and the ashes

\textsuperscript{400} This description of Heruka and Vajravarāhī follows that given by Jayabhadra in his Cakrasamvara-paṇḍika, p. 109, on Laghuśaṃvara 1.10. for the iconography of the Yogiṇīs and Vīras see Bhavabhaṭṭa’s Cakrasamvara-vivṛti on Laghuśaṃvara, Paṭāla 4 (vol. 1, pp. 44–47). See also Nispannayogāvalī, pp. 26–29.
on his limbs. All these had entered Śiva’s iconography long before the formation of the Tantras of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle. Śiva’s trident appears on seals and intaglios during the Kuśāṇa and Kuśāṇa-Sassanian periods in Gandhāra and Afghanistan.\footnote{For a recent analysis of Śiva images in the subcontinent, including those on coins, from the first century B.C. to the end of the Kuśāṇa period, see GHOSE 2002, pp. 70–96.} The third eye appears in sculptures of Śiva from Mathurā around the beginning of the third century; and the ascetic’s piled braids and the new moon upon them appear there and elsewhere from the beginning of the fifth;\footnote{KREISEL 1986 (Mathura, c. 400), p. 82; BAKKER 1997, pp. 149–151 (Mansar, c. 400–450).} and all these characteristics, the trident in his hand, the third eye, the ascetic’s braids, and the new moon, are mentioned in the Mahābhārata,\footnote{Mahābhārata 3.8.111a (triśūlapāneh); 13.14.119 (bālendumukutam ... tribhir ne-traiḥ krtoddyotam), 12.122.24b (śūlajāṭādharah), 7.172.59c (jaṭāmaṇḍalacandrāmauliṃ).} as are his tiger-skin, his multiple faces and arms, his skull-bowl, his skull-staff, his brahmanical thread in the form of a snake, his sharp fangs, his garland of skulls, and his living in the cremation grounds smeared with ashes from its funeral pyres.\footnote{See, e.g., Mahābhārata 13.127.18a (vyāghracarmāmbaradharah); 14.8.30d (mahā-devam caturmukham), 13.14.116c (aṣṭādaśabhujam sthānam), 14.8.28a (virūpākṣam dasabhujam), 13.17.40a (dasābhāhus tv animiso); 12.36.2c (kapālapāniḥ khaṭvāṅgō), 10.7.4d (khaṭvāṅgadvāhināṃ); 13.15.11cd (tiṅsnadamśtrāṃ ... vyālayaṇopavītam), 14.8.21a (tiṅsnaṃṇaṃstrāya karālāya); 10.6.33c (kapālamālināṃ); 10.7.4a (śmaśānavāśināṃ); 13.14.153c (sūklaḥhāsamāvaliṃtāya).} His wearing a bleeding elephant hide is also a commonplace by that time, being mentioned along with his crematorical characteristics in the works of the poet Kālidāsa.\footnote{Meghadūta 36c: hara paṣupater ārdraṇāgājinecchām ‘Remove Śiva’s desire for his [blood-]wet elephant hide’; Kumārasambhava 5.67d: gajājināṃ sōnitibinduvārṣi ca ‘[his] elephant hide that showers drops of blood’; 5.77b: trilokanāthah pitṛsadmagocarāh ‘The Lord of the Three Worlds frequents cremation grounds’; 5.69c, 5.79b: citābhasmarajah ‘the ash-dust of funeral pyres’; and 5.71b: kapālinah ‘decked with skulls’. Rudra/Śiva frequently has the epithet krtivāsas- ‘wearer of the hide’ in the Mahābhārata. The Matsyaapurāṇa (Patala 153) relates that this is the hide of the elephant demon Gajāsura killed by Śiva in a great battle between the gods and the Asuras. How the elephant hide was understood when incorporated into the iconography of Heruka is not stated in most instances of its mention. But in two Kalpas in the Abhidhānottara, those of Samayaśaṃvara and the Heruka of the ekavīravīdhānam, it is said to be that of the elephantine Śiva-brahmanical deity Gaṇapati (B f. 34v1: aparabhujadvayena gaṇapaticarmāmbbaraḥdharah (corr. : dharā Cod.) and (B f. 40v2–3: aparabhujadvayena gaṇapaticarmāmbaradharah).} As for the severed head of Brahmā, this too derives from a well-known Śaiva myth which though not found in the Mahābhārata in the text common to all the regional versions,\footnote{There is a reference to it in a supplementary passage of 26 verses inserted within a
probably composed in the sixth or perhaps the first half of the seventh century.⁴⁰⁸ Other features in addition to these, namely the garland of severed or desiccated heads, the chopping knife, the rattle-drum, the Kāpālikā bone-ornaments, the consort, the skull-bowl full of blood and entrails, the retinue of Yoginis, their pairing with Vīra consorts, the sacred sites, the theriocephalic gate-guardians, and the encircling cremation grounds, are commonplaces of the iconography of the Vidyāpiṭha texts. Only the Vajras place a Buddhist seal on the icon.

The image, then, has every appearance of representing a Buddhist transformation of Śiva himself in his Bhairava aspect. Indeed in his commentary on the Laghuśamvara Jayabhadra refers to this Heruka as Vajrarudra, that is to say, as Śiva/Bhairava converted and liberated by assimilation into the essence of Buddha-hood,⁴⁰⁹ thereby definitively surrendering and transcending his Śaiva identity. In clear expression of this transcendence Heruka/Vajrarudra and Vajravārāhī are depicted and visualized standing on the sprawling, terrified bodies of a black Bhairava and a red, emaciated Kālarāтри, their own pre-Buddhist identities as the principal deities of the Vidyāpiṭha.⁴¹⁰

⁴⁰⁷ Ambikākhanda, probably composed in the sixth or perhaps the first half of the seventh century.⁴⁰⁸ Other features in addition to these, namely the garland of severed or desiccated heads, the chopping knife, the rattle-drum, the Kāpālikā bone-ornaments, the consort, the skull-bowl full of blood and entrails, the retinue of Yoginis, their pairing with Vīra consorts, the sacred sites, the theriocephalic gate-guardians, and the encircling cremation grounds, are commonplaces of the iconography of the Vidyāpiṭha texts. Only the Vajras place a Buddhist seal on the icon.

⁴⁰⁸ See here p. 51.

⁴⁰⁹ Jayabhadra, Cakrasamvarapāṇi or on Patāla 12: kṛtapūrvasevo mantrirāti iti vajrarudrayogavān ‘When the king among Mantra adepts has completed the preparatory service (pūrvasevā), that is to say, when he has achieved a state of complete identification with Vajrarudra . . . ’; and on Patāla 27: jñānahetujam iti | jñānasya prakarsaparyantam | tasya hetuh kāranam bhagavān vajrarudrah | tasmāj jāto bhavatīty arthāḥ ‘jñānahetujam means born from the cause of knowledge, where knowledge is wisdom’s ultimate degree and its cause is Lord Vajrarudra’. Vajrarudra appears already in the Sarvabuddhasamāyoga in a passage that associates the nine dramatic sentiments (rasāh) with Vajrasattva, Tathāgata, Vajrarahara, Lokesvara, Vajrāsūrya, Vajrarudra, Śākyamuni, Āralī (or perhaps Āralī), and Śāśvata (Vairocana) respectively. Vajrarudra’s is the sentiment of terror (bhayānakarasaḥ) and it is probable therefore that we should understand Vajrarudra to be Heruka. Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba f. 128r3: rdo rje sens dpa’ stag pa la | dpa’ la dpa’ bo de bzhin gshegs | rdo rje ’dzin pa snying rje la | rgod pa ’jig rten dbang phyug mchog | rdo rje nyi ma khro ba la | rdo rje drag po ’jigs pa la | shā kya thub pa mi sdug la | ngo mtshar la ni a ra li | rab tu zhi la sangs rgyas rtag ’sprīgāre vajrasatvō hi vire caiva tathāgatah | vajradhrk karunāyām tu bāse caiva lokeśvarah | vajrāsūryas tathā raudre vajrarudra bhayānake | sākyamunis tu bīhbatse ārarālīd abhute tathā | prasānte sāśvataś caiva).

⁴¹⁰ Kālarāтри here is the fearsome emaciated goddess variously called Carcā, Carcikā, Cāmuṇḍā, and Karṇamoṭī; see here p. 231.
The Rise of the Goddess to Independence. Here Heruka’s consort is visibly his dependent: while he has four faces and twelve arms she has only one and two. But in the subsequent development of this tradition we find a strongly Śākta tendency to elevate her to equality with Heruka and eventually to superiority, just as occurred in the development of the Vidyāpītha.\textsuperscript{411} Thus in certain other Kalpas in which Heruka is united with Vajravārāhi at the centre of the Maṇḍala her status is raised by endowing her with four faces and four or more arms. This is the case in the Kalpa of the sixth Paṭala of the Abhidhānottara, which teaches what it calls the ekavīravidhānam, the procedure in which the two deities alone are worshipped as ‘solitary heroes’ (ekāvīra-), that is to say, without the the retinue of the thirty-six Yoginis and twenty-four Viras. Here Heruka has twelve arms and Vajravārāhi four, holding a blood-filled skull-bowl, a chopping-knife raised aloft with the gesture of threat, a rattle-drum, and a skull-staff. But both have four faces.\textsuperscript{412} In the seventh Paṭala a two-faced, six-armed Vajrasattva transforms into a six-faced, twelve-armed Heruka Maṅjuvajramahāsukha accompanied by a Vajravārāhi who has the same number of faces and arms and holds the same attributes in her hands. Brahmā’s severed head is absent here, but Brahmā himself is not: his flayed skin takes the place of the elephant hide; and in place of a tiger skin we see that of Bhairava.\textsuperscript{413} We see the same equality in the tenth Paṭala, where both Heruka and Vajravārāhi are five-faced and ten-
armed, and in the eleventh, where a six-faced, twelve-armed Heruka wearing the flayed skin of Rudra on his back embraces a twelve-armed Vajravārāhī, and in the twentieth, in which a red five-faced and twelve-armed Heruka embraces a Vajravārāhī with same colour and hand-attributes.

The literature also teaches Kalpas in which Vajravārāhī is worshipped in her own right in the centre of a circuit or circuits of Yoginīs. She may be one-faced and two-armed, as when she is worshipped as Heruka’s consort, standing in the warrior pose at the centre of the circle of the eight cremation grounds, naked, red and menstruating, her face contorted with anger, with large fangs, three red eyes, wearing a chaplet of five skulls framed by two rows of Vajras, with crossed Vajras on her unbound hair, wearing a garland of fifty heads, which are not desiccated, as they are when she is Heruka’s consort, but, like his, freshly severed and dripping blood. She holds aloft a red Vajra in her left hand with her index extended, a skull-bowl full of blood in her right, and a long white skull-staff resting in the crook of her left arm, She may possess, as before, only the first five of the six Mudrās; but some emphasized her pre-eminence by requiring that since she is now the central deity of the Maṇḍala she should also be smeared with ashes. She is surrounded by the thirty-six Yoginīs, disposed as in the Maṇḍala of Heruka, but with the difference that the Yonīs, like her, wear garlands of freshly severed heads, or by only the inner circuit of four, or with no retinue

---

414 Abhidhānottara B ff. 71r3–72v5: vajrasattvaparavrttyā herukatvam vibhāva-yet | pañcānanam dasabhujam vārāhyāsamalaṃkṛtam ... (f. 72v4–5) tadvarṇa-bhujā*saṃsthamā (corr. : saṃsthamā Cod.) muktakesī tu nagnikā vyāghracarna-nivasanā khaṇḍamanḍitam mekkhala | kāpalamālinī raudri karunārāgasuwihalā.

415 Abhidhānottara B ff. 79v3–80r6: saḍvaṅkṛtaṃ viṛmaṃ bighasaṃ śriṇgārahasitam raudrāṃ lelihānanaṃ | saṃnāḍrāṃ mūḍhitam dehaṃ nānābharaṇaṃ | vārāhyā *tu samāpannaṃ (em. : nusamāpanna Cod.) jānudvayāsaṃvitām ... (f. 80r2) rudracarmāṃbaradharāṃ ... (f. 80r5–6) tadvarṇabhujasaṃsthamā muktakesī tu nagnikā.

416 Abhidhānottara B f. 113r3–v4: herukākram ātmānāṃ dākinīcāyaparāvrttaṃ | mahāgraṃ raktavapusuṃ pañcajaṅṅānordhavodhavam | raktam nīlam ca haritaṃ pīṭam śāntasātidhvakam | trinetraṃ dvādaśabhaṃmālāpadaṃ vāsasthitam | ... (f. 113v3–4) agrato vajravrāhyā tadvarṇāyudhadhārīnī.

417 This is the main Kalpa taught in the Abhisamayamaṇjarī (pp. 131, l. 9–133, l. 1). I propose the following emendations and corrections to the text of the published edition: for mithyā drṣṭiprahanād viṅktaikānāṃ (p. 131, l. 15) read mithyā-drṣṭiprahaṇād viṅktaikānāṃ; for cakriṅḍaḷaṇḍaḥkārakakakṣaṭvanga-mekkalakhyapaṇcamaṇḍudrādharāṃ (p. 131, l. 18) read cakriṅḍaḷaṇḍaḥkārakakakṣaṭvanganekkalakḥyapaṇcamaṇḍudrādharāṃ; for iti kecit manḍaḷaṇāyikāvman saṃnudrāti ity eke read iti manḍaḷaṇāyikāvman saṃnudrāti ity eke (p. 132, l. 3); for vajrāvadāyamadhyāyikṛta- read vajrāvadāyamadhyāyikṛta- (p. 132, l. 9); and for aṣṭavijñānāṁ nairatmyāsvarūpatvam read aṣṭavijñānāṁ nairatmyāsvarūpatvam (p. 132, l. 12).
There are other forms of this kind, among which one is particularly worthy of note because it shows her four-faced and twelve-armed like Heruka himself, his equal as it were or, rather, the fusion of both within her, since her fanged face is divided down the middle into a male half on her right and a female half on her left (اردھनारिष्वारमुख”), a Śākta reflex of the well-known Ardhanārīśvara image of Śiva. She has the same hand-attributes as the twelve-armed Heruka except that the battle-axe and trident have gone, an elephant-goad has taken the latter’s place. The hand that held the skull-staff now holds the skull-bowl, the skull-staff rests in the crook of that arm, and the two hands that are now free form the flame gesture (ज्वालामुद्रा) on her forehead. The place of the elephant hide is taken by the flayed skin of a man. She holds the Vajra and bell in her crossed principal hands and turns them over each other in the gesture known as the revolving lotus (कमलवर्ताह). She is red, naked, and intoxicated with passion, adorned with all six Mudrās, the new moon and crossed Vajras on her hair, a chaplet of skulls above her forehead, and the bone-filigree around her hips. She dances wildly in the centre of her retinue, visualized at the moment that she stands with her left leg on the ground flexed at the knee and her right foot raised and placed on the inside of her left thigh with the right knee turned out. She is surrounded by the thirty-six Yoginīs with the addition of the four goddesses Māmakī, Locanā, Tārā, and Pāṇḍāravasin of the Guhyasamāja Yogottara system. The four innermost goddesses have the heads of a lion, sow, elephant, and horse, and hold in their four hands the skull-bowl, skull-staff, head of Brahmā, and chopping-knife. Outside them are the four Yogottara goddesses, each at the centre of a lotus with six petals, six-armed and adorned with the six Mudrās. They hold in one of their two principal hands the symbol of the Tathāgata-family to which each belongs (a Vajra, a wheel, two crossed Vajras, and a lotus respectively) and in the other a bell, turning them over each other. In the other hands they hold a skull-bowl, the head of Brahmā, and a rattle-drum, with a skull-staff in the crook of the principal left arm. The twenty-four Yoginīs of the sacred sites are placed in groups of six on the petals of these lotuses. They are four-armed, and hold the symbol of the Tathāgata-family of the Yogottara goddess on whose lotus they are placed, a skull-bowl, a skull-staff, and a rattle-drum. They wear chaplets of skulls and show only five of the six seals. Like the central goddess they are half male and half female (اردھनारिष्वर्याह). All the goddesses in the Maṇḍala up to this point are naked and dancing. Outside them is the final circuit of eight Yoginīs. The four in the four doors of the Maṇḍala, with the heads of a

---

418 Abhisamayamañjarī, p. 142, ll. 13–19.
crow, owl, dog, and sow, stand naked in the warrior-POSE, dwarffish, with squinting eyes. The four in the corners have the heads of a buffalo, an ass, a camel, and a horse, and like all but the door-guardians, are visualized in the dance posture. All eight of these outer Yoginis have the five Mudrās and chaplets of skulls, and are four-armed, holding a skull-bowl, the head of Brahmā in their left hands, and a chopping-knife and rattle-drums in their right. 419

The cult of the independent goddess (Bhagavati) appears to have been a particularly vigorous development, to judge from the exceptionally large number of variant forms that emerged. 420 Within the earlier scriptural literature the Abhidhānottara contains several sections devoted to Śādhanas of Vajravārāhi; 421 in the Herukabhāhyudaya eleven of its forty-four chapters are devoted to her Mantras and their procedures; 422 and the section of the Tenjur devoted to the Cakrasaṃvara cycle (Tōh. 1403–1606) contains over sixty texts devoted to the varieties of her cult as Vajravārāhi or Vajrayoginī (Tōh. 1541–1606). Sākyaraksita, a pupil of Abhayākara-gupta (1064–1125), after detailing the Śādhanas of several of her forms in his Abhisamayamañjarī, 423 adds that these are but a few of the many that were current in his time: 424

So it should be understood that in accordance with the various mentalities of those requiring to be trained there are countless traditions of the Goddess such as this, transmitted through the generations from teacher to pupil in accordance with the [founding] instruction of various Siddhas. What I have shown here is no more than an indicative fraction of the whole.

This Śākta trend is also evidenced in the practice of the Newars of the Kathmandu valley down modern times. For their ceremony of initiation before the Maṇḍala of Cakrasaṃvara is followed on the final day by initiation before

---

419 This form is taught in Abhidhānottara ff. 63v1–70r4 (Paṭala 9 in the enumeration of this manuscript), from which it entered the Vārāhyabhāhyudaya. A lightly adjusted version of this Kalpa is found in the collection of Śādhanas of Vajravārāhi/Vajrayoginī that came to bear the title Guhyasamayasādhanamālā in the colophons of later manuscripts; see ENGLISH 2002, pp. 54–59.

420 See ENGLISH 2002 for an illustrated survey of these variants.

421 Paṭala 12/9: Vārāhi Vajrayoginī (4-faced, 12-armed; ardhanārīśvarīmukhā); 22/19: Mṛtasamjñīvani (4-faced or 8-faced, 16-armed); 36/33: Vajravārāhi (3-faced and 6-armed or 6-faced and 12-armed, surrounded by Guhyottama etc.); 37/34: Vajravārāhi surrounded by Yāminī etc.

422 Paṭalas 6, 8–11, 23–24, 29–31, and 34.

423 The Abhisamayamañjarī is ascribed to Śubhākara-gupta in its sole edition. This is an error and goes against the evidence of the colophons of the manuscripts (ENGLISH 2002, p. 357, n. 6).

424 Abhisamayamañjarī, p. 152: tad *evamādayāḥ (em. : evam ādāya Ed.) siddhopedasadaparamparāyātā vineyāsaya bhagavatyā āmnāyā boddhavyāḥ | diṁmātram idaṁ darsītām.
the Manḍala of Vajrdevī (Vajravārāhī). Nor was this confined to the subcontinent. In Tibet too Vajravārāhī/Vajrayoginī rose to a position of special honour, notably in the bKa’ brgyud and Sa skya traditions, but also in later times among the dGe lug pas, rNying ma pas, and Bon pos.

There are other compilations, scriptural and secondary, that survive in Nepalese manuscripts but did not reach Tibet, which attest her prominence in the last phase of the Mantranaya: the Vājrayoginīkalpa, of about three thousand verses, which interweaves the Dākārṇava and the Saṃvarodaya, and incorporates thirteen non-scriptural Sādhanā texts of Vajravārāhī and one of Nairātmyā, the consort of Hevajra; the closely related Yoginījāla, of about one thousand verses; and the collection of forty-six Sādhanas of Vajrayoginī known as the Guhyasamayasādhanamālā. Moreover, two texts devoted to the cult of this goddess were added to the canon of scripture received by the Tibetans. The first is the Vārahībhajyatantra, a short work of three hundred verses counted among the explanatory Tantras of the Laghuṣamavāra but consisting almost entirely of passages lifted from the Sam. put.odbhava, the Abhidhānottara, and the Sam. varodaya; and the second

---

425 GELLNER 1992, pp. 273–279. His account of the ceremonies is based upon what he was told by the late Asha Kaji Vajracharya (ibid., p. 273). That the Cakrasamāvara initiation is followed by a separate Vajrdevī initiation is confirmed by the evidence of the Dīksāvidhi, the manual in the Newari language that guides these rituals.


427 I have not yet undertaken a thorough analysis of the whole text. The interweaving that I report is of Dākārṇava, Paṭala 2–3 and Saṃvarodaya 2–3 in the first 3 Paṭalas. The nidānavākyam of the Saṃvarodaya is borrowed with the substitution of vārahībhagesu for the Saṃvarodaya’s yoginībhagesu. I have noted the incorporation of the following Sādhanā texts (identified here with the numbers ascribed in BHATTACHARYA’s composite Sādhanamālā): 217–218 in Paṭala 36, 219–225 in Paṭala 37, 226–228 and 231 in Paṭala 38.

428 This is the title under which the work has been catalogued in TSUKAMOTO et al. 1989, p. 285. It is based, I surmise, on the colophon of the last Sādhanā in the collection, the Dūkinīguhyasamayasādhanā of Anaṅgayogin.

429 The correspondences are as follows (S = Sampuṭodbhava; LŚ = Laghuṣamvara; AU = Abhidhānottara; SU = Saṃvarodaya): 1.5–6b = S 6.3.26–27b; 1.17 = S 6.3.44c–45b; 1.8ab = S 6.3.45cd; 1.20cd = S 6.3.46cd; 1.21 = S 6.3.47; 1.31 = S 6.4.39; 1.33–43b = S 6.4.40–50; 2.15 = LŚ 1.19; 2.17c–18 = S 6.3.2–3b; 2.24–27b = S 6.3.3c–6; 2.27cd = S 6.2.2ab and 6.3.7ab; 2.28–29 = S 6.2.2c–4b; 2.31–33b = S 6.2.4c–6b; 2.34–40 = S 6.2.6c–14; 2.43–44d = S 6.2.15c–16; 3.1–2 = S 6.2.27–28; 5.8–14 = S 6.3.11–17; 6.1–2 = SU 7.1–2; 6.3b–6b = SU 7.14c–17; 6.6c–12b = S 6.3.35–40b; 6.14–19b = S 6.3.40c–45; 6.23–30 = AU 14.58–65; 7.3–7 = S 6.3.19c–24; 8.3–5 = AU 3.8c–11b; 8.17c–18 = AU 16.2–3b; 8.20b = AU 16.3c; 8.20c = AU 16.4a; 8.21–22 ≃ AU 16.4b–5; 8.24–37 = AU 16.6–19; 8.39–41 = AU 16.23–25; 9.1c–5 = AU 4.3–7b; 9.6–17a = AU 4.9–20b; 9.21–39a = AU 4.24–38b; 9.39c–41b = AU 4.42c–44b; 9.41c–44 = AU 4.39–42b; 9.45–51 (‘47’, ‘48’ and ‘50’ are Mantras) = AU 4.44c–46 (with the same Mantras); 9.52ab = AU 4.51ab; 9.54ab = AU 4.51cd; 10 = AU 50.
is the *Vidyādharikramavajrayoginīsādhana*, which appears in the Kanjur (Tōh. 380) between the major Tantras of the Cakrasamvara cycle and those of contested authenticity, included perhaps, in spite of its genre, because it states in its opening words that it is part of the otherwise unattested *Mahāmāyājālo-rdhvajottottaratrantra*, which, it claims, was extracted from the *Trilakṣa*, that it to say, from the vast mythical Ur-text of this cycle, the *Trilakṣābhhidhāna*.

Further evidence of this Śākta trend is seen in the views of the tradition concerning the nature of the revelation of this Ur-text, which, it was claimed, contained the required Buddhist preamble (*nidānāvākyam*) that is lacking in the *Laghuśaṁvara* itself. Bhavabhaṭṭa, taking care not to claim direct access to that mythical source, saying only that his knowledge of its *nidānāvākyam* has reached him through the lineage of his teachers (*guruparamparā*), asserts that it reveals that the teacher of the Tantra was Bhagavān Mahāvajradhara, the requester his consort Bhagavatī Vajravārāhī, and the reciter Vajrapāṇi. These then, it follows for Bhavabhaṭṭa, are the *dramatis personae* of the *Laghuśaṁvara* too. But he reports a contrary view that Vajravārāhī was the teacher and Mahāvajradhara her pupil. The imposition on the text of the claim that it is a dialogue between the deity and his goddess-consort brings it into line with the Śaiva scriptural literature of the Vidyāpīṭha. For there the Tantras take the form of Bhairava’s teachings in answer to the questions of the Goddess (Devi/Bhairavī). In the explanatory Tantras of the Cakrasamvara cycle this model is made explicit in the *Vajradhakakalpa*, where Vajrasattva/Vajradhaka teaches in response to the questions of Devī, and in the *Dākārnava* and *Vajravārāhīkalpa*, where Vireśvara responds to the questions of Vireśvari. But in the *Caturyoginisampūta*, another of the satellite Tantras of this cycle, the goddess Vajrini (Vajravrāhī) is the teacher and Vajrin (Heruka) the questioner. That this inversion seen in the view reported by Bhavabhaṭṭa and

---

430 In Sanskrit it is preserved as the twenty-first Sādhana in the *Guhyasamaya-sādhanaṃalā*, ff. 85r4–86r1.
431 *Guhyasamaya-sādhanaṃalā*, f. 62r2: *atha tu saṃpravakṣyāmi trilakṣākrśtamahā-māyājālordhvajottottaratrantre* . . .
432 Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasamvarapāṇijikā*, introduction: *mahāvajradharo desakah. . . bhagavatī vajravārāhī adhyesikā vajrapāṇīḥ samgatā . . . vajravrāhī-ādyheṣitasya bhagavataḥ prativacanam etad athāta ityādi . . . adhyesikā devīti ko niyama iti cet | guruparamparāto hi śrūyate mūlantre saivādhyeṣiketi | tata ihāpi saiveti gamyate.
433 Ibid., following the preceding citation: *bhagavān adhyeṣako bhagavatī desiketi kecit. acintyarūpo hi tathāgatānām abhiprāyah* ‘Some say that the Lord [Mahāvajradhara] was the requester and the Goddess [Vajravrāhī] the teacher. For the intention of the *Tathāgatas* is inscrutable’.
434 *Caturyoginisampūta* 2.15d–16: *atha sā vajriniḥ devī idaṃ vākyam uḍḍrayet | abhiṣekam *sukathitam* (conj. [=legs par brjod nas Tib.] : kathitaṃ Cod.)
in the Caturyoginīsāmputa is evidence of a more Śākta tendency within the tradition is obvious in itself, but it is confirmed by parallel practice in the most Śākta of the Śaiva scriptures, namely the Kālikukramasadbhāva, the Kālikulapañcaśataka, and the Manthānabhairava.

THE ADOPTION OF THE VIDYĀPIṬHA’S CARYĀ AND YOGA. As for the practice of initiates into this tradition, that too shows increased Śāktization. For it now enacts the iconography of their deities through the adoption of the Vidyāpiṭha’s Kāpālīka mode of post-initiatory observance (caryāvratam). Buddhist Śādhakas now carry the skull-bowl (kapālam) and skull-staff (khatvāṅgaḥ), and put on the Mudrās of human bone and a brahmanical thread (yañnopavitam) made of the twisted hair of corpses or human sinew, and dust their bodies with ash.435

*ganamandalam eva ca (conj. [=tshogs kyi dkyil ’khor nyid dag dang Tib.]: lacking in Cod.) | aparam kathayisyāmi devatānyāsam uttamam ‘Then that goddess Vajrīṇī uttered the following words: I have fully explained the initiation rites and the Gaṇamandala. Next I shall explain the supreme [rite of the] installation of the deities’. For the verb udīrayet as a past indicative cf. Pali udīrayi.

435 E.g. Yogaratnamālā on Hevajra, p. 155: caryākāle gaṇacakraṇdau vā pañcānāṃ mudrānāṃ dhāraṇāṃ; Laghuśaṃvarā f. 37v3 (51.2): nivasaṇāṃ pañcamudrādī gātrasya; Abhidhānoṭtara B f. 10v2–2 (3.18): pañcamudrādharo nityaṃ kapālākṛtaśekharaḥ | kapālakahāvāṅgadhārī ca bhasmodhulītavigrahāḥ; Bhavabhāṭṭa, Cakrasaṃvarapāṇijīkā on Laghuśaṃvara 51.21a: pañcamudrāditi. kaṇṭhikācūḍa-keṣyūrakundalabrahmasūtrāṇīti; Jayabhadra, Cakrasaṃvarapāṇijīkā on Laghuśaṃvara: p. 128: pañca mudrā rucakāśiromanikundalakaṇṭhikāyañnopavitāḥ pañca | sarvadā tair avirahito bhavet; Yoginīśaṃcāra 6.12c–13d: kaṇṭhikārucaka-kundalāsaṃbhūtiḥ yajñoṇopavitāṃ bhāṣmiṃ mudrāsāṭkam prakṛtitam; Khrag ’thung mngon par ‘byung ba f. 13r4 (Herukābhyudaya 15.27): nuṅ mo ru ni dam tshig ste | dpa’ bo rtag tu gcer bu yin | sgrub pos sngags dang phyag rgya dang | phyag rgya lnga dang yang dag ldan ‘Observing the vows (samayī), the Śādhaka Hero (vīraḥ) [should] always [be] naked at night (rātrau ca satatam nagnah ?), equipped with the Mantras and Mudrās (mantrasmudrāvāṇītah), and wearing the five [bone] Mudrās (pañcamudrāsamanvītah); Hevajra 1.3.14: cakri kundala kaṇṭhī ca haste rūcaka mekhāla | pañcabuddhaviṇuddhyā ca etā mudrāḥ prakṛtitāḥ; 1.6.2a: sīrasi cakri dhātavyā (= śiromanīḥ, a circlet of bone; the mekhā is a filigree made of small pieces of bone worn around the hips); Hevajra 1.6.16c: bhasma keśapavītraṃ ca yogī bhibhīrti caryāyā; Muktāvalī ad loc.: keśapavītraṃ keśayañnopavitāṃ; Vajrāvalī B, p. 218: athavaḥ nṛiharumayām keśakṛtam | vrasmaśātram ‘or the sacred thread may be made of human sinew or hair’; Abhisamayamani, pp. 131–132: cakrikundalakaṇṭhikārucakaḥkhāṃdānākamekhalākhypaṇcamudrāḍhārāṃ (see here p.174) | kaṇṭhikārucakundalāni śiromanivibhūṣitaḥ | yañnopavitāṃ bhāṣmīti mudrāṣaṭkam prakṛtitāṃ iti kecit. For the Śaiva case see, e.g., Svachchandoddyota on 3.2b: mudrālakāraḥbūṣitaḥ sikhākarnaprapoṣṭoḥpratisṭhāpitapāṇcamudrā; Picumata, f.101r3 (21.104): kaṇṭhāraḥ sīrāsī bāhūbhāyām asthikhaṇḍair vibhūṣitaḥ; a verse cited by Yāmunācārya in his Agamaprāmānya, p.93 (Y), edited here by collaboration with the closely related verse cited by Nirmalāmani as cited by Brunner in Somaśambhupaddhati vol. 3, p.681, n. 7 (N): *kaṇṭhikā (em. : kaṃṇikā
The pan-Indian topography of the Śākta Śaivas’ sacred sites, their Pīṭhas, Kṣetras, Upakṣetras, Samdohas/Chandohas,\(^{436}\) and the like, is also adopted. Two lists of such sites are found: one in the Vajraḍāka and the other in the Laghuśaṃvara.\(^{437}\) Also adopted is the practice of visiting these sacred sites (pīṭhabhrāmaṇaṇa)\(^{438}\) in search of meetings with the Yoganis/Ḍākinis that are

---

\(^{436}\) The Śaiva term samdohā for one class of site consistently appears in Buddhist treatments in the form chandohā (e.g. Laghuśaṃvara 50.22 and Hevajra 1.6.10). This substitution of initial ch- for s-/ś- is probably an east-Indianism; cf. Oriya chaṇcibā < Skt. samcayati; Bengali chātu < Skt. saktuḥ; Oriya chāc, chācā < Skt. satya-; Bengali chut, Bengali and Oriya chutā < Skt. sūtram; Oriya chāna < Skt. śānaḥ; Bengali chādālā < Skt. śādvalam; and Bengali chikal, chikli < Skt. śrṅkhala-, śrṅkhalikā.

\(^{437}\) On these lists see here pp. 192–203.

\(^{438}\) See, e.g. Samvarodaya 8.29b,d: pīṭhādīdeśaṅgaśānaṇa viṣuddhadehaṃ ... vande sadā guruvaram śirasat natena ‘At all times, with head bowed, I venerate the best of Gurus, ... whose body has been purified by going to the Pīṭhas and other [such] sites’; 9.25: pīṭhapaphaśeṣavānāṁ nirmalo bhavati mānaḥ | bhraman nimittam samlakṣya nirvikalpena dhimataḥ ‘A man becomes pure by frequenting Pīṭhas and UpaPīṭhas. The adept should wander [there] without hesitation, observing [any] signs [that may arise] without inhibition’; 26.14 ... 18c–19:
believed to frequent them and to be incarnate there in human women enlightened from birth or in childhood;\(^{439}\) classifying such women as belonging to one

\[\text{pīthe kṣetreo cchandohe melanāpakaśmaśānake} \| \text{pūjyapūjakasambandhe amṛtam argham uttamaṃ} \| \ldots \text{pratiṣṭhāhomakāleṣu pīthabhranāmagocare} \| \text{naimitte yoginīpūjye mantrasādhanatātksane} | \text{evam bahuvidhā jñeyā tasya doṣo na vidyate}
\]

In a Pītha, Kṣetra, Chandhoh, Melāpaka, a cremation-ground, or an encounter between worshipper and worshipped, wine is the highest guest-water. \ldots\) on the occasion of installation ceremonies, when wandering through the Pīthas, during worship of the Yoginīs occasioned by some event, and when doing the Śādhana of a Mantra. He should know that there are a manifold [occasions] such as these [on which he may drink wine]. He will not be at fault'. Cf. Nīśisamcāra, f. 10v2–3: 

\[\text{evam eva prakāreṇa ghorasādhanataptram | kṣetra paryaṭamānasya sādhatasya mahādhiye | śaḍaṃm dadāti yaḥ kaścit tasya praśnām vadāmy ahām 'O you of great understanding, I shall teach [you] the requests [that should be addressed] to any [divine being] who speaks to the Śādhaka as he wanders in this manner visiting the Kṣetras, intent on the Ghorasādhana'; Tantrāloka 29.40ab: iti samketābhijño bhramate pīthēṣu yadi sa siddhiṣuḥ 'If a person seeking Siddhis wanders from Pītha to Pītha knowing these signs, the chummāḥ' \ldots\]

\(^{439}\) Jayabhadra, Cakrasamvarapaṇiṣṭīka on 26.1, p. 125: yāvanti kṣetrapaṇetraṇi yogapītāṃ tatra vyavasthitā dūṭyaḥ siddhīdās cumbanāvagāhanād etāḥ viśeṣeṇeti yāvat 'Dūta are present in all the Yogapīthas, the Kṣetras, and Upaṇetras. These bestow Śiddhi, especially through kissing and copulating [with the Śādhaka]'; Lagusahumara 41.4c–5, reconstructed from the lemmata in the Cakrasamvarapaṇiṣṭīka of Bhavabhat.t.a, the commentary Śādhanaṇidhi of Kam-balapāda (K), this passage as incorporated in Vajradāka f. 41v2 (18.2) (V), and the Tibetan translation (T): sarvottares. u pītāṃ d.ākinyas tu sarvavyāpiṇi | dese dese \*bhijyante (V, mngon par skye T : jāyante K) jñānayuktāḥ svayonis | dākinyas tāḥ samākhyaṭāḥ vajrāmaṇḍalanāyikāḥ 'In all these superior [sites] in various regions, namely the Pīthas and the rest, women are born who are endowed with knowledge in their mother's wombs. It is these that are called Dākini, leaders of the Vajramanḍala'. Cf. Tantrasadbhāva f. 115v3–4 (16.279c–280): vijñāna-mudayāṃm āśāṃ kathyamānaṃ nibodha me pīthajāṃ cāṣṭabhīr varṣaḥ kṣetrajā dvādāsaḥbādikāḥ | dvāre sādabhīr devī yonijāḥ svaptaṃvātī 'Listen to my account of the emergence of the enlightenment of these [Yoginīs]. Those born in Pīthas [achieve it] at the age of eight, those born in Kṣetras at the age of twelve, [those born in] Đvāras at the age of sixteen, and those born of [lowly] wombs at the age of twenty-seven'. Cf. Tantrāloka 15.97cd–100b: bāhye tu tādṛśaṃtaḥsthayoga-mārgaviśāradāḥ || devyāḥ svabhāvaḥ jāyante pīthāṃ tad bāhyam ucyate | yathā svabhāvato mlecchā adharmapathavartināḥ || tatra dese nīyayetthāṁ jñānayogau sthitau kvacit | yathā cātanmayo ṣty eti pāpitāṁ tāḥ samāgamāt || tathā pīthas-thito ṣty eti jñānayogādṛipātrāt ānāṃ 'In the outer [Pīthas, Kṣetras and the rest as opposed to these transposed into the person of the worshipper] divine women are born who are innately adept in the path of such internal meditation. Just as the barbarians of other lands naturally follow paths outside of ordained religion, so in some [women] in these places enlightenment and meditation-trance are naturally present. And just as a person becomes a sinner through association with those [barbarians], even though he makes no effort to assimilate, so a person residing in a Pītha becomes the beneficiary of enlightenment, meditation-trance, and [Siddhis]'; and 29.40: iti samketābhijño bhramate pīthēṣu yadi sa siddhiṣuḥ | acrāl labhate tat tat prāpyaṃ yad yoginiṃvadānāt 'If a person seeking Siddhis wanders from Pītha to Pītha knowing these signs, the chummāḥ', he quickly attains from the mouths
or other a fixed number of deity-clans (*kulam*) and of specifying various characteristics of appearance and behaviour that enable the adept to determine these clan-affiliations;\(^{440}\) the consumption and offering of meat and alcoholic liquor in their rites;\(^{441}\) the consumption of foul substances without inhibition as an initiatory test of nondual awareness;\(^{442}\) the sacrifice and consumption of the flesh of Yogiṇī whatever he wishes'.

\(^{440}\) *Laghuśaṇvara*, Paṭalas 16–24 (*Abhidhānottara, Saṃpuṭodhava, Saṃvarodaya, Mahāmudrātilaka, Vajraḍāka*); and parallel passages in the Vidyāpiṭha texts Yo-

\(^{441}\) Bhavabhāṭṭa, *Cakrānvarapaṇḍitā*, p. 497: ‘āsu pūjaniyā madyaiś ca māṃsair api vajra-devayā | tāḥ pūjita bhaktivat janasya srīherukasyābhiratim gatasya samtuṣṭacitā varadā bhavanti ’On these [lunar days] [the women who embody] the Vajra goddesses should be worshipped with offerings of alcohol and flesh. When they have been worshipped they become delighted and bestow boons on any devotee who is attached to Heruka’; *Abhidhānottara* B f. 48v5– (6.50d–56a): *vividhai-*

\(^{442}\) See, e.g., Kumāracandra, *Herukābhuyudayapaṇḍitā*, p. 156: tatreti maṇḍale ‘mbojhabhājane saṃskṛta<\textsuperscript>m> bidālavidādikam dakṣinaḥbhimukhācaryo vāso-

\(^{443}\) Genesis and Development of Tantrism
of human beings believed to have been reincarnated seven times for this purpose (saptavartaḥ), recognized in both traditions on the basis of similar physical characteristics, and the use of their skulls as skull-bowls;\(^\text{443}\) the practice of visualizations in which the Sadhaka enters the body of a victim through the channels of his vital energy (nādi), extracts his vital essences, and draws them into himself;\(^\text{444}\) that of yogically raising one’s consciousness out of one’s body through should sacramentalize in a skull-bowl some substance such as cat excrement. He should then lead the blindfolded candidate forward, protect him with the Gāyatrī [of Heruka] beginning with OM. , and after addressing him with the word POTA˙NGI, the chommā of welcome] and having received [the chommā] PRATIPOTA˙NGI in response, he should bring him before [the Manḍala] and place that substance in his mouth’. For the Śaiva literature see the passages cited in SANDERSON 2005c, pp. 113–114, fn. 63.

\(^{443}\) See, e.g., Laghuśamvara f. 10r3–4 (11.1–2) and 49.4–13 (49.4–8 = f. 35v5–7; 49.8–13 = bDe mchog nyung ngu, f. 244r2–5); Abhidhanottara, Paṭala 63; Herukābhhyudaya, Paṭala 13 (Khrag 'thung mgon par 'byung ba f. 10r7–v6); Hevajratantra 1.11.10–11; Mahāmudrātilaka f. 23r3–4 (12.20–21): tādṛśaṁ yatnāt saptajanmanaṁ ānayet | nānāpūjopahārena pūjayed tām samāhitaḥ || tasvottamānāṃ utkṛtya kārayet padmabhājanam | tatraiva pātre madanaṁ pāyayet prajñāyā saha ‘He should with all effort bring such a man of seven rebirths. With concentrated mind he should honour him with the various offering-substances. Having decapitated him he should make the head into a skull-bowl. In that vessel he should drink wine with his consort’; f. 51r5–v2 (24.1–3c): athānyam *caiva (conj. : caika Cod.) karmākyam pravakṣyāmy ādarāc chṛnu | yena prāṣitamātrenā śāyānā svarūpam | susnīgḍhaḥ ca sugandhānāḥ sugandhasvedanānām | satyavādi salajjātāma niveṣṭi ciraṁ sadā | krpaṁaḥ ksantiyutah satyavādi nirāsrayah | saptajanmā trijanmā vā. In the Vidyāpiṭha literature see the treatments of this topic in Jayadrathayāmala Śaṭka 3, Yoginīsamcāra, Kālajñānapaṭala; Tantrasadbhāva, Adhikāra 7; and Tantrāloka 16.63–64 and Jayaratha’s introduction to this passage.

\(^{444}\) See, e.g., Herukābhhyudayapanjika on Herukābhhyudaya, Paṭala 13 p. 155: svadeḥāt dākinīḥ sādhvānā ṛtikṛtāḥ sādhye gudena praveśya navadvārāraṁ nāṁmārgena paśoh sādhyasya *bījaṁ (conj. : bījaṁ jīvaṁ bījaṁ Ed.) šukrādikam gṛhayītvā nākāśya svadehe praveṣayet ‘He should emanate the D.ākina from inside his body, have them enter the victim through his anus [or any one of] the nine apertures and passing through the channels of the victim’s vital energies, seize his seed, his semen and other [vital essences]. Then he should have them exit [the victim] and return [with these] into [his own body]’; on Herukābhhyudaya, Paṭala 42, p. 167: athāvā sādhyam ākṛṣṭaṁ tачhukrādi pitvā bhakṣayat ‘Having attracted the victim he should [extract and] drink his semen and other [essences], then eat [the flesh]’; Abhidhanottara B f. 51v1–3 (9.62–64b): vāraṁyātmabhāvañca tarjanyā nābhī vedhayet | dākinīyādi tu cakrasthā devya<h> *sūcyākṛtis (em. : śucyākṛtis Cod.) tathā || navadvāre *praveśyātī (conj. : praveśya tām Cod.) vedhayed (corr. : vi- dhayed Cod.) dhṛdayapankajam | yoginīya hatāṁetre (conj. : mātram Cod.) tu pibet ksatajām uttamam || hatam ca bhakṣayet so hi buddho bhaviṣyatī nāṇyathā ‘By identifying with Vāraṇī he should pierce the navel [of the victim] with his index finger [in the gesture of threat] and cause the Dākini and other goddesses of the Maṇḍala to take on the form of a needle [through visualization]. When he has made them enter [the victim in this form] through the nine apertures [of the body] he should have them pierce through the lotus of his heart. As soon as the Yoginīs have killed him he should drink his excellent blood and eat his flesh. For it is certain
the central channel as a means of ending one’s life and ascending to a paradise or liberation, a practice known as utkṝntih in Śaiva sources and thence in the Buddhist Yoginitantras (Tib. ’pho ba); the adaptation of this practice as a
means of assisting the dying and the dead—we have seen a ritualized realization of this in the Mantranaya’s funeral ceremony taught by Padmaśrimitra and Śunyasamādiḥ; and the practice of transferring one’s consciousness out of one’s body to pass into and animate a corpse (parakāya-praveśaḥ).

Nor is the adoption of the Vidyāpīṭha’s practices restricted to externals. It also extended into the domain of Yoga. For one of the most striking features that distinguish the Yoginītantras from the Yogatantras and indeed from all that preceded them in the history of Buddhism is that they based their inner practice on the theory that the body is pervaded and sustained by a network of energy channels (nādi), variously numbered, with three pre-eminent: two vertical lateral channels, lalana and rasanā, and a hidden third extending between up the centre of the body to the head, called avadhūti or caṇḍāli, with Cakras located along its course, which was to be awakened and perceived as the means of access to the bliss (sahajānandaḥ, mahāsukham) of enlightened awareness. This Yoga of meditation on the channels of the vital energy and the Cakras is not found in the transitional Sarvabuddhasamāyoga nor indeed in the Laghuśaṃvara, but it is in fact the Samputa, the work that also appears in this translation as the Sambhuta Tantra, reproducing a faulty Tibetan transcription of the same title. Tsong kha pa notes that this practice of ascent from one’s body (utkramāḥ) is a unique feature of the highest (bla ma) Buddhist Tantra class (MULLIN 1996, p. 209). That is so within the Buddhist Tantras; but the source of the practice is the Śaiva tradition, whose texts have always placed a great emphasis on it both in the Atimarga and in the Mantramarga; see Pāñcupatasūtra 5.30–40; Pampāmāhāmya 11.54–71 (explaining that passage); Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa, Adhyāya 182; Rauravasūtrasamgraha, Paṭala 9; Sārdhatriśatikālottara 11.13–19b; DviṣatiKA-lottara ff. 2v9–3r6; TryodayaśāśatiKA-lottara ff. 30r9–31r7; Kiranā, Paṭala 59; Matangapārameśvara, Cārayāpāda, Paṭala 9; Picumata, Paṭala 100; Mālinīvijayottara 17.25–33; Tantrasadbhava f. 36r11–v10 (9.294–321); Tantralokā 28.292–302; and, in Java/Bali, Jñānasiddhānta, chapters 3, 5–7, and 20.

Tilopa, the sNyān rgyud rdo rje’i tshig rhang attributed to Nāropā, and the Nā ro chos drug gi ’khris rim yid ches gsum ldan of Tsong kha pa (1357–1419) (Gsung ’bum, vol. ta, pp. 401–532) see MULLIN 1996 and 1997. For Tsong kha pa’s detailed treatment of this practice of ascent from the body see MULLIN 1996, pp. 209–215. His sources are those Tantras listed here: the Catuspīṭha (and Bhavabhāṭṭa’s commentary), the Vajradāka, the Samputa (= Sampūtodbhava), and the Samvarodaya. MULLIN translates the Tibetan rendering of these titles into English. He identifies his ‘Mystic Kiss Tantra’ as the Caturyoginīsampūta. It is in fact the Samputa, the work that also appears in this translation as the Sambhuta Tantra, reproducing a faulty Tibetan transcription of the same title. Tsong kha pa notes that this practice of ascent from one’s body (utkramāḥ) is a unique feature of the highest (bla na med) Buddhist Tantra class (MULLIN 1996, p. 209). That is so within the Buddhist Tantras; but the source of the practice is the Śaiva tradition, whose texts have always placed a great emphasis on it both in the Atimarga and in the Mantramarga; see Pāñcupatasūtra 5.30–40; Pampāmāhāmya 11.54–71 (explaining that passage); Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa, Adhyāya 182; Rauravasūtrasamgraha, Paṭala 9; Sārdhatriśatikālottara 11.13–19b; DviṣatiKA-lottara ff. 2v9–3r6; TryodayaśāśatiKA-lottara ff. 30r9–31r7; Kiranā, Paṭala 59; Matangapārameśvara, Cārayāpāda, Paṭala 9; Picumata, Paṭala 100; Mālinīvijayottara 17.25–33; Tantrasadbhava f. 36r11–v10 (9.294–321); Tantralokā 28.292–302; and, in Java/Bali, Jñānasiddhānta, chapters 3, 5–7, and 20.

See also TANAKA 1996, p. 272.
but it is much developed in the latter’s ancillary scriptures such as the Vajradāka
and Samvarodaya, and elsewhere in the Yoginitantras, notably in the Hevajra,
the Sampūṭodbhava, the Mahāmudrātilaka, and the Kālacakra.449

The elements of this model are ‘purified through equation’ (viśuddha-) with
Buddhist soteriological factors, either newly acquired, such as the twenty-four
sacred sites or long established in the Mahāyāna, such as the three bodies of
a Buddha (nirmāṇakāyaḥ, saṃbhogakāyaḥ, and dharmakāyaḥ), equated with
the three principal channels, and Means (upāyaḥ) and Wisdom (prajñā), whose
co-functioning (yuganaddhāvitā) is the way to liberation, equated with the
lateral pair.450 But the basic conception is derived from the Yoga of the Śaivas
in general and the Śākta Śaivas in particular.

THE INCORPORATION OF TEXT-PASSAGES FROM THE VIDYĀPĪTHA. In the
light of this evidence of the pervasive similarities between the Yoginitantras
and the Śaivism of the Vidyāpītha, and considering the fact that these similarities set
the Yoginitantras apart from all earlier forms of Buddhism, the reader will not
be surprised to know that there is also evidence that this tradition incorporated

449 That the Yoga of the energy channels was one of the principal features that distin-
guished the Yoginitantras was asserted by the learned of the Mantranaya itself; see
Śraddhākārarvarman cited here on p.239; also Mkhas grub rje, rGyud spyi, p. 256,
ll. 6–7: phung khams skye mched kyi rnam dag gtso bor ston pa’s rgyud yin na pha
rgyud | rtsa’i rnam dag gtso bor ston pa ma rgyud ‘If a Tantra principally teaches the
purification of the Skandhas, Dhātus, and Āyatanas it is a Father Tantra. A Mother
Tantra principally teaches the purification of the energy channels’. In this pas-
sage the distinction is between the esoteric Yogatantras (Mahāyogatantras, Yogot-
taratantras) headed by the Guhyasamāja and the Yoginitantras or Yoganiruttara-
tantras exemplified by the Tantras of Śaṁvara and Hevajra, the two divisions of
what the Tibetans called bla med kyi rgyud ‘the unsurpassed Tantra [class]’. Mkhas
grub rje’s tradition rejects this criterion for distinguishing between the two divi-
sions on the grounds that there are Yoginitantras (Mother Tantras) that also teach
the purification of the Skandhas and the rest. That is true. We find this, for exam-
ple, in the Hevajra (1.7.12; 1.9.6–9, 13–14; 2.2.31–36) and the Abhidhānottara (e.g.
B ff. 20v5–21r1; f. 26r3; f. 36r3–v6; f. 51r3–4; ff. 69v2–70r1). But that is because the
second-wave Yoginitantras sought to encompass the tradition of the Guhyasamāja
by incorporating many of its elements. He does not, we may note, support his argu-
ment by pointing to the presence of the purification of the energy channels in any
Father Tantra. From the historian’s point of view the distinction that he rejects
remains accurate in spite of his objections. VAN SCHAIK (2008, p. 50) has noted the
absence of material on the manipulation of the internal energies in the Dunhuang
manuscripts, which represent Tantric Buddhism up to about the middle of the ninth
century.

450 For a comprehensive listing of ‘purifying equations’ for the principal channels and
four Cakras (the Nirmāṇacakra at the root of the navel, the Dharmacakra in the
heart, the Saṃbhogacakra in the throat, and the Mahāsukhacakra in the head) see
Jñānodayatrantra, p. 6, ll. 1–14 (the four Cakras), and p. 6, l. 20–p. 7, l. 9 (the three
channels).
and adapted much textual material from the Śaiva scriptures in the process of producing its own.

This is particularly evident in the case of the *Laghuśaṃvarava* and its satellites. I have reported and tabulated elsewhere correspondences with passages in five Śaiva scriptures: (1) the *Yoginiśācāra* of the third Śatka of the *Jayadrathayāmala*,\(^{451}\) (2) the short redaction of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*—a much longer redaction, known to Abhinavagupta, has not come down to us—, (3) the *Tantrasadbhāva*, (4) the *Picumata* (*Brahmayāmala*), and (5) the *Niśīcāra*, all of which are texts of the Vidyāpītha. There are also a few correspondences with earlier texts of the Buddhist Mantranaya;\(^{452}\) but unlike those the *Laghuśaṃvarava*’s parallels with the Vidyāpītha are not short passages of one or two verses but detailed and continuous expositions that run in two cases over several chapters, amounting in all to some 200 verses out of a total of

\(^{451}\) *The Yoginiśācāra*, though it comes to us as part of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, has very probably been incorporated from another source. This is evident from the register of its Sanskrit, from its style, and from its content. This source may be a text closely related to the lost *Yoginījālaśaṃvarava*. For it claims at its beginning to be about to explain what has already been taught in that Tantra. *Jayadrathayāmala*, Śatka 3, f. 169r8 (*Yoginiśācāra* 1.1–6b): devy uvāca || purā tu śavcurrentColor varitē yad uktam paramēśvarā | *tan na (em. : tatra Cod.) jñātam mayā deva guhyatantrasya vistarīt | 2 katham sa bhairavo dehas tvaiy deva mahābalaḥ | katham devyo yajanty enam kulām tāsām kati smṛtyaḥ | 3 katham kramaṃ mahāgūḍha<\*> cāram tāsām katham vibho | carusiddhiḥ katham tāsām etan me brūhi vistaram || 4 evam ākārya deveśyāvadānāmbhurhacyutam | vaṃcṛtāṃ mahādeo bhūyo vacanam abravīt || 5 sādhu sādhu mahābhage sarvajñānārthabhājane | mahārāhasyam atulāṃ yo-

\(^{452}\) See here p. 163.
about 700 with some prose equivalent in length to about 80 more. They teach the characteristics by which the initiate may recognize women as belonging to various classes of Yogini, Dākinī, and Lāmā, and vocabularies of special words and gestures (chommāh) for communicating with them when encountered (Paṭalas 15–24), the rules (samayāh) that bind initiates as they engage in post-initiatory caryā (Paṭala 26–29), the system of Pīṭhas and other sacred pilgrimage centres for wandering ascetics engaged in this practice (Paṭala 41), and the characteristics of the ideal sacrificial victim known as a saptāvartah or saptajanmā (Paṭala 49).453

These parallels demonstrate a high degree of overlap with the Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha in the parts of the text and its satellites that deal with the religious discipline (samayācāraḥ) of the adherents of this form of Buddhism. Still lacking, however, was evidence of textual dependence in those parts that deal with that discipline’s ritual core. But that gap can now be closed. For since publishing those results I have located further evidence in what survives of the Vidyāpīṭha’s scriptures that this corpus was also the source of substantial parts of the Laghuśaṃvara’s instruction in this domain. The areas of prescription in which this textual dependence has emerged are (1) the daily worship of the ‘Kulikā’ prescribed in the first chapter of the Laghuśaṃvara, (2) the ceremony of initiation before the Maṇḍala through which a candidate becomes qualified and obliged to practice the Tantra’s rites and observance, which is taught from the end of the first chapter to the beginning of the fourth; and (3) the ritual procedures for supernatural effects, mostly hostile sorcery, that form a considerable part of the work and take the form of fire-sacrifices (homāḥ), and the use of the Mantras and the name of the target (sādhyanāma) to empower substances in various ways and combinations to bring about these results. These new parallels are as follows:

1. The worship of the Kulikā: Laghuśaṃvara 1.4–7b (< Herukābhhyudaya 15.6–10) < Picumata 84.9c–16.
2. The initiation ceremony: Laghuśaṃvara 1.15–4.1 < 8.3–28 of the Yo- ginīsamcāra.
3. The ritual procedures for supernatural effects:
   (a) Laghuśaṃvara, Paṭala 34 < Picumata 41.1–3, 49.3c–4c, 41.4–7b, 41.12abc, and 41.15d.
   (b) Laghuśaṃvara, Paṭala 35 < Picumata 26.1–2b, 26.41c–44.

Comparison of the textual parallels reveals that it is the Cakrasāṃvara corpus that has adopted and adapted the Śaiva sources rather than the other way round. For the Buddhist versions abound in instances in which it can be seen that Śaiva material has been misunderstood, crudely, artificially, and incompletely modified, or rendered contextually incongruous. The Śaiva versions, on the other hand, seem to me to be entirely free of signs of textual dependence on Buddhist originals.

Before proceeding to demonstrate this through the presentation and analysis of examples I wish first to address an objection that has been raised against my conclusion.\(^\text{454}\) I do so before my analysis because that objection, if it were valid, would block in advance the force of all my evidence, being based not on contrary analyses of particular parallels but on a perceived characteristic of all the materials I have identified. This characteristic is that the Buddhist versions are less clear in meaning, less grammatically correct. By concluding that the direction of redaction is from Śaiva materials to the Buddhist in spite of this characteristic I am held to have overlooked or violated the textual critic’s maxim *lectio difficilior potior* ‘The more difficult reading is to be preferred’. This maxim means that when one is confronted by two readings, both of which are plausible, one should prefer that which is less easily explained as the result of the alteration, accidental or deliberate, of the other, provided there is a clearly established line of transmission between the sources of the divergent readings. Thus, it is implied, the less clear and more incorrect Buddhist versions should be judged to have preceded the clearer and more correct Śaiva versions on the grounds that it is conceivable that a Śaiva redactor revised a deficient Buddhist version but not that a Buddhist spoiled a superior Śaiva version.\(^\text{455}\)

What exactly the concept of lack of clarity is thought to cover in this argu-


\(^{455}\) In fact it is not clear whether these authors think that the application of this principle means that the Buddhist versions *cannot* be secondary or only that it less likely that they are. The second alternative alone would accord with a more fundamental principle of textual criticism, namely that there are no hard-and-fast rules because every textual problem must be regarded as possibly unique (Housman 1921, pp. 68–69).
ment is unclear; but I assume that the authors had in mind not merely grammatical deviations from the Paninian standard of high scholarship, since those are seldom difficult to understand, being characteristic of a particular register of the language, but also and principally lack of clarity in meaning caused by syntactical incoherence and the like, which is indeed a conspicuous defect in the Buddhist versions. Indeed they are sometimes barely intelligible, as is revealed by fact that the commentators confronted by these passages offer widely divergent but equally arbitrary interpretations.\footnote{See here p. 216.}

Now, the objection that a version which is less clear in this sense must have preceded one that is freer of these defects, proceeds from a serious misunderstanding of how the rule of the 	extit{lectio difficilior} is to be applied. Firstly, like all other ‘rules’ of textual criticism, it should never be put to work mechanically and in advance, without the application of thought to the weighing of probabilities in each case; and secondly, it should never be invoked to give precedence to readings that are grammatically defective, incoherent, or contextually awkward.\footnote{This point has been made against DAVIDSON and GRAY by SZÁNTÓ (2008b, p. 218). On the principle invoked here, that a ‘more difficult reading’ must be plausible, see WEST 1973, p. 51: “When we choose the ‘more difficult reading’ … we must be sure that it is in itself a plausible reading. The principle should not be used in support of dubious syntax, or phrasing that it would not have been natural for the author to use. There is an important difference between a more difficult reading and a more unlikely reading”; CHADWICK 1957, p. 255: “The principle \textit{lectio difficilior potior} does not extend to nonsense, …”.}

Lack of clarity is hardly likely to the fault of the original framers of the text-passages, who, after all, probably knew what they wanted to say in whatever register of Sanskrit they chose to adopt. It is much more likely to be the result of incompetence and/or carelessness on the part of Buddhist redactors who had difficulty in understanding the Śaiva texts they were cannibalizing.

The secondary status of the Buddhist versions is also apparent in another deficiency: their greater metrical irregularity. In principle that might be explained either as the result of the Śaivas’ having polished the Buddhist versions or as the result of indifference to the preservation of metrical form on the part of Buddhist redactors as they adapted metrically correct Śaiva materials. But the latter explanation is much to be preferred. For, as we shall see, metrical irregularity is particularly noticeable in the Buddhist versions at those places where the imprint of Buddhism is apparent.\footnote{See here p. 207.}

Let us assume, however, that there are indeed readings in the Buddhist versions which do not derive from the Śaiva parallels that I have identified. Would these not refute my conclusion that the Buddhist versions are secondary? No. For
the inference that they would rests on the assumption that I consider that the Śaiva text-passages redacted into the Buddhist versions were exactly those seen in these parallels. In fact I hold that the collation of these parallels with the Buddhist passages demonstrates that the former are, in most cases at least, closely related variants of the passages on which the Buddhist redactors drew, and that these passages were accessed in what were probably earlier and less elaborate redactions of the works in which I have found the parallels, or else in texts of the same corpus which are now out of reach, such as the Yoginījālaśaṅvara, the Sarvavīrasamāyoga, the long version of the Siddhayogēśvarīmata, and the Pañcāmṛta. For what survives in the manuscript collections of India and Nepal is only a part of what once existed, as we learn both from citations of other texts in the works of learned Śaiva commentators and from the surviving scriptural redactions themselves, which, when listing the canon of texts to which they belong, mention many works, such as those mentioned above, which have not survived or await discovery. My argument, then, is not that these Śaiva parallels are the direct sources of the Buddhist versions but only that the Śaiva parallels are close enough to the Buddhist versions to reveal the direction

---

459 On these sources see SANDERSON 2007, pp. 234–237, footnotes 15–16, and 21–22. 460 See, for example, the list of Tantras ‘venerated by the circle of Yoginīs’ given in the first chapter of the Yoginīsamācāra as sources on the matters it covers (Jayadrathayāmala, Śaṭṭha 3, ff. D 170v2–171r3 [1.29–42b]): mūla- tantrāṃ kubjikā ca yoginījālaśaṅvaranām | *aṭṭhasambaranāmānāṃ (ABCE : aṭṭhasasvaranāgānām D) haṭṭadhūtis tathāparā || 1.30 calākṣaram mahātantrāṃ visvākriḍāvātāraṇam | mahāmāyottarāmāṃ nāma sarvavīraṃataḥ tathā ||

1.31 alamgrāsām mahātantrāṃ *kruṇicodghātam (em.: kruṇicodghātām ABCDE) eva ca | siddhacakraṃ prakhāsām ca paṭāṃ tūrām *tathāparāṃ (em.: yathāparaṃ ABCDE) || 1.32 siddhakaulaṃ mahājālam tathā bhairavaghaṃ varanām | kulaghaṃvaranāṃnaṃ kulaḍāmarabhairavām || 1.33 jhānkarukalam atyugraṃ tathā siddhāramaṃ sūbham | kācanāmatāṃ evānyat kusumālikasamajñitāṃ || 1.34 siddhayogēśvarītantrāṃ trikasārottaram tathā | picutantrāṃ mahārāudram vimalocchusmasamajñitāṃ || 1.35 khaḍgarvaṃnaṇānaṃ tathānyan taka- maṇḍalam (em.: taṃkaṃḍanām ABCDE) | karoṭi maṇḍamālākhyaṃ śicchedaṃ bhayaṇakam || 1.36 hāhāraṅottaramaṃ tantrāṃ krodhaṃ unnat- tabhairavām | ruruyālamāṃ atyugraṃ tathānyan rudrāyālamāṃ || 1.37 umāyālamāṃ evānyad gauryālamāṃ eva ca | skandayālamāṃ evānyam tathā bhairavāyālamāṃ || 1.38 viṣṇuṇyālamāṃ eva syān nandiyālamāṃ eva ca | śukrayālamāṃ evānyac chakrayālamāṃ eva ca || 1.39 kapalāsīmatāṃ nāma meghanādiśvaram tathā | hamsayālamānānaṃ caṇḍogramaṃ hātakēvaram || 1.40 mahāvāmeśvarītantrāṃ laṅkeśimatāṃ uttamaṃ | lampatādyam ca raktādyam tathā haddāmatāṃ param || 1.41 durvāsamatāṃ evānyam evamādyā hy anekasāḥ | ete tantravrāṃ praktā yoginīcakravanditāḥ || 1.42 eṣu tantravrāvēv eva tāṣām cāraṃ vicāritam. The great majority of these works appear to have been lost. Works that have survived with titles listed here are distinguished by bold characters. Works here that are known only by citations or as loci of attribution in early colophons have been underlined.
of dependence. It is possible, therefore, that any ‘more difficult readings’ were inherited from this earlier stratum in the development of the Vidyāpiṭha; and this mere possibility is sufficient to invalidate the inference of the priority of the Buddhist versions. If I am mistaken in my conclusion that the Buddhist versions are secondary that will have to be demonstrated by presenting a persuasive contrary analysis of the relationship between the Śaiva and Buddhist versions based on a detailed examination of the particulars I have identified. General arguments of this kind, which attempt to settle the matter in advance without engaging with the specifics of the parallels, will not suffice. 461

Having dealt with this objection I can now turn to the evidence. In advance of a more thoroughgoing demonstration I consider a few passages here that reveal that the Buddhist redactors were using Śaiva materials and enable us to see how they did so.

I have mentioned the entry into the Cakrasaṁvara corpus of two lists of Śaivismata sacred sites. That found in the Vajraḍāka, ff. 42r1–43v3 (18.10–60) corresponds very closely in the Vidyāpiṭha to Niśīsaṁcāra, ff. 16v–19v (4.6b–5.11), both in content and wording. The passage lists twenty-four sacred sites and identifies for each its presiding goddess, the high Tantric goddess to whose family she is assigned, her weapon (āyudham), the site’s sacred tree, and a guardian Bhairava (kṣetrapālah). 462 The version in the Vajraḍāka leaves

461 The same applies to a line of defence that objects to my conclusion in a manner that renders even a non-specific engagement with the parallels unnecessary. Confronted with the information that such parallels have been claimed some are inclined to respond with the question “Why would Buddhists have drawn on Śaiva sources?” The question is purely rhetorical and somewhat plaintive, implying that since the authors of these texts were Buddhists they would surely not have drawn on non-Buddhist scriptures. The inference has no force at all, because it invokes a notion of the nature of Buddhism and consequently of what Buddhists can or cannot have done that is derived from texts other than those of this corpus. No amount of evidence that other Buddhist scriptures were free of dependence on non-Buddhist texts can counter evidence that these Buddhist scriptures were not. 462 Closely related to the Niśīsaṁcāra text is a version seen in Kubjikāmaṭa 22.23–46, which lacks one of its elements, namely the specification of the high Tantric goddesses to whose families these local goddesses belong. Another, somewhat divergent and giving the sites alone and the points on the body that should be empowered by them through nyāsah, appears in the Vidyāpiṭha’s Mādhavakula (Jayadrathayāmala, Satka 4, f. 124r1–5 [Kālikakule pūjanirṇayah, vv. 16–22 (followed in Tantrāloka 29.59–63 (TĀ); parts of a Kashmirian redaction of the text are cited in Tantrāloka viveka on these verses (TĀV); the procedure of the nyāsah is put in Paddhati form in Kālikulakramārcana, f. 22r5–v5 [KKK]): aṭṭahāsaṁ śikhāsthāne carīṭrāṃ ca karandhrake | *kulagiryam (corr. : kullagiry Co.) priye *karne (corr. : karnnäm Co.) *jayantyā (corr. : jayamīya Co.) uttare punah (conj. [cf. jayantīpitāpāda vāmakarne KKK : uttaroyane Co.) | 17 *ujayanayā (corr. : ujejonayam Co.) tu bhrūmadhye prayāgām vakttramadhyagam | vārāṇaśī tu hṛdaye śrīpiṭhañ skandhayor dvayoḥ | 18 kaṇṭhadeṣe tu virajaṃ *hy eruṇdyā
this Śaiva pantheon and its ancillaries intact, the only major deviation being that it has four sites that differ from those in the Niśisāṃcāra. Particularly striking in the Vajraḍāka’s version is not only the fact that it transmits all the details of this distinctively Śaiva religious map, which includes such well-known deities as Mahālakṣmī of Kollagiri (Kolhāpur), Hetuka[bhairava] of Devikottā, and Vettāḍā/Vetalā of Nagara (Pāṭaliputra/Kusumapura), but also that it preserves the classification of the goddesses of these sites as belonging to one or other of the families of Raktā, Karālī, Canḍāksī, Mahocchusmā, Karālā, Danturā, Bhīmavaktā, and Mahābalā, information that is revelant only in the context of the Śaiva Age.

The name of the goddess of this city is Vettavāsinī in the Niśisāṃcāra (f. 17v [4.43]; em.: vettavāsinī Cod.) Vetrakachanivāsā in the Kubjikāmata (22.37c; em. [MSS E and K]: cetrakacchanivāsā BCDJG: caitrakacchanivāsā Ed.), and Vetrā in the Kalīkahulakramācāra (em.: vatrā Cod.). In the Buddhist version we see Vettāḍā in the Vajraḍāka (em.: vettaheti Cod.) and Vetāḍā in the Dākārnava. The Vāsavadattā of Subandhu (p. 16, l. 2 to p. 17, l. 4) independently identifies her as ‘the Kātyāyayanī called Vetalā’: kusumapuram...yatra...kātyāyayanī vetālābhidhāraki. We therefore have two phonetically related but semantically unrelated names, one meaning the goddess ‘who dwells in the thicket of reeds (vetra-)’ and the other ‘the female Vetalā’, vettaḍā- and vetāḍā- being well-attested variant forms of vetala-. I propose that the latter evolved from the former through a vernacular synonym Vetalā corresponding to Sanskrit Vetrālayā. See, e.g., Picumata f. 19r2–3 (4.254c–256): guhyakādyām tato vakṣye nāmato
context outside this text-passage and its derivatives. Thus, for example, the *Niśisāṃcāra* (4.10–13), covering Kolāgiri (Kolhāpur) and Jayantī, reads:

10 *kolāgirya-ṃ* mahālakṣmī karālā*yonisaṃbhavā* |
   kālarūpā sthitā devī danḍahastā subhīṣanā ||
11 tasmin kṣetre sthitā devī parvatāgrasamasārītā |
   anigketi ca vikhyātāḥ kṣetrapāla mahātape ||
12 *jayanty-ṃ* danturā*yon-ṛ* jvālāmukheti viśrutā |
   khāḍgahastā sthitā devī sarvasattvabhayaṃkārī ||
13 tasmin kṣetre sthitā devī nimbavṛksasamāsārītā |
   mahāpreteti vikhyātas tasmin kṣetra mahābalaḥ ||

ff. 16v4–17r3

13a *tasmin kṣetre corr.* : *tasmiṃ kṣetra* Cod.

and the corresponding passage in the *Vajradāka* (18.12–14) reads:

12 *kollagirya-ṃ* mahālakṣmī karālā*yonisaṃbhavā* |
   kālarūpā sthitā devī vikṛtā cātībhiṣaṇā ||
13 tasmin nagare sthitā cagrā parvatāgrasamasārītā |465

varṇatas tathā || 255 raktā karāli *caṇḍākhyā* (corr. : caṇḍākhyāṃ Cod.)
mahoccūṃsā tathāiva ca | ucchuṣmatantra nāmāni guhyakānāṃ na saṃsayaḥ ||
256 karālā danturā caiva bhīmavaktrā mahābalaḥ | guhyakānucāryaḥ hy etāḥ
kīmkaryo 'nukraṇeṇa tu 'Next I shall explain the [retinue] that begins with the
guhyaṅkāś, giving their names and colours. In [this scripture,] the *Ucchuṣmatantra*,
the names of the Guhyakās are, without doubt, Raktā, Karāli, Čaṇḍākhyā
(/Caṇḍākṣi), and Mahoccūṃsā. Karāla, Danturā, Bhīmavaktrā, and Mahābalā:
these are respectively their attendant servants’. The *Ucchuṣmatantra* is the
Pīcumata itself (f. 185r4: *ity ucchuṣmatantra pīcumate nādisāṃcārapaṭalaḥ śat-
trimśatimāḥ*). The four secondary goddesses that attend the Guhyakās are also
called their Dūṭīs. I have not emended caṇḍākhyāṃ, because although Čaṇḍākṣi is
the standard form of the name there are several other places in this text in which
the goddess is called Caṇḍākhyā.

465 Both the *Niśisāṃcāra* and the *Vajradāka* read *parvatāgrasamasārītā* (*Do rje mkha’
’gro f. 49r7: ri yi rtse mor brten te gnas) ‘on a hilltop’ here. This is surprising
because what we expect is a reference to the site’s sacred tree, as in the
parallel expression *nimbavṛksasamāsārītā* ‘by a Nimba tree’ in the next verse.
It is tempting to emend, therefore to *parpaṭāgrasamasārītā* ‘in front of a Box
[trees]’, since this is so close to the transmitted reading. However, two consid-
erations oppose this: (1) in a passage on Kollāgiri in the *Pīcumata* (f. 7r3–4
[3.84–87]), which agrees in giving Mahālakṣmī as the goddess, Agnīka as the
Kṣetrapāla, and danḍaḥ as the weapon, the sacred tree of the site is said to be a
Vaibhītaka (84 daksīṇena likhen mantri mahāghoram bhavyāvaham | mahāraudram
śmaśānāṃ tu nāmānā kollāgirī tathā || 85 tatra danḍaṃ samālihya madhye
vaibhītakadrumum | nānāvṛksasamākīrṇāṃ kollāgiryparpis tathā || 86 citihī
draujvalantibhiḥ samantāt parivāritam | dīkṣuṣ caiva vidīkṣuṣ ca bahis tasya
mahāyaśe || 87 tasyādhaṃstāt likhet padam aṣṭapatram sakāṅkham | agnikam
kṣetrapālaṃ tu mahālakṣmīḥbhavyāvaham); and (2) in the *Kubjikāmaṭa*’s parallel
version of this material Mahālakṣmī is described as ‘residing on a hill’ (22.25: *ag-
Moreover, this Buddhist parallel provides additional evidence of the direction of redaction through the state of verse 14. For it lacks the first quarter, which contained information vital to the coherence of the passage, namely the name of the site over which the goddess Jvālāmukhī presides and the goddess of the Picumata to whose family she is assigned. As a result of this error, committed either by a Buddhist redactor or inherited from a defective Śaiva manuscript, what was originally the second quarter has become the first. Aware that the metrical cadences required at the end of first and second quarters of a verse in this metre are different the redactor has removed the resulting metrical blemish by substituting the synonym vikhyātā for viśrutā. But this was not enough, since to mend the unmetrical mess that resulted from the omission he would have had also to recast the quarters that follow. This was evidently beyond his competence or required more effort than he thought necessary. The result is a verse with five quarters (a, a, b, a, b) or one and a half verses of which the first half verse consists of a prior quarter without the posterior quarter required to complete it.

As for the four sites found in the Vajradāka’s version but not in the Niśisāṃcāra, namely Uḍḍiyāna, Jālandhara, Tibet, and Mālava, there can be little doubt that the presence of the third is the work of a Buddhist redactor, since Tibet had no religious significance for the Śaivas but much for the Buddhists from the eighth century onwards. As for the other three, their presence might be explained by assuming that the direct source of the Vajradāka’s passage was not the Niśisāṃcāra as we find it in its single surviving Nepalese manuscript but rather a closely related redaction either within another version of the Niśisāṃcāra, such as we find in the paraphrases and citations of a work of this name in the Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta and Jayaratha’s commentary,\footnote{See the paraphrase of the Niśisāṃcāra’s treatment of these twenty-four Śākta sacred sites in Tantrāloka 15.88–97b and the direct citations in Jayaratha’s commentary on these verses. These show a list that differs somewhat from that found in the Nepalese manuscripts. The latter has Aṭṭahāsa, Caritra,}
or within some other Śaiva source. However, this is improbable in the light of the Vajradāka’s treatments of all four of these sites. For what they have in common is that they deviate from the pattern of the rest of the passage in that their presiding goddesses, Mahādevī of Udḍīyāna, Caṇḍālinī of Jālandhara, Sahajā of Tibet, and Sekā of Mālava, are not assigned to one or other of the eight goddesses of the Picumata. Instead, in the case of the first three the redactor has filled in the text at these points by assigning them to the families of Guhyā (guhyākhyāyonisambhavā), Soma (somasaṃbhava), and Svayambhū (svayambhuyonisambhavā), and in the case of the fourth omitting to assign her to any deity.467 Why he chose these names is unknown to me. Only one is a goddess and not one of them is of any significance in Tantric Buddhism, unless the Svayambhū intended is that of the famous Svayambhūcaitya of Kathmandu. It seems likely that he supplied these names at random in order to maintain the compositional structure. In any case, since it would have been an easy task to insert names from among those of the eight goddesses that structure his Śaiva source, it is evident that they meant nothing to him.

The other list of sacred places appears in Laghuśaṃvara 41.6–15. The verses first list these places (6–8b) and then state the classes of Yoginiś and other female supernaturals said to be present in them, though without covering them all.468 The Śaiva source, or rather a later redactional variant of it, is seen in the following passage in the Tantrasadbhāva:

---


468 A related system of thirty-two sacred sites is taught in Hevajra 1.6.10–19, and, with some differences, in Mahāmudrātilaka, Paṭala 10 (ff. 17v1–20v5).
The Śaiva Age

kulūtāyām aranyeṣe sindhudeṣe nageṣvare ||
62 samudrakuksyāṃ saurāṣṭre pretapuryāṃ himālaye |
kāncyāṃ lampākaviṣaye kalinge kauśale sthale ||
63 triśakunis tathā caudre kāmarūpe ca mālave |
devikoṭhe sudhārāme godāvāryāśa tate rbude ||
64 esu deṣese yāh kanyāḥ striyo vā klinnayonayaḥ |
sarvās tāḥ kāmarūpīnyo manovegānuvrṭtayaḥ ||
65 seṣese yās samutpānṇāḥ sākinyo ghoraṃāṭaraḥ |
ṣad yoginyah kulūtāyām aranyeṣe ca māṭaraḥ ||
66 sindhudeṣe bhaginayas tu nageṣe kulaṇāyikāḥ |
samudrakuksyaṃ kāmpilyaḥ saurāṣṭre grhadevatāḥ ||
67 pretapuryāṃ mahākālyo rūpiṇyo himavadgirau |
kāncyāṃ ambāḥ samākhyaṭā lampākavisaye mṛṭāḥ ||
68 kalinge vrataḥārinyah kauśale piśītāśanāḥ |
cakravākyāḥ sthale proktās triśakunyāmarah smṛtāḥ ||
69 deśadevaṣe ca sākinyo nāyikā vīrtanāyikā<ḥ> |

... 126 yās cānyāṣa ca vinirdīṣṭa raurdhā bhaivamāṭarāḥ |
mahāmanthānarudras tu tāsāṃ maṇḍalānāyakah.469 ||

ff. 109v5–110r1, 111v1 (16.61c–69a, 16.126)

62a samudrakuksyaṃ corr.: samudrakuksyā Cod. 62c kāncyāṃ em.: kancya Cod. 63a caudre corr.: codre Cod. 64a esu em.: esā Cod. 68b triśakunyāmarah conj. [Aiśa Sandhi for triśakunyām amarāḥ]: trisamyāmarāḥ Cod.

The corresponding passage of the Laghuśaṃvara is not present in the incomplete Sanskrit manuscript accessible to me, since the folios that contained it, covering 38.13c to the end of Pāṭalā 44, are among those it lacks. But it can be restored with some confidence, except in the matter of the presence or absence of a few particles, by combining the evidence of the Tibetan translation,470 the

469 The fact that the text of 69ab and 126 are contiguous in the Buddhist version indicates that the Śaiva text on which it drew was not the Tantrasadbhāva, at least not in its surviving redaction, but an earlier source to which 69c–125, which contain a further, much longer list of Stānayoginīs and their classification as belonging to the families of one or other of the seven Mothers (sapta mātrkulāni), have been added. The alternative, that the Buddhist redactor removed this section because he had no use for this list and its scheme of classification, is not impossible. However, it seems unlikely that in that case he would have taken the special trouble of retaining 126. It is not needed to complete the sense and proved awkward to integrate because he had it in what was evidently an already corrupted form.

470 bDe mchog nyung ngu, f. 238v1–5 (= Laghuśaṃvara 41.6–15): kuluta dang dgon pa dang | si ndhu'i yul dang grong khyer dbang | gser gyi gling dang sa rasha | de bzhin lha yi khyim dang ni | yi daggs grong dang kha ba'i gnas | kā ni' am la mā ka yi yul | ka li ngga dang ko sa la | tri sha ku ne o tre dang | kā ma rū pa må la wa lha mo'i mkhar dang rā ma'i dbang | go da ba ri a rbu da | au ñya na dzā la ndhar dang
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lemmata in the surviving Sanskrit commentaries, and a rewriting of parts of the passage in the Vajradāka.\footnote{Vajradāka f. 41v3–6 (18.3c–10b): \text{sad yoginyas tu sādhakāḥ mlecchabhāṣaṁ tu bhāṣitam | 18.4 kulatayāṁ tu marudeśe ca yā mātāraḥ | sindhau ca nagare | kuladevatāḥ | himagirau | kāncyāṁ yāḥ sabālikāḥ (em.: kāncyāṁ yā bālikā Cod.) | 18.6 pañcāla grhadevatāyāṁ yā kanyā sahajarūpiṇī | kālīṅge | kalyanāśvame (corr.: kauśale Cod.) | caiva vratadhārinī | pīṣitāsaṁā | 18.7 pretpurūḍaṃ triśakunau ca sthūleśvāri khaṇḍa | rohikā | *pūrṇgraur (corr.: puṇṇagirau Cod.) | jālandhare candalajāḥ striyaḥ | 18.8 oḍre kāmarūpe ca mahākanyāḥ devikāto rāmeśvare ca yā kanyā maṭā | *godbhāvyaṁ arbude ca (corr.: godāvāryāmbude va Cod.) | dākini pariṃśavari | 18.9 suvarṇadhāvipa<\small>−m> | *yathoddhiṣṭaṃ (corr.: yathodhiṣṭaṃ Cod.) | udāyaṇaṃ tathāva ca | eteṣu deṣeṣu yā kanyā vīrādvaicyāpinī | 18.10 sarvasā tāḥ kāmarūpyaño *manoveganiṃrtayaḥ (corr.: manoveganiṃrtayaḥ Cod.)}

\begin{itemize}
\item 41.6 kulatāyāṁ aranyo ca sindhudeśe nagareśvare
\item suvarṇadvīpe saurāṣṭre \textbf{tathā ca grhadevatā}
\item pretpurūḍaṃ himālaye
\item 7 kāncyāṁ lampākavisaye kālīṃge ca[iva] kosale
\item triśakunis tathā oḍre kāmarūpe [ca] mālaye
\item 8 deviṭoṭte rāmeśvare godāvāryaṁ [tathā]rbude
\end{itemize}

\textbf{odḍiyānajālandharapullirimalayādiṣu}

\begin{itemize}
\item 9 eteṣu deṣeṣu kanyā yā vīrādvaicyāpinī
\item sarvās tāḥ kāmarūpyaño manoveganiṃrtayaḥ
\item 10 saḍ yoginyāḥ kulatāyāṁ marudeśe ca mātāraḥ
\item sindhudeśe [ca] lāmās tu nagare kulanāyikāḥ
\item 11 lampāke saurāṣṭre kuladevatāḥ
\item pretpurūḍaṃ mahākālāyo dākini saha ṛūpiṇī
\item 12 himagirau kāncyāṁ sabālikāḥ
\item pañcālavasiṣye \textbf{grhadevatā}
\item 13 kālīṅge vratadhārinī āh kośale pīṣitāsanāḥ
\item pretpurūḍaṃ vajradākyāḥ sthāleśvare
\item 14 triśakunyām [ca] amarāḥ pullirimalayae
\item kanakagirau antajāḥ striyaḥ sahasrāṅg ekaviṃśatiḥ
\end{itemize}

\footnote{Vajradāka f. 41v3–6 (18.3c–10b): \text{saḍ yoginyas tu sādhakāḥ mlecchabhāṣaṁ tu bhāṣitam | 18.4 kulatayāṁ tu marudeśe ca yā mātāraḥ | sindhau ca nagare | kuladevatāḥ | himagirau | kāncyāṁ yāḥ sabālikāḥ (em.: kāncyāṁ yā bālikā Cod.) | 18.6 pañcāla grhadevatāyāṁ yā kanyā sahajarūpiṇī | kālīṅge | kalyanāśvame (corr.: kauśale Cod.) | caiva vratadhārinī | pīṣitāsaṁā (em.: pīṣitāsaṁ Cod.) | 18.7 pretpurūḍaṃ triśakunau ca sthūleśvāri khaṇḍa | rohikā (em.: rohikā Cod.) | sthīta | *pūrṇgraur (corr.: puṇṇagirau Cod.) | jālandhare candalajāḥ striyaḥ | 18.8 oḍre kāmarūpe ca mahākanyāḥ devikāto rāmeśvare ca yā kanyā maṭā | *godbhāvyaṁ arbude ca (corr.: godāvāryāmbude va Cod.) | dākini pariṃśavari | 18.9 suvarṇadhāvipa<\small>−m> | *yathoddhiṣṭaṃ (corr.: yathodhiṣṭaṃ Cod.) | udāyaṇaṃ tathāva ca | eteṣu deṣeṣu yā kanyā vīrādvaicyāpinī | 18.10 sarvasā tāḥ kāmarūpyaño *manoveganiṃrtayaḥ (corr.: manoveganiṃrtayaḥ Cod.)}
addition of Od. d. iy¯ ana, J¯ alandhara, and Pull¯ıramalaya at the end of the first section (8cd). The reason for the addition is not made explicit in the Laghu¯ sam. vara Pracan. d. ¯a; itself; but the fourth Pat .ala had listed twenty-four Yogin¯ıs from Mah¯av¯ıry¯a to Laghu¯ sam. vara 472

The words within square brackets are purely conjectural

In the Buddhist version the total of twenty-one sites has been raised by the addition of Odijy¯a, J¯alandhara, and Pulliramalaya to the end of the first section (8cd). The reason for the addition is not made explicit in the Laghusamvara itself; but the fourth Patala had listed twenty-four Yoginis from Mahavy¯a to Pracana; and in the ritual system followed by the commentators and the

472 Laghusamvara f. 4v4–6: *tato (JAYABHADRA: tatah Cod.) d¯akinyo bhovan¯i vijrmbhayant | 4.1 mahavy¯a cakravartinī mahabhala svūrī cakravarmini |
corpus of explanatory Tantras the sacred sites, as we have seen, are likewise twenty-four because each is the location of one of these Yoginis. We have evidence of two stages in the modification of the text that produced this result. For the earlier redaction, attested by Jayabhadra, states that Pullīramalaya is not mentioned in this passage but must be understood to be included.\footnote{See here p.158. Kānha, Yogaratnamālā on Hevajra 1.7.12, identifies Pullīramalaya with Pūrṇagiri and that appears in its place in listings of these sacred places in later texts of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle, as in Samvarodaya 9.14. In the treatment of the thirty-two sacred sites of the Hevajra system in the tenth Pataḷa of the Mahāmudrātīlaka we find Pūrṇagiri and Pullīra denoting the same place (f. 17r5–v1: odiyānaṁ pīṭham ākhyātaṁ pīṭham jālandharaṁ srṃtṛam | pīṭham pūrṇagiriṁ caiva kāmarūpaṁ tathaiva ca ... f. 18r1–2: sīrasi sthitam vajrapīṭham sikhāyāṁ jādisaṃjñitam | pullīram maṇṭaka jīneyaṁ bhrāmadhye kāmarūpakaṁ). On the location of Pūrṇagiri, in the Deccan, see SÅNDERSON 2007a, pp. 298–299. In Śaṅkā Śaiva sources it is one of the principal Pīthas and is often referred to, but never under the name Pullīramalaya/Pullīra.} It is clear then that his text mentioned only Od. d. iyāna and Jālandhara in addition to the twenty-one of the Śaiva source. Jayabhadra does not cite the actual wording of the insertion, and no other indications allow us to establish it. However, it is unlikely that the redactor took the trouble of stretching his interpolation of

\begin{verbatim}
śauṇḍī khaṇḍarohā cakravegā khagānanā || 2 haya*karnā (corr. : varṇṇa Cod.)
subhadrā ca *śyāmādevī (corr. : syāmāthavi Cod.) tathaiva ca | surābhakṣi vāyuvegā
tathā mahābhairavā || 3 aīravatī drumacchāyā lāṅkesvārī kharvarī tathā | viṛmati
mahānāsa prabhāvatī caiva caṇḍakṣī pracaṇḍa ca sādhakha || 4 etāt siddhās tu vai pūrvam caturvimśati ākāraṁā

It is clear then that his text mentioned only Od. d. iyāna and Jālandhara in addition to the twenty-one of the Śaiva source. Jayabhadra does not cite the actual wording of the insertion, and no other indications allow us to establish it. However, it is unlikely that the redactor took the trouble of stretching his interpolation of

\begin{verbatim}
śauṇḍī khaṇḍarohā cakravegā khagānanā || 2 haya*karnā (corr. : varṇṇa Cod.)
subhadrā ca *śyāmādevī (corr. : syāmāthavi Cod.) tathaiva ca | surābhakṣi vāyuvegā
tathā mahābhairavā || 3 aīravatī drumacchāyā lāṅkesvārī kharvarī tathā | viṛmati

\end{verbatim}
the names of these two places to fill a whole line (8cd). The later reading, \textit{oddīyānajālandharapullirāmalaya\dīśu}, attested by the Tibetan translation and by the lemmata in the commentaries of Bhavyakūti and Bhavabhāṭṭa, supplies the missing \textit{Pullirāmalaya} and, incidentally, is an almost metrical half-verse: its first half (\textit{oddīyānajālandhara}) is unmetrical, but the second is not, and together they provide the required total of sixteen syllables. As for the meaning of the insertion, ordinary usage suggests that it is ‘Oddīyāna, Jālandhara, Pullirāmalaya, and others’. But that would not sit well with the closed list of twenty-four Yogiṇīs to which the sacred places were required to correspond. Thus it has been interpreted by Bhavabhāṭṭa to mean ‘beginning with Oddīyāna, Jālandhara, and Pullirāmalaya’, this compound with its locative plural ending being read as qualifying the twenty-one sites, each listed in the common text with actual or virtual locative singular endings. Thus we have twenty-four Yogiṇīs in twenty-four sites. All that was needed to make this fit the system known to the commentators was to claim that the \textit{Laghuṣaṃvara} is deliberately concealing the true order of the items, both the names of the Yogiṇīs in Patāla 4\textsuperscript{475} and the names of the sacred sites in Patāla 41. For in their system that order is not Oddīyāna, Jālandhara, and Pullirāmalaya followed by the twenty-one from Kulutā to Arbuda, as the \textit{Laghuṣaṃvara} itself indicates, but the added three in reverse order followed by the twenty-one in reverse order, with the order of the Yogiṇīs also reversed, so that the true sequence is from Pracāṇḍā in Pullirāmalaya to Mahāvīrā in Arbuda.\textsuperscript{476}

\textsuperscript{474} The frequent deviations from correct metrical form in this corpus create the impression that the redactors were largely indifferent to this aspect of composition, happily inserting and deleting without feeling the need to rewrite the result to conform to the rules of the Anuṣṭubh metre. The alternative, that they lacked not the inclination but the ability to do so, seems to me less likely. In the texts of the Śaiva Vidyāpitha, even when the Sanskrit is of a register well below that of the learned, the metrical structure is generally sound. Indeed since we find forms from both learned and scriptural (Aīṣā) registers used in the same texts it seems that by drawing on both the redactors were not only asserting that their compositions were divine rather than human utterances but also making the task of metrical composition easier for themselves by using an Aīṣa form that fitted the metre when the Paninian would not, as, for example, in the case of the not infrequent use of Aīṣā genitives plural in -\textit{ām} in place of the Paninian -\textit{ānām}.

\textsuperscript{475} On the passage listing the twenty-four Yogiṇīs/Dākinīs in Patāla 4 Jayabhadrā comments (\textit{Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā}, p. 115): \textit{tricakravyavasthitānāṃ dākininām prthak prthān nāmāni kathyante | mahāvīryetyādinā vilomena kathitam} ‘The names of each of the Dākinīs that occupy the three circuits are now taught. This has been done in the reverse order, beginning with Mahāvīrā [and ending with Pracāṇḍā]’. The order in which Mahāvīrā is the last and Pracāṇḍā the first, the order of their ritual application, is, however, indicated later in the text, in f. 35r7 (48.13): \textit{yoginīyah pracaṇḍādayas tathā}.

\textsuperscript{476} Bhavabhāṭṭa, \textit{Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā}, f. 126v\textit{1–3} (Ed. p. 547): \textit{oddīyānajālandhara-
Most of the few other differences between the version in *Laghusaṃvara* 41 and that seen in the Śaiva source are of little significance. But there is one that is more revealing. The *Tantrasadbhāva* has Sthala between Kosala and Trīśakuni (16.62c–63b: kāncyāṃ lampākaviṣaye kaliṅge kauśale sthale | trīśakunis tathā cauḍre kāmarūpe ca mālave), whereas the *Laghusaṃvara* lacks it (41.7: kāncyāṃ lampākaviṣaye kaliṅge ca[iva] kosale | trīśakunis tathā oḍre kāmarūpe [ca] mālave), and instead between Saurāṣṭra and Pretapurī has Grhādevatā (41.6: kulatāyāṃ arāṇye ca sindhudeśe nagaṇaśvare | suvarṇadvīpe saurāṣṭre tathā ca grhādevatā pretaṇurvyāṃ himālaye), which the *Tantrasadbhāva* lacks (16.61c–62b: kulūtāyāṃ arāṇyeśe sindhudeśe nageśvare | samudrakusyāṃ saurāṣṭre pretaṇurvyāṃ himālaye). Two features are immediately obvious here. The first is that the additional words tathā ca grhādevatā have been added to an otherwise metrically correct verse with the result that it has five Pādas rather than the required four, with the fourth and fifth both with the cadence restricted to the second and fourth Pādas of the Anuṣṭubh, thus crudely violating the required metrical alternation of evenly and unevenly numbered Pādas that is hallmark of this metre. The second is that Grhādevatā, meaning ‘household deity’ is a most implausible place name. The key to the mistake, which became a permanent part of the ritual system of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle, is in the second part of the passage in the version of the *Tantrasadbhāva*, which tells the reader the classes of supernaturals that are present in the sacred sites. For there grhadevatāḥ ‘household deities’ are said to be present in Saurāṣṭra in a verse in which the items Saurāṣṭra, grhadevatāḥ, and Pretapurī are stated in that order (16.66c–67b: samudrakusyāṃ kāmpilyas saurāṣṭre grhadevatāḥ | pretaṇurvyāṃ mahākālyo rūpiṇyo himavādigrāu ‘In Samudrakukṣi Kāmpilīs, in Saurāṣṭra Grhadevatās, in Pretapurī Mahākālīs, in Himālaya Rūpiṇiś’). Evidently the redactor has read the sequence saurāṣṭre grhadevatāḥ pretaṇurvyāṃ as though these were three sites rather than one site followed by its resident supernaturals and another site. Probably his manuscript read grhadevatā rather than grhadevatāḥ and he took it as a stem-form to be understood as locative, a licence of kind seen elsewhere in both the *Laghusaṃvara* and its Śaiva sources, as, apparently, in the unmetrical insertion that this error prompted: suvarṇadvīpe saurāṣṭre tathā ca grhadevatā pretaṇurvyāṃ himālaye. Bhavabhāṭṭa duly comments on the occurrence of grhadevatā in that
The direction of redaction is also unmistakeable in the passage of the *Laghushāṇavara* (1.15–4.1) (B) that prescribes the ritual of initiation. This has evidently been redacted on the basis of a Śaiva source of which an expanded variant is seen in 8.3–28 of the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* (A) redacted in the *Jayadrathayāmala*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.3 girigahvaraguhyesu</td>
<td>1.15 girigahvarakuñeṣu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mahodadhitateṣu ca</td>
<td>mahodadhitateṣu vā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ādisiddhe śmaśāne vā</td>
<td>ādisiddhe śmaśāne ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ālikhen maṇḍalaṁ śubham</td>
<td>tatra maṇḍalam ālikhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iti herukābhidyāne</td>
<td>maṇḍalāvibhidhānapaṭalaḥ prathamaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 śmaśānabhasmanā miśraṇi</td>
<td>2.1 tatra pāṇagomayena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapilāgomaṇḍaṁ śubham</td>
<td>maṇḍalabhūmi pralepayet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raktodakavimisreṇa</td>
<td>śmaśānabhasmanā yuktaṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tena bhūmiṁ pralepayet</td>
<td>paṇcāmṛtasamanvitam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 śmaśānabhasma samgrhyā</td>
<td>2.2 upalipyā tato bhūmiṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śmaśāne 'ṣṭadalaṁ śubham</td>
<td>tatra maṇḍalam ārabhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śmaśānāṅgārācārṇaṁ tu</td>
<td>śmaśānaṁ tu samācāreṇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trirekhaṁ maṇḍalaṁ likhet</td>
<td>2.3 cityaṅgārācārṇena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 ekaḥastāṁ dvihastaṁ vā</td>
<td>ālikhen maṇḍalaṁ divyaṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caturaṣṭakaraṁ tathā</td>
<td>ācāryaḥ susalakṣaṇaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sütrayed rudhirāktena</td>
<td>2.4 samyagjñānatantraṇaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savasūṭreṇa sütradhrk</td>
<td>śrīherukamantraṇaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7 akrodhano śucir dakṣo</td>
<td>akrodhanoḥ śucir dakṣo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ācāryo jñānapāragaḥ</td>
<td>yogaṇaḥ jñānapāragaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapālāmadābharano</td>
<td>2.5 kapālakṛtamūrdhajaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raudrabhaṃsāvaguoṭhitāḥ</td>
<td>bhaṃsuṇuḷṭaṅgaḥ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.8 pañcamudrāvratadharo
bhairavāṅgair vibhūṣitāḥ
mahābhūtāstrajālana
samantāt pariveśṭitam

saṃbhavān mātrair vibhūṣītagātraḥ
mudrāmantrair alāṃkṛtām

8.9 ālikhen maṇḍalavaram
ghorasiddhipradāyakam

caturasraṃ caturduvāraṃ

caturasraṃ tu samantataḥ
caturdvārasamākīrṇaṃ
catusṭoraṇabhūṣitam
vicared dviguṇaṃ mantri
yajēd dākinijalāśaṇvaram

madhye padmavibhūṣitam
8.10 aṣṭapatraṃ tu tat padmaṃ
carṇikādhiśhitaṃ śubham

sapatraṃ karṇikojvalam
puṣkaraś ca kesarānvitaṃ

madhye nyased devi
8.11 daksinābhīmukham diptaṃ
bhimarūpam bhayāvaham

mahābhairava bhīṣaṇam
tejakṣam tu sudiptāṅgam
aṭṭāṭṭahāsamahārvam

8.12 bhairavābhīmukhaṃ kruddham
raudrarūpaṃ nyaset tataḥ

mahābhairavābhimukhaṃ kṛtvā tu
trimukhīṃ raudrarūpiṇīṃ

...
8.21 agrato vādayed ghanṭām
paṭahīṃ ōmauruṃ tathā
ghanṭāṃ vādayet susvarāṃ
paṭahīkāṃ vāpi sādhakaḥ
3.2 ghanṭānādam ālambya
puspadhūpair ālakṣṛtāṃ
3.3 hāhākāraṃ ca kārayet
evam vidhivat pūjya
maṇḍalaṃ sarvakāmikam
8.22 pradakṣiṇikṛtya puraṃ
vastracchannamukhaṃ devi
puspāṅjalidharaṃ tathā
3.4 saṃchādaṇa paṭavastreṇa
mukhaṃ teṣāṃ tu putrakāṃ
3.5 pradakṣiṇaṃ ca tataḥ kṛtvā
sādhakaḥ susamāhitaḥ
praveśayet tat puravarāṃ rāmyaṃ
dakṣiṇāmūrtim āśritaḥ
3.6 puspāṅjalin tataḥ kṣipet
tato dāvāpayet puspān
mandaṇasopari
devasyopari put rakam
8.23 yasminm tāt puṭate puspāṃ
tat tasya kulam ādiṣet
yasmin patati tat puspam
kulaṃ tatra vinirdiṣet
8.24 raktan darsāyey tasya
tilakāṃ teṣu kārayet
mukham udghāṭya maṇḍalam
yad yasya devatāsthānāṃ
tat sarvaṃ tasya darsāyey
3.7 śrīherukādiśītha darsāyey
tataḥ pūjaya mudrām
acāryaḥ susamāhitaḥ
3.8 śīṣyaṃnān tu dvitīya ahani
hrīṃmantraparijaptena
raktena trijaptena
tilakāṃ tasya kārayet
8.25 samayaṅ śrāvayītvā tu
mukham udghāṭya śīṣyaṃ
darśayaṃ maṇḍalaṃ tataḥ
yad yasya devatāsthānāṃ
tat sarvaṃ tasya darsāyey
3.9 yad yasya devatāsthānāṃ
tatra tām darśayaṃ samyak
8.26 gurum sampūjya vidhivad
vittaśāthya vivarjitaḥ
pranipatya puraṃ guroḥ
3.11 tatas tu gurave dadyāt
suśrūvaṃ pūrvavidhinā
tathāgatoktadakṣiṇāṃ
samśiddhaputrakāṅvitaṃ
tathāgatoktadakṣiṇāṃ
8.27 távad ārādhayed devi
pragrhyay kulajān maṇtrāṇ
dakṣiṇyo yogamātarāḥ
shāntiṣ ca samayāṃs tathā
dakṣiṇyo lāmayaś caiva
8.28 távad vītāṣṭhayaḥ
dakṣiṇyo lāmayaś caiva
yāvadantaṃ krameṇa tu
khaṇḍaroḥa tu rūpinī
tatas tuśyaṃ tu
mātrātuḥyo vratāṃś caiva
3.15c tatas tuśyaṃ tu
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8.28 ārādhanaçramad yāti
triṣaṭṭicarûsodhitaḥ
bhairavibhuvanā devi
4.1 tato dākinya bhuvanāni
trijmbhayanti mahāvīryā
sarvaśaktibhir āvṛtāḥ

APPARATUS CRITICUS OF A

Codd.: A ff. 286v2--; B ff. 182r4--; C ff. 166v3--; D ff. 200r2--; E ff. 183v7--.


APPARATUS CRITICUS OF B

Codd.: f. 2r3--. TESTIMONIA: AbhU = Abhidhānottara 46.10–57 (A f. 146r6–[<Lagnahusamvara 2.1–]); BhBh = Bhavabhat. t.a ad loc.; BhK = Bhavyakirti ad loc.; IBh = Indrabhūti ad loc.; JBh = Jayabhadra ad loc.; ŚV = Śāśvatavajra ad loc.; Tib. = De mchog nyung ngu; VV = Viravajra ad loc.

Here we see several tell-tale signs. In the Buddhist version the disciples undergoing the initiation are referred to as put rakāḥ (3.4ab: saṃcchādaya paṭavastreṇa mukham teṣām tu put rakāṁ ‘Having covered the faces of those disciples with a piece of cloth’), a term that is standard in this technical sense in the Śaiva literature but to my knowledge appears with it nowhere else in Buddhist Tantric sources.

In 2.15 the installation of the main deity in the centre of the initiation Maṇḍala is described as follows: karṇikāyāṁ nyased vīraṁ mahābhairavā bhīṣaṇam ‘On the pericarp [at the centre of the lotus diagram] he should install the terrifying Vīra Mahābhairava’. The Śaiva version (8.10cd) has tasya madhye nyased devī bhairavaṁ bhīmavikramam ‘O Devi, in the centre of that [lotus] he should install Bhairava of terrible might’. But for this parallel we might have been tempted to read the Buddhist version not as mahābhairavā bhīṣaṇam, with mahābhairava as a stem-form substituted for the accusative mahābhairavana for metrical convenience, a common licence in this register of the language, but as mahābhairavabhiṣaṇam, preferring a pleonasm ‘most frightening [and] terrible’ to a reading that shows the name of the deity of the Vidyāpītha, a clear sign of incomplete assimilation.

The Śaiva text follows this with tasyāgrataḥ sthitām devīṁ aghorāṁ ghoravikramāṁ | bhairavābhimukhāṁ kruddhāṁ raudrārupāṁ nyaset tataḥ ‘Then he should install the goddess Aghorā of frightening might standing before him, facing Bhairava, furious and of terrible aspect’. The Buddhist version first inserts a description of some of the male deity’s iconographic features and then returns to redact its Śaiva exemplar as follows: tasyāgrataḥ sthitām devīṁ vajravārāhiṁ sughorāṁ | mahābhairavābhimukhāṁ kṛtvā tu trinetrīṁ raudrārupinīṁ ‘[and] the most frightening goddess Vajravārāhī standing before him, three-eyed, of terrible aspect, making her face Mahābhairava’. The Buddhist name of Heruka’s consort has been inserted but the redactor has not troubled to do the same for Heruka, leaving the Śaiva name unchanged. The accessible Sanskrit manuscript does give the name of Heruka here, reading śrīherukābhimukhāṁ kṛtvā tu, and this reading is supported by the commentators Bhavabhaṭṭa (śrīherukābhimukhāṁ kṛtvā) and Indrabhūti (he ru ka dpal ye shes phyogs ni [*śrīherukajñānābhimukha-]), and the Tibetan translation (he ru ka dpal che la phyogs [*mahāśrīherukābhimukha-]). But it is certain that this is a later improvement, because mahābhairavābhimukhāṁ kṛtvā tu is what we find in the older redaction attested in Jayabhadrā’s commentary, and in the text as incorporated in the Abhidhānottara (mahābhairavābhimukhāṁ). It is also supported by the commentary on the later form of the Laghuśāntara by Viravajra, who gives rab ’jigs byed che la phyogs ‘facing Mahābhairava’ here.
Further, in most places where a Buddhist imprint is visible the text becomes unmetrical. This is most economically explained by the hypothesis stated above\(^{477}\) that what we are seeing is a Śaiva source after its redaction by a Buddhist with little concern for metrical accuracy.\(^{478}\)

Finally, the *Laghuṣaṃvara*’s account of initiation is remarkably un-Buddhist in its content. This is not so much because it adheres so closely to the structure and detail of the ceremony outlined in the *Yoginīsaṃcāra*, including such distinctive details as the pitching of the lines of the Maṇḍala with a cord soaked with human blood and made from the hair or sinews of a corpse (2.11), the use of such substances as the five nectars of the body (*pañcāmṛtām*) and the ash and powdered charcoal of cremation pyres on the ground of the Maṇḍala (2.1–3),\(^{479}\) the beating of a drum in its worship (3.2–3), and the marking of the

\(^{477}\) See here p. 190.

\(^{478}\) See 2.4ab: *samyogijñānatraṣṭājñāḥ śrīherukamantraṃṣṭājñāḥ*: 2.13d: *yajed dākinijālasaṃvaraṃ*; and 3.7a: *śrīherukādiṣṭha darsāyeta*. The reading *mahābhairavābhimukhāṃ kṛtvā tu* (2.18a) probably represents a first attempt to differentiate the Buddhist version from its metrical Śaiva prototype by adding *mahā*.

\(^{479}\) This substitution of inauspicious and dangerous substances in the preparation of the Maṇḍala is a marked feature of accounts of initiation found in Vidyāpiṭha texts. See, e.g., *Picumata* f. 5v1 (3.12ab), concerning the Aghorimandala: *ashticūrṇatadāṅgāraṁ mantrajñāno alikhet puram* ‘The mantra-master should draw the Maṇḍala with powdered bone and charred bone’; f. 5v6 (3.31ab): *śmasānoththena sūṭreṇa sātrakāryam tu kāryaṃ* ‘He should do the outlining with a cord from the cremation ground’; f. 10r2–3 (3.184–185): *śmasānoththāni bhāṇḍāni vastraśatradāṅkāni tu | vastra¬<r> dhvajā tu kartavyā sūṭreṇa karaṇī tathā || kesaśi darbhā¬<n> yathāyāyam *acchinnāgraḥ* (corr. : *acchinnāgraḥ* Cod.) prakalpayet | veṣṭayen maṇḍalāṃ tais tu astrajapatiḥ samantaṭah ‘The vessels, cloths and cords should be made with what has come from cremation grounds. With [funeral] shrouds he should make the banners and with threads [therefrom] the pitching cord. With the hair [of corpses] he should provide the uncut-ended stems of [protective] Darbha grass. After empowering them with the weapon-[mantra] he should surround the maṇḍala with them’; *Jayadrathayāmala, Ṣaṭṭka* 4, f. 65v7 (*Rāvinīyāgapaṭalā*, [concerning the Maṇḍala of Rāvinī in the Kālikula section of the *Jayadrathayāmala-tantra*], v. 101ed: *śavasūṭreṇa saṃsūtṛya asthicūrṇādiḥbhīr likhet* ‘He should colour [the Maṇḍala] with powdered [human] bone and the like after pitching its lines with a corpse-cord’; *Jayadrathayāmala, Ṣaṭṭka* 3, f. 200r5–6: *sūṭrayed rudhirāktena *śavasūṭreṇa* (corr. : *śavasūṭreṇa* Cod.) ‘He should outline the Maṇḍala with a corpse-cord smeared with blood’. The nature of this cord is indicated by Kṣemarāja on *Svacchandatantara* 13.21b: *mṛtasūṭreṇa vaksyamāṇacchumnakāryuktā mṛtasāṇyunā* ‘The expression “with a corpse-thread” means “with the sinew of a corpse” in accordance with the secret vocabulary to be taught below’. He refers here to *Svacchandatantara* 15.5: *snāyuḥ śātraṃ prakīrtitam* ‘The word cord means sinew’. This understanding is also seen in Buddhist Tantric literature. In his commentary (-piṇḍārthaṭikā) on the *Hevajratantra* Vajragarbha glosses *śmasānoṣṭreṇa* ‘cremation ground cord’ as *rō’i rgyus pa rin maṅ byas pa’i srang bus* ‘a cord made from the sinews of a [human] corpse’ (SNEILL-GROVE 1959, Pt. 1, p. 51, n.1, who mistranslates this to refer to ‘a thread made
foreheads of the candidates with human blood (3.8). It is more because the redactor has not added what from the time of the Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi onwards had been the most marked characteristic of the Mantranaya’s adaptation of Śaiva Maṇḍala initiation, namely the series of consecrations known as abhiṣekāḥ. The commentators evidently could not accept that this crucial Buddhist signature might be absent. For they have resorted to strained exegesis in order to impose it. Jayabhadra claims that the terse injunction to worship the Mudrā in 3.7 alludes to the guhyābhisekāḥ, in which the Guru unites with a consort (mudrā) and the candidate swallows the semen. Then avoiding the difficult task of reading in allusions to any of the six consecrations that normally preceded this climactic act in his time he simply asserts that they should be done following the procedure familiar from other Tantras.

Bhavabhaṭṭa, however, adopts a more bold and imaginative strategy, finding all seven con-

---

480 Both versions say only that this is to be done ‘with blood’ (raktena). But a variant specifying human blood (mahāraktena) is attested by the Tibetan translation (mtshal chen gsum lan bzlas pa yis [mahāraktena trijaytena]) and the commentators Durjayacandra (mtshal chen lan gsum brzlas pa yis), Viravajra (id.), and Indrabhūti (mtshal chen ni).

481 Jayabhadra, Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā, p. 114, ll. 9–11: kulaṃ tasaṃ vinirdiśed (3.6) itiparyantaṃ sukaram eva | tadanantarāṃ tantrāntaraprasiddhena vidhinā sarvam abhiṣekanāh viparyetānāt (3.7) iva sāpateḥ guhyābhisekāḥ sūçayati ‘The text up to ‘he should indicate his Family’ is easy. He now alludes to the guhyābhisekāḥ with the words beginning ‘he should worship the Mudrā’. He does so because this is the most important [of the consecrations]. [It is should be understood that] ‘he should worship the Mudrā [i.e. the consort] after he has completed the whole consecration [process that should be performed] immediately after that [determining of the candidate’s Family by casting the flower] following the procedure that is well known from other Tantras’. The expression ‘the whole consecration’, though singular, should be understood to refer to the whole sequence of the consecrations that precede the guhyābhisekāḥ.
secrections up to and including the *guhyābhisekaḥ* in 3.2–3.3a.: *ghanṭānādam ālambya puspadihūpair alamkritām | ghaṇṭām vādayet susvarāṁ paṭāhiṃkām vāpi sādhakah | hāhākāraṁ ca kārayet* ‘Resorting to the resonance of the bell the Sādhaka should ring the bell after it has been adorned with flowers and [fumigated with] incense; or he may [beat] a drum. He should also laugh wildly’. He asks us to accept that the ringing of the bell refers to the consecration of [the giving of] the bell (*ghanṭābhisēkaḥ*)\(^{482}\) and, more astonishingly, that the wild laughter enjoined, literally ‘the sound hā hā’, is the consecration of [the giving of the initiatory] name (*nāmābhisekaḥ*).\(^{483}\) Having conjured up these two consecrations he then asserts that the three that precede them are therefore implicitly intended, namely the consecration with water (*udakābhisekaḥ*), the consecration with the crown (*makutābhisekaḥ*), and the consecration with the Vajra (*vajrādhipatyābhisekaḥ*).\(^{484}\) He then subjects this same passage to a second reading in order to force it also to refer to the two consecrations that follow these five: the *acāryābhisekaḥ*, which qualifies the initiate to officiate as a Vajrācārya, and the consecration of the secret (*guhyābhisekaḥ*). He claims that in this second reading the resonance of the bell, the ringing of the bell, and the beating of the drum refer to the Guru’s uniting for the purpose of the second of these consecrations with a girl of twenty-five, twelve, or sixteen respectively.\(^{485}\)

---

\(^{482}\) Bhavabhāṭṭa, *Cakrasamvara-paṇḍikā*, p. 37, l. 17: *ghanṭānādam ityādina ghaṇṭābhisēkaḥ pratipādyate* ‘The passage beginning with *ghanṭānādam* teaches the consecration of the bell’.

\(^{483}\) Bhavabhāṭṭa, *Cakrasamvara-paṇḍikā* p. 38, ll. 6–7: *hāhākāraṁ ca kārayed iti | hāhākāraṁ nāmābhisekaḥ | tāṁ gurubhāṭṭāraskenātmahāḥ kārayet* ‘In the expression “He should have the *hāhākāraḥ* done”, the *hāhākāraḥ* is the consecration of the name. He should have that done for himself by the venerable Guru’.

\(^{484}\) Bhavabhāṭṭa, *Cakrasamvara-paṇḍikā*, p. 38, l. 10: *tata udakāmaulivajrādhipatyābhisekānāṁ grahaṇaṁ tatpārvaṅkavatī tayoḥ* ‘From this [reference to the consecrations of the bell and the name] it follows that the text also refers [by implication] to the consecrations of water, crown, and the Vajra Lord, because those two have to be preceded by these [three]’. The five consecrations covered here are as in *Samvarodaya* 18.27, where they are associated with the five Tathāgatas.

\(^{485}\) Bhavabhāṭṭa, *Cakrasamvara-paṇḍikā*, p. 38, ll. 13–14: *ghanṭānādaḥ *svalingavasthitapaṇḍaviṃśatikādhiḥdhānam (em.: svalingavasthitā paṇḍaviṃśatikādhiḥdhānam Ed.) | ghaṇṭā dvādaśādhiḥ | paṭāhiṃkā śodāśādhiḥ | ghaṇṭānāda vajrakulam | ghaṇṭā ratnakulam | paṭāhiṃkā padmakulam | hāhākāraṁ tathāgatākulam | cakāraḥ anyac ca | *ghanṭānādaśādhiḥdhānam anyatamāṁ acāryaṁ sevayet (em.: ghaṇṭānādaśādhiḥdhānam anyatamāṁ acāryaṁ sevayet Ed.)* | *ghanṭānādām aho sukheti mantram śādakah sīsyah kārayed uccārayed ity arthaḥ | kuto ‘nantaram ity āha | anāmāyādi | anāmāṅguṣṭhavakrāṭhyām lehayed yogavit sadā | somapāṇavad āsvādyā dhīḥim āpnotī sāsīvatīm (1.12c–13a) iti gātheha yo倚itayā | tato ‘syā idam arthāntaram | pārvoktaphrajeśeveyā yad bhūtam tad anāmāṅguṣṭhavakrāṭhyām acāryaṁ sīsyam lehayaḥ | sa ca sīsyāṃ tatāḥ somapāṇavād āsvādyā dhīḥim āpnotītī guhyābhiseko ‘yam* ‘The resonance of the bell denotes a girl of twenty-five mounted on one’s penis; the bell is a girl of twelve; and the drum is a girl of sixteen. [In addition] the resonance of the
Having made the text refer to the *guhyābhiṣekah*, he finds the *ācāryābhiṣekah* by using the same argument that he had employed to arrive at the full sequence of the five consecrations that precede it, namely that its presence is entailed by the supposed reference to the *guhyābhiṣekah*, because that requires it as its antecedent.\(^{486}\) He finds a reference to the final consecration that he needed to discover here, that of wisdom (*prajñābhiṣekah*), in the statement in 3.7 that Jayabhadrā had taken to allude to the preceding *guhyābhiṣekah*: *tataḥ pūjayen mudrām ācāryah susamāhitaḥ* ‘Then the Ācārya, fully concentrated, should worship the Mudrā’. If, as is highly probable, the consecration understood by Bhavabhaṭṭa here was the *prajñājñānābhiṣekah* of the initiation manuals, then there would appear to be a problem, because the active agent in that consecration was not the Ācārya but the candidate, who now unites with the consort himself. Bhavabhaṭṭa is very terse at this point but it is likely that he was attempting to remove this difficulty when he wrote that the text refers to the agent as Ācārya here because he is endowed with such qualities as self-control. I take him to mean that it is indeed the candidate rather than the officiant that is the agent here and that he is referred as an officiant only figuratively, because he has all the qualities that are required of an officiant.\(^{487}\) These readings are, of course,

---

\(^{486}\) Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasamvaraapāṇīkā*, p. 38, ll. 23–24: *sa ca śisyāḥ tataḥ somapāṇavad āsvādyā saddhim āpnotītī guhyābhiṣeko ‘yam | ata evācāryābhiṣekah saddhah tatpūrvavatātī’* ‘This is the *guhyābhiṣekah*. This itself establishes the presence of the *ācāryābhiṣekah*, because the former is preceded by the latter’.

\(^{487}\) Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasamvaraapāṇīkā*, p. 39, ll. 21–22: *tata ityadinā prajñābhiṣekam darśayati | tato guhyābhiṣekānanantaram | ācārya iti dhaiyūdiguṇayogāt* ‘In the passage beginning *tataḥ* he reveals the Wisdom Consecration. The word *tataḥ* (‘next’) means directly after the *guhyābhiṣekah*. He is termed the officiant [here] because he has such qualities as self-control’. Bhavabhaṭṭa is probably alluding to the qualities of the good Ācārya as stated in vv. 8–9 of the *Gurupaṇcāśikā*: *dhiro vinito matimān kṣamāvān ārjavā ‘sathah’* …
artificial and could be imposed on the text only because Bhavabhaṭṭa, like Jayabhadra, could not accept the possibility that there might be no reference to the consecrations in a Buddhist Tantra’s treatment of initiation.

Further exemplification of the direction of redaction can be seen in the first of the new parallels listed above, that on the subject of the regular rite of worshipping the Kulikā (as the Laghuṣaṃvāra has it). For ease of comparison I give in bold characters those parts of each of the three related texts, the Picumata, the Herukabhuyadaya, and the Laghuṣaṃvāra, that partly or completely correspond to passages in one or both of the other two. The Picumata passage is as follows:

mūlasūtrādikānām tu kramāṃ sādhanaLakṣaṇām ||
10 durlabham trīṣu lokesu samayācārāpālanaṃ ||
yāgaṃ vidhis tathā jñānāṃ cakraṃ yogāṃ ca sōbhānam ||
11 kathayāmi mahādevi yat tvaYā coditām *balaṃ (?) |
madhyamottamacchāgēna gandhodasaḥiṭena tu ||
12 vaṭikāṃ prāśayet prājñāḥ pūjākāle viśeṣataḥ ||
vidhānaṃ tu sādā yoyāṃ carvāhārena suvratē ||
13 samaye sādhane caiva dravyālabhanakarmanī |
tasyaiva dūtayah saṃbhah sāhajā vīvaṃdite ||
14 gurūṇādivibhāgēna srṣṭidravyādiṣaṃgrahē |
ṛtvugaviyogena anulomavilomājā ||
15 yāgādhdhavagatā devi sarvakāmavilākṣanā |
kundāgolodbhavanaiva svayambhukusumena ca ||
16 japahomārcaṇām snānam būkapuṣpasamanvitam |
niyojyāṃ svena mārgena svakāle yāgapūrvakam ||

f. 319v3–5

11c madhyamottamacchāgēna em.: adhamottamacchāgēna Cod.⁴⁸⁸

The related passage in the Herukabhuyadaya is accessible only in its Tibetan translation. I give that here with a reconstruction of the Sanskrit of the parts

---

⁴⁸⁸ I propose this emendation for two reasons. The first is that the reading contradicts information given later in this chapter. According to that there are three grades of flesh for use in the preparation of the sacrament (caruḥ): goat, cow, and human. The first is said to be inferior (adhamā-), the second intermediate (madhyama-), and the third superior (uttama-): adhamāṃ cchāgaṃ ity uktam madhyamaṃ gobhavam bhavet | puruṣottamaṃ mahādevi tridhā tu caravāḥ smṛtāḥ (f. 320r5–v1 [84.36c–37b]). Consequently without this emendation we have nonsense: ‘with the inferior [i.e. goat], the superior [i.e. human], and goat’. With it we have a statement that is consistent with this classification: ‘with the intermediate [i.e. cow], the superior [i.e. human] and [the inferior, i.e.] goat. The second reason is that the emendation has the support of the Buddhist parallels, which, as we shall see, read madhyamottomasāvāsena or madhyamottamocchvāsena here.
that match the passage in the *Picumata*:

(15.6) sngags dang phyag rgya sbyar bar bya |
dam tshig thams cad bskyang bya ste |
’jig rten gsum na rnyed dka’ ba (durlabhaṃ triṣu lokeṣu) |
g.yon nas skyes pas byed pa yin |
(7) dam tshig spyod pa’i mtshan nyid dang (samayācāralaṅkṣaṇam) |
sbyor nyid cho ga’i yi ge shes ni (yoga eva vidhijñānam) |
de ni nga yis bshad kyis nyon (tan me nigaditaṃ śṛṇu) |
dbugs dbyung mchog gi bar dag ni (madhyamottamaśvāsena) |
(8) dri yi chu dang beas pa dang (gandhodakasahitena [tu]) |
rtag tu ril bu bza’ par bya (vatīkāṃ prāśayen nityam) |
mchod pa’i dus kyi bye brag la (pājākālaviśeṣataḥ) |
pho nyas lhan cig skyes dngos grub pa (dūtayaḥ sahajaḥ siddhā) |
(9) dman pa mchog dang ’bring rnas kyi (adhamottamamadhyamāḥ) |
de yis sbyor bas dngos grub ’gyur (tābhīr yogena siddhiḥ syāt) |
’dod pa’i don kun sgrub pa’o (sarvakāmārthasādhakah) |
dpal ldan he ru ka las byung (śrīherukabhavam) |
(10) rang byung me tog nyid dag gis (svayambhukusumair api) |
cho ga shes pas kun tu spyod (vidhijñānasamācāra-) |
bzlas dang bsam gtan mchod pa dang (jāpadhyānapūjā) |
me tog gcig dang yang dag ldan (ekapuspasamanvitam) |

Khrag ’thung mngon par ’byung ba D f. 12r6–v2 (Herukābhhyudaya 15.6–10)

**TESTIMONIUM**—Kumāracandra, Katipayākṣarā nāma Herukābhhyudayapañjikā, p. 156: evam maṇḍaṇaṅga niṣitaṃ śṛṇu | madhyamottamaśeṣaḥ paṇca pradhāṇa | gandhodakaṃ paṇcāṃśāśaḥ | vatīkāṃ prāṣya (Cod. [f. 3v6] : prāpya Ed.)
*bhāvanāgaṇaṃdalandau (bhāvanāgaṇa corr. : bhāvanā gaṇa Ed.) dūtīṃ pūjayet | adhamāḥ mantraḥ | uttamaḥ sahaḥ | madhyamāḥ kṣetrajāḥ | tābhīḥ siddhiḥ syāt tasya yoginaḥ.*

The version of the *Laghushāṃvara* reads:

1.4 sambhāvān nādārūpād viṇiśkrāntaḥ samayācāraṃ gocaraḥ |
durlabhaṃ triṣu lokeṣu ādīmadyāntaṃ saṃśthitam ||
5 manthyaṃnātanṣamyoṣaṃyaṃ yathā tathā mantraḥ janadhyāṇādiyuktaṃ |
yogaṣ caiva vidhiṣṭaṃ sāṃt treṣaṅaṃ niṣitaṃ śṛṇu ||
6 madhyamottamocchvāṣena gandhodakasahitena tu |
kulikāṃ pūjyaye nityaṃ kālaviśeṣaṇa tu ||
7 dūtayaḥ sahaḥ siddhāḥ adhamottamamadhyamāḥ |

f. 1v2–5

6a madhyamottamocchvāṣena JAYABHADRA : madhyamottamaśvāṣena Cod.
BHAVABHATTA

The *Herukābhhyudaya*, then, shows a version that is closer than the
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*Laghuśaṃvara* to the text of the *Picumata* in some details and covers more of it. It is particularly striking that it preserves the *Picumata*’s *vaṭīkāṁ prāśayet prājñāḥ pūjākāle viśeṣataḥ* (84.12ab), reading *rtag tu ril bu bza’ par bya* | *mchod pa’i dus kyi bye brag la* ‘Let him always swallow the sacramental pellet, especially at the time of worship’, diverging from the *Picumata* only in having *nityam* (*rtag tu*) and *pūjākālaviśeṣataḥ* where that has *prājñāḥ* and *pūjākāle viśeṣataḥ*. That the Sanskrit read *vaṭīkāṁ* is shown by the gloss *vaṭīkāṁ prāsyet* in the *Herukābhhyudayapaṇḍjakā* (f. 3v6).

Even so it shows signs of having had difficulty in understanding some of the Śaiva proto-text’s technical terms and of having dealt with this difficulty by resorting to rewriting. Thus in 15.10 *me tog gcig dang yang dag ldan* ‘together with a single flower’ corresponds to *bukapus. pasamanvitam* ‘together with the Buka flower’ in *Picumata* 84.16, so that the Sanskrit may be restored from the Tibetan with some confidence as *ekapuspasamanvitam*. The context is a listing of impure ingredients to be consumed at the time of practice. Now, ‘a single flower’ yields no appropriate sense in this context, whereas ‘Buka flower’ (*bukapusam*) does. For the *Picumata* tells us that in its secret vocabulary *bukam* means ‘the impurity of the male organ’ (84.38a: *buko liṅgamalo jñeyas*; 87.196d: *bukam liṅgamalāṁ smṛtam*), and the *Kubjikāmata* tells us that *bukapusam* has the same meaning (25.226ab: *bukapuspa kaṇākhyaḥ ca liṅgapañcamalaṁ tathā*). It is probable that the Buddhist redactor, failing to understand this obscure term, modified the text to produce something that had at least the appearance of sense. Kumāracandra confirms the reading *ekapuspa* in his *Herukābhhyudayapaṇḍjakā* and ventures to explain it as ‘the blood of a [woman’s] first menstruation’: *ekapusam prathamaṁ rajah vajrapadmābhyaṁ sādhyamānaṁ kapālaṁastham* (p. 156) ‘[After putting it] in a skull-bowl [he should swallow] the ‘one flower’, i.e. the first menses, produced by the penis and vagina’. But this gloss is not only strained: it also leads the text into an implausible repetition, since the blood of first menstruation has just been mentioned in 15.10a, in the term *rang byung me tog* (= *svayambhukusumam*). He also seems not to have understood the expression *kuṇḍagolodbhava*- seen in *Picumata* 84.15c (*kuṇḍagolodbhavenaiva*), another ‘secret’ Vidyāpiṭha term, referring to the mingled ejaculates. He resolves his quandary by substituting the name of his deity, the Tibetan *dpal ldan he ru ka las byung* (15.9d) evidently rendering *śrīherukodbhavam*.

In the abbreviated version seen in the *Laghuśaṃvara* we have *kulikāṁ pūjayen nityam* ‘let him constantly worship the Kulikā’ in place of the reading *vaṭīkāṁ prāsayen nityam* seen in the *Herukābhhyudaya* and in the Śaiva proto-text. This is evidently the result of a corruption of a redaction which read not
"vaṭikām" but the exact synonym gulikām;\(^{489}\) and this hypothesis is confirmed by the Abhidhānottara, which in its own first chapter preserves gulikām in a passage modelled on these verses of the Laghuśaṇvara, thus bearing witness to a stage of the redaction of this text that is earlier even than that known to our earliest commentator, since Jayabhadra accords with all later witnesses in reading kulikām here:

1.7 nādarūpād vinīṣkrāntā samayācāragocaram | durlabhaṃ triṣu lokeṣu ādīmadhyānāntanirmalam | । । । ।
8 manthamanthānayogena samyogād yatra yat tathā | prakṛtiprabhāsvaramuśuddham guhyapiṭhadbhavodbhavam | । । । ।
9 nirdoṣam śāsvatām śāntam khasamaṃ srṣṭikārakam | svabhāvasuddham svayambhūtām yoginīnāṃ sukhapradam | । । । ।
10 jāpadhyānādibhir yuktāṃ yogasyaiva vidhijñātā | tantar nigaditaṃ tattvāṃ guhyākādhipate śṛṇu | । । ।
11 madhyamottamaśāsena gandhodakasahitena tu |
gulikāṃ kārayed dhīmān pūjayet parṣamaṇḍalam\(^{490}\) | । । । ।
12 kālavēlāviśeṣena pūjayet tatra dūtāyah | sahajāḥ siddhīdāḥ sarvā adhamottamamadhyāmāḥ | । । । ।
13 antargatena manasā kāmasiddhiṃ tu sādhyat | Abhidhānottara A f. 2r2–6; B f. 2r4–v3

The otherwise unattested kulikāṃ was then construed by force to mean yoginīṃ ‘a/the Yogini’, and the verb prāsayet ‘let him swallow’, since it now made no sense, altered to pūjayat ‘let him worship’.\(^{491}\)

---

\(^{489}\) For gulikā (variant forms: guṭikā and gudikā) see here p. 217.

\(^{490}\) The reading of 11c is further supported by the Tibetan translation: mkhas pas dril bur byas nas ni. Note that dhīmān (mkhas pas) here is synonymous with prājñāḥ found at the corresponding point in the version seen in the Picumata (vaṭikāṃ prāṣayet prājñāḥ). This, then, has probably survived from the Śaiva source on which the first Buddhist version drew.

\(^{491}\) Bhavabhāṭṭa, Cakrasaṃvarapaṇḍikā, p. 20: kulikā yoginī | tām pūjayed ārādhayet | nityam sarvakālam pratidinam ity arthaḥ ‘[The word] kulikā [means] yoginī. It is she that he should propitiate [in this way]; and he should do so constantly, at all times, that is to say, every day’. Cf. Jayabhadra, Cakrasaṃvarapaṇḍikā, p. 110: kulikāṃ iti tantar samayabhāṣā | vajrārāhīṣvarūpāṃ bāhyānganāṃ pūjayed
That the Buddhist versions arose from Śaiva prototypes is clear from the detailed analysis of these and many other parallels. Other features reinforce this conclusion. In all cases the Śaiva passages fit neatly into the contexts in which they occur, without ragged edges, as it were, at their beginning and end, whereas this is often not so with the parallels in the Buddhist texts, a circumstance that fits well with a scenario in which the latter where constructed by a rather careless process of extraction, insertion, and superficial editing.

The same is suggested by the high degree of divergence between the various Buddhist commentators in their attempts to tell us what these new texts mean. They were caught out, as it were, by new materials that lacked roots in the Buddhist textual corpus in which they were trained. They did their best to make sense of what were in many cases barely intelligible passages; but without much guidance from existing Buddhist sources and with no central authority to impose consistency on their efforts they were bound to diverge.

We have a good example of this in the passage just discussed, in the words madhyamottamaśvāsena gandhodakasahitena tu . . . . The meaning of the Śaiva prototype as seen in the version of the Picumata, namely madhyamottamacchāgena gandhodasahitena tu | vaṭīkāṃ pṛāśayet pṛājñāḥ, is perfectly clear to anyone who has read the whole chapter of which it is part. It means 'The wise [initiate] should swallow a pellet made from beef, human flesh, or goat mixed with scented water'.

The case is very different with the Buddhist versions. Their madhyamottamaśvāsena surely began life as a copyist’s corruption; for it yields no sense in either Śaiva or Buddhist terms in the context of this rite of the pellet or, indeed, in any other. Kumāracandra, therefore, in his commentary on the passage as it appears in the Herukābhhyudaya, could only guess at the meaning on the basis of the one part of the sentence that made undoubted sense, namely the injunction to swallow a pellet. Knowing that such pellets were made in practice from the five meats and the five body nectars he tells us that madhyamottamaśvāsah ‘the intermediate and upper breath’ means those meats and that the gandhodakam ‘scented water’ with which this ‘breath’ is to be mixed.

\[\text{iti } yathā samtoso jāyate tathā karanīyam ity arthaḥ }\]
\[\text{The word kulikām is used in [this] Tantra following [its own special] convention. It refers to the physical woman [who is the practitioner’s consort, when she is perceived as] identical with Vajravarāhī. He should worship her, which means that he should do whatever is necessary to satisfy her.} \]
\[\text{In his Kālacakra-influenced commentary on the Laghusāmvāra (Laghutantraṭṭikā) Vajrapāṇi interprets kulikā more esoterically as referring to Vajravarāhī as the non-conceptual central energy-channel: kulikāṃ pūjayen nityam iti }\]
\[\text{ipa kulikā madhyamāvadhūtī vajravarāhī nirāvaranā grāhyagrāhakavarjitā }\]
\[\text{(p. 59).} \]

\[\text{492 See the footnote on my emendation madhyamottamacchāgena on p. 212.} \]
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means those nectars.\footnote{Kumāracandra, *Herukāhyudayapaṇijīka*, p. 156: *madhyamottamaśvāsah pañca pradīpaḥ | *gaṇdhodakanyo pañcāmrṭānī* The word *madhyamottamaśvāsah* means the five ‘lights’; and *gaṇdhodakanyo* means the five nectars’. On the five lights and five nectars see, e.g., Vāgīśvarakūrti, *Tattvaratnāvalokavivarana* 18: *pañcabrahmapradīpadena gokudahanalakṣaṇasya amrṭasabdena vimūrārasulakṣaṇasya satatāṇuṣṭhānam eva sādhyaṃ manyante* [The learned] hold that the expression *pañcabrahmapradīpa* refers to the accomplished regular practice of the [five meats] of the cow (*ga*), dog (*ku[kkura]*)-, horse (*da[mya]*)-, elephant (*ha[st]*)-, and man (*na[ra]*)-, and the expression *amṛta*- to that of excrement (*vi[t]*)-, urine (*mū[tra]*)-, flesh (*mā[msa]*)-, blood (*ra[kta]*)-, and semen (*ṣu[kra]*)-. Cf. Jayabhadrā, *Cakrasamvarapanijīka*, p. 108: *ādau tāvan manonukūle sthāne niṣadaya pañcāmrṭaktagulikāṃ mukhe kṛtvā ...* ‘At the beginning [before he begins the Śādhaṇa] he should sit in a place conducive to meditation, place a pellet of the five nectars in his mouth, ...’; Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasamvarapaṇijīka*, p. 24: *gokudahanānāṃ pañcāmrṭasaya ca vaṭīkāṃ bhāvanārambhā bhāṣṣāyet* ‘At the beginning of his meditation he should swallow a pellet consisting of [the flesh of] cow, dog, horse, elephant, and man, and the five nectars’; Śādhanamālā 251 (Advayavajra, *Saptākṣaraśādhaṇa*), p. 490: *yogī prātār uttātā samayaṅgulikāṃ mukhe prakṣipya ...* ‘The meditator, having risen before sunrise and placed a Samaya pellet in his mouth ...’. The term *samaya*- in *samayaṅgulikāṃ* means the five nectars; see Bhavabhāṭṭa, *Cakrasamvarapaṇijīka* p. 18: *samayapālanam samayarākaṃ samayaṅgulikāṃ pañcāmrṭabhaṃṣām ‘maintaining the samaya- means keeping the pledges [and] swallowing the five nectars’; Jayabhadrā, *Cakrasamvarapaṇijīka*, p. 109: *samayo dvividhaḥ rakṣaniyo samayaṇyaḥ ca The samayaḥ is of two kinds: that which is to be maintained [i.e. the post-initiatory pledges] and that which is to be swallowed [i.e. the five nectars]’.}

Jayabhadrā, *Cakrasamvarapaṇijīka*, p. 110: *madhye bhavatīti madhyamah | padma ucyate | tasmīn uttamocchvāsā jihvāvīnyāsah | tena kimbhūtena | gaṇdhodakasahitenā tu bodhicitasahitenaiva saha | vajravrāhīsvarūpām bāhyyanāṃ pujayed iti | yathā saṁstosā jāyate tathā karaṇīyam ity arthāḥ* ‘The word *madhyama-*, meaning ‘that which is in the centre’, refers to the Lotus [i.e. the vagina]. The word *uttamocchvāsah* means ‘the placing of the tongue’ and *madhyamottamocchvāsena* is a locative Tatpurṣa compound meaning ‘by the placing of (his) tongue’ in that. The words *gaṇdhodakasahitena tu* ‘together with the scented water’ describe that [placing of his tongue in her vagina] and mean that it should be together with [his] Intention to Attain Enlightenment
In Bhavabhatṭa’s commentary we find an entirely different understanding. According to him \textit{madhyamottamaśväsena gandhodakasahitena tu | kulikāṃ pūjayer} means ‘he should worship the Yoginī with the place or time (-śväsena) of fire (\textit{madhyama}-) and earth (-uttama-) together with wind (\textit{gandha}-) and water (\textit{udaka}-)’. The purpose of this invention, which the Sanskrit entirely fails to support, is to find a reference (1) to the symbols of the four elements as constituting the thrones of the various groups of Yoginis in the Maṇḍala and (2) to various time periods considered to be governed by these elements as the occasions for the successful performance of rituals for hostile purposes (\textit{abhicāraḥ}), re-invigoration (\textit{paustikam}), expulsion (\textit{uccātanam}), and the averting of danger (\textit{śāntikam}) respectively. That Bhavabhatṭa has decided what he would like to find here and then imposed it is clear from the extreme artificiality of the glosses that bend the text to his will: ‘the intermediate’ (\textit{madhyama}-) is fire (\textit{vānih}) because it is falls in the middle of the list of the four elements (actually in the penultimate position); the ‘highest’ (-\textit{uttama}-) is that of Mahendra, the presiding deity of the symbol of earth (\textit{prthivī}), because he is the king of the gods; \textit{gandhah} means not ‘fragrance’, its lexical meaning, but ‘that which possesses fragrance’, namely the wind (\textit{vāyuḥ}), since that is the bearer of fragrance; \textit{udaka-} is not \textit{udakam} ‘water’ but an unattested \textit{udakah} meaning Varuna, literally ‘he who possesses the waters’, since Varuṇa is the presiding deity of the symbol of water (\textit{udakam}); and \textit{śvāsah} means not ‘breath’ but ‘that in which X breathes’, that is to say, by an entirely unwarranted leap, the locus or time of X’s operation.\footnote{Bhavabhadrā, \textit{Cakrasamvarapaṇijīkā}, p. 20: \textit{madhyama uttamaḥ śvasity asminn aneneti vā | śvāsah sthānaṃ kālo vā | madhyamo vānih prthivyaṃtējovāvaya iti vacanena madhyodbhavatvāt | \textbullet\textbullet\textbullet madhyodbhūtattive \textit{py upāyagrahaṇaṃ yatasya tām vakṣyati||\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet uttamo māhendro devarājatvāt | madhyamottamaśvāsah sthānaṃ kālo vety arthah | tena kulikāṃ pūjayed iti sambandhah | kimbhūtenety āha gandhetyādī | gandho \textit{śyasastītī gandho gandhavāhatvād vāyuḥ | udakam asyāstīty udako varunah | tayoḥ sthānena sahito gandhodakasahita iti madhyapadalopī samāsah ghrtapīrṇo ghaṭo ghrtaṅghato yathā| The term \textit{śvāsah} is to be understood here to be derived from the root \textit{śvas} ‘to breath’ in the meaning ‘that in which X breathes’, X in this case being \textit{madhyamaḥ} and \textit{uttamaḥ}. The \textit{śvāsah}, then, is the locus of these or their time-period. The \textit{madhyamaḥ} ‘intermediate’ is ‘fire’, because it arises in the middle, in accordance with the text ‘earth, water, fire, and wind’; and the \textit{uttamaḥ} ‘highest’ is the [symbol] of Mahendra[, the presiding deity of the earth symbol], because he is the king of the gods. So the meaning of \textit{madhyamottamaśvāsah} is ‘the locus or time of the \textit{madhyamaḥ} and the \textit{uttamaḥ}’. With this he should worship the Kulikā. Such is the core syntax. The compound beginning \textit{gandha-} describes this \textit{śvāsah} further as ‘accompanied by \textit{gandha-} and \textit{udaka-}’, meaning ‘together with the \textbf{locus} of these [other] two (gandhodakasthānasahitaḥ). This is a com-}
Since these confused and barely comprehensible verses are found in the opening chapter of the *Laghuśamvara* the redactor has made a greater effort than usual to assimilate them to their new Buddhist milieu. But he has not done this by rewriting them in such a way that Buddhists would recognize and understand them as formulated within their own established discourse. His approach is rather that of montage or bricolage, in which bits and pieces of various texts have been clumsily combined. Instead of rewriting the verses he has sandwiched them between others derived from well-known Buddhist sources. Thus the opening verses of the work (1.1–3), which immediately precede this passage, are a version of the opening of the Buddhist *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*; and the verses (1.7c–13b) that follow it contain awkwardly collocated variants of verses found in that text and the Buddhist *Sarvatathāgatatattvasamgraha* and *Guhyasamājā*.497

But this attempt to lend the compilation a Buddhist character by embedding the passage from the Śaiva Vidyāpiṭha between verses that Buddhist Tantrics would immediately recognize as Buddhist is mostly restricted to this first section. The rest of the work up to the point at which the redaction known to Jayāpound of the type in which an intermediate word is dropped, as when one says ‘a pot of ghee’ (*ghṛtaghataḥ*) when what one means is ‘a pot full of ghee’. The other two are *gandhah* and *udakah*. The first is a primary derivative of *gandhah* ‘fragrance’ in the meaning ‘that which has fragrance’ and refers to the wind, because that is the bearer of fragrance. The second is [likewise] a primary derivative of *udakam* ‘water’ in the meaning ‘that which has water’, i.e. Varuṇa, the God of Water’. The application of this explanation then follows. One is instructed to meditate on the Yogins one by one in a fixed order of rotation tied to the passage of time. Thus on the first Tithi of the lunar fortnight one meditates on the first eight Yogins during the day-time, each for one eighth of the day, the second eight during the eight half Praharas of the night, the third eight during the day of the second Tithi, the fourth eight during the night, and so on. Bhavabhata explains there that the three eights that make up the 24 Yogins associated with the sacred sites must have the symbols of fire, water, and earth as their thrones (pp. 21–22: *devinām āsanam vahnimandalam iti dinabhāgah; devinām āsanam vārṇamanandalam iti rātrībhāgah; devināṃ māhendramandalam āsanam iti dinabhāgah*). This, evidently, is what he means by *śvāsah* in the sense of ‘place’. He explains its second meaning as ‘time’ in the following: *agnyādiyogas py abhicārādau tathāvaiṇa jñeyah | yathābhācāre cittacakrasya vahnikṣane sāntike vākacakrasya varunāksane pauṣṭike kāyacakrasya māhendrakṣane uccātane śmasānacakrasya vāyukṣane yoginīnām anyatamā bhāvyā ‘This application of fire and the others should also be understood in the case of hostile rites and the like. Thus in a hostile rite one should meditate on one of the Yogins of the Circuit of Mind (the first eight) at a fire moment, on one of those of the Circuit of Speech (the second eight) at a Varuṇa moment in a rite to avert danger, on one of those of the Circuit of the Body (the third eight) at a Māhendra moment in a rite of re-invigoration, and on one of those of the Circuit of the Cremation Grounds (the fourth eight) at a wind moment in a rite of expulsion’.

496 See here p. 154.
497 See here p. 163, parallels 1, 5, and 6.
bhadra and Bhavyakirti ends consists almost entirely of (1) sections for which I have found close Śaiva parallels, (2) sections for which I have not found such parallels but which are of the same type, and (3) sections devoted to giving the Mantras. These, of course, have not been lifted directly from Śaiva sources, because the Mantras so taught are peculiar to this and related Tantras. However, the Mantras themselves are Śaiva in style; and the method of teaching them by giving them letter by letter in encoded form (mantroddhāraḥ) has been adopted in imitation of Śaiva scriptural practice, appearing first, as we have seen, in the Sarvakalpasamuccaya that supplements the proto-Yoginītantra Sarvabuddhasamāyoga.\footnote{498} In the light of this one readily understands why the redactor of the version known to Bhavabhaṭṭa and the other later commentators and seen in the one accessible manuscript and the Tibetan translation felt the need to add explicitly Buddhist material at the end of the work, thus accomplishing for the whole an unambiguously Buddhist frame, which in the earlier redaction had been present only in the first chapter.\footnote{499}

CONVERTING THE OUTSIDERS. The textual dependence of these Buddhist Yoginītantras on the scriptural corpus of the Vidyāpīṭha would surely have been obvious to any learned Śāktā Śaiva who examined them; and there is evidence that it was indeed noticed. We do not find this evidence in the Tantric Śaiva literature, since the only historical data that intrude there are the spiritual genealogies of its teachers. For the rest it is concerned purely with what it sees as the timeless realities of fact and injunction, and it is interested in relations between its own and other traditions only to the extent that it establishes a hierarchy among these traditions by ranking their various goals along an ascent that culminates in its own. If awareness of this textual dependence was to find expression in Śaiva literature then it could only be in the distorting mirror of mythology, where the specifics of the tensions between sects could be translated

\footnote{498 See here p. 154.}
\footnote{499 The special character of the added, 51st chapter is indicated in the spiritual biography (rnam thar) of Tilopā ascribed to Marpa (Mar pa chos kyi blo gros). For there the Jñānaḍākinī and her retinue are said to have taught it to Tilopā together with the oral transmission (Torricelli and Nag 1995, p. 12): gsungs nas rtsa rgyud le’u nga gcig pa bshad rgyud dang bcos pa dang snyan rgyud gnang ngo. The extended Tantra was already current when at least some of the Vyaḥhyātantras were redacted. The Adhidhānottara contains 50.20c–51.12b. It is possible that the text was extended first only to this point. Parts of the 50th chapter after this point are seen in the Sampūṭodbhava: 50.21–23b and 24ab > Sampūṭodbhava 5.1.16–19b; and 50.25 > Sampūṭodbhava 5.1.19cd. Verses from the remainder of the longer text, from 51.12c to the end, are found in the Yojinisamccāra and the Samvarodaya: 51.7ab > Yojinisamccāra 17.10ab; 51.13c–16b > Yojinisamccāra 17.21c-24b; 51.18–19 > Samvarodaya 32.29c–30b; and 51.21d > Samvarodaya 32.31d.
into accounts of the interaction of the gods with demons and men. Thus we find our evidence in a variant of the famous narrative of Śiva’s burning of the celestial cities of the three demons (tripuradahanam) given in the Haracaritacintāmaṇī, a collection of Śaiva myths for the instruction of the laity compiled in the thirteenth century by the Kashmirian Śākta Śaiva Jayadratha.\(^{500}\)

According to that account Brhaspati, the ingenious Guru of the gods, puts an end to the invincibility of these demons, the reward of their devotion to Śiva, by fooling them into abandoning the worship of that deity. He composes and introduces to them various texts for the visualization of Buddhist deities in which Śiva and other Śaiva deities are portrayed as their inferiors. Then, once they have become used to these, he adds Mantras by adapting those of the Śaiva Tantras and composes passages giving instruction in Tantric ritual procedures by cobbling together various excerpts from the same sources. Finally, he composes Buddhist treatises which supplement this Tantric corpus with reasoned arguments designed to undermine the demons’ commitment to their rites and belief in God.\(^{501}\)

\(^{500}\) Jayadratha was the brother of Jayaratha, author of the Tantrālokaviveka, on whose date see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 418–419. That Jayadratha shared his brother’s Śākta Śaiva adherence, in keeping with the family’s long-established tradition, is evident throughout his work, but particularly in the opening verses of each chapter, in which he gives a metaphysical reading of the myth that follows. Thus in 13.1, introducing this narrative of the destruction of the three cities, whose point is to glorify the Kashmirian sacred site of the volcanic fire-Liṅga (jvālālingam) at Sayam (Svayambhū) (on which see STEIN 1900, vol. 2, pp. 484–485), he equates the three cities with the cognizer, cognition, and the cognized differentiated in contracted consciousness, and the fire that destroys them with the all-inclusive nonduality whose emergence bestows liberation: 

\[\text{etad vedakavedyavedanamayam dagdhvā purānām trayaṃ pūrnādvairahutāsanena} \]

\[\text{māyā Jayadrathasam. prati bhāsatām mama parām ullāsayan nirvrtim} \]

\[\text{May that god Svayambhū blaze forth for me now, revealing the highest bliss, he who has favoured the world by manifesting himself as the fire-Liṅga after burning these three cities that are the cognizer, the cognized, and cognition, putting an end to the torment of bound existence with the fire of all-inclusive nonduality’}. \]

This is exactly in the conceptual mode of the Śākta Śaiva nondualism of Kashmir.

\(^{501}\) Haracaritacintāmaṇī 13.61–83: ripūṇāṃ bhagavadbhaktir vijaye mūlakāraṇam | sā saithilyam avānanti kena yatnena cintyatām || 62 tatrābhupāyah prāyena kaścit samcintito mayā | śukrasya saṁsthāne tu kathāṁkāraṁ pragabhate || 63 teṣāṃ hitam *prāpyayitum* (conj. : prārthāyitum) Codd. Ed.) śukra eva dine dine | bhagavadbhaktidārdhyāya pratyānādhatiṇhāti || 64 svayam yady api *te* (Codd. : ye Ed.) bhaktās tathāpy aśvāya garvitāḥ | mitaprajñās ca yojyante 

\[\text{helayaiva viparyaye} || 65 ity uktavān mahendreṇa *prchye(ate)* (A*: prchāte Ed. A*BC) sma sa kautukāt | bhagavan brāhi tām yuktiṃ teṣām lingācārapāhām || 66 śruteti so *brāvaḥ prāyaḥ sarve *pi sarvaṅgāḥ | uttarottaram utkārṣam jñātāvā rajyanti jñātāvāh || 67 tad iśvarād rte ko ‘tra sarvesām mūrdhāni sthitāh | svavikalpena taṣyāpi kaścid ārdhvāsthā ucyate || 68 evam māyāmāyam teṣām vartenya svopakalpitam | śāstraṃ ca darṣyate kimcil likhitvā nījayā dhiyā ||
“The root cause of the victory of our enemies is their devotion to Śiva. We must think carefully what will cause that to fade. I have already thought in general terms of a means of accomplishing that. But how, I wonder, will it succeed while [their Guru] Śukra is with them? For he exerts himself day after day to strengthen their devotion to the Lord in order to secure their welfare. Although they are genuinely devoted to Śiva they are proud of their power and of low intelligence. It should therefore be easy to lead them astray”. When he had said this Indra eagerly asked him to explain the stratagem that would put an end to their worship of the Liṅga. Having heard this he replied and said: “Behold. All persons usually assign their devotion on the basis of their understanding of an ascending hierarchy. Who but Śiva is at the summit of this hierarchy, surpassing all others? Nonetheless I shall use my imagination and tell them that there is a being above even him. In this way I shall give them false instruction of my own invention. I shall also use my wits to compose and show them some learned writing in support of my teaching. I shall deceitfully write visualization-texts of deities in relation to whom this Śiva will be placed in a position of inferiority, and I shall tell them that these show that there is another being who is greater even than him, so that they may give up their worship of the Liṅga and so be destroyed. However, these false teachings will have no effect while Śukra is present.
[For] he, through intuition and reason, is fully conversant with ultimate reality”. Thus said the Atharvavedic priest [of the gods]. Then Indra respectfully asked him to explain the stratagem more fully. After some reflection Brḥaspāti said to Indra: “It is entirely inappropriate that it should be you that has to divert [these demons] from the worship of Śiva’s Liṅga. [So I shall take on this task myself.] My way of destroying their understanding will be this. I shall call this teaching Buddhist, [appropriately enough] since it will be born of [nothing more than] my intellect (buddhiḥ). The well-known Buddha will be conceived therein as the sole lord of the gods. Even the greatest deities will be portrayed as his chowry-bearers. Gods that I shall call Buddhist will be depicted positioned on top of Gaṇapati and others of the highest Śaiva deities. When the demons see these falsely conceived visualization-texts they will certainly make the mistake of thinking that these gods are greater than Śiva. Once these texts have been established and I have accustomed the demons to them I shall introduce Mantras modelled on [those of] the Śaiva Tantras (śaivatantrānuvādena) and by redacting various passages from these same scriptures (uddhṛtya śivasāstrebhyaḥ khaṇḍān khaṇḍān) I shall add a worthless, concocted system of [Tantric] observances involving Mantras, ritual, and the rest. The learned [Buddhist] literature that I shall compose to define bondage and liberation will be nourished by higher reasoning of an exceptional degree of rigour. It will explain, of course, that of these two bondage includes such activities as worshipping the Liṅga; and liberation will be [defined as] a voidness [of self] that [once accepted] will subvert [their commitment to their] religious duties. Their sacrifices and other rituals will be opposed there; and coming to believe [though this teaching] that there is no soul they will denigrate Śiva himself [for teaching otherwise]. Indra, when I have composed learned teachings of this kind I shall insinuate them into their hearts and so put an end to their devotion to Śiva. For the plan to succeed we have only to wait until Śukra is absent”.

Bṛḥaspāti’s plan works. The demons’ Śaiva Guru leaves for a year to attend a sacrifice. Brḥaspāti takes on his appearance and thus disguised sets about converting them to Tantric Buddhism. They become so anti-Śaiva that they can no longer bear even to mention the Śivaliṅga, let alone worship it, thus making it possible for Śiva to destroy them.

Evidently the Buddhist Tantric scriptures that Brḥaspāti is represented here as having concocted are the Yoginītantras as typified by the Laghuśāmvara and its satellites, and the fact that this understanding of the nature of the

---


503 That this is the Buddhism envisaged here is in keeping with another anti-Buddhist myth in this collection (Haracaritacintāmaṇī, chapter 17 and Sanderson 1995b, p. 94 for a summary). For there the adherents of Buddhism are said to be led by three demons: Heruka, Śaṃvara (the two Vajraḍākas), and Adibuddha (Kālacakra).
genesis of these texts appears in a work of this kind suggests that it was common knowledge. For the Haracaritacintāmaṇi, being concerned with the cults of Śiva at sacred sites, is not addressed to the narrow community of the initiated but to the widest possible audience for a Śaiva text in Sanskrit, that is to say, the uninitiated Śaiva laity. Nor can this text be seen in spite of this as reflecting the knowledge of a learned minority at the time of its composition. For between the opening and closing verses of each chapter the text is written in a rather unpolished style that is so similar to that of the anonymous Purāṇic tracts in praise of sacred sites that it should not be seen as a composition in the full sense of that term but rather as a compilation in which Jayadratha has lightly edited pre-existent materials of this popular genre.\textsuperscript{504}

The redactional relation between the Yoginītantras and Śaiva Tantras of the Vidyāpiṭha may not, of course, have been so obvious to learned Buddhists once these texts had been propagated and the work of commentary undertaken, let

\begin{quote}
17.4: māyāsambāriko nāṁnā herukākhyaś ca dārunaḥ | ādbuddhābhidhānaś cety asurās traya āsate; 17.9: vajradākāv iti khyātau tadā herukasambarau | ādibuddhena sahitau surānāṃ cakratur bhayam. Heruka here is evidently Heva-jra, since he is described as eight-headed, four-legged, sixteen-armed, and embraced by Nairātmyā (17.5). He leads the Buddhists in their war against the gods. He is surrounded by an army of Mādhyamikas (madhyamanāmānaḥ), followers of the Mantranaya (mantranayātmakāḥ), bhramamohātmakāḥ, mithyājñānātmakāḥ, Śrāvakas (śrāvakātmānaḥ), and Buddhas copulating with their consorts (17.7–8). The meaning of the terms bhramamohātmakāḥ and mithyājñānātmakāḥ is not immediately obvious. Since it is clear from the context that they refer to distinct groups among the Buddhists (bhramamohātmakāḥ kecīn mithyājñānātmakāḥ pare) I take them to mean ‘those who are devoted to the delusion of [the objective existence of] non-objective cognitions’ and ‘those who are devoted to the view that [belief in this reality of] cognitions [containing the appearance of their objects] is false’, understanding these expressions to refer to the two kinds of Yogācāras, those who hold mind-only with form and mind-only without form respectively to be ultimately real, that is to say Sākāravijñānavādins and Nirākāravijñānavādins. Classifying Mahāyāna Buddhists into Mādhyamikas and these two kinds of Yogācāras and the classification of all these into those who follow the Mantranaya and those who do not, that is to say, those who follow the non-Tantric Pāramitānaya, is a commonplace in the doxographical tradition of late Indian Buddhism; see, e.g., Advayavajra, Tattvaratnāvali, pp. 4–8; Sahajavajra, Sthītisamāsa ff. 4v1–6r2 (nirākārayogācārasthitisamāsah), ff. 6r2–7r1 (sākārayogācārasthitisamāsah), ff. 7r1–11r3 (madhyamāsthitisamāsah), and ff. 11r3–18v5 (Mantranaya); Vāgīśvarakīrti, Tattvaratnāvalokavicarana, pp. 141–142 (mantranaye ca vijñānavadāmadhyamakamatayor eva pradhānatvāt ...); Moksākaragupta, Turkabhäṣā, pp. 107–110; and KAJIYAMA 1998, pp. 148–151, 154.

\textsuperscript{504} Consider Jayadratha's own statement at the beginning of the work (1.5): ċeṣe śrīvijyayasya nivasan preranāt tayoh | caritrāṇi trinetrasya sāstradrṣṭānī gumphaye ‘While living in the land of Śiva Vijayeśvara I shall string together the deeds of the Three-Eyed [God] as I have seen them in the sacred texts, at the instigation of these two [teachers]’.
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alone to the ordinary lay devotee of the Buddha. But the iconographical repertoire, the retinue types, the style of worship and Kāpālika observance, and the growing autonomy and diversification of the goddess, are so closely parallel to what we see among the Śākta Śāivas that it is hard to believe that any Indian, learned or not, could have seen these deities and observed the practices of those that propitiated them without being aware of this fact.

This must have been especially so in east India. For the Śākta tradition was particularly strong there, as it still is, and had deep roots in the domain of popular religion, as is evident from such Purāṇas of the region as the Devīpurāṇa, Bhṛhannārādyāpurāṇa, Bhṛaddharmapurāṇa, and Kālikāpurāṇa, from non-eastern testimony, from the fact that east-Indian locations are conspicuous in early lists of the Śākta sacred sites, and from the inscriptions and other his-

505 See Chakrabarti 2001 passim. The Devīpurāṇa (39.143–145) lists places where the Mother goddesses are especially present. In this list are Varendra, Rādhā, and Kāmarūpa: veṣyāsu gopabālasu tudahānakhasesu ca | pīthe himavatas ca | cālpa (?) | jālandhare (corr.: jālandhara Ed.) savaidise || mahodare (?) varendre ca rādhāyāṃ kośale pure | bhoṭadesē sakāmākhye | kiskindhe (corr.: kiskindhye) ca nāgottame || malaye | kollanāme (conj.: kollunāme Ed.) ca kāncyāṃ ca hastināpure | uṣajayināṃ ca tā vidyā viṣeṣena vyavasthitāḥ Those Vidyās are especially present among courtesans, cowherd girls, Tūdas (?), Hūnas, and Khasas, in the sacred site of Himālaya* . . . (?), in Jālandhara, Vidisā, *Mahodara (?), Varendra, Rādhā, the capital of Kosala, Tibet, Kāmarūpa, the great mountain of Kīśkindhā, Malayā, Kollagiri (conj.), Kāncī, Hastināpura, and Ujjayini*.

506 A verse in a Purāṇic passage on the calendrical festivals of Kashmir cited by Laksmaṇaḥāra early in the twelfth century in the Niyatākālahāṇḍa of his Kṛtyakalpataru (p. 410, ll. 4–5) associates the sanguinary cult of Durgā/Bhadrakāli with the peoples of Bengal and Orissa (Aṅga, Vaṅga, and Kalinga), the Kinnaras, the Barbaras, and the Śakas: evam nānāmelecchagaṇaḥ pūjyate sarvadasyubhiḥ | angavangakalingais ca kinnarair barbarair ākāḥ ‘She is worshipped in this way by various foreign communities, by all the Dasyus: the people of Aṅga, Vaṅga, and Kalinga, the Kinnaras, the Barbaras, and the Śakas’. In this list only the people of Aṅga, Vaṅga, and Kalinga and the Iranian Śakas (if this reading is sound) are well-known. As for the Kinnaras and Barbaras, Varāhamihira locates the former, under the synonym Aśvavadana, in the east (Bṛhatsamhitā 14.6ab: khasamagadhaśibiragritytimithilasamataḥodrāśavadanadanturakāḥ), and the latter in the southwest (14.18c).

507 See Sanderson 2001, p. 7, fn. 4. This is particularly clear in the case of the eight principal sites among the twenty-four: the eight Kṣetras, namely Aṭṭahāsā, Caritra, Kolāgiri, Jayantī, Ujjayinī, Prayāga, Varaṇā/Vārānasi, and Koṭīvarṣa (see here p. 195), or, in a variant, Prayāga, Varaṇā/Vārānasi, Kolāgiri, Aṭṭahāśa, Jayantī, Caritra, Ekāmra, and Devīkotā (see, e.g., citation of the Mādhavakula in Tantrālokaḥiviveka on 29.67; Kularatnoddhyota f. 13r3–4: prayāgā varunā kollā atṭahāśā Jayantikā | caritairakāmrahaṇ caiva | devikoṭṭham [corr.: devikoṭṭham Cod.] tathāṣṭamam). Aṭṭahāśa, Koṭīvarṣa/Devīkotā, Caritra, and Ekāmra are all in eastern India, the first two in Bengal and the last two in Orissa. The location of Jayantī is uncertain. It too is east-Indian if it is the Jayantipura in the Ganjam District of Orissa rather than that in Karnāṭaka (Banavasi). Other east-Indian sites among the twenty-four are Viraja (Jajpur in Orissa), Nagar’a (Pāṭaliputra, in
torical records of this period. Thus when Devapāla is eulogized in an inscription of his son Mahendrapāla it is for two achievements: his martial success and, as we have seen, his building of two exceptional temples, one of the Buddha and the other of the Śaiva Goddess; Śākta Śaiva deities figure strongly, as we have seen, in the various pious works of Nayapāla detailed in the Siyān inscription: several Vadabhi temples for goddesses, one of them for a hill-top Carcikā installed by his predecessor Mahendrapāla, temples for the Nine Durgās, and temples for the [Bhairava] Hetukeśvara and a Bhairava accompanied by a retinue of sixty-four Mothers, and Madanapāla, the patron of Śaṁdhyākaranandin, is described in that poet’s Rāmacarita as having attained his success in war through the favour of Cāndi. Even the Saiddhāntika Praśasti from Bāṅgarh has a Śaṅkta context, its immediate purpose being to report the building by the Rājaguru Mūrtiśiva of a Vadabhi temple for Carcikā.

[Mūrtiśiva], being devoted to pious works, has constructed this Vadabhi temple which seems to embody his two halves miraculously transformed in a mountain of snow and a mountain of gold. I fancy that Indra’s elephant, now that he can see the wondrous reflection of the lions [on its roof] in the waters of the heavenly Ganges, will recoil [in fear] and no longer drink its waters.

That the temple is described as a Vadabhi surmounted by lions establishes that it is a temple of a goddess. The inscription does not state explicitly that this goddess is a Carcikā: it did not need to do so since the inscription was not doubt in situ. But we can infer that she was from the fact that the inscription begins with obeisance to her followed by two benedictory verses in her praise:

---

508 For Nayapāla’s foundations see here pp. 111–114.
509 Śaṁdhyākaranandin, Rāmacarita 4.21: candicaranasarojaprasadasampannavigrahasrīkam | na khalu madanam sāngeśam īśam agāj jagadvijayaśrī | Did not the glory of world-conquest come to King Madana when, with the king of Anga, he had achieved success in battle by the favour of the lotus-like feet of Cāndi?
510 SIRCAR 1983b, v. 25: teneyaṁ himakāñcanācalamahākautūhālōvēṣitaśvīyārdhā-
rdhavapuṁṣmati vaḍabhī pūrṇātmanā nūrīṁī | yatiṁhaṣṭpratibimvam ambara-
dhunītiyoṣu manye ḍhūtaṁ ḍṛṣṭvā saṁkucadanghrir adya na jalān āirāvataḥ |
“pasyati (em.: paśyati Ep.).
511 See here p. 112.
512 om namaś carcikāyai || surāsurasiraḥśreṇipaṭavāsasamā jagat | pāntu viśvākṛtā—
Obeisance to Carcikā.
May the world be protected by the dust from the feet of Carcikā, worshipped by
the creator of the universe, fragrant powder for the heads of all the gods and
demons.
May Carcikā protect the world, who at the aeon's end, garlanded with human
skulls, with her body becoming desiccated out of anxiety at the poverty of her
fare, thinks: “What shall I eat? If I devour this universe in a single bite, it will be
no more than a fragment that will lodge between my teeth. What shall I drink?
The water of [all] the seven oceans is insufficient to be visible in the hollow of my
palm.\footnote{513}{With these verses compare those of the east-Indian poets Bhāsoka
and Umāpatidhara in the anthology \textit{SaduktiKarṇāmṛta} (vv. 126 and 129), compiled
by the east-Indian Śrīharadāsa in 1205 under Laksmanaśena. Bhāsoka's being
east-Indian is evident from his name in -oka; see the many names of this kind in
the east-Indian anthologies \textit{Subhāśitaratnakośa}, and \textit{SaduktiKarṇāmṛta}, Amrūtaka,
Sāngkā, Uchaka in the inscriptions of Bengal (N.G. Majumdar 2003, pp. 179,
27, 37, 178), and Dibboka and Rudoka in the commentary on \textit{Rāmacarita} 1.39.
Umāpatidhara composed the Deopāra inscription of the Sena king Vijayasena (r.
c. 1096–1159) and is reported in Merutunga’s \textit{Prabandhacintāmani} to have been a
minister of the Sena Lākṣmaṇasena (r. c. 1179–1206); see N.G. Majumdar 2003,
p. 45.}

That a Saiddhāntika Guru should have built a temple for a fearsome goddess
of this kind is compelling evidence of the strength of Śaktism in the Pāla realm.
For there is nothing in the Siddhānta itself to prompt such a construction, that
tradition generally marking itself off from the cults of such deities with their
gruesome iconography and their ecstatic and transgressive rites.

Indeed, as this anomalous foundation suggests, the cult of the emaciated
Carcikā seems to have been particularly well-established in the region. There
are numerous surviving images of this goddess at or from sites in Bihar, West
Bengal, Bangladesh, and Orissa, dating from the ninth century to the four-
teenth,\footnote{514}{See Camunda (Cāmunda) in the \textit{Huntington Archive}. For Orissa see also Donaldson 1991.}
and

\footnote{515}{See in particular \textit{Devipūrāṇa}, Patala 7 and 9 (> \textit{Agnipūrāṇa} 135) on Cāmunda’s Padamālāmantra. In that Mantra Cāmunda is described as having her body clothed
with an elephant hide (\textit{gajacarmapārvṛtaśarīre}). This feature, which was borrowed
from the iconography of Śiva not only by Cāmunda but also, as we have seen, by
Cakrasaṃvara and Vajravārāhī, is found in most of her east-Indian images. See \textit{Huntington Archive}, Scans 0058416 (Bangladesh), 0006042 (Itahar, North Dina-
jpur District, West Bengal), 0013693 (findspot not recorded), 0013697 (findspot
not recorded), 0002686 (Harsinghpur, Darbhanga, Bihar), 000308 (West Bengal),
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in early canonical treatments of the Śākta Śaiva sacred sites this goddess is said to preside at Devīkoṭa, Pundravardhana, both in Varendri, and Ekāmra (Bhubaneswar) in Orissa. In the first she has the name Karṇamoṭi, according to the Niśisamcāra, Picumata, and Kubjikāmata, and Bahumāṃsā according to the Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākāṇḍa. In the other two she is called Cāmūṇḍa.

0013061 (Dighapatia, Natore District, Bangladesh), 0002607 (Munger [Monghyr], Bihar), 0013063 (Bangladesh), 0013062 (Mahātore, Dinajpur District), and 0013476 (Vikramapura, Dacca District, Bangladesh); also AIIISP Acc. no. 32782 (Advahati, Burdwan, West Bengal). It is not generally seen in images of Cāmūṇḍa from other regions. An exception is a fine sculpture at Khajuraho (Bihar), 0013061 (Dighapatia, Natore District, Bangladesh), 0013062 (Mahātore, Dinajpur District), and 0013476 (Vikramapura, Dacca District, Bangladesh). In the Chandella period (c. 900–1150) it is perhaps to be introduced by emulation from the description of Cāmūṇḍa’s icon in Agnipurāṇa 50.21c–23b: cāmūṇḍa koṭarākṣi syān nirmāṃsa tu trilocanā || nirmāṃsa asthisārā vā ārdhvakesī kṛṣodarī || *dvīpācarmaḥdharā (dvīpa conj. : dvīpi Ed.) vāme kapālāṃ pāṭīśam kare || śūlam kavrī dākṣine ’syāḥ śāvarūḍhāsththibhūṣānā.

See here p. 112.


Karṇamoṭi is listed as a synonym of Cāmūṇḍa in Amarakośa 1.1.92 (see here p. 231). The name appears for Cāmūṇḍa in the series of eight Mother goddesses when these are given as the deities of the seven sets of sounds of the Sanskrit syllabary plus ḪṢ in Siddhayogeśvarimita 16.41c–43c: kavarge samsthīta brāhmi cavarge caiva vaisnāvī || māheśvarī javargasthā yāmāṇya pūjya t-a-ādīnā | kaumārī sarpavālaya pādyenaṁtaḥ prapuṇyayet || yavarge vasāvī tatra karṇamoṭi sa-m-ādīnā | krodhe *jñeyā (conj. : seiya Ed.) parā saktir aghoreśī ’Brāhmaṇī in the gutturals, Vaiśṇavī in the palatals, Māheśvarī in the retroflexes, and Yāmāṇya in the dentals. He should worship snake-bangled Kaumārī with the labials. Aindrī is in the semi-vowels and Karnamoṭi (= Cāmūṇḍa) in the bilabials. Know that the goddess in ḪṢ is the supreme Power Aghoreśvari’. The origin of the name is unknown, the common interpretation ‘Ear-pearl’ being implausible since it fails to account for the retroflex f.

Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākāṇḍa 171.109, 112, 124 This name is probably an epithet that served as this Karnamoṭi’s personal name and so does not indicate a different goddess. The epithet, meaning ‘having much meat’, no doubt refers to her insa-
Of these sites Devīkotā appears to have been of special importance from early times. The Mādhavakula refers to it simply as Śrīpūta, that is to say, as the Seat [of the Goddess], and the Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa describes it as a city originally fashioned by Brahmā where this goddess and the other Mothers who accompany her were created by Śiva and the other gods from their own bodies in order to destroy the demons who had seized it. After the city has been freed Śiva declares that henceforth it will be the Mothers’ sacred abode, that he will reside here with them as Hetukeśvara, and that they will be worshipped following ritual procedures taught in Tantras that will be composed for this purpose by the grateful gods. The titles of these Tantras of the Mothers (mātratantras), which are listed in the narrative, reveal them to be Yāmalatantras, headed by the Brahmayāmala.

### Footnotes

521 See here p. 192 and Tantrālōka 29.60cd.
522 Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa 171.78–137, referring to Devīkotā under its name Kotīvarsā. See here p. 113.
523 Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa 171.120c–121b [Śiva addresses the Mothers]: bhavatiṁ idam sthānam koṭiварsām iti śrutam | bhaviṣyati jagatsaṁhārurūpiṇīṁ ‘Then the deity [Śiva] emulated the fine Mother goddess Rudrāṇī, and, taking on a hideous form, a second Mother, the [well-known goddess] called Bahumāṁsā, who embodies the destruction of the universe’.
524 Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa 171.121c–122b [Śiva addresses the Mothers]: ahām hetur hi yuṣmākām yasmāt srṣṭā mayāvī ca || heruceśvaranāṁnāham sthāsyāmy atra varapradāḥ | yuṣmābhiḥ saha vatsyāmi nāyakate vyavasthitāh || yaś tu yuṣmān mayā śārdham vidhihat pūjāvyisyati | sarvapāpavimuktātmā sa parām gatim āpsyati ‘Because I am your cause (hetuh) and it was I that created [you], I shall be present here to bestow boons with the name Hetukeśvara. I shall dwell here with you as your leader. Whoever correctly worships you with me will be freed from all sins and attain the highest goal’.

525 Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa 171.127–132b [Śiva addresses the Mothers]: ahām brahmā ca viṣṇuṣ ca rṣayaś ca tapodhanāḥ | mātrtantrāṇi divyāṇi mātryajñavidhīṃ *prati* (conj.: param Cod.) || 128 puṇyāṇi prakārīsyāmo yajāṇām yair avāpsyaṭha | brahmāṇ tuṣāyambhuvāṁ caiva kaumārāṁ yāmālāṁ tathā || 129 sārasvutāṁ ca gāndhāram aśānaṁ nandiyālām | tantrāṇī etāni yuṣmākām tathānyāṁ sa-hasrasāḥ || 130 bhaviṣyanti nārā yais tu yuṣmān yakṣyanti bhaktītaḥ | nārāṇāṁ yajāṁnānaṁ varān yuṣmān pradāṣyaṭha || 131 divyāsiddhipradāṇā devyo divyayogā bhaviṣyaṭha | yāṣ ca nāryāḥ sadā yuṣmān yakṣyante sarahasyaṭaḥ || 132 yogēsvaryaḥ bhaviṣyanti rāmād divyaparākramāḥ ‘I, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and the ascetic sages will compose excellent and holy Mātrtantras for the rites of the worship of the Mothers, by means of which you shall receive offerings. The Brah-
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Moreover, it is probable that some at least of the surviving east-Indian images of the emaciated goddess reproduce the iconography of this important local form. An image of Carcikā from the Dinajpur District of Bangladesh, in which Devikotā was located, shows the goddess seated beneath a banyan tree, and we see the same in an image from an unrecorded site in West Bengal. In both images severed human heads are attached by their hair to the tree’s branches, indicating that the site of this tree is a cremation ground, since cremation grounds were also places of execution. Now, in the tradition of the Picumata and the Nīśisāmcāra each of the major Śākta sites is a cremation ground with its own distinctive sacred tree; and in the case of Koṭīvarṣa/Devikotā this is in-

526 Pāla period; black stone; 9 inches in height; now in the Varendra Museum in Rajshahi: Huntington Archive, Scan 0013117.

527 Sena period; black stone; 25.75 inches in height; now in the National Museum, New Delhi: Huntington Archive Scan 0000308.

528 See, e.g., Kumārasambhava 5.73cd; Kathāsaritsāgara 18.130d; Rājataraṅgini 2.79–84; Picumata 3.32d–93, describing the depiction of the cremation ground at Prabhāsa: tato nibam samālikhet | sapaṭḍālam mahābhīmam citibhiḥ prajvalantibhiḥ | ekaikasmim likhet dāle nagnam udbaddhakam naram | Then he should depict a Nimba tree with seven branches, most frightening with the burning pyres [around it]. On each branch he should draw a naked hanged man; 15.16: kṣṛnāstamāyaṁ caturdaśayāṁ śavam ghṛyam tha sādhakah | udbaddham sūlaprotam vā aksaṭāṅgāṁ tu dārakam; Jayadrathayāmala, Sāṭka 3, Yōginiścārāprakaraṇa 8.71c–72b, describing the depiction of cremation grounds: yāmyādyayair nairṛtāntais tu diśair vrksaṁ samālikhet | udbaddhanararapraçchannān; Vajragarbha on Hevajra 1.7.21 (dhvajam sāstrahatam caiva) quoted in Snellgrove 1959, Pt. 1, p. 71, n.: rgyal mtshan ni rgyal pos rkun po la sogs pa skyes pa ’am bud med ’ga’ zhiug chad pas bcad de lus mtshan gyis dral nas ro shing la dpyangs pa’o ’a dvahāj is a corpse of some man or woman guilty of theft or some other crime whom the king has had executed with the sword, which has then been hung up on a tree [in the cremation ground]’.
deed the banyan (vaṭavṛkṣaḥ).\textsuperscript{529} This strongly suggests that the local Carcikā of Devikotā may have been multiplied in the manner of the Naṭarāja of the Tamil country, which though originally the deity of Cidambaram was established in secondary forms in temples throughout the region. We may note also that most of the surviving east-Indian Carcikās hold the trident, often as the most conspicuous of their held attributes. Both the Picumata and the Niśisamcāra specify this as the weapon distinctive of the Karnāmoti of Devikotā, and the Skanda-purāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa says that it is because the goddess of this place slew the demons with her trident here that the site contains a sacred bathing-place called Śulakunḍa ‘the pond of the trident’ and that anyone who drinks its water (śūlodakaḥ) after doing obeisance to her will be safe from all harmful beings (171.124–125). The Picumata too refers to this Kuṇḍa.\textsuperscript{530} Finally, the pre-eminence of the emaciated goddess in the Śaktism of eastern India during this period is strongly underlined by the fact it is she that the Buddhists of the cult of Cakrasamvara chose to represent supine beneath the right foot of Śaṁvara and Vajravārāhī as the female representative of the Śaṭkā Śaiva tradition.

In textual references to that Buddhist icon she is generally called Kālarātri. But there can be no doubt about her identity. For (1) she is called Carcikā in the Vajravārāhīsādhana of the Siddha Lūyi,\textsuperscript{531} and Cāmunda in a Kalpa of the Abhidhānottara and in the anonymous Trayodaśātmaka-vajrañākinī-vajra-vārāhīsādhana, which is based upon it,\textsuperscript{532} (2) Carcikā is called Kālarātri in a

\textsuperscript{529} See here p. 112. That the sacred sites are the cremation grounds (śmaśānam) of the places listed is clear from the context in the Picumata, that (3.8–127) being a description of the nine cremation grounds that must be installed in the initiation Maṇḍala (maḥaṃaṇḍalam), one at the centre (Prayāga) and eight around the periphery (Vārāṇasi, Vīraja [Jajpur in Orissa], Kollagiri [Kolhāpur in Karpāta), Prabhāsa [in Kathiawar], Ujjayinī [in Malwa], Bhūteśvara [in Mathurā?]), Ekāmraka [Bhubaneswar in Orissa], and Koṭīvāsa). It is also clear from the account of Koṭīvāsa given in the Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa, since that prophesies that the site will become a great cremation ground (171.133c–134b): koṭīvāram idam sthānaṃ mātṛṇīṃ prīyang uttamaṃ || śmaśānam pravaraṃ divyaṃ bhaviṣyaṃ suhāsram.\textsuperscript{530} Picumata f.8r3 (3.119c–121b): tiṣāne tu diśabhage koṭīvāraṃ prakalpayet || 120 vatam tatra samālikhya tatra sūlodakaṃ likhet | diśa caiva vidikṣa ca śālaprotā likhet tathā || 121 sūla tasyāgrato likhya kuṇḍasyaiva mahātape. It appears from this that the pond (kuṇḍam) was also known as the Śūlodaka.

\textsuperscript{531} Guhyasamayasādhanaṃāla f. 11r1–2: vāmabhāṣṭanāmaṇḍadalḥdayasambhava-ṃilitadakṣiṇāṅgṛiṃ (em. : milita | dakṣiṇāṅgṛiṃ Cod.) | carcikā<ṃ> raktā<ṃ> dakṣiṇaśīrāḥpatī<ṃ>.

\textsuperscript{532} Abhidhānottara, Paṭala 56, A f. 173v2: pāḍatalākrāntabhairava-cūmundaṃ ‘treading on Bhairava and Cāmunda with the soles of her feet’; Trayodaśātmaka-vajrañākinī-vajravārāhīsādhana in Guhyasamayasādhanamāla, f. 78r4–5: pāḍākrānta<ṃ>kṛta-śambhocūmundaṃ (em. : kṛtaṃ | śambhuścūmundaṃ Cod.). For the full visualiza-
verse by the east-Indian poet Bhāṣoka;\textsuperscript{533} and (3) the goddess beneath the foot of Śaṃvara/Vajrārāhī is depicted as emaciated, with sunken eyes and withered breasts, holding a skull-bowl and chopping knife in her two hands.\textsuperscript{534} The emaciated Carcikās of our surviving images have four, six, eight, or ten arms, but the skull-bowl (\textit{kapālam}) and chopping knife (\textit{kartriṇā}) are indeed among their four primary attributes, the other two being the trident and a severed head.\textsuperscript{535} The goddess beneath the right foot is, as it were, the east-Indian Carcikā reduced to essentials: the emaciated body, the red colour, and only two arms, brandishing what were felt to be her two most basic attributes.

It is inconceivable, therefore, that east-Indians, for whom Śākta Śaivism was so central, then as now, would not have been conscious of the Śākta Śaiva guise of this new Buddhism; and it is equally inconceivable that they would have been blind to the fact that the humiliated goddess supine beneath Śaṃvara’s and Vajrārāhī’s feet was the pre-eminent goddess of the east-Indian Śākta tradition. Clearly the east-Indian Buddhists who developed this iconography chose this goddess precisely because she occupied so prominent a position in that tradition and therefore would be instantly recognized.

In explanation of why this profound transformation of Buddhism occurred, we might be tempted to say that Buddhism was simply yielding ever more completely to the Śākta Śaiva religious tradition then dominant in the region, failing, as it were, to maintain its original purity in the face of this external pressure and the concomitant expectations of its patrons. This was perhaps how the matter would have been represented by the Śrāvakayānists; and no doubt there is some truth in this assessment, since it is extremely unlikely that east-Indian Buddhists would have chosen to develop this new manifestation of their religion if Śākta Śaivism had not become the pre-eminent religious idiom of the region. But

\textsuperscript{533} \textit{Saduktikaranāmyta} 126. For the east-Indian character of names in -oka see here p. 227.

\textsuperscript{534} For this depiction see two stone sculptures from Ratnagiri in Orissa (Linothet 1999, figs. 198–202), two bronzes, one from Vikramaśīla and the other from an unrecorded site in eastern India (Linothet 1999, figs. 206–208), a Kashmirian bronze (Pal 1975, Plate 64a,b; Linothet 1999, fig. 211; Huntington Archive Scan 0059531), some early Tibetan bronzes (Linothet 1999, figs. 213–214), a Nepalese bronze of the fourteenth century (Pal 2003, fig. 31), a Nepalese bronze dated 1772 (Reedy 1997, fig. N299), a painting from Khara-khoto, before 1227 (Rie and Thurman 1991, fig. 92), and a Nepalese painting of the early seventeenth century (Kreijger 1999, p. 53). In some Tibetan paintings Kālarātrī’s emaciation is absent (e.g., Pal 2003, fig. 117; Kossak and Singer 1998, fig. 43; Rie and Thurman 1991, fig. 69.2); but that this is a secondary development can be inferred from its much more restricted occurrence.

\textsuperscript{535} See Camunda (Cămunḍā) in Huntington Archive.
the iconography of the humiliation of Carcikā and Bhairava and the extensive learned literature that developed around the kernel of the Yogini tantras alert us to the fact that those who created and refined this tradition saw the matter in an entirely different light. In their view they were not succumbing passively to an alien influence. Fully conscious that they were assimilating the dominant Śākta Śaiva idiom of the region, they justified their doing so as a means of converting non-Buddhists, taking their practices and encoding them with Buddhist meaning so that outsiders could rise effortlessly through what was familiar to them to what would save them, a view exactly reflected in Jayadratha’s myth of the compilation of anti-Śaiva iconography, Śaṭkā Śaiva liturgy, Mantras, and Buddhist doctrine as a means of luring devout Śaivas away from their faith.

For while the learned literature of Tantric Buddhism claims with sincere conviction that its special methods are designed for exceptionally able aspirants within the Buddhist fold, its point of entry, namely initiatory introduction before the Manḍala, was designed to facilitate the recruitment of those outside it and to this end access was rendered as easy as possible. Thus in the seventh century the Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi sets out a number of qualities to be sought in candidates but states that if even only one of these is present there is no need to investigate further, and in the eighth century the Sarvatathāgata-
tattvasamgraha goes so far as to prohibit the application of any criteria for distinguishing between those who are and are not worthy. Furthermore, it makes this open-door policy absolutely clear by specifying those to whom introduction before its Maṇḍala is intended to appeal.\textsuperscript{538}

Next is [the topic of] the detailed procedure that begins with the entry of Vajra disciples into this Great Maṇḍala of the Vajradhātu. In this the first step is entry in as much as it is the means of rescuing all persons without exception and of bringing about the accomplishment of the highest joy for the benefit of all. With regard to this entry before the Great Maṇḍala [the officiant] need not examine candidates to determine who is and is not worthy. Why is that? Venerable Tathāgatas, there are (1) people who have committed great sins. By seeing and entering this Great Maṇḍala of the Vajradhātu they will be freed of all the bad rebirths [that would be the consequences of those sins].\textsuperscript{539} Venerable [Tathāgatas],

\textit{bhisambodhitantra}, f. 162v4–6: de nas de yi phyi de nyin | slob ma dad cing rigs btsun pa | de bzhi dkon mchog gsum la dad | zab mo yi ni blo dang ldan | spro ba che zhing tshul khrims ldan | bzod dang ldan zhing ser sna med | dpa’ la yi dam brian pa ni | buc ‘am bryad dam bdun nam lnga | gzig gnyis bzhis las lhag kyang rung | dpyad mi dgos par gzung bar bya Then, the next day, he should assemble candidates (1) with faith, (2) of good family, (3) with belief in the Three Jewels, (4) with deep understanding, (5) with great energy, (6) adhering to moral conduct, (7) patient, (8) free of envy, (9) intrepid, and (10) steadfast in their observances. They are acceptable without need for [further] examination if they have [all] ten, or eight, seven, five, one, two, four, or more [of these qualities].’

\textit{Sarvatathāgatasamgraha}, sections 210–213:

\textit{vajraśisyapraveśādavidhivistarohavati | tatra prathamam tāvat praveśo bhavaty aśeṣānavavesasattvadāhutaparitrāṇasarvahitasukhottamasiddhikārakārayātra mahāmaṇḍalapraveṣe pāṭrāpātraparikṣā na kāryā | tat kasmād dhetoh | santi bhagavantas tathāgataḥ kecit sattvā mahāpakkārīnāḥ | ta idam vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalam drṣṭvā praviṣṭvā ca sarvāpāyavagāta bhaviṣyanti | santi ca bhagavantah sattvāh sarvārthahbhajanaṇāpāmāṃgaṇaṃgrṛddhāh samayadvistāh purāṇāradeṇīṣu asāktaḥ | teṣām apy atra yathākṣamārakāriyataḥ praviṣṭānāṃ sarvāsaṃpurpiḥ bhaviṣyati | santi ca bhagavantaḥ sattvāḥ nṛtta-gaṇahāsāśiṣyāḥ mahāravihārapriyataḥ sarvātmaḥgatamahāyānābhisaṃyadharmatānaṃvadhatvād anyadevakulamandalaṃ praviṣānti | sarvāsaṃpurpiḥsamangrahabhūteṣu niruttara- raḷiḥṛtaḥārjasambhavakaraṃ sarvātmaḥgatakulaṃdalaṃ sīkṣāpadaḥbhaviṣṭāḥ na praviṣānti | teṣām apāyanandalapravesapathavahitamukhānām ayam eva vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalapraveśo yuṣṭe sarvaratprītyuttamasiddhisukhasaumanyānuḥbhavanārtham sarvāpāyapratīpvesābhikathapativinvartanāya ca | santi ca punar bhagavanto dhārmikāḥ sattvāḥ sarvātmaḥgatatāsaḥ saṃmadhī- prajnoṭtasiddhyupāyair buddhabodhiḥ prārthayanto dhyānāvimsādibhir bhūmibhir yatantāḥ klīsyante | teṣām atraiva vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalapravesa- mātrenāiva sarvātmaḥgatatvam api na durlabham kim anga punar anyāiddhitī.

The doctrine that the mere sight of the Maṇḍala destroys all one’s sins is seen here in section 900: tato yathāvān mukhabandham muktvā mahāmaṇḍalam darśayet | maṇḍale drṣṭamātṛt tu sarvāpāpar vimucyate ‘Then after duly removing the blindfold he should show him the Great Maṇḍala. As soon as he has seen it he is freed of all his sins’. But it is much older. It is already found in the Mahā-

\textsuperscript{538} Sarvatathāgatasamgraha, sections 210–213:

\textit{vajraśisyapraveśādavidhivistarohavati | tatra prathamam tāvat praveśo bhavaty aśeṣānavavesasattvadāhutaparitrāṇasarvahitasukhottamasiddhikārakārayātra mahāmaṇḍalapraveṣe pāṭrāpātraparikṣā na kāryā | tat kasmād dhetoh | santi bhagavantas tathāgataḥ kecit sattvā mahāpakkārīnāḥ | ta idam vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalam drṣṭvā praviṣṭvā ca sarvāpāyavagāta bhaviṣyanti | santi ca bhagavantah sattvāh sarvārthahbhajanaṇāpāmāṃgaṇaṃgrṛddhāh samayadvistāh purāṇāradeṇīṣu asāktaḥ | teṣām apy atra yathākṣamārakāriyataḥ praviṣṭānāṃ sarvāsaṃpurpiḥ bhaviṣyati | santi ca bhagavantaḥ sattvāḥ nṛtta-gaṇahāsāśiṣyāḥ mahāravihārapriyataḥ sarvātmaḥgatamahāyānābhisaṃyadharmatānaṃvadhatvād anyadevakulamandalaṃ praviṣānti | sarvāsaṃpurpiḥsamangrahabhūteṣu niruttara- raḷiḥṛtaḥārjasambhavakaraṃ sarvātmaḥgatakulaṃdalaṃ sīkṣāpadaḥbhaviṣṭāḥ na praviṣānti | teṣām apāyanandalapravesapathavahitamukhānām ayam eva vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalapraveśo yuṣṭe sarvaratprītyuttamasiddhisukhasaumanyānuḥbhavanārtham sarvāpāyapratīpvesābhikathapativinvartanāya ca | santi ca punar bhagavanto dhārmikāḥ sattvāḥ sarvātmaḥgatatāsaḥ saṃmadhī- prajnoṭtasiddhyupāyair buddhabodhiḥ prārthayanto dhyānāvimsādibhir bhūmibhir yatantāḥ klīsyante | teṣām atraiva vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalapravesa- mātrenāiva sarvātmaḥgatatvam api na durlabham kim anga punar anyāiddhitī.

\textsuperscript{539} Sarvatathāgatasamgraha, sections 210–213:
there are (2) people who are attached to every [kind of] wealth, food, drink, and other sense objects, who are [therefore] averse to [submitting to] the rules [of the initiated] (samayāḥ) and incapable of such disciplines as the Preliminary Observance (purasćaraṇam). If they enter this [Maṇḍala] they too will have all their

This is the practice otherwise known as pūrvasevā. It consists of a high number of repetitions of a Mantra along with ascriptive restraints by means of which the practitioner qualifies himself to undertake procedures that require its use. See, e.g., Maṇjuśriyamūlakalpa, p. 236: ādau tāvat parvatāgram āruhya viṁśallakṣāṇi jape | pūrvasevā kṛtā bhavati | kṣīrāhāreṇa mauninā nānyatra mantragaṇacīttana trīsaraṇanam asampradāya upadātabodhibhīṣṭena ca posadhaśīlasamvarasamādhanābodhisattvaśvamānaparārīghṣṭena japtavām | tataḥ karmāṇi bhavanti ‘Before [beginning the Kalpa] he must first climb to a mountain top and [there] repeat the Mantra two million times. [Thus] the Preliminary Service [of the Mantra] will have been accomplished. He must repeat the Mantra while sustaining himself with [nothing but] milk, maintaining silence, with his mind fixed on the Mantra and nothing else, after taking the three Refuges, having formally resolved to attain the Awakening, and having taken up the Posadhā fast, the restraint of morality, and the restraint of a Bodhisattva. [Only] then can the rituals be undertaken.’

This, barring the specifically Buddhist vows, is exactly as prescribed in the Śaiva Mantramārga, where, as here, the terms pūrvasevā and purasćaraṇam/purasćaryā are standard and synonymous. See, e.g., Niṣvāsaguhya, f. 80v3: japamāṇa-m eva māsena pūrvasevā kṛtā bhavati ‘By repeating the Mantra for a month the Preliminary Service will have been accomplished’; and Kṣemarāja Śvacakondoddyota ad 7.104c: purasćaryā prathamam eva mantragrahaṁ purvaṁ vratam niyatajaṇādikaraṇam ‘The purasćaryā is the observance that follows immediately after receiving the Mantra. It is to do a fixed number of repetitions [of that Mantra] with certain other [requirements].’ Living on a diet of milk and maintaining silence is also a standard feature of Śaiva Mantra observances; see, e.g., Niṣvāsaguhya f. 81r4: dasāhaṁ kṣīrāhāreṇa japtavāḥ kālamṛtyuṁ jayaṁ; f. 82vr4: naktāśi kṣīrāhāro vā maunena tu japed yas tu | sa śivo ’bdena mānavaḥ; f. 84v6: anena mantreṇa kṣīrāhāro saṁvatsaraṁ jape.
hopes fulfilled in accordance with their desires. Venerable [Tathāgatas], there are (3) people who cannot grasp the nature of the understanding of the Mahāyāna of all the Tathāgatas because they are attached to dancing, singing, joking, amusements, and the pleasures of eating, and [so] take initiation before the Maṇḍalas of other, non-Buddhist families of deities. Being afraid of the moral regulations [of Buddhism] they do not enter the Maṇḍalas of the family of all the Buddhas, which comprise the fulfilment of all aspirations, which bestow the highest happiness, delight, and joy. It is for these too, who are inclined to enter the way of Maṇḍalas that lead to bad rebirths, that this entry into the Maṇḍala of Vajradhātu is appropriate, so that they may experience every happiness and delight, the highest Siddhi, joy, and contentment and be turned aside from the path that leads them to enter all [Maṇḍalas that result in] bad rebirths. Venerable [Tathāgatas], there are also (4) pious persons, who seek the Buddhas’ enlightenment by means of the morality (śīlam), concentrations (samādhiḥ), and wisdom (prajñā) of all the Tathāgatas but who experience hardship as they strive to attain the levels of the meditations (dhyānam), liberations (vimokṣah), and the other [states on the path taught in the Pāramitānaya]. They will easily attain All-Buddha-hood without difficulty in this very life (atraiva), all the more so other Siddhis, simply by entering this Maṇḍala of Vajradhātu.

Thus the text offered Maṇḍala initiation not only to Buddhists, and in particular to those who had found themselves unable to progress on the exacting path of the Pāramitānaya, but also to sinners and sensualists regardless of their religion, and, most important in the present context, to outsiders who had already taken a non-Buddhist Tantric initiation or might otherwise be expected to do so.

The Sarvatathāgataattavasamgraha does not tell us whether it has particular kinds of non-Buddhist Tantrics in mind. We can only guess from the character of the initiation ceremony, with its emphasis on possession, and the cult to which initiation leads, with its erotic and sensual elements, that Śākta Śaivas must have been intended. Later sources, however, do make clear that it is indeed the non-Buddhist followers of the kinds of practice being adapted by the Buddhists that are in mind. Thus Ānandagarbha, the period of whose activity, though not yet narrowly determined, may be assigned to the ninth century, attempting

541 The dating of Ānandagarbha in the ninth century seems probable solely on the grounds of the range of his exegesis, which covers the Yogatantra systems of the Sarvatathāgataattavasamgraha (his Sarvavajrodaya, his commentaries on the Sarvatathāgataattavasamgraha [Tōh. 2511]), the Paramādyā (his commentary [Tōh. 2512]), the Māyājāla (his commentary [Tōh. 2513]), Guhyasamājā (his commentary [Tōh. 1917]), and the Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākintījālasamvāra (his commentary on the Sarvakalpasamuccaya [Tōh. 1662]). In the last of these Tantric systems we also have in Sanskrit but not in Tibetan translation his Vajrajvālodayā nāma śrīherukasādhanopayikā in a codex photographed by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana
in his commentary on the *Guhyasamājatantra* to explain the extraordinary fact that the place where the Buddha is said to have been residing at the time that he revealed this Tantra is the vaginas of the goddesses, declares.\(^{542}\)

If it is asked why he was residing in their private parts, the answer is [that this is] in order to bring it about that those devoted to the Tantras of Viśṇu and the other [gods], who have not yet abandoned [their attachment to] the objects of the senses, may come through desire itself to delight in the abandoning of desire. For they seek to attain the Siddhis of such [gods] as Viṣṇu by resorting to women, and using such [offerings] as beef and urine. Those engaged in the quest for the Siddhis taught by these [gods do indeed] copulate with women [for this purpose]. For [it is said in their texts]: “Viṣṇu is Bhagavān [‘the possessor of bhaga-’] in that he resides in the genitals (bhaga-) of women. He is called Nārāyaṇa [for the same reason,] because [by residing there] he gives pleasure to men”\(^{543}\).

in the Ngor monastery in Tibet which comprises apart from this work forty-one items pertaining to the cult of Hevajra (ISAACSON 1999). The dating is supported by the tradition (*Blue Annals*, p. 373) that he was a pupil of Dipaṅkarabhadra, who was a pupil of Buddhajñāna, a contemporary of king Dharmapāla (r. c. 775–812) (see here p. 93).

\(^{542}\) *gsang ba ‘dus pa’i dka’ grel*, f. 4r3–5: ci’i phyir de dag gis gsang ba la bzhugs she na | smras pa khyab ’jug la sogs pa’i rgyud la mngon par dga’ zhir gling yul yongs su mi spong ba rnam s ni ’dod chags khyis ’dod chags spong ba ’di la dga’ ba bskyed par bya’i phyir te | ’di ltar bud med bsten pa dang *ba sha dang (conj.: bshad Derge, Cone, Ganden) gei la sogs pa bsten pas khyad ’jug la sogs pa bsgrub par ’dod cing | des bstan pa’i dngos grub tshol pa la zhugs pa de dag btsun mo’i gsang pa la mngon par ’jug par ’gyur te | de yang | bha ga legs ldan khyab ’jug ste | bud med kyi ni mdoms na gnas | mi rnam s dga’ bar byed pas na | des na sred med bu zhes bya zhes bshad do.

\(^{543}\) The unknown author of this verse intends a nirvacanam of nārāyaṇah. A nirvacanam is a kind of semantic analysis that explains why a word is appropriate to that to which it is applied (anvartha-). When this is not thought to be adequately revealed through ordinary grammatical analysis one may resort to an analysis in which the meaning sought is discovered by deriving one or more of a word’s syllables from a verbal root that resembles it in sound. See the analysis of Yāska’s statement of this principle in KĀHRS 1998, pp. 35–39. In this case the name is made to mean ‘he who gives pleasure to men’. The first component in this analysis of nārāyaṇah was evidently nāra-, understood as either as ‘sons of man’ (nara-) by Aṣṭādhyāyī 4.3.120 (tasyedam; cf. Manusmṛti 1.10ab in another nirvacanam of nārāyaṇah: āpo nārā iti prakā āpo vai narasūnavah), or as ‘men’ (nara-) by application of Aṣṭādhyāyī 6.3.136 (anyes. api drṣyate) to account for non-standard lengthening of the first vowel. For these two alternatives see Kullūka on Manusmṛti 1.10ab and Medhātithi on the same for the second. Since aya- can mean ‘good fortune’, I speculate that the author found his meaning by deriving the last syllable, -na, from āni- ‘to lead [to]’, arriving by this artifice at ‘he who leads men to good fortune, i.e. happiness’ (nārāṇ ayāṇ sukham nayatti nārāyaṇah), the substitution of n for n being caused by the preceding r. The artificial derivation of -na from āni- is seen in the semantic analysis of samānah for the fourth of the five vital energies implicit in, e.g., *Niśvāsanaya* 4.124ab (*Niśvāsatattvasamhitā* f. 40r3) (> Svachchandatantra 7.308d): samānah samatāṁ nayet, and Sārdhatriśatikālottara
It comes as a surprise that Ānandagarbha attributes the extreme Tantric practices that he details here to Vaiṣṇavas, since nothing of this kind has been noted in their known literature. Because of this and because the use of female consorts, cow-flesh, urine and other products of the male and female body in the propitiation of deities for the attaining of supernatural powers or effects appears in our sources to be the hallmark of the Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha, and of the Picumata in particular, it is tempting to propose that Ānandagarbha has made a mistake and that had he been better informed or less careless he would have attributed these practices to those whom we know to have adopted them. But this cannot easily be accepted in the light of the fact that he backs up his attribution by citing a verse that supports it. I conclude, therefore, that his claim is rather evidence that some Vaiṣṇavas had assimilated the transgressive, Śākta Śaiva style of observance, just as the Buddhists had. In any case, whatever the accuracy of this attribution, it is extremely unlikely that Ānandagarbha did not also have the Śākta Śaivas in mind when he referred to “those devoted to the Tantras of Viṣṇu and other [gods]”.

Similarly Śraddhākāravarman, one of the Indian teachers of the Tibetan translator Rin chen bzang po (958–1055), says in his *Yoganiruttara-

10.10cd: samaṁ nayati gātreṣu samāno nāma mārutaḥ.

544 See, e.g., Picumata f.280v4: 67.71 śaktigarte kṣipel liṅgaṁ tataḥ pūjā<ṃ> samārabhet | gati-r-āgatiyogena śaktivikṣobhatatparaḥ ‘He should insert his penis into the vagina of his consort and then begin the worship, intent on bringing his consort to orgasm through to-and-fro motion’; f. 106v3–4: 22.152 śaktim tu kṣobhayen mantri vidyāyāśatasatam japet | mantrasya va jape caiva svayāgavidhidicotām || 153 dravyaprāṣya purā kṛtvā gomāṃsam kiṁcitsanyutam | surāṣṭhinā samāyuktam piṣṭaṁ piṇḍikṛtaṁ tathā || 154 kṣobhadravyena sammardya liṅgākāram tu kārayet | prakṣiped yonimadhye tu nīsīsam cālya piḍayet || 155 mantram uccārayen mantri saṁkhyāyāśtasatam tathā | karsayītvā tu taṃ liṅgam gudīkāṁ kārayet tataḥ || 156 japārcaṇavidhau nityaṃ pūjayaḥ sādhakottamah ‘The Mantra-adept should arouse his consort and [as he does so] repeat the Vidyā 108 times. He should do the repetition of his Mantra as prescribed in the procedure for his set of deities. First he should swallow the substances. Then he should grind cow-flesh mixed with faeces and surāṣṭhi (urine?) into a ball, kneed it with the ejaculates, make it into the shape of a Liṅga, insert it into [his consort’s] vagina, move it about for a short while and then compress it. The Mantra-adept should utter the Mantra 108 times, then withdraw the Liṅga, and make it into a pellet. The best of Śādhakas should always offer [this] when he performs the repetition of the Mantras and the act of worship’; f. 10v5: gomāṃsam guggulaṁ caiva pīṇyākam laṣūnam tathā || 3.210 siddhyartho gudīkā hy etā homayen nityakarmanī | maṇḍale tarpāṇam kṛtvā gomāṃsa surayāvāvanitam ‘Cow-flesh, bdellium, oil-cake, and garlic: he should offer this [mixture as a] pellet into the consecrated fire in his daily ritual’; f. 141v2 (28.38cd): gomāṃsam surayā mitraḥ homayita vicākṣaṇah ‘The adept should offer into the fire cow-flesh mixed with wine’; f. 39v3 (5.40ab): sampute sthāpayītvā tu mūtraḥomam tu kārayet ‘He should place urine in a bowl and offer it into the fire’.
The Śaiva Age

tantrārthāvatārasamgraha, referring to the Yogatantras as the Tantras of Method (Upāyatantras) and to the Yoginītantras as the Tantras of Wisdom (Prajñātantras): 545

A Method Tantra is one in which the Maṇḍala shows mainly male deities in order to train (vinī-) men and insiders (svayuthya-), whereas a Wisdom Tantra is one in which, in order to train women and non-Buddhist outsiders (bāhyatīrthika-), the Maṇḍala shows mainly female deities, deities, that is, who are appropriate for these. 546 A Method Tantra is one that exhibits deities that purify the outer and inner aggregates of personality (skandhāh), the elements (dhātavah), and the faculties and their objects (āyatanāṇi), whereas a Wisdom Tantra is one that exhibits deities that purify the outer and inner channels of the vital energy (nāḍī) and the Bodhicitta [semen]. A Method Tantra is one that exhibits deities [whose appearance and conduct are] in conformity with the [norms of] the world, whereas a Wisdom Tantra is one that exhibits deities [whose appearance is] contrary to [these norms of] the world.

Since Śraddhākāvarman states here that the predominance of female deities is designed to recruit non-Buddhists he can mean only the followers of Śākta Śaivism, since there is no other known group to whom this feature would have been particularly appealing. As for the other features that he identifies as distinctive of the Yoginītantras, he does not state explicitly that they were introduced with the same purpose in mind; but it seems to me probable that he means this to be understood, since the transgressive character of these deities, his third distinctive feature, is indeed a fundamental characteristic of the goddesses worshipped by these outsiders.

The Buddhism sponsored by the Pālas had come a long way: too far, in fact, for those conservative Buddhist monks at Vajrāsana who adhered to the ancient

545 rNal 'byor bla na med pa'i rgyud kyi don la 'jugs pa bsdus pa, f. 103v7–104r3: gang du skyes pa dang rang gi sde pa 'dul ba'i phyir lha po'i rnam pa mang par ston pa'i dkyil 'khor ni thabs kyi rgyud do | gang du bud med dang phyi rol mu stegs can 'dul ba'i phyir de dag dang rjes su mthun pa'i lha mo'i rnam pa mang pa'i dkyil 'khor ston pa ni shes rab kyi rgyud do | gang du phyi nang gi phung po dang kham dang skye mched kyi rnam par dag pa'i lha ston pa ni thabs kyi rgyud do | gang du phyi rgyud do | gang du 'jig rten dang rjes su mthun pa'i lha'i rnam pa ston pa ni thabs kyi rgyud do | gang du 'jig rten dang 'gal ba'i lha'i rnam pa ston pa ni shes rab kyi rgyud.

546 Part of this formulation, namely the doctrine that the Yogatantras are designed to appeal to men and the Yoginītantras to women, has scriptural status, being found in the mKha'gro ma'i dra ba'i rdo rje gur rgyud (Dākinīvajrapaṇjaratantra), f. 104v5–6: skyes bu rnam s ni gdul ba'i phyir | rnal 'byor rgyud ni yang dag bshad | btsun mo rnam s ni bsdu ba'i phyir | rnal 'byor ma yi rgyud bshad do The Yogatantras were taught in order to train (*vinayanāya) men. The Yogiṇītantras were taught in order to recruit (*samgrahāya) women'
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Buddhism of the Śrāvakayāna. For according to the testimony of Tāranātha they broke up the silver image of Heruka in the temple and burnt the collection of Tantras housed there, saying that these were the teachings not of the Buddha but of Māra, the evil obstructor of the Buddha’s enlightenment.547

The reflux of Buddhist Śāktism into the Śāktism of Bengal. Indeed, Buddhism had assimilated the Śākta Śaiva style of religion so thoroughly that some of its creations went on to be adopted into the later Śākta Śaivism of eastern India with little or no revision. This is the case with the goddesses Chinnamastā and Ugratārā. The Buddhist origin of Chinnamastā is certain, since her Śaiva Mantra is ŚRĪM HRĪM KLIṀ AIM VAJRAVAIROCANIYE HŪṀ HŪṀ PHAT ŚVĀHĀ, and the two companions that flank her are Dākinī and Varnī.548 In the Buddhist prototype the flanking goddesses are Vajravarṇā and Vajravairocanī, and the Mantra for recitation (jāpamantrah) is OṀ SARVABUDDHAHĀKINĪYE OṀ OṀ VAJRAVARṆĀNIYE OṀ VAJRAVAIROCANIYE HŪṀ HŪṀ HŪṀ PHAT PHAT PHAT ŚVĀHĀ.549 Moreover, the procedure of her visualization retains features distinctive of her Buddhist Śādhana, notably that one is to visualize the goddess standing on a red sun-disk marked with a Yoni triangle on a white lotus in one’s navel.550 The only differences here are that in the Buddhist Śādhana the triangle

547 Rgya gar chos ’byung, p. 168, ll. 14–: he ru ka’i sku dngul las byas pa chen po zhig dang | sngags kyi legs bam mang dag cig yod pa si nga gling pa sogs nyan thos se ndha pa ‘ga’ zhig gis ’di dag ni bdud kyi byas pa’o zhes byas nas | legs bam rnams kyi bud shing byas | sku gugs de yang dum bur bgos nas nryed pa byas so ‘There was a great silver statue of Heruka and many manuscripts of [texts of the] Mantra[naya]. Some Saindhava Śrāvakas from such [regions] as Sri Lanka, saying that these manuscripts had been created by Māra, used them as fuel, and, moreover, after dividing up the image into pieces pocketed them’; HBI, p. 279.

548 Śāktapramoda, p. 222 (her Mantra); pp. 221, 224–225 (the visualization of Chinna-

549 Śāktapramoda, p. 222 (her Mantra); pp. 221, 224–225 (the visualization of Chinna-

550 Abhisamayamaṇjarī, pp. 151–152.

550 Šāktapramoda, pp. 224–225, Purascaryāraṇava, p. 816, Karmakanda, vol. 4, p. 239d–240a (in the Kashmirian Śaṅkarādiddha): svanabhau nirajaṁ dhyāye chuddhamvikasitam sitam | tatpadmakosamadhye tu maṇḍalam caṇḍaroṣiṣaḥ | japaṇusumasaṇkṣaṇam raktabandhukasamnitibham | rajahsattvatotamorekhayonimandalamanḍitim | madhye tasya mahādeviṁ sūryakoṭisamaprabhāṁ | chinnamastāṁ kare vāme dhārayantiśvamastakam | prasāritamukhīṁ bhīmāṁ lelihāṅgajriḥvīkāṁ | pibantiṁ raudhīṁ dhārāṁ niṇḍhāṅhaviningatāṁ | viṃśīnakoṭaśāh iṁ nāṇaṇupoṣasamanvitīṁ | daksīṇe ca kare karpīṁ mundaṁalāviḥbhūṣīṁ | digambaraṁ mahāghorāṁ pratyālidapade sthitāṁ | asthīmadādarāṁ deviṁ nagayojipavitīṁ | ratikāmoparīṣṭham ca sadā dhyāyanti mantriṇāh ‘He should visualize a pure, open, white lotus in his navel, the disc of the sun in the centre of the seed-pod of that lotus with the colour of the Japā flower, resembling the red Bandhūka blossom, adorned by a Yoni triangle with [three] lines, red, white, and black representing the Gaṇaṣ Rajas, Sattva, and Tamas. At its centre Mantra adepts always visualize the Great Goddess Chi-
has the strictly Buddhist name *dharmodayā* and that the goddess is visualized as a transformation out of a yellow HRHITH visualized in that triangle.  

In the case of Tārā the Buddhist origin is even more apparent, since here the dependence extends to textual borrowing. For the Śākta literature of the worship of this goddess has incorporated the *Mahācīnakramatārāśādhana* of the Buddhist Śāśvatavajra, which appears almost in its entirety in the eleventh chapter of the Śākta *Phetkārīṇītantra*.

I am unable to determine within narrow limits how long after Śāśvatavajra this Tantra was composed. The earliest mention of the text in sources known to me is in 2.15 of the *Sarvollāsatantra* of Sarvāṇandanātha, in a list of a canon of sixty-four Tantras cited from the *Todalatantra* but not appearing in the published text of that work. It is probable that Sarvāṇandanātha, who wrote his work in Senhati in what is now Bangladesh, was born around the beginning of the fifteenth century. It is tempting to assume that the *Phetkārīṇī* was written at a time closer to Śāśvatavajra’s than to Sarvāṇandanātha’s, that is to

---

551 Abhisamayamaṇjarī, p. 151: *svanābhīṣhisthaśuklakamalasūryaśthīsindūrārunadharma-odayāmadhye pītahīhkārājā svayam eva kartitavamastakam vāmahasta-sthitam dhārayantī . . . ‘Arising by transformation of a yellow syllable HRH in the centre of a vermilion-red Dharmodayā triangle upon a sun-disc on a white lotus in his navel, holding her own head, which she herself has severed, in her hand . . .’.

552 The take-over of Śāśvatavajra’s *Sādhana* of Ugratārā (= *Śādhanaṃalā* 101) by the *Phetkārīṇītantra* and its subsequent influence have been demonstrated by BÜHNEMANN (1996). Śāśvatavajra flourished around the last decades of the tenth century and the first decades of the eleventh. His *Bāhyapūjāvidhi* (= *Śādhanaṃalā* 252), *Hastapūjāvidhi* (= *Śādhanaṃalā* 253), and *Cakrasamvarabalivīḍhi* are found in the series of ritual texts published in FINOT 1934 from a manuscript brought to China in 1057 by the Dhyāna master Baocang on his return from India. His *Śādhana* of Ugratārā is found in the *Śādhanaśataka* (a facsimile of an undated Sanskrit palm-leaf manuscript from Tibet has been published in BÜHNEMANN 1994 = Töh. 3306 ff.) and was translated into Tibetan by the Indian Paṇḍita *Amogha-vajra* and the Tibetan monk Bari Rin chen grags of Khams (Tōh. 3373; DT, Rgyud, Mu, f. 49v1, colophon: *rgya nag po’i rim pa’i sgrol ma’i sgrub thabs dpon rtag pa’i rdo rjes mdzad brjogs so | pa ndi ta don yod rdo rje dang kham pa lo tsā ba dge slong ba ris bsgyur cing zhus so*). The latter was born in 1040 (*Blue Annals*, pp. 73 and 405) and was appointed to the chair of Sa skya in 1103 (*Blue Annals*, p. 211). A Sanskrit manuscript of his most important work, his commentary on the *Laghusaṃvara*, translated by Bu ston Rin chen grub (Tōh. 1410), survives in the Potala Palace in Lhasa, where it awaits study.

553 SANDERSON 2007b, p. 236, fn. 89.
say, when the Buddhist Mantranaya was still at its height in eastern India, before the destruction of the great monasteries around 1200. But this destruction did not eliminate Tantric Buddhism and its literature from the region at a single stroke. For it was still alive in the early fifteenth century, when Vanaratna (1384–1468) travelled to Tibet in 1426, 1433, and 1453, gave various Tantric initiations, notably in the Kalacakra according to the system of Anupamarakṣita, and assisted in the translation of Tantric texts, as is attested in the biography of this extraordinary figure given by Gzhon nu dpal (1392–1481), 554 who collaborated with him in a translation of the *Trayodasatmakaśricakraśaṃvara-
maṇḍalavidhi (Tōh. 1489). We also have the Vanaratnastotrasaptaka, a Sanskrit hymn in praise of Vanaratna composed during his lifetime by a devout lay Buddhist Āditya, whom both the Sanskrit and Tibetan colophons say was a native of Magadha;555 and we have a manuscript of the Mahāyāna classic Bodhicaryāvatāra copied by a lay Buddhist in Bengali characters at Venugrāma in 1436.556

After her incorporation from the Mantranaya Tārā became with Dakṣinakāli and Tripurasundarī one of the three principal deities in the east-Indian Śākta system of the ten Mahāvidyās, which soon became widely disseminated throughout the subcontinent. Thus in a passage cited from the scripture Jñānavipa in the Sarvollasatantra (3.1–29) the ten Mahāvidyās are said to be [Dakṣinā]kāli (Śyāmā), Tārā, and Tripurasundarī (Śoḍasi), with the third dividing into eight: herself and the seven others that make up the total of ten, namely Bhuvanesvarī, Bhairavī, Chinnamastā, Dhūmavatī, Bagalāmukhī, Mātaṅgī, and Kamalā. The centrality of these three goddesses is reflected in the corpus of east-Indian Śākta scriptures. The Todalatantra teaches the rites of these three alone, and the Brhannilatantra follows the same model but adds Kāmākhya, the great goddess of Assam. Their centrality is also evident among the Paippalādin Atharvavedins of Orissa; for when they absorbed the influence of the Śāktism of Bengal in the latest stratum of their diverse Āngirasakalpa corpus it was principally the rites of Dakṣinakāli and Tārā that they adopted.557

The importance of Tārā in late east-Indian Śāktism is independently

556 SHASTRI 1917, p. 21: ASB MS 8067. The scribe identifies himself as Sadbauddha-karanakāyasthāthakkura Amitābha.
confirmed by the existence of substantial texts devoted exclusively to her worship, notably the Tārārahasyavarttī of Gauḍīya Śaṅkara composed in 1630, the Tārābhaktisudhārṇava, a work in some 11,000 verses composed by Nṛśimha Ṭhakkura c. 1688, the Tārābhaktitaraṅgini of Kāśinātha, composed in 1682 at the request of Krṣṇacandra, Mahārāja of Nadia in West Bengal, and two other works with the same title, one by Vimalānandanātha and the other by Prakāśānandanātha.

THE JAINS’ ADAPTATION OF THE ŚAIVA MANTRAŚĀTRA

Jainism too enjoyed royal support during this period, notably in western India under the Caulukyas and in Karṇātaka among the Gagās of Taḷakāḍ, the Rāṣṭrakūtās, and Hoysalas, and it too developed a Tantric ritual culture along Śaiva lines for the propitiation (ārādhana) of Mantra-goddesses for mundane benefits using Mudrās, Japa, and offerings into fire (homāḥ). Among goddesses worshipped in Jaina rites for such purposes are Lakṣmī and Vāgīśvarī (Sarasvatī) belonging to the higher world, the Vidyādevīs belonging to the middle, and, most important, in the lower world the Yakṣī attendants of the Tīrthankaras, associated with major Jaina pilgrimage sites, notably Ambikā (/Kūśmāṇḍīni), the attendant of Neminātha at Girnār, Cakreśvarī, the attendant of Rṣabha at Śatruṇjaya, Padmāvatī, the attendant of Pārśvanātha at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa, and Jvālāmālinī, the attendant of Candraprabha. That these deities were developed on the basis of the Śaiva tradition is more transparently obvious here than in Buddhism. Thus the Bhairava-padmāvatikalpa, the Digambara Mallīśeṇa’s Paddhati on the propitiation of Padmāvatī, written in 1057 equates her with Totalā, Tvaritā, Nītīyā, Tripurā, and Tripurabhairavī, all well-known Mantra-goddesses of the Śākta Śaivas.

558 See STEIN 1998, especially pp. 147–152.
559 In the classical listing these are the following eighteen: Rohinī, Prajñāpti, Vajrāśīnkhalā, Vajrāṅkuṣā, Aprācakrā, Puruṣadattā, Kālī, Mahākālī, Gaurī, Gāndhārī, Sarvāstramahājvalā, Mānavī, Vairoṭyā, Acchuptā, Mānasī, and Mahāmānasī.
560 For images of Ambikā, Cakreśvarī, Padmāvatī, and Jvālāmālinī see, e.g., AII S PL, Accession numbers 45246, 10029, 58659, and 19995. On the cult of Padmāvatī see JHAVERY 1944. On the cult of Jvālāmālinī see SETTAR 1969.
561 On the worship of goddesses in Jainism and their division between the three worlds (ūrdhvalokah, tiryaglokah, and adholokah) see CORT 1987. On the centrality of the culture of Mantras and Mantrasiddhas in medieval Jainism see the survey and analysis by Paul DUNDAS (1998), who writes there of “the Jain mantraśāstra’s partial linkage to an ultimately Śaiva-inspired style of religiosity” (p. 36), of the Jñānārṇava of the Digambara Subhacandra, probably in the tenth century, that it “blends much of the “software” of Śaiva mantraśāstra with specifically Jaina so-
Unlike Śaivism, Pañcarātra, and Tantric Buddhism in its mature form, Jaina Tantrism did not claim to offer Jainas a new path to liberation. It remained entirely focused on mundane benefits. Nonetheless it was not the preserve of the laity. Monks produced the manuals and monks were held to perform these propitiations. Thus Yaśobhadrasūri and other Mantra-adepts (māṇtrikāḥ) use the power that they have obtained by propitiating the goddess Kurukullā to unblock the throat of Devācārya when on the sixteenth day of a debate in the court of the Caulukya Siddharāja between him and the Digambara Kumudacandra the latter had used his supernatural power to silence him by causing him to choke;\textsuperscript{562} the Jaina Guru of king Ajayapāla undertakes a two-month propitiation of Ambikā on the Raivataka mountain at Gīnār in order to gain for himself the boon of equality with the renowned Śvetāmbara Hemacandra and for his patron that of equality with Kumārapāla, the great Caulukya king of Gujarāt.\textsuperscript{563} Hemacandra, Devendrasūri, and Malayagirisūri go to the same mountain at night to undertake the propitiation of the Siddha-cakramantra, after first performing preliminary rites to summon the presiding goddess Ambikā into their presence;\textsuperscript{564} and Hemacandra propitiates the spell-goddess Tribhuvanasvāminī in Anahillapattana, the Caulukya capital, in order to ask her about the previous birth of his pupil Kumārapāla.\textsuperscript{565}

As in the non-Jaina tradition the goddesses were put to work to serve the interests of rulers. The \textit{Prabandhacintāmaṇi} of Merutunga, written at Vardhamāna (Vaḍhvān) in eastern Kāṭhia-vāḍ in 1304, claims that Pāduvātī was propitiated by means of a fire-sacrifice by a Digambara monk in order to protect Vārāṇasi, the capital of king Jayacandra (in the late twelfth century), from attack by a Muslim army;\textsuperscript{566} bards in Kāṛaṭaka at the court of Yaśodhara...
are said to have invoked Aparājitā to secure the king victory in battle; and these powers are fully confirmed by the manuals for these rites. According to the unpublished Jvālāmālinīkalpa, composed by the Digambara Indranandin in Karnāṭaka in 939, the benefits that can be attained by propitiating Jvālāmālinī include the splitting open of the gates of enemy forts; and the Bhairavapadmāvatikalpa teaches a spell (vidyā) for making one’s enemies fall asleep and magical receipts both for causing dissension among them (vidvesaṇam) and causing their death (māranam). Moreover, Padmāvatī was the lineage goddess (kuladevi) of a number of Jaina ruling houses in Karnāṭaka and functioned in this capacity much as she would have done if they had not been converted. Thus she appears in a local manifestation as the Padmāvatī of Śašakapura (Sosavūru) in a Jaina myth of the origin of the name of the Hoysaḷa (/Poysaḷa) dynasty related in an inscription of 1133. When a Jaina ascetic Yogen was trying to subjugate this goddess with a Mantra and a tiger sprang out to break its power the ascetic commanded king Sala, saying “Strike [it], O Sala” (poy sala). The king then worshipped the goddess under the name Vāsantikā. Since this story introduces an account of the conquests of the dynasty it is probable that the goddess is seen here in the manner of the martial lineage goddesses of the Śaiva type venerated by non-Jaina kings during the early medieval period as the source of their sovereignty and military might.

In one important respect, however, Jaina lineage goddesses were bound to differ from their non-Jaina counterparts. Since Jainas are the strictest of vegetarians and are rigorously opposed to the harming of any living creature, their goddesses, like those of the Buddhists, had to renounce the animal sacrifices that were so conspicuous a part of their cult in non-Jaina lineages. Thus the Osvāl

567 CORT 1987, p. 248.
568 Notably the Śilāhāras, Rāṭṭas, and Śāntaras; see CORT 1987, p. 243.
569 EC 5:124.
570 Cf. EI 6:10, l. 6: sa hoy saḷeti prāpat tam kila vinihatyā hoysaḷākhyām.
571 In the Buddhist case, however, animal sacrifice, though unusual, does occur. We see it in the mahābali sacrifice performed by the Buddhist Newars at Lāgapkhel on the occasion of the chariot festival of Bugmalokeśvara (Karunāmaya); see SINCLAIR 2008. Nor is this a recent innovation. See Catuspīṭhacaritra ff. 30r2–32r3. The Mantra for the Bali there (f. 31v2–) is derived from a Śaiva prototype seen in the Vidyāpīṭha’s Niśisamcāra (14.56–63; ff. 47v5–48v2: ekavrksē śmāśane vā . . . ). My pupil Péter-Dániel Szántó has kindly informed me (personal communication, 4 March, 2009) that the verses that immediately precede that Mantra in this manuscript, containing the reference to sanguinary offerings, are not part of the original Catuspīṭha but have been added from the Catuspīṭhamandalopāyikā of Cāryāvatrapāda (19.30–33 [f. 20r]). On that work, its author, and the incorporation of material from it in this MS of the Catuspīṭha see SZÁNTÓ 2008a. He has also drawn my attention to references to sanguinary offerings elsewhere in the Catuspīṭha itself, in the Śādhanā of Dākinī (2.4.63–66) and in that of Cūṣinī (2.4.75),
Jainas of Rajasthan and Saurashtra hold that their lineage deity Saccikā or Sac-
ciyā adopted her present non-violence only when she and they were converted
to Jainism by the monk Ratnaprabhasūri, probably in the twelfth century,\textsuperscript{572} in
consequence of his having miraculously cured a boy of snake-bite when he had
already been thought dead and prepared for cremation. They claim that be-
fore their conversion they had been Rajput warriors—a claim also found among
other Jain castes—\textsuperscript{573} and she a fierce Cāmuṇḍā whom they propitiated with the
Tantric rites of the Vāmamārga. Her pre-Jaina past is still visible in her tem-
ple at Osiān near Jodhpur, the Osvāls’ original home. For the outer wall of her
innermost shrine shows images of Cāmuṇḍā, Mahiśāsuramardini, Śītalā, and a
naked Bhairava.\textsuperscript{574}

We have another story of the conversion of a lineage goddess in Jaina
accounts of the life of the Caulukya king Kumārapāla of Gujarat (r. 1143–
1174), who converted from Śaivism to Jainism under the influence of the
illustrious Śvetāmbara scholar monk Hemacandra. According to these accounts
Kaṇṭheśvarī, the lineage goddess of the Caulukyas, and the other goddesses
associated with her had always been placated during the nine days of the annual

\textsuperscript{572} See DUNDAS 2002, p. 149.
\textsuperscript{573} On the claims of Rajput kṣatriya ancestry among the Jain castes of the Osvāls,
Khaṇḍelvāls, Agrāvāls, and Śrimāls see BABB 1993, pp. 7–8.
\textsuperscript{574} AGRAWALA 1954 and 1956; CORT 1987, pp. 243–244; and BABB 1993, pp. 9–10,
following accounts in BHUṬORIYĀ 1988. For photographs of the Cāmuṇḍā and
Mahiśāsuramardini see AJISPL, Accession numbers 59386 and 59388. An account
of the conversion of Saccikā is found in a chronicle, the Upakeśagacchapatṭavali,
of the monastic community followed by the Osvāl laity, which ends with the in-
stallation of Siddhasūri in [Vikrama] 1655. See pp. 237–238 of the translation by
HOERNLE (1890), who does not provide the original, for which see AGRAWALA 1954.
Ratnaprabhasūri describes Saccikā in that account as follows (HOERNLE’s transla-
tion, p. 237), addressing her former devotees: ‘O ye faithful, ye should not go to the
temple of Sachchikā-devī; she is merciless, and incessantly delights in hearing the
sound of the breaking of bones and the killing of buffaloes, goats, and other animals;
the floor of her temple is stained with blood, and it is hung about with festoons of
fresh skins; the teachers of her devotion, rites, and service, are cruel men; she is
altogether disgusting and horrible’. The text continues: ‘Hearing these words of the
Āchārya, they replied,— “What you say, O Lord, is quite true; but if we do not go to
worship that cruel Devī, she will slay us and our families.” The Āchārya, however,
promised to protect them; whereupon they ceased to go any longer to the temple
of the Devī’. Ratnaprabhasūri then goes on to convert the goddess, a tradition also
asserted in an inscription of 1598 (CORT 1987, p. 244). Thereafter, it is said, she
would accept no sanguinary offerings and not even red flowers, because they resem-
ble such offerings.
Navarātra festival by the sacrifice of thousands of goats and buffaloes. But this stops when Kumārapāla, now a convert to Jainism, declares a fourteen-year ban on the taking of life. Kanṭheśvarī appears before the king and demands to know why she and the other goddesses have been denied their usual sacrifices. When he explains that he cannot sacrifice to her now that he is a Jaina she is enraged and strikes him on the head with her trident, causing leprous sores to break out on his body. Hemacandra miraculously cures his affliction, tries to persuade the goddess to accept in future offerings of vegetarian food of equal value, and when this fails binds her with a Mantra. Thoroughly humbled, she begs the king to free her, promising that if she is released she will give up her ways and work instead to police his ban on the slaughter of animals throughout his realm. With Hemacandra’s permission he releases her and she takes to her new role as the king’s informer with all the zeal of the convert. She reports a vassal king in Saurāstra for secretly butchering goats in his home: Kumārapāla sends his minister Udayana at the head of an army to punish him. She reports a merchant for plucking a louse from his wife’s head and crushing it: his entire property is seized and the money used to fund the building of a Jaina monastery, named accordingly the Monastery of the Louse (Yūkāvihāra).

Three thousand seven hundred goats and thirty-seven buffaloes were to be sacrificed: a hundred goats and one buffalo on the first day, two hundred goats and two buffaloes on the second, three hundred goats and three buffaloes on the third, and so on, so that nine hundred goats and nine buffaloes were sacrificed on the ninth (Mahānavami). See Somatilakasūri, Kumārapāladevacarita vv. 387–389: sūdhasamayaktaupūtātmā mahānāvamāparvanī | kumārapālabhūpāla amīgādhīhir ākhyata || 388 devī *kaṃṭheśvarī (corr.: kaṃṭheśvarī Ed.) gotra devī svām bhāvyam ihate | ekam chāgaśatam caiko māhiśā ca pratipaddine || 389 etāva eva dvignam dvitiye divase punah | tṛtiye trigunam yāvan navame *nasamagunam (corr.: nava samagunam Ed.); and Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha §75: athāmārim pravartayati rājāni āśvīnaśuklapakṣo āgā | tatra *kaṃṭheśvaryādevatānām (kaṃṭheśvaryādi corr.: kaṃṭheśvaryādi Ed.) arcakair vijñaptam deva saptamyaṃ sapta sātāni pāsavaḥ sapta māhiśā ca devatānāṃ puro dīyante rājāḥ | evam aṣṭamyaṃ aṣṭau sātāni navamyaṃ nava sātānī. In the editions of the Kumārapāladevacarita and the Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha the goddess’ name appears in the form Kaṃṭheśvarī. I have corrected this to Kaṃṭheśvarī on the dubious strength of a passage in the Prabandhacintamani of Merutunga in which the author implies that she owes her name to the fact that in the eighth century Vanarāja, the founder of the Cāpotkatā dynasty that preceded the Caulukyas at Anahillapattana, had a shrine built for her in the kaṇṭhāh (‘narrow entrance’) of his palace (p. 35: tathā ca tena dhavalagṛhakāntāḥ kaṃṭhe kaṃṭheśvaraprāśādāḥ ca kaśritāḥ).

Three thousand seven hundred goats and thirty-seven buffaloes were to be sacrificed: a hundred goats and one buffalo on the first day, two hundred goats and two buffaloes on the second, three hundred goats and three buffaloes on the third, and so on, so that nine hundred goats and nine buffaloes were sacrificed on the ninth (Mahānavami). See Somatilakasūri, Kumārapāladevacarita vv. 387–389: sūdhasamayaktaupūtātmā mahānāvamāparvanī | kumārapālabhūpāla amīgādhīhir ākhyata || 388 devī *kaṃṭheśvarī (corr.: kaṃṭheśvarī Ed.) gotra devī svām bhāvyam ihate | ekam chāgaśatam caiko māhiśā ca pratipaddine || 389 etāva eva dvignam dvitiye divase punah | tṛtiye trigunam yāvan navame *nasamagunam (corr.: nava samagunam Ed.); and Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha §75: athāmārim pravartayati rājāni āśvīnaśuklapakṣo āgā | tatra *kaṃṭheśvaryādevatānām (kaṃṭheśvaryādi corr.: kaṃṭheśvaryādi Ed.) arcakair vijñaptam deva saptamyaṃ sapta sātāni pāsavaḥ sapta māhiśā ca devatānāṃ puro dīyante rājāḥ | evam aṣṭamyaṃ aṣṭau sātāni navamyaṃ nava sātānī. In the editions of the Kumārapāladevacarita and the Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha the goddess’ name appears in the form Kaṃṭheśvarī. I have corrected this to Kaṃṭheśvarī on the dubious strength of a passage in the Prabandhacintamani of Merutunga in which the author implies that she owes her name to the fact that in the eighth century Vanarāja, the founder of the Cāpotkatā dynasty that preceded the Caulukyas at Anahillapattana, had a shrine built for her in the kaṇṭhāh (‘narrow entrance’) of his palace (p. 35: tathā ca tena dhavalagṛhakāntāḥ kaṃṭhe kaṃṭheśvaraprāśādāḥ ca kaśritāḥ).

Kumārapāladevacarita, vv. 387–396 and Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha §75.

Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha §85.

Kumārapāladevacarita, vv. 404–406; cf. Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha §77. The same sources relate another occasion on which the Jaina Mantravāda was used to curb a sanguinary goddess. Hemacandra and Yaśaścandra fly through the
Thus, while drawing heavily on the Śākta Śaiva tradition of the propitiation of Mantra-goddesses, the Jain Mantravāda, was bound to keep itself free of the sanguinary aspects of those cults and, also, one would assume, of all other transgressive elements that would conflict with the ascetic character of the Jaina path, notably the use of flesh and alcohol, and the employment of female consorts. However, that exclusion was not as complete as one would expect in respect of the last of these elements. This is apparent in the accounts of two of the propitiations mentioned above. We are told that when Hemacandra, Devendrasūri, and Malayagirisūri undertook the propitiation of the Siddhacakramantra on the Raivataka mountain they did so with a Padminī in the person of the wife of a village headman as their Tantric assistant (uttarasādhakatvena).\textsuperscript{579} How the wife of the village headman assisted in the propitiation is not stated. But the story of Hemacandra’s propitiation of Tribhuvanasvāminī is more explicit. Again he has the assistance of a Padminī. The daughter-in-law of a farmer is brought to the city for this purpose and the goddess shows her favour after Hemacandra has

\textsuperscript{579} Kūmārapālaprabodhāprabandha §61: \textit{te ca trayāḥ kṛtapūrvakṛtyāḥ śrī-ambikā-krtasānnidhyāḥ śubbhādhyaśādhiḥ śirāivaivaśvādātādṛṣṭau triyiṃyāmā-hvānāvaguṇānudrākaraṇanamantaranyāsavisarjanāṇādibhir upacārair gurūktavidakūhī samīpasthapadministrīvottarasaḍhakakriyāh śrīsiddhacakramantram *a-sādhyan (em.: asādhayat Ed.). ‘And those three, after performing the preliminary service (pūrvasvā) and bringing about the presence of Ambikā, with their mind firmly concentrated in the ‘pure’ mode of meditation, in the sight of the goddess of the Raivataka mountain, performed at night the Sādhanā of the Siddhacakramantra following the procedure taught by the Guru, with all the [required] rites of summoning, enclosing, making the Mudrās, installing the Mantras [on their bodies], dismissing and the rest, with the actions of the Tantric assistant performed by that Padminī beside them’. According to the erotological literature Padminīs are one of four classes of ideal love-partner (nāyikā); see, e.g., Panicsāyakamanājari 1.6: sampūrṇendumukhi kuranganayanā pinastāni daśāsuvā mṛdvānī śikcāرابrāvindasurabhī śyāmāthā gauradyutī | alpāhārātā vilāsakusālā hamsasuvānā sadgattā lajālīr gurudevapūjanaśāry śyān nāyikā padminī; and in Tantric literature Hevaṣjatrātantra 2.7.2–5 and Saṃvarodayatatantra 31.3–5b.
repeated the Mantra for three days on the Padmini’s vulva (tasyā yonau).\textsuperscript{580} The text tells us that Hemacandra’s mind remained undisturbed during this practice, no doubt wishing to stress that he was not compromising the monastic rule of celibacy. Indeed there is no evidence of which I am aware that the Jaina Mantravāda, unlike Śaivism and Tantric Buddhism in its later phases, created two levels of discipline, one for ordinary practitioners and one for an élite that transcended the rules that apply to the first. Nonetheless, we see from this story that it had gone surprisingly far in this direction, too far for some, one suspects, who would have preferred monks to avoid any practice in which they could be suspected of departing from the straight and narrow Jain path of purification.

**Śaivism in the Brahmanical Substrate**

As for the long-established brahmanical tradition, the Śaivas saw it as subsumed within their own, accepting it as the only valid source of authority in what they saw as the lesser domain of mundane religion (laukiko dharmaḥ). This perception is much emphasised in their literature,\textsuperscript{581} and it is expressed through the

\textsuperscript{580} Kumārapāladevaprābandha §21: atha śrīhemacāryais tribhuvanasaṁvinīṃ vidyām ārādhayitukāmā bhāndāgarikam kapardinam prāhur yan mehatāgrāme trihuṇasimhāh kauṭumbikāh | tasya putrāś ca tvāraḥ | laghor vakdhāḥ padmini | yadi sāyāti taddā *tasyā avācyapradēse (corr.:tasyāvācyapradēse Ed.) dinatrayam jāpe datte devi prasīdati | etad atidukāram | kapardinoktam | cintā na vidheyā | bhāndāgarikas tatra gataḥ kauṭumbikagṛhe | tena satkṛtaḥ | prayojanam prṣṭaḥ | bhāndāgarikenoktam laḥhuputravadhūm mamārpayya | tenoktam kim idam ādiśasi | evam eva | vicāro ‘pi na kartavyah | tenoktam yadi bhavatām *vicāre samāyātam idam (?) tadaivam astu | sukhāsane ‘hihīrya pattane samāgataḥ | śrīhemaśūri bhīḥ paramāṁhārraparair avikṛtacaitās tasyā yonau dinatrayam jāpeḥ kṛtaḥ | devī tustā ‘Then Hemacārya, desiring to propitiate the spell-deity Tribhuvanasvāminī said to his treasurer Kapardin: “There is a farmer called Trihun asim. ha in Mehatāv village. He has four sons. The wife of the youngest son is a Padmini. If she comes here and I offer Japa for three days on her unmentionable part the goddess will favour me. This is extremely difficult [to accomplish]”. Kapardin told him not to worry. So the treasurer went to the home of the farmer in that [village] and after being honoured was asked his purpose. The treasurer said: “Give me the wife of your youngest son”. [The farmer] said: “Is this an order?”. He replied that it was but that he should not be concerned. [The farmer] said: “So be it, if this is *what you have decided after due deliberation (?)”. So [the treasurer] put her in a comfortable sedan and returned with her to the capital. The venerable Hemasūri did the Mantra-recitation on her vulva for three days, intent on eating paramāṁnam, with his mind undisturbed [by lust]. The goddess was pleased’. The food paramāṇnam is, I presume, the dish of rice, milk, and sugar or jaggery otherwise known as pāyasam and considered the ideal food for offering to a vegetarian deity.

\textsuperscript{581} It is encapsulated in the often cited words of their scripture Bhārgvottara: iti varṇāśramācārāṇ manasāpi na(lang)hayet | yo yasmīn aśrame tiśthan diśītaḥ śivaśāsane | sa tasmin eva samtiṣṭhe chivadharmam ca pālayet ‘So he should not transgress the practices of his caste and [brahmanical] discipline even in thought.
collocation of the epithets *paramamāheśvaraḥ* and *paramabrahmanyaḥ* that is sometimes found with the titles of our kings in inscriptions.  

But the brahmanical tradition was not merely accepted by the Śaivas. It was also influenced by them. During this period we find an ever-growing corpus of traditions that while claiming to be on the brahmanical side of the divide derive from the Śaiva, both Śaiva devotional literature assigned to the Purāṇas and a form of worship that followed Śaiva models. In Purānic texts such as the *Uttarabhāga of the Līngapurāṇa*, the *Kālikapurāṇa*, the *Devīpurāṇa*, and the *Agnipurāṇa*, the boundary between the Śmārta and Tantric domains has almost completely dissolved, prompting the conservative brahmanical author Ballālasena, the twelfth-century Sena king of Gauḍa, to reject them as invalid as sources of the knowledge of religious duty, objecting particularly to their containing instruction on such matters as Śaiva initiation and idol consecration.

In reality there was no reasonable hope of turning the tide by this period, as had to be conceded even by so conservative an authority as the *Nibandha* on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* compiled by or under Aparāditya, the Śilāhāra king of Koṅkana in the last quarter of the twelfth century. While firmly denying in general the validity of the practices taught in the Śaiva scriptures, it admits a partial exception in the case of the Sthāpaka, the priest who consecrates idols and shrines. It is admitted that he may draw on these texts to supplement the

---

582 He should remain in the discipline in which he was when he was initiated into the Śaiva religion and [at the same time] maintain the ordinances of Śiva’; see Sander-son 1988, p. 662 (= 1990, p. 139); 1995, p. 23; 2005a, p. 389; 2007a, pp. 231–232. The Śaivas’ understanding of how the relation between the general, Vaidika ordinances and those of the Śaiva scriptures should be perceived is explored at length in Sanderson forthcoming b.

583 On the presence of the Śaiva Mantramārga in its Saiddhāntika, Dakśina (Bhairava), and Śaṅkta forms in the *Uttarabhaga of the Līngapurāṇa* see Sanderson 2005b, pp. 235–236.

584 On the *Agnipurāṇa’s* incorporation of the Saiddhāntika Śaiva Paddhati of Somaśambhu see p. 65 above.

585 In vv. 55–67 of the introduction to his *Dānasāgara* Ballālasena rejects on these and allied grounds the *Garudapurāṇa*, the *Brahmapurāṇa*, the *Agnipurāṇa*, the *Vaiśnavapurāṇa* in twenty-three thousand verses, the *Līngapurāṇa* in six thousand, the *Devīpurāṇa*, and parts of the *Bhavisyapurāṇa*. That he did not include the *Kālikapurāṇa* in his list strongly suggests that it postdates him.
ritual of consecration when installing a Śiva, and likewise on the other appropriate bodies of non-Vedic scripture when consecrating images of the Goddess and the like, provided that his Vedic procedure needs to be supplemented, provided that the imported auxiliary does not offend the Vedic procedure in any way, and provided that he does not take the initiations (dikṣā) which those scriptures require.\footnote{This position is established at length in the course of the commentary on Yājñavalkya-smṛti 1.7, which lists the valid sources of knowledge of religious duty (dharma-māla), namely Śruti, Smṛti, and observation of the practice of exemplary brahmans, supplemented by personal judgement and preference where the other sources of knowledge leave scope for them. Aparādiya considers at length and rejects the proposition that the scriptures of the Pāśupatas, Śaivas, Pāncāratikas, and others not rooted in the Veda (vedamāla-) should be added to the list (vol.1, p.10, l.6 ff.). He concludes: tataḥ ca devāpūjāдаu narasimhāpurāṇādiprasiddhāvaitikaravāt grāhyā nānyā | evam dikṣayām api avagantavyaṃ | na hi purāṇaprasiddhāvāṃ dikṣayāṃ jātiśodhanaṃ asti (vol.1, p.14, ll.17–19) ... evam pratiṣṭhāvām api purāṇādikavaitikaravātā grāhyā nānyā teṣām eva vyāmiśradharmāpramāṇatvena bhaviṣyātpūrāṇe pariṇātatavāt (p.15, ll.1–2) ‘And so the procedure for such [rituals] as the worship of deities that may be adopted is that taught in such Purāṇas as the [objectionable Śaiva] rite of the elimination of [the initiand’s] caste is lacking... Equally, in the case of rituals for the installation [of the image of a deity and the like only the procedure taught in Purāṇas and [related texts] may be adopted, since the Bhaviṣyātpūrāṇa acknowledges none but these as sources of valid knowledge of hybrid religious duty’. By ‘hybrid’ (vyāmiśra-) Aparādiya means procedures that incorporate auxiliary elements from the Tantras. The issue of this hybrid installation rituals is taken up in detail on pp. 16, l.1–19, l.12.} In other words it had to be conceded that a hybrid of Tantric and Vedic rituals procedures was already an institutional reality; and that this was so is confirmed by a Śaiva source, which protests against their existence, insisting that patrons should engage only initiated Śaiva officiants of full conviction, who would perform Śaiva rituals of consecration uncontaminated by such hybridization.\footnote{This source is the Saiddhāntika scripture Devyāmata. It devotes several verses to distinguishing types of Sthāpakas and to exhorting patrons to avoid all but one, who is described as learned both in the general Śaiva scriptures and in the specialized Tantras of Installation, as content with the teaching of Śiva, focused wholly upon it, strictly adhering to the discipline of the initiated (samayācārah), without any inclination towards the scriptures of the unintitiated (pasūṣāstram), taking no pleasure in the mundane religion, but delighting in the religion of Śiva alone: (2.16cd, 17ab, 19ab, 20ab): acāryah śivasāstraśajñān pratiṣṭhātanaṁtropāragah || ...17 śivasāstrārthasaṁtuṣṭaḥ samayācārapālakah || ...19ab śivasāstrākacittātmaṁ pasūṣāstraparāṁmukkah || ...20 viraktā lauikike dharme śivadhanāmūraṇātijātah. Sthāpakas to be avoided are those who are Vaidika in their religious commitment and learning. Some of these have no more than a partial knowledge of the Tantras of Installation; but they should be avoided even if they mastered both the Tantras of Installation and the general Śaiva scriptures (2.7–8b and 2.13–14):}
Instances of incorporation of Śaiva ritual in the Śmārta domain can be ad-
duced from most regions and periods, but perhaps the most striking because it
was so widely disseminated and accepted by those who considered themselves to
be on the Śmārta side of the divide is represented by the Prapañcasāra attributed
to Śankarācārya and the closely related Śāradātilaka of Lakṣmanaṇadesīka. These
two texts, which, I have argued, were composed in Orissa or on the basis of Oris-
san tradition, most probably in the twelfth century, present a system of ritual
that differs from the properly Tantric only in its catholic character—in Śmārta
fashion it includes rituals of propitiation for all the main deities—, its avoidance
of all the elements of ‘impure’ practice that the Śmārtas castigated in the Śaiva
cults of Bhairava and the Goddess, and its expurgation of doctrines that were
contrary to what could be found in acceptably brahmanical sources, notably the
doctrine of the thirty-six levels of reality (tattvāni).

THE CAUSES OF THE DOMINANCE OF ŚAIVISM

Śaivism, then, was undoubtedly the most successful among the religious sys-
tems that received royal patronage during the early medieval period. It was
the most commonly adopted. Of the others some were absorbed by it and the
rest while flourishing independently beside it came to remodel themselves along
Śaiva lines.

No doubt there were many factors that led to Śaivism’s rise to dominance
within this complex environment, and no doubt many of these will remain in-
visible to us, since they could be discerned and weighed only if we had access
to much more detailed evidence of the activities and motivations of individuals
and institutions, both religious and political. Nonetheless, I venture a general
explanation.

THE EARLY MEDIEVAL PROCESS

On the basis of the epigraphical record of acts of patronage, and consider-
ing evidence of changes over time within the Śaivas’ prescriptive literature, I

pratiṣṭhātantrakiṇcijñāṇah paśūśāstrūṇarāṇijñāh | tattvopadeśahīnas ca nācāryo na
cā sādhakah || 8 tena samsthāpitam līṅgam siddhidam na kāḍā cana | . . . 13 pa-
davākyapramāṇajñō brāhmaṇo vedāparagah | pratiṣṭhātantrakiṇcijñāh sthāpako
na praśasyate || 2.14 pratiṣṭhātantratattvajñāḥ śivaśāstravīśāraḍaḥ | so ’pi na sthā-
pakair iṣṭaḥ paśūśāstrūṇarāṇijñāh.

588 One of these, the assimilation of Śākta Śaiva propitiation rites by the Athar-
navedic tradition of the Paippalādins of Orissa, has been demonstrated at length
in Sanderson 2007b.

propose that the fundamental reason for the religion’s success, underlying and structuring the mass of particulars now lost to view, was that it greatly increased its appeal to royal patrons by extending and adapting its repertoire to contain a body of rituals and theory that legitimated, empowered, or promoted key elements of the social, political and economic process that characterizes the early medieval period.

These elements were:

1. the spread of the monarchical model of government through the emergence of numerous new dynasties at subregional, regional, and supraregional levels;
2. the multiplication of land-owning temples, both royal temples in nuclear areas and lesser temples in peripheral zones, often established by subordinate local lords, thus promoting the rural economy and the progressive penetration of the authority of the centre into new territories;
3. the proliferation of new urban centres, both commercial centres that grew from below through a process of agglomeration, and planned settlements, growths from above, founded by rulers;
4. the expansion of the agrarian base through the creation of villages, land reclamation, and the construction of water-reservoirs, wells, and other means of irrigation, with the steady growth in population that these developments imply; and
5. the cultural and religious assimilation of the growing population of communities caught up in this expansion.\textsuperscript{590}

At the same time it took steps to integrate itself with the brahmanical sub-

\textsuperscript{590} For this positive characterization of the period I am indebted to the work of a number of historians who in recent decades have shown the invalidity of the widespread view that it was a time of decline, de-urbanization, fragmentation, and general impoverishment in the aftermath of a glorious classical age that culminated under the Gupta kings and ended with their demise. I acknowledge in particular the research, conclusions, and hypotheses of Noboru Karashima (1984), R. Champakalakshmi (1986), Hermann Kulke (1990, 1995a, b), Brajadalal Chattopadhyaya (1994), Upinder Singh (1994), Burton Stein (1994, 1998), James Heitzman (1995), and Cynthia Talbot (2001). That judgement, which owes more, one suspects, to the concept of the European Dark Ages after the collapse of the Roman empire than to unbiased analysis of India’s epigraphical and archaeological record, has its counterpart in the not uncommon assessment that these centuries also witnessed a progressive degeneration of Sanskritic literary, intellectual, and religious culture. It is refreshing to see that the work of those historians who are engaging vigorously with the epigraphical and archaeological evidence of the age has brought forth a view that is more consonant with the abundant literary evidence of intellectual and aesthetic vigour.
strate in ways that rendered it accessible and acceptable to a far wider constituency and therefore all the more appealing to rulers in their role as the guardians of the brahmanical social order.

ŠAIVISM AND MONARCHY

Šaivism’s engagement with the first and most crucial of these elements is apparent in the fact that from the seventh century onwards inscriptions and prescriptive religious texts reveal that Šaiva brahmin Gurus were holding the position of royal preceptor (rājaguruḥ) in numerous new kingdoms both on the Indian subcontinent and in Southeast Asia and in this capacity empowering and legitimating the monarch’s rule by granting him Šaiva initiation (śivamaṇḍaladīkṣā). It might be thought that this would have been an unappealing step for any but the most reclusive and ineffectual of kings, since after initiation Šaivas were obliged to adhere to a complex and time-consuming program of daily and occasional rituals. However, early in the development of the Mantramārga, the Šaivas, no doubt in order to extend their recruitment and hence their influence, admitted a category of initiates who in consideration of the fact that they were incapable of taking on these onerous duties were exonerated from doing so.591 The king was considered to qualify for this less arduous route to liberation by reason of his royal obligations. He was therefore required to adhere only to the obligations of an uninitiated devotee of Šiva taught in the texts of the Šivadharma corpus, which in his case were principally to support the religion and its institutions and to sponsor and appear in conspicuous ceremonies in the civic domain.

Moreover, according to prescriptive sources the king’s initiation was to be followed by a Šaiva modification of the brahmanical royal consecration ceremony (rājyābhīṣekah), bestowed both on the king and his chief consort, and also given to the heir apparent at the time that he was consecrated to succeed to his father’s

591 The distinction between these two categories of initiate, those who receive initiation with post-initiatory duties (sabījā dīkṣā ‘initiation with seed’) and those who receive it without (nirbījā dīkṣā ‘initiation without seed’), is not present in the earliest Saiddhāntika scriptures, namely the corpus of Niśvāṣa texts found in the Niśvāsatattvasamhitā codex, the earliest of which, the Mūlasūtra, was probably composed at some time between 450 and 550, for which dating see the conclusions of a recent workshop on this text summarized in the newsletter of the Nepal-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project (GOODALL and ISAACSON 2007). On the relatively archaic character of the Niśvāsa corpus see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 22–31 (archaic features listed in fn. 32, pp. 29–31), and SANDERSON 2006. The category of exonerated initiates appears later in the Kirana, the Pārāmesvara, and the Svacaṇḍa, and, following the latter, in the Paddhatis. The textual evidence is given in SANDERSON forthcoming a.
The Śaiva Age

This new ceremony was added to the purely Śaiva consecrations recognized by the core tradition, through which a Śaiva Guru empowered an initiate to take office as a Śādhaka (śādhakāḥ), a specialist in Mantra-rituals for supernatural effects (siddhiḥ), and that through which a retiring Guru (ācāryaḥ) consecrated his chosen successor (ācāryābhisekāḥ), passing on to him his duties. In this way the monarch was incorporated as a third kind of Śaiva initiate, who differed from the Śādhaka and the Guru not in the character of the initiation itself but in the consecration ceremony that followed it: while they were to be consecrated for purely Śaiva functions, the king was to be consecrated to take up office as the “head of [the brahmanical social order of] the caste-classes and religious disciplines” (varnāśramaguruḥ), the role already assigned to him by brahmanical prescription.

As the function of the Śaiva consecration is modified in this case, so its form, though in general Śaiva, incorporates distinctive non-Śaiva elements appropriate to its mundane and brahmanical aspects, such as the inclusion of the royal

592 The textual and epigraphical evidence for the practice of royal initiation, and the textual evidence for the king’s exoneration from Śaiva duties, and this ancillary Śaiva modification of the brahmanical royal consecration ceremony are presented in SANDERSON forthcoming a. On the brahmanical consecrations of the king, queen, and heir apparent see SANDERSON 2005a, p. 382 and notes 115–117.

593 Naimittikakarmānusamdhāna f. 74v1: [4.118] varnānām āśramānām ca gurubhāvaya bhūpateḥ | yo ‘bhisekavidhiḥ so ‘pi procycate dikṣitātmanah ‘I shall also teach the rite of consecration as the means by which a king, provided that he has received [Śaiva] initiation, becomes the patron of the caste-classes and brahmanical disciplines’. The characterization of the king in accordance with these injunctions as the Guru of the castes and disciplines (varnāśramaguruḥ) is a commonplace in our period. See, for example, Sātvatasamhitā 24.16–17 (> Iṣvarasamhitā 17.14–15); Somadeva, Kathāsarasāgara 12.65; Candraprabhasūri, Prabhāvakacarita v. 284ab; Kṣemendra, Avadānakaḷpatāla 2.60c and 27.22b. See also the cognate expressions sarvāśramaguruḥ and āśraminām guruḥ in Netratantṛa 19.87 and 20.55b, varnāśramadharāmāryādācāryaḥ and akhilāśramaguruḥ in Agamadambara, Act 2, prose after 20 and Act 3, v. 4, and varṇaguruḥ in Rājatarangini 3.85ab.
banners, weapons, and armour in the objects of worship,595 the seating of the king on a platform covered with the skins of a fighting bull and a cat,596 the

595 Naimittikakarmānusamdhāna, f. 75r4–v1 (4.129c–132): ghateṣu abhyarca lokesān sāstrān indrapuraḥ> sarān || 130 śivam agnīḥ ca hetiḥ ca kētum (conj.: kētus Cod.) cēsādvediṣu [Marginal glosses: khadgaḍī on hetiṣ ca dhvajācchānaṁ on kētus] | samnīdhiḥktya samtarpya pājāyec cakrvartinah || 131 udagvediṣiśa> sthēṣu kalaśeṣuṅkalakṣeṣaṁsu | anantādīśikhaṇḍyāantān (corr.: antā Cod.) digvidikṣa yathākramam || 132 tāsyaś tadav adha>-stheṣu rudramātrgyanārthadān | grahasurapalāsākyāṇ (conj.: ākhya Cod.) bhoginām adhipān api 'He should worship Indra and the other Lokapālas together with their weapons in the vases, and then Śiva, Agni, the [royal] weapons, and the [royal] banner on the altars beginning [with that] in the northeast. He should then summon, gratify, and worship the [eight] Universal Monarchs [i.e. the Vidyēśvaras], beginning with Ananta and ending with Śīkaḍaṇḍ, in the vases whose required characteristics have been stated above, set on the northern altar, and likewise, below that [altar], the Rudras, the Mātrās, Kubera, the Grahas, the Asuras, the flesh-eating [Rākṣasas], and the Nāga lords'; f. 76r2–4 (4.141–142): sivāgnihiṭketunāṁ kāritāhyāṁ athārcanam | paścagavyayam carum tāḥhyāṁ datūca dojvāsodānam || svāpayitvā tu tātā sarakṣau vedikādaye | prṭha< > prākṣirasau mahāyāṁ samyatau kṣaumāsayayoḥ 'He should make both [the king and queen] offer worship to Śiva, the Fire, the [royal] weapons, and the [royal] banner, and then give them the five products of the cow, rice porridge [prepared on the sacred fire], and a tooth-cleaning twig. He should then have them sleep on the ground with their heads to the east on beds of linen on the surface of the two altars, having provided them with protection (sarakṣau). They should observe chastity [throughout the night].' For the protection mentioned here see the rites such those of protecting the beds by reciting of the Weapon-Mantra over them and surrounding them with Weapon-empowered lines of mustard-seeds, sesame-seeds, and ash set out in Uttarakāmika 23.54–59 (elaborating the related expression sarakṣan svāpayen nīśi) and Mrgendra, Kriyāpāda 7.98c–103, both cited in BRUNNER 1977, pp. 216–221. As for the requirement that the king and queen should sleep with their heads to the east, this too expresses the relatively mundane nature of this consecration. For that point in Śāiva initiation ritual candidates are to sleep with their heads to the east if they seek benefits other than liberation; see Mrgendra , Kriyāpāda 7.99ab: bubhokṣoḥ sayanaṁ kuryād gurūḥ prācinamastakam.

596 Naimittikakarmānusamdhāna f. 76v4–5 (4.150–152b): hetin astreṇa ketumś ca varmaṇa kaṅkaṭāṇy api [Marginal gloss on kaṅkaṭāṇi: samnahyāni] | sugandhapuspapadādyair naivedyāntaṁ prapūjya ca || anantādīṁ ca *vidyeśan udagvedyāṁ (conj.: ved+ + + + + vedyāś Cod.) ca pūrvavat | rudrādīṁ ca ghateṣv iṣṭvā vedyoṛ ārdhvaṁ athāstaret || bhadukṣoṁ tiṣṭirasya vṛṣadamsasayā car[maṇi] 'After worshipping with offerings beginning with fragrant flowers and incense and ending with cooked food the weapons and the banners with the Weapon-Mantra and the cuirasses with the Armour-Mantra, he should worship Ananta and the other *Vidyēśvaras on the northern altar (conj.) as before and after worshipping the Rudras, the Mātrās, Kubera, the Grahas, the Asuras, the flesh-eating (Rākṣasas), and [the Nāga lords] he should spread on the two altars the skins of a fighting bull and a cat'. Cf. Varāhamihira Brhatśamhitā 47.75–76, on the royal pusaṃnānam: gatvā dvitiyavediṁ samupaviśec carmāṇaṁ upari rājā | deyāni caiva carmāṇy upary upary evam etāṁ || vṛṣasya vṛṣadamsasasya ruros ca prṣatasya ca | teṣāṁ upari simhasya vyāghrasya ca tataḥ param; and Visnuḥdarmaṭṭara 2.21.35 on the brahmanical royal consecration (rājyābhisekāḥ): vṛṣasya (corr.: vṛkasya Ed.)
recitation of the Mantra text of sixteen verses prescribed for the brahmanical prototype when the water of consecration is poured over the king’s head, and, after the ceremony is complete, the king’s return to his palace in full military parade, mounted on an elephant or white horse, preceded by the royal banners, and showered with parched rice by the women standing on the roofs of the mansions along his route.

Just as this brahmanical rite is subsumed within the Śaiva process of initiation and consecration, so its outcome, the king’s entitlement to rule as guardian of the brahmanical social order now entails the additional requirement or, one might say, compensation to the Śaivas for this descent into the mundane, that he should ensure that the authority of brahmanical prescription be subsumed within, and subordinate to, that of the Śaiva scriptures, an injunction supported by the promise that by enforcing this hierarchical relationship he will secure the stability of his rule and kingdom, implying that by neglecting to do so he will bring about their collapse.

vrṣadamśasya dvīpinaś ca bhṛgūttama | teṣām upari śimhasya vyāghrasya ca tataḥ param.

Naimittikakarmanusamdhāna ff. 78r1–79r1 (interrupted by the loss of a folio), beginning (4.168–169): loke vede prasiddhā<ṃ>ś ca viprān etarhi pāṭhayet | abhiṣekāśiṣaḥ (corr.: abhiṣekāśiṣkāh Cod.) ślokān ṛṣiproktā<ṃ>ś ca taḥ yathā || surās tvām abhiṣiṇcāntu ye ca siddhā<h> purātanaḥ | brahmā viṣnuś ca samāhūś ca śakraśyās ca marudgaṇaḥ || . . . . These verses are prescribed for this purpose by Varāhamihira in the first half of the sixth century in Brhatsamhitā 47.55–70.

Mohacudottara f. 21v–22r (4.276–281): śrutismṛtipurāṇāni āgamā dharmadesakāh | etair yo vartate rājā sa rājyaṃ bhūṭjate ciram || 277 purāṇaṃ bādhya te vardārāmaś ca tadvaktayaḥ | sāmānyam ca viśeṣam ca śaivaṃ vaiśeṣikaṃ vacaḥ || 278 bādhyaḥbādhakabhāvēna no vikalpyaṃ vicaksanaṁ || yad yathāvasthitam vastu sarvaśnjas tat tad āvadet || 279 āgamanām bahute tu yatra vākyavayam ṛhavat || kim pramāṇam tadā grahayaṃ pramāṇaṃ sāṅkaraṃ vacaḥ || 280 *granthād granthāntaram tikā (?) | sāpeksanirapekṣayoh | samādhanam tayoḥ kāryam arthāpattyadśiṣdhanaiḥ || 281 evaṃ jñāṭvā surādhyaśa nivrutīṃ paramāṃ vṛjaḥ | evaṃ dharmaṁvite rājñī varṣāstre sarvadā śivam [The sources] that teach religious duty are the Vedas, the Dharmaśāstras, the Purāṇas, and the Āgamas. The Purāṇas are outweighed by the Vedas and the teachings of the latter by the Āgamas. The common and the special, the latter being the teachings of Śiva, are related so that the second outweighs the first. The learned should have no doubt about this. [For it is] all-knowing [Śiva that] has taught everything as it truly is. When, there being a plurality of scriptural authorities, there are two [contradictory] text-passages
The Śaivas also adapted the theory of their ritual practice to enable them to claim that those rulers who underwent their ceremonies would be empowered in their efforts to maintain their supremacy and extend it through conquest. The ceremony of initiation had been conceived as the means of obtaining liberation and was always presented in these terms in theoretical texts. But a fifteenth-century Kashmirian scholar can proclaim in a eulogy of his patriline that by receiving initiation from one of his ancestors kings had expelled their enemies and long enjoyed distinguished reigns. Similarly, an inscription of the twelfth or thirteenth century from Hariyāna tells us that the effect of the initiation of King Sūrapāla was to give him power beyond that of all his rivals. It adds that if his Guru Mūrtigana initiated a brahmin, a king, or his minister he thereby made them [respectively] the repository of knowledge, the master of all the earth, and the foremost of men. In the Malkāpuram inscription of A.D. 1261 we are told that the effect of the initiation given by Viśveśvaraśiva to the Kākatīya prince Rudradeva was to make the might of his [right] arm, that is to say his valour in battle, shine more brilliantly.

The same notion is apparent in the great Mebon inscription of A.D. 953 of the Khmer monarch Rājendravarman.

---

600 Rājānaka Śītakaṇṭha, Rājānakaṃvāṃsaprasāmasa, v. 5ab: tasmād yodhagurur babhūva bhagavān samprāpya dīkṣām yatah | prājyam rājyam apāstavairinikarāś ca kraus cīram bhābhujah | ‘His son was the Venerable Yodha. When kings received initiation from him they drove off all their enemies and had long and outstanding reigns’. For the probable identity of these kings see Sanderson 2007a, p. 397.

601 EI I, pp. 61-66, ll. 12–13.: tadbhaltimāṃ mūrtigano guṇindro (corr.:guṇindro Ep.) babhūva bhūpāḷahrdabhasūryaḥ | saddīkṣayā yasya sa sūrapāladevo babhūvāpratimataprabhāvah ‘Then there was his devotee Mūrtigana, foremost of the virtuous, the sun that opened the lotus that is the heart of the king, by whose excellent initiation Sūrapāladeva became [a king] whose might was unequalled’.

602 Ibid. ll. 13–14 (continuous with the passage cited in the preceding note): . . . vipram bhūmipatim tadiyam athavāmāyām sa yam dīkṣayet | tam tam bodhanidhim samastaprtihvinātham pradhānaṃ nrṇām sthāṇum patrinam ātātum iva srīyānāvalkyo muniḥ ‘Any brahmin, king, or minister that he initiated he made the repository of [all] knowledge, lord of the whole earth, and the foremost of men, just as the sage Yājñavalkya caused a tree, a [mere] plant, to burst into leaf’. When the dissolute king Supriya contemptuously refused the sacred water and grain that Yājñavalkya had brought to the palace to restore his health, Yājñavalkya sprinkled them on to a rotten tree and departed. Seeing that the dead tree immediately burst into leaf the king tried without success to have him return.

In a passage describing his marching forth to war it speaks of the ceremony of [Śaiva] Maṇḍala initiation as intensifying his brilliance, a statement that in the context must be taken to refer to his power to conquer his enemies.604 Nor was it only the theory that was adjusted to suit their patrons. According to the Brhatkālottara the Śaiva Guru was to close the initiation ceremony by giving abhiṣekah to the horses, elephants, chariots, and soldiers of the army by sprinkling them with the water from the vase of the Weapon-Mantra (astra-kalaśaḥ), one of the two main vases prepared in the course of the ceremony, “in order to remove all obstacles and to ensure victory in battle”605. The Śaivas also created a double of their ritual of post-initiatory consecration (abhiṣekah) to be performed for the king before he entered the fray.606 A much elaborated form of this ‘consecration for victory’ (jayābhiṣekah), involving Śākta Śaiva rather than Śaiva Mantra-deities and one thousand vases, is taught in the 248 verses of the 27th chapter of the Uttarabhāga of the Lingapurāṇa.

They also offered a wealth of apotropaic, invigorative, and hostile Mantra-rites that could be performed on demand for the benefit of the realm, to promote the success of royal patrons, and to frustrate their enemies. The evidence for such

---

604 The Mebon inscription (in FINOT 1925 [=K. 582], pp. 309–352), vv. 39–40: itas ta-toto vidyud ivādyutac chrīs tāvan nrpaṃ m pracalā prakṛtyā | ramyā sarat prādur abhūn na yāvad yadiyāyātrāsamyayo nirambrā || 40 tūrāstranirājanārājītaśrīr dīpto mahāmaṇḍaladikṣayā yaḥ | vidyāṅgamantraiś ca kṛtātmaguptih asādhayaḥt siddhiṃ udārabbhūtim ‘The fortune of kings, [though] unstable by nature, did not flicker here and there like lightning until the charming, cloudless autumn appeared, the season of his marching forth. His splendour enhanced by the lustration of his mighty weapons, he himself [made more] brilliant by initiation before the Great Maṇḍala [of Śiva], his person protected by the Vidyāṅga Mantras, he accomplished the Siddhi of total success.’

605 Brhatkālottara A, f. 45v2–3 (22.24c–25b): hastyaśvaratha*vodhānām (em.:yodhānā Cod.) secanam astravārīnā | kartavyām vighnaśamanam saṃgrāme jaya-kāranam ‘He should [then] consecrate the elephants, horses, and soldiers with water from the Weapon[-vase] to remove obstacles and [so] bring about [the king’s] victory [in war].’

606 Kīrāṇa f.52v (27.23c–25b): prokto ‘yam abhiṣeka<h> syā<d> vijayārtham nrpaśya ca | 27.24 saubhāgyajananam mukhyām grahaśādiśvivāyam | sarvasampat*pradaṃ śrīdām (corr.: pradaś śrīdā Cod.) yaśokirtiśivardhanam || 27.25 śāntipuṣṭikarah proktaḥ seko ‘yam vighnaṃśakah ‘This consecration that I have taught may also be performed to ensure a king’s victory. It is the principal means of bringing about good fortune. It removes oppression by possessing spirits. It bestows all success and wealth. It augments [the king’s] fame and reputation. I have also taught it as the means of warding off ills, restoring vitality, and eliminating obstacles;’ Cf. Siddhāntasārāpadhatti: evam anenaiva vi-dhinā rājyākāmasya bhrāṣṭarājasya putrakāmāyā saubhāgyakāmāyā abhiṣekam kuryāt ‘Following this same procedure he may perform the consecration for one who desires sovereignty, for one who has lost his kingdom, and for a woman who desires a son or good fortune’. 
rituals in the scriptural literature of the Śaivas, especially in its Śākta Śaiva texts, is pervasive. There is also historical evidence of specific performances. For example, an inscription of the fifth year of the reign of the Cola Rājādhirāja II (r. 1163–1179 or 1166–1182) from the Tiruvālīśvara temple at Ārppākkam near Kāncipuram tells us that when an army from Sri Lanka had invaded the Pāṇḍya country, plundered the treasury of the temple of Rāmeśvaram, and interrupted the cult of Śiva there, the emperor, fearing that the war might spread approached a certain Jñānaśivadeva of Gauḍa, who can be seen from his name to have been a Saiddhāntika Śaiva Guru, to free the country from this menace by ritual means. The Guru, we are told, then worshipped Śiva for this purpose for twenty-eight days continuously, and it was reported subsequently that these ‘attackers of Śiva’ (śivadrohi) had indeed been defeated. The Badāun inscription of Lakaṅnapāla praises the Rāja guru Mūrtigana for his expertise in “the great rites of subjection and attraction” (l. 13: vaśyākṛṣṭimahāvidhānanipunah); and Hrasvanātha, a Kashmirian Guru of the Kālikula who also held office as the minister of peace and war under Yaśaskara (r. 939–948), performed a ritual to kill his king and other rituals to cause dissension and immobilize, presumably directed against an invading army.

Just as the Guru imbued the king through the ceremonies of initiation and consecration with the numinous power of Śivahood in the exercise of his sovereignty, so the Śaiva rites by which the Guru assumed his office ensured that he, as Śiva’s agent among men, was imbued with the numen of royalty. As in the brahmanical consecration of a king, in which the royal astrologer was to provide him with the royal elephant, horse, throne, parasol, fly-whisk, sword, bow, and jewels, so at the time of a Guru’s consecration he received from his predecessor the non-martial symbols of sovereignty (rājāngāni, rājacihiṇāni), such as the turban, crown, parasol, sandals, fly-whisk, elephant, horse, and palanquin. To these we may add the throne supported by sculpted lions

\[607\] For some examples see SANDERSON 2007a, p. 281, fn. 166.
\[608\] ARE 20 of 1899, SII 4:456; ARE 1899, §§23–38 (partial translation in §34).
\[610\] Viṣṇudharmottara 2.4.18c–20b: tato bhisekasāṁbhārāṁ tasya kuryāt sa daivavit | kuñjaram turagam kuryāt tasya rājñāḥ parāksitau | bhadrīsanam ca chattṛman ca vàlavyajanam eva ca | khadgaratnam tathā cāpam ratnāṁ vividhāni ca.
\[611\] Bhojadeva, Siddhāntasārārapaddhatī f.41v (< Svacchandatantra 4.470): uṣñiṣa-makutacaktrapādukācāmarahastyaśvaśibikādīrājāṅgāni … dattvā. Svacchandatantra 4.70b has a throne or seat (chattṛman pādukam āsanam) where Bhojadeva has a fly-whisk, but his account agrees with that of the Svacchandatantra as transmitted in Nepalese and Grantha manuscripts. Thus NAK MS 1-224, f.48r3: uṣñiṣamakuṭādyāṁś ca cchatrapādakācāmarah | hastyaśvaśibikādyāṁś ca rājāṅgāni aśeṣataḥ; and IPI T. 1032, p. 96: uṣñiṣamakuṭādyāṁś ca chattacāmarapādukāḥ | hastyaśvaśibikādyāṁś ca rājāṅgāni aśeṣataḥ. In
(simhāsanam) so intimately associated with kingship in the Indian tradition.\textsuperscript{612}

For a manual for royal initiation, the \textit{Amṛtesadikṣāvidhi}, instructs the king to reward his Guru with gifts that should include golden jewellery set with rubies and pearls, a pair of jewelled sandals, a parasol, two white chowries, an elephant, and also a golden lion-throne,\textsuperscript{613} and the Malkāpuram inscription of A.D. 1261 describes Viśveśvaraśivācārya sitting on such a throne by virtue of his office as the Śaiva Guru of the Kākatiya king Gaṇapati of Warangal (r. 1199–1261),\textsuperscript{614} decked out in royal splendour, “with his mass of tawny locks adorned with a diadem trembling [as he speaks], with the full-blown lotus of his face radiating blessings, with his pearl ear-rings striking the tops of his shoulders [as he moves his head from side to side], entrancing with his strings of pearls”.\textsuperscript{615}

Furthermore, according to the prescriptions of the Śaiva scriptures the residence to be built for the Guru by his royal disciple was in many respects similar in its layout to the royal palace. It included, for example, an arsenal for the storage of weapons of war.\textsuperscript{616} That Gurus should have needed the

\textit{Līṅgapurāṇa, Uttarabhāga,} 27.259–261 the attributes of kings (nrpacihnāni) are “the conch, the fly-whisk, the drum etc., a moon-white parasol, a palanquin, and the war-banner” (śaṅkhacāmārabheryādyāṃ chaṭṭrām candrasamaprabhām | sībikām vaijāyantīṃ cā sadhayen nrpateḥ subhāṃ | rājābhīṣeṇakutātyā kṣatryāyeśvarāya vā | nrpacihnāni nānyesāṃ kṣatriyānāṃ vidhiyate).

\textit{Amṛtesadikṣāvidhi} f. 16v2–3: 37 paścād gurur daksānyah svarabhāraiva *su- vistaraih (em. : suvis. t.araih. Cod.) | māṇiyamuktiḥkacitair alankāraiva caddhukaih | 38 navaratnamayair dāntais tathā vai ratnapādeke | haimam simhāsanam chaṭṭram dattvā vai cāmāre subhe | 39 manimuktāsvanāgandara-uṣṭra-mesagavādibhīh | kṣetramūḍāvādiviṣayair māṇḍalaih ca subhair varaih ‘After that the Guru should be rewarded with extremely large quantities of gold, with marvellous jewellery set with rubies and pearls, made of the nine jewels, and of ivory, and, having given him a pair of jewelled sandals, a golden lion-throne, two white chowries, with jewels, pearls, horse, elephants, camels, rams, cows and the like, fields, villages and the like, districts, and fine provinces.’

\textit{Pantulu} 1930, v. 38d: tasmin gaṇapatyadhīṣaṃgurutsimhāsanādhyāsini śrīvīśe- śvaradeśīke ‘While the Guru Viśveśvara[śiva], occupies the lion-throne of his office as Guru of King Gaṇapati’.

Note also the reading chaṭrapādukam āsanam ‘parasol, sandals, and throne’ in the Kashmirian text of Svacchandatantra 4.470.


\textit{Mayasamgraha} 5.182ab: dhanuḥkhadgaśarādīni vidadhyāt tu çṛhākte;
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means of warfare may surprise. But a fragmentary inscription of the late tenth century from Kadwāḥā in the Guna District of Madhya Pradesh relates that when hostile forces had invaded the region and the king had been slain, the Śaiva ascetic Dharmasāiva, abbot of the Aranipadra monastery, went into battle and routed the enemy through his skill as an archer, at the cost of his own life. Nor is this an isolated instance. From the Jubbulpore stone inscription of Vimalaśiva, Rājaguru of the Kalacuri kings Jayasimha (r. c. 1163–1188) and Vijayasimha (r. c. 1188–1210), we learn that the activities of his predecessor Kūrtiśiva, Rājaguru of Narasimha (r. 1153–1163), extended beyond the spiritual to those of a military commander who expanded his monarch’s realm and added to his own through the appropriation of temples in the territories gained.

Piṅgalāmata f. 71r1–2 (10.28c–31): grhakṣate grhaṃ caiva śastraṃ sthāpanāya tu | ṭhāgagāndhanuṣ caiva kuthāro mudgāras tathā | cchurīkā kuntadāṃśa ca citradanās tathāvai ca | lakuṣṭaṇi pāśaḥ ca kaṇḍayaḥ śūlapatrakaḥ | cakraśi gadavajraḥ ca aṅkuṣāś ca kupaṭṭisāḥ | evamādibhi cātrāṇi phārāṇi vīvīhāni ca | sthāpita-vāyāni devese grhe grhakṣatasya tu. The term grhakṣaṭaḥ here denotes [the deity of] a segment immediately to the east of its centre of the southern edge of the square plan. In the last verse I take phara- to be a variant of spha-ra- ‘shield’ from Iranian (Old Persian spara-barai ‘shield-bearer’; Persian ispar ‘shield”).

EI 37:20, ll. 10–16. The inscription is fragmentary, but this much of its meaning is clear: while the ascetic Dharmasāiva was in the monastery at Aranipada (elsewhere called Aranipadra) performing austerities (tenāraṇipadam nāma kṛtaṁ padam aninditaṁ ... dattvārānipe ... tasya dharmasāvam ity abhayav jītaṁm śiśyaḥ ... tasyaśrāme vardhayatasya tapāmśi [ll. 10–12]) a ruler called Gobhaṭa came there with a force of elephants (tatrājaṇaṁ madasindhurāṇām balena bhūpah kilo gobhaṭākhyaḥ [ll. 12]). Someone, perhaps the local ruler, was killed by this king ([nṛṛpene śaṭaḥ sahaśa papāta [ll. 12–13]); and he, evidently Dharmasāiva, wept with compassion for a while when he heard the news (tasyāvagamyaya sa kathāṁ karunāvimuktābāṣpad kṣanaṁ [ll. 13]), then, flying into a rage (tad anupiṣita-lākṣaḥ [ll. 13]), went into battle, a veritable Śiva on earth, armed with a bow *that had come [down to him] from Prabhāvaśiva? (?) (atha prabhāvīgata-kārmukena bāṇais ca diptah sa dhārāvṛṣāṅkhaḥ [ll. 14]), and, like Śiva in his Tripurāntaka embodiment, routed the whole army of the enemy before ascending to the incomparable world [above] in a shower of flowers scattered by Indra’s celestial nymphs (āṭṭal[sval]lijalas tripūrāntakasaya ... sakalam api sa jītvā śātravāṃ śarvakalpaḥ | surapatiramanīṇām puspavrṣṭāvākinkṣṇaḥ puram anupam[aṃ] ... [l. 15]). The poet refers here to the reward conventionally attributed to a warrior who dies bravely when fighting to protect his country; see, e.g., Mahābhārata 8, supplementary passage 14, ll. 31–34; 13, supplementary passage 15, ll.1388–1361.

EI 25:33 (A.D. 1174), vv. 23–24: na syandanam vasumatī na ca candrasāvyau cakre na śārthir abhūt sa viśiyonih | nesur hariḥ paraparakīnī tathāpi bhasma cakre yataḥ sa iti kūrtiśivaḥ śpūṭam saḥ || yaśobhir induviśadās tathaiśvārikṣiṭaiḥ | apūpurat sa sarvaśā vivekakusmaṁ iva ‘He was manifestly [worthy of the name] Kūrtiśiva [Temple/Fame-Śiva]. For he [was a Śiva in as much as he] reduced the cities of his enemies to ashes [just as Śiva did to the cities of the three demons] even though his war chariot [unlike Śiva’s] was not the earth, the sun and moon were not its two wheels, its driver was not Brahmā, and his arrow was not Viṣṇu; and he filled all the directions with the moon-white temples that he had wrested from his
The Śaiva Age

Kings rewarded their Gurus with the donation or construction of monasteries (maṭṭhaḥ) and with grants of revenue from designated lands with which they themselves constructed and endowed such institutions. Thus in the first half of the ninth century the Rājaguru Purandara founded two monasteries in Gwalior, one at Mattamayūra and a second at Aranipadra, using the funds he had received from king Avantivarman as the daksīnā for performing the king’s Śaiva initiation, for which purpose he had been persuaded to move to Mattamayūra, probably from Mālava. The wealth received is described in the inscription that records these events as “[the revenue of] the most valuable portion of his kingdom”.

Similarly, when the Kalacuri Yuvarājadeva fought, just as he did with the [white] blossoms of his Vivekas’. My translation finds a reference to [lost] works by Kṛttisaṇḍa entitled Viveka, presumably commentaries on Śaiva texts. It is possible that the poet refers not to works but to Kṛttisaṇḍa’s spiritual insights (vivekaḥ).

619 Ranod inscription, EI 1:41, vv. 10–15: tasmāt purandaragurur guruvad garimnaḥ prajñātirekājanitasya babhūva bhūmiḥ | yasyādhanāpi vibudhair itikṛtyāsāṃṣai vyāhanyate na vacanam paurāṇaṃ yamārāgavidbhīḥ || 11 vandyāḥ ko ’pi cakāstī acintya-mahīmā tulaṃ munir bhāsāvatā rājann uttamaśābapūrvaśikharābhavhyāram prakṛtanyuṭiḥ | dīkṣārthīti vaco niśamya suktī cāroktam urvīpātīr yasyaḥāna- yanāya yatnam akroc chrīmān avantīḥ purā || 12 gatvā tapasyantam upendraśīrve pure tadda śrīmadavantivarmā | bhṛṣṭam samārādhyā tam ātmabhūṃ kathāmeic aṇīya cākāra pūtām || 13 athopasadayāya ca samyag aśīṃ dīkṣām sa da kho gurudaksīnāratham | nivedya yasmā niṣarājyaśāram svajānasāphālyam avāpa bhūpāh || 14 sa kārayām āsa saṃṛddhhībhājām munir maṭhāṃ sāmnunīratnabhūmim | prasiddham āvaṇidhi merukalpam śrīmatpure māttamayūrānumānim || 15 punar dvitīyam svayam advitiyo gunair munīndro ‘raṇipadrasaṃjīhām | tapovanam śreṣṭhathamaṭhām vidhāya preṣṭhāḥ pratisṭhām paramānāṃ niṇāya ‘Then came the Guru Purandara, who as befitted a Guru had the gravity that comes from the highest wisdom, whose teachings concerning the duties [of Śaiva initiates] have still not been surpassed 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 Uttamaśikharā shining in unimaginable glory, shedding his radiance like the sun. Avantivarman then went to [Purandara], who was practising austerity in Upendrapura, and having striven to win his favour succeeded in bringing him back to sanctify his kingdom. 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 Aranipadra’. I say that Purandara probably came from Mālava because we are told here that before he was brought to Mattamayūra he was in Upendrapura and a grant of 1110 issued by the Paramāra king Naravarman (EI 20:11) refers to the gifting of land in a village in the district of Upendrapura (l. 5: upendrapuramanḍale), which must have been within his kingdom, that is to say, in Mālava. It is probable that this town and
Genesis and Development of Tantrism

I alias Keyūrarvāsa (r.c. 915–945) induced Purandara’s spiritual descendant Prabhāvaśiva (/Sadbhāvaśiva/) to move to his kingdom in Chattisgarh, he founded for him at huge expense the great monastery at Golagī, granting him by royal charter numerous villages and a whole well-populated town, which, since it is not named, was probably Golagī itself, or, according to the account of

district bore the name of Upendra, the first of the Paramāra kings according to the genealogy given by the poet Padmagupta in 11.76 of his Navasāhasāṅkacarita.

In all secondary sources, including SANDERSON 2007a (p. 274), the name of this monastery (mat.hah.) appears as Golakī-. That spelling is well attested, but only in manuscripts and inscriptions from the Dravidian South, where the scribes, speaking languages in which voiced and unvoiced consonants are not distinguished, are liable to substitute k for g. We also find kolakī there. I now correct to Golagī- because this is what I find in the earliest testimony, which comes from regions whose vernacular languages do distinguish these consonants, namely Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts of the Kriyākāndakramāvali and the Bāngar Praśasti of the time of Nayaṭā (r.c. 1027–1043) (SIRCAR 1983b, v. 6: golagāyā sa mahāmathah). The name appears as Golagī in the Chandrehe inscription (caraṇapūtagolagikāḥ). I identify Golagī with modern Gurgī (244° 31′ N, 81° 27′ E), about 12 miles due east of Rewa Town, in the north of the Kalacuri kingdom. This is the site of once vast Śaiva ruins (CUNNINGHAM 1885, pp. 149–154; MEYER et al. 1908–1931, vol. 21, pp. 282–283; BANERJI 1931, pp. 41–45). A full account of my reasons for proposing this location and for rejecting as groundless the widespread view that the monastery was in the south of the kingdom at Bherāghāt. on the Narmada river, close to the Kalacuri capital Tripūrī, must be set out elsewhere.

Chandrehe inscription, CII 44:44, v.5: *tato madhumatipateh kṛtamahātapaḥ-saṃcayaḥ prabhāvaśiva ity abhūt sakalaśāivacūḍāmāniḥ | anekanṛpavanditaḥ sa yuvarajadevena ya tapodhanapatiḥ kṛtaḥ caraṇapūta-golagikāḥ* (my reading: golagnikāḥ MIRASHI, BANERJI [EI 21:23]) ‘Then after the abbot of Madhumati came that crest-jewel of all the Śaivas called Prabhāvaśiva, who had accumulated vast power through his asceticism and was revered by many kings. He purified Golagī [=Golagi] with his feet after being appointed by Yuvarajadeva as overlord of the ascetics [of the monastery at that place]; and the Gurgī inscription, EI 22:21, vv. 6–7: *tasāyākāṣitaipraparṇatattamāṅgaśudānandyuticaśadītāpadāpiḥaḥ | śīṣya babhūva bhuvanatrayaṅkirāntiḥ śīmatprabhāvaśivanāmaṇunamunī || āniya yaṃ sahajavāsaṇāya nayaṇāḥ śrīmudghatungetanayo yuvarāja-devah | sattvopākārabhavaḥ addutamakīrtihetor agrāhayan mat.hah. anantadhana-pratisēham* ‘His disciple was the glorious and learned ascetic Prabhāvaśiva, worthy of celebration throughout the three worlds, the pedestal beneath whose feet was honoured by the dense rays of the crest-jewels on the heads of all the kings who prostrated themselves before him. Yuvarājadeva, the son of Mudghatunga, skilled in policy, brought [him to his kingdom prompted] by an inborn predisposition and had him accept a monastery that he established [for him] with infinite wealth’. The damaged vv. 35–40 at the end of this inscription list the places that the king made over to Prabhāvaśiva: *[sthānaṃ] . . . . . . . . ya kīrtaniyam punyāṅvitaḥ mu-naye svayam arcitāya | - nam u:līkhiita/sāsana - - - keyā:varṣanantapati [svayam ājahāra] || 36 pakk + . . . . . . [tam?] | tathā śa:rasa:ddolakam | vakkadollakarajauddhe ko + +{nā}sapundikā || 37 + + + . . . . + + + + + puraṃ katolikā | nakalābhirapalli + + sarasvati || 38 [ettesām] dvādaśakaḥ ca kavacakṣetram eva ca | sāmanta:paṭa:ka: sa:iva va:ta + + . . . + || 39 + + + + yā:talapati śāsanaṃ | sa:tram iti api sa + + bhad-dhacī:jra [kusu?]mvā ca ku/kku/kjīyā | 40 rajgrāmāṅvitaḥ[nt etān sā]sanatena dat-
of the Malkapuram inscription, gave him a vast reward which that ascetic, after he had himself founded the monastery, transferred to it as its endowment. In the next generation the Kalacuri Lakṣmanaṁarāja II (r. c. 945–970) brought in Hṛdayaśīva and gave him the monasteries attached to the temples of Vaidyanātha and Nohaleśvara, the second of which Hṛdayaśīva passed on to his disciple Aghoraśīva; and the Bāṅgarh Praśasti reports, as we have seen, that

---

622 PANTULU 1930, vv. 25c–26: tasmai niḥsṛṣaḥcitase galacuriks. māpālaud. aman. ir grām. am. yuvarāja devanpatir bhikṣām trilakṣīṁ dādau || 26 krivā sa saivamunir adbhutasilamāṃrīḥ śrīgolakīmatam udāram udāttacitterḥ | itasyakarasaya nrpesikamauktikānām vyttēm cakārā sakalām api tām trilakṣīṁ To that [ascetic] whose mind was free of all craving the king Yuvarājadeva, that crest-jewel among the Kalacuri monarchs, gave a 300,000 endowment of villages. That Śaiva ascetic, the noble-minded embodiment of extraordinary good conduct, built the great Golakī [Golagī] monastery [there] and then made over the whole of that 300,000 living to that [monastery, which, ocean-like, has become] the source of [many] pearls in the form of Rājagurūs’. MIRASHI (CII 4i, p. clviii) interprets the words grāmānāṃ bhikṣām trilakṣīṁ ‘a 300,000 endowment of villages’ to mean that 300,000 villages were given to Prabhāvasīva and points out that if the report is correct it indicates that “the king assigned to him one third of the total revenue of his home province of Dāhala, which, according to tradition, comprised nine lakhs of villages”. This would indeed be a vast endowment, so vast indeed that I find it hard to accept his interpretation. The Gurgi inscription mentions only about twenty villages and a town and the Malkapuram inscription need mean only that the endowment [consisting of the revenue capacity of these places] was valued at 300,000 of some unspecified monetary unit. This alternative was already considered by PANTULU, the first editor of the Malkapuram inscription. For though he proposed the interpretation later adopted by MIRASHI, he saw the difficulty it entails (1930, p. 52): “The founder of the monastery was one Sadbhāva Śambhu who obtained a gift of three lacks [sic] of villages (or was it a villages [sic] fetching an income of Nishkas [coins]?) from the Kalachuri king Yuvarājadeva and gave away those villages to the Matha as an endowment”. In favour of this more realistic reading is a parallel expression seen in an inscription of the sixth century from a site near Mrohaung in Arakan. There we learn of the gift to a Buddhist monastery of a trīsāhasriko grāmāḥ (EI 37:13, l. 13: denguttanāmā trīsāhasriko grāmo nisṛṣto), which can only mean ‘a village which has [a revenue yield of] 3000’. As the editor, D.C. SIRCAR points out (p. 63), this refers “apparently to the revenue income in the standard coin”.

623 Bihāri inscription, EI 1:31, vv. 56–58: 56 kim stūyate sauvamunipūngavo ‘ṭavā śricedicandro nrpatih kṛttādaraḥ | sadoṣrjtitapotrivait upāyanaḥ pradarṣya bhaktim vidhināṁiṇyā yam || 57 śrīmallakṣmaṇarāja ‘pi tasmai sutapase svayam | matham śrīvaidyanāthasya bhaktiyuktah samārpayat || 58 svikṛtyāpi munir bhūyō matham śrīnauhalesvaram | aghorasvaśiṣṭasya sādhvṛttasasya dattavān ‘Or rather why should I praise that foremost among ascetics? [It suffices to report that] king Lakṣmaṇarāja, the moon of the Cedi dynasty, brought him [to his kingdom] after earnestly showing his devotion to him through presents sent by virtuous envoys, and then out of his devotion freely bestowed on that [saint] of great austerity the monastery of Vaidyanātha. The ascetic also accepted the monastery of Nohaleśvara and then gave it to his virtuous disciple Aghoraśīva’.
the Pāla emperor Mahīpāla I (r. c. 977–1027) bestowed a lofty gilded monastery on the Guru Indraśiva at Śivavāṭī near Koṭīvarṣa.624

Moreover, we have several records of Gurus using their resources independently to establish further monasteries. Thus Prabhāvaśiva’s disciple Praśāntaśiva built a monastery at Chandrehe for ascetics devoted to meditation625 and a hermitage on the banks of the Ganges at Benares.626 His disciple, the Rājaguru Prabodhaśiva, also built a monastery at Chandrehe;627

624 Bāngarh inscription, SIRCAR 1983b, v. 9: śrīmān indraśivah spuṭam hari-haraprāyaṁ śivendrākṛtim bibhrad vamsāvibhūṣanam samabhavac chisyo ‘ṣya puṇyātmanah | yasmai kānçana-puñjamañjuraśitaprasādamerusphuratkañjusābhama-maṭham dadāv iha mahīpalo nṛpas tuttavvit ‘The disciple of that [Guru] devoted to piety was the illustrious Indraśiva, an ornament of his lineage, who did indeed have an appearance [matching his name, in that it was one] that embodied both Śiva and Indra [=Uṇḍra, i.e. Viṣṇu] as though it were an image of Harihara [in which Śiva is both himself and Viṣṇu in a single body]. To him king Mahīpāla, [once he had become through initiation] a knower of [ultimate] reality, gave in this place a monastery that resembled Mt. Kailāsa, radiant with its Meru-like towers beautifully wrought with much gold’.

625 Chandrehe inscription, CII 4i:44, vv. 6a, 7: praśāntaśivacandramās tad anu tasya śīsyo ‘bhavat . . . 7 sa sōṇanadāsamgame bhramarāśailamule ‘tulaṁ priyālāvānasamkule phalamṛṇālakandāsanah | cakāra viditam janair munisakāh prāsāntaśramaṁ svapādapadaṇktibhiḥ pavītabhūtaloyah kṛti ‘The successor of [Prabhāvaśiva] was his disciple, the moon-like Praśāntaśiva. . . . Eating [nothing but] fruits, lotus stems, and bulbs, that wise friend of ascetics built the famous hermitage with his name [the Praśāntaśrama] at the foot, thick with a forest of Priyāla trees, of the Bhramara hill, at the confluence of the river Son, purifying the earth with the lines of his foot-prints’; and the Gurgi inscription, EI 22:21, v. 8 and 13: tasyāmañleṇa tapasā ca vivardhamāṇavidyābalaṇa ca samastajagatpratīṭatḥ | śīsyāḥ prakāmakaṁityagunāukadhāma śrīmatprasāntaśivasanāmamunir babhūva || . . . 13 dāhottiṁrṇasuvardāśasamitardrayārthásprprāhaḥ siddhasthānam acikarat tad apaṛam yah sōṇatīropari | yasmin yogajusah praviṣayā niyamadvaśtāntarāyāḥdhyah saṁtāḥ siddhasamādhyah ‘chamatayoc gacchanti mukteḥ padam ‘The disciple of this [Prabhāvaśiva] was the ascetic Praśāntaśiva, who was known to all for his unblemished austerity and the power of his ever growing knowledge, the unique abode of the most desirable of qualities. . . . [13:] He, who quenched the desire of a multitude of people in need of funds with fire-refined gold, built another [monastery as] a seat of Siddhas on the bank of the river Son, where masters of Yoga enter, abolish the torment of [all] hindrances through their ascetic restraint, and, when they are at peace, having achieved perfect concentration, reach with pure awareness the goal of liberation’.

626 Gurgi inscription, EI 22:21, v. 14: tīrthasāṇanisevanodayatadhiyāṁ atyatavāsrāntaye yas tat kāṛitavāṁ muniḥ surasaritīre tapaḥsthānakam | yat sammeseṣvaya mahēśvarārcanaratā vāraṇāśivāsinino manyeṇe bhavasāgaram guruṁ api keśam yathā gospaḥdam ‘That ascetic had a hermitage built on the bank of the Ganges for the complete repose of those whose minds were devoted to the practice of bathing at its Tīrthas. By resorting to it those living in Benares who are devoted to the worship of Śiva consider the ocean of transmigratory existence, vast though it is, to have dwindled into a mere puddle’.

627 Chandrehe inscription, CII 4i:44, v. 16ab: gurukṛṣṇasurāgarād ārād amuṇ maṭham
Patanāgaśīva, a spiritual descendant of Purandara through another line, built a monastery in Gwalior at a site now unknown; and the Rājaguru Viśveśvaraśīva, after receiving a village in Andhra from the Kākatiya Queen Rudradevi, built a monastery there and renamed the village Viśveśvaragolakī after both himself and the original home of his preceptorial lineage in Chattisgarh, dictating that only a Guru of this lineage, one consecrated by another Guru of the same (golakīvamśyakṛtābhisekāh), should be allowed to preside over his foundation. According to the same source he also established monasteries in Kāliśvarapura, Mandrakūṭānagara (v. 82), and Īśvarapura (v. 85), no doubt under the same conditions.

In this way there developed a far-reaching network of interconnected seats of Saiddhāntika Śaiva learning. Figures at the summit of this clerical hierarchy thus came to exercise a transregional authority whose geographical extent could be greater than that of any contemporary king. Viśveśvaraśīva while holding office as the Rājaguru of the Kākatiya Gaṇapati is said also to have been the Guru of the Kalacuri king, the Cola king, and the king of Mālava, and praise of Śaiva

---

628 Gwalior Museum inscription, MIRASHI 1962, v. 40: matham devakulam kupās tadāgānām ca paṇcaḥam | prākalāro vātikā . . . . 'A monastery, a temple, wells, five reservoirs, a circumvallation, *an orchard (?) . . . .

629 Malkāpuram inscription, PANTULU 1930, vv. 42–45 and v. 70: devasya satrasya māthasya tasya grāmasya sarvasya ca so 'dhikāri || 70 yo golakīvamśyakṛtābhisekāḥ sāntaḥ śuciḥ śaivaḥ saṁśrayaṣyaśvedī | śaiva-gamānām api pāragami samātānapālāḥ samalostahemā || 71 sarvāṇi bhūtāṇi anukam-pamānaḥ samastavidyāṣyo kṛtāvagāhāḥ | mahisuraḥ śilavatāṃ purogo bhavettārām naiśthikadesikendraḥ | 72 viśveśvaravāsiva-cāryo dhīmān rājaguruḥ svayaṃ evam ājñāpayad dhiraḥ śaiva-cāryaṣaṭaśaṁ vṛṭṭaḥ 'Surrounded by hundreds of Śaiva-cāryas the learned and noble Viśveśva-vāsiva-cārya personally ordered that the superintendent of the [temple of the] god [Viśveśvara], the refectory, the monastery, and the whole settlement [that he had established] could only be an ascetic Guru whose consecration [to office] had been performed by [a Guru] of the lineage of Golagi, a brahmin outstanding among the virtuous, tranquil, honest, one who understands the esoteric doctrines taught by Śiva, who has mastered the Śaiva scriptures, a guardian of his initiatory line, for whom a clod of earth and gold are of equal value, compassionate to all living beings, and deeply versed in all branches of learning'.

630 Malkāpuram inscription, PANTULU 1930, v. 38: śrīcolesvaramālavaṇaśiṣṭipati rājanyacakādamānī yaḥcyayau kim ataḥ paraṃ gaṇapatikṣoṇipatir yatstuḥ | na syāt kasya mude sa desikavaraḥ śaiva-gamāṁbhonidhiḥ śrīviśveśvaradesihāḥ kalacuriṣmāpālādikṣa-guruḥ 'The Cola king and the king of Mālava, the crest-jewels among rulers, were his disciples. King Gaṇapati too was his [spiritual] son. Whom does this excellent Guru not delight? The Guru Viśveśvara, this ocean of [knowledge of] the Śaiva scriptures, was the Guru that [also] initiated the Kalacuri king'.
Gurus as venerated by a plurality of kings is common, even a commonplace. The wealth accumulated by these Gurus enabled them behave like royal patrons themselves, not only founding new monasteries but also bestowing land-grants on brahmins, rewarding poets, founding temples and new settlements, and providing the means of irrigation. The Badāun inscription reports that the Rājaguru Mūrtigaṇa “honoured brahmins in abundance with many gifts of land that he had received due to the devotion of his royal disciple”\(^\text{632}\), the Malkāpuram inscription says concerning the Rājaguru Viṣveśvaraśiva, a native of Gauda in eastern India: “Who can count the Gauda [brahmins] whose wishes he has granted, the ascetics who have received rich endowments [from him], the leading poets who have been delighted [with the rewards he has bestowed]?”\(^\text{633}\) and the Bāngarh Praśasti relates that Sarvaśiva, the Rājaguru of the Pāla Nayapāla, gave [to brahmins] all the Great Gifts (mahādānāṇī) of the Purānic tradition, including the tulāpuṟuṣadānām in which the donor gives away his weight in gold, an activity that increasingly became emblematic of exemplary kings during the second half of the first millennium.\(^\text{634}\) His brother Mūrtiśiva, to

\(^{631}\) See, for example, in the colophonic verses of the Prāyaścittasamuccaya of Hṛdayaśiva, concerning his Guru Iśvaraśiva (see SÄNDERSON 2001, p.3): āsīt tatasāmtatau muniḥ śrī-iśvaraśiva iti | jagatīpatibhir nrpaiḥ pūjitapādopāṅkajāḥ; Chandrehe inscription (CII 4i:44), v.4b, concerning Purandara: yatra puranda-raḥ kṛtaṭāpā jajne gurur bhūbhujām; v.5c, concerning Prabhāvaśiva: anekanṛpa-vanditāḥ; Bilhāri inscription (CII 4i:45), v.5b, concerning Dharmaśiva: bhūpā-lamaulīmaṇiṅkāntibhir arcitāṅghriḥ; v.51bcd, concerning Sadāśiva: nrpaiḥ | yat-pādadvayam vandaym arcitam ṣekharamśubhik; v.54cd, concerning Hṛdayaśiva: nrpaṃkutaniṁśtaḥ yasya māṇikyaacakram aṅkṛta caraṇaṃśulam kāṁtam ekṣanta-ṇḍyam; Guri inscription (CII 4i:46), v.6, concerning Prabhāvaśiva: tasyāḥbhikāsitipratīpanotchāntatiṣāmattādaṃcādāmāṇididaṃcyacāritapatidāpithāḥ | śisyo bhābhava bhuvana-trayayakīrtāṇīṣvā śrīmatprabhāvaśivāvāṇāmāṇimunir manis; and v.17cd, concerning Īśānaśiva: śrīśānasambhur akhilāvanipālulamulīmaṇiānityupiṣāṅgitapādapa-dmah.

\(^{632}\) Badāun inscription, EI 1:10, 1.15: savasīṣyavarabhūpālabhaktilabdhdena bhūrinā | bhūmīdānena yo viprān pājayām āsa bhūrinā.

\(^{633}\) PANTULU 1930, v.39ab: gaudāḥ pūrṇamanorathāḥ kati kati prāptaśriyas tāpaśāh samtuṣṭāḥ kavipungavāh kāti kāti pradhavastapāḥ nrpāḥ.

\(^{634}\) SĪRCAR 1983b, v.11. The inscription lists prthīvīdānām, merudānām, viśvacakra-dānām, [sapt]aśgaradānām, brahmāṇḍadānām, kalpavrksadānām, [hīranyajkā- madhenudānām, bhavanadānām, grāmadānām, godānām, parvatānām dānām (the ten parvatadānāni of the Matsyapurāṇa, with Meru in the centre), sakalpādramabhadragaṭādānām, hīranyāvastradhajādānām, hīranyahastijraṭajjādānām, hīranyagarbhādānām, āsvadānām, tulāpuṛuṣadānām, and śrīnandīśvaradānām. For an exhaustive presentation of the prescriptions of the Purānic and other sources on the “Great Gifts” see especially the fifth Adhyaśya of the Dānakhaṇḍa of the Caturvargacintāmani of Hemādri, written while he was a minister of Mahādeva, the Yādava king of Devagiri (r.c. 1260–1270). The śrīnandīśvaradānām mentioned in this inscription is, I presume, the gift of a golden image of Nandikesvara that is to accompany the gift of a thousand cows (Caturvargacintāmani, vol. 1, p.253). On
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whom he handed over his office as Rājaguru is likewise praised in that inscription for his abundant donations to brahmins. Sarvaśiva’s disciple Rūpāśiva is also praised there for his generosity to suppliants,636 as is Īśānaśiva, the disciple of Praśāntaśiva, in the Gurgi inscription.637 The predecessors of the Rājaguru Vimalaśiva receive similar praise for their pious largesse in that Guru’s Jubbulpore inscription, and Vimalaśiva himself is commended there for the support he gave to the brahmanical order by bestowing gifts on brahmins, and adorning the land with gardens, water-tanks, charitable feeding-houses (sattrāṇi), temples, and houses for brahmins.638 In the Bāngarh Praśasti Vidyāśiva and Dharmaśiva are

635 SIRCAR 1983b, v. 15cd: bhratā mūrtiśivah sa mānya mahimo dānāmbekair jagat pūtam yah kṛtavān . . . ‘His brother Mūrtiśiva, of venerable glory, washed the world clean with the water he poured when making donations’. The poet refers to the rite of pouring water on to the hand of the brahmin recipient, or, in his absence, on to the ground, that must accompany any formal act of donation (Caturvarcintāmaṇi, vol. 1, p. 92); and by saying that he cleansed the world with these libations he suggests that his donations to brahmins were frequent, widespread, and very numerous.

636 SIRCAR 1983b, v. 28: śiśyāh sarvaśivasya dīpatatapāsah sarvārthicintāmaṇir . . | śīrūṃ rūpaśivo babhūva ‘The disciple who succeeded Sarvaśiva, [that Guru] of blazing ascetic power, was the illustrious Rūpāśiva, who was a wishing-granting jewel for all supplicants’.

637 EI 22:21, v. 18ab: . . . [sarvaṛthi]nām yena śīr gaminopabhogapadavīm daurgatyaudhkhacchidā ‘He caused [his] wealth to be enjoyed by all suppli- cants, thus ending the torment of their poverty’.

638 EI 25:33. The inscription precedes its account of the life of Vimalaśiva with some information about the predecessors in his Guru lineage. Unfortunately the section on his predecessors is lacunose because of damage to the stone, with the loss or partial loss of some of these Gurus’ names. The inscription yields the following succession: . . . N > Vimalaśiva > Astraśiva—in ll. 5–6 I read . . . (l. 6) vāstivābhīdhānāh where the editor, MIRASHI, reads . . . (l. 6) vāstūvābhīdhānāh: Astraśiva is a Saiddhāntika initiation name but *Vāstūśiva is not— > N? (if Astraśiva’s successor was covered in the lost v. 11) > N-śiva (the first part of the name has been lost: . . . śivaḥ śiṣyaḥ in l. 6) . . . N > Puruśaśiva, Guru of Yāśāṅkarna (r. 1073–1123) > Śaktiśiva, Guru of Yāśāṅkarna’s successor Gayakarna (r. 1123–1153) Kṛitiśiva, Guru of Gayakarna’s successor Narasimha (r. A.D. 1153–1163) > Vimalaśiva, Guru of Narasimha’s successors Jayasimha (r. 1153–1188) and, on the evidence of EI 40:46, Vijayasimha (r. 1188–1210). Of N-śiva we are told (v. 11): + śivāḥ śiṣyaḥ purusārthāya sampadāṃ | guṇānām ca dhanānām ca paropakrāteye param ‘[His] disciple N-śiva [employed] his abundant virtues only for the accomplishment of the goal of human existence and his abundant wealth only for the welfare of others’; and of his now nameless successor we learn . . . (v. 15) pritih pātre ratis tīrthe sthītiḥ pathi mate satāṃ | bhaktis bhave ’bhavat tasya samasya ‘That ascetic’s only delight was in [giving to] worthy recipients, his only attachment was to holy sites, his only adherence was to the path approved by the good, and his only devotion was to Śiva’. Of Vimalaśiva we learn in v.34cd: [yacchā]yām vibudhagano ’dhigamya dhatte vaidhuryam na khalu [mahotsa]vodayeṣu ‘Enter-
praised for building temples, and the Rājaguru Mūrtiśiva for building many and excavating numerous reservoirs. In the Gurgi inscription Praśāntaśiva is said to have added a lofty temple of Śiva at Golagī to the north of one that had been established there by king Yuvarājadeva, and in the Chandrehe inscription his successor Prabodhaśiva is said to have provided that place not only with a monastery but also with a water reservoir and a well. The Gwalior Mu-

ing the shade [provided by the parasol] of this [patron] a multitude of brahmīns was freed from the distress [of penury] on the splendid occasions of major festivals; in v.38: yasyārthidvijarājadarsanavāsad dānāmbu[bhir vardhate] śraddhā [prātridivam] vareṇa vidhīnā dharmasya *tantrīr (?) iva | yo darṣeṣu api sādāram dvijapatin akiṣṇaśobhāhārharan daks̄o yoyajate svavānivikasatadṛśāh ṁīnāṁ ṣatāḥ 'At the sight of great brahmin supplicants his faith grows day and night along with the [frequency with which he does] the pouring of the water of donation, in accordance with the best procedure, like a * . . . (?) of religious duty. And on the days of the new moon [this] learned [Guru] bestows with devotion on the leading brahmīns, their rich adornments never diminished, hundreds of fine ruddy cows shining with gold [adorning their horns]; v. 41bc: [dattam] na yan nāsti tat | pātram tan na yad arcitam ‘there is no gift that he did not give, no worthy recipient whom he did not honour'; and v. 43: udānānasarasi[sattrapṛāśadadviveṇasabhiḥ | bhūmiḥ paribhavaty asya na kair bhūṣābharañ divam ‘With what rich adornments [created by him], with gardens, reservoirs, charitable feeding-houses, temples, and houses for brahmīns, did [this] land not surpass heaven?’
seum inscription records that Pataṅga´siva built a great temple of Śiva\textsuperscript{644} and excavated four huge reservoirs.\textsuperscript{645} The Jubbulpore inscription records that the Rājaguru Vimalaṅga built a temple of Śiva Kṛtiśvara in honour of his preceptor and predecessor, the Rājaguru Kṛtiśiva.\textsuperscript{646} A Kannada inscription recording the death in 931 of the Śaiva Guru Tribhuvanakartaradeva alias Kaliyugarudra tells us that during the forty years of his rule as the pontiff of Āvani in Nolambavāḍi he built fifty temples and two large water reservoirs;\textsuperscript{647} and the Malkāpuram inscription records that the Rājaguru Viśveśvara founded temples to house Śivas bearing his own name in Viśveśvaragolakā, Mandrakūtanagara, Candravallinagara, Viśveśvaranagara, Kommūrgrama, and Uttarasomasilā, and also that he founded a town with his own name (Viśveśvarapura) at Ānanda.\textsuperscript{648}

The exalted status and king-like behaviour of these Gurus is reflected in the fact that we have inscriptions in which they have been given royal, even imperial titles. This is so with Vāmadeva, also called Vāmaśambhu, the Rājaguru of a Kalacuri of Tripūri who was probably Gāṅgeyadeva (r. c. 1015–1041), on whom that king is said to have transferred his status as the monarch (nijarājalakṣmī) as payment for his service as his Guru (gurudakṣiṇā) when he set out on a camp-

\textsuperscript{644} Mirashi 1962, v. 29: tenedam haramandiram susikham yat sarvatah sundaram bhaktaya kāritam indudhāmadhavalam kailāsāśailopamam | ākalpaṁ sthiram astu tad bhuvī satām ānadandaṁ darśanād asyavāmalam āgamat pariṇatim prāśādamūrya yaśaḥ ‘Out of devotion he had this temple of Śiva built with its fine towers, altogether beautiful, white as the light of the moon, resembling Mt. Kailāsa. May it endure on earth to the end of the aeon, delighting the virtuous when they see it. His spotless fame has been transformed to take material form as [this] temple’.

\textsuperscript{645} Mirashi 1962, vv. (30–)38: sutat.am. catus. t.ayam idam. ruciram. cirabhushanam mahīvadhvāḥ | vikaṭataratadāgānām acīkarac chripataṅgeseḥ ‘Pataṅgaṅa made these four lovely and immense reservoirs with beautiful banks as an enduring ornament for the woman that is the earth’.

\textsuperscript{646} EI 25:33, vv. 45–46: jačīkarac candramauler mandiram ādarāt | guror kṛtiśivasayaitat kirtaye suktāya ca || devāya kṛitiśvarasamjñātāya prādād amuśmai jayasimha deva | bibhrad bhave bhaktibharam gurau ca grāmān raveḥ parvani n + dāyān ‘He built out of reverence this temple of Śiva for the fame and religious merit of the Guru Kṛtiśiva. The god [installed in it] was named Kṛtiśvara; and King Jayasimha, having great devotion both to Śiva and [his] Guru, gave it [three] villages as * . . . (?) gifts on the sacred day of the sun[‘s eclipse]’.

\textsuperscript{647} EC 10, Mbn:65: svasti śrīmad-āvanyada sthānanaṁ nālattu-varṣaman ād yava-ttu-dēgulaṁ mādi piriyav-erāḍu-kereya katī śaka-varṣam eṃṭu-nūr-embatta-mūr ādand utkṛanti geydu śrītribhuvanakarttara-devaṁ kali-yuga-rudrāṅka rudra-loka-prāptan ādam ‘Hail! After governing the sacred domain of Āvani for forty years and building fifty temples and two large reservoirs, in the Śaka year 853 [the soul of] Tribhuvanakartaradeva alias Kaliyugarudra has ascended [from his body] and reached the world of Rudra’.

\textsuperscript{648} Pantulu 1930, vv. 82–84, 88.
paign of world conquest. Beginning with the inscriptions of his son and successor Karṇa (c. 1041–1071) the Kalacuri rulers of this kingdom are described as meditating on the feet of this Vāmadeva, to whose name are prefixed the imperial epithets paramabhaṭṭarakamahārājādhirājaparamesvara-paramamāheśvara-raśrī. A variant of these titles, samadhigatapañcamaḥśabdaparamabhaṭṭarakamahārājādhirājaparamesvara-, is found in Nolambavādi records attached to the names of two other Saiddhāntika Gurus, namely Brahmaśīva in an inscription of c. 870 and Varuṇaśīva in one of 936. Similarly, but more modestly, an inscription of 1331 on a step-well in the vicinity of the Acaleśvara temple on Mt. Abu tells us that it was constructed during the victorious reign of the great ascetic rājaśrī-Sarveśvara during the victorious reign of the ruler rājaśrī-Tejaḥśimha of Candrāvatī.649

649 For these imperial and royal titles attached to the names of Śaiva Gurus see D.C. Sīrcar in EI 30:10, pp. 46–51. There he refutes the claims expressed by V.V. Mirashi in EI 27:29. These are (1) that Vāmadeva is a king Vāmarājadeva [seen by him alone] in the Saugor inscription of Śankaragaṇa, which has been assigned on palaeographic grounds to the eighth century, (2) that this king should be assigned to the second half of the seventh century, and (3) that the references in inscriptions of the later Kalacuris to these king’s devotion to [the memory] of Vāmadeva, should be referred to this much earlier monarch as the founder of their dynasty. Sīrcar removes Vāmadeva from the Saugor inscription, reading -vāvarāja- rather than -vāmarāja- and citing other examples of vāva- or bāva- in inscriptions, and then cites these examples of imperial or royal epithets bestowed on Śaiva Gurus to counter Mirashi’s argument that their being prefixed to the name of Vāmadeva proves that he was a king not a Guru. I side with Sīrcar. His view has the great strength that it accords (1) with the testimony of the Malkapuram inscription of 1261/2, which, referring to Vāmaśambha as the third Guru in succession after Sadbhāvaśambhu, the first pontiff of the Matha at Golagi, reports that the Kalacuri kings were being praised (prasāmsyante) [in their Prāsastis] up to the present as worshippers of his feet (Pantu 1930, v. 28: atha nṛpaśekharaśālalālitapādo 'tra vāmaśambhur abhūt | adyāpi kalacurīśā yaccaraṇārādhakahāḥ prasāmsyante)— in the inscriptions of the Kalacuris of Tripūrī from Karṇa onwards they are said to be -vāmadevapādānudhyāta---, (2) with the fact that there is no reference to a king Vāmadeva in any of the inscriptions of those kings, and (3) with the fact that the source which reports the Kalacuri king’s bestowing his rājalakṣmī on Vāmadeva refers to the latter as an ascetic (sāhasīkas tapasvine vāmadevanāmme nijarājalakṣmīm gurudakṣinayai dattvā sarvām bhūnim jetum prasthitavān). Sīrcar convincingly identifies the Kalacuri king here called Śaḥasīka as Gāngeyadeva on the grounds that the latter was both an illustrious conqueror and known as Sāhasānka ‘he who has the cognomen Sāhasa’. This source, cited by Sīrcar (EI 30:10, p. 50), is a paraphrase in Jonarāja’s commentary on the Prthivirājavijaya of Jayānaka of a verse of that work now lost in a lacuna.

The inscription referring to Brahmaśīva is EC 10, Śrīnivāsapura taluk, no. 27 (p.346). Sīrcar (EI 30:10, p.49) wrongly gives the name as Brhamarāśīva and the page reference as 376. The relevant part of the inscription is: svasti samadhigatapañcamaḥśabdabapallavānvayā śrīprthivīvallava pallavānvayakulitilakaṃ śrīmat-nolambādhirājar prthivirājya
Clearly the Śaiva Rājaguru had become a far grander figure than the king’s brahmanical chaplain, the Rājapurohita, who was tied to the service of a single king and was unambiguously his subordinate. Yet, it appears that the Śaivas did not rest with this but also sought to encroach on the territory of that lesser office. For the Netratantra shows the existence of a further class of Śaiva officiants who were to function in almost all the areas traditionally reserved for that officiant: the performance of the king’s recurrent duties to worship the various deities on the days assigned to them, to celebrate the major annual royal festivals of the Indrotsava and Mahānavami, to protect the royal family through rites to ward off ills, to restore them to health after illness, to ward off or counter the assaults of dangerous supernaturals, to empower through lustration (nīrājanam) the king’s elephants, horses and weapons of war, and to protect the king with apotropaic rites before he eats, sleeps, and engages in his regular practice of martial skills.⁶⁵⁰

We see here one of several instances in which the Śaivas used their authority to colonize downwards, producing modifications of their ritual procedures for this purpose. These adaptations inevitably entailed loss of status for those that implemented them, but we should understand that this did not affect those at the summit of the clerical hierarchy, the king-like Rājagurus, but only the humbler clones that extended their authority into domains that those Gurus would not deign to enter.

---

⁶⁵⁰The purpose, date, and provenance of the Netratantra are the subject of SANDERSON 2005b.
Genesis and Development of Tantrism

ŚAIVISM AND THE ROYAL TEMPLE

The second element of the early medieval process to which I have drawn attention is the proliferation of land-owning temples. All but the most ephemeral sovereigns during this period, both in the subcontinent and in Southeast Asia, gave material form to the legitimacy and solidity of their power by building grand temples in which images of their chosen God were installed, animated, named after themselves (svānamṇā), and endowed with land and officiants to support their cult. As we have seen, the great majority of these temples enshrined Śiva [in the form of a Linga].

The Śaivas of the Mantramārga provided specialized officiants and rituals to establish these Śivas, developing in course of time a secondary body of scriptural authorities, the Pratiṣṭhātantras, devoted exclusively to this domain, setting out the rituals of installation (pratiṣṭhā) and defining the norms for the form of the Linga, the iconography of ancillary images, and the architectural design of the various temple types. Moreover, they asserted the principle that the Śaiva Sthāpaka, the specialist who performs these rituals, is competent not only in the Śaiva domain but also on all the levels that the Śaivas ranked below it. Thus they claimed that he is empowered to officiate in the construction and consecration of non-Śaiva deities such as Viṣṇu following the Pāñcarātra. This

651 None of the early works of this class have been published. Those known to learned authors before the end of the eleventh century and surviving in manuscripts are the Mayasamgraha, not to be confused with the published Majyamata, a later south-Indian work, the Piṅgalāmata, the Mohacūḍottara, and the Devyāmata, which declares itself the pratiṣṭhātantram of the Nīśāśa. Four other works of this type, not known to have survived, are cited by the Kashmirian Vidyākaṇṭha around the beginning of the eleventh century in his commentary on the Mayasamgraha: the Pratiṣṭhāpārameśvara, the Nandikēśvaramata, the Paitāmaha, and the Pratiṣṭhāsamuccaya, the last of which was probably a Paddhati rather than a scripture. On all these texts see SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 440–442.

652 See, e.g., Brhatkālottara, B f. 108v4: bauddhāvaiṣṇavapañcarthe sauraśekamukhādiṣu | śaivaḥ sarvādhikāri syān na śaive 'mi kathāmeśaśa The Śaiva [Guru] has competence that extends into all [religious systems], the Buddhist, Vaiṣṇava, Pāñcaratha[-Pāṣupata], Saura, Kālamukha, and others; but [Gurus of] those have absolutely no competence to act in the Śaiva [system]; Kāmika, Purvabhāga 1.121c–126, on the authority of the Śivabrahmaṇas, the married Śaiva brahmans who alone were competent to officiate for others: śaivaḥ sarvādhikāri syāt svakiye ca paratra ca || 122 śaivaḥ sarveṣa kurvanti ye grhaṭhā dvijottamāḥ | yamale mātrante ca kāpāle pāñcarātra ke || 123 bauddhe cārhāmate caiva lāke vaidīke 'pi ca | anyeṣu api ca mārgesu tattacchāstraiḥ svasastrataḥ || 124 śaivaḥ kurvanti diṣkādyam tallingasthāpānādikam | mukhyatvād iha śaivasya mukhamāhātmyato 'pi ca || 125 adhikāro 'ṣṭya sarvatra nāyeṣuṁ śīvadarsane | tasmāt paraṁtham ātmārtham sthāpānam yajanaṁ tathā || 126 śivavipreṇa kartavyam anyeṣāṁ svārtham eva hi | paraṁtham api kuryāc cel "lobhena (em.: lopena Ed.) nrpaṃtes tathā | tadrāṣṭrasya ca nāśaḥ svād aciṃaṇa na saṃśayah The Śaiva is competent in
universalization of their authority, which is backed by learned theory of the relation of the Śāiva with the other bodies of scriptural injunction, seems not have been merely theoretical. For the Śāiva Paddhati literature contains instructions for the consecration of Viṣṇu, as we have seen in the case of the Paddhati of Somaśambhu, and Vaiṣṇava sources protest at this encroachment, insisting that images of Viṣṇu installed by Śaivas should be reconsecrated.

all [systems], both his own and others. Married Śaivas, the foremost of brahmins, can officiate in all [the systems, namely] the Yāmala and Mātrtantra, the Kāpālika, the Pāñcarātra, the Buddhist, the Brahmī, the Jainī, the Lākula, the Vaidika, and yet others, using the scriptures of these systems in accordance with their own. [Such] Śaiva[ brahmī]s perform initiations and the like, the installation of images, and so forth [in these other systems], because the teaching of Śiva is superior [to all others] and because the mouth [of Puruṣa] has been glorified [in the Purusaśākta] as the part of his body from which the brahmins, as the highest caste-class, were created. [The Śīvarāhμaṇa] is competent to act in all [systems], but not others in the teaching of Śiva. Therefore the Śīvarāhμaṇa [alone] may worship and install [images] both for others and himself. Others may act only for themselves. If out of greed [anyone other than a Śīvarāhμaṇa] performs rituals for the benefit of others[, thus usurping the exclusive right of the Śīvarāhμaṇas], then without doubt both the king and his kingdom will swiftly be destroyed'.

653 See Somaśambhupaddhati vol. 4, pp. 294–311 (visṇusthāpanavidhih).

654 In his Pañcarātṛarakṣa (pp. 26–27) Vedāntadeśika, the influential Śrīvaiṣṇava of the fourteenth century (EI 13, p. 222), quotes a passage from the Śaiva Kāranatantra that is more or less identical with 1.121c–124 of the passage of the Kāmika, Pūrvabhāga cited above, and after asserting that it is inadmissible as evidence because all Śaiva Tantras are condemned by Vedic authorities quotes a passage from the south-Indian Pāñcarātriṇa Pādmasamhitā (Caryāpāda 19.128b–130) to the effect that if a Viṣṇu has been installed with the system of the Śaivas it must be re-installed following the system of the Pāñcarātriṇa and purified by bathing with a thousand vases. See also Viṣvakṣenasanāthi 39.283–285: sthāpite raudramārgena pujyamāne dine dine | hitvā raudravidhānaṁ tu sarvesaṁ hitakāmyayā || grāmavṛddhikāraṁ pūryaṁ rājabhūśuravadhanam | tasmāt sarvaprayatnena hitvā raudraṁ tu tatkaṇṇat || sthāpayet sattvatenātha vidhinā pujyayed dharim | tasmāt sarvaprayatnena na kuryāt tantrasaṅkaram ‘If [a Viṣṇu] has been installed following the Śaiva procedure and is in daily worship [following the same] then, desiring the welfare of all, one should abandon the Śaiva procedure and [adopt] the holy [Vaiṣṇava procedure] that will cause the village, the king, and the brahmmins to prosper. Therefore one should abandon the Śaiva rites immediately and scrupulously re-install the Viṣṇu with the Pāñcarātriṇa ritual and worship it [with the same thereafter]. So one must take great care to avoid [this] contamination of the [Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava] systems of worship; 39.305–306: jātisamkaraṇenaiva jagac caṇḍalatām vrajēt | tantrasamkaranenaiva rājarāstrāram vinasyati || rāṣṭrām sarīraṁ rājās tu rājā jīvaṁ sa ucyate | rāṣṭrākṣaye ksayaṁ rājāḥ tasmād rakṣyaṁ duvayam budhaiḥ ‘People become untouchables through the contamination of castes. Through the contamination of the systems of worship the king and kingdom are destroyed. [The scriptures] teach that the kingdom is the body and the king its soul. [So] when the kingdom is destroyed, so is the king. The wise, therefore, should guard both [by preventing the encroachment of the Śaivas into the Pāñcarātriṇa domain]’. Śaiva ritual is called raudra- in the first of these passages
The involvement of the Śaivas of the Mantramārga in the temple cult covered in early Śaiva scriptural sources and all the early Paddhatis up to at least the twelfth century does not extend beyond the performing of the rituals necessary to initiate the cult by consecrating the images and the temples that house them. The texts are silent on the nature of the worship that would be performed before those images once the Śaiva Guru had completed his task. It would appear, therefore, that the temple worship was in the hands of officiants of a different kind. However, the texts lagged behind reality in this regard. For at some point, well before the Śaiva literature was prepared to register this fact, there were Śaivas of the Mantramārga working as the priests that performed the regular rituals in the Śaiva temples. The new practice is first attested in the Far South in the late seventh century. We learn from a grant of the Pallava Paramēśvaravarman I (r. c. 655–960) that a certain Ananta Śiva-Śucārya, whose name makes it very probable that he was an initiated Saiddhāntika officiant, was appointed as the priest with hereditary rights to perform the ritual of worship (devakarma) in the temple of Śiva Vidyāvītāpallavaparameśvara established with his name by the Pallava king Paramēśvaravarman I alias Vidyāvīnīta.

The persistent disjunction during this period between what was prescribed for Śaivas and what was being done by some of them is due, I propose, to the fact that functioning as a priest in a temple, and therefore living off the endowment of the deity in return for one's work, carried a loss of status with which the older tradition was unwilling to be associated. According to brahmanical sources any brahmin who persists in such work for three years is considered to

---

655 Saiddhāntika Śaiva initiated brahmins have initiation-names (dīkṣānāma) that end in -śiva (with -śambhu or, less commonly, -śiva or -śāṅkara as synonyms) as the second of their two components, and those of these who have consecrated to officiate by receiving the ācāryabhīṣekāḥ are referred to as N-śivācārya, a practice that has continued into modern times. Other Anantaśivācāryas are the author of the Siddhāntasārāvalīvyākhya, one of the Śivācāryas, probably 95 in all, among 108 12th-century labelled images at Dārāsūram in Tamilnādu (SRINIVASAN 1987, vol. 1:17, no. 60), and one mentioned in an inscription of 1571 at the Vaṭāranyēsvāra temple at Tiruvēḻaṅgū (ARE 497 of 1906 [Appendix B: stone inscriptions copied in 1905]) as a disciple of Ponnambala Dharmāśivācārya and Guru of Immaḍi Dharmāśivācārya.

656 The Kūram plates of Paramēśvaravarman I (r. c. 655–90): MAHALINGAM 1998:46, ll. 55–57 (Sanskrit) and ll. 84–88 (Tamil).
have lost his brahmin status and is then known as a Devalaka. He is described as an *upabrahmanaḥ* ‘a sub-brahmin’ or, even more disparagingly, as a *brāhmaṇacandālaḥ* ‘a brahmin untouchable’, and this loss of status is confirmed in modern times in the way that the Śmārtha brahmans, the dominant community in Tamilādu have viewed the Ādīśaiva community that provides the priests who after undergoing Saiddhāntika Śiva initiation (*dikṣā*) and consecration as Ācāryas (*ācāryabhisekah*) perform the worship in the Śiva temples of the region. They were forbidden to live in brahmin streets and the Śmārthas would not intermarry or interdine with them. The Ādīśaivas, as one might expect, resisted this condemnation, arguing in their scriptural productions and in learned exegesis that it applies only to brahmans other than members of their endogamous community, more precisely that the three-year rule applies to Śaiva initiates other than themselves. Strengthening the brahmanical position they held that Śiva has ruled that ordinary, uninitiated brahmans who work as temple-priests will forfeit their status after only six months. As modern practice

---

657 Yāmuna, Āgamaaprāmāṇya, pp. 15–16: *tathā ca devalah “devakosopajyay sa devalaka ucjate” iti | tathā “vṛtyartham pūjayed devam tvāṃ tvāṃ varṣānī yo dvijah | sa vai devalako nāma sarvakarmasu garhitah “ iti ‘And Devala [teaches]: “One who lives off the wealth of a god is called a Devalaka”, and: “Any brahmin who does the worship of a god for his living for three years is called a Devalaka, and is condemned in all rites”’. By ‘condemned in all rites’ the text means that such a brahmin must not be chosen as an officiant in any brahmanical ritual or invited as a participant in a Śrāddha.

658 Atri cited in Āgamaaprāmāṇya, p. 16: *tathā ca viṣadataram amisām evopabrahmanyaṃ varṇayaty atrīḥ: “āhvāyakā devalakāḥ kalpadevalakā gaṇabhogadevalakā bhāgavatavrītī iti caturthāḥ. etā upabrahmanāḥ” iti ‘And Atri makes it absolutely clear that it is those that are sub-brahmins, when he says: “Couriers, Devalakas, Kalpadevalakas, Gaṇabhogadevalakas, and fourth, who lives by being a Bhāgavata: these are sub-brahmins’; and Mahābhārata 12.77.8: *āhvāyakā devalakā naksatrāgrāmāyājakaḥ ete brāhmaṇacandālā mahāpathikapañcamāḥ ‘All the following are brahmin untouchables: couriers, temple-priests, those who perform worship to the asterisms, those who perform worship on behalf of a whole village, and, fifth, those who undertake long journeys’.

659 See THURSTON 1909, p. 51, and FULLER 1984, pp. 49–71. The Dikṣitars, the priests of Śiva at Cidambaram, rank above the Ādīśaivas, probably because they are the trustees of their temple; but they are still considered inferior to non-priestly brahmans; see FULLER 1984, p. 192, n. 3.

660 Vedajñāna II, Ātmārtha-pūjāpaddhati A, p. 123 and B, p. 99, quoting the Vīraṭantra and the Sāṃśāraratna: vīraṭantra “bhrtyartham sarvadākālam ādīśavah śīvam yajet | tac ca svadharmanuṣṭhānam na dosāya prakalpate | adikṣitās caturvedi śiva-liṅgam na samsprṣet | dikṣitaś cāpī yo vīpro bhrtyartham tu na pūjayet || ātmārthapūjām kuryāt “parārthaḥ naiva (A: parārthaḥ caiva B) pūjayet” | sāṃśāra “adikṣito pi yo vīprah śaṃvāsāma tu śīvam sprṣet | so ‘pi devalakah praktaḥ sa nāḥa deva-pūjane | dikṣitaś cāpī yo vīpro bhrtyartham (em.: pratyartham A: bhrtyānved B) vatsaratrayāt | pūjayed yadi deveśaṁ so ‘pi devalako bhaved” iti ‘Vīraṭantra: An Ādīśaiva may worship Śiva for a living permanently; and that, since it is his reli-
reveals, this counterargument had no effect on the Śmārtha majority; and, indeed, it is obvious that its real purpose was rather to defend their professional rights against encroachment by others, rights that they took care to write into their scriptures.\textsuperscript{661} For, no doubt in consequence of the efflorescence of the Śaiva temple cult under the Coḷa emperors, we find a new wave of Śaiva scriptures appearing in the South, in which the ceremonial life of the temple and the duties and rights of its priests are regulated, and, indeed, form their principal subject matter. Citations from the majority of the scriptural texts of this kind do not appear before the works of Vedajñānaguru II, composed during the second half

\begin{verbatim}
gious duty, cannot be sinful [for him]. An uninitiated [brahmin], [even if he is one] who knows [all] four Vedas, may not [even] touch the Liṅga of Śiva; and even a brahmin who has been initiated may not worship [it] for a living [unless he is an Ādiśaiva]. He should worship [Śiva] for his own benefit [as a private individual]. He may not also worship him for the benefit of others [as a priest in the temple]. \textit{Samṭāna}: If an uninitiated brahmin has physical contact with a Śiva [installed in a fixed Liṅga in a temple] for six months he is called a Devalaka and is disqualified from offering worship to [any] deity [thereafter]. Even an initiated brahmin becomes a Devalaka if he [is not an Ādiśaiva but] worships Śiva for a living, once three years [of his doing so] have passed\textsuperscript{;} and Kachchapesvaraśivācārya, \textit{Kriyā-kramadyotikāvyākhyā}, p. 80, ll. 4–7, quoting the \textit{Vīrataṇtra}: \textit{adikṣītakaturvedinaprśen nāpi cārcayet bhṛtyarthaṁ paramesānaṁ dīkṣāvivaiḥitaṁ jaṅaṁ | śaṅmāsād yānti (em.: śaṅmāsāvāyānti Cod.) pātityāṁ te ca devalakāṁ smṛtāḥ || triṁśi varṣāṇi bhṛtyarthaṁ sthirālinge *hi dīkṣitaṁ (em.: hy adikṣitaṁ Cod.) pūjayed yadi *vipras (corr.: viprās Cod.) tu sa vai devalako bhaved iti ‘An uninitiated [brahmin], [even if he is one] who knows [all] four Vedas, may not touch and worship Śiva for a living. The uninitiated fall from their caste after six months [if they do so]. It is they that are known as Devalakas. If an initiated brahmin [who is not an Ādiśaiva] performs the worship [of Śiva] in a fixed Liṅga for a living for three years[, that is to say, as a priest serving in a temple,] then he [too] will become a Devalaka\textsuperscript{’. In the older, north-Indian literature the \textit{Prāyaścitattapāṭaḷa} of the \textit{Dvādaśasāhasra Svacchanda}, quoted by Hṛdayaśiva in his \textit{Prāyaścitattasamuccaya}, f. 92v3–4, defines Devalakas when considering the matter of contamination by them, as those who as priests (bhojakāḥ) live off the Moon-god, Brahmā, the Sun-god, Skanda, Viṣṇu, the Goddess, or the Mothers: \textit{somabrahrmaraviskandaviṣṇudevyāṁ ca mātaraṁ | upajīvanti ye devi pūjāyitvā tu bhojakāḥ | te vai devalakāṁ teśāṁ prāyaścittaṁ vadāmy aham}. The omission of Śiva from this list implies that it is only the priests of other gods that fall from caste. Likewise, defending the Pāṇcarātraita priests of Viṣṇu’s temples against the same consequence, Yāmuna argued, citing Vyāsa, that it is only those who earn their live off Rudra (i.e. Śiva) and Kāli by serving as their priests that become Devalakas (bhaved devalako yo vai rudrakālyupajīvakāḥ): Viṣṇava temple-priests do not become Devalakas, because they have been consecrated for their work by initiation. See Yāmuna, \textit{Āgama-prāmāṇya}, pp. 15–17 (the accusation), and pp. 156–157 (the rebuttal).

\textsuperscript{661} See, for example, the \textit{Kāmika} cited here p. 274, the \textit{Vīra} and \textit{Raurava} cited in \textit{BRUNNER} 1964, p. 468, n. 11, and the \textit{Yogaja, Cintya, Vīra, Samṭāna}, and other Āgamas cited by Vedajñānaguru II in his \textit{Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati} A, pp. 121–123 and B, pp. 97–99.
\end{verbatim}
of the sixteenth century. But some others are already being cited in the thirteenth, and one in the twelfth.

Here too, of course, the royal connection is maintained and carefully nurtured. Thus the ceremonial repertoire of these temples included special rituals for the king’s protection (rājarakṣa); and temple festivals (utsavaḥ) were often timed to coincide with the day of his natal asterism or of that of a member of his family. Indeed the texts place a great emphasis on the connection between the temple and the welfare of the ruler and his kingdom, warning repeatedly that while the proper maintenance of the temple and its ceremonies will benefit both, deviations or neglect will have dire consequences for them. This duty to maintain the status quo naturally included that of recognizing the exclusive hereditary rights of the members of this priestly community.

The Ādiśaivas are the only endogamous community of Saiddhāntika Śaiva temple-priests for which we have evidence and they seem not to have operated beyond south India. But it seems likely that there were parallel developments in other parts of the subcontinent, evidence of which has been lost or not yet come

These scriptures that first appear in the works of Vedajñanaguru are the Aṃśumat, the Ajīta, the Kāśmiratana, the Cintyaviśva/Cintyaviśvasādākhyā, the Dīpta, the Devikālottara, the Bhīma, the Makuta, the Mukhabimba, the Yogaja, the Raurava, the Vijaya (Vijayottara), the Videśaṇa, the Vīra, the Saṃtāna, the Sahasra, the Siddha, the Sūkṣma, and the Skandakālottara. The works of Vedajñānaguru in which they are cited are the Atmārthapūjāpadhattī, Dīkṣādarśa, and Śaivāgama-paribhāṣāmaṇjarī. For his date see DAGENS 1979, pp. 6–7.

The extant Kāmika is perhaps the first work of this kind to be cited in a dateable work. Substantial passages found in it are quoted without attribution in the Jñānaratnavallī of Jñānaśiva, a teacher of Trilocanaśiva and therefore a near contemporary of Aghoraśiva, who completed his Kriyākramadottikā in 1157. The next earliest known work in which there are citations from such scriptures is the Śivapūjāstavavāyākhyā composed by a nameless author in the thirteenth century, probably in its second half. This date follows from the fact that he identifies himself as the great-great-grandson of the same Trilocanaśiva. He cites the Kāraṇa, the Acintya, the Suprabheda, the south-Indian Pauṣkara, and the Vātulasuddhākhyā. I derive this information concerning the citations in the Śivapūjāstavavāyākhyā and Jñānaśiva’s unattributed citations of the Kāmika from a lecture given by Dr. Dominic Goodall in the Early Tantra Workshop held in Kathmandu in September 2008. For the relationships between Aghoraśiva, Jñānaśiva, and Trilocanaśiva see GOODALL 2000 and for confirmation of the date of Aghoraśiva’s Kriyākramadottikā see GOODALL 1998, pp. xiii–xvii, fn. 24. No Sanskrit Saiddhāntika works have yet been identified which can be dated within the period of three centuries between the author of the Śivapūjāstavavāyākhyā and Vedajñānaguru II.

Chapters devoted to this protective temple ritual for the king are found in such south-Indian Śaiva texts as the Sūkṣmāgama (pp. 290–297: rājarakṣāvidhīh), and the Dīptāgama (pp. 211–215: rājarakṣāvidhipaṭalāh).

See DAVIS and ORR 2007, p. 91, for epigraphical evidence of such arrangements.

See, for example, the passage of the Kāmika cited above, p. 274.
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to light.667

ŚAIVISM AND NEW SETTLEMENTS

The early Śaiva Pratiṣṭhātantras show that the authority of the Śaiva Sthāpaka was to extend to the creation of the palaces of their kings. Among the early Pratiṣṭhātantras the Mayasamgraha, Mohacūdottara, and Pingalāmata,

667 Against the view that the Ādiśaiva caste is peculiar to Tamil Nadu one might cite the fact that the Ādiśaivas are mentioned the Somasambhupaddhati, a work composed in the eleventh century far to the north (at the end of the Pavitrārohanavidhi): paṇcayojanasamsthe 'pi pavitraṃ gurusanmīdhau | kurvīta vidhinānena labhate vāṃchitam phalam | sarvaṃ vai tv ādiśaivānām dikṣitānāṃ śivoditam | paropakāraśilenā śrīmatā somaśambhunā | kriyākāndaṃkramāvalyāṃ pavitrakavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ. However, the line is not in the edition based on Kashmirian manuscripts (see Karmakāndaṃkramāvalī vv. 494c–496b: paṇcayojanasamsthe 'pi pavitraṃ gurusanmīdhau || kurvīta vidhinānena labhate vāṃchitam phalam | adhītaśivasāstrena kṛto 'yam somaśambhunā || karmakāndaṃkramāvalyāṃ pavitrakavidhiḥ sphutah) nor in the Nepalese transmission (see Kriyākāndaṃkramāvalī f. 22v4–5: paṇcayojanasamstho 'pi pavitraṃ gurusanmīdhau | kurvīta vidhinānena labhate vāṃchitam phalam | paropakāraśilenā śrīmatā somaśambhunā | kriyākāndaṃkramāvalyāṃ pavitrakavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ). It is found only in BRUNNER’s edition and the Devakoṭṭai edition, which her edition reproduces here. It rests, therefore, exclusively on the evidence of Grantha manuscripts from the south. Evidently, then, one must suspect that the line has been interpolated in Tamil Nadu by a redactor in the Ādiśaiva community. Its lack of intelligible connection with what precedes and follows strengthens this suspicion.

I have not seen the term Ādiśaiva in any inscription. There the officiants of the Śiva temples are always termed śivabṛāhmāṇah or śivadvijah. That term first occurs to my knowledge c. A.D. 863 in an inscription of Pallava Nandivarman III, from Tiruvallam in North Arcot (MAHALINGAM 1988:132). Concerning a grant to the temple of Paramesvara at Tikkālivallam it specifies that 500 kādi of paddy are for the Śivabṛāhmāṇas who offer worship and services in the sanctum (āṛādi[t]ṭ-upāśarikkum [śiva]bṛāhmānarkku) (ll. 25–26). Thereafter the term is commonplace. But it is clear that it is the group known as the Ādiśaivas that is intended, because in these inscriptions when Śivabṛāhmāṇas are named their Gotras are sometimes given and these are those of both the Ādiśaivas as attested by their prescriptive texts and among their modern descendants, namely Kauśika, Kāśyapa, Bhrāadvāja, Gautama, Ātreya, Āgastya, and Parāśara. See, e.g., SII 3:41 (Kāśyapa), 55 (Kauśika), 58 (Kauśika), 209 (Kauśika, Kāśyapa, Kauśika); SII 12:197 (Āgastya); SII 17:152 (Bhrāadvāja), 157 (Bhrāadvāja), 160 and 161 (Gautama), 162 and 163 (Bhrāadvāja), 165 (Gautama, Parāśara), 203 (Ātreya, Bhrāadvāja), and 730 (Kāśyapa); EC 3, Sr:44 (Gautama); EC 10, KI:106a (Kauśika), 106d (Gautama), 107 (Kauśika), 187 (Kauśika, Kāśyapa); EC 10, Bp:29, 32, 35a, and 37a (all Gautama, Bhrāadvāja). Six of the seven, minus Āgastya, are listed in the Saṃtāna as cited in the Ātmārthaṃkārppaddhati A, p. 125. Five of them, lacking Ātreya and Parāśara, are listed in Svāyambhuva, p. 14 (Aśāyalaṃkānampātala 94c–95b). This evidence accords with contemporary testimony. According to the data collected by FULLER (1984, p. 28) the Ādiśaiva priests of the Mīnakṣīśundaresvara temple in Madurai belong to the Kāśyapa, Kauśika, Bhrāadvāja, Gautama, and Ātreya Gotras.
all prescribe the layout of the royal palace in detail, the latter two distinguishing between different classes, the highest being that of a paramount sovereign or Mahārājādhirāja; and in the first two works the design prescribed includes a section of the palace reserved for teachers of the Śaiva Mantramārga (mantriṇaḥ, mantramārgopadesināḥ). But the layout of the palace taught in these Prātiṣṭhātantras is only part of the layout for an urban settlement to be established by the king around the palace, complete with markets and segregated areas for the dwellings of the various castes and artisans, with instructions for the size and plan of these dwellings determined by caste status. The founding of such royal towns is not explicitly enjoined in the Śaivas’ ritual manuals. That is to say that no ritual of nagaraprātiṣṭhā was envisaged. The Sthāpaka was engaged, it seems, only for the choice and consecration of the site (vāstuṣṭūja) and his instructions followed for the layout of the buildings to be constructed upon it. Nonetheless, we see the Śaivas involving themselves in one aspect of the third of the elements of medieval process that I have listed, namely the creation of new urban settlements from above. The epigraphical record and Kalhaṇa’s history of Kashmir demonstrate that any king of substance felt it incumbent on him to demonstrate his sovereignty not only by the building of temples but also by the creation of new urban settlements (puram), which, like the deities he established, were generally named after him.

One of the early Prātiṣṭhātantras, the Devyāmata, devotes its 66th chapter

668 The layout of the royal palace is prescribed in Mayasamgraha ff. 33v–34r (5.188–199), Mohacūḍottara ff. 20v–22r (4.245c–281), and Pingalāmata ff. 74r–75v (10.126–180).


670 Mayasamgraha ff. 34v–35r (5.209–216); Mohacūḍottara f. 21v1–6 (4.270–275b); Pingalāmata ff. 75v–76r (10.181–194).

671 This practice was followed both throughout the subcontinent and in Southeast Asia, as the following examples demonstrate: in Kashmir Pravarasena II’s Pravarapura (SRinagar), Durlabhaka-Pratapāditya II’s Pratāpapura, Jayāpīḍa’s Jayapura, Lalitāditya’s Lalitapura, Avantivarman’s Avantipura, Śankaravarman’s Śankarapura, and Didda’s Diddapura, in eastern India Rāmāvati (Rāmauti) (of Rāmapāla), Vijayapura of Vijayasena, and Laksmanāvati (Lakhnauti) (of Laksmanasena), in the south Gangaikondacolapura, Parakesaripura, Parantakapura, Rājakesaripura, Rājarājapura, Rājadītyapura, Rājāśrayapura, Rājendracolapura, Vikramacolapura, Vikramapāṇḍyapura, Vikramasimhapura, Vīrājaṇendracolapura, Vira-rajaṇendrapura, and, among the Khmers Isānapura, Bhavapura, Yāsodharapura, Rājendrapura, and Jayendranagarī.
to the layout to be followed not only in new towns but also in new villages, with an emphasis on the positioning of the various deities within the plan and the directions in which they should face. The regulations imposed show us Śaiva officials on a purely civic level. There is nothing specifically Śaiva in the layout. The Devyāmata’s chapter on iconography shows further evidence of the involvement of the Śaivas in both urban and rural planning. Differentiating various forms of Śiva in accordance with mood and number of arms it tells the Sthāpaka which are appropriate where.\footnote{672} The same concern can be seen in the Pratiṣṭhā sections of the South-Indian Yāmalatantra texts with regard to the positioning and iconography of the images of Bhadraṅkāli whose installation and cult are their concern.\footnote{673}

### Śaivism and Irrigation

The creation of new settlements and the concomitant extension of agriculture required the provision of the means of irrigation. Rituals for the consecration (pratiṣṭhā) of wells (kūpah), step-wells (vāpi), and reservoirs (puṣkarini, taḍāgaḥ) were already provided by the brahmanical tradition. A Vaidika procedure of the Grhya type is outlined or touched upon in a number of sources,\footnote{674} a more elaborate, Paurānik form of the ritual, taking five days and requiring twenty-four priests in addition to the Sthāpaka, is set out at length in the Mat-\footnote{675}asyapurāṇa (58.4–56),\footnote{676} and the currency of this form is evident from the fact that it became the basis of further elaboration.\footnote{676} There is no trace of irriga-

---

\footnote{672} Devyāmata f.68r4: dvibhujoyārajadhānyāṃ tu pattane tu caturbhujah | tathā cāṣṭabhujo bhadre prāṣastah pattane sthitah.

\footnote{673} Thus in Brahmayāmala IFP 40.1–4b: ataḥ param pravakṣyāmi pratimālaksaṇam param | navatālapramāṇena pratimām kārayed budhaḥ \| 2 silāmayaṃ lohamayaṃ mṛṇmayat vāpi kārayet \| grāme cāṣṭabhujoṃ vidyāṃ nagare ca caturbhujam \| 3 vanāntare dvibhujoṃ vidyāṃ parvatāgre tu śoḍaśa | samudre dvaḍaśaṃ kuryāt ājandandya (?) ...ṣadbhujam \| 4 taṇāke dasabhujam kuryāṃ catuspathe caturbhujam; and Brahmayāmala Triv.3.3–8: grāme ca nagare caiva pattane rājadāṇike | raksḍrthaṃ vāstavasthānam pure vai kheṭakādiṣu \| 4 sarvasadāhāraṇaṃ vidyād yathāvibhavavistaram | bahiḥ prakārataḥ kuryāṃ mātrsthāṇam tu vāstavam \| 5 śreṣṭham pūrvottare bhāge śatadaṇḍaṃ nantare | tadardhe vātha tasyārdhe dasādaṇḍaṃ tāpi vā \| 6 some svād vāstavam brahman mātrnāṃ iha coditam | pūrve vā paścime vāpi sthānāṃ asya prāṣasyate \| 7 yo me pūrvottare vāpi nagaragṛmāsobhitam | daksine keṭaksayoktam anyeṣaṃ prāci paścime \| 8 āgneyanairṛtiś caiva tṛṭiyāṃ vāyugocaram | + + fiḥṭham prāṣamsantī yāmale śivabhāṣīte. On these south-Indian Yāmala texts, the cult they teach, and their non-brahmin priests see S\footnote{674}ANDERSON 2007b, pp. 277–278 with footnotes 140–143.

\footnote{674} See EINO\footnote{2002 for the details of these sources.}O 2002 for the details of these sources.

\footnote{675} A procedure of the Paurānik type is also taught in Āśvalayāṇiyagṛhyaparīṣṭā 4.9 and Hiranyakesīghṛtyaśasasūtra 1.7.1. (EINO\footnote{2002, pp. 713–714}).

\footnote{676} We find procedures based on the prescriptions of the Matsyapurāṇa in the rit-
tion rituals in the early Šaiva scriptures, including the Pratiṣṭhātantras. But in due course Šaiva officiants, seeking to add this important domain to their ritual repertoire, produced their own version. It first surfaces in our surviving evidence towards the end of the eleventh century, in the Paddhati of Somašambhu, and from that source entered both later Paddhatis such as the Siddhāntasekhara and the Ātmārthapūjāpadhātī and the second wave of Šaiva scriptural literature produced in southern India. In spite of the Šaivized character of these new rituals the underlying model is still recognizably that of the brahmanical tradition. The Šaiva elements are little more than a veneer on what it essentially a brahmanical procedure, marked by such distinctive features as the erecting of a Nāga pole (nāgayasyaḥ) at the centre of the excavation, the casting of metal images of aquatic creatures into the water, the crossing of the excavation by a cow followed by the patron of the rite, the making of offerings to Varuṇa, and the giving of the cow to the officiant. Nor is there any attempt to attribute to

677 See Somašambhupaddhatī, BRUNNER 1998, pp. 392–403 and pp. 406–411. The first passage sets out the ritual for the consecration of a puskarini, but adds at its end that it applies also for the consecration of a vāpi or tātākah. The second passage gives the ritual for the consecration of a kūpah. A kūpah is a simple well, whereas a vāpi is a step-well, a well with a flight of steps leading down to it on one of more sides (kūpo ‘dvārako gartaviśeṣah baddhasopānako ‘yam vāpiṁ dvaitanirṇayah: Raghunandana cited in KANE 2ii, p. 893). Such step-wells survive from the early medieval period, notably in Gujarat. The most splendid is no doubt the Rāṇī kī Vāv at Patan (Anahilapattana), the old Caułukya capital. Both a puskarini and a tātākah (itadāgah) are water reservoirs. The difference appears to be one of scale alone, the latter being larger than the former. KANE (loc. cit.) reports the view expressed by Raghunandana in his Jalāsayotsargatattva that a puskarini is from 100 to 200 cubits in length, and a tādāghaḥ is from 200 to 800, and the view of the Vasiṣṭhasamhitā as quoted by Raghunandana that a puskarini is up to 400 cubits in length and a tādāghaḥ up to 2000.

678 See Siddhāntasekhara of Viśvanātha (13th century, Benares), pp. 565–568 (11.1–28b); Ātmārthapūjajpadhatī of Vedajñānaguru II (16th century, Cidambaram), A, pp. 621–629, citing from the scripture Cintyavisvāsādākhyā a passage obviously incorporated from the Somaśambhupaddhati (see BRUNNER 1998, p. 392, fn. 1); ‘Kriyākramadyotikā’ MS transcript, pp. 344–346 (Kūpapratiṣṭhā); Virāgama, Patala 92. The section of the Somaśambhupaddhati on the consecration of reservoirs is also included in the Kashmirian *Vāpyādipratiṣṭhā (ff. 907v10–908r9).

679 See Somaśambhupaddhatī, BRUNNER 1998, pp. 397–403 (vv. 8–19). Šaiva elements: the officiant recites the Pāśupatāstra Mantra as the patron crosses with the cow, makes oblations with the Aghora Mantra, instead of making an offering to the Vedic god Varuṇa may to do so to the Šaiva Vāmadeva, and after preparing a

---
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the ceremony any specifically Śaiva purpose or meaning. A work of public utility (pūrtam) after all is just that.

That Śaiva officiants were engaged to perform the consecration of irrigation works undertaken by their royal patrons seems very likely. No inscription known to me records any such ritual, but then no inscription to my knowledge conveys information about any religious ceremonies that accompanied the inauguration of reservoirs and other such works. It is even more probable that the Śaiva version of the ritual would have been performed when Śaiva Gurus undertook such constructions in their own right. We have seen above that inscriptions record the creation of reservoirs by Vimalaśiva, Mūrtiśiva, Prabhodhaśiva, Patan ğaśiva, and Tribhuvanakartarādeva.

ŚAIVISM AND SOCIAL INTEGRATION

The fifth and last respect in which Śaivism can be seen to have played an active role is that of the assimilation of the communities that were caught up in the extension of the reach of the state that characterizes this period. For the Saiddhāntikas opened initiation to candidates from all four caste-classes, including the Śudras or at least the Sacchūdras or 'Pure Śudras', those, that is, who had already succumbed to the values of brahmanical society to the extent that they had abjured alcohol, a move that both promoted the penetration of these

---

680 Vaktrasāmbhu, Mrgendraçaddhativyākhyā, p.188: śrīmatpauskare 'pi: brāhmanāḥ ksatriyāḥ vaiśyāḥ śudrāḥ caiva striyas tathā | *jāndhabadhirā (em.: jālāndhavrtrako Cod.) mūkā dīkṣyāḥ *śaktipracoditāḥ (śakti em.: saktthaa Cod.) 'And in the Pauskara(pārāmeśvara): Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śudras, women, imbeciles, the blind, the deaf, and the dumb: all should be initiated if they have been inspired by [Śiva's] power'; and Raurava quoted by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakāṇṭha on Maṭan-ga-pārāmeśvara, Kriyāpāda 5.93 in support of the view that candidates for initiation should be brought before the Mandala in the order of their castes: yad uktam śrīmadrauravādau: brāhmanān ksatriyān vaiśyān śudrāṁ caiva striyas tathā 'As has been taught in such scriptures as the Raurava: brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śudras, and women'.

681 Parākhyā cited by Trilocanaśiva in Prāyaścittasamuccaya, p.141: yad uktam śrīmatparaṅkhe: kāryā dīkṣāpi sarvesaṁ *tacchaktividyoginām (tacchakti corr.: tacchaktir Cod.) | tvāyānāṁ api varnānāṁ na tu śudrāntyajātiṣu | amadypās tu ye śudrāḥ saivācārakriyādārāḥ (corr.: ādirāḥ Cod.) | śivabhaktās *ca (corr.: cai Cod.) teṣāṁ sā dīkṣā *kāryānyathā na hiti (em.: kāryannathānuhita Cod.) 'As has been taught in the Parākhyā: ‘Initiation should be done for all who have received the action of [the descent of] his power, for all three caste-classes but not for [ordinary] Śudras and the lowest-born [below them]. One may initiate Śudras, but only those who do not drink alcoholic liquor, who revere the disciplines and rites taught by Śiva, and are devoted to Śiva themselves'.
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values and enabled the integration of the landowning agriculturalists, classed as Sacchudras, that were dominant in the countryside both within and beyond the core territories of these expanding states. It thus provided a means of articulating a social unity that transcended the rigid exclusions of the brahmanical social order. Nor did it allow non-brahmins only to be initiated. More crucially it sanctioned their appointment as Acaryas, restricting this licence only by requiring that persons could officiate for persons of none but their own or inferior caste-classes. Thus a brahmin could teach, initiate, and perform ceremonies of installation only for brahmins, Ksatriyas, Vaisyas and Sudras, a Ksatriya only for Ksatriyas, Vaisyas and Sudras, a Vaisya only for Vaisyas and Sudras, and a Sudra only for others of his caste-class. The key groups here appear to have been the first and the last. For there is little evidence of the presence of Vaisya traders in Saivism, and though, as we have seen, Ksatriya rulers were commonly Saiva initiates, their social status and function were obviously incompatible with pontifical office. The core social structure here is one of brahmin Gurus initiating other brahmins, Ksatriyas rulers, and perhaps on occasion members of lower castes, and of Sudra Gurus initiating other Sudras and the powerful in their communities, who though kshatriya-like in their local authority were nonetheless formally of the same caste-class as their initiators. The Sastric formulation

---

682 Kirana f. [60]v2–3 (38.4–5): *caturṇām api varṇānāṃ (em. : catuvarṇānāmapivarṇānāṃ Cod.) ācāryatvam ihoditam | brāhmaṇādicituṣṭakasya dvijo 'nugrahakṛd bhavit | kṣatriyādīrīkṣant yac ca *kṣatriyo *diṣṭo (corr. : diṣṭot Cod.) guruh | vaiśyādividyāyam vaiśyāh śūdraḥ śūdrān tu diṣṭayet. In this [system] the office of Acarya has been taught for all four caste-classes. A brahmin may initiate persons of the four beginning with his, an initiated Ksatriya Guru the three beginning with his, and a Vaisya the two beginning with his. A Sudra may initiate [only] Sudras.

683 Parākhyā quoted in Dīkṣādatśa A, p. 26; B, p. 42: *amadyapāḥ (em. : amadyapa A : amādyapa B) *kūlināḥ (corr. : kūlināḥ A : kūlināṅ B) ca nityadharmā*parāyānāḥ (em. : parāyānāḥ AB) *śūdraḥ (em. : śūdra AB) kṣatriyavaraj jīneyāḥ śesā nindyā<盛> tato bhrṣam. ‘Those Sudras who do not drink alcohol, who are of good family, and devoted to the obligatory religious duties should be looked upon as Kṣatriyas. All the rest are completely to be condemned’. Cf. Pārāmeśvara f. 3v2–3: *amadyapās (em. : amedhyapās Cod.) tu ye śūdraḥ<盛> saucēcārastamanvitāḥ | rudrabhaktās tu teṣān tu bhojyam annam prakṛtītām ‘One is permitted to accept food from those Sudras who do not drink alcohol, who observe the rules of purity, and are devotees of Śiva’; Trilocanaśiva, Somaśambhupaddhativyākhya, p. 84: tad uktam brahmaśambhupaddhatītām ‘brahmaśambhupaddhatītām bhiksām *abhisēkādīvāritām (em. : abhisēkādīvāritām Cod.) | amadyapās tu ye śūdraḥ saucēcārastamanvitāḥ | teṣām eva cared bhikṣā nānyeṣām tu kadācana’ iti ‘That has been taught in the Paddhati of Brahmaśambhu in the following: ‘One may gather alms only from brahmans, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas, provided it is not from someone who been condemned [for some sin] or [permanently excluded from his caste], and also from such Sudras as do not drink alcohol and observe the rules of purity. One may never accept alms from others’

---
of the full set of possibilities, in which members of any caste-class are said to be able to initiate only their equals and inferiors, serves, I suggest, not as a record that all these possibilities were enacted but rather as an abstraction that adds authority to the more restricted common practice by presenting it as following a universally valid principle upheld in the brahmanical social system, seen, for example in the rule that a man may marry a woman born of parents of his own caste or one below it but never a woman from a community ranked above him. Indeed Saiddhāntika texts that discuss who may receive initiation and consecration and who may not include the offspring of such forbidden marriages in the latter category.

Evidence of the existence of such self-contained Śūdra Saiddhāntika lineages is abundant in the Tamil country at the end of our period and after it down to modern times. There members of the Sacchūdra Veḷḷāla community such as Meykaṇṭār, and Nāṇacampantar played a significant part in the development of the canon of the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta, and a good number of powerful Maṭhas emerged, such as those at Tarumapuram (Dharmapuram) and Tiruvāḍuturai, in which the presiding ascetics were and have continued to be members of this upwardly mobile Sacchūdra caste.

684 See, e.g., Yājñavalkyasṃṛti, Ācārādhyāya 57, 91–95.

685 Dīksādarśa A, p. 23; B, p. 25: atraḥdhikāri*tvanirūpaṇavādhir (corr. : nirūpaṇatvavidhir Codd.) ucyate | viprādīnām dasānām guṛutvam uktam | tathā cintyaviśve “viprādiṣu caturṣu evam anulomādiṣu satṣu ca | eteṣām dasājātīnām ācāravyavam vidhiyate” | tathā kāmike “catvāro brāhmaṇādyāś ca anulomāś ca ye matāḥ” ‘I shall [now] explain how one determines who is competent for this [office]. Ten, beginning with the brahmin, can be Gurus. Thus in the Cintyaviśa: “It is ruled that these ten castes may be Ācāryas: the four beginning with brahmin, and the six Anulomas”. And in the Kāmika: “The four beginning with the brahmin and the [six] Anulomas”. The term Anuloma here is a synonym of anulomajaḥ ‘born of a union that is in the natural direction’, that is to say, hypergamous. The six Anulomas are (1) from a brahmin man and Kṣatriya woman (Mūrdhāvasikta), (2) from a brahmin man and Vaiśya woman (Ambaṣṭha), (3) from a brahmin man and Śūdra woman (Pārasāva), (4) from a Kṣatriya man and a Vaiśya woman (Māhiṣya/Madgu), (5) from a Kṣatriya man and a Śūdra woman (Ugra), and (6) from a Vaiśya man and a Śūdra woman (Karaṇa). See, e.g., Yājñavalkyasṃṛti, Ācārādhyāya 91–92. The -ādi- in anulomādiṣu satṣu ca in the passage cited from the Cintyaviśa is redundant and may be corrupt (perhaps for anulomātmasu).

686 ARE 1909, p. 105; STEIN 1994, pp. 235–241; GHOSE 1996, pp. 222, 253–282. STEIN hypothesizes (1994, pp. 237–239) that this rise of the Veḷḷālas was the cause of the fact that from the thirteenth century onwards independent shrines of the Goddess (kāmakoṣṭham) began to be built in the Tamil area alongside those of Śiva and to be enclosed with the latter in a single architectural complex. He takes this to be evidence of “the assimilation of folk conceptions of deity”. See also GHOSE 1996, pp. 221–222. There is certainly widespread evidence of Śaktization in the later south-Indian Śaiva literature. In the south-Indian Saiddhāntika scriptures Raurava, Cintya, Mukṭa, and Śūkṣma all the male deities in the circuits surrounding
It might be suspected that this is an isolated development peculiar to the Far South; and I must say that I am not yet aware of historical evidence of parallel developments elsewhere in India at this time or before it. However, it is extremely improbable that we would have found unambiguous statements in early texts that are very unlikely to have emanated from that region to the effect that Śūdras may receive consecration as Ācāryas, initiate others of their caste and pass on their office within it, if this was not indeed a widespread practice. This is all the more certain in the light of the fact that the same early corpus provides specific instructions on how such initiates should be named, how they should dress their hair, mark themselves with ash, and the like.

Śiva in temple worship, from the first of the Brahmas to the last of the Weapons have been provided with a personal Śakti; see Raurava, Kriyāpāda, Pañalā 59, and N.R. BHATT’s introduction to his edition of the Śārdhatriśatikāloṭṭara, pp. xviii–xix (Cintya and Makuta) and pp. lxviii–lxix (Cintya, Makuta, and Śūkṣma). There is striking evidence of a related development in the Tamil Śaiva literature in the Tirumantiram of Tirumūla. That text has been assigned to the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries. But it weaves together the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta, the Vedānta, a Śaṅkta tradition that features kundaliniyogah and the cult of Tripurā, and the cult of Naṭarāja. This is a combination which is unlikely to predate the twelfth century (see also GOODALL 2004, pp. xxix–xxx). In Sanskrit the same amalgam appears in such works as the scripture Jñānasiddhyāgama and the Siddhāntapaddhati of a Jñānaśīva.

687 Sarvajñānottara A f. 35r3–5 (14.35–40), B pp. 99–100 (Liṅgodhārādipakarana vv. 34c–40b): āpādamastakam yāva bhasmasnānām dvijasya tu | nābher ārdhvam nrpayoebhaṁtya ṛṣabhaṁ ṛṣabhaṁ | 36 vaisvajñānaṁ paṭṭikāṁ prakṛtoc śūdrasya tu tripundrabham | bhasmasaṁ brahmajaptena yathāsthānaṁ (A : sthāneṣu B) anukramat || 37 brāhmaṇasya jatā|h> *śūkṣma|h> (A : śasna B) kanakāḥ parikīrtitaṁ | śhālas taddvignāṇaṁ jñeyā ksatriyasya tu cyantarāḥ || 38 vaisvajñānaṁ sikhāsthāne tathā śūdrasya kirtitaṁ | hrasva ślakṣaṁ*āksasamyuktāḥ (ākṣa A : ānu B) samyatasya jīten driyaiḥ (conj. : jīten driyaḥ Cod.) || 39 *yajnopavitam sautram (A : yajnopavitāsūtram B) tu vipre pāncasaram smṛtam | trisaram ksatriyasyo kyam vaisvajñānaṁ dvisaram smṛtam || 40 śūdrasyaikasaram yajnopavītam sautram | νyajnopavītasautram tu | trisaram ksatriyasyoktam vaisvajñānaṁ dvisaram smṛtam || 40 śūdrasyaikasaram jñeyam nityam avyabhicārināh | *arcagīcāryakāle tu (A : arcāyām angikāryo vā B) smdhīyākāle ca nānyathā ‘ A brahmin’s bath with ashes should be from foot to head. A Ks.atriya’s has been taught to be from the navel up and with reddish ash. A Vaiṣya may have only a broad band [of ash] on his forehead. A Śūdra may make the Tripundra marks with ash on the various prescribed points on the body in the [prescribed] order. In each the bath should be done] with ash empowered by the [five] Brahma[mantra}s. A brahmin’s braids should be narrow and [of the round variety], called ‘thorn apples’ (kanakāḥ). A Ksatriya’s should be twice as thick *... (?) A Vaiṣya should have only one braid, on the crown of his head. It should be short, smooth, with a Rudrākṣa bead attached. The same applies to a Śūdra ascetic, *O you of controlled senses (?) The sacred thread should always have five strands for a brahmin, three for a Kṣatriya, two for a Vaiṣya, and one for an observant Śūdra. The last, however, may wear it only when doing Pūjā, making offerings into the sacrificial fire, and during the periods of the junctures of the day’; Kiranā f. 60r3–4 (37.10, 12–13): upavītam *bhaved (corr. : bhaved Cod.) evam ksatriyadītrayasya tu | trisaram dvisaram vāpi kāryaṁ ekasaram kramat || 12 pūjātanaṁātrakaṁ kāḷam nṛdhvaṁ...
As for those below the Pure Śūdras, that is to say, members of Śūdra castes not considered pure and, below even them, members of the various more or less untouchable communities defined as the lowest-born (antityājāḥ), these too were drawn by the Saiddhāntikas within the reach of the religion. Texts of this tradition declare that a Guru is forbidden to give them initiation in the full sacrificial form (hautrī dīkṣā). But if he sees that they are inspired by sincere devotion to Śiva he is required to perform for them a simplified form of initiation that avoids direct contact. This is to be accomplished mentally (mānasī dīkṣā) or in the form of a gaze believed to transmit Śiva's liberating power (cākṣuṣī dīkṣā), or by allowing them to drink the water with which his feet have been washed, an extension of the common devotional practice of drinking the water that gathers at the foot of an image in the course of its worship.  

\[\text{tesāṁ bhaved iha | jaṭānāṁ dhāraṇāṁ | bhasmalepanaṁ (corr.: bhasmamlepanaṁ Cod.) | brāhmaṇe (corr.: brāhmaṇe Cod.) bhavet | 13 tripūndraka-śikhā caikā ksatriyādīitraye bhavet} \]

This is how the sacred thread should be [for a brahmin]. But for Kṣatriyas and the rest it should be made with three, two, and one strand respectively and may be worn only at the time of worship, not after. A brahmin [only] may wear [full] braids and smear [his whole body] with ashes. The three [castes] beginning with Kṣatriyas may have a Tripūndraka and a single [braid at the crown]; Mrgendra, Caryāpāda 1.3–4a: vratino jaṭālā munḍās tēṣṇārya bhāṣmapāṇḍarāḥ | tilakāh punḍrakaih paṭṭair bhūsītā bhūmipādayāḥ | jaṭā na śūdro bhīhṛyāt ‘Ascetics [should either] have their hair in braids or be shaved bald. The foremost among them[, the brahmins,] should be white with ash [from head to foot]. Kṣatriyas[, Vaiśyas,] and [Śūdras] should be adorned with dots [of ash], Vaiśyas with the [Tripūndraka] lines, and Śūdras with a broad band [of ash on the forehead]. A Śūdra may not wear braids’. For the differentiation of initiation-names according to caste see here p. 291.

\[\text{Kīrana f. [60]v3–4 (38.6c–7):} \]

yathāṣṭhitena bhāvāṇa | mantrāḥ (em.: mantra Cod.) kurvanty anugraham || yatas tato | ntyajasyasyāpi (conj.: ntyajasyasyāsyā Cod.) dīkṣā | kim tv atra (em.: kintatra Cod.) mānasī | kārūkāṁ tu samsparśā<\> | na tu hautrīṁ (em.: nugalautrī Cod.) prakalpayet ‘Since Mantras grant initiation in consideration [only] of the state of [a person’s] mentality he may give initiation even to an untouchable. But [the initiation] in this case [must be only] through the medium of the mind. It the case of workmen [it should be] by touching them. He must not do the initiation involving fire-sacrifice [for either]’; Kāmika quoted in the Dīksādarṣa A, p. 27 and B, p. 43: antyajānāṁ na hautrī śayā kim tu dīkṣā tu caṅkṣuṣī ‘Untouchables may not receive initiation through fire-sacrifice. But they can receive ocular initiation’; Vāyasyasamhitā quoted in the Dīksādarṣa A, p. 26 and B, p. 41: asacchūḍrāntyajājātināṁ patitānāṁ visesataḥ | tathā saṃkaraṇātyajājātinām nādhaivaśuddhir vidhiye | te’py akrtrimabhāvās cec chīye paramakāreṇe | pādodakapradānādyaih kuryāt | pasvāvisodhanam (A : pāduvisodhanam B) | atrānułomājāṭa ye | yuktā ye (em.: yuktaye AB) | vā (A : va B) dvijāṭiṣu | tesāṁ adhaśuśuddhyādi | kāryam atra (em.: kāryamātra AB) | kucitam (A : kulojitam B) The elimination of the paths [of the universe through oblations in the sacrificial fire] is not permitted for Impure Śūdras, untouchables (antityājāṭi-), and, above all, for outcastes (patita-), nor for those of the mixed castes (saṃkaraṇāṭi-). If[ , however,] they have genuine devotion to Śiva, the highest cause,
Orthodox brahmanical practice denied all Śudras access through Upānayana to the Veda and the rituals that are animated by its Mantras and excluded even more radically the various groups it ranked below these as ‘the lowest born’ (antyajaḥ, antyajātiḥ). The texts of the Śaivas justified their liberating inroads into the mass of humanity beyond these brahmanical boundaries by boldly declaring that the system of the separation of the castes (jātibhedāḥ) is a fabrication without basis in reality, a cultural epiphenomenon rather than a deep fact of nature, pointing to its absence among human beings outside of India. Only mentality matters; and consequently all devotees of Śiva form a single community regardless of birth, one whose only true internal

he should eliminate their bonds by such means as giving them the water from his feet. As for those who are born of inter-caste marriages in which the father’s caste is higher or if they are connected with brahmins (?) he may do [for them the full ritual procedure] that begins with the elimination of the paths as appropriate to the [caste of the] family [in which they have been born]. The term samkarajātih, which I have translated literally as ‘of the mixed castes’ refers to offspring of such unions as that between a Māhiṣya (born of a Kṣatriya man and Vaiṣya woman) and Karaṇa woman (born of a Vaiṣya man and Śūdra woman; see, e.g., Mitākṣarā on Yaṅnavalikyasṝti, Acarāhyāya 95.

689 Pauṣkaraṃsvaras quoted in Nityādisamgraha f. 62v12–13: manusya jātiḥ tatra varṇam vāpi sitādikam | yonilingodbhavaḥ sarve ātika ekaḥ samaḥ sṛhitāḥ | tatra sarvagato devo drīṣṭe jñānacaksuṣā | ajñāna∗dhvastacittānām (conj. : pāpa-cittānām Cod.) kuśāstra∗vivāśatmanām (conj. : vāhitāmanām Cod.) | vākpralāpāḥ sthitas teṣām yadi jātiḥ prayojanam ‘No caste has been enjoined with respect to them, nor colour such as white. All are born from sexual union and the souls [of all] are equal. With the eye of knowledge Śiva is seen pervading all of them. If [they declare that] caste is relevant then this is the prattling of men whose understanding is destroyed by ignorance, who are under the sway of false teachings’; Kulasāra f. 72r2: ekabājaprasūtaṁ hi sarvam. idam priyev | tasmāj jātićāraṁ tu bhrāntipārvam idam kṛtam ‘This whole world, my beloved, has been born from a single seed. So this concern for caste that people have springs from an error’; Tantrāloka 15.595c–601b.

690 Cintyaviśvaśadākhya quoted in Dīkṣādarśa of Vedajñānaguru II, A, p. 24; B, p. 38: navakhandaṣu sarvesu bhārataṣu *(mayena ca (B : ca yena ca A)) | jātibhedam idaṁ kalpyam anyadeṣeṣu nāsti tat | tasmāt tat kalpanāmātra jātibhedam *iti kramam (?) ‘Maya [the Guru of the Asuras] created this division of the castes throughout the nine divisions of the continent of Bharata. It does not exist in other countries. Therefore it is nothing but a fabrication/fiction.’

hierarchy is that created by the four levels of empowerment through initiation and consecration.\textsuperscript{692}

However, it should not be imagined that because they insisted that the divisions of the castes are ultimately groundless when explaining the inclusiveness of their recruitment they rejected these divisions in practice. It is one thing to extend one’s recruitment into lower social strata and quite another to reject the divisions between them in practice. Thus in spite of their rhetoric of the underlying unity of man they required that caste divisions be respected not only in relations between initiates and the wider society in matters such as marriage but also in relations between fellow-initiates. As we have seen, they denied impure Śūdras and untouchables the full ceremonial form of initiation, they refused to transmit the office of Ācārya to the offspring of unions between a man of a lower caste and a woman of a higher, and they would not countenance an Ācārya’s initiating his caste superior, in effect a Śūdra’s initiating a brahmin. They also required, for example, that when initiates of different caste-classes gathered they should sit apart, each in a separate line;\textsuperscript{693} the penances (prāyaścittam) that they pre-

\textsuperscript{692} Nityādisamgraha f. 63r11–12: tapontiaddho yair atmā brāhmaṇāṁ tāṁ vidur janāḥ | pasupāśavindhāṇāṁ śivajitnānusārināḥ | te hi devādevasya paja-karmanī kirtitāḥ | ity uktam candrahāsākhye mukutādyāgamṣu ca samayā-diviśeṣaṇa jātīr ekāva kirtitā ‘People judge as [true] brahmmins those who have controlled themselves through austerity, who know the bound soul, the bonds, and the rites [of initiation], and who follow the teachings of Śiva. For it is these that have been declared [fit to officiate] in the rites of the worship of the Supreme Deity. This has been taught in the [scripture] Candrayaśa; and in such texts as the Mukutā we are told that there is only one ‘caste’ [for Śaivas] with differentiation [by status] only into Samayins, [Putrakas, Śadhakas,] and [Ācāyas].

\textsuperscript{693} Somaśambhu, Brunner 1961, p. 301 (v. 8cd.): savarnair ekāya paṅktyā bhuvājitantarmanāmuniḥ ‘One should eat in silence with concentrate mind in a single line with others of the same caste-class’; Trilocanaśiva, Prayaścittasamuccaya, p. 25: ekapānktiḥ sadā varjyā bhojane bhinnajātiḥ ‘When eating one must always avoid sitting in a single line with persons of other castes’. Note the distaste expressed by the brahmin Saṁkarṣaṇa in the Āgamadambara (p. 56) when, in a Kashmirian monastery, he notices that Buddhist monks do not form separate lines according to caste when they eat together: catvāro varṇā varnasaṁkarā api vā sarva evaikasyāṁ paṅktau bhuvāje ‘Persons of all the four caste-classes and even

\textsuperscript{(conj. : yukto Cod.)} *tulyā (conj. : tulyam Cod.) eva na samśaye || 166 śivatantram samāśriya vibhaktim yah kariṣyati || *pacyen naraḥ sa (conj. : sa pacyen naro Cod.) ghoręṣu dvātrimśan narekuṣa ca || 167 brahmanas tu dināḥ paṅca dināḥ paṅca ca keśave | dinatrayam tu rudrasya prāyaścittiyate naraḥ; Valadhārīn, Kriyāsamgrahapadhdhati f. 49r4–v1, extending this principle to include foreigners (better to initiate a sincere Mleccha than an insincere brahmin): māyāṁvito yadā śiṣyo viprajātisamudbhavah | māyāṁhinās tataḥ pātram mlecchasūdraśdismbhavah || na vipre dāpayed dīkṣāṁ dāpayen mlecchajāmine | nādhikāri yato vipra māyādūnasamyutaḥ || niṣprapāṇcagunair yukto mlecchaś caiva śivāgya | dīkṣā vai sarvāthā yatya yato māyāvivarjitaḥ. See the same point made in the lost scripture Mukuta cited by Jayaratha on Tantrāloka 15.514cd.
scribed for initiates contaminated by an accidental or wilful contact with a person in a state of impurity were calibrated in severity according the degree of distance in caste-status between the persons contaminating and contaminated, and they assigned compound initiation-names such as Aghora-śiva and Aghoragaṇa whose second member indicated the caste-status of the bearer, marking out brahmins from non-brahmins, non-Śūdras from Śūdras, or each of the four caste-classes from each other.

694 See Trilocana śiva, Prāyaścittasamuccaya p. 25. Similar differentiation according to caste applies to the penances for eating the leavings of another's food (ucchīṣṭabhojanam), illicit sexual intercourse, and the taking of human life; see ibid., pp. 32, 35, 48, and 52–53. How the hierarchy of caste was perceived in relation to that between the initiated and the uninitiated can be seen in the rules for the penances needed to restore purity if one's food has been contaminated through contact with an ucchīṣṭah, a person who has eaten but has not yet purified himself. The rules for initiated brahmins will suffice to illustrate this. If a brahmin initiate's food is contaminated by another brahmin initiate the penance is 100 repetitions of the Tatpuruṣa, the Mantra that is the Lord of his Caste (jātīṣaḥ). It is doubled if the contaminator is an uninitiated brahmin or an initiated Kṣatriya. One day of fasting is added to the repetitions if the contaminator is an uninitiated Kṣatriya, two if the contaminator is an initiated Vaiśya, three if an initiated Śūdra, four if an uninitiated Vaiśya, and six if an uninitiated Śūdra (ibid., p. 31). Here we see traces of a view that the status bestowed by Śaiva initiation should prevail over that of caste. In its pure form this would entail that a Śaiva brahmin should consider contamination by an initiated Śūdra one degree less severe than that by an uninitiated brahmin, two degrees less severe than that by an uninitiated Kṣatriya, and so on. But the Saiddhāntikas have preferred to limit the application of this view to the lowest two castes, where it was of least consequence, allowing an initiated Śūdra to be less contaminating than an uninitiated Vaiśya, but not a initiated Vaiśya to outrank an uninitiated Kṣatriya or an initiated Kṣatriya an ordinary brahmin. In other words the primary distinctions here are (1) that between brahmins and Kṣatriyas on the one hand and Vaiśyas and Śūdras on the other, and (2) that between brahmins and Kṣatriyas. So while a Śūdra will be purer than a Vaiśya if he has been initiated, a Kṣatriya, in effect the king or a member of his family, will never be less pure than a Vaiśya, nor a brahmin less pure than a non-brahmin. In this regard the benefit of initiation in the case of the Kṣatriya is limited to an acceptance that he is no more contaminating than an uninitiated brahmin. But this is already a major concession in terms of caste and articulates the view seen elsewhere in the literature that the prosperity of society requires an alliance between the brahmins led by the Śaivas and a monarch who has received initiation from the Śaiva Guru. This view is underlined by the fact that penance is without fasting in the case of contamination by brahmins or an initiated Kṣatriya but with fasting in all other cases.

695 I am aware of five different rulings in this matter. (1) names in -śiva, etc. for brahmins only, in -gaṇa for Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, and in -śakti for women; see Kīraṇa 37.11–12b: kṣatriyādītrayasyoḥktaṁ <m>antraṇāma gaṇāṅkitaṁ || 12 viprāṇām *mantrapūrvam (conj. : mātapūrvan Cod) tu sagotrāntam bhaved iha 'In the case of the three [castes] beginning with the Kṣatriya it should be the name of one of the Mantras distinguished by [the addition of] -gaṇa. In the case of brahmins from the mixed castes are eating together in a single line'.

---

The Śaiva Age

---

96 From the mixed castes are eating together in a single line'.

694 See Trilocana śiva, Prāyaścittasamuccaya p. 25. Similar differentiation according to caste applies to the penances for eating the leavings of another's food (ucchīṣṭabhojanam), illicit sexual intercourse, and the taking of human life; see ibid., pp. 32, 35, 48, and 52–53. How the hierarchy of caste was perceived in relation to that between the initiated and the uninitiated can be seen in the rules for the penances needed to restore purity if one's food has been contaminated through contact with an ucchīṣṭah, a person who has eaten but has not yet purified himself. The rules for initiated brahmins will suffice to illustrate this. If a brahmin initiate's food is contaminated by another brahmin initiate the penance is 100 repetitions of the Tatpuruṣa, the Mantra that is the Lord of his Caste (jātīṣaḥ). It is doubled if the contaminator is an uninitiated brahmin or an initiated Kṣatriya. One day of fasting is added to the repetitions if the contaminator is an uninitiated Kṣatriya, two if the contaminator is an initiated Vaiśya, three if an initiated Śūdra, four if an uninitiated Vaiśya, and six if an uninitiated Śūdra (ibid., p. 31). Here we see traces of a view that the status bestowed by Śaiva initiation should prevail over that of caste. In its pure form this would entail that a Śaiva brahmin should consider contamination by an initiated Śūdra one degree less severe than that by an uninitiated brahmin, two degrees less severe than that by an uninitiated Kṣatriya, and so on. But the Saiddhāntikas have preferred to limit the application of this view to the lowest two castes, where it was of least consequence, allowing an initiated Śūdra to be less contaminating than an uninitiated Vaiśya, but not a initiated Vaiśya to outrank an uninitiated Kṣatriya or an initiated Kṣatriya an ordinary brahmin. In other words the primary distinctions here are (1) that between brahmins and Kṣatriyas on the one hand and Vaiśyas and Śūdras on the other, and (2) that between brahmins and Kṣatriyas. So while a Śūdra will be purer than a Vaiśya if he has been initiated, a Kṣatriya, in effect the king or a member of his family, will never be less pure than a Vaiśya, nor a brahmin less pure than a non-brahmin. In this regard the benefit of initiation in the case of the Kṣatriya is limited to an acceptance that he is no more contaminating than an uninitiated brahmin. But this is already a major concession in terms of caste and articulates the view seen elsewhere in the literature that the prosperity of society requires an alliance between the brahmins led by the Śaivas and a monarch who has received initiation from the Śaiva Guru. This view is underlined by the fact that penance is without fasting in the case of contamination by brahmins or an initiated Kṣatriya but with fasting in all other cases.

695 I am aware of five different rulings in this matter. (1) names in -śiva, etc. for brahmins only, in -gaṇa for Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, and in -śakti for women; see Kīraṇa 37.11–12b: kṣatriyādītrayasyoḥktaṁ <m>antraṇāma gaṇāṅkitaṁ || 12 viprāṇām *mantrapūrvam (conj. : mātapūrvan Cod) tu sagotrāntam bhaved iha 'In the case of the three [castes] beginning with the Kṣatriya it should be the name of one of the Mantras distinguished by [the addition of] -gaṇa. In the case of brahmins from the mixed castes are eating together in a single line'.
However, the non-Saiddhāntika traditions of the worship of Bhairava and the Goddess in the Mantrapītha and Vidyāpītha have shown themselves much less willing to tolerate such compromises, seeing them as a contamination of the true Śaiva tradition and appropriate only for those, namely the Saiddhāntikas, whose degree of illumination by Śiva is insufficient to enable them to appreciate and enact his higher teachings.696 Distinction on the basis of caste is generally

...
allowed to intrude only at the point of entry, to determine the length of the period during which a Guru should examine a candidate to determine his or her fitness for initiation, or in the Mahālakṣmīmata that ends the fourth Śatka of the Jayadrathayāmala to enable a Guru to select the impure substance that the candidate will be given to swallow without inhibition before receiving consecration (abhiṣekāḥ).697

Although there is no division of castes in this great Tantra, it is found nonetheless, O beautiful-eyed, in the commencement of initiation. [For only] when people have gone through initiation do they have no caste at all. [Or rather only then] do they become members of the one 'caste' of Śiva. For this reason, in the Viṣeṣadīkṣā [the Ācārya] must do what I shall now explain. Slender-waisted one, he should initiate brahmans by making them drink wine, Kṣatriyas by [making them drink] urine, Vaiśyas by making them drink semen, Śūdras by [making them swallow] faeces, and women by making them embrace the body of an initiate.

We find accordingly a stronger rejection of caste in ceremonial contexts, a conviction that pride of caste is one of the factors that hold souls in bondage, and prohibitions against ever mentioning the birth-caste of a fellow initiate. Thus in the Svacchandatantra of the Mantrapīṭha we read:698

O fair-faced one, all those who have been initiated by this ritual are of equal nature, whether they be brahmans, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śūdras, or others [of lower castes]. [For] they have been brought into a state of fusion with the nature of Śiva. All are said to be [Śivas,] wearers of [his] braids, their bodies dusted [like his] with ash. All Samayins should sit in a single row. Putrakas, Sādhakas,

697 Jayadrathayāmala, Śatka, f. 230v4–6: yady apy asmin mahātandre jātibhedo na vidyate \| 33 tathāpi diṅśāprārambhe bhavaty eva sulocane | diṅśitānaṁ na jātiḥ syād ekā jātīs tu caṭsvartī \| 34 tasmād viṣeṣadīkṣāyām *vakṣyānām (corr.: vakṣyamānāṁ Cod.) samācāre \| brāhmaṇā<ś> *cālipānena (em.: cālipātēna Cod.) *kṣatriyaṁś (em.: kṣatriyaśa Cod.) ca śivāmbhaṇa \| 35 vaiśya<ś> can-danapānena śūḍr<ś> vai viśvabhasmanā | striyo virāṅgasamśparsā<d> diṅśayeta sumadhyme.

698 Svaccchanda 4.539c–545: anenaiva vidhānena diṅśitā ye varānane \| 540 brāhmaṇāḥ kṣatriyaḥ vaiśyaḥ śūdrāḥ cāntye 'tḥavā priye | sarve te samadharmānāḥ śivadharme nivijātaḥ \| 541 sarve jaṭādarāḥ proktā bhasmoddhūlitavigrāḥāḥ | ekapāṅkitibhujāḥ sarve samayinas tu varānane \| 542 putrakānām bhaved ekā sādhasakānām tathā bhavet | cumbakānām bhaved ekā na prājātivibhedatāḥ \| 543 ekaiva sā smṛtvā jātī bhairaviyā śivāvyayā | tantram etat samārṣitya prājātī → na hy udieyata \| 544 putrakānām sādhasakānām tathā samayinām api | prājātivudāṁsā vā prāyāscitte bhaven naraḥ \| 545 dinatraṁ tu rudrasya pañcāhām keśavasya ca | pitāmhasya pakṣaikāṃ narakā pacaye tu saḥ \| 545 aviveki bhavet tasmād yadīcchha uttamām siddhiḥ | avivekena devēsī siddhir muk-tir dhruvaṁ bhavet. This passage is related to Niṣvāsakārikā 12.161–167 cited above, p. 289.
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and Cumbakas [Ācāryas] should do the same. They may not sit according to the divisions of their former castes. [For] they are said to form but a single caste of Bhairava, auspicious and eternal. Once a person has taken up this Tantric system he may never mention his former caste. If any [initiate] mentions the former caste of any Putraka, Sādhaka, or Samayin he will have sinned and will be roasted in hell for three days of the life of Rudra, five of the life of Viṣṇu, and fifteen of the life of Brahmā. So, if he aspires to the highest Siddhi he must make no [such] discriminatory distinctions. O Empress of the Gods, it is [only] through [this] freedom from discrimination that one will certainly attain both Siddhi and liberation.

Rituals involving the participation of people of all castes, especially those considered untouchable, is a marked feature here, and while the Saiddhāntikas were

---

699 See, for example, SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 282–287 for a detailed account of the orgiastic cakrāḍā/vīramelāpaḥ given in the vīratāṇḍavavidhipatalaḥ of the Jayadrathayāmala’s fourth Śaṭka and by Vimalaprabodha in his Kālīkukramārcana. The participation of women of the following castes/professions, in addition to those of the four Varnas, is prescribed in those sources: Pukkasa, liquor-seller (dhvajini), Antyaja, potter (cakrini), dyer (chippini), butcher (saunaki), Mātanga, tanner (carmakāri), fisherman (dhivari), prostitute (veśyā), washerman (dhāvaki), and dancer (nartaki). The Mādhavakula (Jayadrathayāmala, Śaṭka 4, f. 128r7 [A]; paraphrased in Tantraloka 29.66 and quoted by Jayaratha thereon [B]) lists nine such women in this context. They are the wives of a Mātanga, a Domba, a butcher, a confectioner (kandukah) (kanduki A : kārmuk B), a tanner, a liquor-seller, a cremation-ground worker (kāpālikah), a fisherman, and a potter. The words kāpālikah and kandukah have not been registered in our dictionaries in the meanings attested here, and while the Saiddhāntikas were
in general prepared to descend in the giving of full initiation only as far as members of those communities classed as Sacchidra, the Śaiva Śaivas had no such reservations, opening such initiation even to those that brahmanism considered untouchable. As evidence that such initiations were not merely prescribed, for such prescriptions might be more rhetorical than intended to support actual common practice, we have the testimony of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakṛṣṇha in his commentary on the Saiddhāntika Sārdhatri śatikālottara, addressing a verse in that scripture that might but for his learned intervention be taken to mean that Saiddhāntikas like himself are wrong to draw the line at the Sacchidras. Indeed his Śaiva near-contemporary and fellow Kashmirian Abhinavagupta cites this verse as compelling evidence that Śiva has allowed elements of the non-dualistic, caste-transcending view of the Śaktas to shine through even in this dualistic stratum of his revelation:

It is for this reason that even in these [dualistic scriptures] the Kaula doctrine is present for those who have perceived the [highest state of] resorption, as exemplified in such [texts] as the Kālapāda [in the statement] “He may initiate even untouchables”.

The passage to which Abhinavagupta refers is this:

The [transcendent] Śāntyatī [Kalā] is the supreme, inactive, eternal void. When [a Guru] has gained knowledge of that, Skanda, he may initiate even untouchables.

Bhaṭṭa Rāmakṛṣṇha argues, as one would expect, that it is purely rhetorical in intention, but he introduces into his argument a report that the Śaktas were citing it in support of their practice of actually initiating such persons. Saiddhāntikas, he insists, must not follow their example.

---

given in the dictionaries. It denotes rather a person of any service-caste, who lives by providing a service to the pure castes, from weaving to disposing of the dead.

700 Malinīvyāvārtīka 1.196c–197b: ata evāsti saṁhāraddṛśaṁ kauliya apiha drk || yathoktaṁ kālapādādau dikṣayaec chvapacān iti.

701 Sārdhatriśatikālottara 8.7: śāntyatītā bhaved vyoma tat paraṁ śāntam aviyayam | taṁ viditvā maḥāsena śvapacān api dikṣayet. In the other recensions of this scripture the same expression appears in the Trayodasaśatika-Kalottara (f. 23r5, Dikṣāpata v.6: śāntyatītam paraṁ vyoma sarvagam pāsāmocakam | taṁ viditvā maḥāsena śvapacān api dikṣayet). But ‘plants’ take the place of ‘untouchables’ in the versions of the Dviśatika-Kalottara (f. 2v7, 5.5) (D) and Saptasatika-Kalottara (f. 5v1–2, 8.7c–8b) (S): *śāntyatītaṁ (D: śāntātītaṁ S) paraṁ vyoma tat param *śāntam (D: paraṁ S) aviyayam | taṁ viditvā maḥāsena *stāvarāṇy api (D: stāvarāṇy anu S) dikṣayet.

702 Sārdhatriśatikālottaravṛtti, p.65, ll.6–10: śvapacān api dikṣayet ity atiśaṁyārtho pīṣābdopahītasya bhāvārthasya “api parvataṁ śīrasā bhīndyād” ityādāv iva *parātisya-pratipadaṇārāthvena (em.: pare tiśayapratiṣṭādārāthatvena Ed.) vi-dhibhivāyavatvasambha*vād iti śīrasā parvatahvedāv mlecchaśvapacādīkṣaṇam atraṁ *mantavyam (conj.: kartavyam Ed.) eveti yuktaṁ vyākyātum. na tu
Examples of the initiation of untouchables, indeed of anyone other than brahmins and kings, are naturally hard to find. Nonetheless they are not entirely absent. Thus the *Picumata*, when giving an account of its own redactional history in its opening chapter, lists fourteen disciples of a certain Padmabhairava of Orissa, stating their castes, in most cases their places of birth, and, for those who were brahmins, also their Veda and, in the case of Yajurvedins, their Śākhā. They include two untouchables. The account lacks the artificiality that might

---

**Explanatory Notes:**

1. *kula-caryair iva balat kartavyam iti* The words *śvapacān api dikṣayet* convey the superiority [of such Gurus rhetorically]. For there is no possibility of [this optative's] being injunctive, because [Pāṇini’s rule *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.3.154 teaches us that] when a verb [in the optative] is qualified by *api* [before it] the intention is [only] to express the superior capacity [of the agent], as in [the standard example of the grammarians] *api parvatam śirasā bhindyāt* “He will be able, I fancy, to break a mountain with his head”. So it is right to explain that in this case likewise [the reference to] the initiating of foreigners, untouchables, and the like *is to be understood (conj.) in the manner the breaking of a mountain with the head [in that example] and should not be forced to mean, as it is by the Kaula Gurus, that these persons should actually be initiated’. Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha is basing his analysis of *api dikṣayet* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.3.154 (*sambhāvane lam iti cet siddhāprayoge*). The example *api parvatam śirasā bhindyāt* is given in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* thereon. The crucial point in this rule for Rāmakaṇṭha is that an optative can be used to express the supposition that someone has the ability to do something, provided that the action envisaged does not actually take place (*siddhāprayoge*). His interpretation is forced, because *api* is more naturally taken with the noun that precedes it than with the verb that follows.

2. The fourteen comprise eight brahmins: four Atharvavedins, of whom three are from Madhyadeśa and one from Sindhu, a Śamavedin from Kashmir, a Vajasaneyin Yajurvedin from Lampā, a Ṛgvedin of Kāśi, and an Āpastamba-Taittirīya Yajurvedin from Odḍijāña. The remaining six are two Kṣatriya princes from Sindhu, two Śūdras of Saurāstra, and the two untouchables (Mātaṅgas), whose place of birth is not recorded. See *Picumata* f.2v4–6, 3r4–5 (1.1.54–62, 76–81): *odarās tu jātasya devadattasya sam. jñayā *bahvr. casyathā (em.: *bahvr. jasyathā* Cod.) *jadēsenā na *samśayathā || 55 asiddhas tu eva devesi padmabhāravasamjñā*ṣaḥ (corr.: *kāḥ* Cod.) *catuvrīṃsātisāhasram granthaṃ dvādasabhīḥ punah || 56 samghāram tu sahasraśca tu kariṣyati śīvecchāya | anenaiva tu *tantrenā (conj.: mantreṇa Cod.) tataḥ siddhiṃ pravāyaṣṭi (conj.: *si* Cod.) || 57 etat tantram asiddhasya sakāṣāt *tata (conj.: *tava* Cod.) eva hi | śrṇuviṣyanti mahābhāge sisyāḥ caiva caturdasa (corr.: *caturdasaṃ* Cod.) || 58 raktabhāravako nāmnā jvalābhāravako *paraḥ | helābhairavakāṣ caiva trayo ‘py ete mahāyaṣe || 59 madhyadeśasamutpannā *cārānātharvanās (conj.: *Aśīṣa = carānād atharvanās; cf. 1.52c and 1.62c: carāṇam-tharuṇaṃ* Cod.) tathā | vāmabhāravako devi vijayabhāravako *paraḥ || 60 saurāṣṭrāyām *samutpannau śūdrau jātāya prakīrtitaḥ (conj.: *samutpanna śūdra jātāya prakīrtitah* Cod.) | bibhatsabhāravo devi gajakarṇas tu bhairavah || 1.61 candābhairavako *kaś (corr.: *kāś* Cod.) caiva śinduwīṣyasambhāvaḥ (corr.: *vah* Cod.) | bibhatsabhāravo devi gajakarṇābhairavo ‘pi ca || 1.62 kṣatriya*ṣau (corr.: *yo* Cod.) rājaputrau tu candābhairavako *kaḥ (corr.: *kā* Cod.) punah | brāhmaṇo ‘tharvano devi caranena na samśayāḥ || 76 karālabhairavo nāma tathā ucchusmahbhairavah | mātāngajātisambhā*ṭau (corr.: *to* Cod.) padmabhāravaśīṣya*kau (corr.: *gau* Cod.) || 77 yamabhārava*kaś cānyaḥ (corr.: *kāś*
suggest that it is a pure fabrication, and even if it were fabricated it would nonetheless reveal that this tradition wished to signal to its followers that the initiation of untouchables has a venerable precedent. Similar evidence is to be found in the literature of the Śākta cult of the goddess Kubjikā in its accounts of the nine and sixteen Nāthas that initiates include in their worship. Among these too there are untouchables.\footnote{See here p. 144.}

Nor is it the case that all Gurus of the Siddhānta would have agreed with Bhatṭara Rāmakanṭha that the statement in the Kālottara is merely rhetorical. This may be inferred from the passage of the Guhyasiddhi of Padmavajra cited above.\footnote{Nor is it the case that all Gurus of the Siddhānta would have agreed with Bhatṭara Rāmakanṭha that the statement in the Kālottara is merely rhetorical. This may be inferred from the passage of the Guhyasiddhi of Padmavajra cited above.} For that tells the Buddhist adept to acquire a girl for his observance from a family of untouchables as payment for his giving them Saiddhāntika Maṇḍala initiation, which reveals not only that an intimate knowledge of the rituals of the Siddhānta could be taken for granted among these Tantric Buddhists, but also that to give Śaiva initiation to such people was not out of the question.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{align*}
cānyāḥ (Cod.) & kāśmire samabhaviṣyati | chandogo brāhmaṇo devi tathā anyo bhaviṣyati || 78 viṣṇubhairavanāmāno lampāyām visaye tathā | vājimādhvyamāndine viṣṇu bhaviṣyati tathāpāraḥ || 79 daṅkṣaṅabhairavaḥ kāśyām utpanno brāhmaṇas tathā | *bahurco cāparāḥ śiṣyo bhaviṣyati (conj.: bahurvo cāparā śiṣyā bhaviṣyanti Cod.) na samāsayaḥ || 80 odṛṇayāne mahādevi tathā sekharaḥbhairavaḥ | brāhmaṇo taṅcitīryaka āpārambhaviṣyati || 81 caturasāsa samākhyātā padmabhairavaḥśiṣyakāḥ | jñātāvā duḍāsasāhasāṃ padmā prāpyanti sūrāte.
\end{align*}
\end{footnotesize}
For if it had been, this Buddhist strategy could not have been recommended.

Our sources reveal, then, that the Śaivas 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 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. At present I have little to offer in this direction. But I can at least point to evidence that the fortunes of Śaivism were not as dependent on the favour of ruling dynasties as most of the data presented here might lead one to assume, enjoying at least in some regions such widespread acceptance that changes in the allegiance of a dynasty had little effect on its popularity. Research into recorded temple construction in the period 450–1050 in South and North Karnataka, that is to say, in the Tuṅgabhadra-Kāverī and Tuṅgabhadra-Bhīmā zones, has counted 164 Śaiva temples as against 30 Vaiṣṇava in the former and 199 Śaiva as against 32 Vaiṣṇava in the latter. This great preponderance of Śaiva foundations might be attributed solely to the predilection of the region’s kings, were it not for the evidence of the next three centuries, when the region passed under the rule of the Hoysalas (c. 1047–c. 1345), who favoured Vaiṣṇavism over Śaivism. For we see a far smaller shift in the preponderance of Śaiva temples than the theory of dependence on royal patronage would lead us to expect. 293 Vaiṣṇava temples were established. But the total of new Śaiva foundations remains very high, at about 1,030. \footnote{For all these data see SETTAR 1992, p. 43 and 54. I have added to the Śaiva totals those of the much less numerous Śākta temples.} This suggests the hypothesis that rulers who invested in Śaivism the wealth they acquired through conquest and revenue were also reflecting the deeply rooted preference of the majority of their subjects.

Similarly, in Kashmir the rule of the Vaiṣṇava Kārkoṭas (c. 626–855) was marked by the founding of many royal Viṣṇus, but it would seem that Śaivism, which predominates in the record of religious foundations in earlier times, had merely moved out of the limelight. \footnote{For knowledge of non-Buddhist religious foundations in Kashmir during the centuries before the advent of the Kārkoṭa dynasty we depend almost entirely on the account of Kalhana’s Rājatarangini. It is highly unreliable for this period, being wildly inaccurate in its chronology, and, in the case of the Hunnic Hepthalite kings that reigned from the time of Mihirakula to the advent of the Kārkoṭas, that is to}
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dynasty it burst forth into its golden age.\(^{708}\) The humbler religious landscape of small-scale religious devotion tells the same story. For among the very numerous pilgrimage sites of the region those sacred to Śiva, Bhairavas, and Śaiva goddesses are overwhelmingly in the majority. We see this in an abundant local literature of Māhātmyas, texts in Sanskrit promoting these sites; and we see it in what survives in manuscript of the \textit{Kāṣmīratīrthasamgraha}, a collection of abstracts of materials gathered without sectarian bias by the local Sanskrit scholar Sāhibrām (d. 1872) with the help of a staff of Panḍīts for an extensive

say, c. 530–626, it is evident from numismatic data that it also disordered. But it is significant nonetheless that almost all the early foundations that Kalhaṇa records other than Buddhist monasteries and brahmin settlements (Agrahāras) are Śaivas. Aśoka, evidently the emperor Aśoka of Buddhist fame, erects a stone enclosure for the national Śiva Vijayeśvara and two Aśokeśvaras within that enclosure (1.105–106). His son Jalauka establishes Jyeṣṭharudra in the capital (1.124), and builds a stone temple for Bhūteśvara at the Nandikṣetra (1.148). His wife Iśānadevi establishes circles of the Mothers (mātracakra) at the points of access to the valley (1.122). Rāvana worships Vaiṭesvara, builds a Matha around it, and dedicates the country to its maintenance (1.195–196). The Hephthalite Huns, with whom his chronicle reaches kings known to us from other sources, are reported to have established Śivas, and, given that they were of Central Asian origin, this no doubt reflects the fact that Śaivism was the dominant tradition of their new subjects, though the Vaiṣṇavism that would come to the fore under the Kārkots begins to overlay the Śaiva substrate during and after the interregnum of the non-Kashmirian Mātrgupta. Mihirakula establishes a Mihireśvara in the capital (1.306). Baka establishes a Bakeśvara (1.329), Gopāditya a Jyeṣṭheśvara (1.341), and Khikhillā Narendrāditya shrines of Bhūteśvara (1.347). Tuṇjina I, son of Jalaukas (probably this is the Jalauka, founder of Jyeṣṭharudra, whom Kalhaṇa makes the son of Aśoka), establishes a Tungēśvara (2.14) and Sandhimat founds a Sandhīśvara, an Iśeśvara with the name of his Śaiva Guru Iśānja, and many other Lingas (2.131–134). Tuṇjina Pravarasena I builds the temple of his Śiva Pravaresvara together with a circle of the Mothers (3.97). The short-reigned non-Kashmirian Mātrgupta establishes a Viṣṇu Mātraṇguptasvāmin (3.263). Pravarasena II (probably the successor of Mihirakula, and identical with Pravarasena I), represented by Kalhaṇa as a supremely devout Śaiva, intends accordingly to install a Pravaresvara in the capital that he has founded with his name (Pravarapura), but a Viṣṇu miraculously takes its place, which the king names Jayasvāmin after the architect of the temple (3.350–351). But he installs Sadbhāvaśrī and four other [Śaiva] goddesses (3.353) in the capital. Lakhaṇa Narendrāditya, identified by \textsc{Stein} (1900, vol. 1, p. 106) with the Lakhaṇa Udayāditya whose name appears on a Kashmirian silver coin, establishes Viṣṇu Narendravāmin (3.383). His brother Tuṇjina Raṇaditya prepares to install two Raṇeśvaras in two new temples but Viṣṇu Raṇasvāmin miraculously takes the place of one through the influence of his wife Raṇārmbhā (3.439–455). The couple establish a Viṣṇu Raṇārmbhasvāmin, a Śiva Raṇārmbheśvara, and a Matha for Pāṣupatas (3.460). The king establishes the Sun-God Raṇapuravāmin (3.462), and Amṛṭaprabhā, another wife of his, an Amṛteśvara (3.463). His son Vikramāditya establishes a Vikramesvara (3.474) and his wife Bimba a Bimbeśvara (3.482). On the later Hephthalites in Kashmir see \textsc{Dani} 1996.

\(^{708}\) See \textsc{Sanderson} 2007a, pp. 425–433.
descriptive survey of these sites and their traditions commissioned by Mahārāja Ranbir Singh (r. 1868–1885).\textsuperscript{709} We also see it in the information on the sacred sites of Kashmir, probably compiled around the seventh century, that is found in the Kashmirian \textit{Nilamatapurāṇa},\textsuperscript{710} and in the list of the major shrines of the valley given by Kalhāṇa in the twelfth century in the preamble of his history of the country.\textsuperscript{711}

Relevant evidence of another kind is available for Andhra and the Far South, since there, where culturally hostile invaders made fewer and less damaging inroads, there remains intact a much larger body of epigraphical evidence recording pious donations, engraved on the walls of the temples of the deities to which they were made. A survey of temple building and donation in Andhra during the thirteenth century under the Kakatiyas of Warangal has shown that the great majority of endowed deities mentioned in the epigraphical corpus were Śaiva. 247 Śiva temples constitute 67 per cent of the total and Vaiṣṇava temples only 19 per cent, and the latter are mostly south of the Krishna river, increasing in frequency the further south they are, no doubt under the influence of the resurgence of Vaiṣṇavism in the Tamil region after Rāmānuja (d. 1137). From the record of those who made donations to these Śaiva temples, particularly to long-established, major temples such as those of Drākṣārāma and Tripurāntaka, we can see that they were far from being restricted to the circles of royalty or the landed gentry. A high proportion of the donations are from herdsmen, women, and traders.\textsuperscript{712} Likewise in the Tamil country we find in Cola times (850–1279) a number of records of donations to Śiva temples made by members of the Sacchudra Veḷḷāla caste, the dominant cultivators of the region.\textsuperscript{713}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{709} On the Kashmirian Māhāmya literature and the \textit{Kāśmīrītīrthasaṃgraha} of Sāhībbrām see \textsc{Stein} 1900, vol. 2, pp. 383–385.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{710} See \textsc{Tokunaga} 1994.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{711} \textit{Rājatarāṅgīni} 1.29–38. Here he mentions the following as the principal deities of the region: Gaurī in the form of the river Vitastā, the Nāgas “Śankha, Padma, and others”, Pāpasūdana (the Śiva Kapaṭēśvara), the goddess Samdhya (Samdhyaḥbhatṭārikā), Svayambhū (a Śiva), Bheḍādevī, [the Śivas of the] Nandikṣetra (Bhūṭēśvara and Jyeṣṭhēśvara), Śāradādevī, Cakradhara (Viṣṇu), and Viṣayēśvara (Śiva).}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{712} This evidence is derived from the work of \textsc{Talbot} (2001, pp. 87–125), who provides detailed statistics and on their basis presents a cogent analysis of the patterns of temple patronage in this region and period.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{713} For Veḷḷālas who gave to Śiva temples, most commonly cattle or cash to provide an income to fund a perpetual lamp, see, e.g., \textit{SII} 3:17 of A.D. 1014; \textit{SII} 3:116 of A.D. 991; \textit{SII} 13:34 (\textit{ARE} 312 of 1906) of A.D. 941; \textit{SII} 13:44 (\textit{ARE} 227 of 1911); \textit{SII} 13:56 (\textit{ARE} 542 of 1920); \textit{SII} 13:62 (\textit{ARE} 618 of 1920); \textit{SII} 13:66 (\textit{ARE} 238 of 1923); \textit{SII} 13:112 (\textit{ARE} 126 of 1914); \textit{SII} 13:189 (\textit{ARE} 332 of 1927); \textit{SII} 13:300 (\textit{ARE} 5 of 1907) of A.D. 871-907; \textit{SII} 13:47 (\textit{ARE} 216 of 1932-1933); \textit{SII} 14:47 (\textit{ARE} 216 of 1932-33); \textit{SII} 14:131 (\textit{ARE} 213 of 1932-33); \textit{SII} 14:135 (\textit{ARE} 416 of 1929-30); \textit{SII} – 300 –}
There is another manner in which Śaivism is likely to have played a significant part in the process of social integration during this period, one which I wish to touch on only briefly and tentatively at this stage. This was in the incorporation of the many local deity-cults of the regions being drawn into the orbit of the state and its patronage of religion. In this it seems that it was the non-Saiddhāntika traditions of the worship of Bhairavas, goddesses, and Yogins, with their indifference to caste-status and brahmanical criteria of purity and their cults of possession that are likely to have provided the avenue of assimilation.\footnote{It seems likely, though difficult to prove, that much of the character of these traditions resulted from this process of incorporation on the frontier between the brahmanical and the not yet brahmanized.}

\section*{The Śaiva-brahmanical Order}

While extending its influence far beyond the confines of the orthodox brahmanical world the Śaivism of the Mantramārga sought to guard itself against dissociation from that world. It elaborated an inclusivist model of revelation that ranked other religious systems as stages of an ascent to liberation in Śaivism,\footnote{On the process by which local deities, often of tribal origin, were assimilated into Śākta Śaivism through their adoption as the tutelaries of local rulers see Śinha 1962 and 1987; and Mallebrein and von Stietencron 2008, pp. 39–67, 93–107, and 173–178. See also Chakrabarti 2001, especially pp. 165–233 (Chapter 5: ‘Appropriation as a Historical Process: The Cult of the Goddess’), for the case of Bengal. See Śinha Kapur 2002, pp. 209–225 on the predominance of the upper strata of non-brahmin society in temple patronage in recent times.}

\footnote{See, e.g., Svacchanda 11.69-74 (Buddhists > Jainas > Vaidikas > Śaṃkhyas > Yogasthas > Pāśupatas > Mausulas and Kārukas > Vaimalas and Lākulas > Śaivas); Sarvañānottara A f. 37r1–3, B p. 96 (Līngoddhārodipakarana v. 3): jñānacaryā-\begin{math} n\text{nito ba} \text{uddh} \text{dho } \text{budd} \text{h} \text{hit} \text{a} \text{tt} \text{avam } \text{va} \text{āp} \text{n} \text{uy} \text{āt} \end{math} | \text{tāmasām } *jīnabhhaktas tu pauruṣam \text{brahma} \text{vedin} \text{ā} | 4 \text{kevalārthavid} \text{āh } \text{kāl} \text{ām } \text{p} \text{r} \text{ānu} \text{v} \text{a} \text{n} \text{t} \text{i } \text{ji} \text{t} \text{endr} \text{ir} \text{i} \text{āh } | \text{vai} \text{dyēśva-} \text{resvāre } \text{tattv} \text{e } \text{somas} \text{h} \text{d} \text{h} \text{ā} \text{t} \text{e} \text{v} \text{i} \text{n} \text{ā} \text{h} \text{ā} \text{h}; \text{Āgama quoted by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakṛṣṇa in Nareśvarapariksāprakāśa, p. 207: } \text{buddh} \text{hit} \text{av} \text{t} \text{e } \text{si} \text{tītāh } \text{b} \text{au} \text{ddh} \text{āh } \text{gun} \text{e} \text{ṣu } \text{tu } \text{ār} \text{h} \text{āt} \text{āh } \text{si} \text{tītāh } | \text{gun} \text{e} \text{ṣu } \text{tu } \text{s} \text{ā} \text{m} \text{khyā } \text{a} \text{v} \text{y} \text{ak} \text{e } \text{pāḍ} \text{a} \text{r} \text{ō} \text{trī} \text{k} \text{āh}; \text{Somaśambhu, Brunner 1977, p. 553 (vv. 7–8): } \text{buddh} \text{hit} \text{att} \text{e } \text{si} \text{tītāh } \text{b} \text{au} \text{ddh} \text{āh } \text{jainā } \text{tu } \text{gu} \text{n} \text{am} \text{ast} \text{ak} \text{e } | \text{vedāntajñās } \text{su } \text{tad} \text{y} \text{on} \text{au } \text{pur} \text{ūṣe } \text{bhagavan} \text{nuk} \text{kāh } | \text{p} \text{ā} \text{s} \text{u} \text{p} \text{a} \text{t} \text{ā } \text{su } \text{m} \text{ā} \text{yā} \text{ṃ } \text{v} \text{i} \text{d} \text{y} \text{ā} \text{ṃ } \text{tu } \text{m} \text{a} \text{hā} \text{v} \text{a} \text{r} \text{ā} \text{tāh} \text{āh } | \text{b} \text{au} \text{ddh} \text{ā} \text{d} \text{i} \text{l} \text{ī} \text{n} \text{ā } \text{m } \text{e} \text{s} \text{ām } \text{m} \text{u} \text{k} \text{t} \text{i} \text{s} \text{t} \text{hān} \text{ā} \text{ṃ } \text{a} \text{n} \text{k} \text{ū} \text{m} \text{āt} \text{āh } | \text{Tirlo} \text{c} \text{a} \text{n} \text{ā} \text{śvā, Siddhānta-} \text{samuccaya, pp. 73–87; Kṣemarājā, Pratibhijñāhṛdaya on Sūtra 8 (tadhūmikāh sarvasaṃstanāsthitayāḥ ‘The positions of all doctrines are its stages’); and here p.47 (Manthānabhairava).}
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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. But though it thereby asserted, especially in its Śākta forms, the limited nature of the brahmanical observance that formed the lowest level and broad base of this hierarchy, it was careful to insist not only that the brahmanical scriptures that govern this observance are exclusively valid in their own domain but also that their injunctions are as binding on Śāivas after their initiation as they were before if they remained in that domain as active members of society. Śāiva ascetics were allowed a degree of choice in this matter, at least in theory, but householders were not.716 The religion of the Śāivas, then, was not Śaivism alone but rather Śaivism and Brahmanism, a fact born out not only by their literature but also by biographical data and the epigraphic record of the activities of Śāiva kings.

Moreover, the determination of the Śaivism of the Mantramārga to be fully embedded in the brahmanical tradition is manifest not only in this rule that initiates should maintain their brahmanical obligations but also in the fact that they extended their own ritual repertoire in order to bring it into greater congruence with the brahmanical. To this end they created a Śaiva ritual of cremation and a series of rituals to mirror the numerous brahmanical postmortuary rituals in which the deceased receives offerings first as a hungry ghost (pretakriyā) and then in Śrāddha rituals as an ancestor, after his incorporation with the immediate ascendants of his patriline (sapiṇḍikaranam). It is clear that the creators of these additions were motivated by nothing but the desire to be seen to conform to the norms of brahmanical society once the Śāivas had moved to extend recruitment beyond the inevitably restricted circle of ascetics into the more numerous ranks of married householders. For these rituals and especially the Śrāddhas make no sense in strictly Śaiva terms, since initiates are held to attain liberation as soon as they leave their bodies and therefore should require no ceremonies designed to ensure their well-being after death.717 This accommodation of Brah-

716 The Śaivas’ doctrines of the relationship between their scriptures and those of the brahmanical tradition with respect both to householders and ascetics are examined in detail together with epigraphical evidence in SANDERSON forthcoming b.

717 For a more detailed examination of the Śaiva postmortuary rituals and their rationale see SANDERSON 1995a, pp. 31–38. They are not found in the preceding Pāṣupata tradition of the Atimārga, in which the dead were buried, nor indeed in the earliest stage of the Mantramārga represented by the substantial Niśvāsa corpus, which in this and numerous other respects remained close to its Atimārgic antecedents, appearing only in the Dikṣottara, which was added to that corpus at a later date, and in several other later scriptures of the Siddhānta, most notably in the Kirana, whose treatment of the Śrāddha rituals became the basis for that found in the Paddhati of Somaśambhu and the later Paddhatis that followed its
manism no doubt gave Śaivism a distinct advantage over those religions that denied outright the authority of the brahmanical scriptures and there can be little doubt that this would greatly have increased its acceptability in the eyes of kings, who could thus draw on the power of the new religion to sanctify their rule and enhance their might—the former predominantly through the Śiddhānta, the latter predominantly through the Śākta Śaiva systems—while at the same time maintaining their legitimacy in their ancient role as the protectors of the brahmanical social order.

As Śaivism advanced by developing the strategies explored in this study it achieved a transregional organization and a consequent standardization of its rituals and doctrines; and this transregional uniformity, I propose, would have heightened its appeal to kings by enabling it more easily to be perceived as a transcendent means of legitimation, empowerment, and the integration of regional traditions, as an essential part of a pan-Indian socio-religious order that each kingdom sought to exemplify. It was by virtue of its great success in attracting royal patronage that it came to exert such a pervasive influence on the religions around it; and it was also on the basis of this success that it could construct the impressive edifice of a literature that is almost entirely silent about these vital but less elevated aspects of its life.
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Durjayacandra. See \textit{Rin po che'i tshogs zhes bya ba dka' 'grel} under Tibetan Texts.

Devagupta. See \textit{'Khor lo sdom pa'i sgrub thabs gnas thams cad rgya cher 'grel} under Tibetan Texts.

\textit{Devaṃrūtapāñcarātra}. NAK MS 1/1078, NGMPP B 29/2: palm-leaf; Newari script; probably 12th century. Transcript prepared by Dr. Diwakar Acharya.
*Devítantrasadbhāvasāra*, a text on the cult of the Śaiva vāmasrotaḥ by an unnamed author. *Gilgit Manuscript Facsimiles*, 3221–3222 and 3340–3341: birch-bark; proto-Śāradā script; incomplete (the first two folios only); undated; probably mid-6th century. 

**Devidvyardhasatikā.** NAK MS 1-242, NGMPP A161/12 Paper; Newari script; undated. 


**Devyāmata.** NAK MS 1-279, NGMPP A41/15 (*Niśvāsamahātantrāntargatapratisthātantra*): palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1060. 

**Dvisātika-Kālottara.** See Kālottaratantra. 

*Nayatrayapradīpa.* See Tshul gsum gyi sgron ma under Tibetan Texts.

**Naresvaraparīkṣāprakāśa,** the commentary of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha on the *Naresvaraparīkṣā* of Sadyojyotis, ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shastri. KSTS 45. Srinagar, 1926. 


**Navarātrapūjāvidhi** A. NGMPP E 88/11: paper; Newari script; 152 folios; Sanskrit and Newari. 

**Navarātrapūjāvidhi** B. NGMPP E 2363/29: paper, thyāsaphu; Newari script; 81 folios; Sanskrit and Newari. 


**Nityākauła.** NAK MS 2-226, NGMPP B 26/21: palm-leaf; badly damaged and incomplete (ff. 2–3 and 6–13), breaking off in the sixth Paṭāla. 

**Nityādisamgraha** compiled by Rājānaka Takṣakavarta. BORI MS 76 of 1875–76: paper; Śāradā (‘Bhrṅgeśasamaṃhitā’); exemplar of BLO MS Stein Or. d. 43 (‘Nityādisamgrahābhidhānapaddhati’). 

**Nityāhnikatilaka** of Śrīkanṭhasūnu. NAK MS 3-384, NGMPP B 41/11: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1153. 

**Niśisāṃcāra.** NAK MS 1-1606, NGMPP B 26/25: palm-leaf; Nepalese Kuṭīla script; probably before 1100. 

**Niruktabhāṣya** of Yāska with the *Niruktavivrāti* of Mukunda Śarmā: *The Niruk-

*Niśvāsa-kārikā*. IFP MS Transcript 17.

*Niśvāsa-tattva-saṃhitā*. NAK MS 1-277: palm-leaf; Newari script; undated; probably second half of the ninth century.


*Naimittikakarmāṇusamādhaṇa* of Brahmasambhu. Calcutta, ASB, MS G 4767: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete; undated but probably eleventh century.


*Pārameśvara (=Paṅkarāpa-rāmeśvara)*. ULC MS Add. 1049 (‘Pārameśvara-tantra’): palm-leaf; Licchavi script; A.D. 819.


*Piṅgalāmata* (Jayadrathādhikāra). NAK MS 3-376, NGMPP A42/2: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1174.

*Picumata* (Brahmayāmala). NAK MS 3-370, NGMPP A42/6: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1052.

Pauṣkarabhāṣya: The Jñānapāda of the Pauṣkarāgama with the commentary (-bhāṣya) of Umāpatiśivācārya, ed. Ambalavanāvalajñānasambandhaparāśaktisvāmi. Cidambaram, 1925.


Buddhakapālatantra. ULC MS Or. 158: palm-leaf; Kuṭila script; fragmentary; A.D. 1162. In the upper left corner of 1r: om vajrāṃrātantra || vajrārālitantra || buddhakapālatantra. Contains parts of the Buddhakapālatantra and Vajrāṃrātantra.


Brahmayāmala IFP. IFP MS Transcript 522 (‘Brahmayāmalākhyāṃ mātrpratiṣṭhātantram’). Incomplete: contains Paṭālas 1–51.1–29b.

Brahmayāmala Triv. Trivandrum University Library, MS 1982 (‘Brahma-
yāmalapratīsthātantram’): Devanāgarī transcript; incomplete, contains Adhyāyas 1–5.71b.

*Bhagavatyāmānāyaṇasūrīṇī. See bCom ldan ’das ma’i man ngag gi rjes su ’brung ba zhes bya ba’i rnam par bshad pa under Tibetan Texts.

Bhavabhaṭṭa. See Cakrasaṃvaraṇaṃjīkā.

Bhavyakirtī. See ‘Khor lo sdom pa’i dka’ ’grel dpa’ bo’i yid du ’ong bzhes bya ba under Tibetan Texts.


Maṇjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti. See DAVIDSON 1981.

Maṇḍalopāyikā of Padmaśrīmitra. TUL MS 280 (New), 499 (Old): palm-leaf; Newari script; undated.


Matasāra. NAK MS 3-379, NGMPP B28/16 (Śrīvidyāpiṭhamatasāra’): palm-leaf; Pāla script; no date


Manthānabhairava, Kumārikhaṇḍa. NAK MS 5-4630, NGMPP A171/11: paper: Newari script.

Manthānabhairava, Siddhakhaṇḍa. Scans courtesy of Sam Fogg Rare Books & Manuscripts, London: palm-leaf; Pāla script; probably penned in the 12th century.

Mayasamgraha. NAK MS 1-1537, NGMPP A31/18: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete.


Mahābhārata. For the first time critically edited by V. S. Sukthankar, with the cooperation of S. K. Belvalkar, A. B. Gajendragadkar, V. Kane, R. D. Kar-

Mahāmaṇīvīpulavānānāsupratiṣṭhitaguhyparamahasyakalpadhāraṇī.
Gilgit Manuscript Facsimiles, 1724–1733: birch-bark; proto-Śāradā; incomplete (ff. 53–57 only); undated; probably mid-6th century. Transcription: MATSUMURA Hisashi, Mikkyō Zuzō [Journal of Buddhist Iconography] 2, 1984, pp. 71–78. See also Nor bu chen po rgyas pa’i gzhal med med khang shin tu rab tu gnas pa’i gsang ba’i dam pa’i gsang ba’i cho ga zhib mo’i rgyal po zhes bya ba’i gzungs under Tibetan Texts.


Mahāvaipracābhisambodhitantra. See rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa’i rgyud under Tibetan Texts.


Mrγendrapaddhativyākhyā of Vaktraśambhu. IFP MS Transcript 1021.

Mṛtasugatiṃyojana of Śūnyasamādhivajra, pupil of Bhadrāpāda. TUL MS 307 (New), 306 (Old), ff. 1v1–9r: palm-leaf; Newari script; dated in A.D. 1269. For the Tibetan translation see Tha ma’i mchod pa’i cho ga under Tibetan Texts.


Mohacūḍottara. NAK MS 5-1977, NGMPP A182/2: paper; Devanāgarī script;
copied from a palm-leaf manuscript of [Valabhī era, year] 806 (= A.D. 1125/6).
Yājñavalkyasārī with the commentary (-nibandha) of the Śilāhāra king
Aparāditya of Konkaṇa, ed. Hari Nārāyaṇa Āpte. Ānandaśramasāmskrita-
granthāvaliḥ 46. Poona: Ānandāśrama, 1903.
Yājñavalkyasārī with the commentary (Mitāksarā) of Vijnānēśvara, ed.
*Yoganiruttaratantrārthāvatārasamgraha of Śraddhākara-varman. See rNal
‘byor bla na med pa‘i rgyud kyi don la ’jugs pa bsdus pa under Tibetan Texts.
Yoginījāla. NAK MS 3-667, NGMPP A141/5 (Yoginījālamahātāntarrāja): paper;
Nepalese Devanāgarī.
Yoginīsaṁcāra with the commentaries of Tathāgata-rakṣita and Alakakalaśa, ed.
Janardan Shastri Pandey. Rare Buddhist Text Series 21. Sarnath, Varanasi:
Central Institute of Higher Buddhist Studies.
Yoginīsaṁcāra: the Śaiva Yoginīsaṁcāraparakaṇa incorporated in the third
Ṣaṭka of the Jayadṛathayāmala.
Ratnāvali: Nāgarjuna’s Ratnāvalī. Vol. 1: The Basic Texts (Sanskrit, Tibetan,
Rājatarangini of Kalhaṇa, ed. M.A. Stein. Reprint. Delhi: Munshi Ram
Rājānakavamsapraśamsā. BLO MS Stein Or. e. 17: paper; Śāradā script; A.D.
1894.
Rāmacarita of Samdhya-karanandin, ed. Hara Prasad Shastri. Memoirs of the
Rauravasūtrasamgraha. Published in volume 1 of Rauravāgama.
Laghuṭantraṭīkā of Vajrapāṇi, ed. Claudio Cicuzza. Rome: Istituto Italiano per
Laghuṣaṁvaratantra, also known as Cakrasaṁvaratantra, Laghvabhidhāna-
tantra, and Herukābhīdhānatantra. Baroda, Maharaja Sayajirao University,
Oriental Institute, MS Acc. 13290 (‘Herukavidhānatantra’): palm-leaf; Kuṭila
script; incomplete; undated. Also accessible are two paper manuscripts; but
these are merely apographs of this, reproducing its lacunae. For commentaries
see under Cakrasaṁvaraṭīkā, Cakrasaṁvarapaṇījkā, Cakrasaṁvarayīttī, and
Laghuṭantraṭīkā.
Lokaprakāśa, attributed to Kṣemendra, ed. Jagadhar Zadoo Shastri. KSTS 75.
Srinagar, 1947.
Vajrajvālodayā nāma śrīherukasādhanopayīkā of Ānandagarbha. Nieder-
sächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen, MS Xc 14/39 (a copy of the negatives of photographs taken of the codex that contains this work by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana when it was in the Ngor monastery in Tibet), f. 170r6–186r5: palm-leaf; Newari script; 14th century (?).

Vajradākamahātantra. TUL MS 342 (New), 326 (Old): palm-leaf: Newari script; undated.


Vajrāmṛtatantra. ULC MS Or. 158 (uncatalogued): palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1162. Uncatalogued. In the upper left corner of f. 1r is the following note: om vajrāmṛtatantra || vajrāralitantra (vajrārali corr.: vajrārāni Cod.) || buddhakapālatantra. As it survives the codex contains only parts of the Vajrāmṛtatantra and the Buddhakapālatantra.

Vajrārali. See rDo rje á ra li under Tibetan Texts.

Vajrāvalī A: Vajrāvalī nāma maṇḍalopāyikā of Mahāpaṇḍita Abhayākaragupta. NAK MS 5-841, NGMPP B31/14: palm-leaf; Māgadha script; pre-1200; some replacement folios in Newari script and Devanāgarī.


Vanaratnastorasaptaka of Āditya. HAHN 1996.

*Vāpyāṭipratiṣṭhā. Folios 893r14–908r9 and 929v7–931v23 of an untitled and undated paper manuscript in the Śaradā script containing the Paddhatis for various mostly non-Śaiva ritual procedures, predominantly Śāntis, Vratas, Pratīṣṭhās, and Dānas. SORL MS 2B15, folios numbered from 785 to 1089.


Genesis and Development of Tantrism


Viravajra. See Yon tan ma lus pa’i gnas zhes bya ba’i ‘grel pa under Tibetan Texts.

Virāgama. IFP MS Transcript 30.


Vṛddhasvacchanda. SORL MS 1514: paper; Śaradā script. This is the manuscript used by Pandey for his edition of the text.


Śāsvatavajra. See De kho na nyid mkhas pa under Tibetan Texts


Śaivāgamaparibhāṣāmaṇḍiṣṭari of Vedajñānaguru II. Dagens 1979.

Sampuṭodbhava. ASB, MS G 4854: palm-leaf; Māgadha script; perhaps 12th century.


Saṃvarodaya: Saṃvarodaya nāma maṇḍalopāyikā of Bhūvācārya of Ratnagiri. TUL MS 450 (New), 296 (Old): palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1056.


Saptaśatikā-Kālottara. See Kālottaratantra.

Sarva-jñānottara. A = NAK MS 1–1692, NGMPP A43/12: palm-leaf; Licchavi script; incomplete; B = IFP MS Transcript 334.

The Śaiva Age

**Saiva Age**

**Sarvadurgatiparīśodanatantra.** SKORUPSKI 1983.

**Sarvabuddhasamāyoga/Sarvabuddhasamāyogaśākinijālaśaṃvara.** See Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba under Tibetan Texts.

**Sarvavajrodaya of Ānandagarbha.** NAK MS 3-360. NGMPP A48/7 (‘Sarvavajrodakā’): palm-leaf: early Newari script; A.D. 1059.


**Sādhananidhi** of Kambalapāda, a commentary (pañjikā) on the *Herukabhidhāna (Cakrasaṃvaratantra)*. NAK MS 4-122, NGMPP B31/20: palm-leaf; Newari script; undated.


**Siddhayogēśvarimata.** See TÖRZSÖK 1999.

**Siddhāntapaddhāti** of Jñānaśiva. IFP MS Transcript 507, pp. 374–394.


**Siddhāntasamuccaya** of Trilocaṇaśiva. IFP MS Transcript 206, pp. 56–111.

**Siddhāntasārapaddhāti** of Mahārājādhirāja Bhojadeva (r.c. 1018–1060). A = NAK MS 1-1363, NGMPP B28/29: palm-leaf; old Newari script; A.D. 1077/8; B = NAK MS 5-743, NGMPP B28/19: palm-leaf; old Newari script; A.D. 1111/2.


Subhāṣitasaṃgraha: Subhāṣita-Saṃgraha. An Anthology of Extracts from Buddhist Works Compiled by an Unknown Author to Illustrate the Doctrines of Scholastic and of Mystic (Tāntrik) Buddhism, ed. Cecil Bendall. Le Muséon 4, 1903, pp. 373–403 (Part 1), and 4, 1904, pp. 5–46 (Part 2).

Sūkṣmāgama. IFP MS Transcript 1003.

Sekanirdesapaññikā of Rāmapāla. ULC MS Or. 149: palm-leaf; Pāla script. A critical edition of the text is being prepared for publication by Professors Harunaga Isaacson and Francesco Sferra, which they have kindly allowed me to consult.


Somasambhupaddhativyākhyā of Trilocanaśiva. IFP MS Transcripts 457 and 170.


Sthitisamāsa of Sahajavajra. NAK MS 5-139, NGMPP B24/4 (‘Kośakārikā’): palm-leaf; 14 folios; incomplete, lacking folios 3, 9, 13, 15, and 19; Newari script; perhaps 13th century. Mantranaya section: ff. 11r3–18v5.


——. IFP MS Transcript 507, pp. 1–356.

Svāyambhuva. IFP MS Transcript 133.


Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgrahaḥ: śrīśāivāgme svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgrahaḥ
yambhuvā mahārṣibhyā uddīṣṭāḥ), ed. Veṅkaṭasubrahmanyaśāstrī, Mysore, 1937.

Svāyambhuvāsūtrasamgraha. IFP MS Transcript 39. An inflated south-Indian redaction.


Haracaritacintāmaṇi of Rājānaka Jayadratha. A = SORL MS 1547: paper: Śāradā script and Devāṅgārī; B = SORL MS 1510: paper: Śāradā; C = SORL MS 599: paper: Kashmirian Devāṅgārī.


Herukasādhana of Kalyāṇagarbha. Sādhanamālā, no. 242.

Herukasādhana of Hūṃkāravajra. See He ru ka'i grub pa'i thabs under Tibetan Texts.

Herukābhuyudaya. See Khrag 'thung mgon par 'byung ba under Tibetan Texts.

Herukābhuyadayapaññikā (Katipayākṣarā) of Kumāracandra, ed. in Dhiḥ 27, pp. 148–170.

Herukābhuyadayapaññikā (Katipayākṣarā) of Kumāracandra. KLK MS 229, NGMPP C26/2 (‘Herukābhuyadayamahāyoginītantra’): palm-leaf; proto-Bengali script.

Hevajratantra. SNELLGROVE 1959.

Hevajratantrapiṇḍārthaṭīkā of Vajragarbha. KLK MS 128, NGMPP C14/6: palm-leaf; Māgadha script; copied in Vikramaśilamahāvīhāra, therefore before c. 1200.

JAVANESE TEXTS


Deśavarṇana. = Nāgarakṛtāgama.


Wrhaspatitattwa. Sanskrit with an Old Javanese commentary. SINGHAL 1957.

TIBETAN TEXTS


*mKha’* 'gro ma’i dra ba’i rdo rje gur rgyud. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. nga, ff. 30r–65v (D); Stog Palace Kanjur, Rgyud 'bum, vol. ca, ff. 148v–202r 94, p. 369, ll. 5–6 (T). Translation by Gayadhara and Śākye ye śes (‘Brog mi) of the Ṣākīnīvajra-pañjaratantra.

*Khor lo sdom pa’i dka’* grel dpa’ bo’i yid du ‘ong bzhes bya ba. DT, Rgyud ‘grel, vol. ma, ff. 1v–41r. Translation by Dharmaśrībhadra and Rin chen bzung po of Bhavyakirti’s commentary (*Viramanorāṇa*) on the Laghuśaṅvaratana.


*Grub thob brgyad bcu rtsa bzhi’i lo rgyus*. Peking Tenjur, Rgyud ‘grel, vol. lu, 1v–68r (A); *Grub thob brgyad bcu rtsa bzhi’ichos skor*, New Delhi: Chopel Legdan, 1973, reprinted in ROBINSON 1979, pp. 312–391 (B). Biographies of the Eight-four Siddhas, which the Tangut monk Smon grub shes rab claims to have heard from an Indian Guru of Tsam pa ra (B : tsam pa ra A [Champaran in N-W Bihar]) named Mi ‘jigs sbyin pa dpal (Abhayadatta śrī) and then rendered into Tibetan.


*rGyud spyi*. LESSING and WAYMAN 1980.


*bCom ldan ’das ma’i man ngag gi rjes su ‘brung ba zhes bya ba’i rnam par bshad pa*. DT, Mdo, vol. ba, ff. 1v-320r. Translation by Alāṅkakadeva and Tshul khrims ‘byung gnas sbas (early 12th century) of the *Bhagavatīyāmānīśūraṇī nāma vyākhyaḥ*, a commentary on the Aṣṭasāhasrika
Prajñāpāramitā composed during the reign of Rāmapāla (c. 1072–1126) by an author who identifies himself only as a resident of the Rājajagaddala monastery (rgyal po dza ga ta la gnas pa).


De kho na nyid mkhas pa. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. ma ff. 253r–352r. Translation by Rin chen grub of the *Tattvaviśāradā, Śāśvatavajra’s commentary (*ur̲t̲ti) on the Laghuśaṃvara. The Skt. title given at the beginning of the translation is śrītattvaviśādā nāma śrīsamvaravr̲t̲i.

De kho na nyid grub pa: De kho na nyid grub pa zhes bya ba’i rab tu byed pa. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. tsu ff. 26v–39r. Translation by Dīpākaraśrīnāna and Rin chen bzang po, revised by Kumārakalaśa and Śākya ‘od, of the Tattvasiddhi (Tattvasiddhināma prakaraṇam) of Śāntarakṣita.

bDe mchog nyung ngu. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. ka, ff. 213r–246v. Translation by Padmākara and Rin chen bzang po, revised by Prajñākirti and Mar pa Chos kyi grags pa, of the Laghuśaṃvaratantra.

rDo rje à ra li: rDo rje à ra li zhes bya ba’i rgyud kyi rgyal po chen po. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. nga, ff. 171r–176r. Translation by Gayadhara and Śā kya ye shes (‘Brog mi) of the Vajrālaśmahātatantrarāja.


rDo rje phreng ba: rNal ‘byor chen po’i rgyud dpal rdo rje phreng ba mngon par brjod pa rgyud thams cad kyi snying po gsang ba rnam par phye ba. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. ca, ff. 208r–277v. Translation by Sujanaśrīnāna and Zhi ba ‘od of the Vajramālahāyogatantra.

Nor bu chen po rgyas pa’i gzhal med med khang shin tu rab tu gnas pa gsang ba’i dam pa’i gsang ba’i cho ga zhib mo’i rgyal po zhes bya ba’i gzungs. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. da, ff. 286v–309r. Translation by Vidyākaraprabha and dPal gyi lhun po, revised by Vidyākaraprabha and dPal brtsegs, of the Mahāmaṇi-vipulavimānasupraṭiṣṭhitaguhyaparamarahasayakalpadhāraṇī.

rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa’i rgyud: rnam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par rdzogs par byang chub pa rnam par sprul pa byin gys rlob pa shin tu rgyas pa mdo sde’i dbang po’i rgyal po zhes bya ba’ichos kyi rnam grangs. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. tha, ff. 151v–260r. Translation
by Śilendrabodhi and Dpal brtsegs of the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhitantra (*Mahāvairocanābhisambodhīvīkūrvitādhiṣṭānavaipulyasūtrendrarājanāmadharmaparyāya).

rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud chen po'i 'grel of Sangs rgyas gsang ba (*Buddhaguhya). DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. nyu, f. 65r–Tu, f. 116r. Revised translation by Gzhon nu dpal of Buddhaguhya's commentary on the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhitantra.

rNal 'byor bla na med pa'i rgyud kyi don la 'jugs pa bsdus pa. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. tsu, ff. 104v–115r. Translation by Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po of the former's *Yoganiruttaratantrarāthvātārasamgraha.

rNal 'byor ma bzhī'i kha sbyor rgyud. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. kha, ff. 44v–52v. Translation by Chings yon tan of the Caturyoginīsampūtatantra.

Byang chub lam gyi sgron ma'i dka’'grel of Dīpaṅkaraśrijñāna. SHERBURNE 2003.

Tshul gsum gyi sgron ma. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. tsu, ff. 6v–26v. Translation by Padmākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po of the *Nayatrayapradīpa of Tripiṭakamala (Tripiṭakamalla?).

Yon tan ma lus pa'i gnas zhes bya ba'i 'grel pa. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. ma, ff. 156v–207r. Translation by Chos skyong and Rin chen grags of Viravajra’s commentary on the Laghuśaṃvara.


Rin po che'i tshogs zhes bya ba dka’'grel. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. ba, ff. 246v-315r. Translation by Tāraklaśu (sic; Tārakalaśa?) and the Tibetan Guṇaśrī of Durjayacandra’s commentary on the Laghuśaṃvara.


Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba: dpal sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba mkha’'gro ma sgyu ma bde mchog ces bya ba'i rgyud phyi ma. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. ka, ff. 151r–193r. Translation of the Sarvabuddhāsamāyoga (Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinijālaśaṃvaranāmottaratantra). No translators recorded, but said to be the work of the Tibetan Lha rin po che; cf. Tōh. 1659, 1664–1669, 1671–1672, 1674, and 1677.

gSang ba 'dus pa'i dka’'grel. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. bi, ff. 1v–81r. Translation by Vijayaśrīdhara and Rin chen bzang po, revised by Śraddhākaravarman, of the commentary by Ānandagarbha on the Guhyasamāja (*Guhyasamājapañjikā).

He ru ka'i sgrub pa'i thabs. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. la, ff. 200r–208r. Translation by Vidyākarasimha and Lha rin po che of the Herukasādhana of Hum mdzad rdo rje (Hūṃkāravajra).
**South and Southeast Asian Inscriptions**


**Epigraphia Carnatica.** 1885–1965. Mysore Archaeological Department, Madras/Bangalore/Mysore.

**Epigraphia Indica.** Archaeological Survey of India. Calcutta/Delhi, 1892–.


**Hultsch, E.** 1885. The Sārnāth Inscription of Mahīpāla. *IA* 14, pp. 139–140.


RAJAGURU, Satyanarayan. 1962. Jayarampur Copper-Plate Inscription of the
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All Souls College, Oxford
Introduction

It has long been commonly supposed that Caṇḍeśvara is a deity exclusively of the Śaiva Siddhānta of whom sculptural representations are found only in the Tamil-speaking South of India. But this is far from the truth: from looking at various sorts of evidence—inscriptions from Nepal, Cambodia and the Tamil-speaking South, Sanskrit Saiddhāntika texts, Tamil devotional hymns and a variety of sculpted images going back to the fourth century—we find that it is a rather jumbled picture of this figure that emerges. This might be because he is an amalgam of more than one personage, or it might be that a single figure has evolved over the centuries and been viewed differently by the followers of the religious traditions in which he played a rôle. (Some might even say, after reading further, that there has never quite been one Caṇḍeśvara, even though there are momentary points of contact between the various figures examined in this article.) We find Caṇḍeśvara (also referred to as Caṇḍikeśvara, Caṇḍiśa, Caṇḍa and, in Tamil sources, as Caṇṭi and Taṇṭi) variously treated as a guardian to Śaiva shrines, as a warrior leader of gaṇas, as the consumer of offerings that have been made to Śiva, as the punisher of the transgressions of Śaiva initiates, as Śiva’s agent in property transactions, as the transmitter of Śaiva knowledge and as a super-bhakta who severed his own father’s legs because of his father’s impiety. Some evidence suggests that Caṇḍeśvara is a form of Śiva or a manifestation of his anger, but other evidence presents him as a gaṇa, as Śiva’s chief devotee or as his principal servant.

In this paper, I should like at least to touch upon the various ritual functions with which Caṇḍeśvara is associated and the various identities attributed to him. Caṇḍeśa is a figure that has engaged the interest of a range of very different scholars—I have gradually discovered that quite a number of articles has appeared devoted to one or other aspect of the deity: Brunner 1969, Dhaky 1970, Gupta 1976, Edholm 1984, Kalidos 1988, Edholm 1998, and, most recently, Acharya 2005—and it now seems to me to be time to synthesise some of these findings (for some of the above authors appear to have been working in ignorance of each other), as well as to add a few ideas of my own. But it is not only my own ideas that I intend to add. In fact I would be hard pressed to state which ideas on this subject, if any, might be truly my own, for I have over the last few years had the good fortune to meet a diverse and numerous group of scholars...
who have been remarkably eager to discuss Caṇḍeṣa with me.¹ The result is that this article is very different indeed from the paper delivered in Tokyo, at the kind invitation of Professor Shingo Einoo, in October 2005. If it is not engaging to read, it is certainly not the fault of the subject matter, which is rich enough to merit a richly illustrated book rather than a mere article.

¹ The first of these was Dr. Erik af Edholm, who came and presented something of his research to the Śaiva reading group in Pondicherry several years ago, at a time when all I knew about Caṇḍeṣa was what I had read in Saiddhāntika texts. Further discussion took place with the members of that same reading group, together with whom I worked to produce a critical edition of Aghoraśiva’s Pañcavaranastava, which contains a disproportionately long note on Caṇḍeṣa (some of the material in this article is repeated from annotation to the Pañcavaranastava: Goodall et al. 2005:184–190). While this was being prepared, I had the benefit of numerous long exchanges with the members of the EFEO’s project on Pallava iconography, namely Dr. Charlotte Schmid, whose longest e-mail message on Caṇḍeṣa runs to eight tightly argued A4 pages, Dr. Valérie Gillet and Emmanuel Francis (Université Catholique de Louvain), who generously furnished me with dozens of photographs. All this stimulus would already have given me the basis for a substantial article. But it happened that in 2004 Dr. Diwakar Acharya (Kyoto University) sent me a copy of his then unpublished article on the Mathurā pillar inscription for comments and I discovered that he too was writing on the same theme, but focussing on data that I had known nothing about. When it was announced that I would be speaking on Caṇḍeṣa at Professor Einoo’s Tantric Workshop in Tokyo in 2005, I received an eager message from Charlotte de Dépercin-Sermet, a student at Paris IV currently producing a doctorate about Cōla-period images of Caṇḍeṣa, with whom further useful exchanges took place. And while preparing the paper, a flood of helpful suggestions reached me from Professor Leslie Orr. Finally, the reactions to the paper when delivered in Tokyo made me change, once again, quite a number of my ideas about the subject. These reactions came principally from Dr. Kimiaki Tanaka, who suggested an unsuspected Buddhist connection, and then, somewhat later, from Professor Alexis Sanderson (All Souls, Oxford). I was also able to benefit from the advice of Professor Gerdi Gerschheimer on the Khmer inscriptions to which I refer to below, as well as on other inscriptions, to which, in consequence of his advice, I realised that it would be prudent not to refer. For the photographs that are not my own or those of other acknowledged individuals, I have relied on the photo-library of the Institut français de Pondichéry, for access to which I am grateful for the enthusiastic assistance of N. Murugesan and K. Ramesh Kumar. Aside from all the above, I must mention N. Ramasamy, also known as Babu, chauffeur of the EFEO, whose tireless explorations in Tamil Nadu have since 2003 been bringing to my attention unusual Caṇḍeṣas that I could never otherwise have known about, the first of which was the arresting image from the ruined shrine of Satyamangalam that lies on the Tiruvannamalai-Tindivanam road (Plate 38).

Finally, in the weeks before submitting the article, I received helpful comments, data and suggestions, as well as corrections of various orders of magnitude, from the following (in alphabetical order): Dr. Diwakar Acharya, Andrea Aciri, Professor Hans Bakker, Dr. Peter Bisschop, Professor Shingo Einoo, Emmanuel Francis, Professor Kei Kataoka, Professor Leslie Orr, and Dr. Charlotte Schmid.
Introducing the three best known types of South Indian images

1. Canḍeśānugrahamūrti

On the South side of the celebrated early eleventh-century temple at Gangaikōṇṭa-cōḷapuruḿ, near Tanjore in the Tamil-speaking South of India, is a well-known image of Śiva, with Pārvatī beside him, shown in the act of garlanding the headdress of the bowed head of a figure seated below who respectfully presses his palms together in āṇjali (see PLATE 1). This is an example of what several South Indian temple scriptures refer to as canḍeśānugrahamūrti.3 Canḍeśa, often called Caṇṭi in Tamil poetry, is one of the 63 Śaiva saints or Nāyaṇmārs, who, according to the legend narrated by the twelfth-century Periyapurāṇa of Cēkkilār, was a brahmin cowherd boy called Viḍyāśārmā who worshipped Śiva in sand-lingas by pouring milk over them. His father, tipped off by brahmans who thought milk was being wasted, observed him, was appalled at the waste of milk, beat his son and kicked at one of the pots of milk. To punish this impiety towards Śiva, Viḍyāśārmā swiped at his father’s legs with his cow-herding stick, which promptly transformed itself into an axe, and cut his father’s legs off. For this great and fiercesome act of devotion, Śiva rewarded him by adopting him as his supreme devotee, giving him the name Canḍeśa, and adorning him with his ornaments and garlands.4 The whole story can be found depicted together, begin-

---

2 I use this expression to refer to a group of tantras of the Śaivasiddhānta for which no firm evidence confirms their existence before the twelfth century, which are transmitted only in South Indian sources, and which focus on describing what happens in a South Indian temple. (Cf. the remarks of SANDERSON 2004:444–5.) Among the best known examples are the Pūrva- and Uttara-Kāmika, the Pūrva- and Uttara-Kārana, the Ajita and the so-called kriyāpāda of the Raurava. For a fuller general account of the Sāiddhāntika canon and the division between, on the one hand, the scriptures known to the tenth-century Kashmirian thinker Rāmakanṭha and Aghoraśiva, his South Indian epigone, and, on the other hand, the post-twelfth-century temple scriptures, see the essay ‘Explanatory remarks about the Śaiva Siddhānta and its treatment in modern secondary literature’, printed as the preface to the edition of the Parākhyatantra (GOODALL 2004:xiii–xxxiv). For more on the relative dating within the pre-tenth-century corpus, see footnote 148 on p. 410 below.

3 Apart from the passages quoted by RAO (1914) on p. 105–7 of Appendix B of Volume II, part II, there are further accounts to be found in Uttarakāraṇa 64:2c–9 and in the Īsānaśivagurudevapaddhati, kriyāpāda 43:71c–72:

\[\text{umāsaḥhitavat kuryaḥ candānugrahakam param }\]
\[\text{varado daksinakaraś candēśasīrasītaraḥ }\]
\[\text{kṛtāṇjalipuṭaḥ caṇḍa āśino dhāḥ śivasaṇat}^*\]

*śivasaṇat 1 conj.; śivasaṇaḥ Ed.

RAO (1914) recounts a version of the legend and discusses other images in Volume II, part I, pp. 205–9.

4 Periyapurāṇa 1256:
ning with the worship with milk and culminating with Śiva’s adorning Caṇḍeṣa with his garland, in the three largest Cōla-period temples,\(^5\) and there are several less well known examples of the Cōla period elsewhere.\(^6\)

**PLATE 1.** Caṇḍeṣaṅugrahamūrti from the temple at Gangaikondacholapuram (Jayamkondam Taluk, Tanjore Dt.): Śiva, whose back hands bear an axe and a deer, holds Caṇḍa’s chignon and puts his own garland upon it. Pārvati sits behind him. Caṇḍeṣa sit-kneels and, clasping his hands in aṅjali, leans forward in deference. As an earring he wears a flower.

Now although this full version of the story is first clear from pictorial representations of the early eleventh century, it seems to accord with the allusions to the story that are made by the Tamil poets of the Tēvāram, who are also among the 63 Nāyaṇmār, and so the story may be as much as four or five centuries earlier.\(^7\)

---

\(^5\) For the depictions at Gangaikondacholapuram and in the Rājārājesvara in Tanjore, see PICHARD et al. 1994, photographs 169–72 and for those at the Airāvatesvara shrine (in an upper frieze in bas-relief on the South side of the main shrine) in Darasuram, see L’HERNAULT 1987:100 and photo 73.20 or LADRECH 2007, images DSC_6230.jpg and DSC_6232.jpg.

\(^6\) One is mentioned, e.g., by SCHMID 2005:61.

\(^7\) Three examples from the Tēvāram should suffice: 1.106:5ab (of Nānacampantar):

\[\text{cintum pôlutil atu nökkuñ ciruvar iṇrayî r iyōnait} \]
\[\text{tantai-y-enavē-y-arintavan ṛaṅ ṛālkal cintun takutiyinān} \]
\[\text{mun̄tai marũkku kijanta kōl eṭuttārkk' atũvē mūrajimaiyināl} \]
\[\text{vantu maļuvāyiṭa-v-erintār; maṅ mēl viṅṭān maraiyōn um.} \]

While [the milk] was spilling, the child watching it realised that his father was wicked towards God, [and] because his [father’s] feet deserved [punishment for] spilling [the milk], he took the stick that was lying just in front of him—that same [stick] went and transformed for him as he took it, by [divine] means, into an axe—and he hurled it. And the brahmin fell upon the ground.

---

If you ask about the place where, in olden times, while the Lords of the eight directions rejoiced, and Caṇḍeṣvara prayed for beautiful garlands and food, He who gave, bending down [to give them(?) resides]. . .

And 7.65:2a (of Cuntarar):

\[\text{anīkōl ātai am pūn manimālai amutuceyta amutam peru caṇṭi . . .} \]

‘Caṇḍeṣvara, who receives garlands of jewels and beautiful gold and garments that [He] had taken and worn, [and who receives] the food offering (amutu) which has been made nectar [by having been eaten by Him], . . .’

And finally 7.16.3 (of Cuntarar):

\[\text{inṭaimalar koṇtu, maṇal īlinkam atu iyarri,} \]
\[\text{inattu āvin pāl āṭṭa, iṭariya tātaiyait tāl} \]
Who is Canḍeśa?

Furthermore, there is a narrative panel in niche 35 of the inner prākāra of
the Kailāsanātha temple in Kancheepuram that belongs to the end of the seventh or beginning of the eighth century which appears to show a large, four-armed Śiva with a garland-like mass dangling above him, a smaller two-armed Canḍeśa with an axe leaning over one shoulder, perhaps about to be garlanded, and below him perhaps his father, semi-recumbent and gesticulating with distress below him on the ground, with one of his legs missing or at least not visible.8

If you ask about the place of the beautiful [Lord] (viṭāṇkaṇātatu) who sought out (totartntu) and made into his servant Canṭi (avanai)—while the gods (aṇtar) praised Canṭi’s feet—[Canṭi] who after taking lotus-blossoms (iṇṭaimalar), fashioning sand into a liṅga, bathing [it] (aṭṭi) with cow’s milk from the herd, had cut to pieces (tuṇṭam itu) [his] father’s legs that had kicked [the milk pots?], it is in Kalayanallur, where there are maṇḍapas, towers, and palace terraces, which rings with the Vedas, which is full of the bustle and sound of festivals, where beauties (kārikaiyār) dive (kutaintu) and bathe (ātum) in lotus-ponds that captivate the minds of those who see them.

I have given references to the poetry of Ėñācampaṭant (Jñānasambanda) and Cundarar (Sundara), but references in the poetry of Appar could be supplied too, for which see Nagaswamy 1989:212.

8 The scene has been identified as a representation of Canḍeśa’s moment of grace by Rao (1941) Volume I, part II, pp. 208–9. Dr. Charlotte Schmid has pointed out to me that it is possible that another niche on the North side of the prākāra, niche 41, shows the moment in which Canḍeśa is about to be garlanded, by Śiva, but as she has also pointed out, it is not unlikely that it should be some other figure receiving a garland, particularly since there are scenes intervening between niches 35 and 41. See also Gillet 2007:36, who supplies an illustration of the scene (Fig. 13) and suggests that it rather shows Rāvaṇa before Śiva. Niches 35 and 41 are both so covered with patchy stucco that they cannot be used as Pallava-period testimony for details of ornament or the like. Earlier still, on a monument from the beginning of the seventh century, a slightly different scene has been identified as the moment of Canḍeśa’s grace: in niche 15 of the second tala of the Northern face of the so-called Dharmarāja Ratha at Mahabalipuram, a four-armed Śiva is seen embracing a two armed figure with a headdress of hanging matted locks (jatā-bhāra) such as is typical of Canḍeśa (but also of other Śaiva forms in the Pallava repertoire, such as Bhikṣuṇī and ‘Dakṣināmūrti’). Both are standing, but the two armed figure’s entire body expresses deference and devotion, most obviously by being slightly stooped with the head bowed towards Śiva. No axe is to be seen. The identification is proposed by Srinivasan (1975:25 and 80 and Plate XIVa), who points out that it is closely parallel to a scene in the same place that shows Viṣṇu with a figure who could be regarded as Viṣṇu’s principal devotee, namely Garuda (Srinivasan 1975, Plate XIVc).
This myth was the starting point of my lecture, for a colleague of mine, Dr. Charlotte SCHMID, asked me how it came about that only one of the 63 South Indian Saints, namely Caṇḍeśvara, came to be prominently represented in almost all Śaiva temples all over the Tamil-speaking South and from a very early date. Others too have remarked on this oddity: ‘Alone of the Nāyaṇārs Caṇḍeśvara receives a niche of his own on the outside of the garbhagṛha’ (SMITH 1996:210). It seems often to be tacitly or explicitly assumed that Caṇḍeśvara was and has largely remained a South Indian figure whose cult has been integrated into the Śaiva Siddhānta and that he is a divinised devotee in origin. It seems to me that he may in fact not be South Indian in origin and that the South Indian story, although it may appear to be among the earliest attestations to the existence of a Caṇḍeśvara figure, is in fact not our starting point but almost certainly an aetiological myth intended to explain Caṇḍeśvara’s principal function in ritual. In other words, the story was, I suspect, composed in order to account for the existence of a fierce Śaiva ancillary deity who receives whatever has been offered to Śiva and is left over (ucchiṣṭa), thereby being rendered dangerously empowered.

2. The seated, axe-bearing receiver of nirmālya

There may be several temples which show the narrative panel we have discussed, but it is perhaps not one that commands instant recognition.\(^9\) But there is a representation of Caṇḍeśvara that is to be found in the vast majority of Śaiva temples in the Tamil-speaking South. PLATE 2 is relatively typical of images that predate the Cōla period. It comes from the larger of the two early temples at Tiruvatikai, near Cuddalore, namely the Viṣṇuṭana. In spite of modifications and accretions of many dates, both temples date back to the Pallava period: NAGASWAMY (1989:31) is inclined to date several of the sculptures from them to the seventh century. He does not mention this sculpture of Caṇḍeśvara, but assigning it an eighth-century date would not be impossible. It shows a two-armed figure, with jatābhāra rather than jatāmukuta, in other words with matted locks falling down beside the side of the head rather than wrapped up into a chignon above it. He is seated on a raised platform with one leg dropping down in front

\(^9\) Although it is surrounded by miniature panels recounting the legend, various misinterpretations of the panel in Gaṅgaikkoṇṭa-cōḷapuram have been suggested, such as, for instance, that it shows Śiva honouring the patron of the temple, Rājendra Cōla. NAGASWAMY (2006:179) ingeniously suggests that Rājendra Cōla has chosen to have himself portrayed as Caṇḍeśvara and that the panel therefore shows both scenes. This punning possibility cannot perhaps be entirely excluded, but it does not seem to me likely. The representation continues to figure in lists of the standard Śaiva images until at least the late sixteenth century: we find it, for instance, in Paṇḍakṣarayogin’s Śaivabhūṣana 155, and verse 353 of that work gives, by kaṭapayādi notation, 1521 śaka (1598/9 AD) as the date of its composition.
Who is Canḍeṣa?

and the other folded up close to the body and resting entirely on the platform. One of his hands rests on the thigh of the folded leg and the other holds an axe. He has, as usual, a yajñopavītā, prominent earrings, a garland round his neck, a band round the stomach, well above the waist (an udarabandha), and some damaged central roundel at the top of his jatābhāra. Could it have been intended to be a flower? He is placed in a small shrine of his own which is positioned to the North-East of the central linga. This is indeed the typical arrangement: he is inside the inner prākāra (enclosure wall), but in an aedicule that is not attached either to the prākāra or to the central shrine. It has only one opening, on its South face: in other words, this seated Canḍeṣa faces the North wall of the central shrine. In some places, Canḍeṣa’s shrine is as old as his image, as for example at the great Rājarājēśvara temple in Tanjore; in many others (e.g. in the Jalanaṭheśvara in Takkolam, Arakkonam Taluk), the shrine, is plainly modern. We shall return to this point below.

PLATE 2. Canḍeṣa in his shrine to the NE of the linga at the Virāṭṭaneśvara temple at Tiruvadigai (Tiruvatikai), Panruti Taluk, Cuddalore District.

It is clear that this type of image of Canḍeṣa expresses his chief function in ritual: he is there to receive the nirmālya, in other words food and garlands that have been offered to Śiva and thereby been imbued with a dangerous power. His position to the North-East of the linga appears to be no accident, for it puts him very close to the pranāla, the North-pointing spout that protrudes from the North wall of the shrine and carries away what ever has been poured over the linga. For a discussion of this function of Canḍeṣa in the context of notions about nirmālya and more generally about food and pollution, it would be difficult to better ED-HOLM’s lucid account of ‘gastrotheology’ (1984) and I shall therefore say little

---

10 It is perhaps worth drawing special attention to this feature, since a number of colleagues have drawn my attention to the similarity in the postures adopted by Canḍeṣa and in those assumed by images of another South-facing iconographical group, the so-called ‘Dakṣināmūrti’ figures. It is true that the postures are similar, but they are not the same: in the typical posture of a ‘Dakṣināmūrti’, one foot actually rests on top of the knee of the other leg. I have not seen a Canḍeṣa with such a posture. Now it is true also that there is considerable variation in the sitting postures of both iconographical types, particularly in the earliest South Indian representations (which in both cases probably begin with those in the Kailāsanātha temple in Kanchipuram); but even among these variously seated figures I am not aware of any case of a shared posture. It seems to me that the seated positions of ‘Dakṣināmūrti’ (unlike those of Canḍeṣa) are intended to be expressive of regal ease.

11 This positioning of Canḍeṣa in the North-East is of course not convenient for the receipt of garlands, at least in a large temple, where the wall of the main shrine stands between the linga and Canḍeṣa, but in a small shrine, such as the rock-cut shrines that we shall mention below, no wall intervenes.
more about it. Briefly, a fierce and powerful deity is required to neutralise what has been tasted and abandoned (\textit{ucchi\-\textit{\text{\text{\text{\textit{s}}}t\text{\text{\text{\text{\textit{a}}}})}}}) by Śiva and is therefore dangerous. This conception vies with that of ‘respect pollution’, namely the notion that by eating what another has tasted and abandoned one expresses a particularly close connection with that other person, as well as profound submission. The resulting tension has produced a multitude of conflicting injunctions about who may do what and under what circumstances with the \textit{nirmālya} of Śiva; many of these are documented in BRUNNER 1969. Canḍeśa’s rôle as the receiver of perishable offerings that have been made to Śiva can be traced, as we shall see below, to the very earliest surviving layer of Tantric Śaiva literature.

Nowadays, Tamilian devotees typically pause three-quarters of the way in their \textit{pradaksī\-\textit{nā}} around the central shrine in a typical East-facing temple, just past the North-pointing \textit{praṇāla}, at the shrine of Canḍeśvara. Here they lean in between the main shrine’s outer wall and the open-face of Canḍeśa’s shrine and clap their hands. This may be a practice that has developed from Canḍeśa’s rôle of receiving the \textit{nirmālya} or from his rôle of repairing defects in the performance of a ritual; but it is now given a range of quite different explanations: 1) devotees must signal to Canḍeśa that they have completed a temple-visit; 2) Canḍeśa is often asleep; 3) Canḍeśa, unlike other divinities in the temple, is deaf; 4) devotees must signal to Canḍeśa that they have nothing in their hands, since Canḍeśa is the guardian of temple property.

3. The surveyor of the temple procession
A third type of Canḍeśa that is widely known from temple processions and art-history books is Canḍeśa as a standing figure cast in bronze. PLATE 3 represents this type: it is a thirteenth-century bronze figure of Canḍeśvara from the Pudukkottai Museum. Here a youthful and peaceful looking Canḍeśvara stands with hands clasped in \textit{aṇjali} and with his distinctive axe tucked in the crook of one arm. Instead of a \textit{jaṭābhāra}, he wears a \textit{jaṭāmukuta}. This is typical of the standing bronze figures, just as the \textit{jaṭābhāra} is typical of the seated stone ones, at least until the late Cāla period, in which the \textit{jaṭāmukuta} may be used also for the seated stone figures.\footnote{For example, a cult-image of a seated Canḍeśa with \textit{jaṭāmukuta} (described by L’HERNAULT 1987:113) occupies the Canḍeśa shrine in the Airāvateśvara temple (LADRECH 2007, image 6062-09.jpg: ‘2nd half of 12th century’).}

Pressed between his clasped hands is a representation of a flower garland. In other words this is probably a type that intends to allude to the South Indian aetiological myth. Like the typical early stone figures he has a single lower garment, which is not a long dhoti, but rather a short one coming only a short way down his thighs, and it is buckled round his waist with
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a kirtimukha.

PLATE 3. A processional image (utsavamūrti) of Caṇḍeśa now in the Pudukkottai Museum and said to belong to the thirteenth century. Pressed between the hands is a garland. In bronze images, his hair seems invariably to be heaped up into a chignon (jaṭāmukuta).

Bronze statues (utsavamūrti) are taken out in temple processions, and this is presumably what such standing bronze figures of Caṇḍeśa were created for. They are typically carried at the end of processions of other Śaiva bronze images.¹³

Four beautiful tenth-century bronze processional images of this type are illustrated and described by NAGASWAMY (1983:119–123).

Caṇḍeśa’s principal rôle according to Saiddhāntika literature

Thus far we have briefly considered the three best known iconographic types and it is at this point that I should like to begin to introduce the contexts in which Caṇḍeśvara is encountered in Sanskrit literature. I shall begin by quoting and translating here a passage of a Saiddhāntika manual of the twelfth century in which the worship of Caṇḍeśvara is enjoined after the regular daily worship of Śiva. The manual in question is the Jñānaratnāvalī of Jñānaśambhu, a South Indian who lived and wrote in Benares, a contemporary of Aghora Śiva, and one of the teachers of the twelfth-century commentator Trilocana Śiva.¹⁴ (The text I shall quote is based on two manuscripts: M₁ = GOML Madras MS 14898, pp.138–9; M Y = ORI Mysore, MS P. 3801). The description of the rite is closely parallel to what we find in the Somaśambhupaddhati, and I could therefore have simply referred the reader to Section 5 of SP1; but I have not done so, partly because BRUNNER’s translation and annotation are in French and some readers will be happy to have an English translation of such a description, and partly because Jñānaśiva’s version is of intrinsic interest, since he appears to be the first of the authors of paddhati to surround his ritual instructions with discussion and with

¹³ See, e.g., FULLER 1984:18; NAGASWAMY 1983:9, plate 36; L’HERNAULT and REINICHE 1999:59–60; DAVIS 2002:57; NAGASWAMY 2006:178. Among South Indian temple āgamas, Ajīta 25:3–4, for instance, mentions that the ‘best’ type of nity-otsava is a procession of nine images, beginning with that of Vināyaka and ending with that of Caṇḍeśa, and the Uttara-Kāmika, in its presentation of nirājana, includes a processional image of Caṇḍeśa (6:253). Cf. also Purva-Kārana 141:171cd: sarvēśāṃ prsthato gacchet tathā caṇḍeśvaras (em.; caṇḍeśvaram Ed.) tataḥ. For pre-twentieth-century visual evidence of such processions, NAGASWAMY (1989, Plate C3) shows a ‘mural painting in the Devasiriya mandapa, in the temple at Thiruvarur, Tanjore district, depicting the procession of Saints Sambandar, Sundarar, Appar, Adhikaranandi and Candikesvara in the annual festival. The mural was probably painted during the reign of the Mahratta ruler Shaji I c. 1700 A.D.’

¹⁴ See GOODALL 2000.
Genesis and Development of Tantrism

scriptural justifications. His account of the worship of Canṣṭa therefore reveals a number of themes that are worth examining, and it appears to be a source for many subsequent discussions of cases in which the worship of Canṣṭa is omitted.

atha caṇḍeśvarārcaṇam ucyate. śivācakānāṁ samayollanghanajanitaṁ
yac caṇḍam ugraghoraṁ pāpam tadapaharaṇakartā caṇḍeśvara ity ucyate.
bahir īsaḵaṭhāyāṁ ardhacandrapamagayamaṇḍale anantadähr mająṇāvairāgaiśvaryapāṅkajam
pranavena vidhāya pūjayed idam āsanaṁ. om caṇḍāsaṇāya humphāṇṇamaḥ iti. tadupari, om caṇḍamūrtaye
humphāṇṇamaḥ iti

mūrtiṁ nilāṇjanaçċhāyān catuvaktrārkalocanāṃ sarpopavitateyūrāṁ mukhotthogrānalārciśam
jvalajvālārdhacandrādhyāyā atibhīmāṁ caturbhujaṁ śulaṁ kamaṇḍalum vāme dakṣe taṅkākṣāsaṁālinīm
rudrāṇiprabhāvāṁ dhyātvā mūlenāvāhāyet param

om dhunicaṇḍeśvarāya humphaṭ svāhety avāhanādīsthāpanāṁ vidhāya, om caṇḍahardayāya humphāṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍaśīkhyai humphāṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍakavacāya humphāṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍāstrāya humphāṇṇamaḥ iti sakalikṛtya mūlena paramikṛtya dhenumudrayaṁṛtikṛtya

---

15 samayollançhana° J M'°; samayolangohtanam M,
yaccaṇḍamugrahaṁ pāpam tadapaharaṇakartā J conj.;
yaccaṇḍamugrahoraṁ pāpam tadaṁapaharaṇakartā M°; yajet grāmghoraṁ pāpamaharaṇakartā M,
ity ucyate J M'°; ucyate M,
16 'kāṣṭhāyāṁ ardhacandrapamagayamaṇḍale J M';
'ko āyāmardhacandrākṛṣṭigomayamaṇḍale M'
17 vidhāyā pūjayed idam āsana J M°; vidhāyātha pūjayed idam mānasam M
18 iti tadupari, om caṇḍamūrtaye humphāṇṇamaḥ iti J M°; iti M' (eyeskip)
mūrti J conj.; mūrti M°; om. M (unmetrical)
caturvaktrārka° J M°; caturvaktrām ca M'
19 jvalacam. drā ṣya javyardhacandrādhyām (unmetrical); jvalajjvālajyamantrādhyām M,
śulaṁ vame daks. e taṅkākṣāsaṁālinī J om.; vāme dakṣe ghaṁtaṅkāsaṁālinau M';
vāmadakṣo taṅkākṣāsaṁālinī M,
20 svāhety avāhanādīsthāpanāṁ vidhāya, om caṇḍahardayāya humphāṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍaśīrāse humphāṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍaśīkhyai humphāṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍakavacāya humphāṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍāstrāya humphāṇṇamaḥ iti sakalikṛtya mūlena J conj.;
svāhetyavāhanādīsthāpanāṁ vidhāya, om caṇḍahardayāya humphāṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍaśīkhyai humphāṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍakavacāya humphāṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍāstrāya humphāṇṇamaḥ iti sakalikṛtya mūlena M'; svāhā M (eyeskip)

---

21 conj.
22 conj.
23 conj.
24 conjunction
25 conjunction
26 conjunction
27 conjunction
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ḥṛdā pāḍyācamanāḍikāṃ dattvā gandhādibhiḥ bhogāṅgopetaṃ sampūjya yathāṣaṭki japam kṛtvā nivedya tataḥ prāṇavena

goḥūhiryaṇavastrādī manihemādībhūṣanam

vihāya šeṣam nirmāyaṃ canḍeśāya nivedayet

lehyāśosyānnapānādi tāmbulaṃ sragvilepanam

nirmāyaḥbhūjanam tubhyaṃ praṇattam tu śivāṇāyām

iti paṭḥitvā śivanirmāyaṃ samarpya oṃ sarvam etat kriyāṃ kṛtāṃ mohat pariṇāṃ tadāstu

iti vijnāpya canḍeśaṃ aṣṭapuşyāṃ śivavad visarjayet. tad anu nirmāyaṃ apanīya gomayenopaliyā sthānam āstṛēṇa sampoṣyārghyaṃ visṛjya kārādikāṃ prakṣālā vidhiḥvād ācamya kārāṅganyāsasṃ kṛtvā yathāṣaṭki śivasamhitāṃ japat. tathā kālottare

aiśāṇyāṃ caṇḍanāthāṃ tu ṇhumphadantena pūjīyat vastrāṇagandhapānārghyanirmālāyādi-pavitrakāliḥ visṛjya cārghapātraṃ ca samācamyopasamsprṣet nyāsāṃ kṛtvā yathāṣaṭki japtavyā śivasamhitā śivārcaṃ maṃ kāmāyaṃ yathāvad anupūrvaṃ. iti.

tathā sarvaṃ jñāṇanottare

visarjitasya devasya gandhaṃ paṇi-viṣedanam nirmāyaṃ tad vijnāyad varja vastrāvihūṣanam arghayitvā tu taṃ bhūyaṃ canḍeśāya nivedayet. iti.
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nanu

bāṇalinge cale rohe siddhalinge svayambhuvi
pratimāsu ca sarvāsu na caṇḍo ’dhikṛto bhavet
advaitebhāvanāyukte sthanḍileśavidhāv api

iti kecit; apare punaḥ

ghaṭiṭasyāpi devasya naiva caṇḍārcanam. iti

tat katham? satyam. etac caṇḍapratīṣṭhāniṣedhavacanam, na pūjāniṣedhārtham.
īt etan matāntarapraṇītam, saivasiddhante punaḥ sarvadā sarvatra

pūjaniyam eveti niyamaḥ. tathā ca kālottare

sthire cale tathā ratne mrddārusailalkalpite
lohe citramaye bāne sthitaś caṇḍo niyāmakaḥ
siddhante netare tante na vāme na ca daksīṇe. iti.

caṇḍadravyaṃ gurudravyaṃ devadṛavyaṃ tathaiva ca
raurave te tu pacyante manasā ye tu bhumjate

tathā

avyakte vyaktake liṅge maṇḍale sthāndile, ’nale
cale sthīre tathā ratne manicitrādike tathā
gandhānnaṃśambhavate liṅge mrddhāsmaphalakalpite
tathā puṣpamaye liṅge caṇḍapūjā niyāmikā. iti.

A translation follows.

Next [scil. at end of the regular worship of Śiva] the worship of Caṇḍeśvara

---

46 rohe siddhalinge J M₂; lohe āṛsaliṅge M
47 ’leśa’ J M₂; ’leśe M’. Somaśambhupaddhati SP4 III:60c–61.
48 naiva caṇḍārcanam. iti J M₂; caṇḍārcanam api M (unmetrical)
49 tat katham? satyam. etac caṇḍapratīṣṭhāniṣedhavacanam, na pūjāniṣedhārtham J
em.; tat katham. satyam. etac caṇḍapratīṣṭhāniṣedhavacanam. na pūjāniṣedhārtham M₂; tatkatham sa ⊃ M₂
50 etan matāntarapraṇītam J M₂; etan matāṁtaraṃ. tatprāṇi ×₂ ×tam M₂
51 saivasiddhānte J M₂; śaive siddhānte M₂
52 sarvadā sarvatra J M₂; sarvāthā sarvadā sarva’ M₂
53 ratne mrddārusailalkalpite J M₂; rakte mamṛṭāraunyakalpite M₂
54 bāne sthitā caṇḍo niyāmakaḥ J em.; nābhau sthiraḥ caṇḍo niyāmakaḥ M₂; bāne
sthita caṇḍo niyāmakaḥ M₂
55 siddhānte netare tante na vāme J M₂; urther tante na ta vāme M₂
56 caṇḍadravyaṃ ... ye tu bhumjate J M₂; om. M₂
57 avyakte vyaktake J M₂; vyaktyaṃvyaktādike M₂
58 sthāndile J M₂; kudāle M₂
59 sthīre J M₂; sthīte M₂
60 gandhānnaṃśambhavete J em.; gandhānnaṃśambhavete M₂; gandhānnaṃśambhavete M₂
61 caṇḍapūjā niyāmikā. iti J M₂; caṇḍa ⊃ miketi M₂. Brhatkālottara, caṇḍayāgapatatala
15–16 (NGMPP B 25/2, f.51r).
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is taught. Whatever fierce and terrible evil may have been generated by transgressing the rules by those who venerate Śiva, the one who is responsible for removing that is taught to be Caṇḍeśvara. Outside, in the North-Eastern direction, in a *manḍala* of cow-dung that is half-moon-shaped he should build a lotus[thron]e with [the base] Ananta, [the four throne-legs of] Dharma, Jñāna, Vairāgya and Aiśvarya, [and the seat that is an open] lotus, using the *pranava* [as a mantra]. He should venerate this throne with [the mantra] Oṁ Caṇḍāsanaṁya Ṣūmphaṇṇamaḥ. Above that, with [the *mūrtimatra*, namely] Oṁ Caṇḍāmūrtaye Ṣūmphaṇṇamaḥ,

he should visualise the form [of the deity] as having the colour of black col-loryum, four-faced, twelve-eyed, with snakes for his sacred thread and for his upper armbands, with flames of fierce fire emerging from his mouth, bright with a fiery-flamed crescent moon, very terrible, four-armed, with trident and water-pot on the left and with axe and rosary on the right, arisen from the fire of Rudra['s anger], and he should then (*param*) invite [Caṇḍeśa] using his root mantra:

Oṁ Dhumicaṇḍeśvarāya Ṣūmphaṭ śvāhā. Having thus accomplished the seating of the deity that begins with invitation, he should perform *sakalikaraṇa* and *paramikaraṇa* with [the *aṅgamantras* of Caṇḍeśvara, namely:]

Oṁ Caṇḍahṛdayāya Ṣūmphaṇṇamaḥ,
Oṁ Caṇḍaśirase Ṣūmphaṇṇamaḥ,
Oṁ Caṇḍaśikhāya Ṣūmphaṇṇamaḥ,
Oṁ Caṇḍakavalacāya Ṣūmphaṇṇamaḥ,
Oṁ Caṇḍāstrāya Ṣūmphaṇṇamaḥ.

With the ‘cow-*mudrā*, he should effect the transformation into nectar, and with the [above-given] heart-mantra he should offer foot-water, water for sipping, etc. He should venerate [Caṇḍeśa] together with his *aṅgamantras* arrayed around

---

62 In a number of printed sources the principal part of this mantra appears in what is probably a mistakenly ‘normalised’ form: dhvunicandeswarāya. But we find dhuni-

 elsewhere, for example in the Sarvajñānottara (IFP MS T.334, p. 122, 19:134):

abhyaarcya pañcabhir brahmaś caṇḍesāya nivedayet dhunicandesvarāyetya hum phat śvāhety anukramāt.

63 The first of these expressions refers to the laying on of the mantras of the deity, either on to one’s hands and certain body-parts as part of an identification of oneself with the deity worshipped, or, as here, on to the imagined body of the deity. The second expression, a synonym of *ekatva* and *ekīkaraṇa*, refers to the unification of these parts.

64 It is possible that the *NETRA*-mantra has dropped out by accident and should also be supplied here.

65 This *mudrā*, of which there is a photograph (No. 8) in Planche 1 of SP1, imitates the udders of a cow and is used for this rite of *amrtikaraṇa* (q.v. in TAK 1), of transforming water or other offerings into nectar.
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him (bhogāṅgopetam) with fragrances and such like [offerings], perform as much recitation as he is able, and then, with [recitation of] the syllable OṀ he should announce:

Apart from cattle, land, gold, cloths and such, ornaments of jewels and gold and such, all else that has been offered and enjoyed [by Śiva] (śeṣam nirmālyam) one should give to Caṇḍeśa. Whatever can be licked, sucked, chewed or drunk, betel, garlands, unguents—all such things that have been offered and enjoyed [by Śiva] are given to you by Śiva’s command.

After reciting this, he should offer what has been offered and enjoyed by Śiva, saying

O Caṇḍa, all this ritual, if, because of ignorance, I have performed it deficiently or adding something, then let it be rendered perfect by your command.

After thus addressing Caṇḍeśa, he should invite him to depart with the performance of the eight-flower rite, just as [one does] in the case of Śiva. After that, one should remove what has been offered and enjoyed, smear the place with cow dung, besprinkle it using the ASTRA-mantra, pour away the guest-water, wash one’s hands and such, sip water according to the prescribed fashion, and lay the mantras [of Śiva back again] on one’s hands and body parts, and recite, for as much as one is able, the [collection of principal mantras of Śiva known as the] ŚIVASAMHĪTĀ.

Thus [the teaching to be found] in the Kālottara:

In the North-East, using [his mantras] ending in HUMPHĀṬ, one should venerate Caṇḍanātha with such purifying [offerings] as clothing, food, scents, drinks, guest-water and what has been offered to and enjoyed [by Śiva]. One should [then] pour away [the water from] the guest-water vessel, sip, touch the lips, perform the laying [of the mantras of Śiva back on to one’s body] and the ŚIVASAMHĪTĀ should be recited for as long as one is able. The veneration of Śiva has [now] been taught in due order exactly as it should be.

Thus [the teaching to be found] in the Sarvajñānottara:

One should know that those scents, flowers and food-offerings made to the God who has [since] been invited to depart are nirmālya. [In other words, everything offered to the God is nirmālya] excepting clothing and ornaments. After giving him guest-water, one should once again offer [those offerings] to Caṇḍeśa.

---

66 See TAK 1 s.v. ṛṣṭapuspikā.
67 Cf. SP1, appendix 1 for a presentation of Aghoraśiva’s account of this procedure.
Surely

In the case of a bāṇalīṅga, a portable one, ones that have risen [from rivers], a spontaneously arisen one and in the case of all [representational] images, Caṇḍa has no authority. [So too] in the case of one in which there is visualisation of a non-dual [deity such as Bhairava or Tumburu]. And also in the case of rites for the Lord [installed] on the ground.

Others, however, [opine:]

No worship of Caṇḍa [is to be performed] when the [image of] the Lord has been crafted either.

How can [such a view as] that [be maintained]? True. [But] this is [in fact] a prohibition of the installation of Caṇḍa and not a prohibition of his worship. This is advanced as somebody else's doctrine. In the Śaiva Siddhānta, however, the rule is that he should always and in every case be worshipped. And this is expressed in the Kālottara:

Whether the liṅga is stable or portable, or made of precious stone, clay, wood, rock, iron, or is represented in a picture, or is a bāṇalīṅga, [the worship of] Caṇḍa remains determined by rule (niyāmakāḥ) in the Siddhānta, but not in other tantric traditions: neither in the Vāmasrotas nor in the Daksinānasrotas.

Those who enjoy what belongs to Caṇḍa, what belongs to the guru or what belongs to the God, [even] in thought, are cooked in [the hell called] Raurava.

And

[When Śiva is worshipped] in aniconic and iconic images, in a maṇḍala, on the ground, in fire, in a portable or fixed liṅga, in one made of precious stones, or in a jewelled picture or the like, or in a liṅga made of unguents

---


69 BRUNNER (1998:242) interprets this pāda to mean: ‘Il n’y a rien à faire non plus dans les cultes où l’officier se sent un avec Śiva…’, but Professor SANDERSON pointed out to me that such an interpretation is unlikely and his alternative interpretation appears to receive confirmation from a fragment of the unpublished Vāstuvīdyā attributed to Viśvakarma, quoted below in the section entitled ‘Caṇḍeśa outside Tamil Nadu’.

70 This presumably means that the worship of Caṇḍa would be recommended when Śiva is worshipped in a bāṇa-liṅga or a svayambhuliṅga, but not in a man-made one.

71 Instead of this interpretation, we could perhaps assume a more regular sense of niyāmakāḥ: ‘Caṇḍa remains in control’.
or food, or in one made of clay or ash or fruits, or in one made of flowers, the worship of Caṇḍa is determined by rule (niyāmikā).

Worship without an image, and the axe and the club

The above passage is rich with material and I shall therefore now attempt, with the following pages, gradually to unpack points that most merit discussion.

Now the first thing which may strike the reader here is that the discussion is about the worship of Caṇḍesa without any image of Caṇḍesa present. The worship is to be performed in a space to the North-East, on a crescent-moon shaped maṇḍala, a detail that echoes the shape of the blade of Caṇḍesa’s characteristic implement, the axe. This is certainly an ancient detail, and the axe, furthermore, is not confined to South Indian prescriptive literature, for we find it in the description of Caṇḍesa as general of Śiva’s army of gaṇas (pramatha) in the old Skandapurāṇa 170:3:

caṇḍeṣvaras caṇḍavapur mahātma jvalatpradiptogra kuṭhārapānīḥ
vyādāya vaktraṁ purataḥ sthīto ‘bhūd devasya śambhoḥ pramathendravīraḥ.

The great-souled, fierce-body Caṇḍeṣvara was standing there in front with open mouth, a flaming, bright, fierce axe in his hand, the hero-prince of Lord Śambhu’s hosts.

And the axe features in the oldest tantric description too, namely that in the Mūlasūtra of the Niśvāsatattvasamhitā. Moreover, we find it in many of the most ancient sculptures of Caṇḍesa, for instance that shown in PLATE 2, but also in those in the perhaps more ancient rock-cut shrines at Bhairavakona (PLATE 34). It is, however, not a universal detail, for we find many old sculptures from the South in which the implement that Caṇḍesa holds, whether in his left or his right hand, is plainly a club, sometimes a club around which snakes are twined. Some examples of this early type are PLATES 4–7.
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PLATE 4. Caṇḍeśa with a club now installed above the pranaśā at the ruined Tirumulaṇāṭha shrine at Perangiyur (Pēranıkīyur), Villupuram Taluk, Villupuram District. It is clear that this is not where the image originally belonged. (I am grateful to N. RAMASWAMY for drawing my attention to this sculpture.)

It is true that such early club-wielding figures have in a few cases been identified by some as images of Lakulīśa, but I have been convinced by EDHOLM’s demonstration (1998) that they represent in fact Caṇḍeśa.75

PLATE 5. Detail of Caṇḍeśa with a club at the rock-cut shrine at Devarmalai, Kulittalai Taluk, Karur Dt. Snakes twist about the club. On the top of his head is a curiously shaped flower that may be compared with that in PLATE 6. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

PLATE 6. Club-wielding Caṇḍeśa in the Śrītyāgarāja Temple at Tiruvarur, Tiruvarur Taluk, Tanjore Dt. Snakes twist about the club. Compare the curiously shaped flower with that in PLATE 5. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

Returning to the absence of the mention of any image of Caṇḍeśvara here, the obvious explanation for this is that Jñānaśambhu is not primarily describing what happens in a temple, but rather the private worship of an individual initiate. Nevertheless, this absence draws our attention to the possibility that one of the reasons why there are so many regions of India (and South East Asia) where no images of Caṇḍeśvara have been identified (even though textual references to him exist there) might be that in those regions there was no practice of representing Caṇḍeśa. And we may note that in parts of Karnataka there is a practice of placing a post or liṅga in the North-East corner of the inner enclosure of a Śaiva temple for the worship of Caṇḍeśa.76

75 See also GOODALL et al. 2005:58.
76 In the photo-library of the IFP, there is a photograph of what appears to be such a liṅga in the Mahābaleśvara temple in Gokarna, Kumta Taluk, North Karnataka (photo 5046-4) and also a photo of a faceted broken stump in the North East corner of the inner enclosure of the Candramauliśvara temple in Udipi, Udipi Taluk, South Kanara Dt., Karnataka (photo 8050-5). ACHARYA (2005:209) points out that there is a shrine in the North-East corner of the famous Paśupati temple in Kathmandu that is “simply called ‘Caṇḍeśvara’s shrine and a small odd shaped linga is worshipped there”. ACHARYA adds (2005:209, fn.11) “It is highly probable that this shrine was built later when the Paśupati temple in Kathmandu got influence from the South and accepted Saiddhantika ritual scheme. It is sure that Caṇḍeśvara is made the consumer of nirmālya only later in Siddhānta Śaivism”. While ACHARYA may or may not be right about the North-Eastern shrine in the Paśupati temple being a relatively recent innovation that post-dates the arrival of South Indian priests there, the relation between Caṇḍeśa and nirmālya goes back to what is probably one of the earliest references to Caṇḍeśa, namely the description of his rōles in the Niśvāsa (a text that appears to predate the split in tantric Śaivism between the Śaiva Siddhānta and other streams), which we shall quote below.
PLATE 7. Club-wielding Caṇḍeṣa (?) inside the enclose to the North-East of the liṅga in the Viraṭāṇeṣvara Temple at Kilaiyur (Kilaiyür), Tirukoyilur Taluk, Villupuram Dt. The image has received the mistaken label ‘Śri Jaṭāmuni’. I treat this image as a possible Caṇḍeṣa, but, as my colleague Dr. Charlotte SCHMID has pointed out to me, the original position of this sculpture (as is the case of some other club-wielding figures) is unknown. Furthermore she has pointed out to me that the same temple has a set of saptamātrka figures of comparable style and that it is therefore conceivable that this figure belongs to that set as the fierce Śaiva deity, who, along with Gajānana, often accompanies the Mothers, and to whom various names (for instance, Virabhadra) are assigned. Photo: Emmanuel FRANCIS.

We may also note that some texts that do really appear to be prescribing the worship of Śiva in a public temple also refer to the possibility that Caṇḍeṣa may not have his own image and may nonetheless be worshipped. An example is Pūrva-Kāmika 4.523–525b:

\[
\text{aiśānyām pūjayec caṇḍam gandhapuspādibhiḥ kramāt}
\text{tasmai samarpayet sarvaṃ nirmālyāṃ tat prakīrtitam 523}
\text{liṅgamūrđhaśtam ity eke piṇḍikāyāṃ athāpare}
\text{aiśānyām piṭhakasthaṃ vā bāhye caṇḍagrhe ’thavā 524}
\]

One should venerate Caṇḍa in the North East with scents, flowers and such in due order. To him one should offer all nirmālya—that has been explained. Some say [one should worship] him situated in the top of the liṅga, others say situated in the piṇḍikā or in the North East of the stand, or outside in a temple for Caṇḍa.

Four-armed visualisations of Caṇḍesā

The second thing to strike the reader’s eyes as they travel over Jñānaśambhu’s prescriptive account will be the visualisation of Caṇḍeṣvara as a fierce, fiery, four-armed and four-faced deity.

PLATE 8. Four-armed and four-faced Caṇḍeṣa still in situ in the shrine to the NE of the liṅga in the somewhat dilapidated but not derelict Maruntiśvara Temple at Kacchur (Kaccūr), Singaperumalkoyil Taluk, Chengleput Dt. The upper hands bear rosary and spouted water-pot; the lower ones hold axe and trident. I am grateful to N. RAMASWAMY for drawing my attention to this image. Photo: N. RAMASWAMY.

Hitherto, we have looked only at two-armed types, which are overwhelmingly more commonly represented in sculpture. In Saiddhāntika literature, however, it is four-armed forms that predominate. Jñānaśambhu’s visualisation of Caṇḍeṣa is essentially the same as that of his twelfth-century contemporary Aghoraśīva (see, e.g., Paṅcāvaraṇaṣṭava 101), of the eleventh-century author Somaśambhu
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(SP1, V:1–2), of a certain Vairocana (Pratīṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya 17:15–17), who was probably a Nepalese author of the eleventh or twelfth century,\(^{77}\) and also of two unpublished pratiṣṭhātantras that survive in early Nepalese manuscripts, namely the Mayasaṅgraha and the Mohacuḍottara.\(^{78}\) The Mayasaṅgraha cannot be later than the tenth century, for a commentary on it survives by Vidyākanaṭha II, the son of the tenth-century Kashmirian author Rāmakanaṭha II (see GOODALL 1998:x–xi).

PLATE 9. Canḍeṣas of various dates and provenance gathered from neighbouring temples and displayed in a courtyard of the Tiruvavatūturai Adheenam (Tiruvāvatūturai), Mayavaram Taluk, Nagapattinam District. N. RAMASWAMY drew my attention to these sculptures.\(^{79}\) Photo: EFEO (G. Ravindran).

PLATE 10. Four-armed and four-faced Canḍeṣa in a courtyard of the Tiruvavathurai Adheenam (Tiruvāvatūturai). The deity’s top right hand has a trident; his top left hand, which presumably held an axe, has been broken away. The lower hands hold a rosary (deity’s right) and a round object that may be a fruit. Photo: EFEO (G. Ravindran).

PLATE 11. The fourth face on the reverse of the sculpture shown in PLATE 10. Photo: EFEO (G. Ravindran).

PLATE 12. Four-armed and four-faced Canḍeṣa in a courtyard of the Tiruvavathurai Adheenam (Tiruvāvatūturai). The top left hand has an axe; the top right hand, a trident. The lower hands hold a rosary and spouted water-pot. Photo: EFEO (G. Ravindran).

\(^{77}\) See GOODALL et al. 2005:24.

\(^{78}\) For the texts of these various passages, see GOODALL et al. 2005:184–5.

\(^{79}\) The label ‘Dvāparayugacanḍeṣvara’ appears to derive from what is probably a late list of five types of Canḍeṣāvaras which is twice presented in a rather corrupt form (with only 4 names although the text twice says that there should be 5) in Suprabheda kriyāpāda 47.3–7b:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pracāṇḍadīr vinīkṛśātā paṇcamūrti vidhānatah} \\
\text{pracāṇḍaṇḍah prathamaṁ tato vikrāntaṇḍakah} 3 \\
\text{trīyō vibhucanās tu vīraṇḍaṇḍaḥ caturthakah} \\
\text{evaṁ vai paṇca canḍeṣāḥ paṇcabrahmasamudbhavāḥ} 4 \\
\text{krtyaugahipatyaṁ tu pracāṇḍam idam ucyate} \\
\text{vikrāntaṇḍanāmā tu tretāyāṁ adhipaḥ śmrtaḥ} 5 \\
\text{dvāpāre cādhipatyaṁ hi vibhūs canḍeṣa ucyate} \\
\text{kālau tu vīraṇeṣaṇāvādhipatyaṁ prakārtitaṁ 6} \\
\text{evaṁ vai paṇcābhredena canḍo nāma vidhīyate}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{3a}\) pracāṇḍadīr I conj.; pracāṇḍādi Ed. \(^{4a}\) vibhū I conj.; bhūvi Ed. 
\(^{3d}\) caṇḍakah I conj.; caṇḍagah Ed. \(^{4d}\) caṇḍesāḥ paṇcabrahmasamudbhavāḥ I conj.; caṇḍesā paṇcabrahmasamudbhavā Ed. 
\(^{7b}\) caṇḍo I conj.; caṇḍa Ed.
We also find an extremely similar visualisation, in the influential eleventh-century *Bṛhatkālottarā*,80 where it is followed by an alternative four-armed visualisation (*caṇḍayāgaṇapatāla* 13c–14: NGMPP B 25/2, f. 51r; B 24/59, f. 45r):

\[
\text{śūlaṭaṅkadharaṃ dhyāyet kamaṇḍalavakṣasāтриṇāṃ 13} \\
\text{mahābhujam mahoraskam bhinnājanacayopamam} \\
\text{ekavaktraṃ trinetrāṃ ca āṃkāḷṣam abhayapradam 14}
\]

One should visualise him holding trident, axe, water-pot and rosary, with powerful arms, a big chest, like a heap of broken charcoal [in colour]. [Or alternatively] one-faced, three-eyed, [holding] axe [and] rosary [and showing the gestures of] abhaya and boon-giving.81

The first of this pair of visualisations does not specify the number of heads, and it is therefore likely that readers would have understood only one head to be intended in each case.

Now all the four-handed four-faced forms, both in literature and in sculpture, appear to be relatively late, the earliest of them being perhaps that of the *Mohacūḍottarā*. Furthermore, given how standard four-armed visualisations are in Saiddhāntika ritual texts, and given the widespread assumption that the majority of temples in the Tamil-speaking South have long been in some strong sense Saiddhāntika, it is surprising how extremely rare it is to find four-armed representations in worship. In GOODALL et al. 2005, we illustrated and described at length a four-armed and four-faced image under worship in the Caṇḍesā shrine of the Uttarāpateśvara temple in Tiruchchennattangudi (Tiruvencēkkattāṅkuṭi), Nannilam Taluk, Tanjore Dt. (2005:60, FIGS. 37 and 38). Since then, N. RAMASWAMY has drawn my attention to a very much later sculpture that accords more nearly with Jñānāsambhu's prescription and that is still *in situ*: see PLATE 8. One other still in worship is in the Caṇḍesā-shrine in the best known of all South Indian Śaiva temples, namely that at Chidambaram; but its identity seems now no longer to be recognised, for, because of its four

---

80 The *Bṛhatkālottarā* is here assigned to the eleventh-century on the grounds that it appears not to have been known to the tenth-century Kashmirian commentators. The first quotations ascribed to it that we can identify in the work as it is transmitted in Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts appear, as far as I am aware, in Jñānāsambhu's twelfth-century *Jñānaratnāvalī*.

81 The second of these visualisations, with one face, three eyes, axe, rosary, abhaya and varada, is adopted in the *Prayogamaṇjarī* of Ravi (20:158).
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heads, it is taken to be a sculpture of Brahmā: as Younger remarks (1995:44, fn. 43), ‘The image of Caṇṭeçuvaraṇ in Citamparam is special because it has a four-faced Brahmā with it, and the two images are always worshiped together.’

No other seated four-faced, four armed Caṇḍeṣvara is known to me that is still under worship in a shrine to the North-East of a šiṅga in the Tamil-speaking South. But there are indeed other surviving images of this type that belong to the ‘Cūḍa period’. Among these, we have referred elsewhere (Goodall et al. 2005: 188) to the four-armed Caṇḍeṣvara identified by De Mallman (1963:65–6) in the Musée Guimet, and to the beautiful (though also damaged) stone sculpture from Darasuram now in the Tanjore Museum (identified as a Caṇḍeṣa by Harle, 1963:108, but see also L’Hernault 1987:118 and photo 108 or Ladrech 2007, image 6766-08.jpg). Here the axe and water-pot are plainly visible in the deity’s upper and lower left hands respectively, but the implements held in the right hands, presumably trident and rosary, are now broken away. Ladrech, in her description of this image dates it to the second half of the twelfth century and says, following L’Hernault 1987:118, that it formerly belonged ‘in a niche of the second gateway’. The reason for his assumption appears to be the inscribed label on the lintel of a niche in the second gateway that reads āḍicaṇḍeṣvara-deva (Ladrech 2007, image 8491-03.jpg). But it may be that this label once belonged to a standing four-armed Caṇḍeṣvara such as those to be found in the gopurams of Chidambaram, as described by Harle 1963:107–8, plates 140–1.

We failed, however, to refer to one other published Cūḍa sculpture that corresponds to this four-armed, four-faced type, which also belongs to the Airāvateśvara temple in Darasuram and is still there. It has all four implements visible, including the trident and rosary in the top and bottom right hands of the deity respectively, and is to be found in a niche on the North face of the Eastern hall of the main shrine (L’Hernault 1987:90–1 and photo 50 or Ladrech 2007, image 47-01.jpg: same as 8488-01.jpg). As L’Hernault remarks (1987:91), the image seems, once again, to be rather squat for the niche that it occu-

---

82 This mistaken identification of the four-faced Caṇḍeṣvara in Chidambaram as Brahmā may be some centuries old if David Smith is correct in his interpretation of verse 30 of the Kuṇcitāṅghristava attributed to the fourteenth-century author Umāpati: see Smith 1996:95, 189 and fn. 5 on p. 277. The attribution of the Kuṇcitāṅghristava seems to me doubtful, however; I believe that a handful of authors called Umāpati should be distinguished: see Goodall 2004:cxv–cxix.

83 Doubtless others exist, but they are rare. A rather crude image of this type that may be under worship in a shrine to the North East can be seen in photograph 445-5 in the photo-library of the IFP, from the Someśvara temple at Andakudi (Āntakkuṭi), Nagapattinam Taluk, Tanjore Dt.
N. RAMASWAMY has pointed out to me two other four-faced, four-armed Caṇḍeśas displayed in a courtyard of the Tiruvavaduturai Adheenam, presumably gathered together from surrounding temples (see PLATES 9–13). One of these corresponds to Jñānaśambhu’s prescription (PLATES 12–13); the other is perhaps closer to what we find in Tiruchchengattangudi, since, instead of a water-pot, he is holding a round object that may be a fruit. Perhaps it is also a fruit held by the handsome four-armed Caṇḍeśvara in the Victoria Jubilee Museum in Vijayavada (PLATE 14)?

PLATE 14. Four-armed and one-faced Caṇḍeśa in the Victoria Jubilee Museum in Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh. The Museum number is ‘VM 495’ and the sculpture, now in the garden of the Museum, bears a label identifying it as a ‘Bhairava’ of the tenth or eleventh century, from Penugonda in West Godavari District. A photograph in the photo-library of the IFP, where it is classed as a Caṇḍeśa, shows it inside the Museum (photo 5984-6). The upper hands hold axe and rosary; the lower hands, abhaya and a round object that may be a fruit.

PLATE 15. Four-armed and one-faced Caṇḍeśa in the Pudukkottai Museum, dated (according to the label) to the tenth century. I have not been able to determine what, if anything, the deity’s upper right hand holds. It displays a kārtarīmudrā as though it should hold something, just as the deity’s upper left hand does, which ‘holds’ a rosary. The lower right hand has the axe and the lower left hand rests on the left thigh. Notice the flat-petaled flower on the expanse of head between the forehead and the heavy jatābhaṇa.

PLATE 16. Four-armed and one-faced Caṇḍeśa in the Candrasekhara temple in Samalkot, Kakinad Taluk, East Godavari Dt. Axe, rosary, abhaya, varada. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

---

84 As for the use of the label Ādicaṇḍeśvara rather than Caṇḍeśvara, L’HERNAULT (ibid.) comments that this manner of creating two names is a conventional way of differentiating between two iconographical variants of the same figure: ‘En réalité ce type de distinction dans les noms paraît être une façon conventionnelle et commune de différencier deux variantes iconographiques d’un même personnage’. Another possibility is that the ‘Ādi-’ element derives from the epithet ‘Ādidda’, which is frequently applied to him in South Indian epigraphs (see, e.g., SII, vol. 1 passim). All L’HERNAULT’s remarks on the various figures of Caṇḍeśvara, incidentally, seem eminently sensible. She may be wrong, however, to suggest (L’HERNAULT 1987:94) that his four-armed, four-faced form was inspired by the Śāradātīlaka. (For the probable date and provenance of that work, see SANDERSON 2007, in particular p.233.) Certainly that is not the ultimate source of this iconography, and it seems more likely that the immediate inspiration too was a Saiddhāntika work. And she may be wrong to state (1987:113) that no representations of the two-armed form of Caṇḍeśa prior to the 11th and 12th centuries show the āhūyavarada gesture, since we find this at Punjai (PLATE 27), and that none has his locks wrapped up into a chignon, since we find this feature in the figure that should perhaps be identified as Caṇḍeśa at Arittappatti, for which see EDHOLM 1998.
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A handful of Southern images reflect the four-armed, one-headed visualisation represented by the Brhatkālottara. One is from the Tēvarcīṅkappumān temple, Tiruvalangadu, Tiruttani Taluk, Tiruvallur Dt., for which see Fig. 39 of GOODALL et al. 2005; another is now in the Museum in Pudukkottai (PLATE 15) and the others are in temples in East Godavari district in Andhra Pradesh (PLATES 16–17).

PLATE 17. Four-armed and one-faced Caṇḍeśa in the Kukkuṭeśvara temple in Pithapuram, Pithapuram Taluk, East Godavari Dt. Axe, rosary, abhaya, varada.
Photo: IFP/EFEO.

But there is an entirely different group of one-faced, four-armed sculptures that may represent Caṇḍeśvara from quite the other end of the sub-continent, from Nepal. ĀCHARYA (2005:213) describes an image in the South-East corner of the court yard of the Paśuptati temple in Kathmandu as having four hands holding a trident and some unidentifiable object to the left, and a rosary of rudrākṣa beads and a citron to the right. The lower part of the body is clothed in the skin of a tiger, while the upper part of the body is shown naked. [...] this image bears the sacred thread [...] It is represented with the third eye in the forehead, with matted hair on the head and the membrum virile upraised.

ĀCHARYA goes on to explain (2005:214):

He is represented in almost each and every Śiva temple in this form. No image of him is found in seated posture, and absence of a hatchet is distinctive in Nepalese sculptures of Caṇḍeśvara.

PLATE 18A. Four-armed, one-faced Caṇḍeśa (?) from courtyard of the nineteenth-century Rāpanukteśvara temple in Kathmandu. In this case, the image is found to the North-East of the shrine and facing West. Diwakar ĀCHARYA has informed me, however, that the standard position for installation of such images is to the South-East of the liṅga and facing West, but that when alterations are made, such images may be moved around for convenience. No motivation for any shift in position is evident in this case. The faceted column behind the sculpture supports a chattra, perhaps in imitation of the ‘Chattra-caṇḍeśvara’ who stands to the South East of the liṅga in the Paśuptati temple (for which, see below). A modern chattra above the image is supported by the faceted post behind the image. In the back

85 The photo-library of the IFP also has photographs that are unfortunately not sufficiently sharp to be reproduced that appear to show a damaged sculpture of a four-armed Caṇḍeśvara with a rosary in the deity’s upper right hand, an axe (?) tucked into the crook of his lower left arm, and with the two lower hands joined together in some sort of mudrā that is built into what may be a broken buttress in the South East corner of the Biccavolu temple at Nakkalagudi, Ramacandrapura Taluk, East Godavari Dt.: photos 3544-11 and 3544-12.
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hands are held rosary (with the bead known as Meru at the top) and trident; in the lower hands are held a chisel (?) and a water pot. Markings on the thighs suggest that he is intended to be shown wearing a tiger-skin. Around the wrists and upper arms and on the head-dress are strings of what may be rudrākṣa beads. A brass plaque beneath the image, added at the time of a festival in 2003, identifies the figure as ‘Śrī Kāmadeva’. Photo: Rajan KHATIWODA of the Nepal German Manuscript Cataloguing Project.

But is ACHARYA correct in supposing that these Nepalese sculptures are indeed representations of Caṇḍeśa? I think that he may be: there are several factors which explain why, until ACHARYA’s article, no secondary literature appears to have identified these figures with Caṇḍeśa. One is that they seem commonly to be placed to the South East of the linga rather than to the North East, which seems to conflict with all prescriptive literature as well as with South Indian practice; a second is that they are standing and ithyphallic, whereas South Indian representations of Caṇḍeśa are all seated, with the exception of the processionals bronzes, and none is ithyphallic; a third is that the Nepalese images do not carry an axe or a club; and a fourth is that the Nepalese images are identified locally as images of Kāmadeva86 or Śiva-Kāmadeva.87 Let us deal with these problematic points one by one. The first is certainly odd, for the placement of Caṇḍeśa in the North East seems so invariable, not only in his capacity as the receiver of nirmālya, but also in his position in the retinue of Sadāśiva when worshipped at the centre of several circuits (āvaraṇa) of deities. Many tantric sources include a circuit of Gaṇeśas, namely Devī (N), Caṇḍeśa (NE), Nandin (E), Mahākāla (SE), Bhṛṅgin (S), Vināyaka (SW), Vṛṣabha (W), and Skanda (NW), in between the ring of 8 Vidyeśvaras and the ring of eight (or ten) Lokapālas (see GOODALL et al. 2005: FIG. 8). And his place in the North East is known to us not just from Śaiddhāntika sources, but also from a work of the Śivadharmacorpus,88 namely the Śivopaniṣat, whose description of the Śaiva temple (āyatanaṃ
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śambhoḥ) contains the following details (2:17c–19b):

tanmahānasam āgneyyāṁ pūrvataḥ sattramanḍapam 17
sthānam caṇḍeśaṁ aṁśāryāṁ puṣpārāṇāṁ tathottaram
koṣṭhāgāraṁ ca vāyavyāṁ vārūnyaṁ varunālayam 18
sāmīndhanukāsthānām āyuḍhāṇāṁ ca nairṛtām.

Its kitchen should be in the South East; in the East should be the sacrificial pavilion; the place [of?] Caṇḍeśa is in the North East; and the North is the garden; the store-room should be in the North West; the water reserve in the West; the place for the Šāmil-wood implements used to make fire, of kindling and of kuśa grass and also of instruments is South-Western.

But it is not unknown for the prescribed directions of deities to change: in Nepal, the bull is consistently placed to the West of Śaiva shrines, just as we would expect from the bull’s position in the above-mentioned gaṇeśāvaraṇa, whereas in South Indian temples the bull is consistently placed in the East. Furthermore, as we shall see below (see the section entitled ‘Caṇḍeśa and the North East’), the very earliest texts do not in fact associate Caṇḍeśvara with any particular direction. As for the standing posture, this conflicts only with South Indian conventions, but not, apparently, with any of the textual prescriptions. Nothing is said in the texts known to us of Caṇḍeśa’s being ithyphallic, but this is a detail that appears to be added to some forms of Šiva in some regions of the subcontinent and not in others. There appear, for example, to be no Śaiva images that...
are ithyphallic in the Tamil-speaking South, whereas in Bengal even Sadāśiva may be ithyphallic (see GOODALL et al. 2005: FIG. 44).

Turning to the four attributes held in the hands, the trident and rosary are to be found in the Saiddhāntika visualisations, and we have already noted that instead of a water-pot, something that could be a fruit is held by the Tirucchen-gattangudi image as well as by those shown in PLATES 12–14. Furthermore, although I have not seen and cannot judge the figure in the Paśupati temple, most of the representations of this figure that I have seen and all of the ones published in the on-line ‘Huntington Archive’ have a gourd-like water-pot (alābu) rather than a fruit. Most problematic, however, is the ‘unidentified object’ that is neither an axe nor a club. Perhaps the two-armed visualisation illustrated in the volume of drawings that accompanies the edition of the Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya (PLATE 30, and cf. the illustrations in the two manuscripts of that same text reproduced by BÜHNEMANN 2003:91, picture 89) may offer a clue. The word坦克, which appears in several visualisations of Cauḍēśa, including both of the ones in the Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya, can, according to MONIER-WILLIAMS, refer to such diverse instruments as a spade, hatchet, stonecutter’s chisel, sword or scabbard. The Nepalese illustrators of the prescriptions appear to have chosen to understand the word to refer to a chisel (see PLATE 30). Perhaps the ‘unidentified object’ is some sort of instrument for chiselling. The figures in the ‘Huntington Archive’ all appear to have a small shield-like object with a knob fixed to its centre. The knob is slipped between the index finger and thumb of the deity’s lower right hand, which hangs down with palm towards the viewer, so that almost all of the shield is hidden by the hand. Now in some cases a round or rounded shield-like shape is clearly part of the object because it covers up something behind it; but in others it looks rather more like a raised portion of stone whose only purpose is to support the finer detail carved in front of it; and in some cases the shield-like object seems to be absent altogether (see PLATES 18A AND 18B). This leaves only a knob-like shape between thumb and forefinger, perhaps intended as a sort of handle-less chisel.

89 The shield-like disc covers the trident-staff in the HUNTINGTONS’ scan No. 0019412 described as ‘Siva Kamadeva’ from ‘Lhugha Baha, exterior courtyard, north side’, dated to the ‘Three Kingdom Malla’ period.
90 In the HUNTINGTONS’ scan No. 0017157, for instance (described as ‘Siva Kamadeva’ situated in the ‘Mahadeva temple, east side, facing temple’ and dated again to the ‘Three Kingdom Malla’ period), the raised portion of stone behind the rosary in the deity’s upper right hand seems comparable with the area of raised stone behind the lower right hand. In this image, incidentally, there is an axe-blade fixed to the haft of the trident, but this probably cannot be taken to be Cauḍēsa’s distinctive weapon: tridents in Nepal often have an axe blade affixed to them, and in some cases also a damaru.
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Plate 18B. Four-armed, one-faced Čandeśa(?) from among the many sculptures placed each to the South-East of one of the numerous liṅga shrines on an upper terrace the other side of the Vagmati river from the Paśupati temple in Kathmandu. Diwakar Acharya has informed me that these belong to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Once again, I take the implement in the deity’s lower right hand to be a sort of ‘chisel’. Photo: Kei Kataoka.

It seems to me possible, therefore, that the chisel is the intended original implement and that it corresponds to the taṅka of our descriptions. In support of this, one more image may be adduced (Plate 18C) in which each implement has been given a sort of decorated halo behind it. If one were to study the image’s lower right hand in isolation, one would have little hesitation in proclaiming it a shield, and yet it is plain from looking at the other hands that it cannot be intended to be one.

Plate 18C. Four-armed, one-faced Čandeśa(?) from one of the many liṅga shrines on the other side of the Vagmati river from the Paśupati temple in Kathmandu. In the back hands are a rosary (with the bead known as Meru at the top) and a trident, each with a decorated halo behind it, and in the lower hands are held a chisel and a water pot, again each with a decorated halo behind. Photo: Rajan Khatiwoda of the Nepal German Manuscript Cataloguing Project.

But there is one further Nepalese image that must be mentioned, for seeing it just before submitting this article allayed a number of my doubts about the presence of Čandeśa in Nepal. The image in question is probably the earliest of those discussed here by a considerable margin, for it stands facing South on a platform a few yards to the North East of the liṅga of the sixteenth-century Mahendresvara temple at Hanumandhoka in Kathmandu (Plate 18D).91 Alone among the Nepalese images I have seen, this figure holds an axe in his upraised left hand, instead of a chisel-like object in his lower right hand. He therefore holds exactly the same implements as the four-armed visualisations prescribe and as can be observed in numerous South Indian sculptures discussed above, including those of Plates 8 and 12–13.

Plate 18D. Four-armed, one-faced Čandeśa placed to the North East of the four-faced liṅga in the Mahendresvara temple at Hanumandhoka in Kathmandu. The temple was founded by Mahendramalla in the sixteenth century. The deity’s upper hands hold a trident and axe, and the lower two hands hold an aksamālā (indistinct in the photo) and a kamaṇḍalu. Like numerous Nepalese images of

---

91 The temple was constructed by Mahendramalla, who ruled in Kathmandu c. 1560–1574 AD: see Slusser 1982:190–1. I am grateful to Dr. Diwakar Acharya for guiding me to this temple.
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this figure (for instance that at the Raṇamukteśvara temple), he is surmounted by a stone chatra, which in this case may be of more recent date than the sculpture. Once again, this may be in imitation of the chatra above the sculpture in the Paśupati complex, whose supporting column has the inscription that mentions Chatracandeśvara. As I was examining this figure, a passer-by, apparently a local, told me that it was ‘Kāmeśvara’. Photo: Kei KATAOKA.

In the above discussion I have been attempting to rationalise the discrepancies between these Nepalese images known as ‘Śiva-Kāmadeva’ with the four-armed visualisation that is widespread in Saiddhāntika literature; in other words I have been assuming that the images reflect the visualisation. But Acharya’s assumption (2005:210ff) is the reverse: the prescriptions derive in his view from the sculpture, and perhaps from a particular sculpture in the Paśupati temple. For the image in the South-East corner of the Paśupati temple courtyard, which faces away from the linga rather than towards it, has its back to a column that supports a stone chattra and bears a seventh-century inscription recording a donation to Pāśupata teachers and beginning with an invocation to Chatracanḍeśvara, who is there praised as the supreme deity of the universe (…jagad idam akhilam yo ‘ṣṛjād. . .). Like several other Nepalese sculptures, this one (which I cannot myself see, since photography and non-Hindus are forbidden there) stands thus ‘beneath a parasol (chatra) made of stone at the top of a pillar’ (Acharya 2005:209), and the pillar that supports the parasol is inscribed with what could be assumed to be his name, among other details. According to Acharya, the image represents Chatracanḍeśvara, in other words Canḍeśvara with a parasol, and, even though the image is ‘medieval’ and so not of the same date as the original which ‘may have been destroyed in some natural calamity or during the Muslim invasion’ (Acharya 2005:214), nonetheless ‘it is possible that the attributes of the original image were copied onto the present image’ (ibid.).

Now the main focus of Acharya’s article is actually the so-called ‘Mathurā Pillar inscription’ of 380/381 AD, edited by Bhandarkar (1931), in which Acharya proposes to read jayati ca bhagavāṇ caṇḍaḥ rudradaṇḍo [’gra[nā]yako nityam (2005:209) where Bhandarkar had read the palaeographically similar but non-sensical jayati bhagavāṇ ḍaṇḍaḥ]… and proposed to correct, partly on metrical grounds (since he believed this to be a half-line of āryā), to jayati bhagavān ḍaṇḍaḥ sa… Sculpted on to the pillar below the inscription is a three-eyed figure wielding a club in his right hand and another (but apparently quite different) ‘unidentifiable object’ almost hidden by his left hand, which is clutched to the left of his stomach. Acharya proposes that this figure is ‘Caṇḍa’, in other words Śiva himself in the form regarded as supreme at this point in time by at least certain Pāśupatas. Furthermore, he suggests (2005:217) that ‘[t]here is thus all reason to identify the sculptures of figures
previously assumed to be standing figures of Lakulīśa as depicting rather Caṇḍa or Caṇḍēśvara’. He suggests (2005:216) that it is probable that

...Caṇḍa was a pre-Lakulīśa deity accepted in all schools of the Pāṣupatas. Afterwards he was downgraded to a minor deity but remained in Śaiva temples as one of Śiva’s gaṇas.

In other words, ACHARYA’s view appears to be that the various sculptures placed to the South East or North East of Śaiva shrines across Nepal and now popularly known as Kāmadeva, Kāmeśvara, or, to art-historians, as Śiva-Kāmadeva are imitations of a lost seventh-century representation of Chatracaṇḍēśvara in the South-East of the courtyard in the Paṣupati temple. This is in turn the ultimate source of a four-armed prescription for the visualisation of Caṇḍēśa in texts of the Śaiva Siddhānta, a religion in which the fierce form of the supreme deity has been relegated to the rank of the receiver of nirmālya of a newer supreme deity, the mild, lacto-vegetarian Śadāśiva. As for the mistaken name identity, this is of course not difficult to explain (2005:216, fn. 35): ‘the general populace takes the image of Caṇḍēśvara to be Kāmadeva, not recognizing the ithyphallic element as a symbol of yogic achievement’. (Confusion, furthermore, seems easier to account for in the Nepalese context than in the relatively codified world of post-Chola iconography in the Tamil-speaking South, for one becomes accustomed, in Nepal, to seeing a profusion of Buddhist, Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva sculptures of all periods jostling one another in the same compound.)

Now this model, if accepted, might explain how Caṇḍēśa may have entered the tantric tradition and it would account for the Nepalese data, but can it explain the evolution of Caṇḍēśa’s iconography elsewhere? There seems to be no absolutely firm reason why even seated forms such as the two-armed, club-bearing Caṇḍēśa that we see in Devarmalai (PLATE 5) should not indeed have developed out of the Pāṣupata iconographic tradition that produced the figure on the ‘Mathurā Pillar Inscription’, and we shall later consider the positions in which such figures appear; but first let us finish speaking of the four-armed form.

Given the prestige of the Paṣupati temple, it is not impossible that surrounding temples should have chosen to copy both the iconography and the South-Eastern location of its ‘Caṇḍēśvara’ image; but is it likely that a variant of this four-armed visualisation should come to be adopted from an image in Kathmandu as the Saiddhāntika standard? Of course there may have been many images in Nepal by the time the iconography came first to be described in Saiddhāntika literature (as mentioned above, the earliest description known to me is that in the pre-tenth-century Mayasangraha), but if so, what has happened to those images? All the Nepalese images known to me, have been
dated by others to well after the tenth century. It therefore seems to me not unlikely that the image now next to the seventh-century Chatracanḍeśvara inscription does not reflect the iconography of the seventh-century image, and that it might instead be a ‘medieval’ sculpture influenced by the Saiddhāntika visualisation.

A further problem with the theory is that, even if we accept ACHARYA’s reading of the Mathura inscription, we could nevertheless, as Professor Hans BAKKER has suggested to me (letter of 20.viii.2008), dispute the identification of the figure: caṇḍaḥ could be an adjective, ‘fierce’, and the real proper name would then be rudraḍaṇḍaḥ. We could therefore assume the figure to be rather a personified ayüdhapuruśa representing Rudra’s weapon, the stick. This is perhaps still more likely if we see this as a half-line in āryā and insert sa before rudraḍaṇḍaḥ to repair both metre and sandhi.92 But then again, as we shall see below, it is not inconceivable that Caṇḍeśa should have been at certain points in his development an ayüdhapuruṣa, nor is it impossible that his name should have begun as an adjective.

Yet another weakness in the theory, perhaps, is the assumption that Chatracanḍeśvara was ‘the’ name of a supreme deity. For might it not instead have been simply the name of Śiva installed in a particular temple?93

In short, ACHARYA’s theory is certainly open to criticism at more than one juncture. Even if we accept his identification of the four-armed, standing, ithyphallic figures placed to the South-East or North-East of liṅga-shrines in Nepal, the line of development he has suggested does not seem plausible in all its details. I am nonetheless inclined to believe that the four-armed, ithyphallic figures might indeed be Caṇḍeśvaras, as ACHARYA has proposed, since it seems to me possible that their iconography is intended to be an expression of the four-armed visualisation that is widespread in Saiddhāntika literature. As for their being often placed in the South-East, perhaps that is the result of imitation of the Paśupati shrine, in which such a figure is placed next to an inscription praising Chatracanḍeśvara.

Is Caṇḍeśa one of Śiva’s hypostases?

As for ACHARYA’s notion that Caṇḍeśa is nothing but a ‘tamed’ form of what was originally a Pāśupata group’s supreme deity, this seems not inconceivable. SANDERSON has recorded another such strategy of expressing transcendence over Atimārga groups, namely that of incorporating their chief divinities—

---

92 The assumption that it is āryā is not unproblematic, for, as BHANDARKAR explains (1931:1), there is no space in which the second half-line could have been inscribed.

93 Cf., for example, the Śiva called Dṛmicaṇḍeśvara or Drimicaṇḍeśvra (BISSCHOP 2006:220).
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Dhruva, Kṣemīśa and Brahmanaspati—at relatively lowly levels in Śaiva tantric cosmography (SANDERSON 2006b:199–200). And perhaps the idea receives some support from the various tantric passages that refer to Canḍeśa being Śiva himself or as being the manifestation of Śiva’s own anger. Thus, for example, Somaśambhupaddhatti SP1 V:2ab (KSTS 292cd):

\[ \text{rudrāgniprabhavam caṇḍam kajjalābham bhayānakam...} \]

...terrifying, collyrium-black, Caṇḍa, born of the fire [of the anger] of Rudra...

Mrīgendra kriyāpāda 8:170ab:

\[ \text{caṇḍarūpaḥ swayaṃ śambhur niruṇaddhy api nīṣkṛtam} \]

Śambhu himself, taking the form of Caṇḍa, punishes even one who has been made complete [by initiation, if he should transgress the rules].

Older than the above is the account of Caṇḍa’s worship in the Mataṅga-pārameśvara (kriyāpāda 9:45b–54):\(^94\)

\[ \text{matāṅga uvāca} \]
\[ \text{sākter yāgāvasāne tu yāgo ’sty atra neti vā 9:45} \]
\[ \text{caṇḍīśasyoddhṛtā mantrāḥ kimartham paramēśvara} \]
\[ \text{paramēśvara uvāca} \]
\[ \text{na kevalaṁ puraṁ mantrāś caṇḍīśasyoddhṛtā mune 9:46} \]
\[ \text{pūrṇendusannibham cāsya maṇḍalaṁ paribhāṣitam} \]
\[ \text{sāṅgaṁ tatra nivesyādau caṇḍīśaṁ ṭaṅkadhārīṇam 9:47} \]
\[ \text{saṅvaśetopaçaśreṇa yāgante pūjayet sadā} \]
\[ \text{sōbhāṣya sāktītaḥ kāryā vibhavasyānurūpataḥ 9:48} \]
\[ \text{bhaktyāvīśṭasya bhagavāṁś caṇḍīśaḥ paramēśvaraḥ} \]
\[ \text{prasannah sarvakāryāni śāddhakasyāmitadyuteḥ 9:49} \]
\[ \text{pradādāti maṇahstāhīni stotreṇaṃ tōṣkāṃṣtāmāṃśramāṃ} \]
\[ \text{namas te bhūtabhavyaśa śivaśyātmane nāmaḥ 9:50} \]
\[ \text{mahogrāpiṇe viśvānāthāya parātmāne} \]
\[ \text{rudrāyāmitavirvāya pārvatāyāmabhavāya ca 9:51} \]
\[ \text{śaktigarbhāya caṇḍāya viśokāya mahātmāne} \]
\[ \text{jvalatparāśastāya daṇḍine sukapardine 9:52} \]
\[ \text{namas te viśvarūpāya namas te ’gnivapuṣmte} \]
\[ \text{namas te śarvasarvāya jagaraḥ kārāṇya ca 9:53} \]
\[ \text{stutvaivam varadam nāthaṁ caṇḍīśaṁ caṇḍarūpiṇam} \]
\[ \text{aṣṭāṅgapranipātena santarpāyānau kṣamāpayet 9:54} \]

\(^94\) The selected apparatus below only gives information where I propose modifying BHATT’s text, or where the readings are potentially significant for our discussion. One difference from BHATT’s text is not signalled: I have consistently adopted Caṇḍīśa where BHATT has preferred Canḍeśa. The Kashmirian manuscripts here are Ū and R, and the oldest source is the palm-leaf Nepalese manuscript C.
Matanga spoke:

At the end of the worship of Śakti, is there or is there not another worship? What were the mantras of Caṇḍiśa raised for, o Lord?

The Lord spoke:

Not only have the mantras of Caṇḍiśa been raised earlier, o sage, but his maṇḍala, which has the form of a full (!) moon, has also been described. After inserting Caṇḍiśa, who holds the axe, into that [maṇḍala], together with his body-part-mantras, one should invariably worship him at the end of the [other] worship using all white offerings. He should be adorned as far as one is able, in accordance with his power. The supreme Lord Caṇḍiśa, when pleased, and when attracted by this [following] hymn in such a way as to become physically present, grants all results that may be in his heart to the sādhaka of infinite radiance who is full of devotion: “Veneration to you, Lord of past and future! Veneration to you who are Śiva’s embodiment, to you whose form is great and fierce, to you who are Lord of the Universe, Supreme, Rudra, to you whose strength is unmeasurable, to you who are the son of Pārvatī, to you who contain power, to you who are fierce (caṇḍāya), griefless, great, to you who hold an axe in your hand, to you who hold a staff, to you who have beautifully braided hair (sukapardine)! Veneration to you have are the universe! Veneration to you who are have a body of fire! Veneration to you Śarvaśarva, who are the cause of the universe!” Having praised the boon-giving, fierce-formed Lord Caṇḍiśa in this way, after a prostration with eight parts [of the body touching the ground], one should satiate [him by making offerings] in the fire and cause him to forgive [shortcomings].

The above passage is somewhat anomalous in several respects—the stipulation of a round maṇḍala (rather than a crescent one), the emphasis on white offerings (cf. Matanga kriyāpāda 1:57–8), the absence of any mention of nirmālya, his bearing both axe and staff (52cd), his being Śiva in form (50d), creator of the universe (53cd) and yet at the same time son of Pārvatī (51d), his being mentioned explicitly only at the end of the initiation involving the yāga of Śakti (which refers in fact to the worship of the VYOMAVYPIMANTRA in the navanābhamanḍala) and not at the end of the other varieties of initiation—but I

---

95 Cf. GRANOFF 2006:90–1.
96 Rāmakaṇṭha in his commentary on the above quoted verses seems to imply that the worship of Caṇḍēśa is not to be supplied at the end of the other forms of initiation that the Matanga teaches; but his commentary on kriyāpāda 7:36c–37 implies the reverse. There appears to be no clear indication in the tantra of which is intended.
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have cited it here not for its anomalies concerning ritual context, iconography and mythology, but rather for the implications that it contains that Caṇḍesa is Śiva, even if the implications are at once contradicted.

Another indication of Caṇḍesa’s identity with Śiva is to be found in a fragment of the Parākhya quoted by Vidyākānta in the Bhāvacudāmaṇi (f. 61v):

\[ uktaṃ ca śrīmatparākhye caṇḍarūpaḥ svayam rudro badhnāti samayakṣatāṁ iti. \]

Rudra Himself, in the form of Caṇḍa, punishes those who break the post-initiatory rules.\(^{97}\)

We find such notions even in later South Indian sources (even though they contradict the well-known South Indian aetiological myth), for example in Purva-Kāmika 4:525ab:

\[ krodhāṁ sah parameśasya caṇḍesa iti kirtitāḥ \]

Caṇḍesa is taught to be a part[ial incarnation] of the anger of the Supreme Lord.

PLATE 19. Caṇḍesa in the Satyagiriśvara temple Senganur, Kumbakonam Taluk, Tanjore Dt. Senganur is traditionally the locus of the South Indian legend of Vicāraśarman. Note the skull in the heavy jataabhara and the curled leaf as an ornament (pattrakundala) in the deity’s left ear. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

Furthermore, it could be argued that an identity relationship with Śiva seems also sometimes to be hinted at in the sculptures. This is particularly clear in the Nepalese images, which may have a skull and a crescent moon in the headdress (e.g. Huntington Scan No. 0017157), and which are all ithyphallic. This is much less clear in the South Indian icons, but there are hints: in Senganur, for example, the heavy jataabhāra is surmounted with a skull (PLATE 19) and the left ear lobe is filled with a rolled leaf ornament (pattrakundala), as on many South Indian sculptures of Śiva, recalling Śiva’s granting Pārvatī the left side of his body (see, e.g., PLATES 1 AND 31). But in fact emblems that are distinctive of Śiva, such as the skull, are often used to indicate not that a figure is Śiva, but rather simply that it is a gana of Śiva or in some sense Śaiva, even if the emblems contain allusions to myths now associated with Śiva.\(^{98}\) Moreover a deity that is

\(^{97}\) One could perhaps translate ‘punishes infringements of the post-initiatory rules’, but one would in that case expect a neuter; I therefore assume that samayakṣatāṁ is intended to refer to the rule-breakers, which entails either taking kṣatān in the sense of kṣatavataḥ or taking the compound to mean ‘diminished with respect to the post-initiatory rules’.

\(^{98}\) On the shifting relationship between Śiva and a number of his Gaṇas, see Granoff 2006, in particular p. 80, in which she expresses the impression she has received from examining different versions of Śaiva myths in the Purāṇas, particularly the old Skandapurāṇa, thus: ‘It is my contention that Śaivism represents the culmination
an incarnation of Śiva’s anger can as easily be thought different from Śiva as identical to him.

PLATE 20. Caṇḍesā in the Maṇikanṭhaśvara temple in Padur (Paṭūr), Tirukkalukkundram Taluk, Chengleput Dt. The image faces South and is to the North-East of the liṅga. No aedicule houses the image. N. RAMASWAMY drew my attention to this sculpture. Photo: EFEQ (G. RAVINDRAN).

PLATE 21. Detail of the Caṇḍesā at the Maṇikanṭhaśvara temple in Padur showing the skull in low relief on top of the jatābhāra. Photo: EFEQ (G. RAVINDRAN).

But then there is also the evidence of the mantras of Caṇḍa and the fact it is sometimes prescribed that they should be installed in the image used for the worship of Śiva. Thus, for example, in the Pingalāmata as quoted by Vidyā-kaṇṭha II in his Bhāvacūḍāmani (Jammu MS No. 5291, f. 61v) we read:

\[
\text{uktam ca śrimatpingalāmate} \\
\text{naivedyāpanayam kṛtvā vidhiśeṣam visarjya ca} \\
\text{nayasya caṇḍesvarāṃ mūrtau krodham daivād viningatam} \\
yajed iti.
\]

Having performed the removal of the food-offering [and] the remainder of the rite, [and] having invited [Śiva] to depart, he should install Caṇḍesvara in the image, [who is] the anger that came forth from the divinity.

In a fragment of the early Pauskara-Pārameśvara (Cambridge University Library MS Add. 1049, f. ‘8’r) we find the following:

\[
sadyojātaṃ samārabhyā caṇḍabrahmāṇi vinyaset \\
sadyojātaṃ paścimena vāmadevam udagdiśi \\
dakṣiṇāyāṃ aghoraṃ tu prācyāṃ vaktraṃ nivesayet \\
liṅgamūrdhāni iśānaṃ gandhapuspādy anukramāt \\
sadyojātām samārabhyā || conj.; sadyojātasamārasya MS
\]

Beginning with SADYOJĀTA, he should install the CAṆḌA-BRAHMAMANTRAS: he should place SADYOJĀTA in the West, VĀMADEVA in the North, AĞHORA in the South, TATPURUṢA (vaktraṃ) in the East and IŚĀNA in the head of the liṅga. [He should offer] incense, flowers and so forth in due order.

Not only are the mantras of Caṇḍa to be installed in the same image that has been used for the worship of the main deity, but those mantras also parallel the

of a development in which the gaṇas, originally totally independent figures, gradually became identified with Śiva and absorbed into his larger narrative’. She draws attention to the fact that later versions of certain myths show Śiva arrogating to himself the actions and identities of the gaṇas to whom they belonged in earlier versions of the same myths.

99 Cf. SP4, III:57ff and Suprabheda KP 47:12.
principal mantras of Śiva in that they are BRAHMAMANTRAS. Similarly, in other sources, such as the passages of the Mataṅga and Jñānaratnāvalī quoted above, although we do not find BRAHMAMANTRAS assigned to Caṇḍesa, we find instead that he has a set of body-part-mantras, just as the principal deity has.100

**Caṇḍesa and nirmālya in the Śaiva Siddhānta**

Returning to the point we had reached in Jñānaśambhu’s presentation of the ritual, once Caṇḍesa has been visualised and worshipped with his mantras ranged around him (bhogāṅgopetam), the nirmālya is offered to him, he is invited to make good any short-comings in the performance of the ritual,101 and then he is invited to depart.

Now in the early texts of the Śaiva Siddhānta, it is often not made explicit whether or not a Caṇḍapūjā should follow ordinary regular daily Śiva-worship (nityapūjā), for Caṇḍa is commonly simply not mentioned. This is the case, for instance, in the shorter recensions of the Kālottara, one of which, the recension in 200 verses, was the source on which the authors of all surviving ritual manuals based their prescriptions.102 Among pre-tenth-century scriptures, the Kirana, has a brief mention of offering nirmālya to Caṇḍa after regular daily worship,103 and so does the Sarvajñānottara, a mention which we have seen

---

100 Cf. Niśvāsamūla 5:23 and 6:23–4, where Caṇḍa has the following bijamantras: one for his āsana, one for Caṇḍa, and five for his āṅgas. Cf. also Kīraṇa 23:4–5 (mūlamantra [CAM] + 5 āṅgamantras).

101 This function of making complete a rite may perhaps occur in some contexts without any connection with nirmālya, for it seems to appear in an inscription of 1268 AD recording the completion of the construction of a temple to Hariraha in a place called Hariraha in Davanagere Taluk, Chitaldroog Dt, Karnataka, by a certain Somanātha, a high officer under the Hoysala Narasimha III, who was also the founder of the celebrated temple nearby at Somanāthapur (thus Narasimhachar 1917:1). The second half of verse 21, consisting largely in vocative epithets of Somanātha, reads: vairiśrīhara gāyigovala bhuvī gaṅḍapemṇḍāra te caṃḍiśaḥ śubhavaitehaṃ vitanuttād ācandrācandadyuti. “O stealer of your enemies’ glory, o gāyigovala, o gaṅḍapemṇḍāra on earth, may Caṇḍiśa ensure that the success of your merit should spread for as long as the moon and the fierce-rayed [sun still shine].” Among the images whose installation is mentioned is Viṣvakṣena (verse 19), the Vaiṣṇava counterpart of Caṇḍēśvara, who will be discussed below. See Epigraphia Carnatica IX (Rice 1903), pp. 44–47 and 74–8 for Dāvaṇagere Taluk.


103 There is considerable variation between the sources that transmit the Kīraṇa at this point in the text, but the purport of the Nepalese and South Indian versions is the same. 14:46c–47b in the Devakottai edition read as follows:

lingamadhyagatam dyātva devadēvam sadāśivam

naivedyaṃ copasamhrtya kṣipe caṇḍāya tat punah

In the Nepalese manuscript of 924 AD, however, this is worded thus (NGMPP A 40/3, f. 30r):

lingamadhyagatam dyātva pūjāṃ kṣipyēsakoṇataḥ
quoted by Jñānaśambhu. But these brief mentions do not make clear whether a full caṇḍapūjā was required at this point: it seems possible that it was not, given the brief treatment of the nirmālya at this point in these two works and from the absence of any mention of it in other early sources.

In other words, Somaśambhu’s remarks quoted here by Jñānaśambhu about occasions when worship of Caṇḍa was not required perhaps present explicit what is unexpressed in some early tantras, namely that there were many contexts where there was no nirmālya (cf. SP2, III:69, p. 282) and therefore no need of making offerings to Caṇḍa. We should notice that private portable substrates of worship (cale) are included among those for which the worship of Caṇḍa is not required. Now if we accept, as BRUNNER firmly concludes after many years of studying the question, that the rituals of the Siddhānta as described by Somaśambhu were those of individual initiates, and not, on the whole, described from the point of view of priests in temples, then this is significant. For it appears as though for Somaśambhu, Caṇḍēśvara is primarily worshipped in fixed, man-made liṅgas, i.e. those of temples.

Now the Brhatkālottara, quoted by Jñānaśambhu just below in the same passage, appears to mark a new development: it prescribes Caṇḍa-worship at the end of Śiva-worship in all contexts in the Śaiva Siddhānta. This text, we reiterate, appears not to have been known to the eleventh-century author Somaśambhu, and the first quotations of it appear to be those of Jñānaśambhu in his twelfth-century Jñānaratnāvalī. For some centuries from Jñānaśambhu onwards, at least up to (but not including) Appayaḍīksita, the South Indian authors of ritual manuals accept the position of the Brhatkālottara, thus confirming in the minds of many that Caṇḍēśa is a deity particular to the Śaiva Siddhānta and found in no other tradition (netare tantra, na vāme, na ca daksīne).

Of course it is not easy to provide textual evidence to confirm that the association is less firm than long supposed, for among the tantric scriptural traditions Caṇḍēśa as the receiver of nirmālya really is found almost exclusively in Saiddhāntika literature. And the relation between Caṇḍēśa and the

naivedyādīn tato hṛtya kṣipe caṇḍasya tat punah.

104 Thus also SP2, III:69:
ratnahemādīliṅgesu cale citre pradakṣine
guruṣv api na nirmālyam vyākhyāsu pratimāsu ca.

105 SP4, p. v: ‘Ainsi répondons-nous enfin clairement à une question toujours présente : cette paddhati est-elle écrite pour le rituel privé ou pour le rituel public ? Notre réponse est maintenant ferme : il s’agit de rituel privé seulement.’

106 A handful of counter-examples may be cited nonetheless. In chapter 26 of the Trika
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Siddhānta is also difficult to challenge on the basis of South Indian sculptures. For the Southern images of Caṇḍeśa that we know of and that appear to be ancient are either undatable, or they come from a period in which we know that the Siddhānta already had a footing in the South. KALIDOS (1988) has assumed that the late eighth- or early ninth-century Caṇḍeśa in the Śaiva rock-cut shrine at Malayadippattti (Malaiyatippatti) is the earliest image in South India, but in fact it is rather the earliest image of which one can assert beyond doubt that it was deliberately placed in the North-East, with the out-flow

scripture, the *Tantrasadbhāva*, we read:

\[
tathā vai caṇḍanātho'pi dvaitādvaitesu kirtitah 59
dvaitādvaitesu yad dattaṁ naivedyaṁ parameśvare
taṁ tu devi taduccinhaṁ caṇḍanathe nivedayet 60
\]

Caṇḍanātha is proclaimed equally (tathā vai) in both ‘dualist’ and ‘non-dualist’ [cults]: whatever food is offered to the Supreme Lord, whether in cults that are ‘dualist’ or ‘non-dualist’, one should offer that, O Goddess, when it has been abandoned by Him, to Caṇḍanātha.

Such nirmālya, it is explained, may alternatively be cast in fire or water. Then the tantra remarks:

\[
dravyam caṇḍeśvaram nāma pūrvadattam mayi priye
bhakṣaṇād bandhate devaś caṇḍeśaḥ paraṃśvaraḥ 63
\]

63b. mayi I conj.; mayā DYCZKOWSKI  ● 63c. bandhate I conj.; vatvate DYCZKOWSKI

What has previously been given to me, My Dear, is called Caṇḍeśvara-substance; if you eat it, the god Caṇḍeśa, great lord, punishes [you].

I have come across one other plainly non-Saiddhāntika tantric account of Caṇḍeśa-pūjā in a stray chapter on ff. 6v–7r of National Archives, Kathmandu, MS 1-1114, NGMPP A 49/5, which Diwakar ACHARYA had kindly drawn to my attention for the fragment it preserves of the *Jñānaratnavalī*. Its colophon appears to read (suggestion of Diwakar ACHARYA in a letter of 12.ii.2006): *iti śrīmate caryāpādāvatārītī mūlā?mnāye caṇḍeśvarāyāgastṛitiyaḥ*. The tantra is a conversation between Kubjikā and Bhairava, who is the teacher, and it explains how to install Caṇḍeśa in a maṇḍala in the North-Eastern corner of the yāga-area in order to give him the nirmālya. The visualisation is short and rather different from what we have seen so far (4cd, ff. 6v–7r)

\[
pūjayed gandhapuspādyais ṭaṅkapāniṁ triśūlinam
\]

\*dyaiś ṭaṅkapāniṁ I conj.; *dyai ṭaṅkapāṅxniṇi MS

One should worship him with unguents, flowers and so forth, an axe in his hand, bearing a trident.

Within the bhairavasrotas we know that two recensions of the Svacchandatantra included Caṇḍeśa: he occurs in chapters on expiation from the *Aghoreśvarisvachanda* (32:1 and 32:28) and the *Rasasvachanda* (39:5–6) that are included in Hṛdayaśiva’s *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*. (The numeration is that of R. SATHYANARAYANAN’s transcription, which is to be incorporated as an appendix into a forthcoming edition of Trilocanaśiva’s *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*.)
from the *linga* (there is here no *praṇāla* to speak of) apparently channelled to run round the edge of the cave so as to pass beneath Čaṇḍesā’s feet.\textsuperscript{107} As EDHOLM rightly points out (1998:54), two images that are certainly earlier are to be found in the North-East corner of the enclosure-wall in the Kailāsanātha temple in Kanchipuram. One of them is in its original location to the North-East of a *linga*, but embedded in the enclosure wall. This two-armed, one headed, axe-wielding image is now entirely covered in stucco and its original features can only be guessed at (see PLATE 22A). The other (PLATE 22B) is an extremely weather-worn free-standing image which has lately been moved in front of the fixed one (old photographs reveal that it was not there until recently).

PLATE 22A Concealed behind the disfiguring stucco is what may be the oldest Čaṇḍesā in South India whose position in the North East is indisputable. It is placed facing South, in the North-East corner of the inner enclosure wall of the early eighth-century Kailāsanātha temple in Kanchipuram. Directly opposite, in the South-East corner, is its counterpart: a stucco-covered bas-relief sculpture of Vināyaka. Photo: Valérie GILLET.

It seems reasonable to assume that this weathered figure was the sculpture that originally stood in the open, inside the enclosure, to the North-East of the *linga*. For although the construction of a miniature temple to house the South-facing Čaṇḍesā in the North-East has become standard,\textsuperscript{108} in many early sites such a

\textsuperscript{107} The image is illustrated (FIG. 35) and its position and late-eighth-century or early ninth-century date discussed by GOODALL et al. (2005:58–9). We were unaware at the time of KALIDOS’ article of 1988.

\textsuperscript{108} It might be supposed that the construction of such shrines was a practice influenced by the two largest examples of the genre, the early eleventh-century Čaṇḍēśvara shrines in the great temples at Tanjore and Gangaikondacolapuram. But one should of course be cautious about assuming that these unusual temples were models for parochial shrines. And such shrines evidently began to be constructed earlier. We have referred earlier (GOODALL et al. 2005:186, fn. 128) to a tenth-century inscription referring to Čaṇḍēśvara on the stone wall of the shrine to Čaṇḍēśvara in the Puṭārjunadeva temple at Tiruppūṭaimarutūr, Ambasamudram Taluk, Tirunelveli District (SII, Vol. XIV, No. 68, p. 46). Professor Leslie ORR has now pointed out to me (letter of 19.viii.2008) that much further North an inscription in ‘characters of about the 10th century A.D.’ records that a certain Śāttukūṭṭi Mādevan, whose initiatory name was Vāmaśiva, consecrated the image of Čaṇḍēśvara and constructed a shrine of stone for him in the temple of Tiruttōṇḍiśvaram-utaiya-nāyanār at Tirunāmanallūr, now Panruti Taluk, South Arcot District (ARIE 1939–40 No. 241, p. 59). The figure now occupying the aedicule for Čaṇḍēśvara, is, according to PARANAN (2006:37), of the twelfth century, but from the photographs of Emmanuel FRANCIS (and according to Emmanuel FRANCIS’ judgement after examining the image itself) it seems that it might well be much earlier, in other words that it might be the image referred to in the inscription. But there is what appears to be a yet older image, now displaced to the west verandah, and, as Emmanuel FRANCIS has pointed out to me, a photograph has been published of it by PARANAN (2006:162).
miniature temple is either absent or of very recent construction and early figures of Caṇḍeṣa seem often more weathered than the other sculptures of a site. The Kailāsanātha in Kanchipuram is the very temple in which we find (in the inscription round the main shrine) one of the first explicit allusions to the Śaiva Siddhānta in the Tamil-speaking South.\footnote{For a discussion of a punning Śaiva meaning intended for several words in the verse in question, see GOODALL 2004: xix, fn. 17. Slightly earlier evidence is to be found in the Kūram plates, as mentioned by GOODALL et al. 2005:112–13, fn. 61.}

\textbf{PLATE 22B} This was perhaps originally placed without covering or shrine in the courtyard to the North East of the liṅga in the Kailāsanātha temple in Kanchipuram. If so, it would be one of the earliest figures of Caṇḍeṣa sculpted in the round for receiving nirmālya for which an approximate date could be advanced. It is true that there is now no trace in the enclosure that shows where the figure might have been placed, nor (as Dr. Charlotte Schmid and Emmanuel Francis have pointed out to me) is there any clear echo in the iconographical programme that might confirm that it was once there. The hypothesis will probably remain impossible to confirm or exclude. The weapon held in the right arm has broken off, so all that can now be discerned is that he sat in the now typical posture (except that his left leg rather than his right dropped down) and that he wore a heavy jaṭābhāra and earrings. Damage and stucco have effaced all other details. Above and behind him in the corner (only a leg is visible) is the figure illustrated in \textbf{PLATE 22A}. Photo: Valérie Gillet.

It is clear from the sculptural record, however, that temples with no connection with the Śaiva Siddhānta nevertheless installed images of Caṇḍeṣa. We find a number of such sculptures among the ruins at Kodumbalur (Koṭumāḷur), which a ninth-century inscription reveals to have been associated with a matha of Kālamukhas (asitavaktra), and a fine eleventh-century sculpture (\textbf{PLATE 23}) survives at Tiruvotriyur (Tiruvorriyūr), which appears to have been controlled by adherents of the Somasiddhānta (see GOODALL et al. 2005, p. 189 and 112, fn. 60).

\textbf{PLATE 23.} Caṇḍeṣa in the Śaiva temple at Tiruvotriyur (Tiruvorriyūr) in Northern Madras. The style of the image suggests that it was produced at the same time and perhaps by the same hand as the famous skull-bowl-bearing, trident-wielding figure now known as Gauliśvara (compare Plates 12–14 in KRISHNA MURTHY 1985), whose shrine has an inscription that dates its construction to c. 1068 AD and that calls it the shrine of Paṭampakkanāyahakadeva (KRISHNA MURTHY 1985:50). A tenth- or eleventh-century statue with the same iconography as ‘Gauliśvara’ survives in the modern Kāmākṣi temple in Darasuram and is described by L’Hernault (1987:1, photo 3) as ‘Śiva dans son aspect de dieu
suprême des Pāṣupata’. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

The thirteenth-century *Siddhāntaśekhara* of Viśvanātha (quoted by Brunner in SP:241) claims that Caṇḍa was considered the chastiser of transgressions for various Atimārga groups and that his worship was therefore common to them:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{śaivānām cāpi śaktānām somasiiddhāntavedīnām} & \quad 232 \\
paṅcārthakahalavakṛtānām bhaktimārgajusām nṛṇām & \\
śāsta caṇḍēśvaras teśām svasvācārayaśilāṅghinām & \quad 233 \\
caṇḍānāthāṁ prapannā ye na teśāṁ bhayakāraṇām & \\
tasmāt sarvaiś ca sampūjaś caṇḍēśas tu avicārataḥ & \quad 234 \\
\end{align*}
\]

232c. śaivānām cāpi śaktānām J Ed.; tathā dipte śaivāglāme Brunner\textsuperscript{110} • 233d. ṛvilāṅghinām J Brunner; ṛvilaminām Ed.

Śaivas, Śaktas, those who know the Somasiddhānta, Paṅcārthika-Pāṣupatas, Kālamukhas, men who delight in the path of devotion—of these Caṇḍēśvara is the chastiser when they transgress their own various rules of conduct. Those who venerate Caṇḍanātha have no reason to fear. Therefore, everybody should worship Caṇḍeśa without reflecting [upon the wisdom of doing so].

Other evidence is furnished by an account of paṅcāvaraṇaṇapūjā in an undated chapter attributed to the *Pampāmāḥāmya* which Vasundhara Filliozat has published (2001:104–18) under the title *Kālāmukхаśivapūjāpaddhati*: the offering of the *naivedya* to Caṇḍēśvara is prescribed in verse 82. But even if we establish Caṇḍēśa’s presence in Pāṣupata traditions in the second millennium AD, this does not of course necessarily help us to establish that he originated in one of those traditions. It is clear, after all, that the notion of a *nirmālya-devatā* could easily spread horizontally by imitation.\textsuperscript{111}

**Viṣvaksena and other nirmālya-devatās**

The best documented parallel case is that of Viṣvaksena as the *nirmālya-devatā* for Viṣṇu in the Paṅcarātra and Vaikhānasa traditions. And here, as Gupta has demonstrated (1976:84), the parallelism between Caṇḍeśa and Viṣvaksena consists in rather more than their both receiving *nirmālya*.

Here we encounter in the tradition of the Śaiva Āgamas an exact parallel to Viṣvaksena in Caṇḍēśvara. Both are commanders-in-chief and leaders of the *gaṇas* in their respective pantheons. Both function as *nirmālya-devatā* in their respective cults, and in temples both act as supreme custodians.

\textsuperscript{110} It is not clear to me what the source is for Brunner’s deviating readings here.

\textsuperscript{111} Since Pāṣupata ascetics were themselves supposed to wear the *nirmālya*, it could be argued that it would be unnatural for their tradition to be the one in which a *nirmālya*-receiving deity arose, but see fn. 152 on p. 414.
Further parallels may be mentioned: Viṣvaksena is to be placed in the North East (GUPTA 1976:77); he is a manifestation of Viṣṇu himself (1976:85–6); and his iconography, in which there is some small variation (as to whether he should raise a threatening finger or hold a club, for instance) shows him with two of the most distinctive attributes of Viṣṇu (the conch and the disc) and seated, as Caṇḍeśa most usually is, with one foot tucked up to rest on the platform on which he sits and the other dangling below it. Viṣvaksena, however, seems to have rather little ‘personality’, and this is enough to suggest that he might have been a sort of ‘copy’ of the Śaiva figure contrived by Vaishnavas calquing their ritual system on Śaiva models. There are other factors that suggest this, the most important being the apparent absence of Viṣvaksena in early sources, whether written (GUPTA 1976:75–6) or sculptural. We may note, for example, that Viṣvaksena appears to be absent from the unpublished early Pāṇcarātra saṃhitās transmitted in Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts and currently being edited by Diwakar Acharya, such as the Svāyambhuvapāṇcarātra and the Devāmrta.

Another minor point that suggests his dependence on Caṇḍeśa is that Viṣvaksena figures flout the rule that ancillary figures in Vaiṣṇava shrines should either be seated or standing according to the stance of the principal image. GUPTA (1976:77) suggests that the fact that Viṣvaksena is always seated may be because of his ‘high status’, but it seems more likely that it is because he is simply calqued upon Caṇḍeśa.112

Of course Viṣvaksena’s absence in the sculptural record may be an illusion: he bears no implement that would distinguish him from Viṣṇu and so it is only context that enables one to identify sculptures of him. Note that in glossy books of South Indian bronzes now divorced from their contexts in temple life and housed in museums there are often a handful of Caṇḍikeśvara images, but no Viṣvaksenas. And yet, for instance, in the recent catalogue of the Madras col-

---

112 Cf. TRIPATHI 2004:352: “Caṇḍa is not offered worship in the Pūjā of Jagannātha. His function has been taken over by Viṣvaksena but the expression ‘Caṇḍanaivedya’ has remained which points towards a secondary character of Viṣvaksena, or at least, towards the secondary nature of his function as a receiver of this Naivedya. In the text of the NNP-Krama [scil.: Pūjāpaddhati of Nilādrinātha], the word Caṇḍa occurs as an adjective to Viṣvaksena which is an effort to bring Viṣvaksena into association with Caṇḍa and to explain the name of this rite.” The mantra which TRIPATHI cites is: OṂ VĀṂ VIṢVAKSENĀYA NAMAḤ. DEVAGĀṆĀYA CAṆḌĀYA VIṢVAKSENĀYA NAMAḤ.
lection there are nine seated images identified as Viṣṇu which could as easily be identified as Viṣvaksena (KANNAN 2003:218–225).

PLATE 25. Śiva crowning Caṇḍeśvara on the North face of the ardhamanḍapa of the Pallava-period (late eighth-century?) Mukteśvara temple in Kanchipuram. Caṇḍa’s matted locks are here being coiffed and adorned by Śiva, while Caṇḍa, the supreme devotee, submissively inclines his head and clasps his hands in a respectful añjali. It is possible, as Dr. Charlotte SCHMID has suggested to me, that the matted locks—like those of other South-facing Śaiva deities in South India, such as ‘Dakṣiṇāmūrti’ and Bhikṣāṭana—are symbolic of his fierce nature, and that their being coiffed and groomed is symbolic of his being tamed. Photo: Valérie GILLET.

PLATE 26. Viṣṇu crowning a devotee on the East face of the Vaikunṭhapurumāḷ temple in Kanchipuram. The same submissive posture is used as in PLATE 25. Photo: Valérie GILLET.

Furthermore, a recent publication of LAKSMI NARASIMHAN identifies a panel on the Pallava-period Vaikunṭhapurumāḷ temple in Kanchipuram as Viṣṇu crowning Viṣvaksena with his nirmālya (2007:330). FRANCIS, GILLET and SCHMID (2005:599) record that the same interpretation was suggested, evidently independently, by G. VIJAYAVENUGOPAL. They also record, however, that Adalbert GAIL has interpreted the image as Viṣṇu crowning Prahlāda. Now it is clear that there is indeed a relation between the Pallava images showing the crowning of Caṇḍeśa and this Vaiṣṇava image. Indeed much of the narrative iconography of the Vaikunṭhapurumāḷ consists of Vaiṣṇava echoes and reworkings of Śaiva scenes (FRANCIS, GILLET and SCHMID 2005:599–601). But, as they point out, the scene in question might show some other close devotee of Viṣṇu. Given the absence of other comparably early evidence for the existence of Viṣvaksena as a nirmālyadevatā, it seems to me unlikely to be a representation of the crowning of Viṣvaksena, but the question remains open: ‘Qui Viṣṇu couronne-t-il?’ (ibid.).

Apart from Viṣvaksena there are other nirmālya-receivers, probably all calqued upon Caṇḍeśa, for other deities. A passage in the Nāradapurāṇa gives a typical sort of list (1.67:99–100):

naivedyaṁ ca tato dadyāt tattaducchiṣṭabhojine
maheśvarasya caṇḍeśo viṣvaksenas tathā hareḥ
caṇḍāṁśus taraner vakratuṇḍaś cāpi gaṇeśituḥ
śakti ucchiṣṭacāndāli proktā ucchiṣṭabhojinaḥ

He should then give the food-offering to the particular remainder-eater of the god in question. For Maheśvara there is Caṇḍeśa and for Hari there is Viṣvaksena; for the Sun there is Caṇḍāṁśu and for Gaṇeśa there is Vakratuṇḍa; for Śakti there
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is Ucchiṣṭa-cāṇḍāli—these are taught to be the remainder-eaters.

I say that this is a typical sort of list, but some of the names here are perhaps not the best known. GUPTA (1976:81) gives a number of other names, among which Ucchiṣṭa-gaṇeśa for Vināyaka and Tejaścāṇḍa for Sūrya seem more commonly used. (We have discussed Tejaścāṇḍa and reproduced an image of Tejaścāṇḍa in GOODALL et al. 2005:55, 98–99 and FIG. 23.) GUPTA also mentions Raktacāṇḍā, Nirmālyavāsini, Nirmālyacaṇḍikā, Baṭukanātha and Ucchiṣṭa-mātaṅgini; but she does not mention the next most frequently represented nirmālya-devatā after Caṇḍeśa, namely Caṇḍeśvarī, who is not his consort, but rather the nirmālya-devatā of the Goddess in South Indian temples. Iconographically, she is like most two-armed Caṇḍeśvaras: her right hand holds an axe, her left arm rests on her left thigh and she sits with one foot tucked up to rest on the platform on which she sits and the other dangling below it. Her hair is wrapped up in a chignon (jaṭāmukuta), as is Caṇḍeśa’s in many post-twelfth-century representations. I do not know when images of Caṇḍeśvarī were first produced, but I do not recall seeing any image that looked earlier than fourteenth-century. Her first appearances in literary sources may be only slightly earlier. Her position is quite commonly not to the North-East of the Goddess image, but rather to the South-East. This is because a Goddess-shrine in a South Indian Śaiva temple complex is typically South-facing, has its pranāla pointing East and so, from the point of view of someone circumambulating the shrine, the image of Caṇḍeśvarī is situated just beyond the pranāla, just as Caṇḍeśa is just beyond the pranāla of the shrine to Śiva. She may be shown facing South, like Caṇḍeśa, or facing West into the wall of the Goddess shrine, just as Caṇḍeśa faces South into the wall of the Śiva shrine. EDHOLM (1984:89) quotes a passage of the Kālikāpurāṇa which prescribes the offering of nirmālya to her.

PLATE 27. Caṇḍeśa in a dedicated shrine at the Naltuṇaiyisvaran Temple at Punjai (or Keṭārakonṭāṇ Puṇcaī), Mayavaram Taluk, Nagapattinam Dt. Notice the flower on the top of his jaṭā and the one above his right ear. There appears also to be the trumpet of a dhattūra flower (cf. PLATE 31) on the left side of his head above the band that goes round his forehead. He has a pattrakundāla ornament in his left ear. His left hand is either missing something that it once held, or it displays the āhūya varada gesture. Beside him in the shrine, but not shown in

---

113 Caṇḍeśa is in fact assigned a consort in a very few temples. His shrine in Punjai, for instance, houses not just a statue of Caṇḍeśa (see PLATE 27), but also a much later sculpture representing his spouse.

114 Pārva-Kārana 90:23. In the thirteenth-century Siddhāntaśekhara Gauri’s nirmālya-receiving goddess, who is to be placed in the North-East, is called Aṃśinī (p. 617). See BRUNNER 1998 (SP4):274, fn. 22.
There is one other domain in which Caṇḍeśa might have been imitated and that is in early Tantric Buddhism. This suggestion was made to me by Dr. Kimiaki Tanaka immediately after a version of this paper was delivered in Tokyo. He suggested several parallels between Caṇḍeśa and Acalanātha (Fudō in Japan), a figure also known by a variety of other names, including Krodha and Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa. He pointed to this figure being seen as an emanation of the Buddha Vairocana, and at the same time the latter’s servant, to his consumption of offerings, and to the fact that he is shown, in Japanese iconography, with a flower on the top of his head (cf. Caṇḍeśa in PLATES 2, 5, 6, 15, 38, 39). Acalanātha appears in a number of early Buddhist tantras that no longer survive in Sanskrit, such as the Trisamayarājatantra, the Vajrapānyabhiṣeka and the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi. A brief account of Acala (and of his partner Trailokyavijaya) as he appears in the last of these texts is given by Linrothe (1999:151ff). Linrothe observes (1999:153) that caṇḍamahāroṣana is a ‘probably descriptive rather than titular’ element in the dharani of Acala, which occurs in a few places in the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi, and that this element subsequently became adopted as Acala’s name (e.g. in the Caṇḍamahāroṣanatantra). But if the element in the mantra is indeed ancient, as it appears to be, then it could indicate some connection with Caṇḍeśa, just like the element caṇḍa in at least one mantra of Caṇḍeśa’s Vaiśnava counterpart Viṣṇukṣema (see fn. 112 on p. 391 above).

It is clear that a thorough study of these materials, which is beyond the scope of this article, would be required before pronouncing on the matter. Furthermore, Sanderson (letter of 12.x.2005) has suggested to me another figure who could be an heir to Caṇḍeśa’s principal function in ritual, namely Ucchusma, whose rôle in Buddhist and other sources he has briefly characterised in a recent article (2007:196–200). In that characterisation, Sanderson quotes an enigmatic passage from the Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā’s cosmography that implies some sort of link between Caṇḍeśa and Ucchusma. The passage in question is a description of the bottommost of the seven subterranean paradises that lie between our earth and the hells below (Guhyasūtra 5:4–5) (ff. 54r–55v):

āyasi prathama bhūmiḥḥ purī bhasma[vati]---

115 As Professor Sanderson has pointed out to me (letter of 8.x.2005, the ACALAHĀRA DAYA quoted by Śāntideva in his (probably seventh-century) Śīksāsamuccaya also has the element caṇḍamahāroṣa (p. 144). Professor Isaacson has suggested to me that Śāntideva may here have been drawing on the Trisamayarājatantra, and has pointed out that we find the same DHĀRAṆĪ in surviving materials related to that tantra, such as the Trisamayarājasādhanā of Kumudākaramati (p. 3).
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\[(dhanam)jalyasya nāgasya tathā uccuṣṭmarudrayoh\]
\n\textit{uccuṣṭmeti purī khyātā āyasi harmamālinī}
\ncanḍiśaṃ pūjayantīha nirmālyapatane gataḥ

Sanderson’s quotation (2007:198) cautiously excludes the bracketed text (supplied from the twentieth-century apographs of the early manuscript) and he says that the passage

\ldots makes Ucchuṣmarudra preside in a city of iron that bears his name in the first of the subterranean paradises known as the Pātālas. This, we are told, is the destiny of souls who have allowed the substances left from Śiva’s worship to fall to the ground. Here they worship Canḍeśa (Caṇḍeśvara), the ferocious Gaṇa of Śiva to whom such remnants are to be offered in Saiddhāntika worship, in order to remove the danger they pose.

A corrupt version of the same passage occurs in the Śivadharmaśāṅgraha (10:6–7, f. 124v), which reproduces the lower levels of the cosmography of the Guhyasūtra.\footnote{I am grateful to Anil Kumar Acharya, currently producing an edition of the Śivadharmasaṅgraha for his doctoral thesis at the University of Pondicherry, both for pointing out the many borrowings from the Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā in the Śivadharmasaṅgraha, and for furnishing me with his electronic transcription of the work.} A slightly different situation appears to be described there:

\[
\text{āyasi prathamā bhūmiḥ purī bhasmavatī yataḥ}
\]
\dhanaṇṭayasya kāmasya rudrasyoccuṣṭhasamjñīnīnaḥ 6
\uccuṣṭmeti purī khyātā āyasi harmyamālinī
canḍiśaṃ pūjayet tasyāṃ nirmālyapatanam yataḥ 7

The first level is of iron, in which there is a city Bhasmavatī belonging to the serpent (kāmasya a corruption of nāgasya?) Dhanaṇṭaya and to the Rudra called Ucchuṣma. [There is also] a [different] city, made of iron, garlanded with palaces and called Ucchuṣmā. There one worships Canḍiśa because of [having allowed in a previous life?] the falling down of nirmālya.\footnote{Or perhaps just conceivably, as Professor Einoo has pointed out to me: ‘There, because [it is where] nirmālya falls down, one must worship Caṇḍiśa.’}

Now Caṇḍeśa may have been an inspiration for Acala, or for Ucchuṣma as he occurs in Buddhist tantric contexts, or it may be that the various ritual functions for which Caṇḍeśa is held responsible were shared among a number of deities including Acala and Ucchuṣma, or that some of their ritual functions just happen to be parallel to some of Caṇḍeśa’s. Whatever the case, a thorough examination of these interesting questions is beyond the scope of this already too lengthy article.
Caṇḍeśa as chastiser of transgressions

Now we have mentioned above that the earliest Siddhāntatantras tend not explicitly to enjoin the worship of Caṇḍa at the end of the worship of Śiva. But that does not mean that Caṇḍeśa was missing from the Śaiva Siddhānta in its earliest surviving phase. For there is one moment in which Siddhāntatantras agree on prescribing the worship of Caṇḍa, and that is at the end of the performance of an initiation rite. Indeed the earliest part of what appears to be the earliest surviving Śaiva tantra (redacted perhaps between 450 and 550 AD\(^{118}\)) teaches the worship of Caṇḍa on the following day (5:22cd of the Mūlasūtra of the Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā, quoted in fn. 73 on p. 366 above). At the end of an initiation ceremony, Caṇḍa is installed and worshipped and the initiate is instructed in the post-initiatory rules of the cult (samaya), in the presence of Caṇḍeśa, whose duty it is to punish transgressions. Eight post-initiatory rules are alluded to at the end of the account of initiation in chapter 5 of the Mūlasūtra of the Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā, and they are explained in the same work’s Nayasūtra, in a passage in which the duties of a group of seven Gaṇas, including Caṇḍeśa, are related.\(^{119}\)

\[
\text{[de]hapāsāḥ smṛtā hy ete gaṇapāśāni me śṛṇu} \\
labdhaṇuṇjño [na] saṅkrāme Vidyeśas tena badhyate 1:100 \\
mūlaṇ krūtvā vadej jñāṇaṃ Śaṇmukhas tena badhyate \hspace{1em} \\
alabdhaṇuṇjño [va]dej jñāṇaṃ dadāti ca adikṣite 1:101 \\
siddhiṃ Gaṇapatir hanyāc chidraṃ drṣṭvā tu sādhake \hspace{1em} \\
parsvaruttayati yas tenṭraṃ paśujoṇānena mohitaḥ 1:102 \\
Nandir badhnāti vai śīghra[ṃ Caṇḍiṣaḥ sa]mayaṣṭasu \hspace{1em} \\
yo nindati śīvaṃ devan tadbhaktan desikan tathā 1:103 \hspace{1em} \\
nir[ṃ]jālyabhakṣane vāpi balidānapaśor api \hspace{1em} \\
adatte cārtavispṛṣṭam śāstranindām karoti ca 1:104 \hspace{1em} \\
lingachāyāvilanghī ca caṇḍiśo bandhate bhṛṣam \\
pratijñāvatṛatam ārūḍhaḥ] punas tyaktvā śīvaṃ vratam 1:105 \hspace{1em} \\
yanyattavrataṃ gṛñṇed Devī tena nibandhati \hspace{1em} \\
śīvanātram adhītvā tu śīvāya jñāṇam prakūrvvate 1:106 \hspace{1em} \\
yajate vaidikair yañāiḥ śīvabhaktāms ca nindate \hspace{1em} \\
viprāṃś caivaṃyaśaṅgasthāṃ pūjayet stunaṭeti ca 1:107 \hspace{1em} \\
Hāṭhaḥkṣumāṇḍarudras tu taṃ vai badhnāti durmmatim \hspace{1em} \\
goaṇpaṇāṇi badhnanti dīkṣitān tu tathā dhṛṭham 1:108
\]

---

\(101c.\) vadej jñāṇaṃ \(J\) NW; vadej jñāṇaṃ \(K\) 
\(103b.\) caṇḍiṣaḥ samayāṣṭasu \(J\) W; caṇḍiṣaḥ samayāṣṭasu \(K\) 
\(104c.\) adatte \(J\) conj.; adatte NKW 
\(105b.\) caṇḍiṣo \(J\) NW; caṇḍiṣai \(K\) 
\(105d.\) śīvaṃ \(J\) NW; śīva’ \(K\) 
\(106a.\) gṛñṇed \(J\) NW; gṛñṇan \(K\) 
\(106b.\) nibandhati \(J\) NW; nibadhyai \(K\) 
\(106d.\) śīvayajñam

\(^{118}\) Thus GOODALL and ISAACSON 2007.

\(^{119}\) N\(_1\), is the ninth-century Nepalese manuscript; K and W are the apographs held in Kathmandu and in the Wellcome Institute in London respectively. Text enclosed in square brackets is not legible in N\(_1\), but has been supplied from the apographs.
praku° J K; śī - --- N; śivayajñā° W 107d. °tunateti J NW; °tuvateti K 108b. tam vai badhnāti durmmatim J conj.; ta vai badhnāti durmmatim N; tavaiva prātidurmatiḥ K; tavaiva prātidurmmatim W

These [above] are remembered as the bonds of the body. Hear now from me the bonds inflicted by the Gaṇas. If, having obtained permission to do so, a person does not commit yogic suicide (na sankṝame),¹²⁰ Vidyeśa punishes him for that (tena).¹²¹ If someone sets a price and teaches scripture, Śaṃmukha punishes him for that. If someone teaches scripture without having first obtained permission or (ca) transmits it to a non-initiate, Gaṇapati searches for some flaw in the sādhaka and destroys his power. Nandi quickly punishes one who, deluded by the systems of thought devised by bound souls, distorts the tantric teaching. In the case of [transgression of] the eight post-initiatory rules of conduct, [it is] Caṇḍīśa [who punishes].¹²² If one reviles the Lord Śiva (i), a devotee of His (ii) or a guru (iii), or in the case of eating the nirmālya (iv), or of giving it as bāli to a bound soul [or perhaps to a beast?]¹²³ (v), or if one takes what has been touched by a menstruating woman (vi),¹²⁴ or reviles scripture (vii), or steps on the shadow of a liṅga (viii), Caṇḍīśa vigorously punishes. If someone undertakes a religious observance beginning with(?) a vow and then abandons that pure observance and takes up an observance taught in another work, Devi punishes for that. If someone studies the Śivatantra, performs Śiva-yajñā [and] sacrifices with Vedic rites and reviles devotees of Śiva and venerates and praises¹²⁵ Brahmins with other religious affiliations, Hāṭhakūśmāṇḍa-rudra punishes that wrong-thinking person. In this way the bonds inflicted by the Gaṇas firmly bind the initiate.

This passage is important for a number of reasons. The Niśvāsa is now thought of as Saiddhāntika, but it apparently predates a split into the Śaiva Siddhānta

¹²⁰ Third person optatives often drop their final consonant in this text.
¹²¹ badhyate, bandhati and badhnāti appear to be used synonymously here.
¹²² Alternatively, we could accept the pre-correction reading of K and understand: ‘In the case of the eight post-initiatory rules of Caṇḍīśa—. . .’.
¹²³ Or as Professor EİNOO has suggested to me, this could conceivably be construed to mean: ‘or [in the case of eating] a sacrificed animal given as bāli’.
¹²⁴ This interpretation assumes that ārtavi- is intended as a vrddhi derivative from ītu and so means ‘a woman in her season’. The conjecture and interpretation are based upon the Siddhāntasārapaddhati of Bhoja, who gives an overlapping list of eight post-initiatory rules, the last of which being that one should not eat food touched by a menstruating woman (ŠANDERSON *2005): …aṣṭau saṃmayän śrāvayet. (i–iv) maheśvarataccāstragurusādhakādinā na kāryā. (v) liṅgachāyām na laṅghayet, (vi) nirmālyam ca. (vii) na tad āṣṇiḥyat. (viii) rajas-valāsprśṭṭānam na bhakṣayet. Assuming that the bhakta of our text corresponds to the category sādhakādi in Bhoja’s, the list of eight rules is the same, though presented differently, except for one item: while Bhoja’s list forbids stepping on the nirmālya, the Niśvāsa forbids giving the nirmālya to non-initiates or perhaps to beasts.
¹²⁵ stunateti is of course irregular, but probably authorial rather than transmissional.
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and into other streams of tantric Śaivism, for it contains no allusion to such a differentiation and yet devotes considerable space (much of its introductory book, which is called the Niśvāsamukha) to a detailed explanation of the religious context that surrounds it.  

We may note, furthermore, that the list of Gaṇas among whom Candaśa is included is archaic. No circuit of eight Gaṇas such as we discussed above (in connection with the so-called “Śiva-Kāmadeva” figures in Nepal) features in the Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā’s accounts of Śiva-worship. Vidyeśa and Hāṭhakuśmāṇḍa do not figure as Gaṇas elsewhere, and the Niśvāsa omits three figures who occur in the later standard list, namely Mahākāla, Bhringin and the bull (vṛṣabha). The passage links Candaśa’s function as the chastiser of eight transgressions with his function as the receiver of nirmālya, since eating the nirmālya is one of those transgressions. And in doing so it confirms that Candaśa was present in the earliest phase of tantric Śaivism that is accessible to us, before the standardisation of a list of eight gaṇas associated with the eight directions. He continues to be associated with the punishing of those who transgress post-initiatory rules, but we find occasional evidence that he is thought of as punishing other sorts of crime.

---

126 Goudriaan treats it as though it were not a Saiddhāntika work, even though it presents the earliest surviving version of the list of twenty-eight scriptures that came to be regarded as the twenty-eight primary Siddhāntatantras (Goudriaan and Gupta 1981:33–6). His discussion of the work concludes with these remarks (1981:36):

The Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā evidently provides a link between the ordinary type of a “Dvaita” Śaiva Āgama and the esoteric Tantras. The esoteric and unorthodox character of much of its contents renders it plausible that the text for this reason could not be accepted by the early Śaiva Siddhānta.

For a presentation of the detailed account the Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā gives of the Atimārga, see Anderson 2006b.

127 In a later part of the tantra (Guhyasūtra 16:52) we find another list of gaṇas, again explicitly seven of them and not eight, which includes these three (assuming that Kāpali stands for Mahākāla) but omits Candaśa: devī skandaṇ ca vighneṣam nandī kāpālim eva ca/ vṛṣabham caiva bhṛṅgīṇ ca saptaite tu prakṛtītāh.

128 For an announcement of a preparation of an edition of this text, as well as mention of a few further indicators of its archaic character, Goodall and Isaacson 2007. We have there suggested that its earliest part, the Mūlasūtra, might have been composed between 450 and 550 AD.

129 See, e.g., TAK s.v. caṇḍāṇāhaṇga.

130 A Khmer inscription may be adduced: K. 195, lines 19–24 (Inscriptions du Cambodge VI, pp. 247–250), dated to 963 sāka (=1041 AD). Cèdès translates: ‘Si le vénérable et les gens qui seront chefs à l’avenir ne se conforment pas à l’ordre gracieux du roi, ils seront condamnés aux peines les plus sévères, soumis aux sept châtiments royaux, jusqu’au séjour de Candaśvara, avec leurs familles durant mille naissances.’
Who is Canḍeśa?

Canḍeśa outside Tamil Nadu

Now if a nirmālya-receiving Canḍeśa is a pan-Indian figure prominent in the Śaiva Siddhānta from its earliest beginnings, and from before the Śaiva Siddhānta had begun to distinguish itself from other streams of tantric Śaivism, then why do we not find many more representations of him from other parts of the Indian sub-continent? Aside from the Nepalese candidates, we have of course referred to images from Andhra Pradesh, and others in Karnataka may be adduced.

But these are arguably all within the furthest reach of the influence of the Tamil-speaking South, which has until now been widely considered to be the source of Canḍeśa worship. Relatively late South Indian influence cannot, some would say, be firmly excluded even in the case of the Nepalese images, because of the periodic importation of South Indian priests to officiate in the Paśupati temple. The art-historian DHAKY, though he too believed Canḍeśa to be an essentially Southern figure, has provided the elements of an answer to this problem. His article on the subject (1970:104) announced the discovery of ‘two medieval works on architecture... of the Māru-Gurjara or Lāta tradition’ that prescribe the construction of shrines to Canḍeśa to the North-East of the liṅga.131 As DHAKY suggests (1970:103–4):

The loss of Śaivāgamas of the Northern tradition, the ascendancy of Vaiṣṇavism at the expense of Śaivism in the late medieval period in North, and the failure so far on our part to recognise—even suspect—Canḍeśa figures among the vast assemblages of a variety of iconic figures of the Śaivaitic affiliation scattered all over Northern India in the many regional styles are factors responsible for the almost total blackout on Canḍa in North India.

But it is evident that CČEDEŚ is confusing āyatana with yātana (‘torment’).

The Khmer reads: pādamula nu anak ta khoṅ ni pradvann dau vnek ni pi vveam thevé rohē vrah karunā neh nirṇaya tov uttamasāhā don [doubtful reading] rājabhayasaptaka lvoṅ ta candīśvaravātānā nu santāna phon sahasra kamnet.

131 He mentions a third treatise, the Laksānasamuccaya of Vairocana, but his quotation of it (1970:109) reveals that it is an extremely corrupt text of Vairocana’s Pratiśthā-laksānasārasamuccaya 17:13–18, to which we have referred above.
A number of the sculptures that we identify as Caṇḍeśa are identified by others as other figures—the four-faced image in Chidambaram is seen as Brahmā, the club-wielding figure at Arittappatti is seen as Lakulīśa, the standing ithyphallic images in Kathmandu are Kāmadeva or Śiva-Kāmadeva—and this illustrates, if even only some of these proposed identifications are correct, that regional and temporal iconographic variations can be utterly bewildering. Now in DHAKY’s two works, the Vāstuśāstra and the Vāstuvidyā, both attributed to Viśvakarman and which he dates, respectively, to the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries (1970:104), we find an entirely different iconographic type described. Both texts envisage a Caṇḍeśa concealed from view by his own shrine, placed with upturned face beneath the pranāla to drink the lustral waters that pour from the linga. It is rather less surprising, then, that no Caṇḍešas have hitherto been discovered in Western India: not only have large numbers of early temples been destroyed, but the type of image chosen to represent him must have been utterly different from what South Indian types would lead us to expect.

PLATE 29. Caṇḍeśa underneath the pranāla in the Mārtāndeśvara temple at Marttandesvaram, Kalkulam Taluk, Kanyakumari Dt. This is not an ancient image, but it seemed worth including since it demonstrates the existence of a tradition that may echo the one DHAKY (1970) has uncovered: the figure does not have his face upturned, but he is partly concealed in the tank and has been placed directly underneath the outflow from the pranāla. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

DHAKY quotes the relevant passages of both the works he discusses, but in an extremely corrupt form. I quote here just a few lines (missing out the description of the aedicule in which Caṇḍa is to be housed) of the passage from the Vāstuvidyā with normalised orthography and a few suggested corrections:

\[
tathā vai kārayet^{132} prājñāḥ jagatyām madhyasamsthitam
cārūsimhāsanāsīnaṁ nilameghānjanaprabham
ūrdhvavaktram sutejādhyām pibantam snapanam sadā
tankapāṇīṁ mahācaṇḍaṁ^{133} pranālādhyavasthitam
idṛṣaṁ^{134} kārayec caṇḍaṁ sarvakāmaphalapradam
svayambhubānaliṅge^{135} ca sthāndile maṇḍale ’pi vā
advaitamantrasaṃyuṅkte caḷe caṇḍo^{136} na vidyate
\]

The wise man should cause him to be made thus, placed in the middle of the ja-
gati, seated on a lovely lion-throne, the colour of a dark cloud or of collyrium, with

---

132 kārayet [em.; kāryyet DHAKY
133 tankapāṇīṁ mahācaṇḍaṁ [conj.; tankapāṇī mahācaṇḍa DHAKY
134 idṛṣaṁ [em.; idaśaṁ DHAKY
135 svayambhubānaliṅge [conj.; svayambhū bānaliṅge DHAKY
136 ‘saṃyuṅkte caḷe caṇḍo [conj.; saṃyuṅtaṁ caḷe caṇḍe DHAKY
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upturned face, full of fierce vigour, at all times drinking the ablution waters [that have been poured over the linga], with an axe in hand, extremely terrible, situated beneath the water-spout. This is how one should cause Caṇḍa, who grants all desires and fruits, to be made. In the case of [worship of Śiva in] a spontaneously arisen linga, or bānalinga, or a prepared ritual ground, or a maṇḍala or [in a linga] in which the mantra of a non-dual [deity, such as Bhairava or Tumburu,] has been installed, Caṇḍa is absent.

Dhaky speculates about waves of South Indian influence that might account for the spread of the South Indian figure of Caṇḍa to the North, but, since we can now show that Caṇḍa was in fact already a pan-Indian figure some centuries before this, another explanation suggests itself: perhaps, after all, various regions independently came up with very different visualisations of Caṇḍeṣa, some of them emphasising his character as a fierce chastiser of transgressions (the seated, axe-wielding figures of the South), others his rōle as the recipient of nirmālya (an open-mouthed figure drinking the lustral waters of a pranāla), and others again his nature as a fierce hypostasis of Śiva (the standing, four-armed ithyphallic figures of Nepal).

Plate 30. Two-armed Caṇḍeṣvara as depicted in the volume of drawings accompanying the Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya. The text’s four-armed prescription is not illustrated in that volume and this is instead a realisation of him as he appears among other Gaṇeṣvaras in 6:183:

śvetas tryakṣo dvibhauś ca jāṭī tānkākṣamālikaḥ
pracando daṇḍadhārī ca kāryaś caṇḍeśvaro mahān.

‘Caṇḍeṣvara should be made white, three-eyed, two-armed, with matted locks and bearing an axe/chisel/dagger (tāṅka) and a rosary; and [alternatively] (ca) [he may be made] big, fierce, wielding a club/stick.’ The drawing (which interprets tāṅka to mean chisel or dagger) has no club or stick, as though the second half of the verse had been considered as giving an alternative. The yogapaṭṭāsana, represented by a band on the ground, is probably the result of confusion.

The ‘muddle’, if such a word can be used for the resulting profusion of forms, is certainly in part produced by the peculiarities of the dialogue between literature (whether prescriptive or narrative) and visual images. A Sanskrit prescriptive text-passage may travel faster and further than an image, but even an appar-

---

137 For the sthāṇḍīla and its preparation, see Einoo 2005:33–41.
138 No such figure has come to light, but it seems reasonable to assume that the works Dhaky quotes from described a real practice.
139 Bühnemann (2003:42, fn. 116) remarks: ‘[a]ccording to PLSS 6.181b, the deity is seated with (and not on) the yogapaṭṭa’. No doubt she is correct, but 6:181 in fact describes Yogeṣvara, another deity.
ently precise and detailed description may retain important ambiguities that may in turn lead to bewildering sculptural representations. Many descriptions use the term *taṅka* to describe Canḍa’s most distinctive implement and, since this term may refer to an axe or to a chisel and perhaps also to other instruments, we find this apparently reflected in axes in the South, certainly reflected in a chisel in the illustration of the *Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya* (PLATE 30), and perhaps reflected in a chisel in some four-armed Nepalese figures. I add the qualifications ‘apparently’, ‘certainly’ and ‘perhaps’ advisedly, for, as any one who has ever tried to match Sanskrit prescriptive texts and images knows, the relations are far from simple.

Occasional perfect matches in the case of significant figures of worship are indeed to be found in various parts of the sub-continent, notably from the eleventh century onwards—remaining in the Saiddhāntika milieu, we may point to the four-armed Canḍeśvara of PLATES 12–13 in the South, or to the ten-armed Sadāśivas of the Bengal region shown and discussed in GOODALL et al. 2005:62–3, 138–45 and FIGS. 44–5—and they grow yet more common, at least in South India, from the twelfth century. This is in part, I believe, because we have a large body of ‘South Indian Temple scriptures’, to which we have referred at the beginning of this article, which catalogued what they found in many a Cōla-period temple and presented description as prescription (cf., again, the remarks of SANDERSON 2004:444–5). A concrete example may make this clear: a seated figure of Śiva known as Daksināmūrti is the principal sculpture on the South side of the outside of the *garbhagrha* of a vast number of South Indian temples, beginning with the Kailāsanātha. Some variation is found in the implements he holds and in what is arrayed around him, but in a typical sculpture we may expect to see him teaching beneath a banyan tree, surrounded by sage-like disciples, and often with animals beneath his seat. Numerous textual ‘prescriptions’ can be found (see, e.g., RAO 1914, Vol. II, part II, Appendix B, pp. 137–46), but not one is to be found in an unambiguously pre-twelfth-century work. Moreover, the various textual sources that we know to be pre-twelfth-century—from identifiable quotations in twelfth-century literature, from early manuscripts, from the existence of commentaries—are silent about this figure. So what work prescribed the first representations of ‘Daksināmūrti’ in the early eighth century? If we take ‘prescribe’ in a literal sense, then perhaps

---

140 This article is not the place to treat in full the problematic case of Dakṣināmūrti, which is much discussed in secondary literature (e.g. BAKKER 2001 and 2004) and which will be examined in a forthcoming book about Pallava-period iconography by Valérie GILLET: *La création d’une iconographie sivaïte narrative : incarnations du dieu dans les temples pallava construits*. 
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none did.

Plate 31. ‘Dakṣināmūrti’ on the South face of the Aṭṭahāsesvara temple in Tiruttani, Tiruttani Taluk, Tiruvalluvar Dt. The back hands hold rosary and flaming torch; in the front hands we see a teaching gesture (index and thumb joined in a ring, with the other fingers extended and the palm turned to the viewer) and a palm-leaf manuscript. A banyan tree rises up behind the figure. Beneath his seat are a snake, two deer and a rat. The left ear only has a pattra-kuṇḍala; above it is the trumpet of a dhattura flower. Dakṣināmūrti more usually rests his left ankle on his right knee.

But once a descriptive literature had begun to grow that couched its descriptions in prescriptive terms, this may in turn have led to an increased readiness to turn to textual descriptions as the starting-points for images, thus expanding the repertoire of sculpted forms to include images that may earlier have existed only in dhyāna.

What I am suggesting is that some iconographies appear to have begun in artists’ or sculptors’ minds before becoming the subject of textual prescriptions, while others may have started life as visualisations (dhyāna) prescribed as part of private worship. To restate that in concrete terms, the iconography of such figures as Dakṣināmūrti may have evolved amongst artists who were attempting to give expression to a welter of notions (about Śiva and about divinities who face South, for instance), drawn directly or indirectly from other images, from religious practice, from narrative literature or from other sources unknown. This iconography then eventually passed into prescriptive literature. Conversely, the iconography of a four-faced, four-armed Caṇḍeṣvara with trident, axe, rosary and water-pot may instead have begun as a prescribed visualisation (dhyāna) to be used in the course of Saiddhāntika worship and then passed into the sculptural repertoire. In Nepal, it did so as a standing, ithyphallic figure, but in South India, where a tradition of showing Caṇḍeṣa as seated in a certain fashion had already evolved, probably amongst sculptors and artisans, the iconography of the visualisation was blended with existing sculptural conventions for the representation of Caṇḍeṣa.

Plate 32. Caṇḍeṣa to the North-East of the liṅga in the Gomuktiśvara temple in Tiruvavaduthurai Adheenam (Tiruvāvatuturai), Mayavaram Taluk, Nagapattinam District. Photo: EFEO (G. RAVINDRAN).

Plate 33. Detail of Caṇḍeṣa in his shrine at the Gomuktiśvara temple in Tiruvavaduthurai Adheenam (Tiruvāvatuturai), Mayavaram Taluk, Nagapattinam District. Notice the flower, perhaps a reference to Śiva’s nirmālya, used to make an unusual earring. N. RAMASWAMY drew my attention to this detail. Photo:
EFEO (G. Ravindran).

Returning then to the early two-armed, seated Caṇḍeṣas of South India, they may appear to reflect prescriptions for two-armed figures, but they may instead have been inspired from an unmappable tangle of factors: half-remembered snippets of legend, the knowledge of his association with the axe, associations that arise from the sound of his name, the appearance of ascetics with matted locks, a knowledge of his association with nirmālya, imitation and modification of other South-facing images, and so forth. Some of these factors appear sporadically in the corpus: his association with nirmālya, for instance, appears to be expressed by his wearing a flattish open-petalled flower prominently on his head which can be seen both in early images (Plates 2[?], 5, 6, 15, 38, 39) and in later ones (27), and may in one place be expressed by an unusual flower earring (Plates 32–3 and cf. Plate 1). Elements that may be intended to recall Caṇḍeṣa’s identity with Śiva are also sporadic, such as the pattrakunḍala in the left ear (Plates 19, 23, 27, 32–3), the dhattūra flower (Plate 27) and the skull (Plates 19, 21). In other details, an early variety is gradually standardised. We may note, for instance, that there is some variation in the posture of the legs (Plates 2, 4, 6, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 28) before the familiar posture (with one leg resting on the platform on which he sits and the other dangling below it) is adopted as standard (Plates 2, 8, 9, 10, 12, 19, 27, 32). The club and the axe are perhaps equally common among the earliest sculptures, but it is the axe that wins through.

Caṇḍa as watchman?

We return now to discuss a feature of many of the earliest sculptural representations that we have not until now commented upon. In rock-cut shrines that may all be of the eighth and ninth centuries, Caṇḍeṣa often appears outside the entrance of a liṅga shrine, paired with Vināyaka.

Plate 34. A Triśūlapuruṣa as doorkeeper, together with Caṇḍeṣa. Both are stationed to the approacher’s right of the entrance to the East-facing cave No. 3 (reading from North to East) at Bhairavakona (commonly referred to in secondary literature as Bhairavaṇḍa), Kanigiri Taluk, Nellore District, Andhra Pradesh. In East-facing Pallava or Pāṇḍya caves, we would expect the watchman on the approacher’s left to be the Triśūlapuruṣa and the one on the right to be the Parasupuruṣa, but their positions are thus reversed in all the eight principal cave-shrines at this site. Caṇḍeṣa too is positioned like this in all the principal cave-shrines, in such a way that he is located to the North-East of the liṅga and facing a sculpture of Gajānana on the other flank. Note the channel cut into the rock that leads away whatever has been poured over the liṅga through the wall.
of the shrine, underneath the watchman and then beneath the feet of Canđeša. Each of the cave-shrines has such a channel, strongly suggesting that, just as at Malaiyadipatti (for which see GOODALL et al. 2005:58–9), Canđeša is conceived of here as the nirṃālyadārin and not simply as a guardian (as was mooted in GOODALL et al. 2005:186, fn. 128).

We find such representations as far North as Bhairavakona, in Andhra Pradesh (e.g. PLATE 34), where Canđeša and Vinayaka face each other, as well as in the South, in the Pândya country, for instance at Arittappatti and at Devarmalai (PLATE 5), where Canđeša and Vinayaka face outwards towards the approaching worshipper.

PLATE 35. Canđeša to the right of the entrance to an unfinished(?) rock-cut cave at Kunnandarkoyil (Kuṇrāṉṭarkōvil), Pudukkottai Taluk, Pudukkottai Dt. In this case there is no answering figure of Vinayaka. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

In these cases Canđeša is on the right-hand side of the caves from the perspective of an approaching worshipper. One way of looking at such images might be to consider them as watchmen guarding the shrine. And there are a few instances of another sort of figure that might arguably show Canđeša in watchman guise. Together, these two types of figure might add another function, that of doorkeeper, to Canđeša’s job-description.

Before we consider these figures, let us first recall that one of the most stable distinctive features in the early iconography of the seated Canđešas is his mop of matted hair (jaṭābhāra); second, we may remind ourselves that among the earliest representations are those of Śiva being venerated by a Canđeša who submissively inclines his head and puts his hands together in a respectful aṅjali (PLATE 25); third we may recall that Pallava-period watchmen, as has been convincingly demonstrated by LOCKWOOD et al. 2001:7ff, are personified weapons of the deity of the shrine they guard. At Pallava sites Śiva’s watchmen are therefore commonly a personified trident, or Triśūlapuruṣa (usually to the approaching worshipper’s left), and a personified axe, or Paraśupuruṣa. Such personified weapons as watchmen are in fact widespread across South India, for they are to be found at Cālukya monuments in and around Aihole, though this seems not to have been observed to date, and also to the South of the Pallava realm. The various well-known Pallava watchmen that represent the axe do

---

141 Rock-cut images of Canđešvara are seen outside six of the Śaiva caves at Bhairavakona (in Kanigiri Taluk, Nellur District, Andhra Pradesh). See PATTABIRAMIN 1971, Plates XXXVII, XLII, XLIV, L, LVI, LVII.

142 Their presence in rock-cut shrines in the Pândya country was pointed out to me by Emmanuel FRANCIS and Charlotte SCHMID and we plan to produce together a more detailed demonstration of the presence of āyudhapuruṣas as watchmen throughout
not have Caṇḍeśa’s distinctive coiffure, but there are a couple of Paraśupuruṣas from further South that are uncannily like him: firstly, they share his distinctive jaṭābhāra and heavy jewellery; secondly, they seem submissively devotional (and therefore relatively unmartial) compared with other watchmen; and thirdly, although they carry no weapon at all, they have the blade of an axe incorporated into their headdresses.

Plate 36. Paraśupuruṣa to the viewer’s right of the approach to the East-facing linga shrine at Kunnantarkoyil (Kuṇṛṇṭārkōvīl), Pudukkottai Taluk, Pudukkottai Dt. Out of the top of this watchman’s heavy jaṭābhāra protrudes the top portion of the haft of an axe, with part of its blade pointing out towards the viewer. He wears heavy jewellery, not just about the neck and chest, but also earrings, bracelets and upper-arm-bands. His head is slightly inclined, in the manner of Caṇḍeśa as the archetypal devotee, towards the door of the shrine he ‘guards’. If one discounts his position beside the door, his crossed arms and watchful look are all there is to suggest his function as a dvārapālaka.

Plate 37. Paraśupuruṣa to the viewer’s right of the Satyagirīśvara at the East-facing eighth-century(?) rock-cut shrine at Tirumayam (Tirumeyyam), Tirumayam Taluk, Pudukkottai Dt. For the left-hand watchman, a Triśūlapuruṣa, see Goodall et al. 2005:55–6 and Fig. 24. Once again, the upper part of an axe, its blade pointing out towards the viewer, protrudes from a heavy jaṭābhāra. Once again, the figure wears heavy jewellery about the neck and chest, on the ears and on the lower and upper arms. This time a stomach-band (udarabandha) is also visible. The left-hand, hidden behind the cloth, is on the upper left thigh; the figure’s right hand gestures to the shrine’s opening and perhaps also registers astonishment. A fold of cloth can be seen hanging below the figure’s right knee. (A modern image of Skanda as Daṇḍapāṇi stands in front.)

Some sort of mixture of ideas may have produced such a watchman figure and it seems not inconceivable that these watchmen were intended both as representations of Caṇḍeśa and at the same time as anthropomorphised representations of Śiva’s axe.

But, setting apart the strange watchmen of the Pāṇḍya country that we have just discussed, there is perhaps no need to suppose that other figures of Caṇḍeśa placed outside linga shrines should really be watchmen. Their being seated, first of all, might argue against this (though admittedly their typical seated posture could be intended to express watchful vigilance, for it is the posture most commonly adopted by the guardian deities of village boundaries all over the Tamil-speaking South, such as Maturaivirān, Kāttavaraiyan, Periyaṉṉan, Lāracāmi, South India.
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Muṇıcuvaran, Ayyanār, etc.). Furthermore, in the case of one of the best known, the one at Aritappatti, there is a separate inner pair of more conventional club-wielding dvārapālakas standing on either side of the entrance. As for their position outside the shrine, perhaps we should rather say that Ganesa is the figure to be venerated as one enters and Caṇḍeśa, in view of his connection with nirmālya, is the figure whom one venerates as one departs. (Admittedly, there are, in the developed Siddhānta, contexts in which Caṇḍeśa is treated as a watchman, but these are when all the eight Ganeśvaras are so treated and are probably not relevant.) In a small shrine, when the essential figures are reduced to just the liṅga and Ganesa with Caṇḍeśa, then the latter pair can appear to be watchmen; but in a larger context, such as in the Kailāsanātha, these figures marking entrance and exit (PLATE 22) do not appear in such a light. The positioning of Ganesa and Caṇḍeśa guarding entrance and exit may not last much beyond the period of rock-cut shrines. In constructed temples in South India they are probably not common, for, aside from in the Kailāsanātha, I am aware of only one ruined shrine where they appear, namely at Satyamangalam, in which they were probably so placed. Nothing remains there except what appears to be a late Pallava plinth, a couple of liṅgas, and two stone bas-relief panels showing Ganeṣa and Caṇḍeśa (PLATE 38).

PLATE 38. Caṇḍeśvara on a stone panel beside the plinth of the ruined Śaiva temple at Satyamangalam, Senji Taluk, Villuppuram Dt. The only other figurative sculpture visible in 2003, apart from the elephant heads carved at the corners on the base of the temple (which suggest a date in the late Pallava period), was a matching panel showing Vināyaka. The character of the stone makes it difficult to be sure, but there may be a flower in front of the conical point at the top of his jatābhāra.

Other evidence, however, for Vināyaka and Caṇḍeśa being installed together with a liṅga is to be found at a later date in Cambodia. The following inscription from Práḥ Phnom, K. 593, appears to record the installation of Caṇḍeśvara, Vināyaka, a liṅga and a set of planets in 852 saka (930 AD) (Inscriptions du Cambodge III, pp. 119–20).

bhaktim sthirikartum avighnakarini dvipaancaaturdaya sivasomanama
caṇḍiśvaraṁ vighnapatiṁ ca liṅgam grahais saha sthapitavan subhakte

143 One such context is the dvārapālapūja before dikṣā in the Kriyākramadyotikā (p. 151); another is in SP4 II.106. Cf. also Matangapārameśvara, kriyāpāda 7:6–8.

144 CEDÈS reads, conjectures and interprets the first verse somewhat differently. My alterations to the text are based upon consultation, with Professor Gerdi GER-SCHHEIMER, of the estampage n. 479 of the EFEO in Paris.
In order to make devotion firm to the one who removes obstacles, a man named Śivasoma installed, with true devotion, a Candīśvara, a Vighnapati, a linga, together with the planets, in [the year marked by 8] forms [of Śiva], 5 and 2.

May good come to you! May the merit in this [pious act] belong to its author! May those in power (balādhipāḥ) at all times joyfully protect this [foundation] for the success Candinām.

Now ČEDES, not expecting a reference to Čandesā, has not unreasonably supposed that candiśvara should be interpreted as ‘Caṇḍī and Īśvara’ (retroflex stops and the retroflex nasal are quite commonly made dental in the Cambodian corpus), but the reading he requires for this interpretation (a reading without anusvāra), is unmetrical.145 Furthermore, SANDERSON (2004:437–8, fn. 317) has pointed out that this inscription is not the only one in the Khmer corpus that appears to refer to Caṇḍēśvara. The second case he points to is verse 26 of Face B of K. 278, an inscription of the first half of the 11th century edited by BARTH (1885:97–117). SANDERSON comments (ibid.)

I am unaware of any surviving Khmer image of this deity. However, the fact that he is in the company of Gaṇēśa, Nandin and Mahākāla make it unlikely that it is not Caṇḍēśvara who is intended. For these are all deities of the same class, being among the eight leaders of Śiva’s attendant demigods (gaṇeśvarāḥ, pramathanaẏakāḥ) that are worshipped in the systems of some of the Śaiva Tantras as the deity-circuit outside the Vidyeśvaras, between the latter and the Lokapālas.

SANDERSON did not go on to quote verse 28 of the same inscription (BARTH 1885:108):

vidhivad adhikānte tīṇḍhipat padmapīṭhe śivaśubhamāṇiliṅgāṃ ca ca\n
ya upacaraṇapātraṃ yad dhalānady umendre punar adita sa eṣa śrīkṣitindropakalpaḥ ca

BARTH translates (1885:117):

Pour affermir la dévotion, le nommé Čivasoma, écarter les obstacles, dans l’année marquée par les (8) formes (de Śiva) – cinq – deux, a pieusement érigé Caṇḍī (Umā), Īcvara (シーヴァ), Vighnapati (Gaṇeṣa), un linga, avec les images des planètes.
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Conformément aux préceptes, il a érigé sur un socle splendide (en forme) de lotus un linga de Čiva brillant de joyaux (et deux images de) Caṇḍi et de Vighneśvara, et il a donné au seigneur d’Umā une coupe de service qui (contient un vrai) fleuve de halā, lui ĉri-Kṣīndropakalpa.

Here, although we do not have other Gaṇeśvaras present (other than Vighneśvara), it seems to me likely that Caṇḍeśvara is again referred to. Two factors, in this case, suggest South Indian influence: the pairing of these two figures beside the liṅga is known to us from the Indian subcontinent only in the South, and the form Caṇḍi recalls the most frequently used Tamil form of the name, Caṇṭi (pronounced Caṇḍi).

Sanderson refers to one other Cambodian occurrence which is of some importance to us because it belongs to the early seventh century. Although no date is recorded, it names the ruling king, whom Cœdès identifies (1951:143) as Īśanavarman I (616–c. 635 AD). This pre-Angkorean inscription, K. 22, records the installation of an image of Harihara in verse 4, and its fifth verse reads as follows (Cœdès 1951:144):

\[
\text{visnucaṇḍevareśānalingaṁ tena pratiṣṭhitaṁ}
\]

\[
\text{ekabhogani vaddhāstu tatpūjety asya niścayaḥ}
\]

He [sic. Īśanadatta] installed a Viṣṇu, a Caṇḍeśvara and a Śivaliṅga.146 This was his decision: ‘Let their worship be connected by enjoyment of the same offerings’.

Now if this is indeed a reference to ‘our’ Caṇḍeśa, it is significant because it belongs to a period for which there is no evidence that any form of Tantric Śaivism had reached Cambodia (Sanderson 2004:435–44). It would therefore be not simply a very early Caṇḍeśa, but also a non-Saiddhāntika one.

Caṇḍeśa and the North East

A final speculative observation about the early units consisting of liṅga, Vināyaka and Caṇḍeśa: is it conceivable that these may be the origin of Caṇḍeśa’s association with the North East? If, as is often the case, the liṅga shrine faces East, then Caṇḍeśa, being placed on the right (from the perspective of the approaching worshipper), is inevitably to the North-East of the liṅga. No association with any particular direction is evident from the earliest Siddhānta-

---

146 This is Sanderson’s proposed translation of the compound (2004:438, fn. 317). He does not enter into the details of the ruminations of Barth and Cœdès (recorded in Cœdès 1951:145–6, fn. 5), but briefly comments that it “most probably means ‘a Viṣṇu, a Caṇḍeśvara and a Śivaliṅga’ (cf. K. 834, v. 84 liṅgam aisiṣānam), as thought by Cœdès (Ic III, 145).” This might seem to imply that Cœdès understood this to be a reference to the nirmālya-receiving Caṇḍa, but Cœdès makes clear that he analyses ‘Lord of Caṇḍa’.
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tantras, namely the *Niśvāsatattvasaṁhitā*, the *Śvāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*, the 200-verse and 350-verse recensions of the *Kālottara* (which appear not to mention Caṇḍesa at all), in the chapters surviving from the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, or in the surviving fragments of the *Pauṣkara-Pāraśvaratantra*.

Of course there are other possibilities that suggest themselves. It may, for instance, be Caṇḍesvara’s position in the North East in the circuit of the Ganeśvaras that has led to his being placed in the North East. But this would only push the question to another level: why should he have been placed in the North-East in that circuit? Furthermore, the first attestations of the circuit of Ganeśvaras in literature may not predate the first appearances of Caṇḍesa in the North East. The circuit is absent in the early sources mentioned just above, and the earliest sources in which it appears are perhaps the *Kiraṇa* 20:34ff (almost the entire passage has dropped out from the edition, but is preserved in the tenth-century Nepalese manuscript), in the 150-verse recension of the *Kālottara* (verse 128, f. 6r) and in the *Sarvajñānottara* 5:34–5.147 The dates of these works are of course not known to me, but I think of them as belonging chronologically in the middle amongst surviving pre-tenth-century Siddhāntatantras.148

---

147 *Sarvajñānottara* 5:34–5:

\[
ganēśvarāṃś caturthe tu kauberyāsādītaḥ kramāt
devīm caiva tu caṇḍiṣaṁ mahākālaṁ ca nandinam 5:34
\]

\[
ganāḥhyakṣaṁ ca bhrṃgīm ca ḥṛṣabhaṁ skandam eva ca
dhyāyen nityam anudvignaḥ padmarāgasamaprabhān 5:35
\]

\[
34ab ganēśvarāṃś caturthe tu kauberyāsādītaḥ J *conj.*; ganēśvarāṃś caturthe tu kauče sāmādītaḥ N₁; ganēśvarāṃś caturthe tu kauberyāsādītaḥ T334
\]

\[
35b bhrṃgīm ca J N₁; bhrṃgīsam T334
\]

\[
35c dhyāyen nityam anudvigna J em.; dhyāyen nityam anudvigna N₁; dhyāyeta sānnidhyam anudvigna T334 (unmetrical)
\]

\[
*’samaprabhān J *conj.; ’samaprabham N₁; samaprabhāt T334
\]

In the fourth [circuit] one should calmly visualise the Ganeśvaras as ruby-coloured, beginning from the North in due order: the Goddess, Caṇḍiṣa, Mahākāla, Nandin, Gaṇāḍhyakṣa [viz. Gajānana], Bṛṅgī, the bull and Skanda.

---

148 A sketch of my notions of the relative chronology of the pre-tenth-century Saiddhāntika canon may be useful here. (Demonstrating with evidence why I think this rough relative chronology likely must be postponed to another publication.) The very oldest Siddhāntatantras, I now suspect, are those in which there is no mention of souls’ impurity (*mala*). In this group we may number the *Niśvāsatattvasaṁhitā*, the 200-verse and 350-verse recensions of the *Kālottara*, and possibly the *Rauravasūtrasaṁhitā* (see GOODALL, KATAKA, ACHARYA and YOKOCHI 2008:315); next should be placed the *Śvāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*, in which *mala* features, and which was certainly known to Sadyojyotiḥ in the late seventh century; then follow the ‘middle-period’ pre-tenth-century scriptures such as the *Kiraṇa* and *Sarvajñānottara*, which Sadyojyotiḥ may not have known; after these, I suspect, follow the more disquisitional or śāstric works, those that attempt to a greater extent to engage with non-Śaiva philosophical traditions, namely the *Mataṅgapāraśvaratāma*.
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Others have suggested or implied (see L’HERNAULT 2002:30) that it is Canḍeśa’s being identified with Śiva (whose direction is the North East) that leads to his association with this direction, or that it is the fact that the North East is the ‘end of the circumambulatory circuit’ and so the most convenient place for the devotee ‘to testify that he does not carry away the possessions of the god’ (ibid.), or the fact that placing him in the North East puts him near to the spout (gomukha) carrying away to the North whatever libations are poured over the linga (ibid.). We cannot rule out the first and last of these suggestions voiced by L’HERNAULT, but we probably can exclude the second, for the notion that Canḍeśa looks after all temple property seems unlikely to me to be ancient.

Canḍeśa and Temple Property

As EDHOLM (among others) has observed (EDHOLM 1984:82) numerous Cōḷa-period Tamil inscriptions refer to Canḍeśvara as the handler of temple property and the arbitrator in all major property transactions (e.g. IPS 90, 96, 135, 136, 140). In this capacity he may be referred to as the lord’s first servant mūlabhṛtya (e.g. IPS 96) or adidāsa (e.g. SII, vol. 1, Nos. 84, 85, 89, 110, 112 and 131). The earliest of these that I have noted is IPS 90 of Tiruvilāṅkuti, dated to the 28th regnal year of Rājarāja I (viz. 1012–13 AD), but somewhat earlier instances no doubt exist.149 This appears not to be a function alluded to elsewhere, and it may not emerge until the tenth century. It is possible that it is more ancient, but it seems likely to me that it developed because of the blurring of the categories of property and nirmālya. According to the passage of the Ṣaṅgam (electronic edition of SANDERSON 2005*):

> nirmālyabhedaḥ kathyante. devasvaṃ devadrayaṃ naivedyaṃ nivedaṃ caṇḍadrayaṃ nirmālyaṃ ceti. devasāṃbandhi grāmādi devasvam. vastrāṅkārādi devadrayaṃ. devārtham upakalpitam naivedyaṃ. tad evotsrṣṭaṃ nivedaṃ. caṇḍāya dattaṃ caṇḍadrayaṃ. bahir niḥkṣiptaṃ nirmālyaṃ. visarjite ’pi deve piṇḍikāṣṭham pavitrakādyam nirmālyaṃ na bhavati. ṣaḍvidham api nirmālyaṃ na jīghren na laṅghayen na dādyaṃ na vikrīṇīta. dattvā kravyādo bhavati, bhuktvā mātaṅgaḥ, laṅghane siddhihīnīḥ. āghrāṇād vṛkah (vṛkah)

149 Professor Leslie ORR has gathered further material on this which I believe she soon intends to publish.
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The various types of nirmālya are explained: devasva, devadraya, nivedya, caṇḍadravya and nirmālya. [Among these,] devasva refers to villages and the like that belong to the god; devadraya refers to cloths and ornaments; nivedya refers to [food] that has been prepared for the sake of the god; niveda is the same as the above once it has been touched and left; caṇḍadravya is what has been given to Caṇḍa; nirmālya is what is thrown outside. Such things as pavîtr-raka-threads that remain on the piṇḍikā even after the god has been invited to depart do not become nirmālya. One should not smell, step on, give or sell any of the six types of nirmālya. If one should give it, one becomes a flesh-eating demon [in one’s next birth]; if one should eat it, one becomes an outcaste (mātangaḥ); if one should step on it, one loses one’s yogic powers; if one should smell it, one becomes a wolf; if one should touch it, one becomes a woman; if one burns it inappropriately, a Caṇḍā; if one sells it, a hunter.

Nirmālya here, it seems, is a sub-category within nirmālya. . . Making Caṇḍeṣa responsible for one category must have led to his being held responsible for the others too.

PLATE 39. An old (or perhaps just crudely fashioned) Caṇḍeṣa to the North-East of the liṅga in the Nāgeśvara Temple at Begur, Bangalore Taluk, Bangalore Dt. For this further evidence of Caṇḍeṣa’s spread in Karnataka, I am grateful to N. RAMASWAMY. The headdress, which is not a jaṭābhāra, appears to be decorated with a large flower. Here it is the right leg which rests on the seat and the left leg that dangles down. The implement in the right hand is an axe; the left hand rests on the left thigh. As often, he wears heavy jewellery (earrings, necklaces, yajñopavīta, angada and bracelets) and udarabandha. Photo: EFEO (G. RAVINDRAN).

Some conclusions

We have now covered so much material that it is difficult to draw together the threads. But we can start to do so by restating the question we asked at the outset: who was Caṇḍeṣa originally? and who did he become?

Among the common preconceptions about Caṇḍeṣa that we mentioned at the beginning, the notion that he is exclusively or even primarily a South Indian figure seems now quite exploded. But it is indeed in South India, and particularly in the Tamil-speaking South, that Caṇḍeṣa’s iconographic career has been most long-lived and eventful.

As for whether Caṇḍeṣa is fundamentally a Saiddhāntika figure, our answer must be equivocal. ACHARYA’s hypothesis that Caṇḍa was at one time and for certain groups a form of Śiva himself certainly seems possible. On the icono-
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Graphical side, the staff-bearing, standing ascetic shown on the Mathura pillar could, arguably, have evolved into the early seated, club wielding figures that we find in the Tamil-speaking South of India, some of which, like the figure on the Mathura pillar, have also often been mistakenly identified as images of Lakulīśa. (But, as Bakker has suggested, these figures could be weapon-deities rather than forms of Śiva, and moreover, as Edholm has suggested (1998:55), if one is looking to identify a South Indian iconographic type that might be connected with Lakulīśa, a more likely candidate is the teacher ‘Dakṣināṃśūrti’ (see Plate 31).) Furthermore, the hypothesis that Caṇḍa was incorporated and ‘tamed’ by the Mantramārga (tantric Śaivism), where he resurfaces as the consumer of a new and higher deity’s nirmālya seems conceivable. But while we admit these hypotheses to be possible, they remain only hypotheses. If Caṇḍa is indeed originally Śiva for certain followers of the Atimārga, then we can of course reply that Caṇḍeśa was not originally Saiddhāntika. But it might indeed be that the Caṇḍeśa whom we associate with the consumption of nirmālya and with the punishment of transgressions is a figure who developed in the early Siddhānta. We have emphasised that what appears to be the earliest surviving text of the Mantramārga, namely the Niśvāsatattvasamhitā, appears to predate the division of tantric Śaivism into Siddhānta, Vāma, Daksīṇa, etc. But it is clear nonetheless that the Niśvāsatattvasamhitā ‘became’ Saiddhāntika once that category came into existence. And we have seen that Caṇḍeśa occurs only rarely in non-Saiddhāntika tantric material. Furthermore, we have commented that none of the sculpted figures of Caṇḍeśa can be proven to predate the arrival in the South of the Śaiva Siddhānta. This means that we cannot conclusively reject the possibility that the nirmālya-bearing Caṇḍeśa was from the first a Saiddhāntika figure. Nevertheless, it seems to me unlikely that the many early shrines for which Caṇḍeśa was carved were from the first all Saiddhāntika. If temples in South India were really designed primarily as an iconographic expression of Saiddhāntika liturgy and thought, then we would surely expect to find a much better match. And yet, as Brunner observes, in an article that deserves to be better known among historians of Śaiva art,

There is no correspondence between the series of sculpted images that a temple houses and the series of Powers that are either invoked (for a finite period of time) in the course of the worship that takes place there or installed (theoretically for ever) in the course of the inaugural rites in particular parts of the building.\textsuperscript{150}

One of the factors that suggests a non-Saiddhāntika background is the early

\textsuperscript{150} Brunner 1990:28: ‘Il n’existe aucune correspondance entre la série des images sculptées qu’un temple abrite et la série des Puissances qui sont, soit invoquées (pour une durée finie) lors des cultes qui y prennent place, soit “déposées” (en principe pour toujours) pendant les rites inauguraux, dans telle ou telle partie du bâtiment ou des cours.’
prominence of the club in sculpture. In our literary sources, from the very first, Canḍesa is associated with the axe rather than with the club, and we have come up with no explanation of the gradual transition from the club to the axe in South Indian images. The non-Saiddhântika South Indian aetiological legend of Vicāraśarman seems to reflect and explain it in mythological terms: as the future Canḍesa grasps his staff to swipe at his father's legs, it transforms into an axe.

It therefore seems more likely to me, that the many undatable but early free-standing Canḍeśas that we find in South India are independent of the Śaiva Siddhânta and that Canḍesa has been incorporated into the Siddhânta from an existing tradition. We may recall that for the eleventh-century Somaśambhu, Canḍēśvara is primarily worshipped in fixed, man-made liṅgas, i.e. those of temples, and not in the context of private worship by Saiddhântika initiates. His association with the Siddhânta today might therefore be the result of the Siddhânta having gradually appropriated to itself the rôle of decreeing how temple worship should be conducted in South India.

Where then did the tradition come from? Perhaps Canḍesa as nirmālya-dhārin was originally part of a culture of temple worship that belonged to none of the theological schools that we know of today. Perhaps a wild-haired and fierce South-facing and typically Southern archetype-deity gradually became differentiated into distinct iconographic types, such as 'Dakśināmūrti', Bhikṣāṭana, dreadlocked door-guardian, and Canḍesa, and the last of these became associated with the receiving of nirmāla? Perhaps another Pāśupata cult, rather than the Śaiva Siddhânta, had the strategy of taming the chief deity of a rival school to become a nirmāla deity who was then simply adopted into the Mantramārga? Another possibility is that no such 'taming' of a rival group's deity occurred at all: food offerings to the liṅga became invested with terrible power and had therefore to be consumed by an especially fierce form of Śiva himself, who was represented with an inherited Pāśupata iconography, or by a fierce gaṇa, or by a weapon-deity.

PLATE 40. Archaic axe-wielding Canḍesa to the North-East of the liṅga but inside the ardhamāṇḍapa in the Mūlanātha temple in Bahur, Pondicherry. The axe blade here points inwards. Photo: N. R. AMASWAMY

I close with a couple of observations about why Canḍesa should have had a flour-

---

151 For the link between wild hair and wildness, which Dr. Charlotte SCHMID has pointed out to me, see description of PLATE 25.

152 Less likely, perhaps, is that early figures represented Pāśupata ascetics, for wearing the nirmāla was one of the distinctive practices of Pāṇcârthika Pāśupatas in their vyaktalīṅga stage (Pāśupatasūtra 1:5). When they were absent, some sculptural representation might have been supplied to fill their place.
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ishing career in South Indian sculpture and not elsewhere. Part of the answer to this riddle is that we can assume, from Cambodian inscriptions and from the Western Indian manuals that DHAKY has brought to light, that in fact Caṇḍeśa was indeed represented elsewhere, and we must suppose that such representations have either been destroyed or have not been recognised because their iconographies were so different. The startlingly different Nepalese icons make this point palpably. Furthermore, I should emphasise that areas other than the Tamil-speaking South and Nepal have received scant attention in this article because of the limitations of my knowledge about them: other sorts of images of Caṇḍeśa may well come to light.¹⁵³ But it seems almost certain that his flourishing in the South was in part a consequence of the popularity of the aetiological legend known to Tamil sources of the transformation of the shepherd Vicāra-śarman into the nirmālya-receiving Caṇḍeśa, the first servant of the Lord and the archetype of the Māheśvara devotee.

¹⁵³ Both Valérie GILLET and Peter BISSCHOP have independently suggested to me a possible Caṇḍeśa at the ruined late Gupta Śaiva temple in Nāchnā in Madhya Pradesh: see WILLIAMS 1983:105–14 and particularly PLATE 163. Amongst these miscellaneous fragments of sculpted stone, the one in the right of the photograph shows a seated figure with the legs crossed at the ankles, wearing a crown, but also matted locks falling to the side of the head, a band-like necklace, heavy earrings and strap-like sacred thread. I cannot interpret the lower garments and the figure’s right hand is broken off, but the left hand holds up an axe.
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Nāgabodhi’s Śrī-guhyasamājamaṅḍalopāyikā-viṃśati-vidhi
— The Sanskrit Text Restored from the Vajrācāryanayottama —

Kimiaki TANAKA

1 Introduction

The Śrī-guhyasamājamaṅḍalopāyikā-viṃśati-vidhi (hereafter: Viṃśatīvidhi) attributed to Nāgabodhi/Nāgabuddhi, who belonged to the Ārya school of interpretation of the Guhyasamājatantra, is a ritual manual for the 32-deity manḍala of the Guhyasamājatantra centered on Aksobhyavajra. It is one of the basic texts for manḍala rites in late Tantric Buddhism and considerable importance has been attached to it in Tibetan Buddhism, especially in the dGe-lugs-pa school. In the Tibetan Tripitaka, there is another ritual manual for the 32-deity manḍala centered on Aksobhyavajra attributed to Nāgārjuna, the founder of the Ārya school. But Tson-kha-pa deemed it to be a spurious work composed at a later date. Therefore, ritual manuals of the Guhyasamāja-manḍala composed by the dGe-lugs-pas are mainly based on the Viṃśatīvidhi.

Rāhula Sānkṛtyāyana writes that he discovered a Sanskrit manuscript of the Viṃśatīvidhi in Tibet, but it went missing during the Cultural Revolution. Some time ago I discovered that the Vajrācāryanayottama, a Sanskrit manuscript in a private collection photographed by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, includes a work combining the text of the Viṃśatīvidhi with explanatory comments. In the following, I propose to introduce the Viṃśatīvidhi, hitherto unknown even to experts in Tantric Buddhism, mainly on the basis of the Sanskrit text recovered from the Vajrācāryanayottama.

---

1 Nāgabodhi has the same name as one of the eight patriarchs of the Japanese Shin-gon sect, but it is not clear whether they are one and the same person.

According to the Shin-gon sect, he inherited Esoteric Buddhism from Nāgārjuna and transmitted it to Jingangzhi (Skt. Vajrabodhi, 671–741). Nāgabodhi is said to have lived for hundreds of years although he looked as if he was only 40 years old when he met Vajrabodhi in south India.

In some manuscripts his name is given as Nāgabuddhi. In Tibet, Tson-kha-pa is said to have wanted to visit India in order to study the difficult points of the Ārya school under Klu-byaṅ (i.e., Nāgabodhi), but was dissuaded from doing so by one of his teachers, lHo-brag Grub-chen, and it is evident that the legend of Nāgabodhi’s longevity had been widely disseminated.


2 The \textit{Vim\'satividhi} and the Vajr\'ac\'aryanayottama

I have already described the \textit{Vajr\'ac\'aryanayottama} in earlier articles, but because this is my first article on this text in English, I shall briefly summarize its content once again. The \textit{Vajr\'ac\'aryanayottama} is a palm-leaf manuscript consisting of 46 folios, and on the basis of the handwriting the folios can be divided into three groups: A (4 folios), B (19 folios), and C (23 folios). The text of the \textit{Vim\'satividhi} belongs to Group B, and the \textit{Vajr\'ac\'aryanayottama} also contains several valuable fragments of other texts of the \textit{\textasciitilde A\textit{rya}} school.\footnote{On texts in Group C related to the \textit{nis\'pannakrama}, see my following article (in Japanese): “Self-Styled M\'adhyamika Tantrists: The Thought and Practices of the \textit{\textasciitilde A\textit{rya}} School of the Guhyasam\'aja Cycle,” in \textit{S\'unyata and Reality: Volume in Memory of Prof. Eji\textasciitilde ma Yasunori} (Tokyo: Shunj\'usha, 2000) (CD-ROM). Another text of the Guhyasam\'aja cycle included in Group C also includes several verses identical or similar to verses in the \textit{Vim\'satividhi}.} At first, I thought that the manuscripts of a commentary on the \textit{Vim\'satividhi} (Group B) and of the \textit{Vajr\'ac\'aryanayottama} (Group A and C) had been mixed up in a single work since the start of the \textit{Vajr\'ac\'aryanayottama} belongs to Group A while the end belongs to Group C. But it was subsequently brought to my notice that another manuscript of the \textit{Vajr\'ac\'aryanayottama} is included in Sector B of photograph Xc14/30 among the manuscripts photographed by R\'ahula S\'an\'krt\'y\=aya\=na and later acquired by the Nieders\'achsische St\'ats- und Universit"atsbibliothek, G\"ottingen, and that it was possible to compare the Kathmandu manuscript with the G\"ottingen photograph.

Furthermore, Toru Tomabechi has discovered correspondences between the two manuscripts not only in Groups A and C but also in Group B of the Kathmandu manuscript. But the \textit{Vim\'satividhi} is not included in the G\"ottingen photograph. Moreover, several folios of the Kathmandu manuscript do not correspond to the G\"ottingen photograph.\footnote{Toru Tomabechi, “On the So-called Vajr\'ac\'aryanayottama, Sanskrit Manuscript of a Related Text,” \textit{Mikky\=o Zuz\=o} 23 (2004).} Consequently, the situation has become more problematic than before.

3 Twenty Rites

Next, I would like to describe the content of the \textit{Vim\'satividhi}. As is suggested by its title, the \textit{Vim\'satividhi} is composed of instructions for twenty rites (\textit{vidhi}). Furthermore, N\'agabodhi explains the twenty rites in verses 3–8 of Chapter 1 (“Bh\=umi\=s\=odhanavidhi”) as follows. (Unfortunately this part is missing in the \textit{Vajr\'ac\'aryanayottama}.)
Nāgabodhi’s Śrī-guhyasamājamañḍalopāyikā-viṃśati-vidhi

First, purifying the site,
Then seizing the site;
Afterwards elimination of the obstructing demons
And pitching the lines with chalk.

Then the preparation of the Earth goddess
And beseeching the deities;
Afterwards the preparation of the disciple
And pitching the lines in space.

The rite of the five-colored powders,
Applying colored powders,
Invitation of the deities,
Then drawing the disciple into the maṇḍala.

The rite of the bathing maṇḍala,
Then initiation of the Buddha,
Then the emblem initiation
And two offerings to the guru and the deities.

Conferral of permission,
Then sending the deities away,
Releasing the daggers from the maṇḍala,
And withdrawing the thread.

With the aforementioned twenty rites
A learned vajrācārya,
Well-versed in the reality (of the ritual),
Should draw a powder maṇḍala.

Alex Wayman has explained that the twenty rites are actually twenty-one, and he has also classified these rites into seven categories, namely, (1) Rites of the site, (2) Rites of preparatory acts, (3) The main rite, beginning with construction of maṇḍala, (4) Initiations of the flask, (5) Offerings, (6) Permission and Unification, and (7) Concluding Acts (cf. accompanying table).6

6 Alex Wayman, Yoga of the Guhyasamājatantra (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1977), pp. 161–162. In the accompanying table, I have adopted Wayman’s numbering of
Genesis and Development of Tantrism

But there are differences in their names and order as given in the manuscript of the Vajrācāryanayottama, as listed by Wayman, and as found in the Vimśatīvidhi included in the bsTan-‘gyur edited by the National Center for Tibetan Studies in China.\(^7\)

Moreover, the aforementioned apocryphal ritual manual attributed to Nāgarjuna lists twenty rites in a different manner as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
d\mathrm{e~la~d} & \mathrm{k}y\mathrm{i}l\; \mathrm{\textquoteleft} & \mathrm{h}o\mathrm{r} \mathrm{\textquoteright} \mathrm{c}h\mathrm{o~g} \mathrm{a~n} \mathrm{\textquoteleft} \\
y\mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \mathrm{\textquoteleft} & \mathrm{\textquoteleft} & \mathrm{s} \mathrm{t} \mathrm{e} \\
s\mathrm{a} & \mathrm{g} \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{\textquoteright} & \mathrm{b} \mathrm{y} \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{n} \mathrm{b} \mathrm{r} \mathrm{l} \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{b} \mathrm{s} \mathrm{a} \mathrm{n} \\
y\mathrm{o} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{s} & \mathrm{g} \mathrm{u} & \mathrm{u} & \mathrm{h} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{b} \mathrm{s} \mathrm{r} \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{b} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{d} \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \\
s\mathrm{a} & \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{y} & \mathrm{h} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{k}y\mathrm{i}l\; \mathrm{\textquoteleft} & \mathrm{h}o\mathrm{r} \mathrm{\textquoteleft} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \\
b\mathrm{u} & \mathrm{m} & \mathrm{p} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{l} & \mathrm{r} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{s} & \mathrm{l} \mathrm{o} & \mathrm{b} & \mathrm{m} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \\
st\mathrm{a} & \mathrm{g} \mathrm{o} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{u} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{g} \mathrm{s} \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \\
\mathrm{t} \mathrm{h} & \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{g} & \mathrm{g} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{b} & \mathrm{p} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{y} & \mathrm{c} & \mathrm{h} & \mathrm{o} & \mathrm{g} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \\
d\mathrm{e~b} & \mathrm{z} \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{r} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{u} & \mathrm{l} & \mathrm{t} \mathrm{h} \mathrm{o} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{d} \mathrm{g} & \mathrm{y} & \mathrm{e} & \mathrm{b} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \\
d\mathrm{k}y\mathrm{i}l\; \mathrm{\textquoteleft} & \mathrm{h}o\mathrm{r} \mathrm{\textquoteright} & \mathrm{b} \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{g} \mathrm{y} \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{b} \mathrm{r} \mathrm{l} \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{b} \mathrm{p} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \\
d\mathrm{e~l} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{m} \mathrm{c} & \mathrm{h} & \mathrm{o} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{p} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{b} \mathrm{r} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{g} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \\
s& \mathrm{l} \mathrm{o} & \mathrm{p} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{o} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{b} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{g} & \mathrm{n} \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \\
d\mathrm{e~b} & \mathrm{z} \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{s} & \mathrm{l} \mathrm{o} & \mathrm{b} & \mathrm{m} \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{g} \mathrm{z} & \mathrm{g} & \mathrm{u} & \mathrm{b} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \\
b\mathrm{u} & \mathrm{m} & \mathrm{p} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{b} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{g} & \mathrm{s} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{b} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \\
\mathrm{s} & \mathrm{e} & \mathrm{s} & \mathrm{r} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{b} & \mathrm{y} & \mathrm{e} & \mathrm{s} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{b} \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \\
d\mathrm{e~b} & \mathrm{z} \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{u} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{b} & \mathrm{z} \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{p} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \\
d\mathrm{a} & \mathrm{b} & \mathrm{g} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{s} & \mathrm{s} & \mathrm{b} & \mathrm{y} & \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{s} \mathrm{t} \mathrm{e} \\
d\mathrm{k}y\mathrm{i}l\; \mathrm{\textquoteleft} & \mathrm{h}o\mathrm{r} \mathrm{\textquoteright} & \mathrm{g} \mathrm{y} & \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{y} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{l} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{m} \mathrm{c} & \mathrm{h} & \mathrm{o} & \mathrm{g} \\
\mathrm{\textquoteleft} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{i} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{g} & \mathrm{h} & \mathrm{o} \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{l} & \mathrm{n} & \mathrm{d} & \mathrm{a} & \mathrm{n} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In this case, the rites of the maṇḍala Are divided into twenty parts: Purification of the site, empowerment, Seizing and protecting [the site], Preparation of the Earth goddess, The maṇḍala, the vases (used in ritual) And the disciples, [Then] the rite of pitching the thread And applying colored powders, The empowerment of the maṇḍala And making a special offering to it, The entry of the acārya [into the maṇḍala] And the entry of the disciples, The initiation of the vase and of the secret, The initiation of the knowledge of wisdom, And the fourth [initiation], The consecration and the fire offering. These parts of the maṇḍala [ritual] Are said to be the twenty rites.

A noticeable difference between the Vimśatīvidhi and Nāgarjuna’s manual is the incorporation of three initiations peculiar to late Tantric Buddhism in the latter. This fact supports Tson-kha-pa’s suspicions about the authenticity

---

of Nāgārjuna's manual.

On the other hand, Padmaśrīmitra’s Maṇḍalopāyikā (University of Tokyo, Matsunami No. 280), which belongs to the same Ārya school of interpretation of the Guhyasamājatantra, lists the rites of the maṇḍala as follows:

\[
\text{ādaś arghavidhiḥ proktā dvitīye bhūparigrāhaḥ/ tritīyaṃ tiptaśūtraṃ (sic) jñānasūtraṃ caturthakānte/ pañcamaḥ rajāśaṁ pātaḥ śa(2a8)ṣṭāṃ kalasādhivasānam (sic)/ saptamaḥ kalasanyāśo (sic) maṇḍalasādhanam aṣṭamaṃ/ pratiṣṭhā navamiś ca daśami homakriyā matā/ ekādaśi visṛṣṭīḥ syād ity uktam tatva(sic)saṅgrahe/}
\]

But strangely Padmaśrīmitra's ritual manual does not follow the above list, and to the best of my knowledge this passage is not included in the Sarvatathāgataḥattvāsasamgraha.

At any rate, there might have been a custom in medieval India to present the list of rites to be explained in a ritual manual, but the number and order of these rites were not fixed.

4 The Text Recovered from the Vajrācāryanayottama

I have already published all chapters of the Viṃśatīvidhi recovered from the Vajrācāryanayottama except for verses 1–17 of the first chapter, “Bhūmiśodhanavidhi,” which are missing in the manuscript.\(^8\)

As had already already been anticipated from the Tibetan translation and other Sanskrit ritual manuals which quote the Viṃśatīvidhi, the text consists of verses. Most of them are ślokas and some of them are triṣṭubhs, and there is only one sragdharā. Their metre is comparatively correct, and the several irregular verses are not beyond the range of what was metrically permitted as vipulā.

The total number of verses is 313, and in many cases one verse of the Tibetan translation corresponds to one verse of the original recovered from the Vajrācāryanayottama. However, I have noticed the existence of several exceptions. Further, mantras are inserted between these verses. Moreover, in the Vajrācāryanayottama explanatory comments have been inserted without any indication that they are additional comments. These explanations are long prose sections or śloka verses. Therefore, without referring to the Tibetan translation, it is very difficult to recover the original text from our manuscript.

5 Parallel Passages from Other texts

In the process of romanizing the text, I noticed the existence of quite a number of identical or similar verses in other texts, and this was extremely helpful in the

\(^8\) Cf. “Romanized texts” in the accompanying table.
restoration of the original Sanskrit from the single extant manuscript.

The *Kriyāsamuccaya* in particular, as Munenobu Sakurai surmised from the Tibetan translation,\(^9\) frequently refers to the *Vimśatiyidhi* without mentioning its sources, especially in the section on initiation rites (including preparation of the disciple). The *Vajrāvalī* quotes the *Vimśatiyidhi* seven times\(^10\) as Nāgabuddhipāda. In addition to these, there are many identical or similar verses to the *Vimśatiyidhi* in the *Vajrāvalī*. The reason that Abhayākaragupta did not mention his source might be that many ritual manuals share these verses and he could not specify a single source.

I could not refer to the entire text of the *Kriyāsamgrahapañjikā* since it is too voluminous, and I referred mainly to Chapter 6 since it explains the construction of the maṇḍala, including rituals employing it. But identical or similar verses are not as frequent as in the *Kriyāsamuccaya*. The reason for this may be that the *Kriyāsamuccaya* mainly explains the rituals on the basis of not the *Guhyasamāja* but the Vajradhātumaṇḍala.

On the other hand, there are not many quotations from the *Guhyasamājatantra* except for mantras and stotras incorporated into the ritual procedure.

In addition to these, I confirmed the occurrence of identical or similar verses in the *Vairocanābhisambodhisūtra*, *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, *Paramādya*, *Sarvabuddhasaṃayoga*, *Sāṃpuṭodbhava*, etc.

### 6 The Date of Its Composition

At present, it is difficult to determine the date of composition of the *Vimśatiyidhi*. However, I found several pieces of circumstantial evidence which point to the date of its composition. For example, the *Vimśatiyidhi* quotes the *Sarvabuddhasaṃayoga* (verses X-16, 17) as the *Samvara*. The same tendency is found also in the *Tattvasiddhi*,\(^11\) *Jñānasiddhi*,\(^12\) *Nāmamantrārthāvalokini*,\(^13\)

---


\(^13\) As far as I know, the *Nāmamantrārthāvalokini* quotes the Śrīsaṃvara three times: “kvacic ca paratirtheṇāṃ sahadharmena nigrahah, “atyantadustaraudresu saumyatā nopayujyate prajñopāyamayaṃ manyum cakruh sarvatathāgataḥ” and “subhago bhagavān vajrī sarvasattvaṁ thakāraṇāt durbhagāḥ śrāvakāḥ sarve atyantaparinirvṛtāḥ.” These passages correspond to the *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*, verses IV-19, V-48 and VII-22 respectively.

— 430 —
Pradīpodyotana\textsuperscript{14} and Caryāmelāpakapradīpa.\textsuperscript{15}

Next, the Viṃśatīvidhi classifies tantras as follows:

\begin{align*}
\text{bya rgyud cho ga ma gtos par/} & \quad \text{Apart from ritual manuals of the} \\
\text{spyod dan gñi ga'i rnal 'byor gyis/} & \quad \text{Kriyātantra,} \\
\text{grub pa'i dkyil 'khor sans rgyas ni/} & \quad \text{Maṇḍalas completed by the} \\
\text{kun lugs las 'oṅs yan dag bsṅags/I-2/} & \quad \text{Caryā(tantra)} \\
\end{align*}

And Two Yoga(tantras) are praised as

Having come from the traditions of all the Buddhas.

On the other hand, in the *Samājāsādhanavyavasthāna, attributed to the same author, the following interesting passage occurs:

\begin{align*}
gsol pa/ & \quad \text{āha} \\
de kho na ŋid bs dus pa la sog s pa dañ/ & \quad \text{tatvasamgrahādy} \\
gñi ga'i rgyud las ni & \quad \text{ubhayatantra-} \\
žal gcig par rab tu grags na/ & \quad \text{prasiddha ekamukham} \\
c'i phyir 'dir & \quad \text{kim artham atra} \\
žal gsum pa lta bur snañ bar 'gyur/ & \quad \text{trimukhākāraḥ} \text{ṣamādyata iti}
\end{align*}

Both passages indicate that Nāgabodhi adopted ubhayatantra as a category for the classification of tantras. The rNying-ma-pa order of Tibetan Buddhism also regards ubhayatantra/upatantra as one of the three categories of outer tantras. According to rNying-ma-pas, upatantra/upayāna corresponds to the Caryātantras of the fourfold classification of the new Tantric schools of Tibetan Buddhism. Tsoṅ-kha-pa also explains in his commentary on the *Samājāsādhanavyavasthāna that gñi ga'i rgyud (=ubhayatantra) appears in the above as the equivalent of the Caryātantras of the fourfold classification of Tibetan Buddhism.

But in the Viṃśatīvidhi, Nāgabodhi explains that the caryā and ubhayayoga are different (=spyod dan gñi ga'i rnal 'byor gyis). Therefore, the Tibetan translation of the Samājāsādhanavyavasthāna — “de kho na ŋid bs dus pa la sog s"
pa dañi gñi ga’i rgyud las ni = tatvasaṁgrahādy ubhayaṭantra” — seems to me a mistranslation. It should be interpreted as ubhayaṭantra beginning with the Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṁgraha.

I think that Nāgabodhi’s intention was that ubhayaṭantra/ubhaya-yoga refers to the Yogatantras beginning with the Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṁgraha and the Mahāyogatantras beginning with the Guhyasamāja.

Anyway, Nāgabodhi’s classification of Buddhist tantras is unique, and it also suggests that the Viṃśatāvidhi was composed before the establishment of the traditional fourfold (kriyā, caryā, yoga, mahāyoga) or fivefold (kriyā, caryā, yoga, mahāyoga, yoganiruttara) classification.

From the above circumstantial evidence, the Viṃśatāvidhi can be provisionally dated to the period from the middle of the 8th century to the early 9th century. This coincides with the date of Vīlasavajra, the author of the Nāmanṭarāṭhāvalokinī, Śaṅtarakṣita, the author of the Tattvasiddhi, and the period when Tantric Buddhism was introduced into Tibet for the first time.

However, it is about one hundred years later than the estimated dates of Nāgabodhi, one of the eight patriarchs of the Japanese Shingon sect.

7 Conclusion

In the above I have focused on the Śrī-guhyasamājamaṇḍalopāyikā-viṃśatāvidhi, a ritual manual for the 32-deity maṇḍala of the Guhyasamājatantra centred on Aksobhyavajra, and on the basis of the above observations it would appear that it represents a very early stage of late Tantric Buddhism.

At the same time, the Viṃśatāvidhi, presenting the standard form of the maṇḍala ritual, influenced ritual manuals composed after the 10th century. This fact is confirmed by the seven quotations by Abhayākaragupta in his Vajrāvali.

On the other hand, the ritual procedures set forth in the Viṃśatāvidhi preserve elements of foregoing Esoteric Buddhism, particularly that of the Guhyatantra, Vairocānābhisambodhisūtra, Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṁgraha and Paramādya.

Therefore, we can deem it to be a text of the stage of transition from the middle phase to the late phase of Tantric Buddhism.

At present I am preparing to combine all my previous articles published separately on different occasions and to attach a general introduction to this text.

The Eastern Institute, Tokyo
Nāgabodhi’s Šrī-guhyasamājamanḍalopāyikā-vimśati-vidhi

Synopsis of the Šrī-guhyasamājamanḍalopāyikā-vimśati-vidhi (Peking No.2675)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Romanized texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(1).sa sbyon ba</td>
<td>1.blūmiśodhanavidhiḥ</td>
<td>Chāseı Indo no gakasaiteki kenkyū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(2).sa yons su gzuñ ba</td>
<td>2.blūmipariṇāḥavidhiḥ</td>
<td>The Mikkyo Bunka 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(3).bgegs ņe bar ži ba</td>
<td>3.vighnopāsamanavidhiḥ</td>
<td>The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture No.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(4).thog le kor gyis thig gdab pa</td>
<td>4.khatikāśūtrapātanavidhiḥ</td>
<td>The Mikkyo Zuzzo 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(5).sa’i lha mo dañ bum pa lhag par gnas pa</td>
<td>5.prthividevatā-kalaśādhiṇāsanaṇavidhiḥ</td>
<td>Three Mountains and Seven Rivers (English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(6).gsol gdab pa</td>
<td>viṇānaṇavidhiḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(7).slob ma lhag par gnas pa</td>
<td>7.śiṣyādhiṇāsanaṇavidhiḥ</td>
<td>The Mikkyo Bunka 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8(8).nam mkha’ la thig gdab pa</td>
<td>8.ākāśāṣūtrapātanavidhiḥ</td>
<td>JIBS 50-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9(9).tshon sna lna</td>
<td>9.ruṇgajāpaṇavidhiḥ</td>
<td>JIBS 49-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9(10).tshon rtsi ’gyed pa</td>
<td>10.ruṇgaptātanavidhiḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10(11).spyan drañ ba</td>
<td>āvāḥavidhiḥ</td>
<td>The Mikkyo Bunka 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11(12).slob ma gzug pa</td>
<td>12.śiṣyapraśeṣavidhiḥ</td>
<td>The Mikkyo Bunka 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chu’i dbañ bskur ba</td>
<td>14.udakābhiṣekah āḍarṣajñānām</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.cod pan gyi dbañ bskur</td>
<td>mukutābhiṣekah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samatājñānam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.dro rje dbañ bskur</td>
<td>pratyavekṣajñānam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rdo rje dril bu’i dbañ bskur</td>
<td>vajraghantābhiṣeka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kṛtvā(si)nusthānajñānam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.me loñ gi dbañ bskur</td>
<td>darppanābhiṣekah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.miñ gi dbañ bskur</td>
<td>14.nāmabhiṣekah// suviśuddha-</td>
<td>The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture No.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhammadhātujñānam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16(14).phyag mtshan gyi dbañ bskur</td>
<td>15.praharanābhiṣekah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vācāryābhiṣekavidhiḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17(15).lha la yon ’bul ba</td>
<td>16.devadakṣiṇāvidhiḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18(16).bla ma la yon ’bul ba</td>
<td>17.gurudakṣiṇāvidhiḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offerings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(17).slob ma la rjes su gnañ ba sbyin pa</td>
<td>18.śiṣyābhisekānunāvidhiḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20(18).ñe bar bsdu ba</td>
<td>19.upasamhāravidhiḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20(19).phur bu dbyuñ ba</td>
<td>20.śiloddharanavidhiḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20(20).gsol ba ’debs pa</td>
<td>Inserted between 3 and 4</td>
<td>The Mikkyo Bunka 213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The *Laud of the Chosen Deity*,
the First Chapter of the *Hevajratantrapiṇḍārthaṭīkā*
by Vajragarbha*

Francesco SFERRA

**INTRODUCTORY NOTE**

This is a new edition and English translation of the first chapter of Vajragarbha’s *Saṣāhasrikā* (aka *Hevajratantrapiṇḍārthaṭīkā*), one of the first works of the Kālacakra tradition.

This chapter describes the figure of the true interpreter of the Scriptures, establishes the hermeneutical criteria for their interpretation and tries — for the first time — to give a special pivotal role to the Ādibuddha, which is believed to be the *mūla* text of the *Laghuṭalacakratantra*. Therefore this chapter is fundamental for the understanding of the founding strategies of the Kālacakra system and of its early masters, a theme that has been investigated a little bit in a paper published in 2005 to which I refer the reader for more details.¹

The language, the style and the metre will be discussed in the introduction of a volume that is being prepared and that contains a critical edition and an English translation of the entire text (Sanskrit and Tibetan). Suffice here to list the three manuscripts used and to give some information regarding the editorial policies adopted.

---

* I would like to express my profound gratitude to the late Prof. Dr. Syed Hasan Askari and the authorities of the Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute and the Bihar Research Society of Patna for kindly having made available their valuable source materials through the good offices of Dr. Gustav Roth and Prof. Raffaele Torella. A special thank you is also due to the authorities of the National Archives of Kathmandu, of the Kaiser Library of Kathmandu, of the Istituto Italiano per l’Africa e l’Oriente (Rome) and of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project for having generously placed manuscript sources and microfilms of unpublished material at my disposal. I would especially like to thank Prof. Raniero Gnoli and Prof. Dr. Harunaga Isaacson for having kindly read this paper and their precious suggestions; Susan Ann White for her help with the English text. This paper reproduces with many substantial modifications the first chapter of my Doctorate thesis that was defended on 8th July 1999 (University of Rome “La Sapienza”). I would like to thank Prof. David Seyfort Ruegg for kindly agreeing to read and evaluate my work. I am indebted to him and also to Prof. Fabrizia Baldissera, from whose stimulating comments and criticism I benefited.

¹ Sferra 2005.
K\textsuperscript{K} Kaiser Library (Kathmandu) MS 128 = NGMPP, Mf C14/6. This manuscript, in Māgadhī script, consists in 33 leaves and is incomplete (missing folios: 2, 6, 8–18, 32–39, 42–46). It begins with \textit{lokācāravivarjīta} and finishes with the famous stanza \textit{ye dharmā hetuprabhavā hetuṁ teṣāṁ tathāgato hy avadat \textbar\space teṣāṁ ca yo nirodha evamūḍī mahāśramaṇaḥ \textbar}. It has probably been written around the end of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century. The copyist, Viśuddhirakṣīta, states in the colophon that he worked in Vikramaśīla (\textit{srīmadvikramaśīlamahāvihāre likhāpitam \[sic for likhitam \] \[\ldots\] viśuddhirakṣītena svārtham parārtham ca \textbar\textbar}). I also used a photographic copy of this manuscript made by Giuseppe Tucci and now held by the IsIAO library in Rome (MS 3.45, Folder 6).

K\textsuperscript{N} NAK (Kathmandu) MS 3-693, vi 230 = NGMPP, Mf A693/11. This manuscript, in Maithili script, consists in 30 leaves (40 leaves according to Moriguchi) and is incomplete (missing folios: 30–43, 45 ff). It begins with \textit{om namaḥ śrīhevajrāya} and finishes abruptly in the middle of Section Eight with the words \textit{atra laghutantre abhis. ekapat.a}. Moriguchi Mitutoshi points out the existence of a third manuscript of the \textit{Ṣaṭsāhasrikā} kept in Kathmandu and listed in the NGMPP as Mf A 1267/6, but it is actually this same manuscript.\textsuperscript{2}

\textit{N} A manuscript originally belonging to the Nor monastery in Tibet and now probably kept in Lhasa,\textsuperscript{3} of which I was only able to study the photographic copy made by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana in 1934 and listed by him as IV.XVII.2.92;\textsuperscript{4} and the one made by Giuseppe Tucci on July 21\textsuperscript{st} 1939 and now held by the IsIAO library (MS 1.20, Envelope 22/S, MT049.1-2). This manuscript, in Māgadhī script, consists in 31 leaves and is incomplete. It begins with \textit{om namaḥ hemavajrāya [sic]} and finishes towards the end of Section Eight with the quote of HT 1.3.14. The colophon, duly transcribed by Sāṅkṛtyāyana, suggests that this MS has probably been copied around the end of the 11\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{5}

Very often K\textsuperscript{K} and \textit{N} share the same readings against K\textsuperscript{N}, which seems to belong to a different family (cf. e.g. notes 180 and 211). The text, critically edited here, has already been published and translated into English by Malati J. Shendge in 2004 (pp. 7–13, 153–160). No reference to this work has been done in

\textsuperscript{2} Moriguchi 1989: 146.
\textsuperscript{3} Cf. Steinkellner 2004.
\textsuperscript{4} Cf. Sāṅkṛtyāyana 1935: 36. I used a copy from the negatives of Sāṅkṛtyāyana now kept in Göttingen (Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek) and Patna (Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, Museum Buildings).
\textsuperscript{5} Cf. Sāṅkṛtyāyana 1935: 36, note 1.
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the notes. Titles in text and translation are not present in the original; they have been inserted to assist the reader. Orthography and sandhi have been silently standardized, *avagrahas* have been supplied when necessary and punctuation (*daṇḍas*, dot-like *daṇḍas* and double *daṇḍas*) has been changed to fit the metre.
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*ac* ante correctionem

conj. conjecture

deeest omitted/absent in

em. emendation

*pc* post correctionem

r recto

v verso


(ep) equally possible

* before Sanskrit words means that these have been retranslated from Tibetan

] separates the accepted reading from the variants

◊ Separates the commentary on different lemmas within the same compound

(…) in the text enclose numbers (not present in the MSS)

[…] in the text enclose the pagination (i.e., numbers of folios) or comments
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[K^K 1v KN 1v Nhap 1v] namaḥ śrīhevajrāya | lokācārāvivarjitaṃ jinamayaṃ nityoditaṃ vyāpinaṃ nirdvandvaṃ2 vimalaṃ nirdriyasyaḥṃ sarvajñam evaṃ param | śāntaṃ cittam3 acittacittam ajaḍaṃ4 sarvendriyaṃ sarvato buddhānāṃ pranipatya kāyaṃ amṛtaṃ svābhāvikaṃ bodhayate || (1)5 pradhvastāṣṭagunodbhavāni6 vadanānyā7 aṣṭau vimokṣa vibhor7 hastāḥ8 soḍaṣa śūnyatāḥ ca9 karuṇā etāḥ kapālāni ca | pañcāsatiṣṭharavartattvaracita10 skandhe śiromālikā aksobhyo makute11 ṛdhacandrapralisam12 mālā kapālātmikā13 || (2) maitreyādyāḥ ca vimokṣakāḥ sacaranaḥ sampīdya mārān sthitāḥ klesaśajñeyasamājayogam uragā mudrājinaṃ14 dvīpinaḥ15 | mārādyāvaranāni yasya lavavat16 sattvārthino17 bhūṣanāṃ taṇ natvāsa ca tantraguhayagadikā tīkā mayā likhyate || (3) śrīmatā vajragarbhaṃ sarvasattvahitaśinā | daśabhūmiśvareṇeyāṃ mārgalābhāya yogināṃ18 || (4) pañcalakṣāṇa mahātantraḥ alpatante samuddhrte | sārdhasaptasaṭe19 'py asmin bahuvajrapadānvite || (5) hevajracoditenaisa20 yā21 śaṭsāhasrikā22 maṭā | seyaṃ tantraprakāśarthaṃ23 mūlantantrānusārinī || (6)

Criticism of Bad Teachers

buddhatvam vajrasattvatvam sekaḥ saṅgṛhya yatnataḥ |
 vayaṃ vajradharāḥ kecid vadiṣyantī narā nrṇām || (10)

avandyā bhikṣavah sarve śilasaṃvaradhāriṇāḥ |
sitavastrā vayaṃ vandyāḥ svayaṃ vajradharā bhuvi || (11)

sevakā vanijāḥ śūdrāḥ krṣikarma ratāḥ ca ye |
saddharmavikrayā mūrkhā abhogaparibhogināḥ || (12)b

guravas te bhavisyantī śisyānāṁ mārakāyikāḥ | [N 2r]
yogācāracchalenāiva goṇayitvā svayamkṛtān || (13)
doṣān doṣaparityāyagakaraṇāya vadanti vai |
ācāryasya guṇā grāhyā doṣa naiva kadācana || (14)c

doṣagrahanam [sic] asiddhir vai śisyānāṁ nātra saṃśayaḥ |
niśkrpaṃ krodham prārūnaṃ stadbhaḥ lubdham asaṃyatam || (15)

svotkarsanāṃ ca no kuryād gurum śisyām ca buddhimān || (16)

naṃ vākyam na śisyānāṁ devasyantī sarvathā |

lubdho 'py aparibhogaṛthī atimadyair asaṃyataḥ |
svotkarsanāṃ iha prokto gu[N 2v] nināṁ doṣādyakah || (18)f

The True Master

abhisekāgralabdho hi vajrācāryas tathāgataiḥ |
daśadiglokadhātusthais trikālam etya vandyate || (19)f

sandhyābhaṣam ajānante nāmamātreṇa mohitaḥ |
pratikṣeṣapāṃ jinendranāṁ kṛtvā yāsyantī rauravam || (20)

bodhimūle 'bhisikto yo vajrasattvena mastake |
abhisekāgraladbhaḥ sa vajrācāryas tathāgataḥ || (21)
daśadigbodhisattvānāṁ kāyā ye lokadhātavah |
tatra sthāiḥ pañcabhiḥ skandhais trikālam etya vandyate || (22)
nānāratnamayeśa teśaḥ maulayo lokadhātavaḥ |
tatra sthair vandyate buddhair vajrācāryah sa yoginām || (23)

śakrd vairocano mūtram śukraṃ vai samayo yathā |
akṣobhyaś cāmīṭhāśa cācāryo vajrādṛk tathā || (24)
vinmūtraśukramudrānām acāryo dāyako yathā |
kāyavākkittasiddhitānām dāyako vajrādṛk tathā || (25)
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samvṛtyā ca vivṛtyā ca śisyāṇāṃ yoginām api
maṇḍale bodhimūle ca70 sekaḥ pūrvo 'paro tathā71 || (26)
sandhyābhaśaṃ72 yathāsandhyaṃ rutam näyad yathārutam73 |
nītārtham tat tathā neyam74 tantram [K^K 3r] śatkoṭilakṣṇaṃ || (27)⁸

ācāryasya guṇā ye 'tra75 vyavahārena76 darśitāḥ |
vajrasattvavagijānāḥ api77 śaḍabhijñādilakṣaṇāḥ || (28)

dhīro vinīto7⁸ matimān kṣamāvān ārjavo śaṭhaḥ7⁹ |
manatrantrapeṣacigānāḥ krpa[N 2v]lūḥ80 śāstrakovidaḥ8¹ || (29)
daśatattva[K^K 3r]parijñātā8² maṇḍalālekhyakarmavit8³ |
mantravyākhyākrāṇ8⁴ ācāryaḥ prasannātmā8⁵ jitendriyaḥ || (30)⁶

The Supremacy of the Monks

 ebhir uktagaṅgir8⁶ yuktō bhikṣur vajradharo bhavet |
 na cellako⁷ grhī tan na⁸ daśa bhikṣusamās⁹ tayoh || (31)
daśāśikṣāpadair9⁰ yuktāḥ⁹¹ pañcaśikṣāpadair yutaḥ |
koṭiśikṣāpadair⁹² yukto na te tulyās trayāḥ⁹³ smṛtāḥ || (32)⁹

mulatantrei9⁴ yathā proktam⁹⁵ bhikṣor⁹⁶ vājradharam⁹⁷ padam⁹⁸ |
gurvārādhakāśiyāṇāṃ⁹⁹ tataḥ10⁰ kiṅcin10¹ nigadyate || (33)

Quotation from the Paṅcalakṣahevaṣa

 nairātmādhyeṣito¹⁰² vajrī yathāvad anupūrvasāḥ¹⁰³ |
sīkṣāpadapradāṇāya¹⁰⁴ idam¹⁰⁵ vacanam abravīt¹⁰⁶ || (34)

pañcaśikṣāpadāny¹⁰⁷ ādau¹⁰⁸ pośadhādisamanvitam¹⁰⁹ |
daśākuśalaparāyaṃ¹¹⁰ dattvā¹¹¹ kuryād upāsakam¹¹² || (35)¹¹³

śrāvaṇeram¹¹⁴ tataḥ¹¹⁵ kuryād dattvā¹¹⁶ sīkṣāpadam¹¹⁷ dasa |
koṭiśikṣāpadam¹¹⁸ dattvā bhikṣuṃ¹¹⁹ kuryāt tato vratī || (36)

prātimokṣam tato¹²⁰ jñātvā vaibhāṣikamatam tataḥ |
sutrāntam ca tato jñātvā vijñānavādam [K^K 3v] svadharmataḥ¹²¹ || (37)¹²²
tato¹²³ madhyamaṃ jñātvā praṇāpāramitāmatam |
sarvantrāntaram jñātvā¹²⁴ hevajram jñāyate tataḥ || (38)

yānatritayaniryāta ekāyānaphale¹²⁵ sthitāḥ |
śrāvakaṃ pratyekam cātra mahāyānaṃ tṛtiyakam¹²⁶ || (39)
caturthaṃ nāsti [K^K 3v] bauddhānaṃ¹²⁷ pañcamam ca¹²⁸ matam muneḥ¹²⁹ |
sarvākāravaroṣṭa¹³⁰ śunyatā¹³¹ hetur āditaḥ || (40)
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praṇidhānāt kṛpā paścāj jagadarthakāri phalam
svārthaṁ kṛtvā parārthaṁ hi kārayed yah
svayaṁ duḥkhiḥ daridro yah so 'nyeṣāṁ
dukkha añyanā yathā sahāphalā sattvāṁ

yāvan na kriyate sākṣād dhetur hetupalārthinā
tāvad ādau phalam
mahāyānāt paraṁ yānaṁ dvitiyam iha

dānaśīlādinaṣṭānāṁ viśrāmāya na tatvataḥ
śūnyātā sarvadharmānāṁ pruktā
niḥsaraṇāṁ mayā

bhaviṣyati nirālambāṁ karuṇātmaphalaṁ mahat
sattvadharmanirālambā karunā trividhā smṛtā

pradeśe 'rthakāri kvičit pradeśe 'rthakāri
siddhānāṁ bodhisattvaṁ daśabhūmā

dvādaśāṅganiuddhānāṁ sa[KK 4r]rvabhūmā
sugatānāṁ nirālambā jagadarthakāri

yādṛśo yādṛśo hetus tādṛśam tādṛśam phalaṁ
kodravebhyo na jāyante

yathā bijaṁ tathā vṛkṣo yathā vṛkṣas tathā phalaṁ
ādau madhye 'vasāne ca kalyāṇām vacanaṁ mama

ādau savikalpā dhetoh savikalpā phalaṁ bhavet
ante ca sarvabuddhānāṁ kalpataḥ

athādau kṣetrasuddhyartham kodravānām hi vāpanam
paścād v[iK 4r]śodhite kṣetre śālibījasya vāpanam

na śuddhaṁ kṣetram ity uktaṁ mānusaṁ karmabhūmijam

aśuddhaṁ šadgatau janma subhāśubhaphaloditam

manuṣyaajanmani kṣetre suddhe 'nālambini kṛpā
dijaṁ hi vāpitaṁ tasmāc śūnyakalpadrumā bhaveta

śūnyatākalpavrksat tv anavalambakṛpāphalam
cintitam sarvasattvānāṁ bhavatiḥa na samśayaḥ

mudrāmaṇḍalamanaṃ tāydm desitaṁ yan mayā priye
gambhirodārādharmesu bhavyatāvigatātanām

mudrāmaṇḍalamanaḥtāyārə deśayisyunti anāgataḥ
buddhatvaṁ vajrasattvatvam ācāryā mārakāyikāḥ
ato bhikṣur¹⁸⁵ mahāyāne desāko vajradhṛk śrītaḥ |
yāna[K⁸¹ ⁵v]trayaparījñātā¹⁸⁶ dharmasaṅgrahavedakah || (58)

Criticism of Bad Teachings. The Need for Good Commentaries
vedasiddhāntayogānāṁ kṛtānāṁ¹⁸⁷ īśvarādibhiḥ¹⁸⁸ |
bauddhānī¹⁸⁹ tantranamrānāṁ viśeṣāḥ¹⁹⁰ śūnyatāṁ¹⁹¹ prati || (59)⁹
yo na jānāti mūdhātmā sa¹⁹² śiṣyān¹⁹³ pātayet khlān¹⁹⁴ |
karma [K⁵v] kartrā¹⁹⁵ vinā nāsti¹⁹⁶ na karmarahitam phalam || (60)

mahāmāya¹⁹⁷ mahāraudrā bhūtasamhārakārīnī¹⁹⁸ |
svayam kartā svayam hartā¹⁹⁹ rājā²⁰⁰ svayam prabhuh²⁰¹ || (61)⁹

īśvarasya²⁰² yathā²⁰³ māyā īśvaro²⁰⁴ ’pi nigadyate |
tīrthikāṁ śivasiddhānte²⁰⁵ gītādharme²⁰⁶ janārdanah |
durdāntadamakāṁ²⁰⁷ so ’pi śadhūnāṁ pālakah²⁰⁸ sa ca || (62)
yadā yadātra dharmasya glānir²⁰⁹ bhavati bhārata²¹⁰ |
adharmsya pravrūtīś ca tadātmānaṁ srjāmy²¹¹ aham || (63)
sādhūnāṁ²¹² rakṣaṇārthāya²¹³ vināśaya ca²¹⁴ duṣkṛtām²¹⁵ |
dharmasamānārthānāhyaya²¹⁶ sambha[N³v]āmi yuge yuge²¹⁷ || (64)⁸
evaṁ sarvāṁ²¹⁸ pariṇāya viparītāṁ dharmadesānāṁ²¹⁹ |
hevajraś codayet²²⁰ tena māṁ tīkākaraṇāya vai || (65)

‘natvā kāyavaraṁ trilokamahitam²²¹ svābhāvikaṁ nirmalaṁ
dharmākyam sukhaduḥkhabhāvarahitam śambhogikaṁ desakam |
nirmāṇaṁ ca vicitrakharḍhhasahitaṁ²²² māyendrajālopaṁaṁ²²³
vaksye ’haṁ laghutantraguptavacanam²²⁴ nītārtham²²⁵ asyālpataḥ || (66)
hevajre jinadesānātra²²⁶ [K⁵r] laghuke sāvisphuṣteyaṁ²²⁷ nṛmāṁ
lakṣaiḥ pañcabhīr ādiṣṭhantrinacaye buddhaḥ kṛtā yaḥ puṟā²²⁸ |
ślokair ekaṁstaiḥ²²⁹ sahasraṁuṣṭadānam²³⁰ laksābhīdhāṁe ’pi vā²³¹
anyasmīṇa api tantrarājamāṇacaye tīkābhir arthāgamah || (67)
yas tīkā[KN⁵r]rahitō²³² ’patantrinacaye²³³ guptaṁ²³⁴ padaṁ deśayet²³⁵
so ’mbuny akṣivivarjitaṁ ciragatasyāheḥ padaṁ vikṣayet |
nītārtham na ca neyam artham akhilam²³⁶ tantraṁ²³⁷ jinair deśitam
neyārtham²³⁸ yadi tīkāyā prakāśitam²³⁹ nītaṁ vṛthā bodhaye || (68)
sandhyābhāṣam asandhyābhāṣam aparāṁ naitadrutam tadrutaṁ²⁴⁰
nītārtham²⁴¹ na ca neyam²⁴² artham²⁴³ akhilam tantraṁ²⁴⁴ jinair deśitam |
skandhā yena viḍādayo²⁴⁵ ’tra samalāḥ skandhā na²⁴⁶ te devatāḥ²⁴⁷
sambuddhā na ca devatāmukhabhujaiḥ saṅkalpitā²⁴⁸ bodhaye²⁴⁹ || (69)
The Laud of the Chosen Deity

yat 250  śaṭkoṭibhir āvṛtaṃ bhagavatā tantram samājādikaṃ
gitaṃ 251  paṇḍitaśastramānadanam tat tarkagamyam kutaḥ |
ādarśapratisenikāsaman idam traikālyasāṃvedakam 252
bhāvābhāvavitarkajālārahitaṃ jñānaṃ yad evādvayam || (70)
dvātrimśad 253  dhī 254  mahāsukhe bhagavatā śukrapravāhāḥ smṛtā 255
nādyah 256  kaṇṭhagatās tathaiva 257  ṣṛdaye nābha ca guhye ca yāh 258 |
kiṃvāhāḥ 259  karapādasandhiṃ 260  tathā 261  ha[KK 5v]stāṅgulisandhiṣu 262
hevajre ’pi na tā jinena kathitā 263  me vajragarbhasya 264 ca || (71)
yac cāraṃ prayadanti bhikṣukajanās tan māgadhām nāparaṃ
vākyam yat pīṭakatraye bhagavatās tat 265  sthāvariye 266 mate |
rogo 267  ’nyo 268  ’pi [KK 5v] tadanyad 269  auśadham 270  idam |
[rogaprahānāya 271 vai
arthādyam 272  sāraṇam 273  caturvidham idam na vyaṇjanādyam muneḥ || (72)
yā devāśuranāgayakṣarutakair 274  anyaiṣ 275  ca sandeśikī 276
dharmāṇāṃ 277  yugapa 278  ca vismayakārī lokopāmarjītā |
seyāṃ samskṛtalakṣāṇā bhagavato ’py evāṃ mayetyādīnā
bhā[N 4r]śaṃseti nigadyate budhajanaīr 279  āścaryam etan 280  na kim || (73)
sarvākāravarendrajālāsadrśo 281  māyopamo vyomagaḥ
kāyo yaḥ sa nigadyate bhagavato 282  bālair viṭair 283  bodhayे |
dvātrimśadbhir 284  aśitibhīṣ 285  ca racitaḥ 286  sallakṣāṇair 287  vyaṇjanaīḥ
skandhaidhātubhir 288  indriyaiś ca viṣayaīḥ 289  sārdham sthito
[maṇḍale 290 || (74)
icchantiha jādaḥ pratītyajasamutpādaṃ hi vettum 291  sadā
nāsotpādatithidhuvādīganitā 292  tantrāntare deśītaḥ 293 |
kaścid bālataro dadhiḥcēti 294  vinā ksīreṇa gobhir vinā
ksīrāṃ gavyam api pragalbharahito 295  doṣo ’tra ko
[jñāninaḥ 296 [KK 6 missing] || (75)
hevajreṇa hi cakrasamvaram idam jñeyam catuhpiṭhakam
hevjaṃ khalu cakrasaṃvarapadair 297  jñeyam 298  catuhpiṭhakam |
hevajrāṃ laghucakrasamvaram idam jñeyam catuhpiṭhakair 299
nitārthaḥ punar ādibuddhavacanair jñeyo 300  mahāsa[KK 6r]ṃvaraiḥ || (76)
evam 301  anyāni tantrāṇi anyaiṣ 302  tantrāntaraīḥ sadā 303
jñeyāṃ uddeśanirdēśaiṣ 304  tiṅkābhir mārgakāṅkṣibhiṣ 305 || (77)
iti śaṭṣāhasrikāyāṃ 306  hevajrāṭikāyāṃ 307  iṣṭadevatāstavas 308 tantrāvatāraḥ
prathamaḥ parichedah ||
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NOTES TO THE TEXT

a Stanzas 1–3 are śārdūlavikṝḍita. Stanza 1 occurs with the following differences also at the beginning of the Ādiyoganāmasamādhi (Dhiḥ 13: 14): páda a) lokānaṁ na [read lokacāra] vivarjitaṁ; páda b) evaśam; páda c) ajatram [read ajaḍam or ajaram?]; páda d) praṇamāmi kāyam; and, as most kindly has been pointed out to me by Iain Sinclair, at the beginning of the Hêvajrasamādhi (Dhiḥ 21: 21) with the following variants: páda b) evaśam; páda c) ajaram; páda d) praṇamāmi kāyam.

b Cf. Mahāsaṃvarodayatantrarāja 8.9: yo grhi naiśthiko bhoktā sevako lāṅgali vanik | saddharavikriyā mūrkhā na cakre gaṇanaṅyakah || (p. 97). This stanza is also quoted in the VP (vol. 2, p. 4) with attribution to the Ādibuddha and slight differences in pádas a and d.

c Verses 14cd–15ab seem to go back to a stanza quoted from the Śrīmaṇḍalāmahātantrarāja by Candrakirti in his GSPU: acāryasya guṇā grāhyā doṣaḥ ca na kaṭācana | guṇagrahaṇaṁ [sic] siddhiḥ syād doṣaḥnaṁ siddhiḥānitaṁ || (p. 216[17–18]). These verses are also quoted, without attribution and in yet another slightly different form, in the VP: acāryasya guṇā grāhyā doṣaḥ naiva kaṭācana | guṇagrahaṇānd bhavet siddhir na siddhir doṣavākyataḥ || (vol. 2, p. 4[4–5]). Verse 14cd appears also with a few differences in the Cit- taviśuddhiprakaraṇa: guṇās tasya paraṁ grāhyā doṣaḥ naiva kaṭācana || (st. 129cd).

d Verses 15cd–16ab correspond to GP 7 (p. 17) with the only variant laghum instead of lubdham. With some slight differences, this stanza occurs in the Mahāsaṃvarodayatantrarāja 8.8 (niṣkṛpaḥ krodhanaḥ krūraḥ stabdho lubdho 'py asamyataḥ | svotkṛšaṇo na kartavyo dātā ca [?] buddhimānaḥ sadā ||; p. 97), and is cited in the LTṬ (niṣkṛpaḥ krodhanaḥ krūraḥ stabdho lubdho 'ṣapya a> samyataḥ | svotkṛšaṇo na kartavyo dātā buddhasukhārthinā ||; p. 107) and in the VP (vol. 2, p. 4).

e Stanzas 17 and 18 are quoted with a few differences in the margin of two MSS of the LTṬ (p. 107, note).

f Stanza 19 corresponds exactly to GP 2. It is quoted in VP, vol. 2, p. 4 (cf. also p. 5), and Kriyāsamuccaya, fol. 2r7–8. Pāda c is similar to Yoginīsaṅcāratantra 8.2c. The same concept can be found in Guhyasamājatantra 17 (cf. also GSPU, pp. 215–216, and JS 17, p. 151).

g Cf. GSPU (pp. 3, 10) and VP (vol. 1, p. 35).

h With slight variants, stanzas 29–30 correspond to GP 8–9: dhīro vinito matimāṁ kṣamāvān ārjavo 'ṣaṭaḥ | mantratantraprayogajñāṁ kṛpāluḥ śāstrakovidaḥ || daśatattvapariṇāṇātā maṇḍalālekhyakarmavit | mantravyākhya-
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*kṛd ācāryaḥ prasannāḥ syāj jītendriyaḥ* ||. St. 30 is also quoted in the VP (vol. 2, p. 5).

i Cf. Kriyāsamuccaya, fol. 2r.

j Verses 40cd–41ab are quoted, with some differences in the second half, in the AKU (p. 134: *sarvākāravaropetā śūnyatā hetur ādītah || anālambanakṛpā paścāj jagadarthakarī phalam |*) and, with attribution to the Pañcalakṣahevajraṭantra, in the Sekoddeśatipanni (ad stt. 152–153ab; ed. Gnoli 1997b: 142: *sarvākāravaropetā śūnyatā hetur ādītah || anālambanakṛpā paścāj jagadarthakarī phalam |*).

k Here the text is paraphrasing *Madhyamakārikā* 13.8ab: *śūnyatā sarvadrśtināṁ proktā niḥśaraṇaṁ jīnaiḥ.*

l Here the text is paraphrasing *JS* 5.3 (p. 115): *hetunā sadrśam jñānaṁ phalam loke tu yujyate | kodrava<n> na hi jāyante śālayāḥ kvacid eva tu ||.*

m Cf. AK p. 37.

n This stanza is also quoted in the Sekanirdeśapanjikā (ad st. 19) with the variant *samastavedasadhānāṁ in pāda a.*

o This stanza is also quoted in the VP (vol. 1, p. 50; cf. also vol. 2, p. 214, and vol. 3, p. 23) and in the PAJS (= VP vol. 3, p. 872–3). The first verse corresponds to *Mahāmāyāntantra* 1.5cd, the second verse (which is not clearly readable in K) corresponds to HT 1.8.47cd. It is also quoted in the *Sahajasiddhi* 3.9cd. According to a MS (entitled *Kāḷparāja* [!]) preserved in the IsIAO Library, Rome, MS FGT V1 263, fol. 31r6–7, it belongs to the Kalparāja: *tathā ca śrikalparāje — svayaṁ harta svayaṁ kartā svayaṁ rājā svayaṁ prabhuḥ.* See also Newman 1987: 402, note 17.

p Stanzas 63cd–64 correspond to *Bhagavadgītā* 4.7–8 (= *Mahābhārata* 6.2.6.7–8).

q Stanzas 66–76 are *śārdulavikriḍita.*

**Variant Readings**

metrum); pañcāṣy akṣaravartanābhabindurāṃ Kṛṣṇa (ṛṇa is not clear); in T we read: 'ṛgyur med hna becu rjod byed de 'niḥ 11 makuṭe Kṛṣṇa N ī mukūte Kṛṣṇa (te is not clearly readable) (ep) 12 'ṛdha Kṛṣṇa N ī unreadable in Kṛṣṇa N 13 'tmi Kṛṣṇa N ī 'li Kṛṣṇa 14 mūdrajīnāṃ Kṛṣṇa N ī mūdra jīnāṃ Kṛṣṇa (ep) 15 dvipināḥ Kṛṣṇa N ī dipināḥ N 16 lavavat Kṛṣṇa N T (cha tsam lta bur) ī canaram Kṛṣṇa 17 satvārthino Kṛṣṇa N ī 'atvānvinā Kṛṣṇa ī yoginām Kṛṣṇa ī 'nām is broken in Kṛṣṇa 19 sārdhasaptāte Kṛṣṇa N ī sārdham asṭātate Kṛṣṇa 20 hevajra Kṛṣṇa N ī hemavajra N ī 'naisā Kṛṣṇa N ī unreadable in Kṛṣṇa 21 yā Kṛṣṇa N ī 'ā is broken in Kṛṣṇa 22 saṭ Kṛṣṇa N ī 'ā is unclear in Kṛṣṇa 23 tantraprakāśā Kṛṣṇa N pc ī prakāśā(pc) N ī ye Kṛṣṇa(pc) Kṛṣṇa N ī ye Kṛṣṇa(pc) Kṛṣṇa N ī ye Kṛṣṇa N 25 bhaviṣyanti Kṛṣṇa K ī bhaviṣyanti N ī desakāḥ Kṛṣṇa N T ī (ston) j dveśakah Kṛṣṇa N ī pa KĀ ī pa KĀ is broken in Kṛṣṇa 26 anāmāsā Kṛṣṇa N ī āsmanāla Kṛṣṇa 29 gamanodyatāḥ Kṛṣṇa ī gamanodyantāḥ N ī 30 kecid Kṛṣṇa N ī īti T ī (zes) 31 dhārīnāḥ N ī dhārīnā Kṛṣṇa ī sita Kṛṣṇa ī sita Kṛṣṇa ī bhuvī N T ī (sa la) ī tu viḥ Kṛṣṇa N ī vanijāḥ N ī vānijāṃ Kṛṣṇa ī südrāḥ kṛṣṭikarmanarātāḥ Kṛṣṇa; südrāḥ kṛṣṭikarmanarātāḥ N ī bhogināh Kṛṣṇa N T ī bhogenaḥ N ī bhaviṣyanti Kṛṣṇa ī bhaviṣyanti N ī naiva Kṛṣṇa ī 'naite Kṛṣṇa 38 'naiya N ī 'naite Kṛṣṇa 39 gopayitvā Kṛṣṇa ī gopijitvā N ī 40 'sān doṣapurīyāga N ī 'sānudōṣapurīyoga Kṛṣṇa ī 41 vadanti Kṛṣṇa(pc) N ī vadanti Kṛṣṇa(pc) ī 42 naiva N ī nai Kṛṣṇa ī Most likely the m is a hiatus breaker. Read 'grahaṇe, 'grahaṇād or 'grahaṇeṇa? Pāda a is in any case metrically irregular ī 44 asiddhir ī. ī asiddhi Kṛṣṇa; ī asiddhar N ī ī sīṣyānāṃ Kṛṣṇa N ī no equivalent in T ī 46 nātra Kṛṣṇa T ī nānu N ī 47 svotkāraṇaṃ N T ī (raṇ bstod) ī sotkāraṇca (ṇca is apparently erased) ī 48 ca N ī ku ī (apparently erased) Kṛṣṇa ī 49 guṛum Kṛṣṇa ī guṛuḥ N ī 50 sīṣyam ca Kṛṣṇa GP ī sīṣyaḥ caiva N ī (not easily readable) (contra metrum) ī 51 buddhīman Kṛṣṇa ī sa buddhīmanāṃ N ī (contra metrum) ī 52 yah N ī ya Kṛṣṇa N ī ī ati N T ī (sīn tu) ī ī atai Kṛṣṇa ī 54 svotkāraṇa em. based on T ī (raṇ bstod) ī sotkāraṇa Kṛṣṇa N ī 55 abhiṣeṃ Kṛṣṇa ī abhiṣeṃ ī 56 daśadīg N ī daśadiṅa Kṛṣṇa ī 'dhātu Kṛṣṇa ī 'tu N ī 57 triśkālam ī. ī triskālam Kṛṣṇa N ī 58 eta vandyate Kṛṣṇa Kriyāsamanuccaya ī etyābhivandyate N ī (see also below, st. 22d) ī 59 sandhyābhāṣam ajānanto Kṛṣṇa ī sandhyābhāṣajānanto N ī 60 mohitāḥ em. ī mohinaḥ Kṛṣṇa N ī 61 masteke Kṛṣṇa ī masteke N ī 62 abhiṣekāgralabdhāḥ Kṛṣṇa ī abhiṣekāgralachāyaḥ N ī 63 vajrācāryas Kṛṣṇa ī vajracāryas N ī 64 pañcābhīḥ Kṛṣṇa ī pañcābhīḥ N ī 65 trikālam ī etya vandyate Kṛṣṇa T ī kālam evābhivandyate N ī 66 'mayās Kṛṣṇa ī 'mayas N ī 67 vandyate em. ī yo vandyate Kṛṣṇa N ī (contra metrum; yo could be a later addition; it is not represented in T) ī 68 sakṛd em. ī sakṛ Kṛṣṇa ī sakṛd N ī 69 vai N ī ca Kṛṣṇa (ep) ī 70 ca Kṛṣṇa ī yaḥ N ī 71 tathā conj. based on T ī (de bizin) ī nāmaḥ Kṛṣṇa; na saḥ (= na saḥ ?) N ī 72 'bhāṣaṃ N ī 'bhāṣaṃ Kṛṣṇa ī 73 nānyad yathārūtam em. (read na ca yathārūtam ?) ī nānyet tathārūtām Kṛṣṇa; nānyat tathā 'ruta N ī 74 nītārtham tat tathā nēyaṃ conj. ī nītārtham tān na tā tāyāṃ Kṛṣṇa; nītārthatva tān na neyar
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Nd; in T we read: dgos bsad dan dgos min dan || ji bzin sgra dan ji bzin min || de bzin nes don draṅ don te || rgyud ni mtha’ druk mtshan ñid rnams ||
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139 nirhetuto K^K | nirhetor K^N; nirahetor Ñ 140 bhaviṣyati K^K K^N | bhāṣyaṇī
tv K T (‘di ru) | iti K^K N 142 śūnyātā K^K K^N | śūnyātā Ñ 143
proktā K^K Ñ | proktān K^N 144 niḥsaraṇāt Ñ | niḥsaraṇāt K^K;
nisaraṇāt K^N
dhānaṇavāśāt K^N | ‘dhānaṇavāśāt K; ‘dhānaṇavāśāt Ñ 146 bhaviṣyati K^K K^N |
haviṣyanti Ñ 147 nirāḷamāṁ K^K Ñ | nirāḷamba K^N (the syllables ‘rāla’ are
clearly not readable) 148 karuṇātmaphalaṁ K^T | karuṇām ekaphalaṁ K^N;
karuṇātmakahalāṁ Ñ (contra metrum) 149 mahat K^K Ñ | mahata K^N 150
dhānaṇabhih ē sitam.

151 kiṃcit K^K Ñ | kiṃcita K^N 152 ‘avalambini K^K Ñ | ‘avalambani K^N
daśabhūmāu K^K Ñ T | ddaśajamo K^N 154 nirāḷambā
K^K Ñ | the syllable ‘mbā is unreadable in K^N 155 jagadarthakarī K^N (ja is
unreadable) K^K T | jagakari Ñ 156 In K^N stanzas 47–48 are written inside verse
53 pada d (see below) 157 phalam K^K Ñ | phalana K^N 158 jāyante K^K | jāyente
K^N; jāyate Ñ 159 madhye ‘vasāne K^K (madhyevasāne) Ñ | madhyāvasāne K^N
cà K^K K^N | deest in Ñ 161 mama K^K Ñ | muneḥ K^T (thub pa) (ep) 162
savikalpād dhetoḥ K^K | viṣkalpakād dhetoḥ Ñ; viṣkalpahetoḥ K^N 163 savikalpaṁ
K | savikalpa‘ K^K; sarvavikalpaṁ Ñ 164 ‘baudhānāṁ K^K Ñ | ‘baudhānāṁ
K^N kalpataḥ K^K Ñ T | akalpataḥ K^N (contra metrum) 166 śūnyātā K^K
Ñ | *aśūnyātā */na śūnyātā | T 167 śālibjasya vāpanām K^K | śālidhānyasya
vāpanām Ñ (ep); śālidhānāsavopanām K^N 168 na śuddhām conj. based on T
(ma dag) and the context nāśuddhām K^K Ñ 169 mānuṣyaṁ karma‘ K^K
Ñ T | paramārthacema‘ (or ‘vesma’ ‘dhesma’) K^N 170 aśuddhām K (even if
not clearly readable) T | āśuddhām K^N | āśuddhām K^N
171 In K^N stt. 47–48 are written after the words janma śubhā
172 manuṣya‘ K^Kpc K^N Ñ | mānuṣya‘ K^Kac 173
175 bhavet K^K Ñ | bhavata K^N 176 śūnyātā K^K K^N | śūnyātā ‘ T 177 tv K^K | deest
in K^N and Ñ 178 anavalambakṛpā‘ K^K | analambakṛpā‘ K^N; anālambakṛpā‘
Ñ (this reading could be admitted if we retain the tu of K^K, but with the hiatus
‘vṛṣāt tu anālamba‘) 179 cintitam K^K K^N | cittita Ñ 180 sarvasattvānāṁ K^K
Ñ T | sarvabuddhānāṁ K^K 181 ‘mantrāyam K^K Ñ T | ‘mattāyam K^N 182
dēsitaṁ K^K T | darsitaṁ K^K Ñ (ep) 183 gambhirodāradharmesu K^K K^N Ñ
no equivalent in T 184 ‘sattvātma K^K Ñ | ‘sattvātmaṁ K^N 185 bhikṣur K^K K^N |
þi K | ‘traya‘ em. (probably K^K, but the MS is partially broken) ‘tritaya‘
K (contra metrum); ‘taya‘ (read traya ?) Ñ 187 Ñ ‘parījñātā K^K K^N | ‘parījñātā
Ñ 188 kṛtānāṁ K^K K^N Ñ | kṛtām Ñ 188 iśvarādibhibhiḥ K^K K^N | iśvaravādibhibhiḥ
Ñ (contra metrum) 189 bauddhānāṁ K^K Ñ | bauddhānāṁ K^N 190 viṣeṣaṁ K^Kpc
K^N | viṣeṣaṁ K^Kac; viṣeṣaṁ Ñ 191 śūnyatāṁ K^K K^N | śūnyatāṁ Ñ 192 sa K^K
Ñ | na sa K^K 193 śisyān K^K | śirsyan K^K; śisyān Ñ 194 pātayet khitān K^K K^N
(sic metri causa for pātayet akhilān) | pātayetad akhilān K^K; *pātayet ad akhilān
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1. *sādharmam.*
2. *295 jñeyam.*
3. *290 man. d. ale dhātubhir*
4. *288 arthādyaṃ K N T (sman) oṣadham K N *
5. *271 prahāṇāya K N pc K K N jprahōṇāya K Nac *
6. *272 arthādyam K N T athādyam K; arthādyā N 273 saranām K N j saranāṃ K N *
7. *274 rutakair K K N pc j garutairrutakair Nac 275 anyaiś K K N j anyai K N *
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TRANSLATION

Introduction

Honour to glorious Hevajra!

1–6. After honouring the deathless (amṛta) Essential Body of [all] the Buddhas, which is beyond worldly behaviour, consists of the Victorious, [and] is always elevated [above the horizon], [all] pervading, devoid of [every manifestation of] duality, immaculate, free from sensorial pleasure, omniscient, [the word] evam, supreme, pacified, the mind —i.e., the mind that is non-mind—, sentient and endowed with all the senses in every direction; after honouring He whose faces, born of the eight destroyed qualities, are the eight final emancipations of the Lord, whose hands are the sixteen [kinds of] emptiness, whose skulls are the compassions, on whose shoulders is a garland of heads made of the fifty beads corresponding to the true reality of the phonemes, on whose diadem is Aksobhya and a vajra encircled with a half-moon, whose necklace is made of skulls, whose beautiful feet —the cause of final emancipation, i.e., the benevolence (maitri), etc.— are treading on the Māras along with the group of the moral and intellectual [faults], who embraces his mudrā, who wears a tiger-skin, whose ornament is the hindrances (āvarana) of the Māras, and so forth, [which he has only in a very small quantity] like a drop, in as much as he is wishing for [the welfare of] beings, being impelled by Hevajra, I —the glorious Vajragarbha, the Lord of the ten Stages, who wishes to impart knowledge (bodhayē) and desires the welfare of all beings— am writing a commentary that explains the secrets of the [Hevajra] tantra, in order for the yogins to attain the [true] path. Since this short tantra of 750 [stanzas], endowed with many adamantine words (vajrapada), has been taken from a great tantra of five lakṣas, this [commentary], called Sātśāhasrikā, follows the root-tantra (mūlatantra) in order to elucidate on the [short] tantra.

Criticism of Bad Teachers

7. In this age of the five decays, there will be masters who teach an [erroneous] yoga practice [and] who promote a wrong path.

8. Using corrupt reasoning (durnaya), they will explain the brief tantras without a commentary. Desiring the wealth and wives of others, they will unremittingly move towards hell.

9. Some [other masters] will comment on [tantras] without the five kinds of super-knowledge, etc. They will belittle the yoga practice through their pride in speculative [logical] treatises.
10–11. “We are the Vajra-holders since we have attained Buddhahood, the state of Vajrasattva, with effort, through the initiations”, some will say to other men. “All monks who observe moral precepts should not be honoured. [Still more so] we who wear white clothes, who are the Vajra-holders in person, must be honoured!”.

12–13ab. Those servants, traders, śūdras and farmers who sell the good law and, foolish [as they are], enjoy non-enjoyable things, will become masters, will be corporeal manifestations of Māra for [their] disciples.

13cd–14ab. Concealing the wrong actions (doṣa) that they have performed in a false clothing of yogic behaviour, in order to cause [their students] to disregard [their] defects (doṣa), they [will] say:

14cd–15ab. “Never should the master’s defects, but only his qualities, be perceived.” Disciples do not attain perfection if they perceive the [master’s] defects. There is no doubt concerning this”.

15cd–16. [These bad teachers] will never impart the following sentence to their disciples: “A wise person should not accept as [his] master or disciple someone who is devoid of compassion, wrathful, pitiless, proud, covetous, unbridled or self-admiring”.

17–18. [Commentary on the above sentence:] He who is “devoid of compassion” is [for instance] a farmer; he who is “wrathful” is he who exploits the weak points [of others] (marmabhedaka); he who is “pitiless” is a man hostile towards monks; he who is “proud” is conceited with bad knowledge; he who is “covetous” is he who desires forbidden things; he is “unbridled” due to a great use of intoxicating drinks; he who is called here “self-admiring” is the detractor of those who are virtuous.

The True Master

19. “The adamantine teacher, since he has received the highest of initiations, is honoured three times a day (tris. kālam) by the Tathāgatas that reside in [all] the worlds of the ten directions, after having reached him.”

20. Those who without knowing the intentional language (sandhyābhāṣa) [and being] confused by the literal meaning (nāmamātra) [of the texts] attack the Jinendras, will go to the Raurava [hell].

21. [Commentary on st. 19 according to the surface meaning:] He who has been consecrated on the head by Vajrasattva at the root of the bodhi-tree (bodhimūla) is he “who has received the highest of initiations”, “the adamantine teacher”, the Tathāgata.
22. The “worlds” are the bodies of the Bodhisattvas “of the ten directions”. He “is honoured three times a day” by the five aggregates (skandha) “that reside” here [in these bodies], “after having reached him”.

23. [Or, according to the deep meaning:] The “worlds” are the [Bodhisattvas’] crowns fashioned from many jewels. Among the yogins, the “adamantine teacher” is he who “is honoured” by the Buddhas “that reside” here [in these crowns].

24. Just as Vairocana, meant as a pledge (samaya), corresponds to excrement (sakr), Akṣobhya to urine and Amitābha to semen, the teacher corresponds to the Vajra-holder.

25. In the same way as the teacher gives [to the disciple] the mudrās of the excrements, urine and semen, so the Vajra-holder gives [him] the perfections of body, speech and mind.

26. For disciples and yogins, the first and subsequent initiations, both based on the relative and absolute truths, are performed in the maṇḍala and in the bodhimūla respectively.

27. The Tantra is characterized here by six standpoints (saṭkoṭi): the intentional language (sandhyābhäṣa), the non-intentional language (yathāsandhya), the literal or standard language (yathārūta), that which is non-literal [or coined] (naruta), the deep meaning (nītārtha) and the surface meaning (neyārtha).

28. Those qualities that are shown here, according to ordinary life, as belonging to the teacher, are also the Vajrasattva’s qualities, [in this case] characterized by the six kinds of super-knowledge, etc.

29–30. “The [true] master is resolute, well-behaved, wise, patient, honest, sincere, and versed in the use of the mantras and of the Tantras; compassionate; skilled in sacred works; learned in the ten realities; proficient in maṇḍala painting; an expounder of the mantras; gracious-minded [and] master of his senses.”

The Supremacy of the Monks

31. [Only] a monk, who is endowed with the above-mentioned qualities, can become the Vajra-holder, not a novice [and not] a layman. Therefore, ten of these two [namely, novices and laymen] cannot be compared to a single monk.

32. The [novice] must observe ten moral precepts (śikṣāpada), the [layman] five moral precepts, the [monk] ten million moral precepts (koṭisikṣā). The three are traditionally believed to be different to each other.
33. According to the root-tantra, the state of Vajra-holder is [the prerogative] of the monk. Therefore, some [stanzas from this text] are quoted below for [the benefit of] those disciples who adore the master.

Quotation from the Pañcalakṣahevajra

34. “The Vajra-holder, when asked by Nairātmā, spoke the following words in order to impart the moral precepts, according to the rules and in the correct order.

35–36. “First, after giving the five moral precepts, the Vajra-holder [the master] will create the lay follower (upāsaka) who has refused the ten malicious [actions] and who must observe the posadha, and so forth. Then, after giving the ten moral precepts, he will create the novice, and, after giving ten million moral precepts, he will create the monk.

37–38. “After becoming familiar with the rules of conduct (prātimokṣa), the thought of the Vaibhāṣikas, the Sūtrānta and the Vijñānavāda, according to their principles (svadharmataḥ), and after learning the Madhyamaka with the Prajñāpāramitā, [and] all the other tantras, the Hevajra[tantra] must be learned.33

39–40ab. “He who has mastered the three vehicles enjoys the fruits of the One Vehicle (ekayāna). [These vehicles are] the Śrāvaka, the Pratyeka and the Mahāyāna.34 Neither a fourth [“Vehicle” (yāna)] nor a fifth [system of thought (mata)] of the Sage (muni) exists for Buddhists.

40cd–41ab. “First, there is emptiness, which is endowed with all excellent forms [and which is] the cause; second, due to the vow (prāṇidhāna),35 there is compassion, which accomplishes the welfare of the world [and which is] the effect.36

41cd–42. “He who, after achieving his own welfare brings welfare to others, is a sage. How can he who is suffering and miserable, [even if] intent on helping [other] beings, give pleasure, power and prosperity to others?

43. “He who desires [to obtain] an effect must first realize directly its cause. The effect, indeed, cannot take place before, since it would then be causeless.37

44. “The existence of a second [superior] vehicle, different from the Mahāyāna, is stated here [simply] in order to make to desist those who have lost [the virtues, starting with] giving (dāna), moral sensitivity, etc., but does not reflect the true reality.

45ab. “I say that emptiness is the abandonment (niḥsaraṇa) of all dharmas'.
45cd–46. “Therefore, by virtue of [this] abandonment, which is the [emptiness as a] cause, [and] then by virtue of the vow, there will be the great fruit of compassion, which is baseless. Compassion is said to be threefold: [based in] beings (sattva), [based in] dharma and baseless (nirālambā).38

47. “[The compassion that] is based in beings and dharmas produces its benefit partially and on a limited sphere. It is the prerogative of the Siddhas [and] the Bodhisattvas, who reside [just] in the tenth Earth.

48. “It is said to be baseless [the compassion that] produces a benefit for the [entire] world. It is the prerogative of the Buddhas (sugata) who have arrested the twelve limbs [of the dependent origination (pratītyasamutpāda)] and have crossed all the Earths.

49. “Every cause produces a specific effect and no other. Grains of rice never come from the corn (kodrava).39

50ab. “A seed produces its own tree and a tree its own fruit.

50cd. “‘My words are beneficial in the beginning, in the middle and in the end.’40

51. “In the beginning, a cause endowed with conceptual constructions produces an effect endowed with conceptual constructions. And [thus, if the emptiness is meditated upon in a conceptual way] the effect of the emptiness will manifest for all Buddhists, according to the conceptual constructions, in the end.

52. “If, in the beginning, the [grains of] corn are sowed to purify a field; then, once the field is purified, the seeds of rice are sown.

53. “It is said that human birth is not a pure field; it springs from the earth of actions (karman). Birth in the six forms of existence (ṣadgati) is impure; it arises from pure and impure fruit.

54. “Baseless compassion can [only] arise after a human birth has become a pure field. The seed [of compassion] has been sown. From this, the great tree of emptiness springs.

55. “The fruit of baseless compassion, which is desired for all beings, springs from the wishing tree of emptiness. There is no doubt about this.

56. “O beloved [Nairātmā], I have imparted mudrās, maṇḍalas, mantras and many other things to help those who are not suitable for the deep and noble dharmas.

57. “Future teachers, who are incarnations of Māra, will teach that Buddhahood, i.e., the state of Vajra-holder, can be attained [simply] through mudrās, maṇḍalas, mantras and other [such] things.
58. “Therefore, [only] the monk who teaches the Mahāyāna, who has profound knowledge of the three vehicles and understands the constitutive elements of the doctrine (dharmasaṅgraha), is traditionally known as the Vajra-holder.”

Criticism of Bad Teachings. The Need for Good Commentaries

59–60ab. The difference between the Buddhist tantras and mantras and those of the Vedas, the Siddhānta and the Yoga, promulgated by the Lord and others is concerning emptiness. The one who does not see [this difference], being confused, brings about the fall of the defective disciples.\textsuperscript{42}

60cd. [He says:] ‘An action does not exist without someone who acts, nor the result without the action.’

61–62. ‘Mahāmāyā is very fierce; she destroys [all] beings. She herself creates, she herself destroys; she herself is king, she herself is overlord,’ exactly as the māyā of Īśvara. Also Īśvara in the Śivasiddhānta, in the doctrine of the Gītā, is called by the heretics janārdana\textsuperscript{43} (‘tormentor of men’), durdāntadamaka (‘tamer of those who are untamable’) and sādhupālaka (‘protector of the virtuous’):

63–64. ‘O Arjuna, I create [a part of] myself whenever justice grows weak and injustice grows strong in this [world]. In each age, I manifest myself in order to protect the virtuous, to destroy criminals and to consolidate justice.’\textsuperscript{44}

65. Thus, Hevajra, perfectly aware of all [these] bad teachings of the Law, urged me to compose a commentary.

66. After honouring the most eminent of the Bodies [of the Buddha] that—Essential (svabhāvika) and pure—is celebrated by the three worlds; after honouring [the Body of] the Doctrine, which is beyond feelings of pleasure and pain; after honouring [the Body of] Enjoyment, which is the instructor;\textsuperscript{45} and after honouring the Body of Transformation, which is accompanied by manifold miraculous appearances in the ether (khardḍhi) [and which is] similar to magic and Indra’s net, I shall partly (alpataḥ) reveal the hidden words of the short tantra according to their deep meaning (nītārtha).

67. The teaching (deśanā) of the Victorious One, which in ancient times the Buddhas taught with 500,000 stanzas in the collection of the Ādītantra\textsuperscript{46} and with 100,000 stanzas in the Lākṣābhīdhāna,\textsuperscript{47} is [condensed] here, in this short [tantra, the] Hevajra. It remains obscure to men. [Therefore] the meaning [of the short tantras] and also [what the Buddhas have expounded] in the other collection of the Royal Tantras (tantrarāja), becomes clear [only] from the commentaries.
68ab. He who tries to reveal, without a commentary, the obscure [meaning of a] word in a short tantra, resembles a blind man who attempts to follow the trail of a snake that has long disappeared into the water.⁴⁸

68cd–69ab. In every tantra, the Victors have taught the deep meaning and not [simply] the surface meaning. If, in order to bestow knowledge, a commentary explains [only] the surface meaning, the definitive one would be useless. In every tantra, the Victors have taught the intentional language and the non-intentional language, the literal or standard language and that which is non-literal [or coined], the deep meaning and the surface meaning.⁴⁹

69cd. That is why, [according to the intentional language,] in this tantra (atra) the aggregates correspond to excrements, etc. [In reality,] the aggregates, which are impure, are not divinities, i.e., Perfect Buddhas. Nor, once visualized (sankalpita) with mouths and arms of the divinities, can the latter help to acquire knowledge.⁵₀

70ab. The Blessed One has veiled the tantras, beginning with the Samāja, by means of six standpoints (koṭi). How could these recited [tantras] that vanquish the pride of the pañdītas and [their] works be understood through [hypothetical] speculation?

70cd. This [true] knowledge [which is expounded in them] is similar to a magical image in a mirror; it has a clear knowledge of the past, present and future; it is devoid of the various speculations regarding being and non-being; it is devoid of duality.

71. The Blessed One stated that the thirty-two channels (nāḍī) which are in the mahāsukha[caakra],⁵¹ and likewise those in the throat, in the heart, navel and secret parts, carry the semen. Which [channels] are bearing what in the joints of the hands and feet, and likewise in the joints of the arms and fingers the Victor did not tell me, Vajragarbha, even in the Hevajra[tantra].

72. The [language] of the Sage (ārṣa) that the monks speak is nothing but the Māgadha. The words of the Blessed One in the three baskets are found in the doctrine of the Elders. Disease is one thing; medicine[, which is used] in order to eliminate disease, is other than that.⁵² The fourfold refuge begins with the spirit (artha) [of the words] of the Sage, and not with [their] literal meaning (vyañjana). ⁵³

73. The wise ones say that the venerable speech of the Blessed One, which contemporaneously teaches the dharmas through the languages of Gods, Demons, Nāgas and Yakṣas and through other [languages], and is a source of
wonder that defies worldly comparison, can also be expressed in Sanskrit, with words such as evaṁ mayā. Is this not a wonder?

74. The Body [of Transformation] of the Blessed One, which, similar to Indra’s net, [manifests itself] in all excellent forms, is comparable to magic and ethereal; it is named by those who are young and spiritually immature to bestow knowledge. This Body, distinguished by [its] thirty-two characteristics and eighty distinctive signs, exists in the maṇḍala through the aggregates, elements, senses and sense-objects.

75. In this [world], those who are foolish calculate always the decay, birth, lunar days (tīthi), fixed points (dhruva), etc., which are taught in other tantras, in order to know the dependent origination. He who is extremely ignorant and spineless (pragalbharahita) desires coagulated milk without milk, and cow’s milk without cows. In this case, where is the blame (doṣa) of the wise man (jñānin)?

76. The Cakrasaṅvara [and] the Catuhpīṭhaka must be understood through the Hevajra. The Hevajra [and] the Catuhpīṭhaka must be understood through the words of the Cakrasaṅvara. The Hevajra [and] the short Cakrasaṅvara must be understood through [the words of] the Catuhpīṭhaka. But the deep meaning [of all these tantras] must be understood through the words of the Ādibuddha, which contain great secrets.

77. Hence, those who desire [true] path must always understand tantras through other tantras, summaries (uddeśa), teachings (nirdeśa) and commentaries.

Thus is the introduction to the tantra, the Laud of the Chosen Deity. It is the first section of the Śaṭṭāhasrikā, a commentary on the Hevajra[tantra].

Notes to the Translation

1 I.e., it is a pleasure that transcends sensorial faculties. The concept occurs for instance in JS 7 and PAJS (Gnoli 1997a: 42–45).

2 This expression comes from the Prajñāpāramitā literature; see, e.g., Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā, ed. p. 3; Abhisamayālaṃkārālokā, ed. p. 39: “this mind exists, [but] this mind is non-mind (asti tac cittam yac cittam acittam)”. It occurs often in Kālacakra texts; see, e.g., VP (vol. 1, p. 432–43): iha punaḥ śūnyatākarunātmakasya bimbasya viśuddhacittasya kumārikāpratisenopamasya na rūpalakṣaṇam paramāṇor abhāvān nārūpalakṣaṇam śūne vidyamānatvāt | ataḥ saṃvṛtiḥ śūnyatārūpiṇī śūnyatā
The Laud of the Chosen Deity


3 See Maṇjuśrīnāma sāṅgīti 8.21cd–23ab, which is also quoted in Śaṭsāhasrikā, Section Two.

4 Most probably, anīmā, etc. Cf. Śaṭsāhasrikā, Section Five, st. 110. Cf. Mahāvyutpattī 125.

5 Cf. VP vol. 3, p. 149.

6 On the sixteen kinds of emptiness and compassion, see HT 1.9.15 (cf. also Snellgrove 1959, vol. I, p. 80, note 1); Yogaratnamāla (MS fol. 36); VP (vol. 1, p. 21, transl. by Newman 1987: 285 ff; cf. VP vol. 2, p. 8).

7 See Dawa-Samdup 1919: 98, note 4.

8 Or “a half moon and a vajra”. On the description of Hevajra, see Tucci 1936: 25. See also Murthy 1998.

9 Cf. HT 2.6.4.

10 Since the Bodhisattvas desire to remain in the world in order to help all beings, the obstacles are still present in them to a small degree. This concept is also expressed in the PAJS p. 931–933 (Gnoli 1997a: 63) and in another stanza of the Hevajra tantrapindaśrīthāti (8.69cd–70ab), which is also quoted in the AK (p. 26). Cf. AKU p. 141.

11 See below, st. 65cd.

12 The word bodhaye appears also below, stt. 68d, 69d, 74b. In st. 74b (just as in HT 1.9.14d; cf. Farrow and Mennon 1992: 126), it seems to possess both a causative and final meaning: “in order to awaken”.

13 In this context, the word vajrapada means “difficult or obscure words”. As a technical term the compound vajrapada appears for the first time in the Ratnagotravibhāga 1.1: buddhaś ca dharmaś ca ganaś ca dhātur bodhir guṇāḥ karma ca bauddham antyam | kṛṣṇasya śāstrasya śārīram etat samāsato vajrapadāni sapta ||; see Takasaki 1966: 141–142. We might also interpret the locative alpatantre (5b) as depending on ūtikā (3d) and translate the sentence as follows: “I [...] write a commentary that explains the secrets of the [Hevajra] tantra, in order for the yogins to attain the [true] path, [a commentary] on this short tantra of 750 [stanzas] that is endowed with many adamantine words (vajrapada) [and] that has been taken from a great tantra of five lakṣas. This [commentary], called Śaṭsāhasrikā, follows the root-tantra (mūlatantra) in order to elucidate on the [short] tantra.”
Lakṣa means here 100,000 stanzas, i.e., the measure of 100,000 stanzas. See also below, st. 67.

In the LTṬ we read: iha pañcakaśyakāle jāmbūdvīpakā manuṣyā viśeṣenāryaviśaye alpāyuo ʿlpaprajñā bhaviṣyanti | ye vajrācāryās te mūlāpattigāmino bhaviṣyanti | bhikṣavo daśākuśalakārīno bhaviṣyanti | grhaṭhā ratnatrayadravyopabhogino bhaviṣyanti | pañḍīṭā aṣrutatantravyākhyātāro bhaviṣyanti pañḍīṭābhimāṇena tandre pañjikāṭikākārā bhaviṣyanti | tantrārthaṃ viparitaṃ desayitvā narakagāmino bhaviṣyanti | ye mūrkhā bauddhās te śraddhājaḍatvena grhaṭhācāryeṣu paryupāsanāṃ kariṣyanti | sar-vajñadhvajadhārakān dūṣaṇyāṃ (pp. 51–52). Cf. also Sanderson 1994: note 5. Stanzas 7–13 have also been translated from the Tibetan by Newman (1987: 409–410).

That is, without divyacakṣus, divyaśrotra, paracittajñāna, pūrvanivāsanuśmṛti and rddhi.


In other words, they impart teachings in order to eliminate defects, while actually concealing their defects.

On this theme, cf. Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇa 129, GSPU p. 216; see also Abhinavagupta, Tantrāloka 23.83–87ab.

I.e., at dawn, noon and evening (cf. VP vol. 2, p. 5).


The twofold interpretation of st. 19 according to nītārtha and neyārtha occurs also in VP vol. 2, p. 5.

Cf. VP vol. 2, p. 5. Bodhimūle corresponds here to bodhivṛksamūle. The general meaning is that the practitioner has received the initiation as if he were at the root of the bodhi-tree as Siddhārtha Gotama himself; he is one who receives the initiation without the monastic ordination (cf. also Milindapaṇḍa p. 76). The compound bodhimūle recurs several times also in the Pāli Canon.

The five Buddhas who are in the crown are inclined towards Vajrasattva.

Cf. CMT (George 1974: 68), JS 2.10–11.

Cf. PAJS (Gnoli 1997a: 22).

Cf. below, stt. 68cd–69ab. On the six standpoints, see Steinkellner 1978.


Cf. Laghukālacakratantra 3.2.

In the LTṬ we read: ācāryo ʿpi mantranaye trividhaḥ | grhaṭhaś cellako bhikṣur adhamo madhyama uttamah [⋯] tathā bhikṣur abhiṣiktāḥ
pradhānācāryo bhavati cellako madhyamācāryo bhavati grhastrho 'dhamācāryo bhavati | atas trayāṇāṃ prāg bhikṣuḥ paścād vajradharaḥ kṛto gaṅacakre pratiśtādau gaṇanāyakah |
asyābhāve cellakas tasyāpy abhāve grhastraḥ | (pp. 102–103); see also VP (vol. 2, pp. 146–147), CMT (ed. p. 46) and JS 14.

31 For various references, see BHSD, p. 527.
32 I.e, the Pañcalakṣaheva Jratantra.
34 This is a reference to the famous doctrine of the ekayāna that is one of the most crucial ones of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. Cf. also Vimalakīrtinirdesa p. 215, and Ratnāvalī 4.88.
35 The reference here is probably to the praṇidhānacitta or praṇidhicitra of the bodhicitta ritual. See Wangchuk 2007. On the term praṇidhāna, see also BHSD s.v.
36 See below, st. 45cd.
37 The translation of this stanza is not literal.
38 In the VP the threefold karuṇā is connected with the 15 tithis (vol. 1, p. 21):
evaṁ karuṇā tridhā — sattvāvalambini dharmāvalambini anavalambini ceti |
tatra sattvāvalambini śuklapratipadādyāḥ paṇca tithayah | dharmāvalambini saṣṭhyādyāḥ paṇca tithayah | anavalambini ekādaśayādyāḥ paṇca tithayah pūrṇimāparyantam |. Cf. Śaṭsāhasrikā, Section Three, st. 23.
39 Paspalum scrobiculatum. Cf. JS 5.3.
40 See, e.g., Dīgha Nikāya, ed. vol. 1, p. 62; cf. also Śaṭsāhasrikā, Section Six.
42 Or, according to the Tibetan translation, “the fall of all the disciples”. For the Kālacakra criticism of several doctrines, see Grönbold 1992. Cf. also Mishra 2002. On the concept expressed in this stanza, cf. also Álokamālā 274.
43 Cf. Bhagavadgītā 1.36a, 1.39d, 1.44a, 3.1a, 10.18c, 11.51b.
44 Stanzas 63–64 correspond to Bhagavadgītā 4.7–8.
45 It is linked to vāc, the speech.
46 Viz., the Pañcalakṣaheva Jra.
48 The same example occurs in the Álokamālā by Kambala (st. 280):
jalaprayāṭāhīpadāni paśyataḥ [...] katham νu lokasya na jāyate trapā ||.
49 See above, st. 27.
50 Similar concepts can be found in the PAJS (Gnoli 1997a: 10–16).
52 Diseases and medicines must not be confused. The yogin must distinguish
between the spiritual and literal meaning of the scriptures.

53 The reference here is to the famous tenets of the Catuspratisharanatāsūtra, which is quoted, for instance, in the Abhidharmakosāvyākhyā (p. 1202), in the Vimalakīrtinirdesāsūtra (12.12) and in the LTṬ (p. 47: iha bhagavatā catvāri pratisarany anyatroktāni | tadyathā — arthapratisaraṇatā na vyañjanapratisaraṇatā, jñānapratisaraṇatā na vijñānapratisaraṇatā, nītārthapratisaraṇatā na neyārthapratisaraṇatā, dharma-pratisaraṇatā na pudgalapratisaraṇatā). Cf. also the Mahāvyutpatti (1545–1549) and Lamotte 1993: 11–27.

54 Lit. “desire the calculations (icchanti gaṇitā) […].”

55 Cf. VP vol. 1, p. 78.
Superiority of Vajrayāṇa
— Part I: Some Remarks on the  *Vajrayāṇaṁntadvayanirākaraṇa (rDo rje theg pa’i mtha’ gñis sel ba) Ascribed to Jñānaśrī—*

Taiken KYUMA

1 Introductory Remarks

Setting aside the sūtra or vinaya literature, in which the concept of ‘author’ comes into question, the attempt to write a history of Indian, especially late Indian, Buddhism, requires us to take the whole system of each author’s thought or practice into account. This attempt, however, seems to encounter the following problem: it is quite common for the same author to write both tantric and non-tantric works in late Indian Buddhism, yet it is often unclear how he sees the relationship between tantric and non-tantric doctrines in his entire system of thought or practice. This might be partly due to the fact that difficulties such as the unusual and little studied terminology of tantric Buddhism, have prevented most scholars from being initiated into research in this field and has hindered investigating of what might possibly be said in tantric texts about such a relationship.1 If we try to describe the history of Indian Buddhism properly, it would be necessary to make clear how these two, i.e., tantric and non-tantric aspects are related to each other within the whole structure of each author’s thought.

---

1 In this regard, we may note that Matthew T. Kapstein methodologically divides this kind of scholasticism into ‘Vajrayāṇa scholasticism’ and ‘scholastic mantrayāṇa’. While the former, according to Kapstein, means “the philosophical and exegetical literature on the subject of Vajrayāṇa, or aspects thereof, the developed tantrism that becomes prominent only during the last few centuries of Indian Buddhist history, and is much later elaborated in Tibet”, the latter refers to “the practice of mantrayāṇa, that is, the way of mantras, as it was conducted in the monastic universities in India during the mid-first millenium”. Cf. Kapstein 2001: 236. Kapstein’s dichotomy seems to be helpful when we try to investigate the relationship between mantrayāṇa and mahāyāṇa Buddhism, as discussed below.

---
or practice.\(^2\) This will call for scholarly cooperation between different fields of research to a greater or lesser extent,\(^3\) but how should we undertake such cooperation? One of the most efficient ways would be to choose and scrutinize together a tantric text, which goes into details about the relationship between tantric and non-tantric doctrines. In that case, of course, it would be necessary to pay attention to the possibility that each author may differ in understanding the intension of the relata, i.e., the doctrines, and precisely this is one reason why such cooperation should be required.\(^4\)

### 2 *Vajrayānāntadvayanirākaraṇa* and Its Title

The *Vajrayānāntadvayanirākaraṇa* (*rDo rje theg pa’i mtha’ gñis sel ba*, ‘VAN’ hereafter) ascribed to Jñānaśrī seems to be one of the best materials for the above-mentioned cooperation, since the author of this text gives a detailed explanation of the superiority of *mantrayāna* (*gsaṅ snags kyi theg pa*) to *pāramitāyāna* (*pha rol tu phyin pa’i theg pa*),\(^5\) especially to the Madhyamaka doctrine.

VAN is available to us only in five Tibetan versions.\(^6\) Although its original title is supposed to be *Vajrayānakotidvayāpoha* in the catalogue of Ōtani University, the form of *-antadvaya-* seems to be more preferable to *-kotidvaya-* since it is quite common to use the term *anta* in the meaning of extreme views such as *samāropa* (*sgro ’dogs pa*) and *apavāda* (*skur pa*), both of which are actually discusses in VAN.\(^7\) Concerning the term *sel ba*, which usually corresponds to *apoha* in the case of *pramāṇa* texts, it is evident that VAN has nothing to do with the

---

\(^2\) A good example of this situation can be found in the intricate arguments about the concept of *yogipratyakṣa* in recent *pramāṇa* studies. Although this concept is almost always mentioned and discussed in the context of the so-called *pramāṇa* traditions, it is still far from certain what kind of practical stage is actually presupposed for the yogin, who has to sharpen his perception by means of practice. For this problem, cf. Kyuma 2008: 188, n.1.

\(^3\) Of course, it does not follow that there is no *tiṣṇendriya* who can investigate both fields properly. Nevertheless, it goes without saying that such cooperation leads us to remarkable achievements more swiftly.

\(^4\) Added to this, we might have to consider if there is any interaction between the relata, since such an interaction will have influence on the relationship itself between them. In that sense too, the research of the relationship between different doctrines should always be accompanied by that of the relata.

\(^5\) It is still unclear to me if the term *mantrayāna* is invariably distinct from *mantranaya* in the context of tantric Buddhism. For example, as is well known, *mahāyāna* is divided into two *nayas*, i.e., *pāramitānaya* and *mantranaya* in Advayavajra’s *Tattvaratnāvali*. Cf. Ui 1963: 1 and 30. In this paper I simply follow VAN’s terminology.

\(^6\) We are now preparing for a critical edition of VAN with annotated translation, collating five versions, i.e., Peking, Ganden, Narthang, Derge and Cone. For our preliminary edition, cf. Kyuma et al. 2008.

\(^7\) I am indebted to Prof. Isaacson for this suggestion.
so-called *apoha* theory, and that the term *sel ba* is used merely in the sense of exclusion or negation. To avoid confusion in using the term *apoha*, according to the proposal of Prof. Alexis Sanderson, we tentatively adopt *nirākarana*, which seems to be most suitable for *sel ba* in this case.8

### 3 Authorship of VAN

With regard to the authorship of VAN, we do not have any other direct evidence than the colophon of Tibetan versions, where ‘Jñānaśrī’ is referred to as the author of VAN.9 Although we have to take into consideration that there might have been an author called by the name of ‘Jñānaśrī’, it is also possible that this name

---

8 My thanks are due to Prof. Alexis Sanderson, who kindly offered us this possibility by checking the database of e-texts in his *kośa* (laptop) on the occasion of the *International Workshop on Tantrism*.

9 Cf. P133r2; D120r2: *rDo rje theg pa ’i mtha’ gñis sel ba žes bya ba slob dpon dzñá na šris bkod pa rdzogs so // There is no mention of any translator and reviser in the colophon. Another work ascribed to ‘Jñānaśrī’, in which there is no mention of any translator and reviser in the colophon, is P3724; D2897: *rDo rje sñin po’i man nag sgrub pa’i thabs žes bya ba (Vajragarbhopadeshasādhanā nāma). Other Tibetan works ascribed to ‘Jñānaśrī’ are as follows:

- P2250, D1539: *lHan cig skyes pa’i dkyil ’khor gsum gsal bar byed pa žes bya ba (Sahajamandalatrayālokasaṃjñanā nāma)*
  - [translator] Ži ba ’od
  - P3746, D2920: *rDo rje rnam par ’joms pa’i las bži sgrub pa’i sbyin sreg gi cho ga (Vajravidārana{karmacatur}asādhanahomavidhi)*
  - [translator] Jñānaśrī and Rab ži
  - P3747, D2921: *rDo rje rnam par ’joms pa’i las sgrub pa’i bum pa’i cho ga (Vajravidārana{karmacatur}asādhanakalaśavidhi)*
  - [translator] Jñānaśrī and Rab ži
  - P3748, D2922: *rDo rje rnam par ’joms pa’i las bži sgrub pa’i ’khor lo’i cho ga (Vajravidārana{karmacatur}asādhanacakraśavidhi)*
  - [translator] Jñānaśrī and Rab ži
  - P5533, D4031: *mDo sde rgyan gyi don bsdus pa (Sūtrālamkārapiṇāṭha)*
  - [reviser] Gunodadhī [translator] Chos kyi brtson ’grus

These six works are ascribed to Jñānaśrībhadra by Naudou (cf. Naudou 1968: 180, fn. 1), since he suggests that Jñānaśrī, Jñānaśrīmitra, Jñānaśrībhadra and Jñānamitra are one and the same person. Cf. *ibid.*: 178–180. “… On peut en conclure que le logicien kaśmirien Jñānaśrī et le traducteur qui a collaboré avec Chos-kyi brcon-’grus, Dge-ba’i blo-gros, ’Phags-pa šes-rab, Rab-ži bṣes-gñen, Šākya bṣes-gñen, Rgyal-ba šes-rab, et qui apparaît sous les noms de Jñānaśrī, Jñānaśrībhadra, Jñānaśrīmitra, Jñānamitra, est un seul et même personage.” In his argument, Naudou supposes that Jñānasrimitra of Vikramaśīla, after the destruction of the temple, took refuge in Kaśmir and began a new life. It is, however, far from proved, as he himself admits. Regarding the translator Rab ži, it has been pointed out that Rab ži or Rab ži bṣes-gñen is often mentioned as Jñānaśrī’s co-translator. Cf. Sukenobu 1974: 68f.
is the abbreviated form of Jñānaśrīmitra (ca. 980–1030),\textsuperscript{10} Jñānaśrībhadra (ca. 11c),\textsuperscript{11} or any other authors whose names begin with ‘Jñānaśrī’.\textsuperscript{12} Since it is too involved a subject to be treated here in detail, I would like to limit the discussion to Jñānaśrībhadra and Jñānaśrīmitra. It has already been pointed out by Prof. Hadano that Jñānaśrībhadra might be the author of VAN.\textsuperscript{13} This is based on his own argument that VAN’s perspective on the whole system of Indian Buddhism appears in Jñānaśrībhadra’s Āryalāṅkāvatāravṛtti too. Prof. Hadano is right when he says that VAN shares such a perspective with the Āryalāṅkāvatāravṛtti. Nevertheless, it remains uncertain whether his argument is enough to identify the author of VAN or not, in view of the fact that late Indian Buddhism has a general tendency to put various Buddhist doctrines together.

Regarding Jñānaśrīmitra, on the other hand, there is a testimony in Tāranātha’s History of Indian Buddhism:

“Jñānaśrīmitra, the second great central pillar (of the Vikramaśīla temple), was the author of mṭha’ gṇis sel ba’i bstan bcos and the teacher to whom Śrī Atiśa also was much obliged ….”\textsuperscript{14}

\textit{mṭha’ gṇis sel ba’i bstan bcos} in this passage has already been identified by some scholars as VAN.\textsuperscript{15} Perhaps we do not need to consider if \textit{mṭha’ gṇis sel ba’i bstan}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{}\textsuperscript{13} E.g., Jñānaśrīgupta, who translated Pañcāpattinikāyaśubhāśubhālapariṣā-sūtra (P970, D304) into Tibetan together with Śākyab lobs gros, and Jñānaśrīrāmati, who is said to be one of Atiśa’s teachers (cf. Roerich 1949: 243). Jñānaśrīrāmati could be a scribal error for Jñānaśrīmitra.
\bibitem{}\textsuperscript{14} Cf. Hadano 1998: 108. In the same place Hadano refers to the content of VAN very briefly. Sukenobu 1974 also assumes indirectly that our text was written by Jñānaśrībhadra, since he concludes that ‘Jñānaśrī’ referred to as author or translator in bStan ’gyur is identical with Jñānaśrībhadra in every case. His argument seems to be based on the fact that Jñānaśrībhadra translated his own Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā in collaboration with Chos kyi brtson ’grus, who in turn translated Sūtrālaṃkārapiṇḍartha ascribed to Jñānaśrī. Cf. ibid.: 68. However, the connection of Indian author with Tibetan translators is not sufficient to account for VAN’s authorship itself, and of course, it seems to be hardly possible to assume that all Jñānaśrīs are equal to Jñānaśrībhadra. For the circumstances of cooperation between Indian authors and Tibetan translators, cf. also Naudou 1968: 174.
\bibitem{}\textsuperscript{15} Cf. Tāranātha 183,11–12: dbus kyi ka chen gṇis pa dzēṅa na śrī mi tra ni mṭha’ gṇis sel ba’i bstan bcos mḥzd mḥkhan de yin lā / dpal a ti śa’i yaṅ sku drin che ba’i bla ma cīg yin / …
\bibitem{}\textsuperscript{14} Cf. Tāranātha 183,11–12: dbus kyi ka chen gṇis pa dzēṅa na śrī mi tra ni mṭha’ gṇis sel ba’i bstan bcos mḥzd mḥkhan de yin lā / dpal a ti śa’i yaṅ sku drin che ba’i bla ma cīg yin / …
\bibitem{}\textsuperscript{15} Cf. Schiefner 1869: 241, fn.1. „mṭha’ gṇis sel ba, genauer im Tandjur B. Nu der Tantras Rdo rje theg pa’i mṭha’ gṇis sel ba (₄₄Enthüllung der beiden Enden des Vadschrājanā)“. Teramoto 1928: 325, fn.1. In his English translation, Chattopadhyaya also seems to regard mṭha’ gṇis sel ba’i bstan bcos as the name of some text, although he makes no particular remark on it. Cf. Chattopadhyaya 1970: 302, 9–10. “…” He was the author of śāstra Free From The Two Extremities…”.
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bcos means Jñānaśrīmitra’s bstan bcos, i.e. śāstra(s) dealing with the exclusion of two extreme views, since the use of mtha’ gñis sel ba for the abbreviation of VAN is well attested in various Tibetan sources.  

Another passage about mtha’ gñis sel ba is found in Sum pa mkhan po’s dPag bsam ljon bzaṅ:

“Jñānaśrīmitra, who was the second great central pillar (of the Vikramaśīla temple) and wrote mtha’ gñis sel ba’i bstan bcos, was born in Gaūḍā, …”

However, Jñānaśrīmitra’s biography following this passage is quite similar to that of Tāranātha. This suggests that Sum pa mkhan po might have borrowed some passages of Jñānaśrīmitra’s biography from Tāranātha, or at least, shared common source(s) with Tāranātha.

Even if these two Tibetan sources refer to Jñānaśrīmitra as the author of VAN, we should notice that Tāranātha does not mention Jñānaśrībhadra in his work at all. Furthermore, it is not quite clear how the Jñānaśrībhadra (or Yeṣes dpal bzaṅ po) is referred to in the dPag bsam ljon bzaṅ. Consequently, it is not impossible to suppose that Jñānaśrībhadra (or possibly other Jñānaśrīs) might have been confused with Jñānaśrīmitra in Tibetan tradition. In any case, at least, we can say for certain that the author of VAN was thought of as Jñānaśrīmitra in some Tibetan sources.

---

16 So far as we know, VAN is quoted as mtha’ gñis sel ba with the name of ‘Jñānaśrī’ in the following Tibetan sources:

(1) Bu ston rin chen grub
   a. rGyud sde spyi’i rnam gzag bsdzas pa rgyud sde rin po che’i gter sgo ‘byed pa’i lde mig
   b. rGyud sde spyi’i rnam par gzag pa rgyud sde thams cad kyi gsaṅ ba gsal bar byed pa
   c. rGyud sde spyi’i rnam par gzag pa rgyud sde rin po che’i mdzes rgyan
   d. rGyud sde’i zab don sgo ‘byed rin chen gces pa’i sde mig
   e. bDe mchog spyi rnam don gsal

(2) Tson kha pa
   a. sNyags rim
   b. gSangs snags tshul khrims

(3) Sum pa mkhan po’s dPag bsam ljon bzaṅ

In all these sources, however, no mention is made of ‘Jñānaśrīmitra’ or ‘Jñānaśrībhadra’. For VAN’s quotations into these Tibetan sources, cf. Kyuma et al. 2008 (Appendices): 67–87. Bu ston’s (a)–(c) are briefly mentioned in Eimer 1989: 27, fn.4.

17 Cf. dPag I 118,18f.: dbus kyi ka chen gñis pa mtha’ gñis sel ba mdzad pa po dzñā na śrī mi tra ni kau ṭar ‘khruns nas …

18 Although Tāranātha says that Jñānaśrīmitra knew many tantric works (cf. Schiefner 1868: 183,16: … gṣan sṅags kyi rgyud sde yān māṇ po mḵhyen / …), we have little evidence for the relationship between Jñānaśrīmitra and tantric Buddhism, and even for his situation in Vikramaśīla. According to the biography of
4 Synopsis of VAN and Some Important Topics

Before examining some important topics discussed in VAN, it will be useful to glance at a brief synopsis of the text:

1 (P128r2; D115r7): Purpose of Writing

2 (P128r3–7; D115v1–4): Two Types of Evidence for mantrayāna Being the Teaching of the Buddha Śākyamuni

   2-1 (P128r3–6; D115v1–4): Scriptural Evidence
   2-2 (P128r6–7; D115v4): Evidence by Reasoning

3 (P128r7–8; D115v4–6): Epithets Expressing Greatness of mantrayāna

3-1 (P128r8–v1; D115v6): Superiority of mantrayāna to pāramitāyāna Including the Madhyamaka Doctrine [as the Supreme One]

   3-1-1 (P128v1–3; D115v6–116r1): Eleven Kinds of Skillfulness in Means (thabs mkhas pa)
      3-1-1-1 (P128v3–5; D116r1–3): Reliance on the Supreme (Scriptural) Basis (dmigs pa bla na med pa la dmigs pa)
      3-1-1-2 (P128v5–6; D116r3): Supreme Accomplishment (sgrub pa bla na med pa)
      3-1-1-3 (P128v6–7; D116r3–4): Supreme Knowledge (ye sès bla na med pa)
      3-1-1-4 (P128v7; D116r4): Supreme Energy (brtson ’grus bla na med pa)
      3-1-1-5 (P128v7–8; D116r4–5): Ability to Include All Those to Be Instructed (gdul bya ma lus pa ’dzin par nus pa)
      3-1-1-6 (P128v8–129r1; D116r5–6): Abandonment of Impurities (ñon moṅs pa spoṅ ba)
      3-1-1-7 (P129r1–2; D116r6): Empowerment of Impurities (ñon moṅs pa byin gyis rlob pa)

‘Brog mi lo tsā ba, who is said to have received various teachings from pāṇḍitas at the Vikramaśīla temple, Jñānaśrīmitra told him “the instructions on protection from obstacles that disturb the body (lus ’khrugs kyi bar chad bsruñ ba’i man nag)”.
Cf. Davidson 2005: 172. In the same context, Jñānaśrīmitra is referred to in Stearns 2001 (in Part II, i.e., Tibetan text and English translation of the Bla ma dam pa’i lo rgyus): 87. “The two great central pillars are Ratnavajra and Jñānaśrīmitra. These two were called “pillars,” but they did not have greater qualities than the others.” Regarding the teachings ‘Brog mi received in Vikramaśīla, cf. also Stearns 2001: 208–209 (fn.22). Sa pan’s sDom gsum rab dbye also provides us with a short episode about Jñānaśrī’s debate with non-Buddhist sectarians. In this episode, however, it is not certain which Jñānaśrī is told. Cf. Rhoton 2002: 159–160.

The numbering of sections corresponds to that of our preliminary edition (cf. Kyuma et al. 2008). As for the folio-/line number, those of Peking and Derge are shown in the above synopsis.
Superiority of Vajrayāna, Part I

3-1-1-8 (P129r2–3; D116r6–7): Swiftness of Empowerment (byin gyis rlob pa myur ba)

3-1-1-9 (P129r3–5; D116r7–v2): Swift Emancipation (myur du 'byuṅ ba)

3-1-1-10 (P129r5; D116v2): Supreme Intention (bsam pa bla na med pa)

3-1-1-10-1 (P129r5–6; D116v2–3): Supreme Intention Connected with Body (sku la sbyar ba)

3-1-1-10-1-1 (P129r6–7; D116v3): Swift Abandonment of the Mental Imprints (bag chags myur du ldog pa)

3-1-1-10-1-2 (P129r7–v1; D116v3–5): Swift Abandonment of the Maturation of Actions (las kyi rnam par smin pa myur du ldog pa)

3-1-1-10-1-3 (P129v1–5; D116v5–117r1): Arising of a Great Mass of Merit (bsod nams kyi tshogs chen po skye ba)

3-1-1-10-1-4 (P129v1–5; D116v5–117r1): Entering Spontaneously into the Selflessness of Things (chos bdag med pa la raṅ bzin gyis 'jugs pa)

3-1-1-10-2 (P129v5–8; D117r1–4): Supreme Intention Connected with Speech (gsun la sbyar ba)

3-1-1-10-2-1 (P129v8–130r1; D117r4): Becoming a Reciter of the Supreme Speech of the Victorious One (rgyal ba'i bka' dam pa bton par 'gyur ba)

3-1-1-10-2-2 (P130r1–2; D117r4–5): Becoming Mindful of Teachings (chos rjes su dran par 'gyur ba)

3-1-1-10-2-3 (P130r1–2; D117r4–5): Having Faith in Teachings after Understanding Them (chos la šes nas dad par 'gyur ba)

3-1-1-10-2-4 (P130r2; D117r5): Establishment of Speech with True Words (nag bden pa'i tshig 'grub pa)

3-1-1-10-2-5 (P130r2–5; D117r6–v1): Attaining Means, Knowledge and Memory with Wisdom (šes rab daṅ ldan pa'i thabs daṅ ye šes daṅ dran pa 'thob pa)

3-1-1-10-2-6 (P130r5; D117v1): Attaining Singlepointedness in Contemplation (tiṅ ne 'dzin rtse gcig pa 'thob pa)

3-1-1-10-2-7 (P130r6; D117v1–2): Becoming a Worshipper of the Noble Ones ('phags pa mchod par 'gyur ba)

3-1-1-10-2-8 (P130r6; D117v1–2): Benefiting People ('gro ba'i don byas par 'gyur ba)

3-1-1-10-2-9 (P130r6–7; D117v2): Swift Accomplishment (of
the Desired Object) by Virtue of the Presence of Deity (lha ñe žiṅ grub pa myur bar ’gyur ba)
3-1-1-10-2-10 (P130r7–8; D117v2–3): Controlling All Things as an Illusion of Syllables (chos thams cad yi ge’i sgu ’phrul du dbaṅ sgyur bar ’gyur ba)
3-1-1-10-2-11 (P130r8; D117v3–4): Producing the Understanding That All Words Are like Echoes (sgra thams cad brag ca daṅ ’dra ba’i šes pa skye ba)
3-1-1-10-2-12 (P130r8–v2; D117v4–6): Entering Spontaneously into the Selflessness of Things (chos bdag med pa la raṅ bezin gyis ’jug par ’gyur ba)
3-1-1-10-3 (P130v2–131r6; D117v6–118v1): Supreme Intention Residing in Mind (thugs la gnas pa)
3-1-1-11 (P131r6–132r7; D118v1–119v1): Skillfulness in the Means of the Supreme Practice (spyod pa bla na med pa’i thabs mkhas pa)
3-1-1-11-1 (P131r6–v2; D118v1–4): Abandonment of the Practice Weakening the Faculty of a Practitioner (nus pa’i chuṅ bar byed pa’i spyod pa spoṅ ba)
3-1-1-11-2 (P131v2–132r2; D118v4–119r4): Abandonment of the Practice Distracting the Mind of a Practitioner (g-yeṅ bar byed pa’i spyod pa spoṅ ba)
3-1-1-11-3 (P132r2–7; D119r4–v1): Abandonment of the Practice Grasping Something as Existent (dṅos por ’dzin pa’i spyod pa spoṅ ba)
3-2 (P132r7–v2; D119v1–3): Greatness of mantrayāna as Vehicle of Means
4 (P132v2–4; D119v3–4): Definition of mantrayāna: Two Types of mantra
5 (P132v4–133r1; D119v4–120r1): Meaning of the Abandonment of Exclusion (skur pa, apavāda) and Superimposition (sgro ’dogs pa, samāropa)
5-1 (P132v4–6; D119v4–6): Meaning of the Abandonment of Exclusion
5-2 (P132v6–133r1; D119v6–120r1): Meaning of the Abandonment of Superimposition
6 (P133r1–2; D120r1–2): Concluding Verse
(Colophon: P133r2; D120r2)
4.1 Superiority of *mantrayāna* and Skillfulness in Means

For the purpose of assuring the legitimacy of *mantrayāna* in Buddhism, the text begins with proving by both scriptures (*agama*)\(^{20}\) and reasoning (*yukti*)\(^{21}\) that the teaching of *mantrayāna* never deviates from that of Śākyamuni. Following this proof, several epithets are given as representing the great characteristics of *mantrayāna*.\(^{22}\) In this context, however, the following question is raised: how is it possible to say that *mantrayāna* is superior to *pāramitāyāna*, especially to the Madhyamaka doctrine? In answer to this question, the author gives a detailed account of the skillfulness in eleven kinds of means, on which the superiority of *mantrayāna* to *pāramitāyāna* is founded. The above synopsis clearly shows that the greater part of the text is devoted to the explanations of these eleven kinds of means.\(^{23}\) It is noteworthy that the author puts so much emphasis on skillfulness

---


\(^{21}\) This reasoning is as follows: *mantrayāna* is common to the teaching of Buddha in that it accomplishes the benefit of self and others (*bdag dan gzan gyi don*), by basing itself on the twofold truth. For this argument, cf. Kyuma et al. 2008: 32 and 50. A similar kind of passage is found in TriYāVya 54,5–6: ... *bden pa gnis las bga' shig kyi don phun sum tshogs par sgrub pa la dbye bar med pas so* // “... For there is no difference (between the profound and great vehicle, i.e., *mantrayāna*, and the profound vehicle, i.e., *pāramitāyāna*) in that (both vehicles,) by means of residing in the twofold truth, accomplishes the benefit of self and others perfectly.” This passage does not directly legitimate *mantrayāna* as the teaching of the Buddha, but emphasizes the non-difference between *mantrayāna* and *pāramitāyāna*. For the relationship between the twofold truth and the two vehicles, cf. also TriYāVya 54,9–10: *don dam pa'i bde don phid la ni nam yan dbye ba* 'ga' shig kyi don phun sum tshogs par sgrub pa la dbye bar 'gyur ba'o // “Although, in the ultimate truth, there never arises a difference (between the profound vehicle and the profound and great vehicle), only in (the level of) convention, there arise the profound (vehicle) and the (profound and) great (vehicle)”. In tantric context, *samvrtisatya* and *paramārthasatya* are often related to *utpattikrama* and *nispannakrama* respectively. Cf. Isaacson 2002: 467–469. In this regard, cf. also SeUd v.9: *satyadvayena dharmānāṁ deśanā vajrīna mama / lokasamvrtisyayena satyena paramārthataḥ* // “I, the vajra-holder, teach dharma by means of the twofold truth, i.e., the conventional truth and the ultimate truth.”

\(^{22}\) The following is the epithets of *mantrayāna* mentioned in 3 of the synopsis: *rdo rje’i theg pa* (*vajrayāna*), *bras bu’i theg pa* (*phalayāna*), thabs kyi theg pa (*upādayāna*), gsan ba’i theg pa (*guyayāna*). It is with regard to thabs kyi theg pa (more exactly speaking, *thab kyi che ba*, i.e., the fact that *mantrayāna* has the great means) that the author introduces the concept of skillfulness in eleven kinds of means.

\(^{23}\) Among them, both ‘the means of supreme intention’ (3-1-1-10: *bsam pa bla na med pa*) and ‘the means of supreme practice’ (3-1-1-11: *spyod pa bla na med pa*) are discussed at length. The latter is carefully discussed by Dr Tanemura’s article in this volume.
in means (upāyakauśalya), even though it is not the title of this work.²⁴

4.2 Greatness of mantrayāna

With regard to the superiority of mantrayāna, the concept of skillfulness in eleven kinds of means seems to be more or less relevant to the greatnesses of mahāyāna mentioned in the Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra: (1) the greatness of (scriptural) basis (ālambanamahattva), (2) the greatness of conduct (pratipattimahattva), (3) the greatness of knowledge (jñānamahattva), (4) the greatness of undertaking endeavour (vīrārambhamahattva), (5) the greatness of skillfulness in means (upāyakauśalyamahattva), (6) the greatness of excelling (in various properties of the Buddha) (samudāgamamahattva), (7) the greatness of actions of the Buddha (buddhakarmamahattva).²⁵ Among these seven kinds of greatness, (1) is clearly equivalent to the first means of VAN (3-1-1-1: dmigs pa bla na med pa la dmigs pa), since the abundance of scriptural basis is emphasized in both cases.²⁶ (3) and (4) are, at least literally, correspondent to the third (3-1-1-3: ye śes bla na med pa) and fourth (3-1-1-4: brtson 'grus bla na med pa) respectively.²⁷ From these facts one may say that the author of VAN was influenced by the concept of the greatnesses of mahāyāna in accounting for the superiority of mantrayāna.²⁸

²⁴ In later Tibetan tradition, several authors, such as Tripitakamāla, Ratnākaraśanti and our Jñānaśrī, are mentioned in the context of explaining how mantrayāna is superior to pāramitāyāna. As said above, this is one of deciding factors in reconstructing the history of late Indian Buddhism. For several kinds of mantrayāna’s superiority given by these authors, cf. Hopkins 2005: 13ff.; Guarisco / McLeod 2005: 79; Rhoton 2002: 182, n.1. Regarding Bu ston and Kṣṇa sprul yon tan rgya mtsho’s references to Jñānaśrī, cf. Kyuma et al. 2008: 67 (Appendices).

²⁵ Cf. MaSuA 171 (XIX vv.59–60): ālambanamahattvam ca pratipatter dvayos tathā / jñānasya vīrārambhasya upāye kauśalyasya ca // (59) udāgamamahattvam ca buddhakarmanah / etan mahattvayogādahi mahāyānam nirucyate // (60) I thank Prof. Isaacson for his valuable advice about this similarity.

²⁶ Cf. MaSuA: 171,14–15: saptavidhamahattvayogān mahāyānam ity ucycate. ālambanamahattvenāpramānānivistarṇasūtrādiriddharmayogāt... “(It) is called the great vehicle, since (it) is endowed with seven kinds of greatness: (it is called the great vehicle,) since (it) is endowed, by means of the greatness of (scriptural) basis, with the teachings of immeasurable and extensive scriptures and so on...”

²⁷ On the other hand, the second one (pratipattimahattva), which is paraphrased as accomplishing the benefit of self and others (Cf. MaSuA: 171,15), seems to be closer to the context of 2-2 of the synopsis. It goes without saying that the fifth one (upāyakauśalyamahattva) is associated with ‘the skillfulness in eleven kinds of means’ itself of VAN.

²⁸ We must also draw attention to the fact that three kinds of supremacy (ānuttarya) of mahāyāna, i.e., those with regard to pratipatti, ālambana and samudāgama, are enumerated in MaVi 5.1a–c. Cf. also Hayashi 1996: 56, fn. 72. In this case, however, ālambana is rendered by Sthiramati with dharma such as pāramitādi or dharmadhātu (cf. MaViṬī 199,23–200,1). Bodhisattvabhūmi also enumerates seven kinds of greatness, but they are slightly different from those in the Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra (cf. BoSaBhū 297,7ff.): (1) the greatness of dharma
4.3 Difference between mantrayāna and the Madhyamaka doctrine

Another important issue in VAN is the way in which the author discriminates between mantrayāna and the Madhyamaka doctrine. This topic appears in 3-1-1-10-3 (thugs la gnas pa’i bsam pa bla na med pa). The author’s argument can be summarized as follows: when the supreme intention resides in the practitioner’s mind, they always abide in seeing everything just like an illusion (māyopamādraṣṭī). Quoting a verse from the Pañcakrama, the author emphasizes the importance of this meditative condition. Although the teaching of māyopama is, according to the author, taught in the Madhyamaka doctrine too, mantrayāna is different from the Madhyamaka doctrine in that the former never loses māyopamādraṣṭī by virtue of the pledge (dam tshig) of mind. Since māyopamādraṣṭī is unbreakable (mi phyed pa), mantrayāna has the name of the diamond vehicle (rdo rje’i theg pa), and is faster than the other paths. In the case of the Madhyamaka doctrine, however, māyopamādraṣṭī arises only rarely because of the lack of pledge.

As discussed above, it is mainly by means of skillfulness in means that the author explains the superiority of mantrayāna to pāramitāyāna including the Madhyamaka doctrine. Added to this aspect, it is noteworthy that the existence of pledge is also highlighted as a factor essential to the superiority of mantrayāna.

4.4 Two Extremes with regard to the Diamond Vehicle

Even though the superiority of mantrayāna plays a major part in the text, the author’s main purpose consists, as is suggested by the title of this text, in reject-

(dharmamahātva), (2) the greatness of arising the mind (pursuing the awakening) (citotpādamahātva), (3) the greatness of belief (adhimuktimahātva), (4) the greatness of intention (adhyāśayamahātva), (5) the greatness of requisite (sambhāramahātva), (6) the greatness of time (kālamahātva), (7) the greatness of excelling (in various properties of the Buddha) (samudāgamamahātva). As for (1), it is also paraphrased as bodhisattvapīṭakavaiśalya. This would be similar to ālambanamahātva enumerated in the Mahāyānasūtrālamākāra.

29 This ‘supreme intention (bsam pa bla na med pa)’ connects itself with practitioner’s body, speech and mind, and in each case, it bestows various virtues on him.

30 PaKra III 33: bhunātra kim uktena vajrayāne tu tattvatah / yad yad ālambayed yogī tāt tān māyaiva kalpayet // “What is the use of speaking much about this? The truth of the diamond vehicle is (as follows): whatever a yogin takes as object, he considers all of that as an illusion.” For this English translation, see Kyuma et al. 2008: 58.

31 In the same context, the need of pledge is also linked with the fact that mantrayāna is suitable for those whose faculties are excellent (tīksṣṇendriya).

32 It may be relevant to note that this argument is introduced by Tson kha pa in his gSan snags tshul khrims. Cf. Kyuma et al. 2008 (Appendices): 83. For English translation, cf. Sparham 2005: 105ff.
ing the two extreme views with regard to mantrayāna. The two extreme views given near the end of the text (5 of the synopsis) are summarized as follows:

*apavāda (skur pa): to exclude inferior people (mchog ma yin pa) from those to be instructed (gdul bya)

*samāropa (sgro 'dogs pa): to suppose any difference with regard to the proper accomplishment of fruit ('bras bu yan dag par grub pa) and the path (lam)  

Both of two extremes are concerned with mantrayāna’s soteriology, but it is slightly strange that they do not have the same stratum (ādhāra): while the apavāda deals with those to be instructed, the samāropa argues the non-difference regarding the proper accomplishment of fruit and the path. Concerning the samāropa, any superimposition is denied on the grounds that the whole world and all beings are, from the beginning, pervaded by Buddha’s body and knowledge.

More noteworthy is that two kinds of interpretation are given to the term mantra in relation to the apavāda:

(1) the essential or natural mantra (no bo ņid kyi gsaṅ sṅags), in which means and wisdom are identical with each other

(2) the metaphorical or constructed mantra (btags pa'i gsaṅ sṅags), i.e., an assembly of deity, mantra, seal (mudrā), ritual (karman), contemplation, worship and praise

According to the author, this dichotomy of mantra corresponds to the following two kinds of those to be instructed respectively:

(1) superior people (mchog), who are supposed to accomplish all the above-mentioned eleven kinds of means

(2) inferior people (mchog ma yin pa), who are not always capable of accomplishing all of them

It is in this context that the author defines apavāda as the exclusion of inferior people from those to be instructed.  

Interestingly enough, the same kind of relationship between mantrayāna and those to be instructed is mentioned with the name of VAN in the dPag bsam ljon bzaṅ:

33 Taking into account that the path (mārga) is discussed as one of the main topics in 5-2 of the synopsis, we emended las (P132v6; D119v6) into lam in our preliminary edition.

34 In 3-1-1-5 of the synopsis, mantrayāna is described as including even Canḍāla or Venukāra into those to be instructed. This fact is enumerated as one of the skillfulness in means.
“Even within the mahāyāna, the two (teachings) are taught for the sake of two kinds of those to be instructed (vineya): pāramitāyāna as the common mahāyāna (is taught for the sake of) those to be instructed, who are intent on (the teaching) which regards the cause as path, and who are less intelligent than those to be instructed in the mantrayāna. mantra- or vajrayāna (is taught for the sake of) superior minds who are intent on (the teaching) in which the fruit is regarded as path. (The following) is taught in the mDo sde gdams niḥ ‘bog pa’i rgyal po

After having set well in motion the running of the wheel of dharma, (for the sake of those who are) engaged in the cause, the Diamond Vehicle, a shorter road, will arise in future. — Thus (it is) taught in the mtha’ gñis sel ba too.

Here Sum pa mkhan po divides mahāyāna into pāramitāyāna and mantrayāna, relating inferior people to the former, and superior people to the latter. Although it is not clear that the author of VAN regards inferior people as belonging to pāramitāyāna, it is not unreasonable to suppose from the last sentence of the above passage that Sum pa mkhan po’s argument was more or less influenced by the content of VAN.

5 Concluding Remarks

What has been examined above leads us to the following conclusions:

(1) VAN is ascribed to Jñānaśrimitra by Tāranātha and Sum pa mkhan po, although the colophon of VAN mentions ‘Jñānaśrī’ as its author

(2) The greater part of VAN is dedicated to the explanation of skillfulness in means (thabs la mkhas pa), by which the superiority of mantrayāna to pāramitāyāna is guaranteed

(3) The idea of skillfulness in means could be derived partly from that of the greatnesses of mahāyāna

(4) Regarding the superiority of mantrayāna to the Madhyamaka doctrine, the author of VAN puts emphasis on mantrayāna’s concept of ‘pledge (dam tshig) of mind’, by means of which māyopadamrśti is well stabilized and

---

35 This source, which is yet to be identified, is curiously quoted with the name of gSaṅ ba luṅ bstan pa’i mdo (‘Guhyavyākaraṇasūtra) in VAN. It is not impossible to regard this source as a certain tantric text pretending to be āgama. For the influence of this source in Tibetan tradition, cf. Karmay 1998.

36 Cf. dPag I 58,25–59,2: theg chen la yaṅ gdul bya rgyu lam du byed pa la mos pa snags kyi gdul bya la llos te blo dman pa daṅ ’bras bu lam du byed pa la mos pa blo mchog gñis kyi don theg chen thun mon pa phar phyin theg pa daṅ gsaṅ snags rdo rje theg pa gñis su gsuns te / mdo sde gdams niḥ ‘bog pa’i rgyal po las — rgyu la mos pa rgyu chos kyi (emended: kyis) / ’khor lo rab tu bskor byas nas / rdo rje theg pa ne lam žig / ma’o’ns dus na ’byun bar ’gyur / žes dan / mtha’ gñis sel bar yan de ltar bsad do //

37 For the relationship between mahāyāna and mantrayāna, Cf. also fn.5.
becomes unbreakable (because of this firmness, mantrayāṇa is also called the diamond vehicle)

(5) Both two extreme views with regard to the diamond vehicle are relevant to mantrayāṇa’s soteriology: in mantrayāṇa one should neither exclude inferior people from those to be instructed, nor superimpose any difference with regard to the proper accomplishment of fruit and the path

(6) In relation to the argument about those to be instructed, two types of interpretation are given to the term mantra

From these points we might first go on to an even more detailed examination of the authorship of VAN. This also means that we will have to reflect on how VAN can be associated with Jñānaśrīmira’s (or possibly Jñānaśrībhadra’s, or even other Jñānaśrīs’) other works. Moreover, it would also be necessary to consider to what extent VAN has been esteemed in Tibetan tradition. Judging from Bu ston and Tson kha pa’s references to VAN, it seems to be quite clear that this text has been referred to as one of important sources when the superiority of mantrayāṇa to pāramitāyāṇa is proved.
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Superiority of Vajrayāna
— Part II: Superiority of the Tantric Practice Taught in the *Vajrayānāntadvayānirākaraṇa (rDo rje theg pa’i mtha’ gṅis sel ba) —

Ryugen TANEMURA

1 Opening Remarks

As stated in Part I by Prof. Taiken KYUMA, Jñānaśrī devotes the most part of the Vajrayānāntadvayānirākaraṇa (VAN) to the arguments of the eleven kinds of skilfulness in means (*upāyakausalya) by which the Vajrayāna is superior to the non-tantric Mahāyāna, i.e. the Pāramitāyāna in general and Madhyamaka in particular. The eleventh upāyakausalya is the fact that the tantric practice (*caryā, spyod pa) is superior in respect that it excludes the following three kinds of wrong practice: (1) practices which weaken the faculties of a practitioner, (2) practices which distract the mind of a practitioner, and (3) practices which cause a practitioner to grasp things as existent. In other words, Jñānaśrī tries to justify the following three matters: (1) tantric Buddhism allows a practitioner’s desire, or it takes a negative attitude towards the traditional Buddhist asceticism, (2) tantric Buddhism takes a negative attitude towards external actions such as worship of a stūpa or caitya and recitation of a scripture, and (3) the tantric practice involves consumption of impure substances. The author argues that these three kinds of practice, which transgress the traditional Buddhist moral precepts and the boundary of purity, are superior in the respect that they are powerful ways which lead a practitioner to the goal, i.e. attainment of enlightenment very swiftly.¹ The latter half of this paper examines the backgrounds of Jñānaśrī’s arguments concerning the superiority of the tantric practice.

¹ For the teaching that tantric caryā leads a practitioner to the goal, i.e. enlightenment very swiftly, see MuĀv ad HeTa 1.6.1: ubhayatattvayogād api samayair vinā na śīhrataram bodhiḥ syāt. ataś caryāpaṭalam āha — ataḥ param ityādinā. sarvabuddhājñayā duskaravratacaraṇam caryā. (MS A f.41r3–4, MS B folio missing. I follow the reading of Isaacson’s preliminary edition. Cf. SED p.60, ll.10–11. SED reads sarvabuddhoktā yā for sarvabuddhājñayā.) (Trsl.) ‘Even if [the initiate is performing his practice] based on the two stages (= utpattikrama and nispannakrama), he does not attain the enlightenment more swiftly without the post-initiatory observance (samayaiḥ). Thus [the Blessed One] teaches the chapter of the caryā beginning with [the phrase] ‘after that.’ The caryā is keeping the observance difficult to keep, by command of all Buddhas.’ YoRaMā ad HeTa 1.6.1: caryayā vinā nāsti śīhratārā bodhir iti tām āha. (SED p.119, ll.9–10) (Trsl.) ‘A practitioner does not attain enlightenment more swiftly without the post-initiatory practice. [The Blessed One] therefore teaches it [in this chapter].’
2 The tantric practice excludes the practice which weakens faculties of a practitioner

Before discussing the three respects in which tantric practice is superior to that of the Pàramitàyàna, I would like to point out that “practice (*caryà)” mentioned in this part of the VAN means the post-initiatory practice which an initiate of tantric Buddhism is permitted to perform. This caryà is sometimes used as a synonym of samaya or samayàcàra (post-initiatory observance).

Jñànaśrî’s argument concerning the first point is as follows. If a practitioner nourishes his body and make it powerful, his mind will be joyful. When his mind and body become very powerful, he can control himself by meritorious actions (*dge ba spyad pa). On the other hand, if a practitioner torments his body, his mind will not be joyful. If his mind is weakened, he cannot control himself no matter how he makes his body powerful. Buddha taught the traditional asceticism such as twelve dhùtagunàs for practitioners with inferior faculties. Jñànaśrî quotes Guhysamàjatàntra (GuSaTa) 7.3 as a scriptural support of his position, i.e. a negative attitude towards religious practices which torment the body of a practitioner. The similar arguments are found in the Guhyasamàjà corpus. Candrakirti comments upon GuSaTa 7.2–7.3 in his Pradìpoddyotàna (PraUd) as follows:

GuSaTa 7.2: sarvakàmopabhogais tu sevyàmànair yathecchataḥ |
svādhiśaivatayogena svām pāraṁś ca prapūjayet

PraUd ad GuSaTa 7.2: evaṁ prapañcacakavyaṁ nirdiśya nisprapañcacakavyām adhi-
kṛtyāḥ — sarvetyāḥ. yathaechathā ity ātmechānurūpātaḥ. yathāsukham anu-
bhūyamānaṁ pañcakāmagnuṁśvātmānāṁ pāraṁś ca pūjayet tarpayet. katha-
mś? svādhiśaivatayogena māyopamasamādhīnā.

(Trs. of PraUd) Having taught the practice with elaboration (prapañcacakavyā) in
this way, [the Blessed One] intends [to teach] the practice without elaboration
(nisprapañcacakavyā) and says sarva` etc. “At the [practitioner’s] will” means “follow-
ing his own wish.” [That is to say,) he should worship, i.e. please himself and
others by enjoying the five desired objects of the sense faculties at his will. How?
By the yoga of his chosen deity, i.e. the concentration [to realise that everything
is] like illusion.

GuSaTa 7.3: duṣkarair niyamais tuvairī sevyamāno na sidhyati |
sarvakāmopabhogais tu sevayamś cāsu sidhyati ||

PraUd ad GuSaTa 7.3: ata eva āha — duṣkarai r ityādi. kāyaklamayogena vīhārā-
dinivartanāni duṣkarānī vrksamālādīvadādhiṭātgaṇaṁī. niyamaṁ giripata-
ṇāgni-praveśādīnī. tīvraṁ kāsthāni. etaiḥ sevyamānāḥ pidyamāno na sidhyati,
bodhiṁ na labhate. tarhi katham ity āha, sarvakāmopabhogais tu sevayann ā-
śu sidhyatīti. sarvaiḥ kāmyante prārthyaṁ iti sarvakāmāḥ, teśāṁ upabhogaṁ
carvan mahāvajradharam ārādhyann āśu ihaiva janmani mahāmudrāsiddhi-
lābhi bhavati. yathārūtam nisprapañca-cakavyā.

(Trs. of PraUd) For this very reason, [the Blessed One] teaches [the verse] begin-
ning with duṣkaraiḥ. Ascetic practices means those which avoid pleasure etc. by
the body-tormenting yoga, i.e. the twelve dhūtāguṇas such as sitting under a tree.
Observance means falling down from a mountain, entering fire etc. Tīrṇa (en-
durable) is paraphrased as kāṣṭha. If [the practitioner] is affected (seyamānah),
i.e. tormented, by these [ascetic] practices, then he does not attain the accomplish-
ment, i.e. does not attain enlightenment. If so, how can he [attain enlightenment]?
[The Blessed One] says “If he does practice enjoying all desired objects, he will at-
tain the accomplishment quickly.” Sarvakāma should be understood to be those
which are desired or longed for by all people. If he does practice, i.e. worships
the Great Vajra Holder, enjoying these, he will attain the accomplishment of the
Great Seal quickly, i.e. in this life. This is the practice without elaboration, and
[this part of the tantra should be interpreted] literally.

---

4 svām pāraṁś || FED; parāṅgaṁś MUD
5 For the three kinds of practice, i.e. the practice with elaboration (prapañcacakavyā),
 the practice without elaboration (nisprapañcacakavyā), and the practice absolutely
 free from elaboration (atyantinisprapañcacakavyā), see below.
6 dhūtāguṇaṁ || em.; “vrata-guṇaṁ” CED
7 giripatanāgni-praveśādīnī || em. following YoMaPaKraṬi; giripātanāgni-praveśādīnī
 CED
8 For yathārūta (literal interpretation), one of the śaṭkotī of the PraUd, see PraUd:
 maṇḍalādiprakalpeṣu caryāyāṁ ca yathāyatham | uttānāṁ arthakathanam tad
The above-quoted verses of the GuSaTa and the passages of the PraUd teach that a practitioner should enjoy the five desired objects agreeable to the sense faculties, not practicing asceticism like the twelve dhūtagunas. Jñānaśrī states that the reason why a practitioner should abandon the traditional asceticism is that such asceticism causes distraction of a practitioner’s mind, which in turn causes failure in attaining the accomplishment. This teaching is found in the Caryāmelāpakapradīpa (CaMePra), one of the principal exegeses of the so-called Ārya-school of the GuSaTa:

CaMePra ch.9: 

\[\text{ato visiṣṭat kāraṇād visiṣṭam eva kāryam utpadyate. evam eva} \]
\[\text{rūpādayo viṣayāḥ}^9 \text{ paribhogabhāvam āpadyamānā viṣiṣṭaphalāvāhakā bha-} \]
\[\text{vantity avagantavyam.}^10 \text{ anyathā duśkaracaryaya}^11 \text{ cittasyaikāgratā na bhavati,} \]
\[\text{pañcendriyanigrahavatvāt. yathoktaṃ bhagavatā śrīparamādyamahāyogantre} \]
\[\text{—} \]
\[\text{duśkarair niyamais tīvrait mūrtiḥ śuṣyati duḥkhhitā |} \]
\[\text{duḥkhād vikṣipyate cittaṃ vikṣepatāt siddhir anyathā ||} \]
\[\text{iti. mūlatantre 'py āha —} \]
\[\text{duśkarair niyamais tīvraitā sevyaṃno na sidhyati}^12 | \]
\[\text{sarvakāmopabhogais tu sevayamś cāsu sidhyati}^13 || \text{(GuSaTa 7.3)} \]

(Trsl.) For this reason, a distinguished cause brings a distinguished outcome. In the very same way, it should be understood that the objects of the sense faculties such as rūpa, if they reach the state of enjoyment, i.e. if they are agreeable, bring a distinguished outcome. Otherwise, if he practises the endurable ascetic practices, his mind is not concentrated, since it damages the five sense faculties. This is as taught in the Great Yogatantra named Śrīparamādyā: “By practising asceticism and keeping endurable observance, the body [of a practitioner] is pained and [therefore] weakened. If [the body] is pained, the mind becomes distracted. If the mind is distracted, the accomplishment is not realised.” [This is] also taught in the root scripture: “A practitioner does not attain the accomplishment by keeping the observances of severe asceticism that are hard to practice. He attain the accomplishment swiftly depending upon the enjoyment of all desire (or desired objects).”

The author of the CaMePra “quotes” a verse from the Paramādyā (PaĀ) as a
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scriptural support of his position. Although a similar teaching is found in the Paṅga, the verse quoted in the CaMePra is not found in the Paṅgā\. I quote the relevant part of the Paṅgā below:\^16

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Paṅgā: } & \text{de la ci}\text{\(^17\) litar phyag rgya thams cad dan rnal 'byor dag rjes su sgrub pa yin } \\
& \text{ze na |}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{phyag rgya skus}\text{\(^18\) ni brtan pa'i phyir } & \text{\| de yaṅ bde bas brtan par 'gyur } \\
\text{sdug bsñal gyis ni g-yo bar 'gyur } & \text{\| yaṅ na 'chi ba thob par 'gyur } \\
\text{de ni rnal 'byor sems las 'byun } & \text{\| yid bde ba yis rab tu sgrub } \\
\text{yid mi bde bas g-yo ba 'am } & \text{\| yaṅ na 'gog pa}\text{\(^19\) thob par 'gyur } \\
\text{de phyir 'bad pa thams cad kyi } & \text{\| phyag rgya rnal 'byor rjes grub byed } \\
\text{dka' thub med cin ņes pa med } & \text{\| bde ba dga' bas bsgrub bar bya |}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{žes bya ba śin tu gsan ba bcom ldan 'das rdo rje sms dpas gsuṅs so } \| \text{de la dam tshig thams cad kyi rnal 'byor rjes su sgrub pa' bde ba de}\text{\(^20\) gaṅ yin ņe na |}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{'dod pa kun la lons spyod cin } & \text{\| ci 'dod par ni bsten pa}\text{\(^21\) yis } \\
\text{raṅ gi lha yi rnal 'byor gyis}\text{\(^22\) } & \text{\| bdag daṅ gzan rnams mchod par gyis}\text{\(^23\) |}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{žes bya ba' a}\text{\(^24\) } \| \text{de bźin gšegs pa thams cad}\text{\(^25\) mchog tu gsan ba bla na med pa'i theg pa chen po'}\text{\(^26\) rnal 'byor bcom ldan 'das rdo rje sms dpas mchog tu bde ba žes bya' o}\text{\(^27\) } \| \text{de la dam tshig thams cad kyi rnal 'byor rjes su sgrub pa de}\text{\(^28\) gaṅ yin žes na |}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dka' thub ņes pa mi zad pas}\text{\(^29\) } & \text{\| sdug bsñal ldan pas myur du skams } \\
\text{sdug bsñal gyis ni sms g-yeṅ 'gyur } & \text{\| rnal 'byor la ni sbyor ba min |}
\end{align*}
\]


\(^{16}\text{The first half and the second half of this scripture is translated as different two texts in the Tibetan canon (Paṅgā\textsubscript{Tib} and PaṅgāMaKaKhā\textsubscript{Tib}). The first half corresponds to Chapters 1–13 and the second half to Chapters 14–25 of the Chinese translation (Matsunaga 1998: 199). A ritual manual called bDe ba chen po rdo rje gsaṅ ba'i rtog pa'i rgyal po chen po is inserted in the beginning of the latter half (PaṅgāMaKaKhā\textsubscript{Tib}, Paṅgā ch.14) (Matsunaga 1998: 214). The part quoted below is included in the latter half.}\)

\(^{17}\text{ci }\text{Tog P D; ji sTog}\)

\(^{18}\text{skus }\text{Tog P D}\)

\(^{19}\text{yaṅ na 'gog pa }\text{Tog P D yaṅ 'gog pa yaṅ sTog}\)

\(^{20}\text{bde ba de }\text{Tog sTog; de ba P D}\)

\(^{21}\text{bsten pa }\text{Tog P D; brten pa sTog}\)

\(^{22}\text{gyis }\text{sTog P D}\)

\(^{23}\text{'dod pa . . . mchod par gyis }\text{Tog P D; bya'o P}\)

\(^{24}\text{bya ba' o }\text{sTog D; bya'o P}\)

\(^{25}\text{thams cad }\text{sTog; thams cad kyi P D}\)

\(^{26}\text{theg pa chen po'i }\text{sTog; theg pa chen po'i yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub theg pa chen po'i yaṅ chen po'i P D}\)

\(^{27}\text{žes bya'o }\text{sTog; žes bya ba'o P D}\)

\(^{28}\text{rjes su sgrub pa de }\text{sTog; rjes su sgrub pa P D}\)

\(^{29}\text{mi zad pas sTog P; mi bzad pas D}\)
(Trsl.) [Question:] In this case, how all seals and yoga can be accomplished?

[Vajrasattva answers:] Because the seals are stable by the body, they also become stable by comfort (*sukha, bde ba), and unstable by pain (*duḥkha, sdug bsnal) [like the body]. They are also destroyed [by pain]. They arise from the mind in contemplation (yoga), and are accomplished by comfortable mind. They become unstable or even annihilated by uncomfortable mind. Therefore, [a practitioner] should accomplish the seals and the contemplation very carefully ('dod pa thams cad kis). The [seals and the contemplation] are accomplished neither by practices difficult to perform nor by observance (*niyama, ņes pa). [They are accomplished] by comfort [of the body] and joy [of the mind].

Thus the very esoteric [teaching] has been given by the Blessed One, Vajrasattva.

---

30 de || sTog D; bde P
31 This short line is reminiscent of the umattavrata (the Observance of the Madman). Cf. GuSi 5.18: kvacid dhasan kvacij jalpan kvacid gevam tu kārayet | kvacin nṛtyan kvacit sphoṭan kvacin nānārutānī tu || (S Ed p.40, ll.15–16) For the umattavrata see TANEMURA forthcoming.
32 gaṅ yan de run zi bžin te || sTog; gaṅ daṅ de ru ci bžin de P; gaṅ daṅ de ru ji bžin de D
33 sam || P D; pa sTog
34 ŋan || sTog D; ran P
35 mchod || sTog D; mchod P
36 yid || sTog D; yin ba P
[Question:] In this case, what is the comfort that accomplishes the yoga of all observances? [Vajrasattva answers:]

[A practitioner] should worship himself and others with enjoyment of all desires he experiences by the yoga of his chosen deity at his will.

The yoga of the highest Mahāyāṇa which is the most esoteric [teaching] of all Tathāgatas is the best comfort of the Blessed One, Vajrasattva. [Question:] In this case, what is the accomplishment of the yoga of all observances? [The Blessed One answers:]

[The body of a practitioner] is soon weakened by wrong practices which are difficult to perform, severe and painful. The mind of [a practitioner] becomes distracted by the pain, and it cannot engage itself in yoga.

He should therefore act as he wishes, eat everything as food, do actions as he wishes, and perform [the post-initiatory] practice (*caryā, spyod pa) as he wishes.

He should wander about in every place. He should laugh or speak [meaninglessly]. Not entering a mandala, whatever it may be, or committing sins, he should have the yoga of his chosen deity as his nature.

[As the physical actions mentioned above,] he should do so with regard to speech (= verbal actions). By this very yoga, everything should indeed be accomplished.

He is not damaged by any wrong practice and sinful [action] by any means. Having all great desires as his nature, he will attain the supreme sovereignty. The eminent, supreme sovereign is the king of all vajra-holders. If being a Buddha and a Bodhisattva is easy to be attained by this yoga, how much more words do you say about [various lower] accomplishments and excellent actions? He accomplishes supreme, efficacious siddhi (*amoghaparamasiddhi, don yod mchog tu grub pa) and all seals. This auspicious yoga which removes all pains is the supreme, unchangeable one.

Thus the Blessed One, Vajrasattva has taught the supreme, comfortable mind.

In the above quotation, first Vajrasattva teaches the following, answering the question “how all seals and yoga can be accomplished?” Since the seals stable by the body, they become stable by comfort and unstable by pain just like the body. They also arise from the mind in contemplation (yoga), so they are accomplished by comfortable mind. The seals and yoga are accomplished neither by actions difficult to do nor by observance. They are accomplished by comfort of the body and by joy of the mind. Secondly, answering the question “what is the comfort to accomplish the yoga of all observances,” Vajrasattva teaches that a practitioner should worship himself and others with enjoyment of all desires he experiences...
by the yoga of his chosen deity at his will. This is the same verse as GuSaTa 7.2. Thirdly, Vajrasattva teaches practice of the yoga of all observances (dam tshig thams cad rnal 'byor). Practice of yoga is impossible if a practitioner tortures his body, since such body-tormenting practices cause distraction of mind. He should act as he wishes. Having all great desires as his nature, he attains the supreme sovereign, i.e. the state of King of Vajradhara. This is called the supreme, comfortable mind.

The verse which the CaMePra “quotes” from the PaĀ is not found in the PaĀ itself, but Tattvasiddhi (TaSi) attributed to Śāntarakṣita also “quote” it from the PaĀ.

TaSi: tathā coktāṃ śriparamādye —
ātma vai sarvabuddhatvam sarvasauritvam eva ca |
svādhidaivatayogena tasmād ātmaiva sādhayet ||
duṣkarair niyamais tivrait mūrtiḥ śuṣyati duḥkhītā |
duḥkhīḥ *vikṣepyat cittaṁ vikṣepāt siddhir anyathā ||
manomūrtidṝhatvāc ca sarvasaukhyam dṝdhīhavet |
duḥkhaś calanam āyāti nirodhaś cāpi gacchati ||

(MS f.40r6-8)

(Trsl.) In the same way, the Śriparamādyā also teaches as follows:

It is [a practitioner] himself who is all Buddhas and all heroes(?). He should therefore accomplish himself by the yoga of his chosen deity. By practising asceticism and keeping endurable observance, his body is pained and [therefore] weakened. If [the body] is pained, the mind becomes distracted. If the mind is distracted, the accomplishment is not realised. By comfort of the mind and the body, all comfort becomes stable. [On the other hand,] it becomes unstable and also annihilated (nirodhaś cāpi gacchati) by the pain.

The same set of verses is found also in Nāgārjuna’s commentary on the GuSaTa with some variants.

---

37 This verse is found in the Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinijālasanvaratantra (SaBuSaYoDāJaSaTa). See SaBuSaYoDāJaSaTa: bdag ſnid sans rgyas thams cad dān || dpa’ bo thams cad bdag yin no || de bas bdag ſnid lhar sbyor bas || bdag ſnid rab tu bsgrub par bya || (sTog f.242r4–5, P f.165r6, D f.152r7) The CaMePra quotes this verse mentioning the SaBuSaYoDāJaSaTa as the source. CaMePra ch.2: śrīsa-rvabuddhasamāyogadākinijālasanvararamahāyogatantre ’pīmam artham dyotayan āhā — na yogaḥ pratibimbetu niṣākādiṣu jāyate | bodhicittamahāyogād yoginaḥ tena devatāḥ || ātma vai sarvabuddhatvam satvāsauritvam eva ca | svādhi- vaijñatayogena tasmād ātmaiva sādhayet || iti. (WED p.365, 1.16–p.366, 1.4, SED p.19,11.1–6)

38 Perhaps ātmaiva should be understood as ātma (neuter accusative) + eva rather than ātma + eva. Judging from the context, ātman should be the object of the verb sādhayet.
It is [a practitioner] himself who is all Buddhas and a son of Buddha. He should therefore accomplish himself by the yoga of his chosen deity. By practising asceticism and keeping endurable observance, his body is pained and [therefore] weakened. If [the body] is pained, the mind becomes distracted. If the mind is distracted, the accomplishment is not realised. Because of stability of the mind and the body, comfort of himself becomes stable. [On the other hand,] it becomes unstable and also destructed by the pain.

Perhaps this set of verses is a versified summary of the passages of the Pañca quoted above, and might have been circulated as a “quotation from the Pañca” from a certain period. Alternatively, this could be a quotation from another version of the Pañca which is no more accessible. The Ācāryakriyāsamuccaya (ĀKriSa) also states that it is a quotation from the Pañca.\(^{41}\) Considering the fact that the ĀKriSa draws upon other texts including the CaMePra, this verse is probably not a direct quotation from the Pañca, but an indirect quotation from the CaMePra.\(^{42}\)

The relevant verse is also quoted in two other texts. In his commentary Yogimanohari (YoMaPaKraTi), a tippanī on the Pañcakrama (PaKra), Munisrībhadra gives a teaching that body-tormenting practices prevent a practitioner from attaining the accomplishment, quoting the relevant verse. But he mentions the source of the verse as “another tantra.”\(^{43}\) In his Marmakalikā

---

\(^{39}\) de bžin || D; de bžin ņid P  
\(^{40}\) mi zad pas || D; mi b扎ad pas P  
\(^{41}\) ĀKriSa: paramādyamahāyogatantre ca — duśkarair niyamais *tīvair (M\textsuperscript{ED}; tīvai MS S) mūrthi *śuṣyate (M\textsuperscript{ED}; śuṣyate MS S) duḥkhitā | *duḥkhīḍ vikṣipāye (M\textsuperscript{ED}; duḥkhīḍ hi kṣipāye MS S) cittaṃ vikṣepāt siddhir anyathā || (MS S f.3r5–6, M\textsuperscript{ED} p.76, l.8–9)  
\(^{42}\) The relevant verse is quoted in the ĀKriSa in the context that a tantric master (guru or ācārya) is superior to a traditional bhikṣu. Just before this verse, a passage of the CaMePra which has been quoted in the following part of this article of the CaMePra is also quoted.  
\(^{43}\) See YoMaPaKraTi ad PiKraSā 4: tasmād evam avagamya *duḥkhitaṃ na (em. T\textsuperscript{ED}; duḥkhetaṃ MS) kuryāc cittarājāṃ yoṭi. tarhi katham ity aha, paṇcakāmo*pa-bhogenenaiva (em. T\textsuperscript{ED}; ‘pabhogeneva MS) sukhena bodhiṃ buddhatvam sādhayet.
MaKa), a pañjikā on the Tattvajñānasamāsiddhi of Śūnyasamādhivajra, the author Vīryaśrīmitra mentions the Vajradākatantra (VaDaTa) as the source of the same verse.\textsuperscript{44} Abhayākaragupta also quotes the same verse in his Abhayapaddhati (APa), a commentary on the Buddhakapālationtra (BuKaTa), without mentioning the name of the source.\textsuperscript{45} These facts may imply the fact that the relevant verse was not found in the PaĀ itself and the authors had found it in other sources. Especially in the case of the YoMaPaKraTi, it is highly possible that the author was able to access the CaMePra, which is closely related to the PaKra, and that he could not find the Paramādyā verse quoted in the CaMePra in the tantra itself.

The VAN mentions the twelve dhūtagunas as representative of the body-tormenting practices which should be excluded by a tantric practitioner. The CaMePra teaches that the ascetic practices such as the twelve dhūtagunas are for those whose religious convictions are inferior (hīnādhimukti) such as śrāvakas.

CaMePra Ch.9: vītarāgarūpam abhinirmāya hīnādhimuktikānām caturāryasa-

\textsuperscript{kutah? yogatantrānusārataḥ. yogatantraḥ *śrīsamājatantraḥ (em.; śrīsamājām tantram T\textsubscript{ED}), tadanusārataḥ, tadarthādhigamataḥ. uktam ca *tantrāntare (em. T\textsubscript{ED}; tantrānte MS) — duskarair niyamais tīvarair mūrtiḥ śuṣyatī duḥkhītā | duḥkhād *vikṣipāte (em. T\textsubscript{ED}; vikṣipātai MS) cītattām vikṣepātāt siddhir anyathā || iti. (T\textsubscript{ED} p.8, ll.16–25) (Trsl.) Therefore, having thus understood, a yoga practitioner should not torment his cittarāja. If so, how [could he attain enlightenment]? It is taught that he should attain enlightenment, i.e. Buddhahood, comfortably, i.e. enjoying the five desired objects agreeable to the sense faculties. Based on what? Based on [the teachings] of the Yogatantra. The Yogatantra is the auspicious Guhyasamājatantra. Based on this means based on the understanding of the meaning of the tantra. This has been taught in another tantra also. “By practising asceticism and keeping endurable observance, the body [of a practitioner] is pained and [therefore] weakened. If [the body] is pained, the mind becomes distracted. If the mind is distracted, the accomplishment is not realised.”’

\textsuperscript{44} tasmat sukhacittāyataye susiddhir iti sthitam. vajradāke ca — “duskarair niyamais tīvarair mūrtiḥ śuṣyatī duḥkhītā | duḥkhād vikṣipāte cītattām vikṣepātāt siddhir anyathā || iti. (S\textsubscript{ED} p.16, l.22 – p.17, l.2) (Trsl.) Therefore, it has been established that excellent accomplishment is brought by comfortable mind. [This has been taught] in the Vajradākatantra also. “By practising asceticism and keeping endurable observance, the body [of a practitioner] is pained and [therefore] weakened. If [the body] is pained, the mind becomes distracted. If the mind is distracted, the accomplishment is not realised.”’ See also VaDaTa ch.1: duskarair niyamais tūvair(r) mūrtiḥ śuṣyatī duḥkhītā | duḥkhād vikṣipāte cītattām vikṣepātāt siddhir anyathā || (MS f.4r2–3)

\textsuperscript{45} See APa ad BuKaTa ch.1: duskarair niyamais tūvair(r) mūrtiḥ śuṣyatī duḥkhītā | duḥkhād vikṣipāte cītattām vikṣepātāt siddhir anyathā || (MS f.2v4)
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tyādhigamaṁ virāgacaryāṁ ca pratipādyā . . . . . . . . 46\textit{yathā}47 śrāvakādayo hīnā-
dhimuktikā vitarkācaritā ātmasādhanarahitā48 dānaśilādikriyāmārgārūdhās
tattvajñāne 'sraddhadhānā mokṣa49 dūrasaṃjñānā sukhopāya anadhigamya
dvādasadhūtaganādīduskaracaryābhīṣ cilakālena bodhim anvesayanti, tattāpi
na prāpnuvanti, nispannakramādhigamaraḥitatvāt. (W\textsubscript{ED} p.461, l.14–p.462, l.11;
S\textsubscript{ED} p.78, ll.3–12)

(Ttrl.)\textsuperscript{50} [The Blessed One] created himself one who was free from passion and
taught the understanding of the four noble truths and the passion-free perfor-
mance. . . . . . . Those whose religious convictions are inferior, such as śrāvakas,
practice based on speculation, do not have the method of the accomplishment
of himself, and are on the path of the external actions such as donation and
moral precepts. They are not faithful to the knowledge of the truth. They mis-
understand the liberation to be far away, and long for the enlightenment after
a long-time practice of endurable performance such as the twelve dhūtānuṣas.
Even so, they do not attain [the enlightenment]. For they do not understand the
nispannakrama-practice.

As examined above, the negative attitude towards body-tormenting practices
is taught in the Paññā, the CaMePra and other related texts. The CaMePra also
teaches that the traditional asceticism is the practice for people whose religious
convictions are inferior such as Śrāvakayānists. Probably these teachings lie
behind Jñānaśrī’s argument.

3 The tantric practice excludes the practice which causes
distraction of mind\textsuperscript{51}

The second reason why the tantric practice is superior to that of non-tantric Bud-
dhism is that it excludes practices which cause distraction of mind. Jñānaśrī’s
argument is as follows. The main cause of the accomplishment, i.e. attainment
of enlightenment, is mind. A practitioner should, therefore, give priority to con-
trolling his mind. If a practitioner of uncontrolled mind does external, physical
and verbal practices such as worship of caityas and recitation of scriptures, his
mind is distracted. There are two alternatives with regard to the way of practice.
First, a practitioner should abide in a comfortable situation, attain the profound

\textsuperscript{46} \textit{yathā} . . . ‘rahitatvāt’ \textsuperscript{[]} Quoted in the ācāryalakṣaṇavidhi of the ĀcKriSa. (MS S
f.3r1–3, M\textsubscript{ED} p.74, ll.22–26)
\textsuperscript{47} \textit{yathā} \textsuperscript{[]} MS W\textsubscript{ED} S\textsubscript{ED}; yathā ĀKriSa M\textsubscript{ED}
\textsuperscript{48} vitarkācaritā ātmasādhanarahitā \textsuperscript{[]} W\textsubscript{ED}; vitarkācaritātmasādhanarahitā MS S\textsubscript{ED}.
Testimonium: ĀcKriSa
\textsuperscript{49} mokṣa \textsuperscript{[]} W\textsubscript{ED}; mokṣa’ MS S\textsubscript{ED}. Cf. Ālokamālā 14: dūrasaṃjñī bhaven mokṣa na
kathampcana yogavit | śūnyāḥ kalpitārūpena drṣṭaḥ svātmani nirvṛtiḥ ||
\textsuperscript{50} See also WEDEMeyer 2008: 281.9–283.12.
\textsuperscript{51} VAN P f.131v2–132r2, D f.118vr–119v4
meditation on mind (*cittanidhyapti, sems la dmigs pa*),\(^{52}\) and acquire power to remove gloss defilement. After that, he should do external practices as mentioned above. Secondly, a practitioner who is satisfied only with meditation need not do any external practice.\(^{53}\) These two alternatives are the practice without elaboration (*nisrapaṇacacaryā*) and the practice absolutely free from elaboration (*nisprapaṇacarā*).

---

52 For *cittanidhyapti* as a probable Sanskrit original word see Pakra.1.6 (TED p.1).

53 Jñāśrī quotes verses from the *Vairocanābhīṣambodhi* (VaiAbhiTa) as a scriptural support of his argument. VAN: *mtshan mar bcas pas mtshan bcas kyi* || *dno grub rgyal ba dam pa bzēd* || *mtshan ma med la gnas pa ni* || *mtshan mar bcas pa’ān grub tu ṛuṇ* || *de bas rnam pa thams cad du* || *mtshan ma med la gnas par bya* || *(P f.191v6–7, D ff.118v7–119r1) (Trsl.) ‘The supreme victorious one holds that the accomplishment with forms [is attained] by that[, i.e. the body of deity] with forms. [A practitioner] who abides in[ , i.e. meditates upon] that [body of deity] without forms is suitable for that [accomplishment] with forms too. Therefore, he should abide in that [body of deity] without forms in all cases.’ These verses of the VaiAbhiTa are also quoted in the PraUd. There are some textual problems. The relevant part of the VaiAbhiTa quoted in the PraUd is two verses, which run as follows: *sanimittena sanimittā siddhir upajayate* || *animittena animittā siddhir iṣṭā jinavaraṇī* || *sādā animittena sthitvā vai animittam praśādhyate* || *tasmāt sarvaprakāreṇa nirmittam niṣevyate* || *(niṣevyate) em.; niṣedhyata (iti) CED; niṣevyate MatsuNaga 1998: 181.6) (CED p.119, l.25–27) The VAN, on the other hand, quotes one and a half verses, which might be reconstructed as *sanimittena sanimittā siddhir iṣṭā jinavaraṇī* || *sādā animittena sthitvā vai animittam praśādhyate* || *tasmāt sarvaprakāreṇa nirmittam niṣevyate* || 

Comparing the two quotations, there might be a haplographical error caused by the eye skip from the first *siddhir* to the second *siddhir* in the latter. The aksaras *sa* and *a* are also similar to each other, and this also could be the cause of the eye skip.

The reading of the relevant part of the scripture itself is almost the same as that in the VAN. See VaiAbhiTa.7: *mtshan mar bcas pas mtshan bcas kyi* || *dno grub rgyal ba dam pa bzēd* || *mtshan ma med la gnas pas ni* || *mtshan ma can yāṅ bsgrub tu ṛuṇ* || *da bas rnam pa thams cad du* || *mtshan ma med pa bsten par bya* || *(sTog f.161r7–v2, P f.154v2–3, D f.190r3–4) It is more problematic that the reading of the Chinese translation of the VaAbhiTa is different from the other two: 佛陀学想故 樂欲或有相 依法無想故 獲無相悉地 是故一切種 當住於非想 (Taisho vol.18, 44a23–28) This might be reconstructed as *sanimittena sanimittā iṣṭā jinavaraṇī* || *sādā animittena sthitvā vai animittam praśādhyate* || *tasmāt sarvaprakāreṇa nirmittam niṣevyate* || 

The intention of the quotation of the VaiAbhiTa is, roughly speaking, to demonstrate that the higher level of practice brings not only the outcome corresponding to that level but the outcome of the lower level of practice. This means that the readings of the Sanskrit quoted in the PraUd and of the Tibetan translation suit the context of the VAN. For this textual problem, see also MatsuNaga 1980: 180–182.

With regard to the passage quoted immediately after the verses of the VaiAbhiTa for the same purpose, Jñānaśrī mentions the *Satyadvayavibhangavṛtti* as the source. But the relevant passage is not found in the *Satyadvayavibhangavṛtti* but in the *Satyadvayavibhangapaññikā*. See VAN: *slob dpon ye ṣes shin pos kyaṅ bden pa gnis rnam par ‘byed pa’i ‘grel pa las* || *chos kyi dbyinbs rtogs na ‘jig rten daṅ ‘jig rten las ’das pa’i chos thams cad bos pa bzin du ‘du ste* || *zad pa ṣes la zag bcas kyaṅ* || *(P f.131v7–8, D f.119r1–2)
(atyantanisprapañcacakarī), which are taught only in the Mahāyogatantra.\textsuperscript{54}

The three kinds of practice, i.e. the practice with elaboration (prapañcacarī), the practice without elaboration, and the practice absolutely free from elaboration, are probably introduced first in the CaMePra and are mentioned in other texts belonging to the Guhyasamāja corpus. Let us look at the definition of the three kinds of practice given in the CaMePra ch.9:

\textit{CaMePra ch.9:} tatra rāgajabodhicaryā trividhā yad uta prapañcatā nisprapañcatātāyantanisprapañcatā ceti. tatra\textsuperscript{55} prapañcatā caryā katamā? yad uta ta-thāgataśvase vajradharaśvase ca yathānirdiṣṭaṃ\textsuperscript{56} sarvatathāgataśravivistaraḥ sā prapañcatā. nisprapañcatā katamā? satatam\textsuperscript{57} vyāpikāravyāsaśāt kvacīd evārallīḥ,\textsuperscript{58} syāt sā\textsuperscript{59} nisprapañcatā. atyantanisprapañcatā katamā? sarvasaṃgam apahāya kevalaṃ\textsuperscript{60} dhyānāvīhāraḥ jñānamudrāśaśātyābhyaset sātattva prapañcatā. yathā kāṣṭham dahatī bhavati bhūtiḥ, tālapatram dahatī bhavati bhūtiḥ, kārpasaṃ dahatī bhavati bhūtiḥ, sarvaṃ bhamasād bhavati, evam eva trividhacaryādhīn.\textsuperscript{61} mahāvajradharpadam\textsuperscript{62} nispaḍayanti. athavaṃ\textsuperscript{63} kecit sā-dhakās tattvasamgrahādyatantreśvarāśīrṇaṃ\textsuperscript{64} hastamudrāguruḥpārśvābhāsahyana-\naṭanartamātiḥ\textsuperscript{65} prayogī gṛhiḥ dyotaṃkucyāvāyam evaṃ evaṃ evaṃ evaṃ evam evaṃ evam evaṃ evam evaṃ evam evaṃ evam evaṃ evam evaṃ evam evaṃ evam evaṃ evam evaṃ evam evaṃ evam eva
ration, without elaboration, and the practice absolutely free from elaboration. Of these three (tatra), which practice is with elaboration? If [a practitioner] fully experiences the sensual enjoyment of all tathāgatas as instructed in the tathāgatāsvāsa and the vajradhārāsvāsa [of the Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinījālasamvaratantra], then that is [the practice] with the elaboration. Which [practice] is without elaboration? If the sensual enjoyment is only occasional by the constantly all-pervading effects, then that is [the practice] without elaboration. Which [practice] is absolutely free from elaboration? If [a practitioner] abandons all attachments, lives on the food that is meditation, and repeats union with his imaginary consort, then that is [the practice] absolutely free from elaboration. Just as wood burns to ashes, a palmyra leaf burns to ashes, cotton burns to ashes, and everything burns to ashes, likewise [practitioners] accomplish the stage of Vajradhara by means of the three kinds of practice. Alternatively, some practitioners who follow [the teachings of the Yogatantra] beginning with the Tattvasaṃgraha employ [external actions] such as hand-gestures, songs, offerings [to deities], throwing away [of obstacles], gestures, and dances (? naṭanartana’), always with mind of industry, and accomplish the Great Seal doing the practice with elaboration day and night. In the same way, some [practitioners] accomplish the stage of the Great Bliss by the practice with elaboration, i.e. the play of all tathāgatas such as sitting in [particular] postures called paryāṇka and āsana (paryāṅkāsanabandhana), and the nine nāṭyarasas, based on the Mahāyogatantras such as Śrīparamādyā. The practice without elaboration and absolutely free from elaboration is, however, taught only in this Śrīguhyasamāja.

If we refer to the definitions of the three kinds of practice given in the above passage from the CaMePra, the criteria of the classification are the degrees of sensual enjoyment (aralli) and the degrees of dependence on meditation. If, in addition, we refer to the details of the three kinds of practice taught after the above-quoted passage, the degree of asceticism is high in the practice absolutely free from elaboration. If we compare the two alternatives of practice

69 See WEDEMeyer 2007: 289, footnote 78.
70 Ākṣepas are particular actions which a tantric officiant does in order to remove obstacles from the site for a maṇḍala in its construction. Tanaka 2004 reports on the ākṣepas taught in Nāgabodhi’s Guhyasamājamaṇḍalopāyikāvimśatividhi and other texts. For the ākṣepas taught in the Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā see Tanemura 2004: 34.
71 Abhinayas are particular gestures which a tantric officiant makes in order to remove obstacles from the site for a maṇḍala in its construction. For the abhinayas taught in the Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā see Tanemura 2004: 31–33. See also Tanaka 2004.
72 For the nine rasas in the SaBuDaJāSaṃTa see Tanaka 1989, 1994.
73 In this sense, the Observance of Madman (unmattavrata) and the bhusukucaryā are incorporated into the practice absolutely free from elaboration.
which Jñānaśrī mentions with regard to the practice without elaboration and the practice absolutely free from elaboration, the contents of the VAN and the CaMePra are identical with each other in the respect that these practices are dependent solely upon meditation. With regard to the practice without elaboration, Jñānaśrī does not mention sensual enjoyment. If, however, we examine the contents of the practice without elaboration taught in the CaMePra chapter 10, we can find some elements common to the VAN.

CaMePra ch.10: vajragurur āha – sādhu sādhu mahāsattva šrīguhyasamājama-hāyogatantrāmnāyena niṣprapañceacaryāṃ pratipadāyāmi śṛṇu ekāgracittena.
 mahātaṇvipradeśeṣu phalapuṣpādyaśīlānkrte |
 parvate vijane sādhyam idam dhyānasaṃuccayam ||
(GuSaTa 12.2)

ityāditantrakte manonukūlapradeśe bhūmigraṃ vā prāśadaṃ vā yathokta-viḍhiṇā sāṃskṛtya, tatra caturasrađiśuṇāya kṣata vajraṃniśikharūśaṃkāraṃ niṣpāda, tataḥ prāksṛtaṅkārāpāgato74 mahāyogī bāhyāṅganāṃ api saṃskṛtya ekātipratibaddhakaiḥ saha śiṣyigaṇāṃ vāksyaṃakramena mahāmudrāsādhanaṃ ārabheta75.

......

tathā ca na mudrābandho na maṇḍalaṃ na kuṇḍaṃ na caityaṃ na pu-stakavaścanam na kāyakleso na paṭākāṣṭhapāśaṃapratimāṃ praṇamati. na śrāvakapratyekabuddhaśāraṇaṃ anumaratī. na tithikaraṇaṃmahā-
ṛtanaṅkāṣatarkāṅkāṃaparāṇaḥ sarotī. sarvam etad adhyātmanaiva sampādāyati.76 (WED p.481, l.5–p.483, l.7; SED p.94, l.4–p.92.14) (Trsl.)77 The vajra master answered, “Excellent, excellent, Great One! I shall teach you the practice without elaboration according to the tradition of the Mahāyogatantra, Śrīguhyasamāja. Listen very carefully.

The following meditations should be accomplished in spots inside great forests, in a spot decorated with fruits, flowers etc., in a mountain, or in an isolated spot.

74 prāksṛtaṅkārāpāgato WED; /prākṛtāṅkārāpāgato MS; prakṛtāṅkārāpāgato SED
75 ārabheta WED; ārabhet SED(WED reports that the reading of the MS is ārabhet, but actually it is ārabheta.)
76 tathā ca ... sampādāyati WED Quoted in the SuSam (Part II, p.54, ll.23–28) For the passages of the CaMePra quoted in the SuSam see Matsumori 2008: 930–929, note 5. The teaching of this part is very similar to the verse which Jñānaśrī quotes as a scriptural support. See VAN: gal te byaṅ chub mchog ’dod na || glegs bam klag par mi bya žin || mchod rten bskor ba mi bya’o || byas na byaṅ chub rṇed par dka’ || (P f.131v2–3, D f.118v4–5) Cf. GuSaTa 17.67 quoted below.
77 See also Wedemeyer 2007: 307–310.
[A practitioner] should make a cellar or a raised platform in comfortable spots as taught in the above verse and other [places] of the tantra. He should visualise the storied palace which has the characteristics such as the square [form], on the top of the vajra-gem mountain. Then the great yoga practitioner should abandon his ordinary ego, and also purify his external consort. Then he should undertake the method for accomplishment of the Great Seal together with his disciples connected with one jāti.

... ...

In the same way, he does not fold his hand in a seal. He does not make a mandala. He does not do a fire sacrifice. He does not make [or worship] an caitya. He does not recite a scripture. He does not torment his body. He does not worship an image [painted on] a scroll, or made of wood or stone. He should not remember refuge in Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas. He is not distracted by [auspiciousness and inauspiciousness of] time [based on] the lunar day, the karana, the muhūrtta and the lunar mansion. He performs all of these only internally.

The elements common to Jñānaśrī’s teaching about the practice without elaboration and the above quotation are the following two. (1) Jñānaśrī teaches that in the practice without elaboration a practitioner should first abide in comfortable situation. The CaMePra also teaches that in the practice without elaboration a practitioner should prepare a spot for meditation in a comfortable place. (2) While the internalisation of practices is required, external elements are involved in both the practice without elaboration taught by Jñānaśrī and that taught in the CaMePra. Jñānaśrī teaches that a practitioner should observe his mind properly and attain the profound meditation on mind, and then do other external practices. In the CaMePra, while external elements such as a practitioner’s external consort (bāhyāṅgana) are involved, a practitioner should internalise external physical and verbal practices. With regard to the second point, there is big difference between Jñānaśrī and the CaMePra. The procedure of Jñānaśrī’s practice without elaboration is that the profound meditation on mind is attained first and then external practices are done. In the CaMePra, on the other hand, external physical and verbal practices are internalised although external elements are involved. It is therefore difficult to say that the practice without elaboration taught by Jñānaśrī is directly based on that taught in the CaMePra.

Then what is the background for the abandonment of external actions and mind-oriented attitude found in the VAN? The negative attitude towards external practices is found in several places of the later tantric Buddhist texts. The same verse as Jñānaśrī quotes as a scriptural support of his position has not been found, but similar teachings are found in the GuSaTa.
Superiority of Vajrayāna, Part II

GuSaTa 17.67 caityakarma na kurvita na ca pustakavacanam | 
maṇḍalam naiva kurvita na trivajrāgravandanam || 
(M_Ed p.107, ll.24–25)

(Trlsl.) [A practitioner] should neither worship caityas, nor recite scriptures, nor make a maṇḍala, nor make obeisance to the three foremost vajras.

PraUd ad loc.: caityakarma mrдвālukādistūpājākriyāṃ na kurvita. ātmana eva sarvatathāgatātātmakasya caityapūjābhinivesāyogāt. na ca pustakavācanam ity anābhogenaiva vajrajāpaṃ satatam eva pravartayataḥ asmin svādhyāyādau pravṛtter na yuktatvāt. evaṃ bāhyāṃ maṇḍalam tan na kurvita. svakāyamaṇḍalāṃ₇₈ muktvā bahirmaṇḍalasya tattvato 'bhāvāt. trivajrāgraḥ śrāvakapratyekabuddhasamayakṣambudhāḥ teśaṃ kāyādinā prāśamanāṃ vandanaṃ tan na kuryāt. ātmanāḥ sarvatathāgatātātmābhāvāsya virodhāt. (C_Ed p.220, ll.25–28)

(Trlsl.) [A tantric practitioner] should not do religious actions for caityas, i.e. worship of stūpas made of mud or sand. For it is not appropriate for him who has all Tathāgatas as his nature to have an attachment to worship of caityas. He should not recite scriptures. For it is not appropriate for him who always performs the vajra-recitation without effort to read scriptures for his study or other [purposes]. In the same way, he should not make an external maṇḍala. For, except his own body that is the maṇḍala, an external maṇḍala does not exist in reality. The three foremost vajras are Śrāvakas, Pratyekabuddhas, and Samyaksambuddhas. He should not take refuge to them, i.e. make homage to them with his body etc. For [this action] is contradictory with [the fact that the practitioner] himself is in the state of all Tathāgatas.

The Guhyasiddhi (GuSi), one of the oldest texts that belong to the Guhyasamāja corpus, teaches abandonment of external practices in the post-initiatory period.₇₉

GuSi 6.49cd–51:
maṇḍalam naiva kartavyaṃ mudrābandhas tu bandhanam ||
mantraṃ naiva japen mantri bhāvanāyantarāyikam₮₈₀ |
dehaṃ maṇḍalam ity uktam prajñā mudreṇ kirtitā ||
mantri śrāvajasattvātmā vandanaṃ tasya sevanam |
etad adhyātmikam kuryāt sarvaṃ bāhyāṃ tyajed budhāḥ ||
(S_Ed p.43, ll.12–16)

(Trlsl.) The mantra-practitioner should not make a maṇḍala, and fold his hand in a seal. He should not utter a mantra which impedes contemplation. For it is taught that his body is the maṇḍala and that his consort (prajñā) is the seal. Since the mantra-practitioner has Vajrasattva as his nature, paying homage to

₇₈ svakāyamaṇḍalam ṛṣam; svakāyamaṇḍala C_Ed
₇₉ See also TANEMURA 2008: 55–58.
₮₀ bhāvanāyantarāyikam ṛṣam; Double saṃdhi is applied here.
himself is worship [in this case]. So, the wise man should internalise everything, abandoning external things.

Jñānaśrī does not clearly state theoretical basis of the internalisation of external practices. If we refer to the above descriptions in the PraUd and the GuSi, we learn that it is the equation of parts of a practitioner’s body with deities. In the case of the PraUd, the physical practices should be abandoned because a practitioner has all Tathāgatas as his nature, and the verbal practice should be abandoned because a practitioner has attained the vajra-recitation, in which all his verbal actions are equated with recitation of mantras. In the case of the GuSi, the theoretical basis of the internalisation is that a practitioner’s body is the maṇḍala, his consort is wisdom, and he has Vajrasattva as his nature. The CaMePra teaches the processes of realisation of this equation as the body-isolation (kāyaviśeṣa) and the speech-isolation (vāgviśeṣa). In the former a practitioner realises that his body-elements are empowered or controlled by the deities, and in the latter he realises that his verbal actions are recitation of mantras.81

4 The tantric practice excludes practices which cause a practitioner to grasp things as existent82

The third reason why the tantric practice is superior is that it prevents a practitioner from grasping things as existent. Jñānaśrī’s argument is as follows. The conceptions such as “this is pure” and “this is impure” are bondage. If a practitioner consumes the five nectars, i.e. semen, blood, excrement, urine, and the meat of human being, and the five meats, i.e. the meat of cow, dog, elephant, horse, and human being, in proper method, conceptual cognition of purity and impurity gradually ceases to arise. The proper method is to consume the impure substances desirelessly after meditating upon them as empty or the nectar of deities. When the conceptual cognition ceases to arise, the ascertaining cognition arises that the conception of difference with regard to all things is false. At this moment, some non-human beings rejoice at the practitioner, guard him, and hold his instruction. The five nectars and the five meats are synecdoche for anything supposed to be impure. When the practitioner attains the cognition of equality, he does not have to consume the impure substances.

In this part of the text, Jñānaśrī justifies consumption of impure substances in the tantric practice. Consumption of impure substances is one of the obser-

81 For the body-isolation and the speech-isolation see TOMABECHI 1996: 263–266, note 409. See also WEDEMEYER 2007: 84–95 (summaries of chapters on the body-isolation and the speech-isolation).
82 VAN P f.132r2–7, D f.119r4–v1
Superiority of Vajrayāna, Part II

Advances clearly taught in tantric Buddhism after the GuSaTa. As stated above, the five nectars are the five kinds of impure substances, i.e. semen, blood, excrement, urine and the meat of human being. See, e.g., LaSaṃTa 1.11cd and CaSaṃPa ad loc.:

LaSaṃTa 1.11cd: madhu raktam sakarpūraṃ raktacandandayojitam (pED vol.1, p.25, l.3)
CaSaṃPa ad loc. idānim paṇcāmṛtam darśayati madhv ityādinā. madhv iti śu-kram. raktam rudhiram. sakarpūraṃ mahāṃśasahitam. punārtagrahaṇa-ṃ mūtram. candanam viṭ. (S_ED p.110, l.7–l.11, l.1)

(Trs. of the CaSaṃPa) Now [the Blessed One] shows the five nectars by [the half stanza] beginning with “honey.” “Honey” is semen. “Red” is blood. With “camphor” is with human meat. The [word] “red” employed again [denotes] urine. “Sandal” is excrement.

The five meats, which are sometimes called the five lamps (paṇcapradīpa), are the meat of cow, dog, elephant, horse, and human being. They are also called gokudahana, which is the combination of the first syllables of the names of those five creatures.83

The GuSi teaches consumption of impure substances to remove conceptual cognition as one of the practices in the unmattavrata (Observance of the Madman).

GuSa 6.8: vikalpayonisambhūtam84 yal lokeṣu jugupsitam ||
tat tadbhāvaṃ samāsthāya cared guhyavrataṃ vratī ||
(S_ED p.39, ll.16–17)

(Trs.) Since what is disgusting in the world is produced from the womb of conceptual cognition, the observer should perform the secret observance depending upon the true nature of it.85

The Prajñopāvyaviniścayasadhi (PraUpaViSi) also teaches that a practitioner should eat anything in order to remove conceptual cognition.

PraUpaViSi 5.29:
gamyāgayādisamkalpaṃ nātra kuryāt kadācana ||
māyopamādiyogenā bhoktavyaṃ sarvam eva hi ||
(S_ED p.84, ll.3–4; T_ED part 2, p.153, ll.17–18)

83 See, e.g., KrYaTaRaĀv ad KrYaTa 3.12b: paṇcamāṃsaṃ gokudahanam (S_ED p.21, l.12).
84 vikalpayonisambhūtam || Tib.: rnam rtog yid las byuṅ ba yi (D f.19r1, P f.20v7, S_ED p.69, l.3)
85 This suggests that the final purpose of the practice is not removal of conceptual cognition, but acquisition of the true nature of things. Cf. SFERRA 1999, especially 89ff.
In this [Observance of the Truth (tattvacaryā)], [an initiate] should not have conceptual cognition such as “[this is] suitable” or “[this is] unsuitable in any case. He should eat anything by the yoga [to realise that everything is] like illusion and the other [yogas by which he can be free from conceptual cognition].

Jñānaśrī teaches that a practitioner consumes the five nectars and the five meats in the proper method, i.e. consuming these impure substances desirelessly after meditating upon them as empty or the nectar of deities. The PraUpaViSi teaches that the five nectars are celestial.

PraUpaViSi 5.29–30:

\[
dharmadhātusamudbhūtā na kecit paripanthinaḥ \mid
\]
\[
prabhūjīta yathākāmaṁ nirviśāṅkena cetasā ||
\]
\[
saṃbhogārthaṁ idaṁ sarvaṁ traidhātukam aśeṣataḥ \mid
\]
\[
nirmitaṁ vajrasattvena sādhakānāṁ hitāya ca ||
\]

(SED p.84, ll.5–8; T_Ed part 2, p.153, ll.27–30)

(Trsl.) [Things to be eaten by an initiate and his consort (bāhyamudrā)] arise from the dharma-realm, and none of them is impediment. He should[, therefore,] enjoy [them] at will with his mind free from fear. All of these in the three worlds, without remaining, are created by Vajrasattva so that practitioners may enjoy them. [These are made] for their sake.

Jñānaśrī teaches that some non-human beings protect a practitioner when he has got the ascertaining cognition that the conception of difference with regard to all things is false. Some texts teach that the consumption of the five nectars is a protection for a practitioner although the teachings are not perfectly in harmony with the statement of Jñānaśrī.

HeTa 1.6.14:

\[
bhakṣitavyam tu bhaiṣajyam pātavyaṁ vāri nityatāṁ \mid
\]
\[
jarāṁṛtyur na bādheta rakṣābhūtaḥ sadā bhavet \mid
\]

(SED p.20, ll.3–4)

(Trsl.) [A practitioner] should always take “medicine,” and drink “water.” [If so,] old age and disease would never trouble [him]. He would always be protected [from evil beings].

YoRaMā ad loc.:

\[
\text{bhaisajyam catuḥsamam. vāry akṣobhyaḥ. nityateti nityam. rakṣābhūta iti piśā-}
\]
\[
cādināṁ adhirṣyaḥ. (SED p.120, ll.6–8)
\]

(Trsl.) “Medicine” is catuḥsama. “Water” is Akṣobhya. Nityatā [should be understood as] nityam (= should be understood as adverbiaL).\textsuperscript{86} Protected means that he would always be invincible for flesh-eating fiends and other [evil beings].

\textsuperscript{86} The reading of the manuscript of the tantra which the commentator accessed might have been nityatā rather than nityatām.
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HeTa 2.3.59a: gūtham catuḥsamaṃ prōktam (S\textsubscript{ED} p.60, l.20)

(Trsl.) It is taught that catuḥsama [denotes] excrement.

CaMePra ch.2: mūtram aksōbhyaśādhiṣṭhānam (W\textsubscript{ED} p.355, l.8; S\textsubscript{ED} p.12, l.2–3)

(Trsl.) Aksōbhya is located in urine.

The above-quoted verse of the HeTa teaches that the impure substances called “medicine” and “water,” which are two articles of the five nectars, protect a practitioner from old age, disease, and evil beings. A similar teaching is found also in the PraUpaViSi.

PraUpaViSi 5.18–19:

vighnamārādiśāntyarthamaṁ paṇcāṃrtam adhiśrayet |

esā tv anuttarā rakṣā viṃmūtraśdivavasthitā ||

jvarā garā viṣā rogā dākṣīnapravragrahāḥ |

mārā vināyaśaś caiva praśāmaṁ yānty anena hi ||

(S\textsubscript{ED} p.83, ll.3–6, T\textsubscript{ED} part 2, p.155, ll.19–22)

(Trsl.) [A practitioner] should consume the five nectars in order to quell obstacles, tempters and other [evil beings]. This is the supreme protection depending upon excrement, urine and other [impure substances]. For fever, diseases (gara), poison, diseases (roga), dākinīs, calamities, grahas, tempters, and vināyakas are quelled by this (= consumption of the five nectars).

As examined above, some tantric Buddhists justified consumption of impure substances, teaching that its purpose is to be free from conceptual cognition. It is no doubt that Jñānaśrī’s argument is based on this justification. On the other hand, Jñānaśrī teaches that some non-human beings rejoice at the practitioner, guard him, and hold his instruction when conceptual cognition ceases to arise. Some tantric texts teaches that the five nectars protect the practitioner from old age, disease, and evil beings, but this teaching is not perfectly consistent with that of Jñānaśrī. He also teaches that the practitioner does not have to consume impure substances when he has attained the cognition of equality. Normally, the practitioner is required to practice this kind of observance until he sees the sign of the accomplishment (siddhinimitta). At this moment, I am not sure whether his teaching is his original idea or he follows a predecessor’s one.

5 Concluding Remarks

I have examined Jñānaśrī’s arguments about superiority of the tantric practice. He states that the tantric practice is superior in the respect that it excludes the three kinds of wrong practice: (1) practices which weaken the faculties of a practitioner, (2) practices which distract the mind of a practitioner, and (3) practices which cause a practitioner to grasp things as existent. These three aspects of the tantric practice are common to each other in the respect that they
are more or less mind-oriented; the tantric practice excludes (1) practices which cause distraction of mind indirectly, (2) practices which cause distraction of mind directly, and (3) practices which cause conceptual cognition. As examined above, generally speaking, tantric Buddhists justified the practices which transgress the traditional Buddhist moral precepts and the boundary of purity, claiming that they bring the state of being free from conceptual cognition or distraction of mind. Jñānaśrī’s arguments are based on the similar justification, but it is still difficult to know the position of the Jñānaśrī in the history of the tantric practice. Our future task is to read related texts more and investigate the background of Jñānaśrī’s arguments.
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Introduction

Doctrines concerning holy sites were often the center of focus among compilers of the scriptures belonging to the Buddhist Saṃvara cycle and its related scriptural cycles in early Medieval India. The systems of holy sites appearing in this body of texts are complex and diverse. Indeed much has been written about the systems of holy sites found in these Buddhist traditions. However, the structure and the nature of each of these systems and the overall picture of these systems have not been clarified enough.

It is the aim of this paper to clarify the base structure that these systems have in common and based on this elucidation draw a comprehensive picture of them in the eyes of the text-compilers. To do so, I will also employ some new data. In the conclusion, I will compare the structure of these esoteric Buddhist systems of holy sites with that of the orthodox Buddhist system of the Eight Great Sites (aṣṭamahāsthāna) i.e. Lumbini/Kapilavastu, Buddhagaya, Varanasi, Sravasti, Sāmkāsa, Rājagrha, Vaiśālī, and Kuśinagarī in the post-Gupta era in order to make the structure of the esoteric system clearer.

1 The structure of the system of holy sites: two levels and three dimensions

The instructions found in the Saṃvara and its related cycles concerning the geographical location and the feature of the holy sites have so far been given only little attention. By examining these instructions, the nature of the system of holy sites of Saṃvara Buddhism and its related cycles will become clearer.

1.1 Instructions concerning the geological locations and the features of individual holy sites

The early scriptures of the Saṃvara cycle such as the Cakrasamvaratantra, although they give the list of names of holy sites and the instruction on how to
perform the practice centered on this list, explain in detail neither the geographical locations nor the features of these holy sites. The detailed instructions on their geographical locations and features appear in some later works. The *Yul ni bceu bshi'i rgyu mtshan bstan pa* ascribed to Nāropāḍa and translated into Tibetan by Mar pa, which is included only in the Peking edition of the Tibetan *tripiṭaka* under the title *Cakrasaṃvaravikurvaṇa* (*dPal Ḥkhor lo bde mchog giren par Ḥphrul pa*), explains the geographical locations, features, and/or tales of origin of many of the holy sites found in the Saṃvara tradition. (For details, see TABLE 3.) This work reveals that Saṃvara holy sites are located not only in present south Asia but also in Tibet, middle Asia, and China and that many of these sites have sacred rocks (or stones) of various shapes as the sacral centers of these sites. Some other scriptures or commentaries (as shown below) also give explanations on the geographical locations of some of these sites.

However, the compilers of these texts did not always reach a consensus on some of the geographic locations of the Saṃvara sites. Let us see the instructions on the sites Himālaya, Nepāla, Nagara, Suvarṇadvīpa, Grha(de)vata, Arbuda, and Vajrapīṭha. According to Nāropāḍa, the site named Himālaya refers to Mt. Kailāsa, but to Kathmandu Valley also called Nepāla according to the Newar Buddhist *Svayambhūpurāṇa* and some other traditions of Newar Buddhism. Furthermore, although Himālaya and Nepāla are identical in these texts, the *Dākārṇavatantra* regards them as different sites. The site named Nagara refers to the Lankāpura or Kaśmīra area according to Nāropāḍa and to Pataśiputra according to the *Yoginījālatantra*, commentaries of the *Hevajratantra*, and the *Āmnāyamaṇjarī*. The site Suvarṇadvīpa, which is generally identified as an island on the ocean of present south India (frequently Sri Lanka), is an island on the ocean of west India or the land in east China according to Nāropāḍa. The term Grha(de)vata, as pointed out by A. Sanderson, was originally the name of a deity at a site called Saurāṣṭra in the Śaiva *Tantrasadbhāva*. On the other hand, Nāropāḍa regards this site as Li yul, Kaṃśadesa, which may be identified as Khotan in present Central Asia. The site named Arbuda, which is generally identified as Mt. Abu in present Rajasthan, is Takṣaśilā according to Nāropāḍa. According to the *Mahāmudrātilakatantra*, the site-name Vajrapīṭha is a synonym for Oḍḍiyāna. However, according to Abhayākaraṇagupta’s *Āmnāyamaṇjarī*, Vajrapīṭha is a synonymous term not for Oḍḍiyāna but for Pollagiri, Kollagiri, and Puliramalaya in the *Saṃputōdbhavatantra*.

Indeed the compilers of each text attempt to pinpoint a specific geographical location for each individual site. However, as examined above, it is likely that the location of these sites was not fixed but rather flexible. Abhayākaraṇagupta’s *Āmnāyamaṇjarī* and Śākyarākṣita’s *Piṭḥādinirṇaya* give a more liberal view
concerning the geographical locations of the sites in question. They state that each site has multiple identities concerning their belonging site-categories\(^{17}\) and that any localities in south Asia, Tibet, China, and other areas where females of any social classes such as *brāhmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*, *vaiśya*, and *śūdra* who are believed to be *dākinīs* or magical female beings (*mkha' bḥ ggro ma*) reside can be regarded as holy sites having the same function as those preached in the *Saṃvara* and its related scriptures because of the presence of these magical female beings.\(^{18}\) It should also be noted that the compilers of the texts had different views concerning the features of the holy sites in question as well as their geographical locations. As mentioned above, while Nāropāda often regarded sacred rocks of various shapes as the sacral centers of these sites, Abhayakaragupta and Śākyaraksita deemed the living magical female beings of any social classes inhabiting these sites as the sacral essence of these sites and made no mention on the sacred rocks.

This flexibility in the assignment of geographical locations and features to the holy sites in question suggests the following point concerning the nature of the system of holy sites in question. Seen from the standpoint of the compilers of the *Saṃvara* scriptures, the basis of the system of holy sites in *Saṃvara* Buddhism is formed by a list of names of holy sites rather than specific localities themselves. (The list of names of holy sites varies according to the texts.) The list serves as a symbolic framework along which individual sites are arranged according to the compiler’s wishes to a certain extent. Thus, the various names of holy sites found in this list can be seen as separate from the actual sites which they refer to. Indeed, the names on the list can be assigned to other existing geographical locations as seen above and can also be systematized in the form of a *maṇḍala* or other systems independent of geographical locations as will be discussed below. The following discussion centers on the above definition of the nature of the *Saṃvara* system of holy sites.

1.2 **Two levels and three dimensions**

It is possible to develop a typology of levels and dimensions of holy sites found in *Saṃvara* Buddhism. Based on the observation made above that the list of holy sites functions as a symbolic framework, it is possible to discern two levels and three dimensions in this system.

The two levels are (i) the level of *the system of practice* and (ii) the level of *the system as the mythological world-view*. These two levels are deeply connected with each other.
The first level

The first level, i.e. the system of practice, has three dimensions: (A) external holy sites as geographical locations, (B) external holy sites seen as separated from specific locations, and (C) internal holy sites. This idea can be developed on the basis of the brief preach on three dimensions of practice centered on holy sites given in Abhayākaragupta’s Āmnāyamaṇjarī i.e. “extrenal (phyi rol) (holy sites),” “(holy sites organized into a) wheel of maṇḍala (dkyil hkhor gyi ḡkhor lo),” and “bodily (lus) (holy sites)”\textsuperscript{19} and on the basis of the survey of individual instructions on the practice of holy sites given in the other texts belonging to Saṃvara tradition and its related scriptural cycles.

Holy sites in dimension (A) refer to geographical locations which the scriptures describe as pilgrimage sites. It is difficult to differentiate the lands that practitioners of the Saṃvara tradition actually visited and those that were, based on D.C. Sircar’s view and A. Wayman’s definition, “imaginary Tantric lands,”\textsuperscript{20} the sites which were listed in the scriptures merely by the compilers’ imagination and to which little or no pilgrimage was actually made. We need more archaeological and historical researches on the lands in question, bearing in mind that the scriptures give different instructions on the actual geographical location of the lands in question. However, it seems possible to state at this stage that all these lands were assumed by practitioners of Saṃvara Buddhism to have sacred qualities, as there are works expounding on the geographical locations of and/or describing the features of these sites as observed in the previous subsection of this paper.

Holy sites in dimension (B) are regarded as separate from any particular geographical location and take the form either of an external (bāhya) maṇḍala to be drawn and to be visualized or of verses to be recited. Practitioners use colored powder to draw on ground and visualize the holy sites as constituent components of a maṇḍala, or praise them in verse.

Holy sites in dimension (C), which are also seen as separate from actual geographical locations, take on the form of an internal (adhyātma or the like) maṇḍala identical with the structure of one’s body (more exactly stated, the sūkṣmaśarīra or subtle body of one’s physical body). This dimension has a close relationship to the idea of the sahaṭja, or the Innate, which is the idea of truth expressed in Tantric scriptures of both Buddhist and non-Buddhist traditions. In Buddhism, the idea of the Innate was first developed in the Hevajra cycle and then incorporated into the Saṃvara and the other cycles. This view holds that one’s innate body already carries within it the means for attaining accomplishments (siddhi) and that one cannot actually attain them without one’s body. Hence, the practices concerning holy sites are performed not outside of one’s body.
but inside and on the surface of it.

**The second level**

In line with the instructions on holy sites given in the *Cakrasaṃvatāratantra* and the *Hevajra* one respectively, the works belonging to the same cycles describe holy sites as places where local goddesses of fierce appearance reside with their husband gods or where human females who are believed to be magical female beings such as *dākini*, *yoginī*, and *dūtī* live or assemble. These indigenous deities or magical female beings are regarded as powerful beings that can bring practitioners various kinds of accomplishments (*siddhi*). Hence, these works attach great importance to the systems of practice in which holy sites play a certain function.

Generally stating, deep correlations between a system of practice and a mythological world-view can often be observed in the religious system. In the case of the systems of holy sites in question, the mythological world-view holds that the holy sites scattered across earth are filled with the divine powers of these pairs of deities or magical female beings. This mythological world-view functions to legitimize the efficacy which the practices centered on these holy sites are believed to have and the perceived efficacy of the system legitimized in this way reproduces analogous myths in successive compilations of scriptures.

**The hierarchy of the three dimensions of the first level**

In line with a tendency often seen in Indian esoteric traditions, *siddhas* (= those who have attained religious accomplishments) or monks who studied the Saṃvara cycle such as Ghanṭāpāda, Kṛṣṇācārya, Abhayākaragupta, and Śākyarakṣīta regarded dimension (C) as being the highest among the three dimensions of the level of the system of practice.

Abhayākaragupta, in his *Āmnāyamaṽjarī*, gives a detailed hierarchy of practices concerning holy sites as shown in TABLE 1. The analogous instruction can be found in Śākyarakṣīta’s *Pīṭhādinirṇaya*. Items numbered (i) correspond to dimension (A), those numbered (ii) to dimension (B), and those numbered (iii) and (iv) to dimension (C). The practice summarized in items numbered (v) means the three-dimensional practices of holy sites with an attempt to understand their Mahāyānic meanings. The practice in dimension (B) is superior to that in dimension (A) and the practice in dimension (C) is higher than that in dimension (B). However, if one attempts to understand the Mahāyānic meanings which the system of holy sites carries, which is the highest manner of practice centered on holy sites, there exists no hierarchy between the three dimensions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>For the lesser.</th>
<th>Pilgrimage to external holy sites.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>For the median.</td>
<td>Practice of the external manḍala of holy sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>For the lower-excellent.</td>
<td>Visualization of the internal manḍala of holy sites by putting seeds (bija) on and in the body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td>For the middle-excellent.</td>
<td>Visualization of the internal manḍala of holy sites without depending on seeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v)</td>
<td>For the upper-excellent</td>
<td>Perfect and skillful practice of the manḍala of holy sites. One attempts to understand what it symbolizes: the manḍala of holy sites signifies the bodhicitta, is illusionary, and represents bhūmi and pāramitā.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note] i) Seeds (bija) in this context mean initial letters of individual holy sites. These seeds signify the individual holy sites. The coupled deities residing in the individual holy sites are cultivated from these seeds.

2 Four typological traditions of the system of holy sites

It is also possible to divide the holy sites into the following typologies of holy sites according to their origins and forms.

The first typological tradition: Twenty-four holy sites systematized on the basis of ten categories of sites such as pīṭha and so forth.

The second typological tradition: Holy sites systematized on the basis of twelve categories of sites such as pīṭha and so forth.

The third typological tradition: Twenty-four holy sites.

The fourth typological tradition: Seventy-two magical female beings residing in seventy-two holy sites systematized on the basis of the theories of inner circles (cakra) and the inner wheel of time (kālacakra).

There also exist further traditions of categorization. However, the traditions listed above can be described as the representative four types of categorization. It is possible to exclude the fourth typological tradition from the above list because holy sites per se appear only latently in this system as will be discussed in the sixth section of this paper. However, I examine this system, treating it as the system of holy sites in which holy sites per se are present only latently.

While keeping their independence from each other to a certain degree, these four traditions of categorizing holy sites also influenced each other as will be seen...
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below. Let us examine the contents of these four traditions in detail and observe how the two levels and the three dimensions discussed in the previous section apply to these four types.

3 The holy sites of the first typological tradition

Among the four representative systems of holy sites, the system of the first typological tradition is the most popular and the most influential in the Samvara cycle as will be clarified in the following analysis.

3.1 The level as the system of practice

A matured form of the system of the first typological tradition appears in many scriptures of the Samvara cycle such as the Abhidhānottaratantra,26 the Yoganisamcāratantra,27 and the Vajradhākatantra,28 and many manuals for ritual and meditation such as the Cakrasaṃvarābhīsāmaya of Lūyīpāda. This system can be summarized as shown in TABLE 2 and 3. There are variants of the system of the first type such as the maṇḍala of four lineage-mistresses introduced in the Abhidhānottaratantra29 and the Vārāhyabhidhānottara30 and the ṣaṭcakravartin maṇḍala or the maṇḍala of six lineage-lords preached in the Abhidhānottaratantra31 and Abhayākaragupta’s Nispannayogāvalī.32

TABLE 2 shows the structure and the meanings of the maṇḍala consisting of twenty-four sites. As A. Sanderson points out, the names of these twenty-four holy sites derive from those of the holy sites mentioned in the Śaiva Tantrasadbhāva. The sites in the order as they are found in the Śaiva Tantrasadbhāva are Kulutā, Aranyeśa, Sindhu, Nageśvara, Samudrakukṣi, Saurāṣṭra, Pretapuri, Himālaya or Himagiri, Kāṇci, Lampāka, Kaliṅga, Kauśala, Sthala, Trīśakuni, Odra, Kāmarūpa, Mālava, Devikoṭa, Sudhārāma, Godāvari, Taṭa (or the bank of Godāvari river, godāvarītaṭa), and Arbuda.33

TABLE 3 provides a summary of geographic locations and features of the sites depicted in Nāropāda’s Yul ni bcu bshi ḷi rgyu mtshan bstan pa.35 As shown in this table, Nāropāda identifies many of the Śaṁvara sites with sites whose center is formed by sacral rocks such as rock liṅga of various shapes and rock dharmodaya.36

The twenty-four holy sites are represented as twenty-four geographical locations in dimension (A) and as an external maṇḍala to be drawn or visualized in dimension (B). There are ten categories of holy sites such as pīṭha, upapīṭha, and eight others (pīṭhādi). These ten site-categories are identical with the ten spiritual stages (daśabhūmi) beginning with the stage pramuditā and ending with
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#### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhūmi</th>
<th>Dākinī</th>
<th>Dhātu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tricakra</td>
<td>ɹ</td>
<td>ɹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramitā</td>
<td>ɹ</td>
<td>ɹ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pīthādi</th>
<th>Holy site</th>
<th>Internal holy site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pulliramalaya</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>Pracanda Khanadakapalin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīra</td>
<td>(= Vīra)</td>
<td>fingernails, teeth, hair on the head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimala</td>
<td>Godvārī</td>
<td>back of the head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīramatī</td>
<td>Vikatadamiśtrin</td>
<td>flesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharvarī</td>
<td>Amitābha</td>
<td>bones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prajñā</td>
<td>Kāmarūpa</td>
<td>hair parting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vākcakra</td>
<td>Prabhakara</td>
<td>anus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhimukhī</td>
<td>Kaliṅga</td>
<td>anus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prapattī</td>
<td>Kālakapīn</td>
<td>anus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Janma (✂)</th>
<th>Upāya</th>
<th>Jaysinī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatsinī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prāpañcā</th>
<th>Heads and body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahāprabha</td>
<td>Head and body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cittacakra</th>
<th>Arbuda</th>
<th>Back of the head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prabhavatī</td>
<td>Kanakalā</td>
<td>Skin, dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahānāsa</td>
<td>Vikatadamiśtrin</td>
<td>flesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīra</td>
<td>Vikatadamiśtrin</td>
<td>flesh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kṣanti</th>
<th>Kṣetra</th>
<th>Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vārya</td>
<td>Upakṣetra</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahābhairava</td>
<td>Vajrajatilaka</td>
<td>bile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahābhārata</td>
<td>Vajrabhairava</td>
<td>bile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiyuvēgas</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahākañkāla</td>
<td>Vajrajatilaka</td>
<td>bile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vairavī</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vairavī</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vimala</th>
<th>Śīla</th>
<th>Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upapāta</td>
<td>Devikotā</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vajradeha</td>
<td>Mahākūṭa</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahābhairava</td>
<td>Vajrajatilaka</td>
<td>bile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiyuvēgas</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prabhakara</th>
<th>Kāmarūpa</th>
<th>Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vākcakra</td>
<td>Prabhakara</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vimala</th>
<th>Śīla</th>
<th>Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upapāta</td>
<td>Devikotā</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vajradeha</td>
<td>Mahākūṭa</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahābhairava</td>
<td>Vajrajatilaka</td>
<td>bile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiyuvēgas</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prabhakara</th>
<th>Kāmarūpa</th>
<th>Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vākcakra</td>
<td>Prabhakara</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vimala</th>
<th>Śīla</th>
<th>Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upapāta</td>
<td>Devikotā</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vajradeha</td>
<td>Mahākūṭa</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahābhairava</td>
<td>Vajrajatilaka</td>
<td>bile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiyuvēgas</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prabhakara</th>
<th>Kāmarūpa</th>
<th>Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vākcakra</td>
<td>Prabhakara</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vimala</th>
<th>Śīla</th>
<th>Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upapāta</td>
<td>Devikotā</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vajradeha</td>
<td>Mahākūṭa</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahābhairava</td>
<td>Vajrajatilaka</td>
<td>bile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiyuvēgas</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prabhakara</th>
<th>Kāmarūpa</th>
<th>Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vākcakra</td>
<td>Prabhakara</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vimala</th>
<th>Śīla</th>
<th>Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upapāta</td>
<td>Devikotā</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vajradeha</td>
<td>Mahākūṭa</td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahābhairava</td>
<td>Vajrajatilaka</td>
<td>bile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiyuvēgas</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>Mahāvēra</td>
<td>lungs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pullīramalaya</strong></td>
<td>Mt. Malaya, which the aroma of sandalwoods fills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jālandhara</strong></td>
<td>The site which is located 1 kroṣa distant from one big town where three rivers from three places named To liṅ, Gar shi, and Śi ka meet each other. This site has 80 rocky caverns, 80 springs, and 80 trees, and a bathing place for heretics and Śi ka natives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Odyāna</strong></td>
<td>The western spot empowered by magical female beings. Owing to this empowerment, the earth of this site is like the dharmodaya or origin of the dharmas and those who live there are very intelligent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arbuda</strong></td>
<td>The town named Takṣaśilā. In this site, there is a dense forest in the mountain shaped like a female's breast and people such as herders and others live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Godāvari</strong></td>
<td>There is a natural product shaped like the dharmodaya filled with [whitish mineral water seen as] bodhicitta in black rocks of the form of a milk-pot. This site lies on the border of the land located in Vindhyā range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rāmeśvara</strong></td>
<td>There is a rock shaped like the mane of a horse. This is situated in the town of the king Rāmeśvara, east of Vajrāsana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Devīkotā</strong></td>
<td>This site is located 4 kroṣa distant from Varendra in eastern district. In this site, there is a temple of king De so pa la where the image of two-eyed Umādevi is enshrined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mālava</strong></td>
<td>There is a rock dharmodaya at a seat of accomplishment shaped like a garland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kāmarūpa</strong></td>
<td>An eastern site. A rock dharmodaya is situated near an image of god shaped like the armpit (? h chan khun).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Odra</strong></td>
<td>This site is located in south, the place of King Daśaratha. Here is a seat of accomplishment, on which there is a mark of the dead (or sivaliṅga) shaped like a nipple. This site bears abundant chattels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trīśakuni</strong></td>
<td>This is Turuṣka’s place where three rivers named Gaṅgā, Pakṣu, and Sindhu meet, a site where many kinds of bird sing. There is a rock dharmodaya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kosala</strong></td>
<td>There is a liṅga shaped like the nose at a seat of accomplishment located 1 kroṣa distant from the realm of King Śas rgyal in west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaliṅga</strong></td>
<td>There is a seat of accomplishment shaped like the mouth. It lies on the border between the grass field and the forest in the land named gLaṅ pas ḫdsin, which is located 12 yojana distant from Vajrāsana. In this site, there are many preta or spirits of dead people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lampāka
There is a rock *liṅga* shaped like the throat at a seat of accomplishment that consists of rock and waterstream. This seat is located behind the tribal (*gar log*) area. There is also a rock which appears to be hanged. Since this site has fallen into the clutches of worldly magical female beings, no people live there currently.

### Kāñci
There is a rock *liṅga* shaped like the heart. It is located at the center of a big town 12 yojana distant from the land of Turuṣṭka. People in this site have clear wisdom.

### Himālaya

### Pretapurī
There is a rock *liṅga* shaped like a mark (some sect mark? *mtsham ma*) at the center of valleys. These valleys are located on the border between India and Tibet. People are suffered from hunger and thirst in this site.

### Grhadevatā
There is a rock *liṅga* decorated with objects shaped like foods for divinities. It is located in the willow forest with dense fog (? *lcān ra rmug po* or this is a name of place) in the land named Li yul.

### Saurāṣṭra
There is a *liṅga* shaped like the thigh at a seat of accomplishment. This is located in the town named Bu mu in the land of Turuṣṭka. The earth and rocks of this site are solid and nice. Someone identifies this site as the town named Ba ra na se.

### Suvarṇadvīpa
The golden island located on the ocean of west India. Someone identifies this site as the realm of King *gTsug gi nor bu*, which is located in east China. In this site, there is a *liṅga* shaped like the shank. People nourish themselves in this site.

### Nagara
Lankāpura, the land of *rākṣasa*. There is a rock *liṅga* shaped like the toes in (or by the side of) lakes. Someone identifies this site as an area around the monastery standing on the border of Kaśmīra and northwest India.

### Sindhu
This site is located between Jālandhara and the land of Turuṣṭka and contains the bank of the river Sindhu flowing near Jālandhara. At this bank, there is a rock *liṅga* shaped like the sole.

### Maru
There is a rock *liṅga* shaped like the big toes in rock caverns where 108 practitioners live. It is located to the north of Jālandhara.

### Kulutā
There is a *liṅga* shaped like the knee and a [rock shaped like] the *dharmodaya* below it. They are situated in a cave of the land named Īnuṭ ti, which is located behind the land Gar sha. In this site, there are blessed rocky mountains.
the stage dharmameghā. The concept of the ten spiritual stages is a traditional doctrine of Mahāyāna Buddhism, although the order of the stage abhimukhī and the stage sudurjayā is reversed in the case of this system of holy sites. The ādīkini or magical female beings who are believed to reside at these sites represent the ten perfections (daśapāramitā). A later work, the Jñānodayatantra, further connects the ten site-categories with the ten wisdoms (daśajñāna). This means that practices based on this system bring the accomplishment of the ten spiritual stages as well as the ten perfections (and the ten wisdoms in the case of the Jñānodayatantra) in the consciousness of the practitioner and manifest them in the ritual space.

Twenty-four pairs of a female divinity and a male one, i.e. couples of vīra (heroes or male divinities) and ādīkini, which are assigned to these twenty-four sites, form three concentric circles (tricakra). Each circle consists of eight pairs of divinities. These circles are called (1) mind circle (cittacakra), (2) speech circle (vākcakra), and (3) body circle (kāyacakra) in order from the innermost to the outermost circle. The mind circle is located in the sky (ākāśa or the like). The speech circle is located on the ground (bhūloka or the like). The body circle is located underground (pātāla). Hence, the ādīkini residing on these three circles have the following aliases: (1) females going in the sky (khecarī), (2) females going on the ground (bhūcarī), and (3) females living underground (pātālavāsinī), respectively. Additionally, the Jñānodayatantra connects the three concentric circles with the three aspects of the Buddha’s body (trikāya), i.e. the dharma-body, the sambhoga-body, and the nirmāna-body, respectively. Although the twenty-four locations constituting these three circles in dimension (A) are all located on the ground and the entire maṇḍala made up of these three circles in dimension (B) is drawn on the ground, they are conceptualized as lying in the three spheres of the experiential world or universe, i.e. sky, ground, and underground. The practices based on this system link the practitioner’s consciousness or the ritual place to the three spheres of the universe (and the three aspects of the Buddha’s body in case of the Jñānodayatantra).

In the case of dimension (C), the twenty-four holy sites mentioned above are located in twenty-four regions (sthāna) of the practitioner’s body. The twenty-four ādīkini reside in the body in the form of inner channels (nāḍī). The twenty-four vīras appear in one’s body in the form of bodily components (dhātu). These inner channels (= ādīkini) link to or carry the bodily components (= vīra), running through the regions of the body (= holy sites). The parts of the body, i.e. the internal holy sites are located throughout the upper, middle, and lower parts of the body, which corresponds to the distribution of the external holy sites in the three spheres (i.e. sky, ground, and underground). From this correspondence, it
can be inferred that one’s body is seen as the microcosmos in this system. By visualizing the above *maṇḍala* of internal holy sites, the practitioner realizes that his/her innate body is parallel to the universe consisting of three spheres (and the three aspects of Buddha’s body in the case of the *Jñānodayatana*tr*na*) and is complete with the ten spiritual stages connected with the ten perfections (and with the ten wisdoms in the case of the *Jñānodayatana*tr*na*).

The *Cakrasaṃvara*tr*atantra*, the earliest scripture of the Saṃvara cycle, does not give details on how the twenty-four holy sites, the three circles, and their internal aspects mentioned above are connected to each other although it alludes vaguely to their correlation. Nor does this text clarify details concerning the internal aspects of this system. This suggests that the system of the first typological tradition as shown in TABLE 2 was only fully formed after the *Cakrasaṃvara*tr*atantra*.

### 3.2 The level as the mythological world-view

The idea that holy sites are abodes of pairs of female and male deities formed the basis for the practices related to this system of holy sites. In addition to this, Nāropāda, in his *Cakrasaṃvaravikuruṇa*, introduces another concept: the myth that the Saṃvara divinities took over the twenty-four sites from Śiva and his retainers.

Variants of this myth extant in Tibet have already been studied in depth by R. Davidson. However, their Indic origin appearing in the above Nāropāda’s work remains unstudied. The myth found in Nāropāda’s work is a mixture of the myth that holy sites are abodes of pairs of female and male deities and the myth of the defeat of Śiva and worldly deities at the hands of the Buddhist divinities. The latter myth can be found in the Buddhist scriptures such as the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgrahāsūtra*, the *Trailokyavijayamahākalparāja*, the *Candraḥyātitalakatantra* and the *Guhyaagarbhatattvaniścaya* as Davidson pointed out. The content of this myth can be summarized as follows.

1. During the era of Kali, a time of moral depravity, some deity of the Thirty-three (*sum cu rtsa gsum gyis[→gyi] lha ḡaḥ shig/ sum cu rtsa gsum pa*), Gandharva, chief Yakṣa and his attendant (*g’yog*), chief Rākṣasa and his attendant, chief Nāga and his attendant, and chief Asura and his attendant, transforming themselves into twenty-four Bhairavas or awful divinities (*drag po*), captured twenty-four sites located on the continent named Jambū. (Regarding who captured which sites, see TABLE 4.) They ate flesh, drank blood, enjoyed sexual intercourse with their wives, and frightened the people living on Jambū. Requested by these Bhairavas, Mahādeva ( = Śiva), who has four bodies, has the nature of four kinds of deed, is four-faced, and resides on the summit of Mt.
TABLE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Some deity</th>
<th>The four sites classified into piṭha.</th>
<th>The four sites classified into upapiṭha.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gandharva</td>
<td>Chief Gandharva</td>
<td>The two sites classified into kṣetra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendant Gandharva</td>
<td>The two sites classified into upakṣetra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakṣa</td>
<td>Chief Yakṣa</td>
<td>The two sites classified into chandroha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendant Yakṣa</td>
<td>The two sites classified into upacchandroha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rākṣasa</td>
<td>Chief Rākṣasa</td>
<td>The two sites classified into melāpaka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendant Rākṣasa</td>
<td>The two sites classified into upamelāpaka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāga</td>
<td>Chief Nāga</td>
<td>The two sites classified into śmaśāna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendant Nāga</td>
<td>The two sites classified into upaśmaśāna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asura</td>
<td>Chief Asura</td>
<td>The two sites classified into ¯smaśāna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendant Asura</td>
<td>The two sites classified into upaśmaśāna.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enjoyment</th>
<th>Enjoyment in assembly (tshogs kyi ḫkhor lo): Heruka deprives Śaiva divinities of their wives and performs (sexual yoga) with these wives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoyment in adornment (brgyan): the Buddhist divinities dress themselves with bones of the Śaiva divinities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolvement</td>
<td>Dissolvement of life (srog): the Buddhist divinities kill the Śaiva male divinities and transubstantiate their consciousnesses (rnam par šes pa i.e. soul).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissolvement of consciousness (rnam par šes pa or ye šes i.e. soul): the Buddhist divinities of both sex absorb the consciousnesses of Śaiva divinities of both sex into their own consciousnesses — the consciousnesses of Śaiva male divinities into those of Buddhist male ones and the consciousnesses of Śaiva female divinities into those of the Buddhist female ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lordship</td>
<td>(Lordship of body): the Buddhist male divinities stand on the individual dead bodies of Śaiva divinities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lordship of word (nag): the Buddhist divinities shut off the individual words of Śaiva divinities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lordship of mind (yid): the Buddhist divinities subjugate the individual minds of Śaiva divinities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meru with his four secondary mother goddesses (ñe baḥi yum) i.e. Gaurī (gaurī) in the east, Ekajāti (e ka dsā ti) in the south, Kālarātrī (ka la ra tri) in the west, and Umādevī (u ma de bi) in the north and his four secret mother goddesses (sbas paḥi yum) i.e. Keśinī (skra can ma), Upakeśinī (ñe baḥi skra can ma), Mun pa ma, and Ṛe baḥi mun pa ma, became the lord of these Bhairavas. These twenty-five paired awful divinities damaged the people living on Jambū and brought this world to a state of degeneration.

[2] Unhappy about this catastrophe, the Samyaksambuddha, in order to subjugate these awful divinities, came down from the Akanisṭha heaven to the sum-
mit of Mt. Meru. The Samyaksambuddha manifested himself as the divinity of the experiential body (loṃs sku), who has the nature of Vajradhara, is one-faced, is two-armed, embraces his consort Samantabhadrī (kun tu bzaṅ mo), and is colored white. Then, he transformed himself into the resultant divinity named Heruka, who is colored black, is four-faced, is twelve-armed, and embraces his consort Vajravārāhī. Subsequently, Heruka and Vajravārāhī created twenty-four pairs of male and female heroic divinities of the body, the word, and the mind (i.e. the twenty-four pairs of vīras and dhākinīs of the tricakra).

[3] The Buddhist divinities attacked Mahādeva and his retainers mentioned above and subjugated them in the manner as summarized in TABLE 5. These subjugating deeds by the Buddhist divinities are classified into three stages: enjoyment (loṃs spyod pa), dissolution (thim pa), and lordship (dbaṅ du byas pa). These deeds are further summarized as follows: the male and female Śaiva divinities were subjugated according to the paths of anger (she sdaṅ gi tshul) and passion (chags pahi tshul) respectively. In this way, the Buddhist divinities subjugated Śaiva divinities and took over the twenty-four sites on Jambū. Heruka further created four female divinities, who were gate-keepers, and four other female divinities (i.e. the eight dhākinīs of the samayacakra). These eight female divinities attacked and subjugated Kinnaras of both sex found in the eight directions of the above Śaiva divinities.

[4] Although the twenty-four pairs of Buddhist divinities established themselves at the twenty-four sites, they had not yet attained enlightenment. Hence, they went to the top of Mt. Meru where (the Samyaksambuddha resided). Asked by them to give instructions on the truth and received various offerings and hymns from them, (the Samyaksambuddha) produced the scriptures of the Śaṇvara cycle as follows in order: a tantra of a hundred thousand chapters, the Khasamatantra of a hundred thousand śloka, the Ṛgveda (mkhaḥ ḥgro ma dra ba sdom pa rgya mtshoḥi rgyud) of a hundred thousand pāda, a tantra of a hundred thousand letters consisting of fifty-one chapters, and scriptures called Abhidhānatantra.

The story summarized above consists of four main scenes: [1] the evil reign by Śiva and his retainers over Jambū where the twenty-four sites are located, [2] Buddha’s transformation into the Śaṇvara divinities, [3] the Śaṇvara divinities’ victory over Śiva and his retainers and their establishment on the twenty-four sites, and [4] the production of the Buddhist Śaṇvara scriptures on the summit of Mt. Meru. From these scenes, the intention of this myth can be interpreted as (i) attaching Buddha-nature to the violent Śaṇvara divinities, (ii) asserting the superiority of Buddhism over Śaivism, and (iii) reordering this world after the reign of Śiva through the establishment of the Śaṇvara divinities on the twenty-
four sites and the creation of the Saṃvara scriptures on the top of Mt. Meru, the center of this world, during the Kali age of moral depravity. The reordering of this world by Saṃvara scriptures does not mean the complete removal of Śaiva qualities or elements. It is intended that the Śaiva qualities were integrated into Saṃvara divinities in this reordering of this world. The myth describes that the Saṃvara divinities dressed the bones of Śaiva divinities, absorbed the consciousnesses of the Śaiva divinities into their own consciousnesses, and stood on their dead bodies as observed in TABLE 5.

This intention to reorder this world containing the twenty-four sites with the integration of Śaiva qualities can also be observed in Nāropāda’s teachings concerning the features of individual holy sites summarized in TABLE 3. As mentioned before, Nāropāda reveals that many of the Saṃvara sites have sacred rocks such as rock linga and rock dharmodaya as their sacred center. He does not mention stūpa in these sites, which function as the general site-center in Orthodox Buddhism. The rock linga and the rock dharmodaya seem to be counterparts to rock śivalinga and rock yoni of Śaivism respectively. Regarding the rock linga, Nāropāda often describes their shapes as being in conformity with those of the bodily parts which the Saṃvara scriptures equate to external holy sites as shown in TABLE 2 e.g. the linga shapes like the nipple in Odra, the nose in Kosala, the throat in Lampāpa, the heart in Kāncī.

4 The holy sites of the second typological tradition

Holy sites of the second typological tradition are systematized using twelve categories of sites (pīthādi). These twelve categories correspond to the ten site-categories of the first type to which two additional categories, the pilava and the upapilava categories, have been added. Unlike the system of the first tradition, the order of these twelve site-categories and the total number of holy sites differ according to the texts in question.

The basis for the second typological tradition had already been formed in the Hevajra cycle before the Saṃvara scriptures introduced this typological tradition. Hence, our discussion starts with an investigation of the system found in the Hevajratantra, the central scripture of the Hevajra cycle.

4.1 Holy sites in the Hevajratantra

TABLE 6 shows the system of holy sites introduced in the Hevajratantra, and interpretations on these sites given in the Yogaratnamālā and the Muktāvalī, two commentaries on the Hevajratantra. The names of the top four sites categorized as pītha, i.e. Jālandhara, Oḍḍiyāna (= Uddiyāna= Odyāna), Pūrṇagiri, and Kāmarūpa coincide with the four great sites (pītha) of female divinities
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piṭhādi</th>
<th>Holy site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) Chandoha</td>
<td>Harikela. The site appearing in the center of the salty ocean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Upacchandoha</td>
<td>Kaliṅga. The golden island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Melāpaka</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Upamelāpaka</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Pilava</td>
<td>The periphery area of a village. The periphery area of a town. Caritra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kośala. Vindhyā. Kaumārapaurikā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Upapilava</td>
<td>Places close to the pilava-sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Smaśāna</td>
<td>A place where pretas assemble (i.e. graveyard). Seashore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Upaśmaśāna</td>
<td>Garden. The edge of a pond.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note] i) The Yogaratnamālā identifies Pūrṇagiri with Kollagiri and Pullimalaya.  
ii) The two commentaries identify this with Pāṭaliputra.  
iii) The two commentaries read as “Harikela, which appeared in the center of the salty ocean.”  
iv) The two commentaries identify this with Suvarṇadvīpa.  
v) Kokaṇam — SKT ed.

The Hevajratantra itself does not clearly mention the one-to-one correspondence between the twelve site-categories and the spiritual stages although its commentaries expound this one-to-one correspondence as will be seen in the next subsection of this paper. (It may be that the function of these twelve site-categories was merely to group the holy sites into ten or twelve in the Hevajratantra.) Since the list of holy sites as shown in TABLE 6 was given by Lord (bhagavat) in answer to a question posed by Vajragarbha concerning the locations where the ritual assembly (melā, gaṇacakra) is performed by magical female beings, the purpose of this list should be understood as selecting and listing the sites deemed appropriate for performing ritual assemblies with the magical female beings. As mentioned in the first section of this paper (1.2.2), the Hevajratantra and other scriptures belonging to the Yoginītantra tradition often uphold the idea that holy sites are places where local magical female beings gather. It can be assumed that it is this idea that lays behind the compilation of the Hevajra list in question.

The purpose of the Hevajra list mentioned above seems to link to the char-
acteristics of this system as follows. (i) Among the three dimensions, this system has only dimension (A). (ii) The list as shown in TABLE 6 includes not only specific sites but also general places such as the periphery area of a village, a place where *preta* assemble, the seashore, and so forth. Some scholars say that this is the unsystematic aspect of the Hevajra list of holy sites. However, we should not jump to such conclusion. From an anthropological viewpoint, these places can be regarded as liminal places, effective for performing ritual gatherings. Thus, it should be stressed that this form of listing sacred sites is logical in the context of the purpose of this scripture.

4.2 Expansions of the Hevajra system

Let us investigate the spread and development of the Hevajra-system. TABLE 7, TABLE 8, and TABLE 9 summarize the system of holy sites preached in the *Samputodbhavatantra*, a scripture belonging to both the Hevajra and the Saṃvarac cycles, and interpretations given in its commentary the *Āmnāyamañjari*, that introduced in the *Mahāmudrātilakatantra*, one of the last scriptures belonging to the Hevajra cycle, and that found in the *Dākārṇavatantra*, one of the last scriptures belonging to the Saṃvarac cycle, respectively. Instructions given in some commentaries will also be investigated.

The main developments that occurred in the systems of the second typological tradition that can be observed in the texts mentioned above are as follows. (i) The realignment of the list of holy sites.

The *Mahāmudrātilakatantra* borrows many sites in almost the same order from the list found in the *Hevajratantra*. In the *Mahāmudrātilakatantra*, Odyāna has an alias name: Vajrapīṭha. At the same time, some of the general sites such as the marginal regions of a village, a town, or a garden, found in the Hevajra list are replaced by specific sites.

The influence of the system of the first typological tradition can be discerned in the following realignments. [1] In the *Mahāmudrātilakatantra*, each of the *piṭha* and the *upapiṭha* consists of four sites, and each of the other site-categories consists of two sites. [2] The compilers of the *Dākārṇavatantra* sought a compromise between the list of holy sites of the first typological tradition and that of the *Hevajratantra* by employing the system of twelve site-categories, which forms the framework for the system of the second typological tradition. In the *Dākārṇavatantra*, all twenty-four sites classified into the first six site-categories from (1) to (6) are identical with the twenty-four sites of the first tradition, and the other twenty-four sites classified into the second group of six site-categories numbered (7) to (12) seem to be derived from the sites listed in the *Hevajratantra*. [3] The compilers of these two scriptures regarded the ten
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TABLE 7 (The Saṃputodbhavatanaṭra)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piṭhādi</th>
<th>Holy sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) Kṣetra</td>
<td>Kāmarūpa. Oḍra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Chandroha</td>
<td>Kalinga. Lampāka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Upacchandoha</td>
<td>Kānči. Himālaya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Melapaka</td>
<td>Pretādhivāsinī. Grhadevatā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Upamelapaka</td>
<td>Saurāṣṭra. Suvarṇadvīpa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Śmaśāna</td>
<td>Nagara. Sindhu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Upasmaśāna</td>
<td>Maru. Kulatā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Pilava</td>
<td>Kāruṇya. Kāmrārapāṭaka. Harikela, which is located at the center of the salty ocean. Vindhyā. Kaumārapūrikā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Upapilava</td>
<td>Places close to the pilava-sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śmaśāna</td>
<td>A place where pretas assemble (i.e. graveyard). Seashore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upasmaśāna</td>
<td>Garden. The edge of a pond.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note] i) The Āmnāyamaṇjarī comments that Pollagiri, Kollagiri, Pullīramalaya, and Vajrapīṭha (ro rje gnas) are synonymous terms. ii) Nagara means Pāṭaliputra, according to the Āmnāyamaṇjarī. iii) Kāruṇya is Kāruṇyapāṭaka, according to the Āmnāyamaṇjarī. iv) The Āmnāyamaṇjarī comments that Caritra and the periphery area of a village or town are also regarded as belonging to the site-category pilava.

site-categories beginning with piṭha and ending with upaśmaśāna as a set of site-categories in the tradition of the first typological system, and posited the remaining two site-categories pilava and upapilava after this set. [4] The compilers of the Saṃputodbhavatanaṭra aimed at a compromise between the list of holy sites of the first typological tradition and that of the Hevajratanaṭra in a manner different from in the case of the Dākārnavaṭanaṭra. In the Saṃputodbhavatanaṭra, the ten site-categories from (1) to (10) and the sites which are classified into these categories coincide with those in the first typological tradition. After these ten categories, the site-categories pilava and upapilava are posited, and again śmaśāna and upaśmaśāna follow these. The sites grouped into these last four site-categories have deep association with those classified into the same four site-categories in the Hevajratantra.

(ii) The internalization of holy sites: dimension (C) in the second typological tradition.

The Mahāmudrātilakatantra reveals internal counterparts of the external holy sites in a manner different from that of the first typological tradition as...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piṭhādi</th>
<th>External holy sites, and their internal counterparts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) Kṣetra</td>
<td>Munmuṇi (jaw). Devikoṭa (throat).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Chandroha</td>
<td>Godāvari (navel). Harikela (heart).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Upacchandroha</td>
<td>Kāṇči (center of the sex organ). Lampāka (secret circle).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Melāpaka</td>
<td>Karmārapāṭaka (protruding portion of the sex organ). Cāmikaradvīpa (anus).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Upamelāpaka</td>
<td>Koṅkaṇa (thighs). Vindhyā (knees).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Smaṇa</td>
<td>A place where pretas assemble (shanks). Seashore (feet).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Upaśmaṇa</td>
<td>Caritra (toes). Kaumārapura (big toes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Pīlava</td>
<td>Kaśmīra (all limbs). Kairātamanḍala (soles).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Upaṇīlava</td>
<td>Nepāla (lower region of the abdomen where three inner channels cross with one another). Karṇakubha (hip).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

shown in round brackets in the table. This shows that the system of the second typological tradition organized in the Hevajratantra had developed into a system that also encompassed dimension (C).

Indrabodhi’s Sampaṭatilakatantraṭikā explains internal counterparts of the external sites of the Sampaṭodbhavatantra. According to Indrabodhi, the internal counterparts of the twenty-four external sites from piṭha to the first upaśmaṇa are identical with those of the first typological tradition shown in TABLE 2. The external sites from pīlava to the second upaśmaṇa correspond to eight petals of a lotus of one’s heart where eight inner channels reside. The influence of the first typological tradition can be discerned in Indrabodhi’s interpretation.

(iii) The one-to-one correspondence between the twelve site-categories and the spiritual stages.

The one-to-one correspondence between site-categories and spiritual stages was, as investigated before, one of the characteristics of the system of the first typological tradition and was not clearly observed in the system of holy sites of the Hevajratantra. However, commentaries such as the Yogaratnamālā (YRM),
The Muktāvalī, the Saṃpuṭatilakatantraṭīkā (STT), the Āmnāyamaṇjarī (AM), and the Pithādinirnaya (PAN) introduce the idea of the one-to-one correspondence between the twelve site-categories and the spiritual stages into the systems of the Hevajratantra (HVT), the Saṃpuṭodbhavatantra (SUT), and/or the Mahāmudrātilakatantra (MMTT) as shown in TABLE 10. The Muktāvalī explains the one-to-one correspondence in question briefly as follows: the twelve site-categories in the Hevajratantra correspond to the twelve spiritual stages beginning with the stage Adhimukticarāya and ending with the stage Samantaraprabhā.

As examined above, the compilers of later scriptures and commentaries attempted to elaborate the system of holy sites of the second typological tradition as introduced in the Hevajratantra. The compilers often borrowed ideas from the first typological tradition in these elaborations.

5 Holy sites of the third typological tradition
The system of holy sites of the third typological tradition differs from those of the first and the second traditions in that, at least in its early stage, neither the ten or twelve site-categories nor the idea of the one-to-one correspondence
### TABLE 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HVT</th>
<th>YRM</th>
<th>PAN</th>
<th>MMTT</th>
<th>PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piṭha</td>
<td>Pramuditā</td>
<td></td>
<td>Piṭha</td>
<td>Pramuditā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upapīṭha</td>
<td>Vimalā</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upapīṭha</td>
<td>Vimalā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṣetra</td>
<td>Arciṣmati</td>
<td>Prabhākarī</td>
<td>Kṣetra</td>
<td>Prabhākarī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upakṣetra</td>
<td>Prabhākarī</td>
<td>Arciṣmati</td>
<td>Upakṣetra</td>
<td>Arciṣmati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandoha</td>
<td>Sudurjaya</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chandoha</td>
<td>Sudurjaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upacchandoha</td>
<td>Abhimukhī</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upacchandoha</td>
<td>Abhimukhī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melāpaka</td>
<td>Dūraṅgamā</td>
<td></td>
<td>Melāpaka</td>
<td>Dūraṅgamā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upamelāpaka</td>
<td>Acalā</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upamelāpaka</td>
<td>Acalā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilava</td>
<td>Sādhumatī</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Śmaśāna</td>
<td>Sādhumatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upapilava</td>
<td>Dharmaṃeṣṭi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upaśmaśāna</td>
<td>Dharmaṃeṣṭi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śmaśāna</td>
<td>Samantaprabhā</td>
<td>Sādhumatī</td>
<td>Pilava</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upaśmaśāna</td>
<td>Nirupamā</td>
<td>Dharmameṣṭi</td>
<td>Upapilava</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUT</th>
<th>STTṬ</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piṭha</td>
<td>Pramuditā / Dānapāramitā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upapīṭha</td>
<td>Vimalā / Silapāramitā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṣetra</td>
<td>Prabhākarī / Kṣantipāramitā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upakṣetra</td>
<td>Arciṣmati / Vīryapāramitā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandoha</td>
<td>Abhimukhī / Dhyānapāramitā</td>
<td>Sudurjaya / Dhyānapāramitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upacchandoha</td>
<td>Sudurjaya / Prajñāpāramitā</td>
<td>Abhimukhī / Prajñāpāramitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melāpaka</td>
<td>Dūraṅgamā / Upāyapāramitā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upamelāpaka</td>
<td>Acalā / Praṇidhipāramitā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śmaśāna</td>
<td>Sādhumatī / Balapāramitā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upaśmaśāna</td>
<td>Dharmameṣṭi / Jñānapāramitā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilava</td>
<td>Adhimukticāryā</td>
<td>Adhimukticāryā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upapilava</td>
<td>Samantaprabhā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śmaśāna</td>
<td>Samantaprabhā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upaśmaśāna</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between these site-categories and the spiritual stages served as its framework. The system of holy sites of this tradition was especially influential in the Kaula (or Kula) tradition of the early medieval age and the later Śākta tradition in the case of Śaiva tantrism and in the Śaṃvara cycle in the case of Buddhist tantrism.

5.1 Holy sites in the Kaula and the Śaṃvara traditions

The Kaula Kubjikāmatatantra⁶⁶ and the Śaṃvara Vajraḍākatantra⁶⁷ give similar lists of holy sites. They can be summarized as shown in TABLE 11 and 12. In both systems, pairs of deities composed of a goddess (devī) and a land-protector god (kṣetrapāla) are thought to reside at these sites. Information on the abodes of the above goddesses is also given. Although these scriptures give the weapons, features, and births/lineages of the goddesses, I have omitted this information in both tables in order to avoid unnecessary details.

It is most probable that the compilers of the Vajraḍākatantra borrowed the list of holy sites from the Kubjikāmatatantra or some similar source and modified

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holy sites</th>
<th>Goddesses</th>
<th>Land-protectors</th>
<th>Abodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Aṭṭahāsa</td>
<td>Saumyāśyā</td>
<td>Mahāghaṇṭa</td>
<td>kadamba-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Caritrā</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇā</td>
<td>Mahābala</td>
<td>karaṇja-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Kolāgiri</td>
<td>Mahālakṣmī</td>
<td>Agnīka</td>
<td>naga-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Jayantī</td>
<td>Jvālāmukhi</td>
<td>Mahāpreta</td>
<td>nimba-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ujjayini</td>
<td>Mahāmāyā</td>
<td>Mahākāla</td>
<td>aśvattha-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Prayāga</td>
<td>Vāyuvegā</td>
<td>Pavana</td>
<td>udumbara-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Vāraṇāsī</td>
<td>Śāṃkari</td>
<td>Śāṃkara</td>
<td>tāla-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Śrikoṭa</td>
<td>Karnamotī</td>
<td>Hetuka</td>
<td>vaṭa-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Virajā</td>
<td>Ambikā</td>
<td>Anala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Airudī</td>
<td>Agnivaktrā</td>
<td>Ghanṭārava</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Hastināpura</td>
<td>Pingāksī</td>
<td>Mahājaṅgha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Elāpura</td>
<td>Kharāṣyā</td>
<td>Gajakarṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Kāśmarī</td>
<td>Gokarṇā</td>
<td>Taḍijjaṅgha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Maru</td>
<td>Kramaṇī</td>
<td>Karāla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Nagara or Caitrakaccha</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Romajaṅgha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Punḍravardhana</td>
<td>Cāmuṇḍā</td>
<td>Kumbhaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Parastīra</td>
<td>Prasannāśyā</td>
<td>Trijaṭa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Prṣṭhāpura</td>
<td>Vidyumukhi</td>
<td>Ghanarava</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Kuhudi</td>
<td>Mahābala</td>
<td>Ulkāmukha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Sopāra</td>
<td>Agnivaktrā</td>
<td>Piṣīṭāsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Kiṣṇika</td>
<td>Lokamāṭr</td>
<td>Mahāmeru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Māyāpūrī</td>
<td>Kampini</td>
<td>Bhimānana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 ĀmṛātiKEsvara</td>
<td>Pūtanā</td>
<td>Mahākrodha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Rājagrīha</td>
<td>Bhagnanāśā</td>
<td>Mahākarna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 12 (The Vajradākatantra)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holy sites</th>
<th>Goddesses</th>
<th>Land-protectors</th>
<th>Abodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Atśahāsa</td>
<td>Saumyamukhā</td>
<td>Mahāghaṇṭa kadamba-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kollagiri</td>
<td>Mahālakṣmī</td>
<td>Agnimukha top of a mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Jvālāmukhī</td>
<td>Mahāvrata nimba-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dharaṇī</td>
<td>Śaṃkari</td>
<td>Ṛudhvakeśa tāla-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Devīkoṭa</td>
<td>Karnamoṭī</td>
<td>Hetuka vaṭa-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Virajā</td>
<td>Ambikā</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Erudī</td>
<td>Agnimukhī</td>
<td>Ghaṇṭārava kāṇcana-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pura</td>
<td>Pingalā</td>
<td>Mahājāṅgha jaṭī-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Elāpura</td>
<td>Kharasthā</td>
<td>Gajakarna —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kaśmīra</td>
<td>Gokarṇī</td>
<td>Nādiṅjāṅgha top of a mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Maru</td>
<td>Kramanī</td>
<td>Karāla big desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nagara</td>
<td>Vetālā</td>
<td>Romajāṅgha vetra-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Paunḍravardhana</td>
<td>Čāmunḍā</td>
<td>Kumbha —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jayantī</td>
<td>Prasannāsya</td>
<td>Trijaṭa divine palace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pṛṣṭhāpura</td>
<td>Vidyunmukhī</td>
<td>Ghaṇṭārava —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sopāra</td>
<td>Piśītāsanā(ii)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Caritra</td>
<td>Karaṇījavāsīnī</td>
<td>Mahāgaṇṭa(karṇa-tree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Odyāyana</td>
<td>Guhyā</td>
<td>Mahānāda(asoka-tree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jālandhara</td>
<td>Caṇḍālinī</td>
<td>Janeta kanaka-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kṣīrīka</td>
<td>Lokamāṭī</td>
<td>Mahāmeru sāla-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Māyāpura</td>
<td>Bhīmā(v)</td>
<td>Bhīma bhūta-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Āmraka</td>
<td>Pūtanā</td>
<td>Mahāvrata dāru-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Rājagrha</td>
<td>Vipannā</td>
<td>Mahākarna(dāru-tree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bhoṭa</td>
<td>Sahajā(vii)</td>
<td>Bhoga(madhu-tree) top of a mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mālava</td>
<td>Sekā</td>
<td>Samapūṃsaṃsvare madhu-tree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


the list according to their Buddhist worldview as can be seen in the integration of the Buddhist site Bhoṭa (Tibet) into the list.68

### 5.2 The development of the system in the Kula stream

The *Kubjikāmatantra* proclaims that practitioners can become stainless (*nirmala*) by conducting pilgrimages to holy sites or reciting verses in praise of these sites.69 This suggests that the system of holy sites in the *Kubjikāmatantra* covers dimensions (A) and (B). In the Śaiva tradition, the list of holy sites similar to that of the *Kubjikāmatantra* (or to the first eight sites, the eight cremation
TABLE 13 (The Tantrāloka)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Part of Body</th>
<th>External Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Atthaḥāsa (tuft of the head)</td>
<td>[2] Caritra (cranial fontanelle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kaulagiri (ears)</td>
<td>[5] Ujjayinī (eye-brows)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>[6] Prayaṅga (mouth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vāraṇaśi (heart)</td>
<td>[7] Śrīpīṭha (shoulders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>[9] Eṭābhī (belly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Virajā (throat)</td>
<td>[11] Hālā = Alipura (navel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>[12] Gōsrutī = Gokarna (testicles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Marukośa (sex organ)</td>
<td>[13] Nagara (right buttock)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>[15] Pauṇḍravardhana (left buttock)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Purastīra (left thigh)</td>
<td>[16] Elāpura (right thigh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>[17] Kudyākeśi (right knee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sopāna (left knee)</td>
<td>[18] Māyāpū = Māyāpurī (right shank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>[20] Kṣiraka (left shank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Paunḍravardhana (left buttock)</td>
<td>[21] Kṣiraka (left shank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>[22] Āmrāta = Āmratakeśvara (right ankle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>[23] Nṛpasadmanī = Rājagṛha (left ankle)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

grounds, of this list) appears in the Jayadrathayāmala, the Brahmayāmala, the Niśisamcāratantra, and the 29th chapter of the Tantrāloka dealing with Kaula doctrine as argued by A. Sanderson, M. Dyczkowski, and J. Dupuche. The extended versions of this system can be found in several scriptures of the Śākta tradition compiled in later ages as suggested by D.C. Sircar. It seems that the tradition on the system of holy sites as seen in the Kubjikāmatatantra became a big stream in the Śākta tradition including the Kaula tradition.

Among these works except the later texts, the 29th chapter of the Tantrāloka explains the form of this system in dimension (C). It is summarized in TABLE 13. The names of body parts found in round brackets in this table represent the internal counterparts to the external sites. A place-name after an equal mark refers to the alias name for the site as given in Jayaratha’s commentary. The list of body parts and their corresponding external holy sites in this system differs from that of the Buddhist systems as discussed in the previous sections.

### 5.3 The development of the system in the Samvara cycle

The Vajradākatantra proclaims that the magical females residing in these holy sites, who perform ritual assemblage every night, bring the practitioners many kinds of accomplishments. This is the myth which legitimates the efficacy of the practice of the twenty-four holy sites in question. However, the scripture does not explain how to practice these holy sites. Hence, it is not clear which dimension these holy sites have.

In the Bauddha (Samvara) tradition, a similar system can be found in the Dākāraṇavatana and the Āmnāyamañjarī, two works composed after the compilation of the Vajradākatantra. Indeed the compilers of these two works attempted to elaborate on the list found in the Vajradākatantra. However, no
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qualitative development can be detected.

The Piṭhādinīrṇaya is the only text that explains dimension (C) of the system introduced in the above texts. The author of this work, Śākyarāksita (14th–15th centuries), worked during the last stage of Indian Buddhism. This means that the development of dimension (C) in the third typological tradition in Buddhism occurred later than in Śaivism. The Piṭhādinīrṇaya gives clear instructions that advanced practitioners of lower rank should seek to internally visualize the holy sites of the Vajradākatantra in the same manner as in the first typological tradition (e.g. Aṭṭhāṣa corresponds to the head, and the goddess and the god assigned to this site are identical with the inner channel running through the head and the set of fingernails and teeth, respectively.\textsuperscript{77}) The bodily parts and the inner channels are related to the ten spiritual stages and the ten perfections respectively in the system of the first typological tradition. Therefore, it may be stated that Śākyarāksita attempted to integrate the Mahāyānic meaning as well as the internal aspect found in the first typological tradition into the system of the third typological tradition.

As mentioned before, the Buddhist Saṃvara cycle introduced this system through contact with the Kaula tradition. However, as can be seen from the discussion above, the compilers of the Saṃvara scriptures attempted to develop this system in a manner different from the Kaula system.

6 Holy sites in the fourth typological tradition

The system of the fourth typological tradition has only an internal dimension, i.e. dimension (C). This system is a mixture of three theories: (i) the theory of holy sites, (ii) the theory of inner circles (cakra), and (iii) the theory of the circulation of the vital wind (prāṇa etc.), or in other words, the theory of the inner wheel of time (kālacakra). A system which is similar in structure to this one appears in the Kālacakratantra and its commentary, the Vimalaprabhā.\textsuperscript{78}

First, we will focus our investigation on the connection between theories (i) and (ii) in the system of the fourth typological tradition. After that, we will proceed to examine any connections between these and theory (iii).

6.1 Holy sites and inner circles

TABLE 14 shows the system of holy sites of the fourth typological tradition introduced in the Daśkārnāvatantra.\textsuperscript{79} The same system can also be found in the Yoginiyālatantra,\textsuperscript{80} the compilation of which is later than the Daśkārnāvatantra. These scriptures were the last ones to be added to the Saṃvara cycle. This suggests that the system of the fourth typological tradition appeared in the last stage of the Saṃvara tradition.
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TABLE 14 (The Dākārṇavatantra)

(A) Sixty-four inner channels running through nirmāṇacakra.\(^{i}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Madhyadeśī</th>
<th>(2) Kaliṅgī</th>
<th>(3) Oḍī</th>
<th>(4) Kārnāṭakī</th>
<th>(5) Sari</th>
<th>(6) Saurāṣṭrī</th>
<th>(7) Malayī</th>
<th>(8) Vaṅgī</th>
<th>(9) Draviḍī</th>
<th>(10) Catalingakī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(B) Eight inner channels running through dharmacakra.\(^{ii}\)

| (1) Prayāgī | (2) Deviṅkoṭī | (3) Ujjayinī | (4) Mahālakṣmī | (5) Jvālāmukhī | (6) Siddhasimbhalī | (7) Śimhāli | (8) Kaumāripaurīkī |

[Note] i) Nirmāṇacakra is an inner circle of the shape of a lotus with sixty-four petals. This inner circle is visualized in one's abdomen. ii) Dharmacakra is an inner circle of the shape of a lotus with eight petals. This inner circle is visualized at one's heart region.

The Dākārṇavatantra states that the inner circles (cakra) have the form of lotus flowers and the inner channels run through the petals of these inner circles, which agrees with the general doctrin on inner circle found in many Buddhist tantric scriptures. The inner circles fitted with the inner channels serve as a framework for the system of the fourth typological tradition. Based on this framework, this system is constituted of seventy-two magical female beings that are assumed to be connected to seventy-two external holy sites. Holy sites per se do not appear in this system. This is the system of holy sites in which holy sites are present only latently. The seventy-two names listed in TABLE 14 are those of the inner channels identified with the seventy-two magical female beings that are in turn connected to the seventy-two external holy sites. Male divinities do not appear in this system. The names of these female beings are derived from the external holy sites with which they are thought to be connected. The terms pilava, upapilava, śmaśāna, and upaśmaśāna, which are used in the other typological traditions as site-categories, are regarded as vast sanctuaries which do
not differ from individual sites in quality in the system in question. (See (57), (58), (59) and (60) of (A) in TABLE 14.)

6.2 The circulation of the vital wind

This system is also characterized by the theory of the circulation (literally, passage, saṃkrānti) of the vital wind in one’s body. The circulation of the vital wind in the body is one of the physiological activities that maintain one’s life operated through one’s breathing. The Ṛkāṇavātantra explains the function of sixty of the sixty-four inner channels running from the inner circle named nirmāṇacakra (i.e. the inner circle situated in one’s abdomen) in the following way.  

One day consists of sixty ghaṭi (=ghaṭikā), which equals twelve saṃkrānti. Hence, one saṃkrānti equals five ghaṭi. The sixty of the sixty-four inner channels lead from the nirmāṇacakra to the twelve joints (presumably, two shoulder joints, two cubital joints, two wrist joints, two hip joints, two knee joints, and two ankle joints). These sixty inner channels correspond to sixty ghaṭi, i.e. one day. Hence, one inner channel represents one ghaṭi, and five inner channels connecting to one joint represent five ghaṭi, i.e. one saṃkrānti. The vital wind passes through the five inner channels connecting to one joint and passes through this joint in one saṃkrānti. In the same manner, the vital wind passes through the other eleven joints by way of the other fifty-five inner channels connected to these joints in eleven saṃkrānti. Thus, the vital wind passes one’s twelve joints in one day through the sixty inner channels leading from the nirmāṇacakra to these joints. 

The Ṛkāṇavātantra does not explain how the following inner channels function in this circulation of the vital wind: the other four inner channels, which are described as running from the nirmāṇacakra to the opening of the navel, the sex organ, and both ribs and the eight inner channels running through the inner circle named dharmacakra (i.e. the inner circle situated in one’s heart region). This is all this text says about this system. However, as these seventy-two inner channels are identical with magical female beings connected with external holy sites and since sixty of these inner channels are also regarded as passageways for the vital wind which circulates in one’s body in line with the passage of time, it may be inferred that the system of the fourth typological tradition implies the idea that the rhythmical circulation of the vital wind in one’s body is identical to the performance of external pilgrimages in order to perform yogic intercourse with magical female beings.
Conclusion: a comparison with the structure of the orthodox system

We started our discussion by clarifying that, in the eyes of the compilers of the scriptures, the basis of the system of holy sites in Śāṃvara Buddhism is formed by a list of names of holy sites rather than specific localities themselves. The list of names of Śāṃvara holy sites fulfills the function of providing a symbolic framework along which individual sites are arranged according to the compiler’s wishes to a certain extent. This is suggested by the fact that the compilers of the scriptures did not always reach a consensus on the actual geographical locations and features of the holy sites in question and by the fact that there were even more liberal views concerning the identity and geographical location of the holy sites in question that each site had multiple identities concerning their belonging site-categories and any site where sacred beings reside could be a Śāṃvara holy site. We further clarified that the list of names of holy sites and the symbolic meaning which the list provides underwent gradual changes in successive compilations of scriptures.

Based on this view that the list of names of holy sites forms the basis of the system of holy sites, two levels and three dimensions can be discerned within the system of holy sites: level (i), which consists of the system of practice comprised of three dimensions (i.e. (A) external holy sites as geographical locations, (B) external holy sites seen as separated from specific locations, and (C) internal holy sites) and level (ii) which consists of a mythological world-view based on the concept of holy sites. These two levels are deeply interconnected. The mythological world-view holds that this world consists of holy sites which function as either abodes of pairs of female and male deities or places where magical female beings reside and gather. This mythological world-view legitimates the efficacy of the system of practice centered on holy sites and the perceived efficacy through this legitimization reproduces analogous myths or its extended version in successive compilations of scriptures.

Among the four major typological traditions of holy sites, the first tradition was the most popular and the most influential one in the Śāṃvara cycle. On the level of the system of practice, the system takes on the form of a three-dimensional maṇḍala carrying traditional Mahāyāna doctrines as its meaning such as the ten spiritual stages and the ten perfections. The meaning which this maṇḍala has became more elaborate in later texts. On the level of the mythological world-view, the system takes on the narrative outlined above and the narrative in a version of it revealed by Nāropāda, which recounts the creation of the Śāṃvara system during the Kali age.
The mythological world-views expounded by the other three systems of holy sites hold that holy sites in this world are abodes of pairs of male and female deities or places where magical female beings reside and gather. No attempt at elaboration, as can be observed in Nāropa’s version of the first typological tradition, can be found in the remaining three traditions. On the level of the system of practice, the system of the second typological tradition, whose earliest form has only dimension (A), and that of the third typological tradition, whose earliest form lacks descriptions that specify the dimension to be practiced, were reorganized into a system incorporating Mahāyānic concepts such as the ten or twelve spiritual stages and also covering dimension (C). The first typological tradition often played an influential role in the reorganization of the systems of the second and the third typological traditions mentioned above.

The system of holy sites introduced in the Samāvara cycle and its related scriptural cycles can be called the esoteric system of holy sites. On the other hand, the system of the eight caitya sites, namely the Eight Great Sites (aṣṭamahāsthāna), which took shape as an extended system of the ancient Buddhist system of the four or six caitya sites, can be regarded as the orthodox system of holy sites in Buddhism. Let us compare the orthodox system in the post-Gupta era and the esoteric one in terms of the two levels and three dimensions of holy sites in order to deepen the understanding of the esoteric system.

First, as in the case of the esoteric system of holy sites, it is possible to see that the list of names of eight holy sites or frequently the list of eight deeds or miracles performed by the Buddha connected with the eight sites functions to form the basis of the system of holy sites in the case of the orthodox system of holy sites in the post-Gupta era. It is suspicious whether all of these eight sites fully functioned as actual pilgrimage sites in this era. This is suggested by the Ta-tang Hsi-yu-chi of Hsuan-Tsang, a Chinese Buddhist practitioner who traveled in India and middle Asia in the seventh century. According to this work, many of the Buddhist temples had already been ruined in some of these eight sites and only a small number of Buddhist monks were there when Hsuan-Tsang visited these sites. However, the list of names of eight holy sites or the list of eight deeds performed by the Buddha connected with the eight sites often played important roles among the practitioners and devotees even in this era. It is known from the fact that they composed hymns for the eight sites in question and made icons whose motif was the eight deeds of the Buddha in these eight sites.

In the case of the first level (i.e. the system of practice), the orthodox system appears as a set of pilgrimage sites to be visited, to be praised in verse, or to be represented in icon in order to accumulate religious merits. Thus, the orthodox
system has dimensions (A) and (B) on its first level. There seems no absolute hierarchy between these two dimensions. On the other hand, the normative type of the esoteric system, i.e. the system of the first typological tradition, covers all three dimensions. There existed the view in the esoteric tradition that the practice in dimension (B) is higher than that in dimension (A) and that the practice in dimension (C), which the orthodox system is lacking, is superior to that in dimension (B). It should be noted that the esoteric system of the fourth typological tradition only consists of dimension (C). At the same time, however, it was proclaimed that there is no hierarchy between these three dimensions if one attempts to attain the true aim of the practice of holy sites i.e. to understand the Mahāyānāc meanings which the system of holy sites carries.

With regard to the second level (the mythological world-view), the idea that the historical Buddha and the mythological Buddha performed his main religious deeds or miracles at the eight holy sites legitimizes the existence of the orthodox system of holy sites. Stūpas or caityas in these sites would have reinforced this legitimization. On the other hand, in the esoteric system, the divine beings playing a central role in the mythology of the holy sites are not the Buddha himself nor his stūpas or caityas but pairs of male and female deities, magical female beings, and/or sacral rocks of various shapes. This difference between the orthodox and esoteric system is related to the fact that the lists of holy sites in the esoteric system are syncretic in the sense that they have incorporated the systems of holy sites of the Śākta or Śaiva traditions, where female divinities play an important role.

Notes
1This paper is an extended and improved version of the chapter 2 of my book published in 2007 [Sugiki 2007].
2For the Eight Great Sites, see Bagchi 1941 and Okano 1998: 1).7.2.A. The eight holy sites appearing in Nāgārjuna’s Aṣṭamahāsthānacaityastotra (a version of TTP: Tohoku 1133) and the Fo shuo pa ta ling t’a ming bao king (Ch: Taisho 1685) can be identified as Lumbini/Kapilavastu, Buddhagaya, Vārāṇasī, Śrāvastī, Śāmkāśa, Rājagrha, Vaiśālī, and Kuśinagarī. Harṣadeva’s Aṣṭamahāsthānacaityāvatāna and other Nāgārjuna’s Aṣṭamahāsthānacaityastotra (a version of Tib: Tohoku 1134) also introduce eight sites of the Orthodox Buddhist tradition. However, it is difficult to identify two of the eight sites in these texts. The former text can be read as intending Lumbini/Kapilavastu, Buddhagaya, Vārāṇasī, Śrāvastī, Śāmkāśa, Kuśinagarī, and two other sites that are hard to indentify. The latter text seems to preach Buddhagaya, Lumbini/Kapilavastu, Vārāṇasī, Śrāvastī, Kuśinagarī, and two other sites that are difficult to identify.
3See TABLE 3 of this paper.
4The Svayambhūpurāṇa, SKT ed: p.176, l.15–p.177, l.6.
5Yoshizaki 1997.
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6 See TABLE 14 of this paper.

7 See TABLE 3 of this paper.

8 The Yoginijālatantra, SKT ms: Baroda 13253, 23a2, Matsunami 313, 51b1. —— śmaśānāṃ pātaliputre śmaśānāṃ sindhum eva ca / Here, the term nagara is replaced by the word pātaliputra.

9 See TABLE 6 and note ii) of this table of this paper.

10 See TABLE 7 and note ii) of this table of this paper.

11 See TABLE 3 of this paper.

12 Sanderson 1995: 95.

13 See TABLE 3 of this paper. See also the word li yul in Chandra Das’s Tibetan-English Dictionary.

14 See TABLE 8 of this paper.

15 See TABLE 7 and note i) of this table of this paper. The Samputodbhavatantra per se does not use the term Vajrapītha in this context.

16 The investigations conducted by M. Dyczkowski [Dyczkowski 2001: map 9] and R. Davidson [Davidson 2002: 209] regarding the holy sites in question err in trying to pinpoint a specific geographical location for each individual site without considering the flexibility that I mentioned. They also err in overly depending on sources which do not belong to the Saṃvara cycle and its relevant ones in identifying the geographical locations for these sites.

17 The Āmnāyamañjarī, TTP: Otani 2328, 168a6–a7. The Piṭhādinīrṇaya, TTP: Tohoku 1606, 132a7–b1. (For this part of the Piṭhādinīrṇaya, see also Davidson 2002: 210–211.) Abhayākaragupta and Śākyarakṣita state that each site has multiple identities concerning its belonging site-category. For example, the site A is classified into the site-category piṭha according to some scriptures but the same site A is grouped into the different site-category kṣetra according to other scriptures. The text-compilers did not always reach a consensus on the matter which site-categories individual sites are to be classified into.

18 The Āmnāyamañjarī, TTP: Otani 2328, 168b1–b5. The Piṭhādinīrṇaya, TTP: Tohoku 1606, 133b6–b7. (For this part of the Āmnāyamañjarī, see also Shizuka 2007: 190–191.) This statement, which appears in the Vimalaprabhā according to Abhayākaragupta, seems to be in line with the idea frequently seen in esoteric scriptures such as the Śaiva Kuhikāmatatantra [SKT ed: 23.104c–109b] that holy sites are not merely locales where ground and water merely exist but are made sacred by the fact that they are sites inhabited by holy beings such as a guru or a religious master. The references to Tibet and China in this statement seem to be based on the one hand on the teachings concerning holy sites found in the Saṃvara Vajradākatatantra, its related scriptures [see the fifth section and TABLE 12 of this paper], and Nāropāda’s work mentioned above (Yul iversary bshibid rgyu mtshan bstan pa) [see Pretapuri in TABLE 3 of this paper], which regard Tibet (Bhoṭa) as one of the Saṃvara holy sites, and on the other hand on the idea expressed in the same work ascribed to Nāropāda, which identifies Suvannadvīpa with east China.

19 The Āmnāyamañjarī, TTP: Otani 2328, 169b6. The reason for my modification of Abhayākaragupta’s terms for the three dimensions is as follows. The texts of the Saṃvara tradition often describe the holy sites practiced in dimension (A) and those performed in dimension (C) also as a manḍala or a wheel of manḍala, by which term Abhayākaragupta signifies holy sites in dimension (B). It is necessary to avoid the confusion. Further, as mentioned, the discussion made by Abhayākaragupta on this topic is brief. We need to survey the instructions on the practice of holy sites given in other texts in order to clarify the base structure of the systems of holy sites in question. For these reasons, I devised
encompassing terms for the three dimensions of the practice centered on holy sites.

20 Sircar 1948: 32. Wayman 1995: 135. The term “imaginary Tantric lands” is Wayman’s. Sircar, through the analysis of Śākta sites, states “Devi and Bhairava were often fabricated by the writers and the association of a tīrtha with one of Satī’s limbs was also determined usually by their individual imagination,” “The fact that in many cases entire countries are mentioned as Pīthas suggests that the writers had only vague ideas about some of the tīrthas and often took resort to imagination,” “That medieval writers on the subject of the Pīthas took the greatest liberty in these respects is . . .”

21 The Cakrasaṃvararatraṇa, SKT ed (restored text): 41.4c–18. For the Hevajraṭaṇtra and other scriptures, see the third, the fourth, and the fifth sections of this paper. The distinction between the human females who are believed to be magical female beings discussed here and those refered to in the first subsection of the first section of this paper is as follows: the former are the magical female beings appearing in the mythological context and the latter are those appearing in the context of the explanations on geographical locations of holy sites. However, actually, it is often difficult to distinguish these two contexts because the scriptures are not always nervous about this distinction.

22 For Ghanṭāpāda’s view, see Sakurai 1996: 300, 307–310. For Kṛṣṇa’s view, see his Vasantatilaka, SKT ed: 1.5–7.

23 The Āmnāyamaṇḍi, TTP: Otani 2328, 168a8–169b7.

24 The Pīṭhādiniṇṇṇaya, TTP: Tohoku 1606, 136b4–137a4, 133b5–135b7.

25 As mentioned before, Abhayakaragupta uses the terms phyi rol (“external”), dkyil hkhor gyi hkhor lo (“wheel of maṇḍala”), and lus (“body”) for my terms dimension (A), dimension (B), and dimension (C), respectively.

26 The Abhidhānottararatraṇa chaps.9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18 may be seen as preaching the matured form of the first typological tradition as summarised in TABLE 2. The large part of chapter 14 is quite similar to Lūyāpāda’s Cakrasaṃvarābhīsamaya.

27 The Yoginīsāmacararatraṇa, SKT ed: 4.1–4, 5.7–17, 5.20, 11.1.

28 The Vairāṭaṭaṇtraṇa, SKT ed: Tsuda 1973, (28)–(30), and Sugiki 2003a, 14.1–19 (= pp.(77)–(81)).


30 The Vārāhyabhidhānottarata, TTP: Otani, 218b2–219a5.

31 The Abhidhānottararatraṇa, SKT ms: IASWR I-100, 93b1–94b6 / Matsunami 10, 100a3–101b2 / Matsumami 12, 117a2–118b3.

The following is the text of the Abhidhānottararatraṇa. I used the IASWR manuscript (= ms) as the base manuscript and the Matsunami 10 and 12 as supporting ones ——
bhagavām — ms. ii) devikoṭa | devikoṭa — ms. iii) -drumachāyā | drumachāyāḥ — ms. iv) vīrāḥ | vīrā — ms.: pitā | pīṭāḥ — ms. v) Tib adds sans rgyas mkoḥ ḥgro ma after this line.

— prabhākārībhūmānā madhye ratnaḍākāḥ ¹⁄₁ pūravadvāraudāvā kāmaraū pesāρī kāyika airāvati / uttare oḍre vajraṇtalamahābhairavā / paścime triśakunau mahāvīravāyuge / dakṣine kośalāyām vajraḥūṃkārasurābhakṣī // vīrāḥ pīṭāḥ, dākini harītā // ²⁄₁ — [Note] prabhākārī bhūmānā I supplemented these words, following Matsunami 10 and 12 and Tib. ii) vīrāḥ | vīrā — ms.

— arciṣmatiī bhūmadhye padmaḍākāḥ ³⁄₁ pūravadvāre kalinge subhadrasyāmādevi / uttare lampāke vajraprabhasubhadrā ⁴⁄₁ paścime kāṇcyāṃ mahābhairavahayakrṇā / dakṣine himālaye vīrā pāṇḍakṣakhaṇīnā // vīrā raktāḥ, dākiniḥ sitāḥ // ⁵⁄₁ — [Note] i) padmaḍākāḥ | padmaḍākām — ms. ii) vajraprabha- | vajrapradra — ms. iii) kāṇcyāṃ | kānci — ms. iv) dākiniḥaḥ | dākiniḥaḥ — ms.

— sudurjayābhūmadhye vajrākāḥ / pūravadvāraudāvā pretapuryām mahā-balacakravēgā / uttare gṛhdevatāyāṃ ratnavajraḥkhandarohā / paścime saurāṣṭre hayagrīvaśauṇḍāni / dakṣine suvarṇadvāpe aṅkagahacakravartini // vīrāḥ kṛṣṇāḥ, dākiniḥ pīṭāḥ / ⁶⁄₁ — [Note] i) vīrāḥ | vīrā — ms. pīṭā | pīṭāḥ — ms.

— abhimukhyāḥ bhūmadhye viśvadadhikāḥ ⁷⁄₁ pūravadvāre nagare śriherukasuvārā / uttare sindhau padmanartesvaramahābala / paścime marau vairocanacakravartini // dakṣine kulatāyāṃ vajrāssattvavahāvīryā // vīrāḥ viśvavarnāḥ, dākinoḥ dūmradhūsaravarnāḥ // — [Note] i) abhimukhyāḥ | abhimukhyāḥ — ms. ii) -suvirāḥ | suvīrāḥ — ms.


The above instruction can be summarized in a table as follows, centered on the correspondence between the ten spiritual stages and the constituents of the manḍala of six lineage-lords.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhūmi</th>
<th>Holy sites</th>
<th>Lords of six lineages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pramuditā</td>
<td>(East) Puliramalaya</td>
<td>(North) Jālandhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimalā</td>
<td>(East) Godāvāri</td>
<td>(North) Rāmeśvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabhākari</td>
<td>(East) Kāmarūpa</td>
<td>(North) Odra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arciṃatī</td>
<td>(East) Kalinga</td>
<td>(North) Lampāka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudurjaya</td>
<td>(East) Pretapuri</td>
<td>(North) Gṛhadevata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhimukhī</td>
<td>(East) Nagara</td>
<td>(North) Sīndhu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Different from the system summarized in TABLE 2, the base concept which structures the manḍala of six lineage-lords is the idea of six lineages rather than that of ten site-categories. The manḍala of six lineage-lords can be stated to be the reformation of the system summarized in TABLE 2 in terms of the concept of six lineages. From this standpoint, the twenty-four holy sites are grouped into six lineages and the first six of the ten spiritual stages are assigned to these six lineages. The remaining four spiritual stages are connected with the four magical female beings, who are not related to any holy sites.

34 It may be possible to interpret this as follows. The Buddhist Yoginītantra scriptures including the Saṃvarā ones, as is well known, often prefer the reverse order. The reverse order, for them, means the symbolic upset of the Brahmanical or other socially authoritative norms afflicting people. Through the reverse of the order of holy sites, the compilers might have asserted the superiority of their Mahāyānic system to the Śaiva one.
35 The *Yul ni bcu bshi bhi rgyu mtshan bstan pa*, TTP: Otani 4628, 126a4–129a5.
36 The dharmodaya means the origin of the dharmas, constituents of beings and the universe. The dharmodaya is generally symbolically represented in the form of a triangle. As I mention in the last paragraph of the third section of this paper, we may say that the dharmodaya in function corresponds to the yoni in Śaivism.
37 The *Jñānodāyatantra*, SKT ed: p.2, l.22, p.3, l.4, l.6, l.9, l.11–12, l.15, l.17, l.20, l.22, p.4, l.3.
38 The *Jñānodāyatantra*, SKT ed: p.3, l.4, l.15, p.4, l.3.
39 According to the *Sampūtodbhavatantra*, the names of these inner channels are (1) abhedyā, (2) sūkṣmaraṇā, (3) divya, (4) vāmā, (5) vāmini, (6) kūrmāja, (7) bhāvakī (8) sekā, (9) dośavati, (10) mahāviśṭhā, (11) mātarā, (12) sarvarī, (13) śītādā, (14) ūśmā, (15) pravanā, (16) hrṣṭavadanā, (17) svārūpinī, (18) sāmānyā, (19) hetudāyikā, (20) viyogā, (21) premaṇi, (22) siddhā, (23) pāvakā, (24) sumanāh, in order [SKT ms: 63a1–64a2]. These names derive from those of twenty-four of the thirty-two inner channels preached in the *Hevajratantra* [SKT ed: I.1.16–18].
40 The existence of female practitioners may be suggested by the biography of Mekhalā and Kanakhalā in the *Caturaśītisiddhapravṛtti*. Mekhalā and Kanakhalā were given by Kāñha ( = Kṛṣṇācārya) an instruction of Vajravārāhī, the highest female divinity in the Saṃvara tradition.
42 The *Cakrasanvataravikurvaṇa*, TTP: Otani 4628, 124a5–126a4.
43 Davidson 1991.
44 Davidson 1991, 203.
45 The text tells that Mahādeva performs (sexual yoga) with Gaurī in the east at the first junction of time (*thun*), with Ekajātī in the south at the second junction of time, with Kāḷarātri in the west at the third junction of time, and with Umādevī in the north at the last junction of time.
46 The entire process of this manifestation of Heruka-manḍala is connected with the nature of five Tathāgatas as follows: the manifestation of the palace with Vairocana, that of the body with Amitābha, that of the crown with Ratnasambhava, that of the assembly
of divinities with Amoghasiddhi, and that of the armor with Aksobhya.

47 The text does not describe who reside at the top of Mt. Meru at this time and who produced the scriptures of the Samvara cycle. The Samyaksambuddha is my inference.

48 The Hevajratantra, SKT ed: 1.7.10–18.


51 The Āmnāyamaṇījari also gives interpretation on this list of holy sites of the Hevajratantra [TTO: Otani 2328, 167b3–b8]. According to the Āmnāyamaṇījari, the number of the sites of pīlava is five in total: the periphery area of a village or town, Caritra, Kośala, Vindhyā, and Kaumārapaurikā.

52 The Kubjikāmatatantra, SKT ed: 14.10 (Odyssey, Jālandhara, Pūrṇagiri, Kāmarūpa). The Kulārangavatāntara, SKT ed: 6.25 (Uddyān, Kāmarūpa, Jālandhara, Pūrṇagiri). The Nityāsodasikākāvya, SKT ed: 1.12 (Kāmarūpa, Pūrṇagiri, Jālandhara, Śripātha =Odyssea) [Shima 2007: 3]. In the Kaulajñānaranīrṇaya, the four sites are Kāmarūpa (= Kāmarūpa), Pūrṇagiri, Odyssey, and Arbuda [SKT ed: 8.20–22]. In this scripture, Jālandhara is replaced by Arbuda. As for some other scriptures which mention the same (= Kāmarūpa), Pūrṇagiri, Odyssey, and Arbuda [SKT ed: I.7.10].

53 The Hevajratantra, SKT ed: 1.7.10.

54 The Samputodhavaṭantra, SKT ms: 47a2–b2. —— piṭhaṃ jālandharaṃ proktam odḍīyanam tathaiva ca 9) piṭhaṃ pollagirīṃ caivaḥ budham tathaiva ca 10) upapiṭhaṃ godāvari proktam rāmesvaram tathāvai ca / devikotam tathā khyātam mālavaṃ tathāvai ca 11) kāmarūpaṃ tathā proktam oḍram kṣetram eva ca 12) upakṣetram trisākunīṃ ca kośalaṃ ca tathaiva ca // kālingam tathā proktam lampākaṃ tathāvai ca / kānci himālayam caiva 9) chhandoham samuddiṣṭam upacchandoha ity api // pretādhiṅvāsinī proktam grhavētā tathāvai ca / savārṇastas tu swarṇadvīpa eva ca / melāpokampelāpakam tathā // nagarāṣṭhah smaśānaṃ caiva upaśmaśānaṃ marukalatā 10) kārūṇyam karmārapātaḥkam tathā harikeleṃ lavanasāgaramadhyagam vīndhyā kaumārapūrīkā pīlavam 11) upapiṭlavam tattāṃnivesam // smaśānaṃ pratasamhātam caddhātān tathā / udyānaṃ vāpi kārttām upaśmaśānaṃ nigadyate // —— [Note] i) piṭhaṃ | piṭha — ms.: jālandharaṃ | jālandharaṃ — ms. ii) pollāgarīṃ | pollāgarīṃ — ms. iii) devikotam | devikotam — ms. iv) oḍram | oḍram — ms. v) kānci | kānci — ms. vi) upaśmaśānaṃ | upaśmaśānaṃ — ms. vii) harikeleṃ | harikele — ms.

55 The Āmnāyamaṇījari, TTP: Odyssey 2328, 167a2–a8.

56 The Mahāmudrātilakatantra, SKT ms: 17b5–18b1, 18b1–19a2.

The commentary, the Vohita, relates that the forty-eight holy sites introduced in the Dākārṇavanattra are grouped into twelve site-categories four by four [TTP Otani: 182a4–a6]. This interpretation seems to be the natural reading of the passages of the Dākārṇavanattra.

57The Dākārṇavanattra, SKT ms: Kathmandu D40/6 (= A), 31b7–32a2, Kathmandu A142/2 (= B), 34a6–b1. —— atha pithopapithaḥ yathākramāni ca āha pithaṁ pārṇagiriś caiva jālandharanam odāyanaṁ arubās ca tathā pithaṁ godāvargopapithakaṁ rāmēśvara-devikotam mālavam copapithakaṁ kāmārūpayā tathā oḍraṁ trīśakunina u kāṣṭhe kanu mātanī kaupagorā na māyāpurī māyāpurī. —— [Note] i) sindhu-śindu — ms. ii) atha [m]khā yī — Tib. iii) godāvari — godāvari — ms. iv) karmāra-karmārī — ms. v) -śikhare [śikharā — ms. devi: tathāntaragataḥ kvacit ms.: godāvarī]

58The Sampūṭatilakatantraṭikā, TTP: Otani 2327, 271a2–b4. However, there is a slight
difference between the list of the Samputodbhavatantra shown in TABLE 7 and that given in Indrabodhi's work. In Indrabodhi's work, the sites which are classified into the site-category pilava are Karunya and Karmāraṇapātaka and those into upapilava are Harikela located at the center of the salty ocean and Vindhyākaumārapaurikā. The remaining sites can be seen as being identical with those shown in TABLE 7.

59 Ratnakarasānti’s Muktāvalī, a commentary of the Hevajratantra, gives a list of thirty-two bodily parts. Thirty-two inner channels preached in the Hevajratantra, to which thirty-two bodily components are connected, run through these thirty-two bodily parts [SKT ed: p.20, l.11–p.21, l.11]. It is obvious that twenty-four of the thirty-two bodily parts and twenty-four of the thirty-two bodily components derive from those in the system of holy sites of the first typological tradition. However, Ratnakarasānti does not clearly state that these thirty-two bodily parts correspond to the thirty-two external holy sites introduced in the Hevajratantra summarized in TABLE 6. If the correspondence of these thirty-two bodily parts to these thirty-two external holy sites is implied in the Muktāvalī, it could be stated that Ratnakarasānti had an intention to develop the system of holy sites as introduced in the Hevajratantra into a system encompassing dimension (C) in the similar manner as that of the first typological tradition.

60 The Yogaratnamalā, SKT ed: p.122, l.11–14. According to the Yogaratnamalā, the twelve site-categories in the system of the Hevajratantra correspond to twelve of the thirteen spiritual stages. The order of the stage arcismatī and the stage prabhākari is reversed in this interpretation. The thirteenth spiritual stage Jñānavatī, which is also known as Vajradharabhumi, does not correspond to any site-categories, for this is the stage of apratiṣṭhita nirvāṇa according to this work.

61 The Muktāvalī, SKT ed: p.70, l.17–19.
63 The Āmnāyamaṇijāri, TTP: Otani 2328, 170b6–172a4.
64 The Pithādinirṇaya, TTP: Tohoku 1606, 130a5—131b3. The views found in the Pithādinirṇaya have a closer relationship to the ideas expressed in the first typological tradition. The Pithādinirṇaya’s interpretation of the systems found in the Hevajratantra and the Mahāmudrātilakotantra insists that ten of the twelve site-categories correspond to the ten spiritual stages. This work connects the two site-categories pilava and upapilava with the pleasure arising in the bodhicitta, the overcoming of the narrow-mindedness of Hinayāna, and the abandonment of the moral contamination produced by one’s mental impression.

65 Not in the system of holy sites as shown in TABLE 9 but in the system of Heruka mandala, the Dākārnavaṇtantra also connects the twelve site-categories, which are assigned to twelve of the thirteen circles constituting the Heruka maṇḍala, with twelve of the thirteen spiritual stages [SKT ms: Kathmandu D40/6, 25a5–31b7 and Kathmandu A142/2, 27a1–34a6]. (The thirteenth stage is represented by the four gates and four corners of each fold of this maṇḍala.) Individual sites as listed in TABLE 9 do not appear in this system. Almost the same lines as those explaining the Heruka maṇḍala in the Dākārnavaṇtantra appear in the Vārāhiḥpalatanaṇṭra [SKT ms: Matsunami346, 74a1–84b7 / Matsunami347, 64a3–82b1].

67 The Vajraḍakatanaṇṭra, SKT ed: 18.10–58 (See also Sugiki 2003a: (65)) —— aṭṭahāse sthitā devī rajā devyā samudbhavā / saumyanukheti ca vikhyātā vajrāyudhabībhratī // tasmin vane sthitā devī kadambadrumam āśrītā / mahāghaṇṭeti= -ṇa iti vikhyātaḥ kṣetrapālo mahābalaḥ // kollagirīṃ mahālakṣmī karalāyonisambhavā / karalarūpā
sthitā devi vikṛtā cātibhiṣaṇā // tasmin nagare sthitā cogrā parvatāgraśamāśritā //
agnimukheti[= -kha iti] vikhyātā kṣetrapālo varānānaḥ // jvālāmukhīti vikhyātā //
hadgahastā sthitā ghorā nimbavṛkṣasāmāśritā // kṣetrapālo mahākāyo mahāvrateti[= -ta iti]
viṣṛutaḥ // dharaṇyāṃ śaṃkari jīyā mahocchusmāṅgasambhavā // gadāyudhadharā
devī dharmāśivayapradāyikā // tasmin kṣetre prisiddhā sā tālavṛkṣasāmāśritā //
ūrḍhvakaśa iti khyātā kṣetrapālo mahoktaḥ // devikito[= devikitoṣ] karṇamoti tu
mahābalakulodbhavā // sūlaḥastā tu sā devī sarvayogesvarī varā // tasmin pīṭhe sthitā
rudra vātavṛkṣasāmāśritā // kṣetrapālo mahādehā hetuḥaḥ paramesvarāḥ // virajyāṃ
ambikā jyēyā mudrāpaṭṭisadharīni // saumyārūpa mahādevī kämaśivayapradāyikā //
tasmin kṣetre sthitānaḥ[=or sthito 'nalaḥ] āmravṛkṣasāmāśritā // āṭṭahāsamaḥānādaḥ sar-
vasatavabhayāvahā // elāpure kha-
rasthā ca pracāṅkukulasambhavā // pāsāhastā mahābhāṁī sammohāṅkṛṣṭasam-
sthitā // tasmin bhavane sthitē devī mahābalaparākramā // gajakarneti[= -rna iti]
vikhyātā kṣetrapālo mahāgrājava // kasmīre caiva gokarṇī caṅḍāyovinīsambhavā //
vajraśṛṅkhalahastā ca ripunāśanataparā // tasmin sthāne sthitē devī parvatāgraśinivāsi
// kṣetrapālo mahābhūmo nādiśāṅgāha iti smṛtāḥ // kramaṇī marudeṣe tu bhīmavaktā
vīrāsambhavā // ankusapāśadharā devī sammohāṅkṛṣṭasamsthitā // tasmin deśe sthitē
devī mahāsthālīsamāśritā // kṣetrapāلاहārā karālaṃkhyā mahāmukharī brahmānukhaḥ // na-
garahalasthā ca mahocchusmāṅgasambhavā // vetaleti mahāvidyā sarvarivavaranaprā
d // tasmin sthāne sthitē bhadrā vetratgaratinivāsi // romajangha iti khyātā kṣetrapālo
mahoktaḥ // cāmundeti vikhyātā devata paṇḍravardhane // mahābalakulotpāṇnā kha-
tvāṅgakarāsobhitā // bhuktimuktikarā devī aśeṣapāpanāśinī // kumbhākhyā kṣetrapālo
vai tasmin kṣetre vyavasati // jayantyaṃ tu prasannāśya raktakusumasmabhavā // vaj-
raśṛṅkhaladharīni sarvasaukhvavaranaprā // tasmin puravare sthitē kūṭāgārasamāśritā //
trijāṭeti[= -ta iti] samākhyātā kṣetrapālo mahoktaḥ // prṣṭhāpure vidyunmukhi
karālonīsambhavā // ankusāṅkakātādharā devī vāma sarvāśaiparipūrini // tasmin kṣetre
sthitā devī raudrārupo bhayaṃkaraḥ // ghanṭaraveti[= -va iti] vikhyātā kṣetrapāla
ulūkumkho bhīṣanāḥ // sopāre cāṅgnavaktrā tu kāṭṭhikaraśobhitā // piśītāsanā
samākhyaṭā sukhāśivayavaranaprā // tasmin kṣetre mahādevī sālmalivṛkṣasāmāśritā //
śobhanaṃ sarvakāryeṣu kṛṣṭaṃ kṣetrapālo bhayaṃkaraḥ // caritre tu karaṇijasthā
tu karalāśaṅkukulasambhavā // karāṇjavāsini khyātā mudrāsaṅkātādharīni // tasmin kṣetre
mahāgāṇaṃ kṣetrapālo mahābhālaḥ // āṁravakṣeṣaḥpāṇiṇināvitaḥ sarvaḍuṣṭhabhayāmkaraḥ //
odāyāne mahādevī guhyākhyā yonisambhavā // vajraśṛṅkhaladharā devi sughōra
divyārūpiṇi // kṣetrapālo mahānādo ghorarūpo mahābhalaḥ // tasmin pīṭhavaraśtā
tu asokavṛkṣasamāśritā // jālandhare tu caṇḍālinī jīyā mudrākaṭṭhikādyātā //
somasambhavamaḥādevī sarvāśivayapradāyikā // tasmin pīṭhe sthitā ghorā
kanaṅkaravṛkṣasamāśritā // janetākhyā mahāvīrāḥ sarvasūraṃbhavāyāhāḥ // kṣiṇikē
lokāmatā ca caṇḍāliniḥmahābhalaḥ // khadgahastā mahādevī sarvasiddhipradāyikā //
ūrḍhvakṣeṣaḥmahādevī śalūvṛkṣasamāśritā // kṣetrapālo mahāmerus tasmin kṣetre
vyavasthitāḥ // bhīmavakṣtrodbhavā bhīmā māyāpure tu kāṁṣi // vajraśaktidakārā
śubhā sādhakasya balapradā // kṛṣṇarūpa mahāghorā bhūtavṛkṣasāmāśritā // bhīmo
nāma sthitā tasmin kṣetrapālo mahābhalaḥ // pūtanā āṁrake caiva sarvaripub-
hayāvahā // lāṅgalagayahastā ca sarvasattvavasaṃkarī // dhāruṭhā tu mahādevī
devī sarvasattvabhayāmkaraḥ // kṣetrapālo mahāvrataς tasmin kṣetre vyavasthitāḥ // rājagre
vipanā sā vajrāṅkuśasamanvītā // mahākṣatramudbhitā sarvacakrajāyāvahā // tasmin
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ksetre sthitā devī jhilliravabhayānakā[or jhilliravabhayānakā] / kṣetrapālo mahākāraṇa

tatrasau nityasaṃnidhāḥ // bhoṭavisaśye sahaajākhyā makaradhvacādhārini / svayam-
bhāyonsambhavā saumyasyā divyārupīṇi // tasmin deśe sthitā devī śailakūṭasamāsrītā / bhogākhyā[→-khyo] haṃvīrāh kṣetrapālaḥ sudurjaya // mālave tu tathā seka

mudrāmudgaradhārini / sādhakānāṃ priyā nityaṃ yaśasvini praśaṃṣyāh syuḥ // tasmin kṣetre sthitā devī mahāhūrksasamāsrītā / samapāṃsvaravo nāma kṣetrapālo viśveśvarāh

—— [Note] i) sama- / samah — SKT ed. I corrected following the Calcutta manuscript.

68For more details, see Sugiki 2003a. I was given a suggestion by Professor Alexis
Sanderson and Professor Harunaga Isaacson on the similarity of the lists of holy sites in
the Kubjikāmatatātra and the Vajrādākatantra in question when I was in Oxford from
1998 to 1999 to study the Sanskrit manuscripts of the Vajrādākatantra and so forth.

69The Kubjikāmatatātra, SKT ed: 22.20–21.

219–221, 361. For the eight sites in the Brahmayāmala in question, see also Hatley 2007:

71Sircar 1948.

221, 361.

73The Vajrādākatantra, SKT ed: 18.59–60. — esu kṣetresu yā kanyā virānām
siddhidāyikā / melāpakaṃ kurvanti rātrau paryātane sādā // dadati vipulāṃ siddhiṃ
khecaraśudurlabhām / sidyante sarvakarmāṇi sādhakasya na sāmāyaḥ //

74The Dākārnavatantra, SKT ms: Kathmandu D40/6 (= A) 78a5–79b4, Kathmandu
A142/2 (= B) 82a1–83a7 ——

First, the Dākārnavatantra explains the site Āṭṭahāśa as follows: atha kāṅkālayogena
āṭṭahāśe rajā devī nāyaki sarvayaṃgiṇī /

(tasmin sthāne sthitā devī mahāhāṃga
kadambadruma // tasā devā virāh kṣetrapālo mahānāhanah / hū) kāṅkālasukhamāyā sā
sambhavantīt[→-ti] mahātmanām // (hū) mudrānaṃ teṣu kāṅkaḷam odyānarandhrato gatam
(hū) svadhātusthitaviṇṇānaṃ sarvadesagatam kramā // —— [Note] i) yuktā / yuko —
B.: -nāyaki / nāyikā — A. ii) rajā ca jā — B. iii) sādā virāh / sādā vīra — A./ sadevi
-randhrato gatam / randhratongatam — B. vi) svadhātu- / svadhātāt — B.

—— After the above, names of other twenty-three sites are enumerated as follows:

tu elāpure kaśmirāke // (hū) maru-nagare tathā ca puṇḍravardhanakṣekrake // (hū)

jayantyaṃ prsthāpure tu sōpāre caritre tathā // (hū) odyāyen jālandhare kṣīrike tu māyāpure

(hū) ambuke rājagṛhe ca bhōtaviṣayabhīs[= -ye] tathā / (hū) mālave pullīrādye tu catuvarvimaśatiptahā

(hū) —— [Note] i) -viraṇakama / viraṇjakama — B. ii) kaśmirāke / kāśmirāke — B. iii)
puṇḍravardhana- / pūṇṇavardhana — B. iv) jayantyaṃ / jayantyaṃ — B.: sopāre

copāle — B. v) jālandhare / jāgandhare — B.: kṣīrike / kṣīrike — B. vi) bhōtaviṣayabhis

(hū) bhogavishayabhis — B. vii) pullīrādye / pullīmarādyā — B. It may be that the

last sentence "pullīrādyē tu catuvarvimaśatiptahā intends that the twenty-four sites begin-

ning with Āṭṭahāśa in question are another forms of the twenty-four sites beginning with

Pulīramalaya (= the first typological tradition).

—— Subsequently, abodes of goddesses residing in the above twenty-three sites are explained as follows: parvātā-gaṇa-tālavrāṃṣaṃ vatā-mra-kāncanam tathā
(hū) jaṭīvṛṣaparākramā parvātāgare samāsrītā // (hū) mahāsthāli-vetrage aśvattha-
kāṭīgārakam / udumbara-sāmali tu karāṇja-sokam āśritā // (hū) kannakavr-ṣalāṃ tu
cūta-ḍhāru[→ dāru] ca dīlākī / śailakūṭa-mahāhūrksaṃ ca samāsrītā purāt // ——

— 553 —
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[Note] i) parvatāgra- 
parvatāgra — B.: vatāmkānām 
vatāmkānasnas — A./ vatāmkārnām 
vatāmkānasnas — B. ii) jati- 
kāki — B.: parvatāgra 
parvatāgra — A. iii) -vetragarte 
vetragarbhe — A./ vetragarbha — B. iv) udumbara- 
ondura — A./ odumbara — B.: karaṇāsakam āśritā 
kalajāsakam āśritā — A./ kalaṃjāsakam āśritā — B. v) -sālaṃ 
sāraṃ — B.

—— Then, details of goddesses and land-protectors residing in the above twenty-three sites are given as follows:

(Information on Kollagiri) mahālakṣmy agnimukhī ca kṣetrapālo varānanah i)
agnimukha-m iti khyātah kānkalasukhavedakah ii)
tasa cyavanagraham→nā] yogini dvayakam sphuret iii) tena samputayogesuf→gena] virādayasamāśritā iv)
sattvesu hitatevartihī→ -rthihī sūtra ca vajrānandale v)

(Information on Varuṇa and Devikota) laṅkēśvarī cordhakeśī kṣetrapālo mahotkāṭah /
urdhvakeśa iti khyātah kānkalasukhahetukah i) 
śeṣam pūrvokta[= -ktena] viṇyeyam viṣeṣam varayoginī→nyā] iv)
karnamoti ca raudrā tu kṣetrapālo mahādehah j)
hetukah paramesvara(r→roj mahāraudrah athāpi v) 
kānkalasukhasāṁyeyus viṣeyā= 

(Information on Virajā and Airuṇi) saumyārūpā cánalā ca kṣetrapālo 'ttahāsakam[→-
kah] j) mahānādo 'pi viṇyeyā= →yo analā=] las] ca mahardhikah j) kānkalacandālini 
tu jvalamadhye mahāsukham j) agnimukhī mahāvīryā kṣetrapālo ghanāravah / 
maḥāvīryā→rya] iti khyātah kānkalasukhasambhavah k) — [Note] i) saumya- 
anulā — B. iii) kāṅkāla ] kaṃkālam — B. /-madhye ] madhya — A. iv) kāṅkāla- 
kaṃkāra — A.

(Information on Pura and Elāpura) piṅgalākhyā bhīṣanākṣī kṣetrapālo mahājāṅgha-
kaḥ / mahābhāyalocano vā kānkalasukhāpurakāḥ j) mahābhimā mahābala kṣetrapālo 
maḥāgajaḥ k) atavah gajakārnāḥ tu kṣetrapālo gajakārnāḥ / kānkalasukham āraḍhaha→-
dhāḥ] sarvanādiśu tanmayah — [Note] i) -sukhāpurakāḥ ] mukhāpurakam — B. ii) 
-bhimā ] bhimo — B. /-balā ] balo — B.

(Information on Kaṃsirā and Maru) gokarṇā ca parvatāgrī kṣetrapālo mahābhī-
makāḥ j) nādiṃkāḥ athāpi vā kānkalasukhalinakam k) kramaṇi bhimavakṣrā ca 
kṣetrapālo karālakah k) mohakaro bhāṃmukhāḥ kānkalasukha-m-āsakah j) —
(Information on Nagara and Puṇḍravardhana) vetālā ca tathā bhadrā kṣetrapālo
romajñahakaḥ 1) athāvā ca mahōtkaṭaḥ kankālasukhamastuḥakāḥ 2) cāmuṇḍaḥ ca
mahādevi kṣetrapālāḥ kumbhāṇḍakaḥ 3) athāvā ca mahādevaḥ kankālasukhantryaḥ
4) — [Note] i) vetālā | vetado — A./ | vedādā — B. | roma- | rāma — B. ii) mahōtkaṭaḥ
mahōtkaṭaḥ — B. -mastuḥakāḥ -mastuḥakāḥ — A. iii) cāmuṇḍaḥ | cāmuṇḍaḥ — A. iv)
kankālasukhantryaḥkah | kankālalo sukhamām mrkaḥ — B.

(Information on Jayantī and Prṣṭhāpura) prasannā ca trijaṭī|→-tā| ca kṣetrapālo
mahōtkaṭaḥ 1) trijato 'tva'vā 'jneyā|= -ya/= ca kankālasukhaśaṭpaṛagah 2) vidiṣyaṃkuhi
ghanṭāravā kṣetrapāla ulākamukhāḥ / ghanṭāravo vikhyātas tu kankālasukhaḥbhavakāḥ
3) — [Note] i) pracandā | pracandā — B. ii) 'tva'vā | dho vä — B.

(Information on Sopāra and Caritra) agnivaktrā mahādevi kṣetrapālo bhayāna-
kah / mahādevo 'tva'vā 'jneyam|→-yāḥ| kankālasukhatejakāḥ 4) karaṇjavāsini tathā
mahāgaṇṭā parā smṛtā 5) kṣetrapālo mahābalāḥ kankālasukhaśobhanāḥ 6)
— [Note] i) kāṇkāla- | kāṇkālaṁ — B. -sukhatejakakāḥ | mukhaṭejakakām — B. ii)
karaṇjavāsini | kalāṇjavāsini — A. | karaṃjaṃ ca vāsini — B. smṛtā | smṛtāḥ — B. iii)
-balāḥ | bala — A./ | balanā — B.

(Information on Odāyana and Jālandhara) guhyākhyā tu mahādevī ghorarūpā
mahābalā 7) kṣetrapālo mahānādo ghorarūpo mahābalāḥ 8) kankālasukhaṃbhūtah
paramākṣaraṣyangavān 9) caṇḍālini ca ghorā ca kṣetrapālo jvalitākhyāḥ 10) ghorarūpā|→-
pōl athāpi vā kankālasukhaveśakāḥ 11) — [Note] i) -balāḥ | balāḥ — B. ii) -pālo | pāla
— B. -rūpo | rūpā — B. ii) -sukha- | mukha — B. iv) caṇḍālini ca | caṇḍāli nila — B.
iv) athāpi vā | adho pi vä — B. v) vesekāḥ | vesekāḥ — A. | vesekāḥ — B.

(Information on Kṣirikā and Māyāpura) lokamāṭā ārđhvaṃśa kṣetrapālo mahāme-
rūḥ / ārđhvakeso athāpi vā kankālasukhaiḥgrhakāḥ 12) bhīmā ca mahābalāḥ ca kṣetrapālo
bhīmā tathā 13) mahābalāḥ bhimaruṇāḥ kankālasukhaṃdakāḥ 14) — [Note] i) -keśo
| keśam — B. | kāṇkālav | kāṇkālav — A. ii) -bala ca | bala ca — B. iii) kāṇkāla- | kāṇkālav
— A. : maṃdakah | maṃdikāḥ — B.

(Information on Ambuka and Rājaṅghra) pūtanā ca mahādevī kṣetrapālo mahāvaratāḥ
/ kankālasukhaṃśāmātāḥ sarvendrīyasukhas tahāt15) vippānā sā jhiliṃvāvā kṣetrapālo
mahākarnāḥ 16) athāvā jhiliṃvāvā cā kankālasukhaṃdandaṃ 17) — [Note] i)
-sāmārthyaḥ | sāmārthyaḥ — A./ | sāmārthyaḥ — B. ii) jhiliṃvā | diḷilīvā | A. : -karnāḥ
karnaḥ — A. : omits this line — B. iii) jhiliṃvāvā | diḷilīvā | A. | diḷilīvakā vā — B.

(Information on Bhotā and Mālava) sahaṃjākhī bhogākhyā ca mahāvīras tathā parah
/ kṣetrapālāḥ sudurjayaḥ kankālasukhaṃdakāḥ 18) seka samaḥ pumṣesvarah kṣetrapālo
viśvesvarah 19) kankālasukham āśīna= -naṃ | javyate sukham svecchaya 20) — [Note] i)
-gāhakah | grāhakah — B. ii) pumṣesvarah | pumṣesvarah — A. iii) kāṇkālav | kāṇkālav
— A. : sukham | sukhamāna | sukhamāna — B. : sukhamāna | svecchaya | svecchahā — A.

— Following the above sentences, weapons of goddesses in the above sites are enu-
merated as follows: vajra-|+muṇḍaṃ|→-dandaṃ|→| gadā śūlāḥ paṭṭiṣam vajraśaktikam
muṣalāṃ pāsakas tathā vajraśṛṅkalā-|→-kuṣam| ca | pāsama= -so | halakhaṭvāmga
ca vajraśṛṅkalahastakā | →| daṇḍaṇaṅka-|kāṭṭarikam|→| kāṭṭarikalā | kāṭṭarikā|→| khaḍgask tathā vajraśakti-ḷaṅgalakām
khaḍgask | khaḍgis — B. : ṭaṅgalakām | ṭaṅgalakām — A. | ṭaṅgalakām — B. vi) gadā
genhda — B.: \(-\text{mudgarakam} \) mumgalakam — B.

— Explanations on features, magical powers, seats, and some other attributes of the goddesses are given after the above sentences. (I skip these.)

The Āmnāyamañjarī, TTP: Otani 2328, 169b7–170b4. Wayman 1995. Sugiki 2003a: (106). The holy sites in the Āmnāyamañjarī has already been examined by A. Wayman. However, Sanskrit names of its holy sites, goddesses, and land-protector gods which he restored have problems. It seems that Wayman did not notice its relation to the Kubjikāmatatantra, the Vajradākatantra, and the Dākārnavatantra.

The Āmnāyamañjarī is a commentary of the Sampuṭodbhavatantra. However, the system as introduced in the Vajradākatantra does not appear in the Sampuṭodbhavatantra per se. The Āmnāyamañjarī introduces the holy sites in question for interpreting eight sites preached in the Sampuṭodbhavatantra. The eight sites with associated eight kinds of tree preached in the Sampuṭodbhavatantra are as follows [SKT ms: 47b2–b4] [Sugiki 2003a: (68)] —— (1) Vijra and cūta-tree, (2) Koṅkana and soma\-varṇa\-tree, (3) Caritra and karaṇja\-tree, (4) Āṭṭhāśa and kadam\-ba\-tree, (5) Devikōta and vaṭa\-tree, (6) Harikela and hari\-tree, (7) Oḍyāna and aśoka\-tree, and (8) Jālandhara and kanaka\-tree. (The Sampuṭatantraitakaṭṭikā identifies soma\-varṇa\-tree with aśvattha\-tree.)

The Pithādinirṇaya also introduces the above list and comments that Ambikā and Anāla reside in Viraja, Karna\-jāva\-śīni and Mahā\-ghaṇṭa in Caritra, Karṇamoṭi in Devikōta, Guhyā and Mahā\-bala in Oḍyāna, and Cāṇḍālini and Janeta in Jālandhara [TTP: Tohoku 1606, 135b7–136a3]. It is most probable that these assignments of goddesses and land-protectors are based on the instructions given in the Vajraḍākatantra (see TABLE 12).

The intention of the Sampuṭodbhavatantra in the above instruction seems to be the introduction of eight mother goddesses.

The fourth section of the 50th chapter of the Dākārnavatantra gives a list of names of scriptures which were compiled before the Dākārnavatantra. The Vajraḍākatantra is included in this list [Kathmandu D40/6, 82b3–b6, Kathmandu A142/2, 86a8–a11]. The Mukțavāli of Ratnakarasānti, who flourished before Abhayākara\-gupta, quotes some verses from the Vajraḍākatantra [SKT ed: p.18–19]. These suggest that the compilation of the Vajraḍākatantra is before those of the Dākārnavatantra and the Āmnāyamañjarī. See also Sugiki 2007: 16–17.

The Kālacakratantra, SKT ed: 2.2.38–40. The Vimalaprabhā, SKT ed: p.177, l.25–p.179. l.11. The difference between the system of the fourth typological tradition in question and that found in these Kālacakra texts can be explained as follows. First, in the Kālacakra system, the inner channels running through the nirmāṇacakra and the dharmacakra are not identified with magical females assigned to external holy sites. Second, the Kālacakra system according to the Vimalaprabhā equates twelve joints of one's body through which the inner channels run with twelve site-categories and with twelve spiritual stages [SKT ed: p.73, l.23–24]. (The Kālacakratantra per se does not have this second instruction [SKT ed: 1.7.20].) These twelve site-categories are (1) pītha, (2) upapiṭha, (3) kṣetra, (4) upakṣetra, (5) chandoha, (6) upachandoha, (7) melāpaka, (8) upamelāpaka, (9) veśman, (10) upaveśman, (11) śmaśāna, and (12) upaśmaśāna. These are the different points between the Dākārṇava system in question and the Kālacakra one.

The Dākārṇava, SKT ms: Kathmandu D40/6 (= A) 14a9–b5, Kathmandu A142/2 (= B) 14b9–15a6. I also used the following manuscripts as supporting sources (Kathmandu B113/3 [= C], 16a5–b7, Kathmandu B113/6 [= D], 23a2–b1) and two Sanskrit
manuscripts of the Yoganijālatantra (Skt ms: Baroda 13253 [= E], 23a9–24a3 / Matsunami 313 [= F], 52a6–53b5), which gives the same instruction as the Dākārnāvanatantra.


— madhyadesi kālinga ca oḍrī karṇatākī sarī (m) saurāstrī mālayī vaṅgī ‘dравадी[-dравиδ] catalangi /k/ mālavī tu mahāraṭṭhī varendī kāmarūpīṇī (m) dāhāli tāvidesī ca bhāḍāri rāḍhamāgadhī (m) tirasutti daddaraṇḍī nepāli rasavāsī (m) rāḍhī tikkāri vaṅgāli khāḍī ca harikelaiki (m) swarṇadvipī ‘singali[-simhali] ca domādi ca kattorāki (m) sindhuhimālayī buddī kulūṭi ṛjaḍāri [or ṛjāḍharī] pathī (m) jajābūti varuṇī ca odiyāni lampākāki (m) jālandharī arbuddī ca kaśmīri kāṣṭhāli kaśmīri[-kaśmīri] (m) jayantī triśakunī cambāhi luharī purarohikī (m) mummunī[-mummunī] kāmbojāki ca baṭṭoliki ghṛheadevāti (m) pretapūri bāhrarī ca pelavi copapelavi (m) smāsāni upaśmāṇi mahodadhitaṃ khasī (m) mlecchī ca sarvadesāki devicatuḥsaṣṭhī kramāt (m) nābhicaṅkresu yogyānih viṇyāḥ[-yāḥ] kulaṇādhikāh (m) — [Note] i) kālinga — A.: oḍrī | uḍrī — A./ oddā — B. Followed A with a slight modification: kālingi | karingi — B. ii) saurāstrī — A./ saorāstrī — B.: vaṅgī — A.B. Followed C. iii) mālavī | māravi — B.: -raṭṭhī | rabdhī — A./ raṭṭhī — B. Other manuscripts say raṭṭhī. (See also Cunningham 2002 [1871]: 745, according to which Maharatī is Mahārāṣṭra, and Bhattacharyya 1999 [1991]: 210, which mentions that Mahāraṭṭhā is Pali form of Mahārāṣṭra.): varendi | varendī — A./ varandi — B. Followed A with slight modification.


Although Sindhu and Himalaya are the independent sites, the “sindhuhimālayī” seems to be the name of one inner channel, which is suggested by the manuscripts listed above and the Vohīṭā.

80The Yoginijālatantra, SKT ms: Baroda 13253, 23a9–24a3 / Matsunami 313, 52a6–53b5.

81The Dākārnāvanatantra, SKT ms: Kathmandu D40/6 (= A) 15b6–b8, Kathmandu

Concerning the theory of the wheel of time (in other words, about ghaṭi and sanmkrānti) expounded in the Dākārṇavatāntra, see Sugiki 2005: (162)–(179).

82See the previous note.

83Okano 1999: (15)–(16).

84With regard to the orthodox system, I used as mainly sources two texts titled Aṣṭamahāsthānacaityavastotra ascribed to Nāgārjuna, the text translated into Chinese by Fa t’ien titled Fo shuo pa ta ling t’a ming bao king, and the Aṣṭamahāsthānacaityavādana ascribed to Harṣadeva (restored Sanskrit version printed in Bagchi 1941 and its Tibetan translation and Chinese transliteration).

85The works ascribed to Harṣadeva and Nāgārjuna and the text extant as a Chinese translation, which we are examining, are the instances of the hymns.

Abbreviations and primary sources

SKT ed. Sanskrit text critically edited.

SKT ms. Sanskrit manuscript.

TTP. Tibetan tripitaka (Tibetan translation).

TTP: Tohoku. Tohoku University Catalogue of Tibetan tripitaka (sDe dge edition).


Ch: Taisho. Taisho tripitaka (Chinese translation).

Abhidhānottaratantra. The Abhidhānottaratantra, SKT ms: the Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions, no I-100 (palm leaf), University of Tokyo, Matsumine catalogue no 10 (paper) and no 12 (paper).


Aṣṭamahāsthānacaityavastotra (1). The Gnas chen po brgyad kyi mchod rten la bstd pa of Nāgārjuna, Tib Tohoku no 1133.

Aṣṭamahāsthānacaityavastotra (2). The Gnas chen po brgyad kyi mchod rten la bstd pa of Nāgārjuna, Tib Tohoku no 1134.


Kubjikāmatatantra. The Kubjikāmatatantra, SKT ed: T. Goudriaan and J.A. Schoter-


**Cakrasaṃvaravikurvanā.** The *Yul nyi bshis ri nyug mtshen bstan pa daṅ dpal hkhor lo bde mchog gi rnam par Ḫphrul pa* of Nāropāda, TTP: Otani no 4628.


**Dākārṇavatāntra.** The *Dākārṇavamahāyoginītantrarāja*, SKT ms: the National Archives of Kathmandu, reel no D40/6 (paper), no A142/2 (paper), and no B113/3 (paper).

**Dākārṇavamandalacakrasādhana.** The *dPal mkhaḥ Ḫgro rgya mtshoḥi rgyud kyi dkyi Ḫkhor gyi Ḫkhor loḥi sgrub thabs rin po che pa dma ṛa ga gter* of Jayasena, TTP: Otani no 2231.

**Dākārṇavamandalārcanavidhi.** The *Śrīdākārṇavatamroḍhdrāśrīmahāśaṃvarasa-parikaramaṅdālaṃcaranavidhi* of Ratnasena, SKT ms: the National Archives of Kathmandu, reel no B24/52 (palm leaf) and no A921/3 (paper).

**Tantrasadbhāva.** The *Tantrasadbhāva*, SKT ms: the National Archives of Kathmandu, reel no A44/2 (palm leaf).


**Niṣpannayogāvalī.** The *Niṣpannayogāvalī* of Abhayākaragupta, SKT ed: Yong-Hyun Lee 2004.
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